

# Is an unbiased estimate of an unbiased estimate still unbiased?

Peter Hedman

November 22, 2015

## Abstract

Yes.

## 1 Preliminaries

We investigate whether the method proposed by Popov et al. [1] produces unbiased estimates of the rendering equation. To simplify the analysis, we apply their sampling method to the 2D integral

$$I = \int_A \int_B f(x, y) dy dx, \quad (1)$$

where (roughly speaking)  $x \in A$  corresponds to a light path and  $y \in B$  corresponds to a camera path.

To compute a Monte Carlo estimate for this integral using the method in [1], we proceed as follows:

1. Sample a light path  $y$  with the probability density function (PDF)  $p(y)$ .
2. Sample  $M$  independent and identically distributed light paths  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$ . That is, 
$$p(\mathcal{X}) = \prod_{j=1}^M p(x_j).$$
3. Select  $K$  light paths  $\{x_{\xi_1}, \dots, x_{\xi_K}\}$  from  $\mathcal{X}$  using weighted resampling with replacement. Crucially, as the probability of selecting a light path  $x_\xi$  depends on both the current set of light paths  $\mathcal{X}$  and the camera path  $y$ , we write the probability mass function (PMF) as  $p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})$ .
4. Estimate  $I$  as

$$\frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{f(x_{\xi_k}, y)}{p(x_{\xi_k})p(y)p(\xi_k|y, \mathcal{X})}. \quad (2)$$

## 2 Proof

We prove that the estimator in Equation 2 is unbiased by deriving its expected value

$$\hat{I} = E \left[ \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{f(x_{\xi_k}, y)}{p(x_{\xi_k})p(y)p(\xi_k|y, \mathcal{X})} \right] \quad (3)$$

with respect to the joint probability distribution  $p(\mathcal{X}, y, \xi) = p(\mathcal{X})p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})$ . Using the linearity of expectation, we see that

$$\hat{I} = \frac{1}{K} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^K E \left[ \frac{f(x_\xi, y)}{p(x_\xi)p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})} \right] = \frac{1}{M} E \left[ \frac{f(x_\xi, y)}{p(x_\xi)p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})} \right]. \quad (4)$$

If we expand the expectation, we get

$$\hat{I} = \frac{1}{M} \int_B \int_{A^M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \frac{f(x_\xi, y)}{p(x_\xi)p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})} p(\mathcal{X})p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X}) d\mathcal{X} dy \quad (5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \int_B \int_{A^M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \frac{f(x_\xi, y)}{p(x_\xi)p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X})} \left( \prod_{j=1}^M p(x_j) \right) p(y)p(\xi|y, \mathcal{X}) d\mathcal{X} dy \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \int_B \int_{A^M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M f(x_\xi, y) \prod_{j \neq \xi} p(x_j) d\mathcal{X} dy. \quad (7)$$

Let  $\mathcal{X}_\xi = \{x_1, \dots, x_{\xi-1}, x_{\xi+1}, \dots, x_M\}$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  that does not contain  $x_\xi$ . By rearranging the order of summation and integration, we see that

$$\hat{I} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \int_{A^{M-1}} \int_B \int_A f(x_\xi, y) \prod_{j \neq \xi} p(x_j) dx_\xi dy d\mathcal{X}_\xi \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \int_{A^{M-1}} \prod_{j \neq \xi} p(x_j) \int_B \int_A f(x_\xi, y) dx_\xi dy d\mathcal{X}_\xi. \quad (9)$$

Now, the innermost integral corresponds to our desired integral  $I$  in Equation 1. In other words,

$$\hat{I} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \int_{A^{M-1}} \prod_{j \neq \xi} p(x_j) I d\mathcal{X}_\xi \quad (10)$$

$$= I \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M \int_{A^{M-1}} \prod_{j \neq \xi} p(x_j) d\mathcal{X}_\xi \quad (11)$$

$$= I \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\xi=1}^M 1 = I. \quad (12)$$

This concludes our proof. We have successfully shown that the expected value of the estimator described in Section 1 corresponds to the value of the desired integral  $I$ .

## References

- [1] Stefan Popov, Ravi Ramamoorthi, Frédo Durand and George Drettakis. Probabilistic connections for bidirectional path tracing. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, 34(1), 2015.