

# Computation of $\log(\Phi(z))$ For Large Negative $z$

Andrew Schein\*  
Senior Algorithms Engineer  
Adobe Systems Incorporated  
aschein@adobe.com

April 4, 2012

We first detour into the erfc function:

$$\operatorname{erfc}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-t^2} dt \quad (1)$$

for which we have convenient asymptotic expansion<sup>1</sup>:

$$\operatorname{erfc}(x) = \frac{e^{-x^2}}{x\sqrt{\pi}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n-1)!!}{(2x^2)^n} + O(x^{-2N+1}e^{-x^2}) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Now we exploit the identity:

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc}\left(-\frac{z}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \quad (3)$$

and by substituting the asymptotic expansion for erfc:

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{-z\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n-1)!!}{(z^2)^n} + O(z^{-2N+1}e^{-z^2/2}) \right] \quad (4)$$

$$= \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{-z\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n-1)!!}{(z^2)^n} \right] + O(z^{-2N+2}) \quad (5)$$

$$= [\text{LHS}] * [\text{RHS}] + \text{error}. \quad (6)$$

In these equations, we drop the big-O portions that do not depend on  $N$ , since we need the approximation to work even more moderate  $z$  such as  $-10$ . We can control accuracy by bounding  $z$  and using a sufficiently large  $N$  to ensure a residual summation that falls below the machine-specific epsilon (`DBL_EPSILON` in C). Finally, we use the symbols LHS (left hand side) and RHS (right hand side) to highlight the multiplication which we will transform into a log of sums in what follows.

Now we can finally focus on the function of interest:  $\log(\Phi(z))$ . Taking the log we have:

$$\log(\Phi(z)) \simeq \left( -\frac{z * z}{2} - \log(-z) - \frac{\log(2\pi)}{2} \right) + \log \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-1)^n \frac{(2n-1)!!}{(z^2)^n} \right]. \quad (7)$$

---

\*Special thanks to Charles Blake for pointing me towards some useful links.

<sup>1</sup>[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Error\\_function](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Error_function)

# 1 Validation of the Method: Modest values of $z$

In order to evaluate the method, we first explore  $z$  in the range  $-120 \dots 0$  to determine if it produces similar values to R's implementation. Below is a small test program utilizing our patch.

```
import math, numpy as np
from scipy.stats import norm
import rpy2.robjects as robjects
__r_pnorm = robjects.r['pnorm']
norm = norm()

def test(x) :
    py = norm.logcdf(x)
    r = __r_pnorm(x,log_p=True)[0]
    print "%10.2f %10.2f %10.2f" %(x, py, r)

print "%10s %10s %10s"%("z", "our_method", "R_method")
for i in range(0,120,4) :
    test(-i)
```

The output follows.

```
aschein@aschein-dev:logcdf$ python temp.py
   z our_method  R_method
  0.00    -0.69   -0.69
 -4.00   -10.36  -10.36
 -8.00   -35.01  -35.01
-12.00   -75.40  -75.41
-16.00  -131.69 -131.70
-20.00  -203.91 -203.92
-24.00  -292.10 -292.10
-28.00  -396.25 -396.25
-32.00  -516.38 -516.39
-36.00  -652.50 -652.50
-40.00  -804.61 -804.61
-44.00  -972.70 -972.70
-48.00 -1156.79 -1156.79
-52.00 -1356.87 -1356.87
-56.00 -1572.94 -1572.94
-60.00 -1805.01 -1805.01
-64.00 -2053.08 -2053.08
-68.00 -2317.14 -2317.14
-72.00 -2597.20 -2597.20
-76.00 -2893.25 -2893.25
-80.00 -3205.30 -3205.30
-84.00 -3533.35 -3533.35
-88.00 -3877.40 -3877.40
-92.00 -4237.44 -4237.44
-96.00 -4613.48 -4613.48
-100.00 -5005.52 -5005.52
-104.00 -5413.56 -5413.56
-108.00 -5837.60 -5837.60
-112.00 -6277.64 -6277.64
```

```
-116.00 -6733.67 -6733.67
aschein@aschein-dev:logcdf$
```

The numbers look identical.

## 2 Validation of Method: Range of Acceptable Values

A separate test explored the maximum  $-z$  for which we can produce a result from this function:

```
aschein@aschein-dev:logcdf$ python range.py
      z our_method R_method
-1.00e+00 -1.84e+00 -1.84e+00
-2.00e+00 -3.78e+00 -3.78e+00
-8.00e+00 -3.50e+01 -3.50e+01
-1.28e+02 -8.20e+03 -8.20e+03
-3.28e+04 -5.37e+08 -5.37e+08
-2.15e+09 -2.31e+18 -2.31e+18
-9.22e+18 -4.25e+37 -4.25e+37
-1.70e+38 -1.45e+76 -1.45e+76
-5.79e+76 -1.68e+153 -1.68e+153
-6.70e+153 -2.25e+307 -2.25e+307
Warning: overflow encountered in log_ndtr
-8.99e+307 -inf -inf
-inf -inf -inf
```

We can conclude that both our patch and R share similar ranges for acceptable inputs.