A turning-band method for the simulation of anisotropic fractional Brownian fields [Working Paper]

Hermine Bierné, Lionel Moisan, Frédéric Richard

To cite this version:


HAL Id: hal-00741167
https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00741167
Submitted on 11 Oct 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.
A TURNING-BAND METHOD FOR THE SIMULATION OF
ANISOTROPIC FRACTIONAL BROWNIAN FIELDS.

HERMINE BIERMÉ 1,2, LIONEL MOISAN 1, AND FRÉDÉRIC RICHARD3

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we propose a method for simulating realizations of two-dimensional anisotropic fractional Brownian fields (AFBF) introduced by Bonami and Estrade (2003). The method is adapted from a generic simulation method called the turning-band method (TBM) due to Matheron (1973). The TBM reduces the problem of simulating a field in two dimensions by combining independent processes simulated on oriented bands. In the AFBF context, the simulation fields are constructed by solving an integral equation arising from the application of the TBM to non-stationary anisotropic fields. This guarantees the convergence of simulations as their precision is increased. The construction is followed by a theoretical study of the convergence rate. Another key feature of this work is the simulation of band processes. Using self-similarity properties, processes are simulated exactly on bands with a circulant embedding method, so that simulation errors are exclusively due to the field approximation. Moreover, we design a Dynamic Programming algorithm that selects band orientations achieving the optimal trade-off between computational cost and precision. Finally, we conduct a numerical study showing that the approximation error does not significantly depend on the regularity of the fields to be simulated, nor on their degree of anisotropy. Experiments also suggest that simulations preserve field statistical properties.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we address the issue of simulating realizations of a generic class of Gaussian fields, known as Anisotropic Fractional Brownian Fields (AFBF) and introduced in [9].
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These fields represent anisotropic extensions of usual fractional Brownian fields (FBF), which are themselves isotropic extensions in several dimensions of the famous fractional Brownian motion (FBM) [26, 29]. Having stationary increments, they are characterized by a variogram $v$ (see Equation (6) later) satisfying the relation

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad v(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |e^{ix \cdot \zeta} - 1|^2 f(\zeta) d\zeta$$

for a spectral density of the form

$$\forall \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad f(\zeta) = c(\text{arg}(\zeta)) \|\zeta\|^{-2h(\text{arg}(\zeta))^{-2}},$$

where $\|\zeta\|$ is the Euclidean norm of $\zeta$, arg($\zeta$) is the direction of $\zeta$, and $x \cdot \zeta$ denotes the canonical inner product on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Functions $c$ and $h$ are two $\pi$-periodic measurable functions, identified with functions defined on $(-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, with ranges satisfying $c((-\pi/2, \pi/2]) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and $h((-\pi/2, \pi/2]) \subset (0, 1)$. When functions $c$ and $h$ are both constant ($c \equiv C > 0$ and $h \equiv H$), the obtained field corresponds to a FBF of order $H$.

The simulation of AFBF is an open issue whose complexity is mainly due to both the non-stationarity and the anisotropy of the fields. In [41], Stein described a specific method for the simulation of (isotropic) FBF. This method is based on a representation of the FBF by a locally stationary isotropic Gaussian field, which is simulated using circulant embedding matrix techniques developed in [42]. This simulation is exact and efficient on a regular grid. However, no locally stationary representation is available for general anisotropic fields so that Stein’s method cannot be extended to this situation. More generic methods based on covariance matrix factorizations [11, 12] can theoretically be applied to the AFBF simulation issue, but their computational cost is prohibitive and covariance functions are not known explicitly in the general case. Other methods based on the discretization of a continuous spectral representation of the field were used for the simulation of FBF in [38] and AFBF in [3, 7]. However, due to truncation or periodization of the spectral representation, the statistical properties of the simulated field do not exactly match those of the theoretical field.
In this paper, we focus on another generic simulation method, called the turning-band method (TBM) [25, 32]. The TBM essentially reduces the problem of simulating a field in several dimensions to the problem of simulating several processes in one dimension. Indeed, consider the problem of generating a realization of a target field \( X \) on a discrete set \( G \) of points of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Choose \( n \) lines (called turning bands) passing through a given origin and denote by \( \theta_i \) the angle indicating the direction of the \( i \)th band. The TBM is based on a combination of \( n \) appropriate processes \( (Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \) independently simulated on each predefined band:

\[
\forall x \in G, \quad X_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\lambda_i} Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i)),
\]

where the \( \lambda_i \)'s are positive weights and \( u(\theta) = (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)) \) is the unit vector with direction \( \theta \). There are two major issues raised by the TBM. The first one consists of determining appropriate weights \( \lambda_i \) and band processes \( Y_i \) which ensure the convergence of the turning-band field \( X_n \) to the target field \( X \) as \( n \) tends to infinity. The second one concerns the simulation of the processes \( Y_i \) on the non-equispaced points \( \{x \cdot u(\theta_i), x \in G\} \).

The convergence issue has been extensively studied in the case when the target field is stationary [10, 15, 17, 23, 24, 30, 32]. In this case, the convergence can be obtained using stationary band processes. Let \( \tilde{C}_\theta \) be the covariance of a band process in the direction \( \theta \). Take orientations \( (\theta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \) uniformly distributed over \( (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \), and set \( \lambda_i = \frac{\pi}{n} \). Then, the covariance of \( X_n \) at point \( x \) is \( C_n(x) = \frac{\pi}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{C}_\theta(x \cdot u(\theta_i)) \) and, as a Riemann sum, it converges to \( T(\tilde{C})(x) = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \tilde{C}_\theta(x \cdot u(\theta))d\theta \) as \( n \) tends to infinity. Hence, for the turning-band field \( X_n \) to converge to a target field \( X \) of covariance \( C_X \), it suffices that \( \tilde{C} \) satisfies the condition \( T(\tilde{C}) \equiv C_X \). In the special case when the target field is isotropic, \( \tilde{C}_\theta \equiv \tilde{C}_0 \) does not depend on \( \theta \), and the previous condition reduces to \( T(C_0) \equiv C_X \).

This integral equation was solved explicitly for many different types of covariance \( C_X \) (Gaussian, Whittle-Matrern, Cauchy, etc.), making possible to apply the TBM to a wide range of stationary isotropic fields [10, 15, 17, 23, 24, 28]. In the anisotropic case, the
equation was solved from spectral representations of covariances by expressing spectral densities of processes as a function of the one of the target field [30].

The TBM can also be adapted to the simulation of non-stationary fields with stationary increments. In such a situation, the convergence of the turning-band field to the target one is rather expressed in terms of variograms. It can be obtained by taking band processes with stationary increments and variograms \( \tilde{v}_\theta \) (in the direction \( \theta \)) which satisfy the condition

\[
v_X(x) = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \tilde{v}_\theta (y \cdot u(\theta)) d\theta,
\]

where \( v_X \) is the variogram of the target field (see Equation (6) later). In [45], the previous integral equation was solved in the particular case when \( v_X \) is the variogram of an (isotropic) FBF of order \( H \). It was shown that variograms \( v_\theta \) do not depend on \( \theta \) and are proportional to the variogram of a one-dimensional FBM of the same order \( H \). In [20], this result was extended to other non-stationary isotropic Gaussian fields with spline generalized covariance. Similar ideas can be found in [19, 31, 34] about the simulation of the so-called intrinsic random fields of order \( k \) generalizing fields with stationary increments [13, 32]. However, none of these works directly addressed the issue of simulating non-stationary anisotropic fields. In [39, 43], some attempts were made for the simulation of such fields with a TBM, but they only cover a few special cases. Let us also emphasize that the simulated fields are not Gaussian, so that Gaussian realizations may only be approximated by averaging several independent realizations and applying a Central Limit Theorem.

One of the main originalities of this paper is the construction of appropriate turning-band fields for the simulation of AFBF, which are themselves centered Gaussian random fields with stationary increments. This is done by solving Equation (4) when \( v_X \) is defined by Equations (1) and (2). This construction is completed by an analysis of the simulation error from both theoretical and numerical viewpoints. This study brings new insights into
the TBM simulation error, which had been mainly investigated in the stationary isotropic case [14, 24, 31].

In the construction of turning-band fields for AFBF, we show that band processes are one-dimensional FBMs with varying Hurst indices. Hence, the application of the TBM to AFBF directly leads to the issue of simulating these processes on non-uniformly spaced points. In the context of TBM application, Yin [45] simulated FBMs using an adaptation of the spectral method [31, 33, 40]. Based on a discretization of the spectral density of the process covariance, this method induces periodization effects and is inaccurate for mainly two reasons: the simulated process is not Gaussian and its covariance function only approximates the target one. In [20, 21], periodization effects induced by Fourier methods were overcome using a continuous spectral method. This method is fast and can be applied with arbitrary simulation points. However, it does not produce Gaussian realizations neither. In another context, Perrin et al. [35] developed a circulant embedding method (see [18, 42] and Section 3.1) for the simulation of FBF. This method is fast and exact but requires equispaced simulation points. However, as shown in this paper, the issue of simulating FBM on band points can be reexpressed on equispaced points using self-similarity properties of FBM, as soon as bands or orientations are conveniently chosen. Hence, we can apply the circulant embedding method to obtain exact simulations of FBM on band points but the cost of these simulations depends on band orientations, and is higher than the one of the continuous spectral method in [20, 21]. To reduce the global computational cost, we thus propose a Dynamic Programming [4] algorithm that selects band orientations in an optimal way.

2. Turning-band method

2.1. Anisotropic fractional Brownian fields. Let \((\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})\) be a probability space. A 2-dimensional random field \(X\) is a map from \(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^2\) into \(\mathbb{R}\) such that \(X(\cdot, y) := X(y)\) is a real random variable on \(\Omega\) for all \(y \in \mathbb{R}^2\). A random field is Gaussian if any finite linear combination of its associated random variables is a Gaussian variable. A centered
Gaussian field $X$ is characterized by its covariance function: $(y, z) \mapsto \text{Cov}(X(y), X(z))$. A field $X$ has stationary increments if the law governing the field $X(\cdot + z) - X(z)$ is the same as $X(\cdot) - X(0)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

When the field $X$ is centered and with stationary increments, we have

$$
\forall y, z \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \text{Cov}(X(y), X(z)) = v_X(y) + v_X(z) - v_X(y - z),
$$

where $v_X$ is the so-called variogram of $X$ defined as

$$
\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad v_X(y) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}((X(y) - X(0))^2).
$$

Hence, if the field $X$ is also Gaussian, its law is characterized by its variogram (6).

In this work, we deal with anisotropic fractional Brownian fields, which are centered Gaussian fields with stationary increments, characterized by a variogram of the form (1) with a spectral density defined as in Equation (2). When $c \equiv C > 0$ and $h \equiv H \in (0, 1)$ are both constant, the variogram satisfies (see Remark 1.1.13 of [27] for instance)

$$
v(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |e^{ix \cdot \zeta} - 1|^2 \|\zeta\|^{-2H-d} d\xi = C \frac{\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} \Gamma(H + 1/2) \gamma(H)}{2\Gamma(H + 1)} \|x\|^{2H},
$$

where for all $H \in (0, 1)$,

$$
\gamma(H) = \frac{\pi}{H \Gamma(2H) \sin(H\pi)}.
$$

It follows that such fields are isotropic, which means that their law is invariant under rotation. They are also $H$-self-similar. When the function $c$ is not constant but $h \equiv H$ remains constant, the field remains self-similar of order $H$ but becomes anisotropic. When $h$ is also allowed to vary, the field is not self-similar anymore but, setting $H = \text{essinf}_{\theta \in S^{d-1}, c(\theta) > 0} h(\theta)$, one can still find a continuous modification of $X$ with $H$ as critical Hölder exponent [9]. The fractal dimension of its graph is still linked with $H$ by the relation $D = 2 - H$ a.s. (see [44] for instance).

In general, it is difficult to get an explicit form of the AFBF variogram similar to the one expressed for the FBF in Equation (7). However, we have computed explicitly the variogram of a particular class of AFBF which is slightly more general than the FBF.
This field, that we call elementary field, is defined by a spectral density of the form (2) with \( c = 1_{[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]} \) for \(-\pi/2 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \pi/2\), and \( h \equiv H \) for \( H \in (0, 1) \). When \( \alpha_2 = -\alpha_1 = \pi/2 \), an elementary field corresponds to a FBF of order \( H \). As explained in Section 4, elementary fields will be of particular interest for the numerical evaluation of simulations.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let \( H \in (0, 1) \) and \(-\pi/2 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \pi/2\). Let denote \( v_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2} \) the variogram of an AFBF with \( h = H \) and \( c = 1_{[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]} \). Then,

\[
\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad v_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2}(x) = 2^{2H-1} \gamma(H) C_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2}(\arg(x)) \|x\|^{2H},
\]

where \( \|x\| \) is the Euclidean norm of \( x \) and \( C_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2} \) is a \( \pi \)-periodic function defined on \((-\pi/2, \pi/2)\) by

\[
C_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2}(\theta) = \begin{cases} 
\beta_H \left( \frac{1 - \sin(\alpha_2 - \theta)}{2} \right) + \beta_H \left( \frac{1 - \sin(\alpha_1 - \theta)}{2} \right) & \text{if } \alpha_1 \leq \theta + \pi/2 \leq \alpha_2 \\
\beta_H \left( \frac{1 + \sin(\alpha_2 - \theta)}{2} \right) + \beta_H \left( \frac{1 + \sin(\alpha_1 - \theta)}{2} \right) & \text{if } \alpha_1 \leq \theta - \pi/2 \leq \alpha_2 \\
\left| \beta_H \left( \frac{1 - \sin(\alpha_2 - \theta)}{2} \right) - \beta_H \left( \frac{1 - \sin(\alpha_1 - \theta)}{2} \right) \right| & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

with \( \beta_H \) the Beta incomplete function given by

\[
\forall t \in [0, 1], \quad \beta_H(t) = \int_0^t u^{H-1/2}(1 - u)^{H-1/2} du,
\]

and \( \gamma(H) \) is defined in Equation (8).

The proof of this proposition is given in appendix A. Now, let us consider the general case from which the TBM will follow.

2.2. **Turning-band fields for AFBF.** By a change of variables in polar coordinates, we derive an integral expression for the variogram of an AFBF.

**Proposition 2.2.** Let \( X \) be a centered Gaussian field with stationary increments. Let us assume that its variogram \( v_X \) is of the form (1) with a spectral density defined by (2) with \( c \) and \( h \) two \( \pi \)-periodic measurable functions with ranges satisfying \( c((-\pi/2, \pi/2]) \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \).
and \( h((-\pi/2, \pi/2]) \subset (0, 1) \). Then, for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \)

\[
\nu_X(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) |x \cdot u(\theta)|^{2h(\theta)} d\theta,
\]

where \( u(\theta) = (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)) \) and \( \gamma(H) \) is defined in Equation (8).

**Proof.** Let \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). Then according to (1) and (2),

\[
2\nu_X(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |e^{ix \cdot \zeta} - 1|^2 c(\arg(\zeta)) \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \frac{1}{|\zeta|^{2h(\arg(\zeta)) - 2}} d\zeta
\]

\[
= \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} |e^{i\tau x \cdot u(\theta)} - 1|^2 c(\theta) \frac{1}{r} r^{-2h(\theta)} dr d\theta,
\]

by a change of variables in polar coordinates. But, for \( H \in (0, 1) \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\int_0^{+\infty} |e^{i\tau r} - 1|^2 r^{-2H-1} dr = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |e^{ist} - 1|^2 |s|^{-2H-1} ds = \frac{1}{2} \gamma(H) |t|^{2H},
\]

according to (7.2.13) of [37]. Then the result follows by \( \pi \)-periodicity of \( h \) and \( c \). \( \square \)

The integral equation (10) is of the form (4) with \( \tilde{\nu}_\theta(\cdot) = \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) \frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^{2h(\theta)} \). This means that \( \tilde{\nu}_\theta \) is a solution of the integral equation (4) when \( \nu_X \) is the variogram of an AFBF. Now recall that a FBM of order \( H \) is a centered Gaussian process with stationary increments and variogram \( w_H(t) = \frac{1}{2} |t|^{2H} \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). Hence, ignoring the factor \( \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) \) depending on the orientation \( \theta \), the variogram \( \tilde{\nu}_\theta \) is equal to the one of a FBM of order \( h(\theta) \), also varying with \( \theta \).

According to previous remarks, we now specify turning-band fields for AFBF simulations. Given an ordered set \( \Theta = (\theta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \) of band orientations \(-\pi/2 \leq \theta_1 < \ldots < \theta_n \leq \pi/2 \), and a set \( \Lambda = (\lambda_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in [0, +\infty)^n \) of appropriate band weights, turning-band fields have the form

\[
X_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\lambda_i} \gamma(h(\theta_i)) c(\theta_i) Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i)), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2,
\]

where the \( Y_i \)'s are \( n \) independent FBM of order \( h(\theta_i) \). In the remaining of the text, turning-band fields \( X_{\Theta, \Lambda} \) will be called the simulation fields and processes \( Y_i \) will always
be FBF of order $h(\theta_i)$. We will also describe the precision of simulation fields $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ using the variable

$$
\varepsilon_{\Theta} = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n+1} (\theta_i - \theta_{i-1}) , \text{ with } n = |\Theta|,
$$

and $\theta_0 \in [-\pi/2, \theta_1]$ and $\theta_{n+1} \in [\theta_n, \pi/2]$ are fixed directions chosen according to the AFBF function $c$. Remark that a uniform choice for the orientations consists in choosing $\theta_n = \theta_{n+1} = \pi/2$ and $\theta_i = -\pi/2 + i\pi/n$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. This choice leads to $\varepsilon_{\Theta} = \frac{\pi}{n}$ while, for general orientations, we always have $\varepsilon_{\Theta} \geq \frac{\theta_n - \theta_0}{n} \geq \frac{\theta_n - \theta_1}{n}$.

The error of simulating $X$ by $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ may be expressed, at point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, as the Kolmogorov distance between the random variables $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)$ and $X(x)$, that is,

$$
d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x), X(x)) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x) \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(X(x) \leq t)|.
$$

When this distance tends to 0, it implies that the random variable $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)$ tends to $X(x)$ in distribution. As stated next, due to our Gaussian framework, this distance can be further bounded by a distance between variograms of simulation and target fields at $x$.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ be a simulation field defined as in Equation (11). Then, $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ is a centered Gaussian random field on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with stationary increments and variogram

$$
v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \gamma(h(\theta_i)) c(\theta_i) w_{h(\theta_i)}(x \cdot u(\theta_i)).
$$

Moreover, $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(0) = X(0) = 0$ a.s. and, for all $x \neq 0$,

$$
d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x), X(x)) \leq 2 \frac{|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)|}{v_X(x)}.
$$

Choosing $(\Theta_n, \Lambda_n)_n$ in such a way that $v_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x) \to v_X(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$(X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} \xrightarrow{fdd}_{n \to +\infty} (X(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2},$$

where $fdd$ stands for convergence of finite dimensional distributions.

**Proof.** Let us write $X_{\theta_i}(x) := Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i))$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, with $Y_i$ a FBM of order $h(\theta_i)$. First, remark that $X_{\theta_i}(0) = Y_i(0) = 0$ a.s. Moreover, since $Y_i$ is a centered Gaussian random...
process it is clear that $X_{\theta_i}$ is a centered Gaussian random field on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Finally, since $Y_i$ has stationary increments, for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, writing $t_{0,i} = x_0 \cdot u(\theta_i) \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\{X_{\theta_i}(x + x_0) - X_{\theta_i}(x_0); x \in \mathbb{R}^2\} = \{Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i) + t_{0,i}) - Y_i(t_{0,i}); x \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$$

$$\overset{fdd}{=} \{Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i)) - Y_i(0); x \in \mathbb{R}^2\},$$

$$\overset{fdd}{=} \{X_{\theta_i}(x) - X_{\theta_i}(0); x \in \mathbb{R}^2\}.$$

It follows that $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ is a centered Gaussian random field on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with stationary increments as a sum of independent centered Gaussian random fields on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with stationary increments fields. Since $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(0) = 0$ a.s.,

$$v_{X_{\Theta,\Lambda}}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} (X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)^2) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)),$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \gamma(h(\theta_i))c(\theta_i)\text{Var}(Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i))), \text{ by independence},$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \gamma(h(\theta_i))c(\theta_i)|x \cdot u(\theta_i)|^{2h(\theta_i)} = v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x).$$

Let $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, then for $x \neq 0$,

$$d_{Kol}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x), X(x)) = d_{Kol}(\sqrt{v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)N}, \sqrt{v_X(x)N}).$$

Then (15) follows from the fact that $d_{Kol}(\sigma'N, \sigma N) \leq 2\frac{|\sigma' - \sigma|}{\sigma}$, already remarked in [6]. Actually, there is nothing to prove when $\frac{|\sigma' - \sigma|}{\sigma} > \frac{1}{2}$. Otherwise we use the fact that for $\sigma > 1$ and $z > 0$ one has $\mathbb{P}(z < N \leq \sigma z) \leq (\sigma - 1)ze^{-z^2/2} \leq \sigma^2 - 1$.

Now, let assume that $(\Theta_n, \Lambda_n)$ is such that $v_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x) \xrightarrow{n \to +\infty} v_X(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. By stationarity of the increments, for all $n \geq 1$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\text{Cov}(X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x), X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(y)) = v_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x) + v_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(y) - v_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x - y),$$

and similarly for $\text{Cov}(X(x), X(y))$ and $v_X$. It follows that $\text{Cov}(X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x), X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(y))$ tends to $\text{Cov}(X(x), X(y))$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Using a Cramér-Wold device, this implies that the field $(X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}$ converges to $(X(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}$, for finite dimensional distributions. □
Let us quote that, since \( v_\Theta, \Lambda \) appears as a numerical approximation of the integral giving \( v_X \), one can choose \( (\Theta_n, \Lambda_n)_n \) in such a way that \( v_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x) \) tends to \( v(x) \) for \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). This implies that \( d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x), X(x)) \to 0 \) so that \( X_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x) \) tends to \( X(x) \) in distribution. Note that conversely, since \( X_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x) \) and \( X(x) \) are centered Gaussian variables, \( v_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x) \) tends to \( v(x) \) as soon as \( X_{\Theta_n, \Lambda_n}(x) \) tends to \( X(x) \) in distribution. The next section is devoted to the rate of convergence.

2.3. Approximation error. We can choose \( \Theta, \Lambda \) such that the following uniform bounds hold for approximation of elementary fields.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \( c \) and \( h \) be two \( \pi \)-periodic measurable functions defined on \( (-\pi/2, \pi/2] \) by \( h = H \) for some \( H \in (0,1) \) and \( c = 1_{[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]} \) for \( -\pi/2 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \pi/2 \). Let \( \Theta = (\theta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \) with \( \alpha_1 \leq \theta_1 < \ldots < \theta_n \leq \alpha_2 \) and \( \theta_0 = \alpha_1 \), \( \theta_{n+1} = \alpha_2 \). Choose \( \Lambda \) as

\[
\lambda_1 = \theta_2 - \theta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i = \theta_{i+1} - \theta_i \quad \text{for} \quad 2 \leq i \leq n.
\]

Then, one can find a positive constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( \Theta, \Lambda \), such that for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \),

\[
d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x), X_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2}(x)) \leq C \varepsilon_{\Theta}^{\min(2H,1)},
\]

where the precision parameter \( \varepsilon_{\Theta} \) is defined in Equation (12).

Moreover, when choosing

\[
\lambda_1 = (\theta_1 - \theta_0) + \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}, \quad \lambda_n = (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) + \frac{\theta_n - \theta_{n-1}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i = \frac{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-1,
\]

one can find a positive constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( \Theta, \Lambda \), such that for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \),

\[
d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x), X_{H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2}(x)) \leq C \begin{cases} 
(\varepsilon_{\Theta}^2 \delta_{\Theta}^{-2\min(2H,1)} + \varepsilon_{\Theta}^{1+\min(2H,1)}) & \text{if } H \neq 1/2, \\
(\varepsilon_{\Theta}^3 \delta_{\Theta}^{-1} |\log(\delta_{\Theta})| + \varepsilon_{\Theta}^2) & \text{if } H = 1/2
\end{cases}
\]

with \( \delta_{\Theta} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i) \).
The proof of Proposition 2.4 is postponed to Appendix B. In [22], the authors also propose a TBM to synthesize isotropic FBF (case $\alpha_1 = -\pi/2$ and $\alpha_2 = \pi/2$) in general dimension $d \geq 2$. However, the processes simulated on the bands are not Gaussian so that the Kolmogorov distance between the simulated random variable and $X_{H,-\pi/2,\pi/2}(x)$ is bounded by the Berry Esseen bound given by $n^{-1/2}$, with $n$ the number of bands, (see Equation (27) in [22]). Moreover, in their case this distance also depends on the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let us compare with our results. Note that when orientations are chosen uniformly one has $\varepsilon_\Theta = \delta_\Theta = \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{n}$ so that, choosing a rectangular rule, we obtain in (17) a bound given by $n^{-\min(2H,1)}$, while for a trapezoidal rule, we obtain in (19) a bound given by $n^{-1-\min(2H,1)}$ when $H \neq 1/2$ and $n^{-2}\log(n)$ when $H = 1/2$. Moreover let us emphasize that our bounds do not depend on $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. This could be generalized to other self-similar AFBF ($h \equiv H$) under regularity assumptions on $c$. In the general case, our bounds depend on $x$ through the term $1/v_X(x)$. However, we obtain uniform bounds for the difference $|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)|$ when $x$ is in a compact set, as stated in the next proposition.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let assume that $h$ and $c$ are piecewise $C^1$ on $(-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. Let $\Theta = (\theta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ with $-\pi/2 \leq \theta_1 < \ldots < \theta_n \leq \pi/2$ containing the singular points of $h$ and $c$ and $\theta_0 = -\pi/2$, $\theta_{n+1} = \pi/2$. Let $T$ be a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, one can find $\Lambda = (\lambda_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in [0, +\infty)^n$ and a positive constant $C_T > 0$, independent of $\Theta, \Lambda$, such that for all $x \in T$,

\[
|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)| \leq C_T \varepsilon_\Theta^{\min(2H,1)},
\]

where $H = \min_{\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]} h(\theta) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_\Theta$ is defined in Equation (12). If moreover, $h$ and $c$ are piecewise $C^2$ on $(-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, one can find $\Lambda = (\lambda_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in [0, +\infty)^n$ and a positive constant $C_T > 0$, independent of $\Theta, \Lambda$, such that for all $x \in T$,

\[
|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)| \leq C_T \begin{cases} 
\left( \varepsilon_\Theta^{2} \delta_\Theta^{-2+\min(2H,1)} + \varepsilon_\Theta^{1+\min(2H,1)} \right) & \text{if } H \neq 1/2, \\
\left( \varepsilon_\Theta^{2} \delta_\Theta^{-1} \log(\delta_\Theta) + \varepsilon_\Theta^{2} \right) & \text{if } H = 1/2
\end{cases}
\]
with \( \delta_{\Theta} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i) \).

The proof of Proposition 2.5 is postponed to Appendix B. A bound for the Kolmogorov distance is then obtained using the fact that \( d_{\text{Kol}}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x), X(x)) \leq 2 \frac{|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)|}{v_X(x)} \). Then we may choose an increasing sequence of \((\Theta_n)_n\) and choose \((\Lambda_n)_n\) as given in Proposition 2.5. Therefore, if \( \varepsilon_{\Theta_n} \to 0 \), the sequence of random fields \((X_{\Theta_n,\Lambda_n}(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}\) converges to \((X(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2}\), for finite dimensional distributions in view of Theorem 2.3. The next section is devoted to the simulation of the band processes.

3. Fast and exact simulation on bands

3.1. Simulation of 1D fractional Brownian motions. Several methods for the synthesis of 1D fractional Brownian motions have been proposed in the literature. Most of them are approximate procedures. However, considering equispaced points on the band one can get exact simulations using the circulant embedding method [18]. Let us briefly recall this procedure. Let \( H \in (0,1) \) and \( B_H \) a fractional Brownian motion. We consider \( Z_H = (B_H(t+1) - B_H(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \), the fractional Gaussian noise that is a stationary process with covariance function given by

\[
\text{Cov}(Z_H(t), Z_H(s)) = r_H(|t - s|) \text{ with } r_H(t) = \frac{1}{2}(|t + 1|^{2H} - 2|t|^{2H} + |t - 1|^{2H}).
\]

Let \( l \geq 1 \), then the vector \((Z_H(0), \ldots, Z_H(l-1))\) is a centered Gaussian vector of size \( l \) with Toeplitz covariance matrix \( R_H(l) = (r_H(|i - j|))_{0 \leq i,j \leq l-1} \). One can embed \( R_H(l) \) in a circulant matrix of size \( 2l \) given by \( S_H(l) = \text{circ}(s_H(l)) \) with \( s_H(l) = (r_H(0), \ldots, r_H(l-1), r_H(l-2), \ldots, r_H(1)) \). The main interesting property of circulant matrices is that they are diagonalized in the discrete Fourier basis, with their eigenvalues given by the Discrete Fourier Transform of their first row. In particular one has

\[
S_H(l) = \frac{1}{2l} F_{2l}^* \text{diag}(F_{2l}s_H(l))F_{2l}, \text{ where } F_{2l} = (e^{ikj\pi/l})_{0 \leq i,j \leq 2l-1}.
\]
The main results of [35] is that for all \( H \in (0, 1) \) and \( l \geq 1 \), \( F_{2l}S_H(l) \) always has positive entries, so that \( S_H(l) \) is a covariance matrix. Moreover, if \( \varepsilon_{2l}^{(1)} \) and \( \varepsilon_{2l}^{(2)} \) are independent vectors of law \( \mathcal{N}(0, I_{2l}) \) the vectors \( Z^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2l}} \Re \left( F_{2l}^* \text{diag}(F_{2l}S_H(l))^{1/2}(\varepsilon_{2l}^{(1)} + i\varepsilon_{2l}^{(2)}) \right) \) and \( Z^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2l}} \Im \left( F_{2l}^* \text{diag}(F_{2l}S_H(l))^{1/2}(\varepsilon_{2l}^{(1)} + i\varepsilon_{2l}^{(2)}) \right) \) are independent with common law \( \mathcal{N}(0, S_H(l)) \). In particular, one has \( (Z_H(0), \ldots, Z_H(l-1)) \overset{d}{=} (Z_0^{(i)}, \ldots, Z_{l-1}^{(i)}) \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) and using stationarity of the increments of \( B_H \) and the fact that \( B_H(0) = 0 \) a.s., one has, for all \( m \leq l \),

\[
(B_H(k))_{-m \leq k \leq l-m} = \left( \sum_{j< k+m} Z_H(j) - \sum_{j < m} Z_H(j) \right)_{-m \leq k \leq l-m},
\]

with the convention that \( \sum_{j<0} = 0 \). Let us emphasize that this procedure is very fast since, choosing \( l \) as a power of 2, the cost is reduced to \( O(l \log(l)) \) using the Fast Fourier Transform algorithm.

3.2. Choice of bands. We consider the exact simulation of \( X_{\Theta, \Lambda} \) on the discrete grid \( r^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap [0,1]^2 \) for some \( r \geq 1 \). Then for any \( i \) with \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) we have to simulate on each band of direction \( u(\theta_i) \)

\[
\{ Y_i(x \cdot u(\theta_i)) ; x \in r^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap [0,1]^2 \} = \left\{ Y_i \left( \frac{k_1}{r} \cos(\theta_i) + \frac{k_2}{r} \sin(\theta_i) \right) ; 0 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r \right\}.
\]

Note that when \( \theta_i = \pi/2 \) we can simply use the fact that \( \{ Y_i \left( \frac{k_2}{r} \right) ; 0 \leq k_2 \leq r \} \overset{d}{=} r^{-h(\theta_i)} \{ Y_i (k_2) ; 0 \leq k_2 \leq r \} \), by self-similarity. When \( \cos(\theta_i) \neq 0 \) we may choose \( \theta_i \) such that \( \tan \theta_i = \frac{p_i}{q_i} \), with \( p_i \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( q_i \in \mathbb{N} \) and use that fact that

\[
\left\{ Y_i \left( \frac{k_1}{r} \cos(\theta_i) + \frac{k_2}{r} \sin(\theta_i) \right) ; 0 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r \right\} \overset{d}{=} \left( \frac{\cos(\theta_i)}{rq_i} \right)^{h(\theta_i)} \{ Y_i (k_1 q_i + k_2 p_i) ; 0 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r \}.
\]

Thus, the band with direction \( u(\theta_i) \) involves the simulation of a 1D fractionnal Brownian motion on a discrete interval of length \( r(|p_i| + q_i) \). The computational cost of this simulation is \( O(C(|p_i| + q_i)) \), where \( O(C(l)) \) is the computational cost of the Fourier Transform
used in the procedure described in Section 3.1 to simulate a 1D fractional Brownian motion on the discrete interval \( \{0, \ldots, rl\} \). If the Fast Fourier Transform with powers of two is used, then one has\( C(l) = 2^{[\log_2(rl)]} [\log_2(rl)] \), where \([x]\) denotes the upper integer part of \( x \). Finally, the overall simulation process has to find a trade-off between the computational cost
\[
C(\Theta) = \sum_i C(|p_i| + q_i)
\]
and the precision of the simulation, which is controlled by \( E(\Theta) = \varepsilon^{\min(2H,1)} \). The optimal choice of \( \Theta \) is discussed in the following section.

3.3. Band selection by Dynamic Programming. As we just saw in the previous section, we need to restrain our choice of band orientations to angles \( \theta \) that correspond to vectors \( (q,p) \) with integer coordinates, that is, such that \( \tan \theta = \frac{q}{p} \). Moreover, in order to control the total computational cost, we would like to favor small factors (small values of \(|p| + q|\)) while controlling the repartition of bands in order to keep \( \varepsilon_\Theta \) small. A simple (but non-optimal) solution to select the set of angles \( \Theta = (\theta_i) \), consists in using a uniform discretization \( \hat{\theta}_i = \alpha_1 + \frac{i}{n}(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) \), then choosing for each \( i \) a rational approximation \( \frac{p_i}{q_i} \) of \( \tan \hat{\theta}_i \) (this can be done very efficiently using the appropriate convergent of the continued fraction associated to \( \tan \hat{\theta}_i \)). However, as we shall see now, one can find a simple algorithm, based on Dynamic Programming [4], that is able to select a set of angles \( \Theta \) that minimizes the computational cost \( C(\Theta) \) under the error control constraint \( \varepsilon_\Theta \leq \varepsilon \). In practice, we restrain our choice to angles that can be written under the form \( \theta = \angle(q,p) \), where \( (p,q) \) belongs to
\[
\mathcal{V}_N = \{(p,q); -N \leq p \leq N, 1 \leq q \leq N, \gcd(p,q) = 1, \alpha_1 < \angle(q,p) < \alpha_2\}
\]
and \( \angle(q,p) \) is the measure in \( [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}] \) of the angle of the vector \( (q,p) \), obtained by \( \angle(q,p) = \arctan \frac{p}{q} \). The integer \( N \) should be chosen large enough to ensure that the optimal solution only involves vectors from \( \mathcal{V}_N \). It seems that choosing \( N = 1 + \lceil \frac{1}{\tan \varepsilon} \rceil \) (so that \( \angle(N,1) < \varepsilon \)) is enough, though we do not have a proof of this (even if this were
not true, the algorithm we present here would yield slightly sub-optimal sets of bands, with little practical consequences).

Now assume that the set \( \mathcal{V}_N \) has been sorted into a sequence \((p_k, q_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}\) such that the associated angular sequence \( \theta_k = \angle(q_k, p_k) \) is increasing. Writing \( e_k = C(r(|p_k| + q_k)) \) the elementary cost associated to a band with orientation \( \theta_k \), we can rewrite the total computational cost of a set of angles \( \Theta = (\theta_{i_k})_{1 \leq k \leq s} \) as

\[
C(\Theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{s} e_{i_k}.
\]

We add the convention that \( \theta_{n+1} = \alpha_2 \) and \( \theta_0 = \alpha_1 \) (with the associated elementary cost \( e_0 = 0 \)). Now, for \( 0 \leq i \leq n+1 \), let us call \( c_i \) the minimal cost that can be realized with a sequence \( i_1 = i, i_2, \ldots i_s = n + 1 \) for some integer \( s \). Then, \( c_0 \) is the optimal cost we look for, and for all \( 0 \leq i \leq n \) we have

\[
(22) \quad c_i = e_i + \min_{j: j > i, \theta_j \leq \theta_i + \varepsilon} c_j.
\]

This induction formula (called Bellman Equation in the framework of Dynamic Programming) permits us to compute the optimal costs \( c_n, c_{n-1}, \ldots c_0 \) recursively (the initialization being made with \( c_{n+1} = 0 \)). Moreover, each time the minimum in (22) is computed, we consider one optimal index

\[
k_i \in \arg \min_{j: j > i, \theta_j \leq \theta_i + \varepsilon} c_j,
\]

then an optimal sequence \( i_1, i_2, \ldots i_s \) can be computed by tracking back indexes that achieve the optimal cost \( c_0 \). This sequence is given by

\[
i_1 = k_0, i_2 = k_{i_1}, \ldots i_s = k_{i_{s-1}},
\]

where the value of \( s \) is obtained using the fact that \( i_{s+1} = n + 1 \). In the end, the desired sequence of integer vectors is simply \((\bar{p}_k, \bar{q}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq s}\), where \((\bar{p}_k, \bar{q}_k) = (p_{i_k}, q_{i_k})\) for all \( 1 \leq k \leq s \). The whole procedure we just described is given in pseudo-code in Algorithm 1 of Appendix C.
Figure 1. Comparison of an approximate uniform sampling of turning bands and their selection by dynamic programming.

4. Numerical Study

This section is devoted to the numerical evaluation of anisotropic fractional Brownian field (AFBF) simulations obtained by turning bands.

Let us recall some notations. The field $X$ is the theoretical field to be simulated (AFBF). Its variogram $v_X$ is of the form (1) with a spectral density defined by (2). The field $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ is the turning-band simulation field defined by Equation (11) for some sets $\Theta$ and $\Lambda$ giving band orientations and weights, respectively. The variogram $v_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ of $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ is defined by Equation (14).

In all experiments, the set $\Theta$ of band orientations was computed automatically using the Dynamic Programming algorithm described in Section C with a constraint on field precision. The precision parameter $\varepsilon_{\Theta}$ associated to the set $\Theta$ is defined as in Equation (12). Weights $\lambda_i$ of $\Lambda$ are defined to fulfill the condition (16) of Proposition 2.4.
4.1. The use of elementary fields. Our evaluation was focused on elementary fields whose spectral density is given by Equation (2) taking $h \equiv H$ for some $H \in (0,1)$ and $c = 1_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}$ for some $0 < \alpha \leq \pi/2$.

Elementary fields are specified by only two parameters, $H$ and $\alpha$, which can be interpreted as regularity and anisotropy parameters, respectively. The Hölder regularity of these fields being equal to $H$ (see [9] for instance), it increases as $H$ tends to 1. When $\alpha = \pi/2$, elementary fields correspond to usual isotropic fractional Brownian fields of Hurst index $H$. When $0 < \alpha < \pi/2$, these fields are no longer isotropic. In this case, they are some kind of fractional Brownian fields whose non-null frequency components are restricted between frequency directions $-\alpha$ and $\alpha$. As $\alpha$ decreases to 0, non-null field frequency components become more and more focused around the horizontal direction.
On Figure 2, some elementary field realizations are shown for illustrating both the effect of increasing $H$ on the field regularity and the effect of decreasing $\alpha$ on its anisotropy. For the evaluation, we considered elementary fields of varying degrees of regularity and anisotropy, taking all parameter pairs $(H, \alpha)$ for $H$ in $\{0.2, 0.5, 0.8\}$ and $\alpha$ in $\{\pi/6, \pi/3, \pi/2\}$.

Let us further mention that variograms of elementary fields can be computed using the closed form given in Equation (9). As it will appear next, this is of particular interest for the computation of evaluation criteria. On Figure 3, some of these variograms are presented for different degrees of regularity and anisotropy.
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**Figure 3.** Variograms on $[0, 1]^2$ of elementary fields for different values of $H$ and $\alpha$.

Finally, let us notice that any anisotropic fractional Brownian field whose spectral density is defined with piecewise constant functions $h$ and $c$ can be decomposed as a
sum of independent elementary fields. Hence, although achieved on elementary fields, our evaluation accounts for more general anisotropic fractional Brownian fields.

4.2. **Approximation error.** As mentioned in Section 2.3, simulation errors result from the distance separating simulation and theoretical fields. This distance can be defined as the Kolmogorov distance between distributions of theoretical and simulation fields at each position \( x \). As stated in Theorem 2.3 (Equation (15)), the Kolmogorov distance is further bounded by

\[
d_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x) = \frac{|v_X(x) - v_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x)|}{v_X(x)}
\]

which is proportional to the error made when approximating the variogram of \( X \) by the one of \( X_{\Theta, \Lambda} \). Moreover, when \( X \) is an elementary field, it is possible to compute the bound \( d_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x) \) using closed forms of \( v_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x) \) and \( v_X(x) \) given by Equations (14) and (9), respectively. Hence, using elementary fields, we could numerically evaluate a simulation error by averaging values of \( d_{\Theta, \Lambda}(x) \) over points \( x \) of a uniform subgrid of \([0, 1]^2\):

\[
d_{\Theta, \Lambda} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} d_{\Theta, \Lambda}\left(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p}\right) = \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \frac{|v_X(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p}) - v_{\Theta, \Lambda}(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p})|}{v_X(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p})}, \quad \text{with } p = 64.
\]

As this is evidenced by Equation (17) of Proposition 2.4, the measured error \( d_{\Theta, \Lambda} \) depends on the precision parameter \( \varepsilon_\Theta \) of the simulation field. Figure 4 illustrates the effect of increasing \( \varepsilon_\Theta \) (i.e. reducing the simulation precision) on simulations of a fractional Brownian field of Hurst index \( H = 0.2 \). When the precision becomes too low \( (\varepsilon_\Theta \geq 0.25) \), field realizations have some stripes in different directions, and simulation field variograms present some singularities on lines radiating from the origin. This well-known effect, often called artifact banding in the literature [24, 31, 21, 20], is due to the fact that the contribution of a band process \( Y_i \) to the sum defining the simulation field (see Equation (11)) is null for points on the line orthogonal to the band direction \( \theta_i \) and passing through origin.

On Figure 5, we plotted values of error bounds \( d_{\Theta, \Lambda} \) obtained for different elementary fields as a function of the precision parameter \( \varepsilon_\Theta \). Whatever the field parameters, error bounds varied almost linearly with respect to \( \varepsilon_\Theta \). They did not seem to depend on the regularity parameter \( H \). However, they were slightly dependent on the anisotropy.
Figure 4. Effect of reducing the field precision on simulations of a fractional Brownian field of Hurst index $H = 0.2$. On the first row, realizations of simulation fields $X_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ of decreasing precision and, on the second row, corresponding variograms: (1) $\varepsilon_{\Theta} = 0.04 \ (n = 103)$, (2) $\varepsilon_{\Theta} = 0.077 \ (n = 51)$, (3) $\varepsilon_{\Theta} = 0.25 \ (n = 15)$ and (4) $\varepsilon_{\Theta} = 0.464 \ (n = 7)$.

parameter $\alpha$, especially at low precision ($\varepsilon_{\Theta} > 0.03$). Error bounds of all fields fell below 1% when $\varepsilon_{\Theta} < 0.02$, such a precision being reached with around 150 simulation bands.

4.3. Estimation error. We also conducted numerical experiments to evaluate errors which arise when estimating field features (e.g. parameters, variograms) from field simulations.

Applying the TBM (with 1321 bands on a $64 \times 64$ grid of $[0, 1]^2$), we simulated 2000 independent realizations $\{y^{(k)}, k = 1, \ldots, 2000\}$ of a given elementary field $X$ of variogram $v_X$. Given $k \in \{1, \ldots, 2000\}$, we then computed the empirical variogram $v^{(K)}(x)$ at position $x$ using the $K$ first samples:

$$v^{(K)}(x) = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (y^{(k)}(x))^2.$$
Figure 5. Variations of the error bound $d_{\Theta,\Lambda}$ relative to the precision parameter $\varepsilon_\Theta$ for elementary fields with different values of $H$ and $\alpha$: (1) $H = 0.2$, (2) $H = 0.5$, (3) $H = 0.8$.

Finally, we computed an estimation error $d^{(K)}(x) = \frac{|v_X(x) - v^{(K)}(x)|}{v_X(x)}$ at point $x$, and its average over points $x$ of the grid

$$d^{(K)} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} d^{(K)} \left( \frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p} \right) = \sum_{k,l=1}^{p} \frac{|v_X(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p}) - v^{(K)}(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p})|}{v_X(\frac{k}{p}, \frac{l}{p})}, \text{ with } p = 64.\quad(24)$$

On Figure 6, some empirical variograms $v^{(K)}$ estimated from simulations of a fractional Brownian field of Hurst index $H = 0.2$ are compared to the theoretical variogram $v_X$ of $X$. This illustrates both the convergence of empirical variograms to the theoretical one as $K$ tends to $+\infty$, and estimation errors due to the lack of samples.

On Figure 7, we plotted the estimation error $d^{(K)}$ as a function of the sample number $K$ for different elementary fields. For a same value of the regularity parameter $H$, the convergence of the error to zero is about the same for all values of the anisotropy parameter $\alpha$. However, the convergence gets slower and slower as $H$ increases. In all cases, around 1000 samples are required for the error to get below 5%.

Besides, we built a statistical test to check the adequacy of simulations to the model. For any position $x$, let $Y^{(1)}(x), \ldots, Y^{(K)}(x)$ be independent and identically distributed
Figure 6. Effect of increasing the number of samples on simulations of a fractional Brownian field of Hurst index $H = 0.2$ (simulations were done with 1321 bands on a $64 \times 64$ grid of $[0,1]^2$): Empirical variograms $v^{(K)}$ computed with (1) $K = 60$, (2) $K = 1000$, (3) $K = 2000$ samples, and (4) theoretical variogram.

Figure 7. Variations of the estimation error relative to the number $K$ of samples for elementary fields with different values of $H$ and $\alpha$: (1) $H = 0.2$, (2) $H = 0.5$, (3) $H = 0.8$.

random variables, and $\mathcal{H}_0^x$ be the hypothesis that their distribution is the same as the one of $X(x)$, i.e. a centered gaussian distribution with variance $2v_X(x)$. For testing $\mathcal{H}_0^x$, we define the rejection interval \( \{ D^{(K)}(x) > c \} \), where the statistic \( D^{(K)}(x) = \frac{|V^{(K)}(x)-v_X(x)|}{v_X(x)} \) with \( V^{(K)}(x) = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (Y^{(k)}(x))^2 \). Under assumption $\mathcal{H}_0^x$, $K^{V^{(K)}(x)}/v_X(x)$ has a $\chi^2$ distribution.
of degree $K$. Hence, under $H_0^x$, the probability of the rejection interval can be computed, and the rejection bound $c$ can be set according to a level of test. Given a realization $d^{(k)}(x)$ of $D^{(K)}(x)$, it also possible to evaluate the p-value $p^{(K)}(x)$ of the test (i.e. the minimal risk of rejecting $H_0^x$) as

$$p^{(K)}(x) = 1 - P(Z^{(K)} < K(d^{(k)}(x) + 1)) + P(Z^{(K)} < K(-d^{(k)}(x) + 1)),$$

where $Z^{(K)}$ is a $\chi^2_K$ random variable.

To evaluate the simulation-to-model adequacy, we computed for different $K$ the average $p^{(K)}$ of p-values $p^{(K)}(x)$ at positions $x$ of the $64 \times 64$ grid of $[0,1]^2$. On Figure 8, the mean p-values are plotted as a function of the sample number $K$. Whatever the value of parameters $H$ and $\alpha$, mean p-values are all above 0.3, indicating that hypotheses $H_0^x$ of adequacy are not rejected at low risks. Besides, the mean p-values seems to reach an upper bound which is below 1 (around 0.5). This is probably due to both the approximation error and estimator inaccuracy.
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5. Discussion

We have constructed turning-band fields suited to the simulation of AFBF. This construction is based on the resolution of an integral equation specific to the non-stationary anisotropic context of AFBF. This ensures the convergence of simulation fields to target fields as the precision increases. Moreover, the band processes involved in the definition of simulation fields are simulated exactly using a circulant embedding method. Hence, errors produced by the simulation method are exclusively due to the approximation of the target field by the simulation field. This approximation error was evaluated theoretically and numerically. From a numerical point of view, we observed that it does not depend significantly on the regularity of target fields, nor on their degree of anisotropy. Experiments have also suggested that simulations preserve the statistical properties of the target field. Besides, we obtained good simulation results with few bands (around 150) at a low computational cost.

The evaluation was achieved on some elementary fields. However, simulation possibilities offered by the TBM go far beyond those fields, as there is a large choice of parameter definitions and tunings. Using the TBM, it chiefly becomes possible to visualize truthfully realizations of different anisotropic field models studied in the literature [9, 6, 16, 36]. In the generic model defined by Equation (2), we recall that the field anisotropy is introduced through two direction-dependent and π-periodic functions: the Hurst index function $h$ and the topothesy function $c$. So as to illustrate the effect of varying these parameter functions, we considered three functions of increasing regularity:

- a discontinuous function $g_1$: for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in (0, 1)$, $g_1(\omega) = \mu_1$ if $\omega \in (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$ and $g_1(\omega) = \mu_2$ if $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$,

- a continuous but not differentiable function $g_2$: for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in (0, 1)$, $g_2(0) = \mu_1$, $g_2(-\pi/2) = g(\pi/2) = \mu_2$, and $g_2$ is piecewise linear on $(-\pi/2, 0)$ and $(0, \pi/2)$.

- an infinitely differentiable function $g_3$: $g_3(\omega) = \mu_1 r(\omega) + \mu_2 (1 - r(\omega))$ with $r(\omega) = (1 + \sin(2\omega + \pi/2))/2$ for $\omega \in [0, \pi/2]$, and $g_3(\omega) = g_3(-\omega)$ for $\omega \in [-\pi/2, 0]$. 

Fixing the topography function to a constant \((c \equiv 1)\), we first simulated field realizations with Hurst index functions \(h = g_i\) for \(i = 1, 2, 3\) and different pairs of parameter values \((\mu_1, \mu_2)\); results are shown on Figure 9. In these realizations, the degree of anisotropy can be measured as the difference \(\mu_2 - \mu_1\) between maximal and minimal Hurst indices. It is the same for realizations of the first and second columns \((\mu_2 - \mu_1 = 0.3)\), and higher for those of the third column \((\mu_2 - \mu_1 = 0.5)\). Moreover, the Hölder regularity of those realizations is equal to \(\mu_1\). It is the same for realizations of the first and third columns \((\mu = 0.2)\) and higher for those of the second column \((\mu = 0.5)\). Comparing realizations on a same row, we clearly see the effect of anisotropy and regularity variations on field textures: as the field regularity decreases, the texture gets rougher, and, as the field anisotropy increases, texture patterns get more obviously oriented. Besides, comparing realizations on a same column, we can observe texture differences induced by changing the regularity of the Hurst index function \(h\) in the model. In particular, realizations obtained with a discontinuous function \(h\) (on the first row) have some linear patterns which are not present on those obtained with a more regular function \(h\) (on the second and third rows).

Fixing the Hurst index function to a constant \((h \equiv 0.5)\), we also simulated field realizations with topography functions \(c = g_i\) for \(i = 1, 2, 3\) and different pairs of parameter values \((\mu_1, \mu_2)\); results are shown on Figure 10. In these realizations, the degree of anisotropy can be defined as the difference \(\mu_2 - \mu_1\) between maximal and minimal topography values. From a column to the next one, it is increased, while the field regularity remains the same for all realizations \((H = 0.2)\). As it can be observed by comparing realizations on a same row, variations of the anisotropy degree cannot be visually detected on textures. However, comparing realizations on a same column, we can notice that the regularity of the topography function has an effect on the field texture. As previously, some line patterns are present on textures when the topography function is discontinuous.

In the simulations we presented, field realizations were generated on a regular subgrid of \([0, 1]^2\). Using our TBM approach, it is however possible to simulate fields on other sets of non-uniformly spaced positions. To do so, the only condition is that position coordinates
Figure 9. Field realizations obtained with different Hurst index functions $h$. For all realizations, the topography function $c \equiv 1$. On the first, second and third rows, Hurst index functions are $h = g_1$ (discontinuous), $h = g_2$ (continuous but not differentiable), and $h = g_3$ (infinitely differentiable), respectively. On the first, second and third columns, Hurst index functions are specified by parameter pair values $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (0.2, 0.5)$, $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (0.5, 0.8)$, and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (0.2, 0.8)$, respectively.

are all rational; this is required for the exact simulation of fractional Brownian motions on turning bands (refer to Section 3.1). The pseudo-polar grid is an example of a set of points satisfying this simulation condition [1]. Such a grid is of particular interest for computing discrete Radon transforms [2], as its points are uniformly spread on different lines radiating from the origin. But Radon transforms are one of the key features for the construction of parameter estimators for AFBF [7, 36]. Hence, those estimators could be better discretized and evaluated using simulations on a pseudo-polar grid.
Figure 10. Field realizations obtained with different topothesy functions. For all realizations, the Hurst index function $h \equiv 0.2$. On the first, second and third rows, topothesy functions are $c = g_1$ (discontinuous), $c = g_2$ (continuous but not differentiable), and $c = g_3$ (infinitely differentiable), respectively. On the first, second and third columns, topothesy functions are specified by parameter pair values $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (1, 5)$, $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (1, 100)$, and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (1, 1000)$, respectively.

Due to the ability of the TBM to simulate fields on quasi-arbitrary points, it also becomes possible to simulate field deformations. For instance, let $A$ be the $2 \times 2$-matrix of an affine transform (with rational components) and $\tilde{X} = X \circ A$ the deformation of the random field $X$ by the affine transform $A$. Realization of $\tilde{X}$ on a uniform grid $G$ of $[0, 1]^2$ can be obtained by applying the TBM to the simulation of $X$ on $\{Ax, x \in G\}$. Figure 11 presents an illustration corresponding to the deformation of a fractional Brownian field of
Hurst index $H = 0.5$ by a shear in the horizontal direction, that is, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This example also shows that deforming isotropic fields is a means to construct anisotropic fields.

Figure 11. Shear of a fractional Brownian field of Hurst index 0.5.

Simulation is a central issue concerning the investigation of anisotropic fields. As shown previously, a simulation technique such as the TBM can serve as a tool for visualizing mathematical properties of anisotropic models under study. From an application viewpoint, it can also help assessing the similarity between model realizations and real-world images. Besides, having reliable simulations is critical for the evaluation of model parameter estimators. In future works, we plan to use TBM simulations of AFBF to evaluate the estimators we constructed using quadratic variations [7, 36]. We also intend to use those simulations to refine the adequacy between models and radiographic images we analyze for the characterization of osteoporosis and breast cancer [5, 8, 36].
Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 2.1

Proof. According to Proposition 2.2, for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \),

\[
v_{H,\alpha_1,\alpha_2}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) |x \cdot u(\theta)|^{2\alpha} d\theta
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \gamma(H) \|x\|^{2H} \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} |\cos(\theta - \arg(x))|^{2H} d\theta.
\]

We will use the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) with \(-\pi/2 \leq a < b \leq \pi/2\), then

\[
\int_a^b |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = 2^{2H} \left( \beta_H \left( \frac{1 + \sin(b)}{2} \right) - \beta_H \left( \frac{1 + \sin(a)}{2} \right) \right).
\]

Proof. Since we assume that \(-\pi/2 \leq a < b \leq \pi/2\),

\[
\int_a^b |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = \int_a^b (1 - \sin(\theta)^2)^{H-1/2} \cos(\theta) d\theta
\]

\[
= \int_{\sin(a)}^{\sin(b)} (1 - u^2)^{H-1/2} d\theta,
\]

by the change of variables \( u = \sin(\theta) \). Then, by the change of variables \( v = \frac{1+u}{2} \), we obtain

\[
\int_a^b |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = 2^{2H} \int_{\frac{1+\sin(a)}{2}}^{\frac{1+\sin(b)}{2}} (1 - v)^{H-1/2} v^{H-1/2} dv,
\]

which gives the result. \( \square \)

This allows us to get the next result, which concludes the proof.

Corollary A.2. Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( 0 \leq b - a \leq \pi \), then

\[
\int_a^b |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = 2^{2H} \begin{cases} 
\frac{\beta_H (\frac{1+\sin(b)}{2}) - \beta_H (\frac{1+\sin(a)}{2})}{2} & \text{if } (a, b) \cap \frac{\pi}{2} + \mathbb{Z}\pi = \emptyset \\
\beta_H (\frac{1+\sin(b)}{2}) + \beta_H (\frac{1+\sin(a)}{2}) & \text{if } (a, b) \cap -\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\mathbb{Z}\pi \neq \emptyset \\
\beta_H (\frac{1-\sin(b)}{2}) + \beta_H (\frac{1-\sin(a)}{2}) & \text{if } (a, b) \cap \frac{\pi}{2} + 2\mathbb{Z}\pi \neq \emptyset
\end{cases}
\]
Proof. We first assume that \((a, b) \cap \frac{\pi}{2} + \mathbb{Z}\pi = \emptyset\). Since \(0 \leq b - a \leq \pi\), one can find \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\) such that \(-\pi/2 \leq a + k\pi < b + k\pi \leq \pi/2\). The result follows from Lemma A.1 when \(k\) is even. When \(k\) is odd,

\[
\int_{a}^{b} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = \int_{a + k\pi}^{b + k\pi} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = 2^{2H} \left( \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 - \sin(b)}{2} \right) - \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 - \sin(a)}{2} \right) \right),
\]

according to Lemma A.1. Note that by a change of variables, for all \(\theta \in \mathbb{R}\)

\[
(25) \quad \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 - \sin(\theta)}{2} \right) = \beta_{H}(1) - \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 + \sin(\theta)}{2} \right)
\]

and the result follows.

Let assume that \(-\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\mathbb{Z}\pi \neq \emptyset\). Then, one can find \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\) such that \(a + 2k\pi < -\pi/2 < b + 2k\pi\), and according to Lemma A.1,

\[
\int_{a}^{b} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta = \int_{a + 2k\pi}^{b + 2k\pi} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta
\]

\[
= \int_{a + 2k\pi}^{-\pi/2} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta + \int_{\pi/2}^{b + 2k\pi} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta
\]

\[
= \int_{a + 2k\pi}^{-\pi/2} |\cos(\theta)|^{2H} d\theta + 2^{2H} \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 + \sin(b)}{2} \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{2H} \left( \beta_{H}(1) - \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 + \sin(a + \pi)}{2} \right) + \beta_{H} \left( \frac{1 + \sin(b)}{2} \right) \right),
\]

which concludes this case using (25). The last case is similar.

\[\Box\]

**Appendix B. Proofs of section 2.3**

**Proof of Proposition 2.4.** Note that \(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(0) = X_{H,a_{1},a_{2}}(0) = 0\) a.s. so that \(d_{Kol}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(0), X_{H,a_{1},a_{2}}(0)) = 0\). Let \(x \in \mathbb{R}^{2}\) with \(x \neq 0\). Then, the error of approximation is bounded by

\[
v_{H,a_{1},a_{2}}(x) - v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x)
v_{H,a_{1},a_{2}}(x),
\]

with \(v_{H,a_{1},a_{2}}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma(H) ||x||^{2H} \int_{a_{1}}^{a_{2}} |\cos(\theta - \arg(x))|^{2H} d\theta\) and

\[
v_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma(H) ||x||^{2H} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} |\cos(\theta_{i} - \arg(x))|^{2H}.
\]
First let us remark that since $\theta' \mapsto |\cos(\theta-\theta')|^{2H}$ is continuous, non negative and non identically equal to 0 one can find $c_1 > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} |\cos(\theta - \text{arg}(x))|^{2H} d\theta \geq c_1$. It follows that

$$d_{Kol}(X_{\Theta,\Lambda}(x), X_{H,\alpha_1,\alpha_2}(x)) \leq c_1(\int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} |\cos(\theta - \text{arg}(x))|^{2H} d\theta - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i |\cos(\theta_i - \text{arg}(x))|^{2H}).$$

Now, let us write

$$g_x(\theta) = |\cos(\theta - \text{arg}(x))|^{2H},$$

and remark that

$$|g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta')| \leq 2|\theta - \theta'|^{\min(2H,1)} \text{ for all } \theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{R},$$

using the fact that $||t|^{2H} - |t'|^{2H}| \leq 2|t - t'|^{\min(2H,1)}$ for all $t, t' \in [-1, 1]$. It follows that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for $0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \left( g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta_i) \right) d\theta \leq c_2 (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)^1 \min(1, 2H).$$

Then, choosing $\lambda_1 = \theta_2 - \theta_0$ and $\lambda_i = \theta_{i+1} - \theta_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, one has

$$\left| \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} g_x(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i g_x(\theta_i) \right| \leq c_2 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)^{\min(1, 2H)}.$$

Moreover $g_x$ is of class $C^2$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\text{arg}(x) - \pi/2 + \pi\mathbb{Z}\}$ with

$$|g_x''(\theta)| \leq c_3 |\cos(\theta - \text{arg}(x))|^{2H-2}, \text{ for all } \theta \notin \{\text{arg}(x) - \pi/2 + \pi\mathbb{Z}\},$$

for some $c_3 > 0$ (non depending on $x$). According to the trapezoidal rule, when $[\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}] \cap \{\text{arg}(x) - \pi/2 + \pi\mathbb{Z}\} = \emptyset$,

$$\left| \int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \left( g_x(\theta) - \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} \right) d\theta \right| \leq \sup_{\theta \in [\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}]} |g_x''(\theta)| \frac{(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)^3}{12}.$$

Note also that using (27) one always has

$$\left| \int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \left( g_x(\theta) - \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} \right) d\theta \right| \leq c_2 (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)^{1 \min(1, 2H)}.$$
For sake of simplicity let us consider the case where \( \arg(x) = \pi/2 \) such that \(-\pi/2 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \theta - \arg(x) + \pi/2 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \pi/2 \) and

\[
|\cos(\theta - \arg(x))| \geq \frac{2}{\pi} |\theta - \arg(x) + \pi/2| = \frac{2}{\pi} |\theta|.
\]

If \( \theta_{n+1} \leq 0 \) we set \( m = n + 1 \), if \( \theta_0 > 0 \) we set \( m = 0 \) and otherwise we choose \( m \in \{0, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( \theta_m \leq 0 < \theta_{m+1} \). Then, according to (29), since \( 2H - 2 < 0 \), for \( i > m + 2 \),

\[
\sup_{\theta \in [\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}]} |g_x''(\theta)| \leq c_3 \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{2H-2} \theta_i^{2H-2} \leq c_3 \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{2H-2} \frac{1}{\theta_{i-1} - \theta_i} \int_{\theta_{i-1}}^{\theta_i} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta,
\]

with, when \( m < n - 3 \),

\[
\sum_{i=m+3}^{n-1} \int_{\theta_{i-1}}^{\theta_i} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta = \int_{\theta_{m+2}}^{\theta_n} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta \leq c_4 \begin{cases} (\theta_{m+2} - \theta_{m+1})^{-1+\min(2H,1)} & \text{if } H \neq 1/2 \\ |\log(\theta_{m+2} - \theta_{m+1})| & \text{if } H = 1/2 \end{cases},
\]

for some constants \( c_3, c_4 > 0 \). While for \( i < m - 1 \) one has

\[
\sup_{\theta \in [\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}]} |g_x''(\theta)| \leq c_3 \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{2H-2} \frac{1}{\theta_{i+2} - \theta_{i+1}} \int_{\theta_{i+1}}^{\theta_{i+2}} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta,
\]

with, when \( m > 3 \),

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \int_{\theta_{i-1}}^{\theta_i} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta = \int_{\theta_{m-2}}^{\theta_{m-1}} \theta^{2H-2} d\theta \leq c_5 \begin{cases} (\theta_{m-1} - \theta_{m-2})^{-1+\min(2H,1)} & \text{if } H \neq 1/2 \\ |\log((\theta_{m-1} - \theta_{m-2}))| & \text{if } H = 1/2 \end{cases},
\]

for some constant \( c_5 > 0 \). Let us choose \( \lambda_1 = (\theta_1 - \theta_0) + \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2} \), \( \lambda_n = (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) + \frac{\theta_n - \theta_{n-1}}{2} \) and \( \lambda_i = \frac{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i}{2} \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). Then, let us remark that for \( 2 \leq i \leq n - 1 \) one has

\[
\lambda_i = \frac{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i}{2} + \frac{\theta_i - \theta_{i+1}}{2}.
\]

Therefore

\[
\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \lambda_i g_x(\theta_i) = \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \frac{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i}{2} g_x(\theta_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i}{2} g_x(\theta_{i+1})
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i) \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} + \frac{\theta_n - \theta_{n-1}}{2} g_x(\theta_{n-1}) + \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2} g_x(\theta_2).
\]
It follows that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i g_x(\theta_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i) \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} + (\theta_1 - \theta_0) g_x(\theta_1) + (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) g_x(\theta_n)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} d\theta + \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta_1} g_x(\theta_1) d\theta + \int_{\theta_n}^{\theta_{n+1}} g_x(\theta_n) d\theta.
\]

Then,
\[
\left| \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} g_x(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i g_x(\theta_i) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left| \int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \frac{g_x(\theta_i) + g_x(\theta_{i+1})}{2} d\theta \right| + \left| \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta_1} g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta_1) d\theta \right| + \left| \int_{\theta_n}^{\theta_{n+1}} g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta_n) d\theta \right|
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} + \sum_{i=m+3}^{n-1} + \sum_{i=m-1}^{m+2} + \left| \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta_1} g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta_1) d\theta \right| + \left| \int_{\theta_n}^{\theta_{n+1}} g_x(\theta) - g_x(\theta_n) d\theta \right|,
\]
which gives the result using (30) with (32) and (33) for the two first sums and using (28) and (31) for the other terms. The general case where \( \text{arg}(x) \neq \pi/2 \) can be computed similarly.

\[\square\]

**Proof of Proposition 2.5.** The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.4, considering
\[
g_x(\theta) = \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) |x \cdot u(\theta)|^{2h(\theta)} = \gamma(h(\theta)) c(\theta) \|x\|^{2h(\theta)} \cos(\text{arg}(x))^{2h(\theta)}.
\]

Instead of \( g_x(\theta) \) given by (26). Note that when \( h \) and \( c \) are assumed of class \( C^l \) (\( l = 1 \) or \( 2 \)) on \([\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \subset [-\pi/2, \pi/2] \), one can find \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( x \in T \),
\[
|\tilde{g}_x(\theta) - \tilde{g}_x(\theta')| \leq C|\theta - \theta'|^{\min(2H(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), 1)}, \text{ for all } \theta, \theta' \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2],
\]
and when \( l = 2 \),
\[
|\tilde{g}_x''(\theta)| \leq C|\cos(\text{arg}(x))|^{2H(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) - 2}, \text{ for all } \theta \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \text{ with } \theta \notin \text{arg}(x) - \pi/2 + \pi\mathbb{Z},
\]
where \( H(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \min_{\theta \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]} h(\theta) \). These estimates allow to proceed as in the proof of Proposition 2.4. The result follows by summing the integrals over which the functions \( h \) and \( c \) are regular using the fact that \( H \leq H(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \) for all \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \). \[\square\]
APPENDIX C. OPTIMAL BAND SELECTION
input: α₁, α₂, defining the considered angular interval
ε: the maximum angular distance between two adjacent bands
r: resolution parameter (the sampling step is 1/r)

output: a finite sequence of integer vectors (pₖ, qₖ)₁≤k≤ₙ

1 N ← 1 + ⌈1/tan ε⌉
2 Build the set V of all integer vectors (q, p) ∈ {1, ..., N} × {−N, ..., N} such that gcd(p, q) = 1 and α₁ < ∠(q, p) < α₂
3 Sort V into a sequence (pₖ, qₖ)₁≤k≤ₙ with k ↦ θₖ := ∠(qₖ, kₖ) increasing
4 Compute the angle θₖ := ∠(qₖ, pₖ) and the cost eₖ associated to each (qₖ, pₖ)
5 Add extremal angles: θ₀ ← α₁ (e₀ ← 0) and θₙ₊₁ ← α₂
6 cₙ₊₁ ← 0
7 for i = n, n − 1, . . . , 0 do
8     cmin ← ∞
9     j ← i + 1
10    while j ≤ n + 1 and θ_j ≤ θ_i + ε do
11       if c_j ≤ cmin then
12           cmin ← c_j
13           k_i ← j
14       end
15       j ← j + 1
16    end
17    c_i ← e_i + cmin
18  end
19  i ← 0
20  s ← 1
21  while i ≤ n do
22     i ← k_i
23     (pₙ, qₙ) ← (p_i, q_i)
24     s ← s + 1
25  end
26 return (pₖ, qₖ)₁≤k≤ₙ
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