

Motivation

First Consider a PDE model:

$$\begin{array}{ll} -\nabla \cdot (e^m \nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ e^m \nabla u \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3 \\ e^m \nabla u \cdot n = \beta (T_m - u) & \text{on } \Gamma_2 \\ e^m \nabla u \cdot n = s & \text{on } \Gamma_4 \end{array} \quad \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{models heat flow across a} \\ \text{conductive surface} \end{array}$$

Inverse Problems: There is some unknown parameter of interest that we seek to infer using knowledge of our governing model and data measurements y .

- inversion parameter: $m(x)$ - spatially varying log-conductivity
- auxiliary parameters: β - heat transfer coef. of medium
 $S(x)$ - boundary source term
 $f(x)$ - heat source in domain
- experimental parameters: y - data measurements
- complementary parameters: auxiliary + experimental parameters

Frequentist Perspective: Solve inverse problem to obtain an estimate of the inversion parameter m^* .

Bayesian Perspective: Solve inverse problem to obtain a posterior distribution of the inversion parameter.

HDSA: We use derivative based sensitivity analysis to determine the sensitivity of the solution of the inverse problem to perturbations of the complementary parameters.

- informs experimental priorities
 - sensor design
 - estimating auxiliary parameters
- dimension reduction for OEDUV
- insight into the inverse problem

HDSA for Bayesian Nonlinear Inverse Problems

Data Model: $y = f(m, \theta) + \eta$

- f : param-to-observable map
- θ : complementary params
- η : additive Gaussian noise, $\eta \sim N(0, \Gamma_n)$

Data likelihood: $\pi_{\text{like}}(y|m) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(f(m, \theta) - y)^T \Gamma_n^{-1} (f(m, \theta) - y)\right)$

- distribution of data y , given m

Prior Distribution: $\mu_{\text{pr}} = N(m_{\text{pr}}, C_{\text{pr}})$

- prior knowledge of m

MAP point:

$$J(m, \theta) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle Qu - y, \Gamma_n^{-1} (Qu - y) \rangle}_{\text{data likelihood}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle A(m - m_{\text{pr}}), A(m - m_{\text{pr}}) \rangle}_{\text{prior}}, \quad A = \Gamma_{\text{pr}}^{-1/2}$$
$$m_{\text{MAP}} = \underset{m}{\operatorname{argmin}} J(m, \theta)$$

Sensitivity of the MAP point:

apply implicit function theorem to J_m

results in a continuously differentiable mapping

$$F: N(\theta^*) \rightarrow N(m^*)$$

We define our sensitivity operator

$$D = \tilde{F}_{\theta}(\theta^*) = -H^{-1}B \quad \text{where}$$

$$H = J_{m,m}(m^*, \theta^*), \quad B = J_{m,\theta}(m^*, \theta^*)$$

We interpret $D\bar{\theta}$ as the sensitivity of the MAP point when the comp. params are perturbed in the direction $\bar{\theta}$.

Pointwise Sensitivity Indices: compare within parameters

$$S_k^i = \frac{\|D e_k^i\|_M}{\|e_k^i\|_\Theta}$$

Generalized Sensitivity Indices: compare across parameters

$$S_k = \max_{\Theta} \frac{\|D T_k \Theta\|_M}{\|\Theta\|_\Theta}$$

Measures of Posterior Uncertainty

Bayes Risk: approximate by sample averaging

$$\hat{\Psi}_R(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \|m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta) - m_i\|^2 \text{ where}$$

$$y_i = f(m_i, \theta) + \eta_i, \quad m_i \text{ are prior draws}$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\text{risk}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \langle m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta), m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta) \rangle - 2 \langle m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta), m_i \rangle + \langle m_i, m_i \rangle$$

$$\frac{d}{d\theta_j} \hat{\Psi}_{\text{risk}}(\theta^*) = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} 2 \langle \frac{d}{d\theta_j} m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta^*), m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta^*) \rangle - 2 \langle \frac{d}{d\theta_j} m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta^*), m_i \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} 2 \langle D_j^i, m_{\text{MAP}}(y_i, \theta^*) \rangle - 2 \langle D_j^i, m_i \rangle, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, p$$

* note that D_j^i is the j^{th} column of sens. op. D^i which depends on the i^{th} sample draw.

$$\text{let } D_j^R = \frac{d}{d\theta_j} \hat{\Psi}_{\text{risk}}(\theta^*) \text{ and } D^R = \begin{bmatrix} D_1^R \\ \vdots \\ D_p^R \end{bmatrix} = \nabla_{\theta} \hat{\Psi}_R(\theta^*), \text{ then } D^R \bar{\theta} \text{ can be}$$

interpreted as the sens. of $\hat{\Psi}_R$ wrt a perturbation of the params in the direction $\bar{\theta}$.

* Note that building D^R requires building n_s sens. op. $D^i = -H^{-1}B$, i.e. many Hessian solves.