Numerical Analysis of Hierarchical Gaussian Process Regression

Aretha Teckentrup

School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh Alan Turing Institute, London

> Joint work with: Andrew Stuart (Caltech)

SIAM UQ '18 - April 17, 2018



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH School of Mathematics

The Alan Turing Institute

Outline

Gaussian Process Regression





- Gaussian process emulators (also known as *kriging*) can be viewed as a Bayesian version of interpolation.
- We are given f at design points $D_N = \{u^n\}_{n=1}^N$, obtaining function values $\{f(u^n)\}_{n=1}^N$.

- Gaussian process emulators (also known as *kriging*) can be viewed as a Bayesian version of interpolation.
- We are given f at design points $D_N = \{u^n\}_{n=1}^N$, obtaining function values $\{f(u^n)\}_{n=1}^N$.
- We interpolate f by a random function f_N , where f_N is conditioned such that $f_N(u^n) \equiv f(u^n)$, for n = 1, ..., N.
- Choosing the distribution of f_N as a Gaussian process, we obtain a Gaussian process emulator.
- The distribution of f_N is chosen to reflect the smoothness and typical length scales of f.

Simple Derivation [Rasmussen, Williams '06]

• We assign a prior probability distribution to f: a Gaussian process on $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$, with mean $m : U \to \mathbb{R}$ and covariance kernel $k : U \times U \to \mathbb{R}$:

 $f \sim \mathsf{GP}(m(u), k(u, u'))$

For every $u \in U$, f(u) is a Gaussian random variable with $\mathbb{E}(f(u)) = m(u)$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{ov}(f(u), f(u')) = k(u, u')$.

Simple Derivation [Rasmussen, Williams '06]

• We assign a prior probability distribution to f: a Gaussian process on $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$, with mean $m : U \to \mathbb{R}$ and covariance kernel $k : U \times U \to \mathbb{R}$:

 $f \sim \mathsf{GP}(m(u), k(u, u'))$

For every $u \in U$, f(u) is a Gaussian random variable with $\mathbb{E}(f(u)) = m(u)$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{ov}(f(u), f(u')) = k(u, u')$.

• Conditioning the prior on the given function values $\{f(u^n)\}_{n=1}^N$ leads to the posterior distribution $f_N \sim GP(m_N^f(u), k_N(u, u'))$, with

$$m_N^f(u) = m(u) + k_*(u)^T K_*^{-1}(f_* - m_*),$$

$$k_N(u, u') = k(u, u') - k_*(u)^T K_*^{-1} k_*(u'),$$

and $(k_{\ast}(u))_{n}=k(u,u^{n}), (K_{\ast})_{nm}=k(u^{n},u^{m}), \ (f_{\ast})_{n}=f(u^{n})$ and $(m_{\ast})_{n}=m(u^{n}).$

Approximation properties

• We have
$$m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$$
 and $k_N(u^n, u^n) = 0$, for $n = 1, ..., N$.
 $\Rightarrow f_N(u^n) \equiv m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$, for $n = 1, ..., N$.

Approximation properties

- We have $m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$ and $k_N(u^n, u^n) = 0$, for n = 1, ..., N. $\Rightarrow f_N(u^n) \equiv m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$, for n = 1, ..., N.
- The predictive mean m_N^f is an interpolant of f, and the emulator f_N is a random interpolant of f, reflecting the uncertainty in f away from the design points D_N .

Approximation properties

- We have $m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$ and $k_N(u^n, u^n) = 0$, for n = 1, ..., N. $\Rightarrow f_N(u^n) \equiv m_N^f(u^n) = f(u^n)$, for n = 1, ..., N.
- The predictive mean m_N^f is an interpolant of f, and the emulator f_N is a random interpolant of f, reflecting the uncertainty in f away from the design points D_N .
- Under certain regularity assumptions on the design points D_N and the functions f and f_N , we have

$$||f - m_N^f||_{L^2(U)} \to 0, \quad \text{and} \quad ||k_N^{\frac{1}{2}}||_{L^2(U)} \to 0,$$

as $N \to \infty$.

Choice of mean and covariance kernel

• The mean function m is typically chosen as a polynomial: $m(u) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\beta_q}{\beta_q} \, p_q(u).$

Choice of mean and covariance kernel

- The mean function m is typically chosen as a polynomial: $m(u) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\beta_q}{\beta_q} \, p_q(u).$
- Covariance kernels frequently used are
 - the family of Matèrn covariances

$$k_{\mathrm{Mat}}(u,u') = \frac{\sigma^2}{\Gamma(\nu)2^{\nu-1}} \left(\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right)^{\nu} B_{\nu}\left(\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right),$$

with smoothness parameter $\nu > 0$, marginal variance $\sigma^2 > 0$ and correlation length $\lambda > 0$.

$$\nu = 1/2 : \sigma^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right), \nu = \infty : \exp\left(-\frac{\|u-u'\|^2}{\lambda^2}\right).$$

the family of separable Matèrn covariances

$$k_{\text{sepMat}}(u, u') = \prod_{i=1}^{d_u} k_{\text{Mat}}(u_i, u'_i).$$

Choice of mean and covariance kernel

- The mean function m is typically chosen as a polynomial: $m(u) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\beta_q}{\beta_q} \, p_q(u).$
- Covariance kernels frequently used are
 - the family of Matèrn covariances

$$k_{\mathrm{Mat}}(u,u') = \frac{\sigma^2}{\Gamma(\nu)2^{\nu-1}} \left(\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right)^{\nu} B_{\nu}\left(\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right),$$

with smoothness parameter $\nu > 0$, marginal variance $\sigma^2 > 0$ and correlation length $\lambda > 0$.

$$\nu = 1/2 : \sigma^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|u-u'\|}{\lambda}\right), \nu = \infty : \exp\left(-\frac{\|u-u'\|^2}{\lambda^2}\right).$$

the family of separable Matèrn covariances

$$k_{\text{sepMat}}(u, u') = \prod_{i=1}^{d_u} k_{\text{Mat}}(u_i, u'_i).$$

- The hyper-parameters θ are unknown a-priori.
- A. Teckentrup (Edinburgh)

Gaussian Process Regression Empirical Bayes'

- We use an empirical Bayes' (or plug-in) approach, where we estimate values of the hyper-parameters from $\{f(u^n)\}_{n=1}^N$ and plug these into the posterior distribution f_N .
- This gives a sequence of estimates $\hat{\theta}_N$, which can be found via maximum likelihood estimation, maximum a-posteriori estimation, cross validation, ...
- We assume that there is a true parameter value θ_0 , defined in a suitable way.

Convergence bounds

Matèrn kernels: convergence as $N \to \infty$ With design points $D_N = \{u^n\}_{n=1}^N$, define:

fill distance
$$h_{D_N} = \max_{u \in U} \min_{u^n \in D_N} \|u - u^n\|, \quad h_{D_N} \sim N^{-1/d_u},$$

mesh ratio $\rho_{D_N} = \frac{\max_{u \in U} \min_{u^n \in D_N} \|u - u^n\|}{\frac{1}{2} \min_{n \neq l} \|u^n - u^l\|}, \quad \rho_{D_N} \ge 1.$

Theorem [Stuart, ALT in prep.]

Under certain regularity conditions, with covariance kernel k_{Mat} , we have

$$\begin{split} \|f - m_N^f(\widehat{\theta}_N)\|_{L^2(U)} &\leq \\ C(\widehat{\theta}_N) h_{D_N}^{\min\{\widetilde{\tau}, \widehat{\nu}_N + \frac{K}{2}\}} \rho_{D_N}^{\max\{\widehat{\nu}_N + \frac{K}{2} - \widetilde{\tau}, 0\}} \Big(\|f\|_{H^{\widetilde{\tau}}(U)} + \|m(\widehat{\theta}_N)\|_{H^{\widetilde{\tau}}(U)} \Big), \end{split}$$

with C independent of f. Furthermore,

$$\|k_N^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^2(U)} \le C(\widehat{\theta}_N) h_{D_N}^{\min\{\widetilde{\tau} - \frac{K}{2}, \widehat{\nu}_N\}} \rho_{D_N}^{\max\{\widehat{\nu}_N + \frac{K}{2} - \widetilde{\tau}, 0\}}$$

Convergence bounds

Separable Matèrn kernels: convergence as $N \to \infty$

Theorem [Stuart, ALT in prep.]

Under certain regularity conditions, with covariance kernel $k_{
m sepMat}$ and

- tensor product domain $U = \prod_{k=1}^{K} U_k$,
- D_N chosen as a Smolyak sparse grid,

we have

$$\begin{split} \|f - m_N^f(\widehat{\theta}_N)\|_{L^2(U)} &\leq \\ C(\widehat{\theta}_N) N^{-\alpha(\widehat{\nu}_N)} |\log N|^{\widetilde{\alpha}(\widehat{\nu}_N,K)} \Big(\|f\|_{H^{\{\widetilde{r}_k\}}_{\otimes K}(U)} + \|m(\widehat{\theta}_N)\|_{H^{\{\widetilde{r}_k\}}_{\otimes K}(U)} \Big), \end{split}$$

with C independent of f. Furthermore,

$$\|k_N^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^2(U)} \le C(\widehat{\theta}_N) N^{-\alpha(\widehat{\nu}_N) + \frac{1}{2}} |\log N|^{\widetilde{\alpha}(\widehat{\nu}_N, K)}$$

Convergence bounds Convergence as $\widehat{\theta}_N \rightarrow \theta_0$

Theorem [Stuart, ALT in prep.]

Under certain regularity conditions, with covariance kernel k_{Mat} or k_{sepMat} , we have for fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta \to \theta_0$

$$\begin{split} \|m_{N}^{f}(\theta) - m_{N}^{f}(\theta_{0})\|_{H^{\kappa}(U) / H_{\otimes K}^{\{\kappa_{k}\}}(U)} &\to 0, \\ \|k_{N}^{1/2}(\theta) - k_{N}^{1/2}(\theta_{0})\|_{L^{2}(U)} \to 0, \end{split}$$

for all $\kappa \ / \ \{\kappa_k\}$ sufficiently small.

Application in Bayesian inverse problems

Bayesian posterior distribution

• We are interested in $\mu^y(u)$ being the posterior distribution in a Bayesian inverse problem (parameter identification problem):

$$\frac{d\mu^{y}}{d\mu_{0}}(u) \propto e^{-\|y-F(u)\|_{\Gamma^{-1}}^{2}}, \qquad \Big(\pi^{y}(u) \propto e^{-\|y-F(u)\|_{\Gamma^{-1}}^{2}} \pi_{0}(u)\Big).$$

- This arises from
 - incorporating knowledge on u in a prior distribution μ_0 (with density π_0),
 - observing data $y = F(u) + \eta$, with noise $\eta \sim N(0, \Gamma)$,
 - conditioning μ_0 on y, resulting in the posterior distribution μ^y (with density π^y).

Application in Bayesian inverse problems

Approximation with Gaussian process emulators

- The map F is often very expensive to simulate, e.g. involving the solution to a differential equation.
- Approximating the data log-likelihood $\Phi(u) = ||y F(u)||_{\Gamma^{-1}}^2$ (or directly F(u)) with a Gaussian process emulator results in an approximate posterior distribution μ_N^y .

Application in Bayesian inverse problems

Approximation with Gaussian process emulators

- The map F is often very expensive to simulate, e.g. involving the solution to a differential equation.
- Approximating the data log-likelihood $\Phi(u) = ||y F(u)||_{\Gamma^{-1}}^2$ (or directly F(u)) with a Gaussian process emulator results in an approximate posterior distribution μ_N^y .
- The error between μ^y and μ^y_N (measured in the Hellinger distance) can be bounded in terms of $\|\Phi m^{\Phi}_N\|_{L^2_{\mu_0}(U)}$ and $\|k_N^{1/2}\|_{L^2_{\mu_0}(U)}$.
- For more details, see [Stuart, ALT '18].

References

- C. E. RASMUSSEN AND C. K. WILLIAMS, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, (2006).
- A. M. STUART, *Inverse Problems: A Bayesian Perspective*, Acta Numerica, 19 (2010), pp. 451–559.
- A. M. STUART AND A. L. TECKENTRUP, Numerical Analysis of Hierarchical Gaussian Process Regression and Applications in Bayesian Inverse Problems.

In preparation.

——, Posterior consistency for Gaussian process approximations of Bayesian posterior distributions, Mathematics of Computation, 87 (2018), pp. 721–753.

H. WENDLAND, *Scattered Data Approximation*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.