Model limitations: Sequential data assimilation with uncertain static parameters

Jonathan Rougier

Department of Mathematics University of Bristol, UK

Data-intensive research workshop Edinburgh, Tue 16 March

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Illustration: the Greenland ice-sheet



Simplest interesting example

Conditional on θ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\sim \pi_{x_0}(\theta) & \text{(init. cond. unc.)} \\ x_t &= g(x_{t-1}; \theta) + Q(x_{t-1}; \theta) \,\omega_t & \text{(state eqn.)} \\ y_t &= f(x_t; \theta) + \nu_t & \text{(obs. eqn.)} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\omega_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, I)$$
 (structural uncertainty)
 $\nu_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, v^2)$ (measurement unc.)

and then let $\theta \sim \pi_{\theta}$, to account for parametric uncertainty. The functions f, g, and Q are given, likewise the measurement uncertainty standard deviation, v.

Sampling from $\{x_{0:T}, \theta\} \mid y_{1:T}$ "intractable and unsolved" (C. Andrieu)



Independent particles



Independent particles









590



Sac







590

The difficulties with uncertainty θ

One simple idea is to attach a realisation from π_θ to each particle, in order to sample jointly from {x_{0:T}, θ} | y_{1:T}.

However, static parameters do not evolve in time, so every interaction reduces the resolution of the θ distribution. Too many observations, and the θ distribution becomes degenerate, unless we have <DrEvil>one million</DrEvil> particles.

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The difficulties with uncertainty θ

One simple idea is to attach a realisation from π_θ to each particle, in order to sample jointly from {x_{0:T}, θ} | y_{1:T}.

However, static parameters do not evolve in time, so every interaction reduces the resolution of the θ distribution. Too many observations, and the θ distribution becomes degenerate, unless we have <DrEvil>one million</DrEvil> particles.

- The solution is to 'integrate out' the state vector in some form. The two approaches are
 - Gaussian (Laplace) approximation for x_{1:τ} | {θ, y_{1:τ}} turning a high-dimensional integration into a high-dimensional optimisation;
 - Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo (P-MCMC), which uses a Gibbs sampler to swap between sampling x_{1:T} | {θ, y_{1:T}} and θ | {x_{1:T}, y_{1:T}}.

Summary

In inference for environmental systems, 'high dimensional data' is \sim 1000 observations. This is at the limit of what we can compute.

- Particle filters, the most general tool for sampling from x_{1:T} | {θ, y_{1:T}}, adapt naturally to parallel implementation;
- ► MCMC for θ | y_{1:T} or θ | {x_{1:T}, y_{1:T}}, can also be implemented in parallel, using the approach of Cui *et al*.

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Small state vectors, though!

Summary

In inference for environmental systems, 'high dimensional data' is \sim 1000 observations. This is at the limit of what we can compute.

- Particle filters, the most general tool for sampling from x_{1:T} | {θ, y_{1:T}}, adapt naturally to parallel implementation;
- ► MCMC for θ | y_{1:T} or θ | {x_{1:T}, y_{1:T}}, can also be implemented in parallel, using the approach of Cui *et al*.

Small state vectors, though!

Two useful references

C. Andrieu *et al*, 2009, Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo methods, forthcoming in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, available at http://www.rss.org.uk/pdf/Andrieu_et_al._14.10.09.pdf

T. Cui *et al*, 2009, Using MCMC Sampling to Calibrate a Computer Model of a Geothermal Field, available at http:

//www.stats.ox.ac.uk/~nicholls/linkfiles/papers/cui09.pdf