EnKF and Catastrophic filter divergence

David Kelly Andrew Stuart Kody Law

Mathematics Department
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill NC

dtbkelly.com

March 28, 2014

Model-data workshop

Newton institute, Cambridge.

Talk outline

1. What is EnKF?

2. What is known about EnKF?

3. How can we use stochastic analysis to better understand EnKF?

The filtering problem

We have a **deterministic model**

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = F(v) \quad \text{with } v_0 \sim N(m_0, C_0) \, .$$

We will denote $v(t) = \Psi_t(v_0)$. Think of this as **very high dimensional** and **nonlinear**.

We want to **estimate** $v_j = v(jh)$ for some $h > 0$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ given the **observations**

$$y_j = Hv_j + \xi_j \quad \text{for } \xi_j \text{ iid } N(0, \Gamma).$$

We can write down the conditional density using **Bayes' formula** ...

But for high dimensional nonlinear systems it's horrible.

Alternatively, we can use **EnKF** to draw **approximate samples** from the posterior.

For linear models, one can draw samples, using the **Randomized Maximum Likelihood** method.

RML method

Let $u \sim N(\widehat{m}, \widehat{C})$ and $\eta \sim N(0, \Gamma)$. We make an observation

$$y = Hu + \eta \; .$$

We want the conditional distribution of $u|y$. This is called an **inverse problem**.

RML takes a sample

$$\{\widehat{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{u}^{(K)}\} \sim N(\widehat{m}, \widehat{C})$$

and turns them into a sample

$$\{u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(K)}\} \sim u|y$$

RML method: How does it work?

Along with the prior sample $\{\widehat{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{u}^{(K)}\}$, we create **artificial observations** $\{y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(K)}\}$ where

$$y^{(k)} = y + \eta^{(k)} \qquad \text{where } \eta^{(k)} \sim N(0, \Gamma) \text{ i.i.d}$$

Then define $u^{(k)}$ using the **Bayes formula** update, with $(\widehat{u}^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$

$$u^{(k)} = \widehat{u}^{(k)} + G(\widehat{u})(y^{(k)} - H\widehat{u}^{(k)}) \; .$$

Where the "Kalman Gain" $G(\widehat{u})$ is computing using the covariance of the prior $\widehat{u}$.

The set $\{u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(K)}\}$ are exact samples from $u|y$.

EnKF uses the same method, but with an **approximation** of the covariance in the Kalman gain.

The set-up for EnKF

Suppose we are given the ensemble $\{u_j^{(1)}, \ldots, u_j^{(K)}\}$ at time j. For each ensemble member, we create an **artificial observation**

$$y_{j+1}^{(k)} = y_{j+1} + \xi_{j+1}^{(k)} \quad , \quad \xi_{j+1}^{(k)} \text{ iid } N(0,\Gamma).$$

We update each particle using the **Kalman update**

$$u_{j+1}^{(k)} = \Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) + G(u_j)\left(y_{j+1}^{(k)} - H\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)})\right) \ ,$$

where $G(u_j)$ is the **Kalman gain** computed using the **forecasted ensemble covariance**

$$\widehat{C}_{j+1} = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K}(\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - \overline{\Psi_h(u_j)})^T(\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - \overline{\Psi_h(u_j)}) \ .$$

There aren't many **theorems** about EnKF.

Ideally, we would like a theorem about **long time behaviour** of the filter for a finite ensemble size.

Filter divergence

In certain situations, it has been observed ($\star$) that the ensemble can **blow-up** (ie. reach machine-infinity) in **finite time**, even when the model has nice bounded solutions.

This is known as **catastrophic filter divergence**.

We would like to investigate whether this has a **dynamical justification** or if it is simply a **numerical artefact**.

$\star$ Harlim, Majda (2010), Gottwald (2011), Gottwald, Majda (2013).

Assumptions on the dynamics

We make a **dissipativity** assumption on the model. Namely that

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + Av + B(v, v) = f$$

with A linear elliptic and B bilinear, satisfying certain estimates and symmetries.

This guarantees **uniformly bounded** solutions.

Eg. 2d-Navier-Stokes, Lorenz-63, Lorenz-96.

Discrete time results

For a fixed observation frequency $h > 0$ we can prove

Theorem (AS,DK)

If $H = \Gamma = Id$ then there exists constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}|u_j^{(k)}|^2 \leq e^{2\beta jh}\mathbf{E}|u_0^{(k)}|^2 + 2K\gamma^2 \left(\frac{e^{2\beta jh} - 1}{e^{2\beta h} - 1}\right)$$

Rmk. This becomes useless as $h \to 0$

For observations with $h \ll 1$, we need another approach.

The EnKF equations look like a discretization

Recall the ensemble update equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_{j+1}^{(k)} &= \Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) + G(u_j)\left(y_{j+1}^{(k)} - H\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)})\right) \\
&= \Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) + \widehat{C}_{j+1}H^T(H^T\widehat{C}_{j+1}H + \Gamma)^{-1}\left(y_{j+1}^{(k)} - H\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Subtract $u_j^{(k)}$ from both sides and divide by h

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{u_{j+1}^{(k)} - u_j^{(k)}}{h} &= \frac{\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - u_j^{(k)}}{h} \\
&\quad + \widehat{C}_{j+1}H^T(hH^T\widehat{C}_{j+1}H + h\Gamma)^{-1}\left(y_{j+1}^{(k)} - H\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly we need to rescale the noise (ie. Γ).

Continuous-time limit

If we set $\Gamma = h^{-1}\Gamma_0$ and substitute $y_{j+1}^{(k)}$, we obtain

$$\frac{u_{j+1}^{(k)} - u_j^{(k)}}{h} = \frac{\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - u_j^{(k)}}{h} + \widehat{C}_{j+1} H^T (hH^T \widehat{C}_{j+1} H + \Gamma_0)^{-1} \left(Hv + h^{-1/2}\Gamma_0^{1/2}\xi_{j+1} + h^{-1/2}\Gamma_0^{1/2}\xi_{j+1}^{(k)} - H\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) \right)$$

But we know that

$$\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) = u_j^{(k)} + O(h)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{C}_{j+1} &= \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} (\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - \overline{\Psi_h(u_j)})^T (\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - \overline{\Psi_h(u_j)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} (u_j^{(k)} - \overline{u_j})^T (u_j^{(k)} - \overline{u_j}) + O(h) = C(u_j) + O(h)\end{aligned}$$

Continuous-time limit

We end up with

$$\frac{u_{j+1}^{(k)} - u_j^{(k)}}{h} = \frac{\Psi_h(u_j^{(k)}) - u_j^{(k)}}{h} - C(u_j)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H(u_j^{(k)} - v_j)$$
$$+ C(u_j)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}\left(h^{-1/2}\xi_{j+1} + h^{-1/2}\xi_{j+1}^{(k)}\right) + O(h)$$

This looks like a **numerical scheme** for **Itô S(P)DE**

$$\frac{du^{(k)}}{dt} = F(u^{(k)}) - C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H(u^{(k)} - v) \qquad (\bullet)$$
$$+ C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1/2}\left(\frac{dW^{(k)}}{dt} + \frac{dB}{dt}\right) .$$

Nudging

$$\frac{du^{(k)}}{dt} = F(u^{(k)}) - C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H(u^{(k)} - v) \qquad (\bullet)$$
$$+ C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1/2}\left(\frac{dW^{(k)}}{dt} + \frac{dB}{dt}\right) .$$

1 - Extra dissipation term only sees **differences in observed space**

2 - Extra dissipation only occurs in the **space spanned by ensemble**

Kalman-Bucy limit

If F were **linear** and we write $m(t) = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} u^{(k)}(t)$ then

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = F(m) - C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H(m - v) + C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1/2}\frac{dB}{dt} + O(K^{-1/2})\,.$$

This is the equation for the **Kalman-Bucy** filter, with empirical covariance $C(u)$. The remainder $O(K^{-1/2})$ can be thought of as a **sampling error**.

Continuous-time results

Theorem (AS,DK)

Suppose that $\{u^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{K}$ *satisfy* ($\bullet$) *with* $H = \Gamma = Id$. *Let*

$$e^{(k)} = u^{(k)} - v \ .$$

Then there exists constant $\beta > 0$ *such that*

$$\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{E}|e^{(k)}(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{E}|e^{(k)}(0)|^2\right) \exp\left(\beta t\right) \ .$$

Why do we need $H = \Gamma = Id$?

In the equation

$$\frac{du^{(k)}}{dt} = F(u^{(k)}) - C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H(u^{(k)} - v) + C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1/2}\left(\frac{dW^{(k)}}{dt} + \frac{dB}{dt}\right) .$$

The **energy** pumped in by the noise must be balanced by **contraction** of $(u^{(k)} - v)$. So the operator

$$C(u)H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H$$

must be **positive-definite**.

Both $C(u)$ and $H^T\Gamma_0^{-1}H$ are pos-def, but this doesn't guarantee the same for the **product**!

Summary + Future Work

(1) Writing down an SDE/SPDE allows us to see the **important quantities** in the algorithm.

(2) Does not "prove" that catastrophic filter divergence is a numerical phenomenon, but is a decent starting point.

(1) Improve the condition on H.

(2) If we can **measure** the important quantities, then we can test the performance during the algorithm.