

Description of the Gaussian process model used in GEM-SA

Marc Kennedy
University of Sheffield

29 November, 2004

Abstract

The GEM-SA (Gaussian Emulation Machine for Sensitivity Analysis) uses a Gaussian process prior probability distribution to describe beliefs about an unknown code output, as a function of the code inputs. The mathematical details behind this Gaussian process model are outlined below.

1 Standardisation

It is convenient within GEM-SA to work with a standardised set of inputs and outputs. This allows for a wide range of different codes to be treated within a generic framework, and helps to prevent numerical problems. The details that are given below all refer to the Gaussian process model of the *transformed inputs and outputs* \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} , rather than the original scale, which we call \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}' :

For each *input* component x_i , we set

$$x_i = \frac{x'_i - x_i^{min}}{x_i^{max} - x_i^{min}} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x}_i^{min} and \mathbf{x}_i^{max} define the minimum and maximum values of all the i th input components seen within the training input data.

For the *output*, we first calculate the sample mean and variance of the output points

$$m_y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y'_i \quad (2)$$

$$v_y = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y'_i - m_y)^2 \quad (3)$$

$$(4)$$

then we let

$$y = \frac{y' - m_y}{\sqrt{v_y}} \quad (5)$$

2 Prior Gaussian process model for the code output

After identifying a suitable *input space* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, the computer code can be represented by a smooth function $\mathbf{f}: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, which yields a one dimensional output vector. For any given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ let $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a vector of arbitrary regression functions.

The following Gaussian process model is adopted:

$$[\mathbf{f}(\cdot) \mid \beta, \sigma, \mathbf{r}] \sim N(\mathbf{m}(\cdot), \sigma^2 c(\cdot, \cdot)), \quad (6)$$

where the mean and correlation functions take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(\cdot) &= \beta^T \mathbf{h}(\cdot), \\ c(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \exp\{-(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)^T \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)\} \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the parameters are: the vector of regression coefficients $[\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q] \in \mathbb{R}_q$; the variance σ^2 ; and the positive definite roughness matrix $\mathbf{R} = \text{diag}\{r_i\} \in \mathbb{R}_{p,p}$. The diagonal form of \mathbf{R} implies a correlation structure between any pair $f(\mathbf{x}_1)$ and $f(\mathbf{x}_2)$ being insensitive to inputs' interactions.

The prior specification is completed by

$$p(\beta, \sigma^2) \propto \sigma^{-2} \quad (7)$$

and for each $i = 1, \dots, p$ independently

$$r_i \sim \text{Exp}(0.01) \quad (8)$$

3 Conditioning on data: The posterior distribution

Running the computer code on a pre-selected *design set* $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ yields simulations $\mathbf{d} = [f_i(\mathbf{s}_r)] \in \mathbb{R}_n$. In light of the assumptions listed above, the joint distribution of the outcomes in \mathbf{d} conditional on nuisance parameters β, σ^2 and \mathbf{R} is the Normal distribution

$$[\mathbf{d} \mid \beta, \sigma^2, \mathbf{R}] \sim N_n(\mathbf{H}\beta, \sigma^2 \mathbf{A}), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{H}^T = [\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{s}_1), \dots, \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{s}_n)] \in \mathbb{R}_{m,n}$ and $\mathbf{A} = [c(\mathbf{s}_r, \mathbf{s}_l)] \in \mathbb{R}_{n,n}$. The code may also have a nugget term, to account for variability in the code data, possibly due to numerical errors in the solver. In this case the nugget variance $1/\lambda$ is added to each diagonal element of \mathbf{A} .

Letting $\mathbf{t}^T(\cdot) = [c(\cdot, \mathbf{s}_1), \dots, c(\cdot, \mathbf{s}_n)] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, standard Normal theory and some matrix calculus manipulations thus imply the following form for the posterior conditional distribution of the computer code:

$$[\mathbf{f}(\cdot) \mid \beta, \sigma^2, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{d}] \sim N_q(\mathbf{m}^*(\cdot), \sigma^2 c^*(\cdot, \cdot)), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}^*(\mathbf{x}) &= \beta^T [\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}), \\ c^*(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) &= c(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) - \mathbf{t}^T(\mathbf{x}_1) \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_2). \end{aligned}$$

The posterior distribution of $\mathbf{f}(\cdot)$ conditional on the roughness matrix \mathbf{R} alone is found by integrating (10) with respect to the posterior distribution of β and σ^2 . This produces the

following marginal Student's t posterior process for the computer code $\mathbf{f}(\cdot)$, still conditional upon the roughness matrix \mathbf{R} :

$$[\mathbf{f}(\cdot) \mid \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{d}] \sim t_{n-q}(\mathbf{m}^{**}(\cdot), \hat{\sigma}^2 c^{**}(\cdot, \cdot)). \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{m}^{**}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{H}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (12)$$

$$c^{**}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = c^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') + [\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})]^T (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{H})^{-1} \cdot \quad (13)$$

$$\cdot [\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}') - \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}')] \quad (14)$$

and where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{d}$ is the GLS estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \mathbf{d}^T \{\mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{H} (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1}\} \mathbf{d}$.

The inferences required for uncertainty and sensitivity analysis are found directly from these posterior quantities for $\mathbf{f}(\cdot)$. For more details of Gaussian process models to analyse computer models, see for example O'Hagan (2004), Sacks et al. (1989), Kennedy and O'Hagan (2001).

References

- M. C. Kennedy and A. O'Hagan. Bayesian calibration of computer models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 63(3):425–464, 2001.
- A. O'Hagan. Bayesian analysis of computer code outputs: a tutorial. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, submitted, 2004.
- J. Sacks, W. J. Welch, T. J. Mitchell, and H. P. Wynn. Design and analysis of computer experiments. *Statist. Sci.*, 4(4):409–435, 1989. With comments and a rejoinder by the authors.