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## Four-dimensional Variational Assimilation (4D-Var)

4D-Var aims to find the solution of a numerical forecast model that best fits sequences of observations distributed in space over a finite time interval.

Minimise cost function

$$
J\left(\mathbf{v}_{0}\right)=\left(\mathbf{v}_{0}-\mathbf{v}_{0}^{B}\right)^{T} B^{-1}\left(\mathbf{v}_{0}-\mathbf{v}_{0}^{B}\right)+\sum_{i=0}^{n}\left(\mathcal{H}\left(\mathbf{v}_{i}\right)-\mathbf{y}_{i}\right)^{T} R^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}\left(\mathbf{v}_{i}\right)-\mathbf{y}_{i}\right)
$$

with constraint $\mathbf{v}_{i}=\mathcal{M}^{i, 0}\left(\mathbf{v}_{0}\right)$.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { analysis } & \mathbf{v}_{0} \\
\text { background (short-term forecast) } & \mathbf{v}_{0}^{B} \\
\text { observations } & \mathbf{y} \\
\text { observation operator } & \mathcal{H} \\
\text { model dynamics } & \mathbf{v}_{i+1}=\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{v}_{i}\right) \\
\text { background error covariance matrix } & B \\
\text { observation error covariance matrix } & R
\end{array}
$$

## Incremental 4D-Var

- Linearise $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{M}$ and solve resulting unconstrained optimisation problem iteratively:

$$
\left.\bar{H}_{k-1}^{i} \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{v}}\right|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}_{k-1}},\left.\quad \bar{M}_{k-1}^{i, 0} \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}^{i, 0}}{\partial \mathbf{v}}\right|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}_{k-1}}
$$

- Hessian of the cost function is

$$
\mathbb{H}=B^{-1}+\widehat{H}^{T} \widehat{R}^{-1} \widehat{H}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H} & =\left[\left(\bar{H}^{0}\right)^{T},\left(\bar{H}^{1} \bar{M}^{1,0}\right)^{T}, \ldots,\left(\bar{H}^{N} \bar{M}^{N, 0}\right)^{T}\right]^{T} \\
\widehat{R} & =\operatorname{bldiag}\left(R_{i}\right), \quad i=1, \ldots, N .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Motivation

Why approximate $\mathbb{H}^{-1}$ ?

- $\mathbb{H}^{-1}$ represents an approximation of the Posterior Covariance Matrix (PCM).
- The PCM can be used to find confidence intervals and carry out a posteriori error analysis.
- $\mathbb{H}^{-1 / 2}$ can be used in ensemble forecasting.
- $\mathbb{H}^{-1}, \mathbb{H}^{-1 / 2}$ can be used for preconditioning in a Gauss-Newton method.


## Issues with approximating the inverse Hessian

- State and observation vectors used in realistic applications can be of length $10^{9}-10^{12}$ and $10^{6}-10^{9}$, respectively.
- Cannot store $\mathbb{H}$ as a matrix: only action of applying $\mathbb{H}$ to a vector is available.
- Evaluating $\mathbb{H} \mathbf{v}$ is expensive in terms of computing time and memory (involves both forward and backward model solves with a sequence of tangent linear and adjoint problems).
- No obvious equivalent option exists for evaluating $\mathbb{H}^{-1} \mathbf{v}$.

$$
\mathbb{H}=B^{-1}+\widehat{H}^{\top} \widehat{R}^{-1} \widehat{H}
$$

- Precondition $\mathbb{H}$ based on the background covariance matrix

$$
H=\left(B^{1 / 2}\right)^{T} \mathbb{H} B^{1 / 2}=I+\left(B^{1 / 2}\right)^{\top} \widehat{H}^{\top} \widehat{R}^{-1} \widehat{H} B^{1 / 2}
$$

- Eigenvalues of $H$ are bounded below by one: more details on the full eigenspectrum can be found in Haben et al. (2011), Tabeart et al. (2018).
- Aim here is to construct a limited-memory approximation to the action of $\mathrm{H}^{-1}$ using only matrix-vector multiplication.


## Correlation matrix

- $\mathbb{H}^{-1}$ (scaled to have unit diagonal)



## Preconditioned correlation matrix

- $\mathrm{H}^{-1}$ (scaled to have unit diagonal)



## Limited-memory approximation for $H^{-1}$

- $H$ amenable to limited-memory approximation.
- Find $n_{e}$ leading eigenvalues and orthonormal eigenvectors using the Lanczos method (needs only Hv ).
- Construct approximation

$$
H \approx I+\sum_{i=1}^{n_{e}}\left(\lambda_{i}-1\right) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{u}_{i}^{T}
$$

- Can also use this to easily approximate matrix powers (including $H^{-1}$ and $H^{-1 / 2}$ ):

$$
H^{p} \approx I+\sum_{i=1}^{n_{e}}\left(\lambda_{i}^{p}-1\right) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{u}_{i}^{T}
$$

## Multilevel limited-memory approximation

- Sequence of grid levels $k=0,1,2, \ldots$.

- Matrix $H_{0}$ is available on finest grid $k=0$.
- Construct a multilevel approximation to $H_{0}^{-1}$ based on limited-memory approximations on a sequence of nested grids.
- Need grid transfer operators (more shortly).
- Identity matrix $I_{k}$ on grid level $k$.
- $[H]_{\rightarrow k}$ means "matrix $H$ transferred to grid level $k$ ".


## Grid transfers for vectors

- Coarse grid level $k=c$; fine grid level $k=f$.
- Restriction matrix $R$; prolongation matrix $P$ : assume "perfect interpolation", i.e., $R P=I_{c}$.
- Split fine grid vector into two parts:

$$
\mathbf{v}_{f}=\mathbf{v}_{f}^{(1)}+\mathbf{v}_{f}^{(2)}=\left(I_{f}-P R\right) \mathbf{v}_{f}+P R \mathbf{v}_{f}
$$

- Restrict $\mathbf{v}_{f}$ to coarse grid:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{v}_{c}^{(1)}=R \mathbf{v}_{f}^{(1)}=R\left(I_{f}-P R\right) \mathbf{v}_{f}=(R-(R P) R) \mathbf{v}_{f}=\mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{v}_{c}^{(2)}=R \mathbf{v}_{f}^{(2)}=(R P) R \mathbf{v}_{f}=R \mathbf{v}_{f}
\end{gathered}
$$

- Modes in $\mathbf{v}_{f}^{(1)}$ are not supported on coarse grid.


## Grid transfers for matrices

- Consider action of coarse grid matrix $H_{c}$ on a fine grid vector:

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[H_{c}\right]_{\rightarrow f} \mathbf{v}_{f} } & =\mathbf{v}_{f}^{(1)}+P H_{c} R \mathbf{v}_{f}^{(2)} \\
& =\left(I_{f}-P R\right) \mathbf{v}_{f}+P H_{c}(R P) R \mathbf{v}_{f} \\
& =\left(P\left(H_{c}-I_{c}\right) R+I_{f}\right) \mathbf{v}_{f}
\end{aligned}
$$

- This motivates matrix transfer operators
- From coarse grid to fine grid

$$
\left[H_{c}\right]_{\rightarrow f}=P\left(H_{c}-I_{c}\right) R+I_{f}
$$

- From fine grid to coarse grid

$$
\left[H_{f}\right]_{\rightarrow c}=R\left(H_{f}-I_{f}\right) P+I_{c}
$$

## Hessian in a multilevel framework

- Diagonal of $H^{-1}$ on various grid levels:


$$
\begin{gathered}
H_{0} \\
H_{0}=\left[H_{0}\right]_{\rightarrow 0} \\
H_{1}=\left[H_{0}\right]_{\rightarrow 1} \\
H_{2}=\left[H_{0}\right]_{\rightarrow 2} \\
H_{3}=\left[H_{0}\right]_{\rightarrow 3}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Motivating idea

- Eigenvalues of $\left[H_{c}^{-1 / 2}\right]_{\rightarrow f} H_{f}\left[H_{c}^{-1 / 2}\right]_{\rightarrow f}$ should be clustered around 1.
- Construct an approximation to $H_{c}^{-1 / 2}$ :
- Precondition $H_{c}$ to obtain $\tilde{H}_{c}=M^{T} H_{c} M$ with eigenvalues closer to 1.
- Build $\hat{H}_{c}$, a limited memory approximation for $\tilde{H}_{c}$ using $n_{c}$ eigenvalues with the Lanczos method.
- Note that

$$
H_{c}^{-1}=M \tilde{H}_{c}^{-1} M^{T} \simeq M \hat{H}_{c}^{-1} M^{T}
$$

so

$$
H_{c}^{-1 / 2}=M \tilde{H}_{c}^{-1 / 2} \simeq M \hat{H}_{c}^{-1 / 2} .
$$

- Use $\hat{M}=\left[M \hat{H}_{c}^{-1 / 2}\right]_{\rightarrow f}$ as a preconditioner on the level above.


## Outline of multilevel concept

Step 1. Start on coarsest grid level.

Step 2. Represent $H_{0}$ on grid level $k$ as $H_{k}=\left[H_{0}\right]_{\rightarrow k}$.
Step 3. Precondition this to obtain $\tilde{H}_{k}=M_{k}^{T} H_{k} M_{k}$.
Step 4. Build limited memory approximation $\hat{H}_{k}^{-1 / 2}$.
Step 5. Project $\hat{M}_{k}=M_{k} \hat{H}_{k}^{-1 / 2}$ to the level above to be used as preconditioner at the next coarsest level.

Step 6. Move up one grid level and repeat from step 2.

## Preconditioners

- On coarsest grid, level $k+1$ does not exist so set $M_{k}=I_{k}$.
- For other levels, $M_{k}$ is constructed on level $k+1$ and applied on level $k$.
- Preconditioners are constructed recursively:

$$
M_{k}=\left[\hat{M}_{k+1}\right]_{\rightarrow k}=\left[M_{k+1} \hat{H}_{k+1}^{-1 / 2}\right]_{\rightarrow k}
$$

- At level 0, final inverse Hessian approximation $H_{a p p r o x}^{-1}$ will contain eigenvalue information from all levels.


## Algorithm in practice

- use $N_{e}=\left(n_{0}, n_{1}, \ldots, n_{k_{c}}\right)$ eigenvalues at each level

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[\Lambda, \mathcal{U}]=M \operatorname{Lalg}\left(H_{0}, N_{e}\right)} \\
& \text { for } \quad k=k_{c}, k_{c}-1, \ldots, 0 \\
& \quad \text { compute by the Lanczos method } \\
& \quad\left\{\lambda_{k}^{i}, U_{k}^{i}\right\}, i=1, \ldots, n_{k} \text { of } \tilde{H}_{0 \rightarrow k} \\
& \text { using preconditioner } M_{k} \\
& \text { end }
\end{aligned}
$$

- storage:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Lambda & =\left[\lambda_{0}^{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{0}^{n_{0}}, \lambda_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{1}^{n_{1}}, \ldots, \lambda_{k_{c}}^{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{k_{c}}^{n_{k_{c}}}\right] \\
\mathcal{U} & =\left[U_{0}^{1}, \ldots, U_{0}^{n_{0}}, U_{1}^{1}, \ldots, U_{1}^{n_{1}}, \ldots, U_{k_{c}}^{1}, \ldots, U_{k_{c}}^{n_{k_{c}}}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Assessing approximation accuracy

- Riemannian distance:

$$
\delta(A, B)=\left\|\ln \left(B^{-1} A\right)\right\|_{F}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln ^{2} \lambda_{i}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

- Compare eigenvalues of $H^{-1}$ and $H_{\text {approx }}^{-1}$ on the finest grid level $k=0$ using distance function

$$
D=\frac{\delta\left(H^{-1}, H_{\text {approx }}^{-1}\right)}{\delta\left(H^{-1}, I\right)}
$$

- Vary number of eigenvalues chosen on each grid level

$$
N_{e}=\left(n_{0}, n_{1}, \ldots, n_{k_{c}}\right)
$$

- Model is 1D Burgers' equation.
- Discretise evolution equation on a grid with $m+1$ nodes (level 0) to represent full Hessian $H_{0}$.
- Grid level $k$ contains $m_{k}=m / 2^{k}+1$ nodes.
- 1D uniform grid with 7 sensors located at $0.3,0.4,0.45,0.5$, $0.55,0.6$, and 0.7 in $[0,1]$.
- Construct a multilevel approximation to $H^{-1}$ with four grid levels:

| $k$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| grid points | 401 | 201 | 101 | 51 |

- Exact (blue circles), approximated (red stars)

- Exact (blue circles), approximated (red stars)

- Exact (blue circles), approximated (red stars)

- Fixed memory ratio $R=\sum_{k=0}^{k_{c}} \frac{n_{k}}{2^{k}}$

$H_{0}$
$(64,0,0,0)$
$(8,0,0,0)$
$(2,4,8,16)$
$(0,0,29,6)$



## Example: PCG iteration for one Newton step

- Hessian linear system (within a Gauss-Newton method):

$$
H\left(\mathbf{u}_{k}\right) \delta \mathbf{u}_{k}=G\left(\mathbf{u}_{k}\right)
$$

- Solve using Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient iteration (needs only Hv ).
- measurement units
- storage: length of vector on finest grid
- solve cost: cost of HVP on finest grid HVP

| Preconditioner | \# CG iterations | storage | solve cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| none | 57 | 0 L | 57 HVP |
| $\mathrm{ML}(400,0,0,0)$ | 1 | 400 L | 402 HVP |
| $\mathrm{ML}(4,8,16,32)$ | 4 | 16 L | 34 HVP |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,8,16,32)$ | 5 | 12 L | 14 HVP |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,0,16,32)$ | 8 | 8 L | 10 HVP |

## Problem 1: Solve cost measured in number of HVPs



## Test problem 2

- Model is 1D shallow water equations for velocity $u$ and geopotential $\phi=g h$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{D u}{D t}+\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} & =-g \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\
\frac{D(\ln \phi)}{D t}+\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} & =0
\end{aligned}
$$



- Uniformly spaced sensors.
- Four grid multilevel structure as before.


## PCG iteration for one Newton step

- Background covariance matrix $B$ constructed using a Laplacian correlation function.

|  | \# PCG iterations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preconditioner | $n=400$ | $n=800$ | $n=1600$ | $n=3200$ |
| none | 308 | 1302 | 5,879 | 25,085 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(4,0,0,0)$ | 38 | 34 | 34 | 47 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(1,2,4,8)$ | 31 | 29 | 28 | 37 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,2,4,16)$ | 27 | 26 | 24 | 32 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,0,8,16)$ | 26 | 25 | 24 | 30 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,0,0,32)$ | 23 | 19 | 19 | 24 |

- Background covariance matrix $B$ constructed using a Second-Order Auto-Regressive (SOAR) correlation function.

|  | \# PCG iterations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preconditioner | $n=400$ | $n=800$ | $n=1600$ | $n=3200$ |
| none | 509 | 2,277 | 10,453 | 43,915 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(4,0,0,0)$ | 39 | 35 | 35 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(1,2,4,8)$ | 28 | 26 | 26 | 34 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,2,4,16)$ | 23 | 22 | 21 | 27 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,0,8,16)$ | 22 | 21 | 20 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{ML}(0,0,0,32)$ | 19 | 16 | 15 | 20 |

- partition domain into $S$ subregions and compute local Hessians $H^{s}$ such that

$$
H(\mathbf{v})=I+\sum_{s=1}^{S}\left(H^{s}(\mathbf{v})-I\right)
$$

- computational advantages of local Hessians:
- fewer eigenvalues required for limited-memory approximation;
- can be calculated at a coarser grid level;
- can use local rather than global models;
- can be computed in parallel.
(1) Compute limited-memory approximations to local sensor-based Hessians on level $k$ using $n_{k}$ eigenpairs:

$$
H_{k}^{s} \approx I+\sum_{i=1}^{n_{k}}\left(\lambda_{i}-1\right) \mathbf{u}_{i} \mathbf{u}_{i}^{T}
$$

(2) Assemble these to form $H_{a}$.
(3) Apply MLalg to $H_{a}$ based on a fixed $N_{e}$.

- Advantage:
- Local Hessians cheaper to compute.
- Disadvantages:
- Additional user-specified parameter(s) $n_{k}$ needed.
- More memory required as local Hessians must also be stored.


## Sample costs including building preconditioner

- Local Hessians with 8 eigenvalues at level 0 (solid lines) or level 1 (dashed lines).



## Practical approach: Version 2

(1) Approximate each local Hessian $H_{k}^{s}$ by applying MLalg to local inverse Hessians based on $N_{e, k}$.
(2) Assemble these to form reduced-memory Hessian $H_{a}^{r m}$.
(3) Use MLalg again on $H_{a}^{r m}$ based on $N_{e}$.

- Advantage:
- Requires less memory than Version 1.
- Disadvantage:
- Additional user-specified parameter(s) $N_{e, k}$ needed.


## Version 2: cost including building preconditioner

- Local Hessians with 8 eigenvalues at level 0 (solid lines) or level 1 (dashed lines) with $N_{e, k}=(8,4,0,0) \mathrm{ML}$ approx.



## Concluding remarks

- Algorithm based solely on repeated use of Lanczos at each level (for building limited-memory approximations).
- Difficult to identify the correct number of eigenvalues to use at each level: good rule of thumb available but analysis would be better!
- Full algorithm may not always be practical, but we have developed practical implementations based on Hessian decompositions.
- Also works well for other configurations (e.g. moving sensors, different initial conditions).
- Potential for extension to higher dimensions and other applications.
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- Also works well for other configurations (e.g. moving sensors, different initial conditions).
- Potential for extension to higher dimensions and other applications.

> Thank you!

