#### MAT3, MAMA

## MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS

### Part III

Monday, 10 June, 2019 9:00 am to 11:00 am

## **PAPER 350**

## BAYESIAN INVERSE PROBLEMS

Attempt no more than **TWO** questions. There are **THREE** questions in total. The questions carry equal weight.

#### STATIONERY REQUIREMENTS

Cover sheet Treasury Tag Script paper Rough paper

#### **SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS** None

You may not start to read the questions printed on the subsequent pages until instructed to do so by the Invigilator.

# UNIVERSITY OF

1 (a) Consider the linear measurement model

$$m = Au + \eta,$$

where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^k$  are assumed to be independent random variables, with probability measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$  is a known matrix. Formulate the posterior probability density function that gives a solution to the inverse problem "given a measurement *m* approximate *u*".

(b) Assume that the measurement is given by  $m = \langle A, u \rangle + \eta$  where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and  $A = (2, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Assume that  $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2)$ , with noise level  $\delta > 0$ , and  $u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ . Derive the posterior distribution and calculate the posterior mean and covariance. Does the prior play any role in the small noise limit  $\delta \to 0$ ? Is the uncertainty in the solution same to all directions? Explain.

(c) Let  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  denote two probability measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to a third probability measure  $\nu$ . The Hellinger distance between between  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  is defined as

$$d_{Hell}(\mu,\mu') = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \int \left(\sqrt{\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}} - \sqrt{\frac{d\mu'}{d\nu}}\right)^2 d\nu}.$$

Let  $\mu_1 = \mathcal{N}(\theta_1, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $\mu_2 = \mathcal{N}(\theta_2, \sigma_2^2)$  be two Gaussian measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The squared Hellinger distance between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  is

$$d_{Hell}(\mu_1,\mu_2)^2 = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta_1 - \theta_2)^2}{4(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)}\right).$$

Prove the above in the special case  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$ . Show that

$$d_{Hell}(\mu_1,\mu_2)^2 \leqslant C_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2}((\sigma_1-\sigma_2)^2+(\theta_1-\theta_2)^2),$$

where  $C_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2} > 0$  is a constant depending on  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ . [Hint:  $e^{-x} \ge (1-x)$ .]

# CAMBRIDGE

3

2 Assume the linear measurement model

 $m = Au + \eta$ ,

where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^k$  are independent random variables, with probability measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$  is a known matrix.

(a) Assume that the posterior density  $\pi^m(u) = \pi(u \mid m)$  exists. Define the conditional mean (CM) estimator and maximum a posterior (MAP) estimator. Let  $u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a positive definite matrix, and  $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ . State the CM estimator for u given a measurement m. [Either of the forms given in the lecture notes is accepted].

(b) Let  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  represent a pixel image, where the  $j^{th}$  component  $u_j$  represents the intensity of the  $j^{th}$  pixel. Assume that the prior knowledge is that the picture contains small and well localised objects with the background having intensity close to zero. Give an example of an appropriate prior density. Assume that random draws from a uniform distribution  $\mathcal{U}([0,1])$  are available. Show how to draw samples from the distribution you chose and justify your method.

(c) Assume that the null space of A is zero, and  $u \sim \mathcal{U}$ , where  $\mathcal{U}$  is an uninformative and improper prior with constant density on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , that is,  $\pi(u) = c > 0$ . Furthermore, assume that  $\eta | \delta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2 I)$ , where  $\delta > 0$  is unknown. The noise amplitude is modelled by assuming  $1/\delta^2 = \gamma \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ , where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , and  $\Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$  is the Gamma distribution, with the density

$$\pi_h(\gamma) \propto \gamma^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \gamma).$$

Write down the posterior distribution  $\pi^m(u, \gamma)$  and the densities of  $u | \gamma, m$  and  $\gamma | u, m$ . Give the MAP estimators for u and  $\gamma$ .

# CAMBRIDGE

4

**3** (a) Define the Cameron-Martin space and Cameron-Martin theorem both for a Gaussian measure  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a self-adjoint, positive definite trace-class operator on a Hilbert space  $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ .

(b) Assume measurement model  $m = Au + \eta$ , where  $A = K^*K$ , with  $K : H^t(\mathbb{R}^2) \to H^{t+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $K^*$  is such that  $\langle K^*u, v \rangle_{L^2} = \langle u, Kv \rangle_{L^2}$ . The unknown u is assumed to follow a Gaussian prior  $\Pi$ , for which  $\Pi(L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)) = 1$ . Assume white Gaussian noise model, that is,  $\eta \sim P_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ . Define the posterior  $\Pi^m$  using Bayes' theorem. Show that it is well defined and justify why we can use Bayes' theorem. [You may use the properties of white noise and the fact that the potential is  $\nu_0$ -measurable for  $\nu_0(du, dm) = \Pi(du)P_0(dm)$  without proof.]

(c) Let  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  be two probability measures on a separable Banach space X. Let  $(Y, \|\cdot\|)$  be a separable Banach space and assume that  $f: X \to Y$  is measurable and has second moments with respect to both  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ . Show that

$$\|\mathbb{E}^{\mu}(f) - \mathbb{E}^{\mu'}(f)\| \leq 2 \Big(\mathbb{E}^{\mu} \|f\|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{\mu'} \|f\|^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} d_{Hell}(\mu, \mu'),$$

where the Hellinger distance  $d_{Hell}$  is defined as in question 1 part (c).

### END OF PAPER