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## Overview

A supervised learning algorithm

An unsupervised learning algorithm（diffusion maps）

Learning the localization function of EnKF

Learning a likelihood function．Application：To Correct biased observation model error in DA
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- Various methods to estimate $\mathcal{H}$ include regression, SVM, KNN, Neural Nets, etc.
- For this talk, we will focus on how to use regression in appropriate spaces to improve EnKF.


## An unsupervised learning algorithm

Given a data set $\left\{x_{i}\right\}$, the main task is to learn a function $\varphi\left(x_{i}\right)$ that can describe the data.
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## An unsupervised learning algorithm

Given a data set $\left\{x_{i}\right\}$, the main task is to learn a function $\varphi\left(x_{i}\right)$ that can describe the data.

In this talk, I will focus on a nonlinear manifold learning algorithm, the diffusion maps ${ }^{1}$ : Given $\left\{x_{i}\right\} \in \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with a sampling measure $q$, the diffusion maps algorithm is a kernel based method that produces orthonormal basis functions on the manifold, $\varphi_{k} \in L^{2}(\mathcal{M}, q)$.

These basis functions are solutions of an eigenvalue problem,

$$
q^{-1} \operatorname{div}\left(q \nabla \varphi_{k}(x)\right)=\lambda_{k} \varphi_{k}(x)
$$

where the weighted Laplacian operator is approximated with an integral operator with appropriate normalization.
${ }^{1}$ Coifman \& Lafon 2006, Berry \& H, 2016.

## Examples:

Example: Uniformly distributed data on a circle, we obtain the Fourier basis.


Example: Gaussian distributed data on a real line, we obtain the Hermite polynomials.




Example: Nonparametric basis functions estimated on nontrivial manifold


Remark: Essentially, one can view the DM as a method to learn generalized Fourier basis on the manifold.
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- Let's use the idea from machine learning to train this localization function. The key idea is to find a map that takes poorly estimated correlations to accurately estimated correlations.
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Given a set of large ensemble EnKF solutions, $\left\{x_{m}^{a, k}\right\}_{\substack{k=1, \ldots, L \\ m=1, \ldots, M}}$ as a training data set, where $L$ is large enough so the correlation, $\rho_{i j}^{L} \approx \rho\left(x_{i}, y_{j}\right)$, is accurate.

- Operationally, we wish to run EnKF with $K \ll L$ ensemble members. Then our goal is to train a map that transform the subsampled correlation $\rho_{i j}^{K}$ into the accurate correlation $\rho_{i j}^{L}$.
- Basically, we consider the following optimization problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \min _{L_{x_{i} y_{j}}} \int_{[-1,1]} \int_{[-1,1]}\left(L_{x_{i} y_{j}} \rho_{i j}^{K}-\rho_{i j}^{L}\right)^{2} p\left(\rho_{i j}^{K} \mid \rho_{i j}^{L}\right) p\left(\rho_{i j}^{L}\right) d \rho_{i j}^{K} d \rho_{i j}^{L} \\
& \stackrel{M \mathcal{C}}{\approx} \min _{L_{x_{i} y_{j}}} \frac{1}{M S} \sum_{m, s=1}^{M, S}\left(L_{x_{i} y_{j}} \rho_{i j, m, s}^{K}-\rho_{i j, m}^{L}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\rho_{i j, m}^{L} \sim p\left(\rho_{i j}^{L}\right)$ and $\rho_{i j, m, s}^{K} \sim p\left(\rho_{i j}^{K} \mid \rho_{i j}^{L}\right)$ is an estimated correlation using only $K$ out of $L$ training data.
${ }^{2}$ De La Chevrotière \& H, 2017.

## Example: On Monsoon-Hadley multicloud model ${ }^{3}$

It's a Galerkin projection of zonally symmetric $\beta$-plane primitive eqns into the barotropic, and first two baroclinic modes, stochastically driven by a three-cloud model paradigm. Consider observation model $h(x)$ that is similar to a RTM.
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## Example of trained localization map

Channel 3 and $\theta_{1}$



Channel 6 and $\theta_{e b}$



## DA results






| - | K1000 | －0． | Ld $\quad-\quad$ obs noise | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| climato std |  |  |  |  |

## Correcting biased observation model error ${ }^{4}$

All the Kalman based DA method assumes unbiased observation model error, e.g.,

$$
y_{i}=h\left(x_{i}\right)+\eta_{i}, \quad \eta_{i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R)
$$

Suppose the operator $h$ is un known. Instead, we are only given $\tilde{h}$, then

$$
y_{i}=\tilde{h}\left(x_{i}\right)+b_{i}
$$

where we introduce a biased model error, $b_{i}=h\left(x_{i}\right)-\tilde{h}\left(x_{i}\right)+\eta_{i}$.

## Example: Basic radiative transfer model

Consider solutions of the stochastic cloud model ${ }^{5}$, $\left\{T(z), \theta_{e b}, q, f_{d}, f_{s}, f_{c}\right\}$. Based on this solutions, define a basic radiative transfer model as follows,

$$
h_{\nu}(x)=\theta_{e b} T_{\nu}(0)+\int_{0}^{\infty} T(z) \frac{\partial T_{\nu}}{\partial z}(z) d z
$$

where $T_{\nu}$ is the transmission between heights $z$ to $\infty$ that is defined to depend on $q$.
The weighting function, $\frac{\partial T_{\nu}}{\partial z}$ are defined as follows:
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## Example: Basic radiative transfer model
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One can check that $h_{\nu}(x, 0)$ corresponds to cloud-free RTM.

## Systematic model error in data assimilation

Suppose the observation is generated with

$$
y_{\nu}=h_{\nu}(x, f)+\eta, \quad \eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R)
$$

The difficulty in estimating the cloud fractions, cloud top heights and (in reality we don't know precisely how many clouds under a column) induces model error.

## Systematic model error in data assimilation

Suppose the observation is generated with

$$
y_{\nu}=h_{\nu}(x, f)+\eta, \quad \eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R)
$$

The difficulty in estimating the cloud fractions, cloud top heights and (in reality we don't know precisely how many clouds under a column) induces model error.
In an extreme case, we consider filtering with a cloud-free RTM:

$$
y_{\nu}=h_{\nu}(x, 0)+b_{\nu}
$$

where $b_{\nu}=h_{\nu}(x, f)-h_{\nu}(x, 0)+\eta$ is model error with bias.

## Observations $\left(y_{\nu}\right)$ v Model error $\left(b_{\nu}\right)$



## State estimation of the model error

We propose a secondary filter to estimate the statistics for $b_{i}$ as follows:


A machine learning technique, kernel embedding of conditional distribution ${ }^{6}$, is employed to train a nonparametric likelihood function.
${ }^{6}$ Song, Fukumizu, Gretton, 2013.

## Secondary Bayesian filter

$$
p\left(b \mid y_{i}\right) \propto p(b) p\left(y_{i} \mid b\right)
$$




## Filter estimates (with adaptive tuning of $R$ and $Q$ ).



## Example: Lorenz-96

Biased occurs random in space and times.




## Nonparametric likelihood function

We will use the kernel embedding of conditional distribution．${ }^{7}$
Recall：Let $X$ be a r．v on $\mathcal{M}$ and distribution $P(X)$ ．Given a kernel $K: \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ，the Moore－Aronszajn theorem states that there exists a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space（RKHS）
$L^{2}(\mathcal{M}, q)$ ．This means that that $f(x)=\langle f, K(x, \cdot)\rangle_{q}$ ．

## Nonparametric likelihood function

The kernel embedding of conditional distribution $P(Y \mid B)$ is defined as,

$$
\mu_{Y \mid b}=\mathbb{E}_{Y \mid b}[\tilde{K}(Y, \cdot)]=\int_{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{K}(y, \cdot) d P(y \mid b) .
$$

Given $g \in L^{2}(\mathcal{N}, \tilde{q})$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{Y \mid b}[g(Y)] & =\int_{\mathcal{N}} g(y) d P(y \mid b)=\int_{\mathcal{N}}\langle g, \tilde{K}(y, \cdot)\rangle_{\tilde{q}} d P(y \mid b) \\
& =\left\langle g, \int_{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{K}(y, \cdot) d P(y \mid b)\right\rangle_{\tilde{q}}=\left\langle g, \mu_{Y \mid b}\right\rangle_{\tilde{q}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

One can verify that

$$
\mu_{Y \mid b}=q \mathcal{C}_{Y B} \mathcal{C}_{B B}^{-1} K(b, \cdot),
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{C}_{B Y}=\int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{N}} K(b, \cdot) \otimes \tilde{K}(y, \cdot) d P(b, y)
$$

is the kernel embedding of $P(B, Y)$ on appropriate Hilbert spaces.

## Nonparametric likelihood function $p(y \mid b)$

Given $\left\{b_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$ and $\left\{y_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$ Apply diffusion maps to learn the data-driven orthonormal basis functions $\varphi_{j}(b) \in L^{2}(\mathcal{M}, q)$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{k}(y) \in L^{2}(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{q})$. Let

$$
p(y \mid b)=\sum_{k} \mu_{Y \mid b, k} \tilde{\varphi}_{k}(y) \tilde{q}(y)
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{Y \mid b, k} & =\left\langle p(\cdot \mid b), \tilde{\varphi}_{k}\right\rangle=\mathbb{E}_{Y \mid b}\left[\tilde{\varphi}_{k}\right]=\left\langle\mu_{Y \mid b}, \tilde{\varphi}_{k}\right\rangle_{\tilde{q}} \\
& =\left\langle q \mathcal{C}_{Y B} \mathcal{C}_{B B}^{-1} K(b, \cdot), \tilde{\varphi}_{k}\right\rangle_{\tilde{q}} \\
& =\cdots \\
& =\sum_{j} \varphi_{j}(x)\left[C_{Y B} C_{B B}^{-1}\right]_{k j}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[C_{Y B}\right]_{j k} } & =\left\langle\mathcal{C}_{Y B}, \tilde{\varphi}_{j} \otimes \varphi_{k}\right\rangle_{\tilde{q} \otimes q} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{\varphi}_{j}\left(y_{i}\right) \varphi_{k}\left(b_{i}\right), \\
{\left[C_{B B}\right]_{j k} } & =\left\langle\mathcal{C}_{B B}, \varphi_{j} \otimes \varphi_{k}\right\rangle_{q} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_{j}\left(b_{i}\right) \varphi_{k}\left(b_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$
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