## Notation

There aree

#### Woah a minute ...

But this approach is fraught with computational challenges.

Coupled  $(\cdot)$  and ( lead to parameter/process identification, confounding and MCMC mixing issues.

Emulation already demands substantial computational effort in (modestly) large contexts, i.e., when applied in isolation.



The result is too wigly, and involves high uncertainty in the gap.

plot(ball, xlab=

# Computer

# Compm



#### Cleaner, but better? Maybe it under-predicts for higher balls?

```
plot(ball); lines(heights, pmhat.nobias$mean, col =4, lwd=2) lines(heights, q1nob, col =4, lty=2) lines(heights, q2nob, col =4, lty=2) legend("topleft", c("yMhat+se2"), col =4, lty=1, lwd=2)
```

### Cross-validation

When we have tw1