ENGSCI 741

INVERSE PROBLEMS

Oliver Maclaren
oliver.maclaren@auckland.ac.nz

MODULE OVERVIEW

Inverse Problems (*Oliver Maclaren*) [~9 lectures/tutorials]

1. *Basic concepts* [3 lectures]
   Forward vs inverse problems. Well-posed vs ill-posed problems. Algebra of inverse problems (generalised inverses etc). Regularisation and trade-offs.
2. *More regularisation* [3-4 lectures/tutorials]
   Higher-order Tikhonov regularisation, truncated singular value decompositions, iterative regularisation. Statistical view of inverse problems

MODULE OVERVIEW

3. *Applications* [2-3 lectures/tutorials]
   Deblurring, numerical differentiation, parameter estimation, tomography, remote sensing...(we'll see!)

LECTURE 2: GENERALISED INVERSES

Topics:

- The algebra (and some calculus) of inverse problems
- Why generalised inverses aren't enough!

Eng Sci 741 : Lecture 2.

- Algebra (& a little calculus) of inverse problems
  - ↳ Resolving lack of existence &/or uniqueness using generalised inverses
  - ↳ Formulating & solving as optimisation problems
- Two step vs simultaneous optimisation
  - → Or, why the generalised inverse also needs regularisation

---

Algebra (& some Calc) of Inverse Problems.

Generalised Inverses

Our basic problem can be defined as:

> 'solve', ie 'invert', equations like $F(x) = y$ for x, given y

where:

- x & y could be vectors, functions, images etc
- solutions might not exist, might not be unique &/or might not be stable

---

Linear or nonlinear? Finite or Infinite?

- We will discuss some basic algebra of the problem in the linear & finite dimensional setting

  → ie using Linear Algebra in $\mathbb{R}^n$

- This can be considered as the 'algebra of linear mappings' in $\mathbb{R}^n$

→ An important question is:

do these results carry over to the nonlinear &/or infinite-dimensional setting(s)?

Short answer: yes!

(key concepts & as long as careful)

Linear or nonlinear? Finite or Infinite?

- Algebra of arbitrary mappings?

  ↳ Category theory

  (see eg Nashed for generalised inverses in category theory setting
  → existence ≡ axiom of choice!)

- Discontinuous infinite dimensional linear mappings ('ill-posed')

  ↳ ill-conditioned finite dimensional matrices

→ Theory is a bit beyond scope, but most of the key tools are applicable to nonlinear setting (we'll solve some of these!)

Linear Setting



Consider the system of equations

$$Ax = y$$

- A is $m \times n$ matrix
- $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ vector
- $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ vector

eg



rows: eq^{n}s
cols: unknowns

How do we solve when $m \neq n$?

→ $m > n$, more rows than cols.

existence?



→ eq^{n}s > unknowns
→ possibly inconsistent/overdeterm.
→ 'more data than parameters'

→ $m < n$, more cols than rows

uniqueness?

→ unknowns > eq^{n}s
→ possibly many sol^{n}s
→ 'more param. than data'

Tools developed to 'solve' each case

Case 1: possibly inconsistent: more equations than unknowns.

Consider $Ax = y$, A is $m \times n$ & $m > n$





→ Assume w.l.o.g. that all n columns are linearly independent

- $y \in R(A)$ $\Leftrightarrow$ there is a unique solution

$R(A)$: range/col space/image of A
→ see handout

- $y \notin R(A)$ ⇒ no (exact) solution

→

1. Inconsistent equations: approximate solution

→ Define $r = y - Ax$ } residual 'error'

→ Measure size of error with a norm $\|\cdot\|$ (see handout for diff. types)

→ Typically assume $\|\cdot\|_2$

New problem:

minimise $\|y - Ax\|$, A & y given
$x \in \mathbb{R}^n$



- "best approximation"
- "closest approx"

etc.

Minimiser of $\|\ \|$ & minimiser of $\|\ \|_2^2$ are same ($x \mapsto x^2$ is monotonic for $x \geq 0$)

⇒ Least squares approximation:

minimise $\|y - Ax\|_2^2$ (equiv. problems)
x

Norms, products, summation etc

- $\|x\|_2^2 = \langle x, x \rangle$

  $= x^T x$

  $= \sum_i x_i^2$

- $Ax = \sum A_{ij} x_j$

  $= A_{ij} x_j$ (Einstein summation convention → sum over repeated indices)

So:

- $y^T A x = y_i A_{ij} x_j$

See handout (?) (we'll do some practice!)

Illustration



no line can fit all → inconsistent



Derivation via calc (can do geometrically too!)

$$\min_x \|y - Ax\|_2^2 = \min_x \langle y - Ax, y - Ax \rangle$$

$$= \min_x f(x)$$

where $f(x) = \langle y - Ax, y - Ax \rangle$

$[\ = (y - Ax)^T (y - Ax)\ ]$

same, different notation.

$$= \langle y, y \rangle - 2\langle y, Ax \rangle + \langle Ax, Ax \rangle$$

$$= \|y\|_2^2 - 2 y^T A x + \|Ax\|_2^2$$

$$= y_i y_i - 2 y_i A_{ij} x_j + (A_{ij} x_j)(A_{ik} x_k)$$

etc

Differentiating matrices, vectors etc?

→ 'just' tensor calc!

→ can use index notation OR remember identities] see 3 key rules.

$\min f(x) \Rightarrow \boxed{Df(x) = 0}$ (if diff.)

Here (convex, differentiable etc)

$\min f(x) \iff Df(x) = 0$

(note: f is scalar, Df is vector)

Detailed steps

Consider index form:

$$y_i y_i - 2 y_i A_{ij} x_j + (A_{ij} x_j)(A_{ik} x_k)$$

$$\sim \quad \sim \quad \sim$$

$$\langle y, y \rangle + 2\langle y, Ax \rangle + \langle Ax, Ax \rangle$$

$$\sim \quad \sim$$

$$(Ax)^T (Ax)$$

$$= x^T A^T A x$$

$$= x_i A^T_{ij} A_{jk} x_k$$

$[Df(x)]_k$ for each term (D: derivative, ∇: gradient)

f scalar

→ Df is row vector

→ $\nabla f = (Df)^T$ is col vector

- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(y_i y_i) = 0$
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(2 y_i A_{ij} x_j) = 2 y_i A_{ij} \underbrace{x_{j,k}}_{\frac{\partial x_j}{\partial x_k}}$

$$\frac{\partial x_j}{\partial x_k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = k \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq k \end{cases}$$

$$= \delta_{jk}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(\quad) = 2 y_i A_{ik}$$

ie $\underline{2 y^T A}$ (row vector)

Define $\nabla f = [Df(x)]^T$ as col.

- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}(x_i A^T_{ij} A_{jk} x_k) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(x_i P_{ij} x_j)$

where $A^T_{ij} A_{jk} = P_{ik}$

→

So

- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(x_i P_{ij} x_j)$

$= x_{i,k} P_{ij} x_j + x_i P_{ij} x_{j,k}$ (chain)

$= \delta_{ik} P_{ij} x_j + x_i P_{ij} \delta_{jk}$

$= P_{kj} x_j + x_i P_{ik}$ (no k sum)

$= x_j P_{kj} + x_i P_{ik}$ (no k sum)

$= x_j P^T_{jk} + x_i P_{ik}$ (no k sum)

$= x_i (P^T_{ik} + P_{ik})$ (no k sum)

ie $x^T (P^T + P)$

But note: $P = A^T A \Rightarrow P^T = A^T A = P$

so here, get

$2 x^T A^T A$ (row)

$\nabla f = (Df)^T = 2 A^T A x$ (col)

Phew!

So : $f(x) = \|y\|_2^2 - 2y^TAx + \|Ax\|_2^2$

$= y^Ty - 2y^TAx + x^TA^TAx$ } scalar

minimised when:

$Df = -2y^TA + 2x^TA^TA = 0$ } vector eqns

or $\nabla f = -2A^Ty + 2A^TAx = 0$

$\Leftrightarrow$ $\boxed{A^TAx = A^Ty}$

[or $A^T(Ax-y) = 0$, geometric condition
$\rightarrow$ residual $\in N(A^T)$]

---

3 Key rules : (A, a independent of x)

- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(x^TAx) = x^T(A + A^T)$
  $= 2x^TA$ if A symmetric
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(y^Tx) = y^T$
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(a) = 0$

↳ know these!

Least squares approximation

we have seen this leads to....

The normal equations: [normal? $A^T(Ax-y)=0$]

$$\boxed{A^TAx = A^Ty}$$

→ Since we assume the n cols of A are linearly independent then A^TA is invertible (see handout) & so get unique approximate soln

$$\boxed{x^* = (A^TA)^{-1}A^Ty}$$

(we will look at what happens if not LI soon!).

Left inverses

$\mathbb{R}^n \underset{L}{\overset{A}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{R}^m$

L is a left inverse (a retraction in category theory) for A if it satisfies

$$\boxed{LA = I}$$

$A: m \times n$
$L: n \times m$
$I: n \times n$

For least squares data approximation, we have

$$\boxed{L = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T} \quad \& \quad \boxed{x = Ly}$$

A left inverse exists when $\geq$ rows $\geq$ cols of A & the cols are LI





① then ② is identity on model space

vs. ② then ① shrinks/projects $\mathbb{R}^m$ data to subspace of $\mathbb{R}^m$

'shrink data to make solvable'

Tools developed to 'solve' each case

Case 2: possibly non-unique: more unknowns than equations

Consider $Ax = y$, A is $m \times n$ & $m < n$



→ Assume w.l.o.g. that all m rows are linearly independent

→ Assume $Ax = y$ has at least one solution, ie $y \in R(A)$ (range / image of A)

General solution of $Ax = y$:

$$\boxed{x = x^* + x_0}$$

where $x_0 \in N(A)$ & x^* is any soln of $Ax = y$

(Recall: Nullspace: $N(A) = \{ x \mid Ax = 0 \}$)

2. Underdetermined equations: least norm soln's

- If we want to 'pick out' a single soln (we don't always!), a 'natural' choice is to choose the 'smallest' (think: 'simplest' or 'most efficient' soln)

- Again, this is relative to a particular norm, eg $\|\cdot\|_2 = l_2$ norm.

⇒ Problem to solve:

$$\min_x \|x\| \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax = y$$

} note: here assuming exactly solvable

Equivalent to:

$$\min_x \|x\|^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax = y$$

} 'least squares soln' (cf least squares approximation)

Least norm problem ('Model reduction')

Using duality (assignment?) you can show that the least-squares solution to the minimum norm problem requires solving the dual problem

$$AA^T v = -2y \quad \text{for } v^*$$

& then obtaining $x^* = A^T v^*$

→ Since we assume the m rows of A are linearly independent then AA^T is invertible (see handout) & so get unique minimum norm

$$x^* = A^T(AA^T)^{-1}y$$

(we will look at what happens if not LI soon!).

Right inverses

$\mathbb{R}^n \underset{R}{\overset{A}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{R}^m$

R is a right inverse (a section in category theory) for A if it satisfies

$$AR = I$$

$A: m \times n$, $R: n \times m$, $I: m \times m$

For least norm problems, we have

$$R = A^T(AA^T)^{-1} \quad \& \quad x^* = Ry$$

A right inverse exists when $\geq$ cols $\geq$ rows of A & the rows are LI





'shrink models to make unique'

② then ① 'shrinks'/projects models to subspace while ① then ② is identity on data space

---

Unification: generalised inverses

→ we can unify the solution of these problems with 'generalised inverses'

→ This will solve both existence & uniquess issues at the same time!
  └ spoiler alert: but not stability issues!

! we will see an alternative way to combine/unify the solutions when we discuss regularisation!)

The (actually, a - see later) generalised inverse can be charaterised as solving the minimum norm approximation problem,

⇒ ie it

solves	$\min \|y - Ax\|$
AND	$\min \|x\|$

(in a particular way)

Unification: generalised inverses

- Generalised (or pseudo, for the special cases we look at) inverses solve the two step optimisation prob:

- Stage 1: $\min_x \|y - Ax\|$ or $\|y - Ax\|^2$

Then

- Stage 2: minimise $\|x\|$ or $\|x\|^2$ among all solutions to stage 1.

The result is a matrix $A^\dagger$ that

→ is a left inverse if one exists
→ is a right inverse if one exists
→ 'close to' left/right inverse if neither exist.

Generalised vs pseudo-inverses

The most general algebraic characterisation of a generalised inverse $A^\dagger$ is just

(1) $\boxed{AA^\dagger A = A}$

Note: • suppose A^TA is invertible

⇒ least sq. left inverse $L = (A^TA)^{-1}A^T$ exists

$A^T \cdot (1) \rightarrow A^TAA^\dagger A = A^TA$

$$A^\dagger A = (A^TA)^{-1}A^TA$$
$$= (M)^{-1}M$$
$$= I$$

} is a left inverse too.

• now suppose AA^T is invertible

⇒ least norm right inverse $R = A^T(AA^T)^{-1}$ exists

$(1) \cdot A^T \rightarrow AA^\dagger AA^T = AA^T$

$$AA^\dagger = (AA^T)(AA^T)^{-1}$$
$$= I$$

} is a right inverse too

Generalised vs pseudo-inverses

We don't have to take

- $A^\dagger = L = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T$ = least squares
- $A^\dagger = R = A^T (AA^T)^{-1}$ = least norm

in each case.

Generalised inverses defined via (1)
are not unique

→ add extra conditions
→ depends on goals

} eg different norms etc diff. inverses

Pseudo? → (& will assume unless otherwise)

Eg what we've been using (least sq/norm)
is the Moore-Penrose [Pseudo-inverse]

This satisfies

$$AA^\dagger A = A$$
$$A^\dagger A A^\dagger = A^\dagger$$
$$(A^\dagger A)^T = A^\dagger A$$
$$(AA^\dagger)^T = AA^\dagger$$

least squares, least norm generalised inverse = 'pseudo-inverse'

Model resolution, data resolution operators

$$R_D = AA^\dagger$$ } how much data is 'shrunk' or smeared

$$R_M = A^\dagger A$$ } how much model is 'shrunk' or smeared

Least squares data approx



ie

$R_D \neq I$

$R_M = I$



Least squares model reduction



ie



'shrinks'/projects models to subspace

$R_D = I$

$R_M \neq I$

Subtle point (see later):

we actually want $R_D \neq I$

in above, if we have noise!

Example

Projectile motion (Aster et al Ex. 1.1)

$$y(t) = a + bt - 0.5ct^2$$

→ estimate a, b, c given we observe at m times: } def $\theta = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= a + bt_1 - 0.5t_1^2 \\ y_2 &= a + bt_2 - 0.5t_2^2 \\ &\vdots \\ y_m &= a + bt_m - 0.5t_m^2 \end{aligned}$$

ie

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & t_1 & -0.5t_1^2 \\ 1 & t_2 & -0.5t_2^2 \\ \vdots & & \\ 1 & t_m & -0.5t_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_m \end{bmatrix}$$

ie $\boxed{F \cdot \theta = y}$

[Note: linear in parameters!]

Example : Least squares (param < data)

→ more than three observations
eg 4 obs., 3 param

```
def fmap(tobs):
    A = np.zeros((len(tobs),3))
    for i, ti in enumerate(tobs):
        A[i,:] = np.array([1,ti,-0.5*ti**2])
    return A

#true parameters
theta_true = np.array([10,100,9.81])

#fine time grid
t = np.linspace(0,15,1000)

#observation times
#tobs = np.array([1,13]) #under-determined
tobs = np.array([1,3,5,13]) #over-determined

#forward map
Aobs = fmap(tobs)

#observed data
yobs = np.dot(Aobs,theta_true) #noise-free
#yobs = np.dot(Aobs,theta_true) + np.random.normal(0,30,size=len(tobs))

#plots
plt.plot(tobs,yobs,'ro',markersize=10)
plt.plot(t,x,'r')
plt.show()
```



noise free



noisy.

Invert :

```
Apinv = np.linalg.pinv(Aobs)
```

noise free



noisy





repeated sampling

Exercise : explore what the parameters are doing compared to true values (this & next)

Example : least norm (param > data)

→ less than three observations

Solutions

noise free data



noisy data



recovered (blue)



recovered (blue)





repeated sampling

Note: we've use the naive model norm $\|\theta\|_2$ including the constant term → here curved actually 'smaller' than straight (see later)

So are we done?

Recall: two stage def^n of generalised inverse

→ First minimise data fit

→ Then minimise model

Inverse problems:

Typically

- undetermined
- also have noise



So: generalised inverse will exactly fit noise!

→ unstable (just like usual inverse)

Example : instability despite model 'reduction'

Eg - high degree polynomial } possibly non unique.
- plus observation noise } possibly inconsistent

$$y = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x + \dots a_n x^n$$ class

But true model : $a_i = 0$ if $i \neq 1$
$a_1 = 1$

'True' data : (5 observations)



noise free recovery ↙

↘ add noise & recover





unstable ! Not reduced enough !

Trade-offs & regularisation

→ Just as we saw in LI that having an inverse in principle is not enough,

having a generalised inverse is not enough

→ stability is still a key issue.

However, the 'extremal' or variational characterisation of generalised inverses provides a as to how to control stability as well !

Trade-offs & regularisation

- Instead of two-step:
  - Stage 1: $\underset{x}{\text{minimise}} \; \|y - Ax\|$ or $\|y - Ax\|^2$

Then

  - Stage 2: minimise $\|x\|$ or $\|x\|^2$ among all solutions to stage 1.

- Try simultaneous minimisation:

vector/multi objective problem

$$\min_x \left(\|y - Ax\|, \|x\| \right)$$

simultaneously

→

Solution curve:



→ allows us to filter noise in underdetermined case, while still 'shrinking' or reducing models to get 'simple' solutions