

Self Consistent ill-posed Inverse Pronlem With Evolutionary Algorithm

August 18, 2015

1 Introduction

In principle, ill-posed inverse problem with the regularization method can give out a very good reconstructed result, but in practice, this is not always the case. The main reason is that we apply our regularization method on the basis of the given, noisy measured value.

In order to solve the ill-posed inverse problem which the measure value or the model is not accurate enough to give out a good reconstructed result, we introduce the self consistent regularization method With Cross Validation.

2 Methodology

2.1 Fredholm integral equation of the first kind

2.2 Tikhonov Regularization

$$x = A^{-1}b = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i} v_i \quad (1)$$

$$u_i^T b = u_i^T (b^{exact} + e) = u_i^T b^{exact} + u_i^T e, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

If all the elements e_i of e are uncorrelated and from the same uniform distribution in the interval $[-\sqrt{3}\eta, \sqrt{3}\eta]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(e_i) &= 0, \quad \varepsilon(e_i^2) = \eta^2, \quad \varepsilon(|e_i|) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\eta \\ Cov(e) &\equiv \varepsilon((e - \varepsilon(e))(e - \varepsilon(e))^T) = \varepsilon(ee^T) = \eta^2 I \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$k < k_\eta : \|Ax_k - b\| \approx \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_\eta} (u_i^T b)^2 + (n - k_\eta)\eta^2 \approx \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_\eta} (u_i^T b^{exact})^2 \quad (4)$$

$$k > k_\eta : \|Ax_k - b\|_2^2 \approx (n - k)\eta^2 \quad (5)$$

2.3 Cellular Evolutionary Algorithm

3 Numerical Results and Discussion

We use a very simple model to illustrate how we use regularization method to solve the ill-posed inverse problem. We use a simplified problem from gravity surveying. An unknown mass distribution with density $f(t)$ is located at depth d below the surface. From 0 to 1 on the t axis shown in Figure. 1. We assume there is no mass outside this source, which produce a gravity field everywhere. At the surface, along the s axis in Figure. 1 from 0 to 1, we measure the vertical component of the gravity field, which refer to as $g(s)$.




Figure 1: The geometry of the gravity surveying model problem: $f(t)$ is the mass density at t . and $g(s)$ is the vertical component of the gravity field at s .

The two functions f and g are related via a Fredholm integral equation of the first kind. The gravity field from an infinitesimally small part of $f(t)$, of length dt , on the axis is identical to the field from a point mass at t of strength $f(t)dt$. Hence, the magnitude of the gravity field along s is $f(t)dt/r^2$, where $r = \sqrt{d^2 + (s-t)^2}$ is the distance between the source point at t and the field point at s . The direction of the gravity field is from the field point to the source point, and therefore the measured value of $g(s)$ is

$$dg = \frac{\sin \theta}{r^2} f(t) dt$$

where θ is the angle shown in Figure. 1. Using that $\sin \theta = d/r$, we obtain

$$\frac{\sin \theta}{r^2} f(t) dt = \frac{d}{(d^2 + (s-t)^2)^{3/2}} f(t) dt$$

The total value of $g(s)$ for any $0 \leq s \leq 1$ consists of contributions from all mass along the t axis (from 0 to 1). and it is therefore given by the integral

$$g(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{(d^2 + (s-t)^2)^{3/2}} f(t) dt$$

This is the forward problem and writing it as

$$\int_0^1 K(s, t) f(t) dt = g(s), \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1 \quad (6)$$

where the function K , which represents the model, is given by

$$k(s, t) = \frac{d}{(d^2 + (s - t)^2)^{3/2}} \quad (7)$$

and the right-hand side g is what we are able to measure. The function K is the vertical component of the gravity field, measured at s , from a unit point source located at t . From K and g we want to compute f , and this is the inverse problem.

Figure.2 shows an example of the computation of the measured signal $g(s)$, given the mass distribution f and three different values of the depth d .

3.1 Discretization of Linear Inverse Problems: Quadrature Methods

We compute approximations \tilde{f}_j to the solution f solely at selected abscissas t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n , i.e.,

$$\tilde{f}_j = \tilde{f}(t_j), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Quadrature methods—also called Nystrom methods—take their basis in the general quadrature rule of the form

$$\int_0^1 \varphi(t) dt = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j \varphi(t_j) + E_n$$

where φ is the function whose integral we want to evaluate, E_n is the quadrature error, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n are the abscissas for the quadrature rule, and $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \dots, \omega_n$ are the corresponding weights. For example, for the midpoint rule in the interval $[0, 1]$ we have

$$t_j = \frac{j - \frac{1}{2}}{n}, \quad \omega_j = \frac{1}{n}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (8)$$

Apply the quadrature methods on Eq.6, we arrive at the relations


$$\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j K(s_i, t_j) \tilde{f}_j = g(s_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (9)$$

The relation in Eq.14 are just a linear system, which can be also written as


$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 K(s_1, t_1) & \omega_2 K(s_1, t_2) & \dots & \omega_n K(s_1, t_n) \\ \omega_1 K(s_2, t_1) & \omega_2 K(s_2, t_2) & \dots & \omega_n K(s_2, t_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \omega_1 K(s_n, t_1) & \omega_2 K(s_n, t_2) & \dots & \omega_n K(s_n, t_n) \end{pmatrix}$$

or simply $Ax = b$, where A is an $n \times n$ matrix. The elements of the matrix A , the right-hand side b , and the solution vector x are given by

$$\left. \begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= \omega_j K(s_i, t_j) \\ x_j &= \tilde{f}(t_j) \\ b_i &= g(s_i) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (10)$$



(a) $f(t)$



(b) $g(s)$

Figure 2: (a) shows the function f (the mass density distribution), and (b) shows the measured signal g (the gravity field) for three different values of the depth d in Figure. 1

3.2 The Singular Value Decomposition

While the matrices that we encountered in the previous section are square, it can be also apply to general case. Hence, we assume that the matrix is either square or has more rows than columns. Then, for any matrix $A \in R^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$, the SVD takes the form

$$A = U \Sigma V^T = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \sigma_i v_i^T \quad (11)$$

Here, $\Sigma \in R^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix with the singular values, satisfying

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n), \quad \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n \geq 0$$

The matrices $U \in R^{m \times n}$ and $V \in R^{n \times n}$ consist of the left and right singular vectors

$$U = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \quad V = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$$

and both matrices have orthonormal columns:

$$U^T U = V^T V = I$$

Here we apply the svd to the inverse problem $x = A^{-1}b$, we immediately see that the “naive” solution is given by

$$x = A^{-1}b = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i} v_i \quad (12)$$

3.3 SVD Analysis and the Discrete Picard Condition

The Discrete picard Condition: Let τ denote the level at which the computed singular values σ_i level off due to rounding errors. The discrete Picard condition is satisfied if, for all singular values larger than τ , the corresponding coefficients $|u_i^T b|$, on average, decay faster than the σ_i .

Figure.3 shows the picard plot for the discretized gravity surveying problem with different noise level.

3.4 Truncated SVD

Figure.4 shows tsvd reconstructed f for the discretized gravity surveying problem with different noise level.

3.5 Tikhonov Regularization


Figure.5 shows Tikhonov Regularization reconstructed f for the discretized gravity surveying problem with different noise level.

3.6 Fitness of the Reconstruction: Generalized Cross Validation


The fitness is calculated as:

$$\min_{\lambda} \|Ax_{\lambda} - b^{exact}\|_2^2 \quad (13)$$

However, we can't calculate it since b^{exact} is not available. Generalized Cross Validation is a classical statistical technique that comes into good use here [1].




(a) With no noise in the right hand side (only discretization noise)




(b) With added noise in the right hand side

Figure 3: The Picard plots for the discretized gravity surveying problem with different noise level. (a) With no added noise (only discretization noise). (b) With an additional white noised added to the measured g (1E-4 random white noise)




(a) With no noise in the right hand side (only discretization noise) truncated number $k = 48$




(b) With added noise in the right hand side (white noise $1E-4$), truncated number $k = 18$

Figure 4: TSVD f reconstruction



(a) With no noise in the right hand side (only discretization noise), $\lambda = 1\text{E-}12$



(b) With added noise in the right hand side (white noise $1\text{E-}4$), $\lambda = 1\text{E-}3$

Figure 5: Tikhonov Regularization f reconstruction




Figure 6: 4 generation of CEA simulation fitness map, we come to the exact de noise measurement of only 2 generation

Using Generalized Cross Validation(GSV), the fitness can be calculated as:

$$\min_{\lambda} \frac{\|Ax_{\lambda} - b\|_2^2}{(m - \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i^{[\lambda]})^2} \quad (14)$$

3.7 Self Consistent Regularization With Cross Validation

4 Cellular Evolutionary Algorithm

4.1 Evolutionary Algorithms

Evolutionary algorithms (EAs) are a family of heuristic search methods that are often used nowadays to find satisfactory solutions to difficult optimization and machine learning problems. EAs are loosely based on a few fundamental evolutionary ideas introduced by Darwin in the nineteenth century. These concepts revolve around the notion of populations of organisms adapting to their environment through genetic inheritance and survival of the fittest.

Each individual may be viewed as a representation, according to an appropriate encoding, of a particular solution to an algorithmic problem. To implement an EAs for solving a given problem, at least approximately, the user must provide the following pieces of information.

4.1.1 Representation

Individuals in the population represent solutions to a problem and must be encoded in some way to be manipulated by the EA processes. They may be just a string of binary digits, which is a widespread and universal representation, or they may be any other data structure that is suitable for the problem at hand such as a string of integers, alphabetic characters, strings of real numbers, and even trees or graphs.

4.1.2 Genetic Operators

Usually Evolutionary Algorithms assume that the structure of the population is panmictic, which means that any individual may interact with any other individual in the population. However, this need not be always the case: we often see populations in the biological and social world in which individuals only interact with a subset of the rest of the population. This situation can usefully be depicted by using the concept of a population graph [2].

References

- [1] Per Christian Hansen. *Discrete inverse problems: insight and algorithms*, volume 7. Siam, 2010.
- [2] Alfons G Hoekstra, Jiri Kroc, and Peter MA Sloot. *Simulating complex systems by cellular automata*. Springer, 2010.