

# Bayesian Projected Calibration of Computer Models

Fangzheng Xie and Yanxun Xu \*

Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University

## Abstract

We develop a Bayesian approach called Bayesian projected calibration to address the problem of calibrating an imperfect computer model using observational data from a complex physical system. The calibration parameter and the physical system are parametrized in an identifiable fashion via  $L_2$ -projection. The physical process is imposed a Gaussian process prior, which naturally induces a prior on the calibration parameter through the  $L_2$ -projection constraint. The calibration parameter is estimated through its posterior distribution, which provides a natural and non-asymptotic way for uncertainty quantification. We provide rigorous large sample justifications of the proposed approach by establishing the asymptotic normality of the posterior of the calibration parameter with efficient covariance matrix. Through extensive simulation studies and two real-world datasets analyses, we show that Bayesian projected calibration can accurately estimate the calibration parameters, calibrate the computer models, and compare favorably to alternative approaches. An R package implementing the Bayesian projected calibration is publicly available at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Sij0P-g5ocnTeL\\_qcQ386b-jfBfV-ww\\_/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Sij0P-g5ocnTeL_qcQ386b-jfBfV-ww_/view?usp=sharing).

*Keywords:* Asymptotic normality; Computer experiment;  $L_2$ -projection; Semiparametric efficiency; Uncertainty quantification

---

\*Correspondence should be addressed to Yanxun Xu (yanxun.xu@jhu.edu)

# 1 Introduction

With the rapid development of computational techniques and mathematical tools, computer models have been widely adopted by researchers to study large and complex physical systems. One can think of computer models as complicated nonlinear functions designed by experts using scientific knowledge (Plumlee, 2017). Compared to physical experiments, computer models are typically much faster and cheaper to run. Furthermore, computer models can be used to generate data that are infeasible to collect in practice. For example, a public available computer model called TITAN2D (Sheridan et al., 2002) was developed to simulate granular mass flows over digital elevation models of natural terrain, to better understand the loss of life and disruption of infrastructure due to volcanic phenomena, the data of which are impossible to collect in real life. For more applications of computer models, we refer to Fang et al. (2005), Santner et al. (2013), and the April 2018 issue of *Statistica Sinica* (<http://www3.stat.sinica.edu.tw/statistica>), which are devoted to computer experiments and uncertainty quantification.

In this paper we consider the *calibration* problem in computer models when they include not only the variables that can be measured, often referred to as *design*, but also unknown parameters that are not directly available in the physical system. These parameters are referred to as *calibration parameters* in the literature (Tuo and Wu, 2016). The goal of calibration is to estimate calibration parameters by combining observational data from physical systems and simulated data from computer models, so that the computer models with the estimated calibration parameters plugged-in provide decent approximations to the underlying physical systems. Formally, we model the outputs  $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$  of the physical system  $\eta$  at design  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1}^n$  through a nonparametric regression model

$$y_i = \eta(\mathbf{x}_i) + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $(e_i)_{i=1}^n$  are independent  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  noises. The computer model  $y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , also referred to as the simulator, is a function designed by scientific experts to model the unknown physical system  $\eta(\cdot)$  when the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is appropriately estimated.

Despite the success of computer models in many scientific studies, researchers often ask

the following question: is the computer model a suitable surrogate for the real physical system? Compared to the physical system, traditional computer models are rarely perfect or exact due to their fixed parametric nature or simplifications of complex physical phenomenon (Tuo and Wu, 2015): i.e., there exists discrepancy between a physical system  $\eta(\cdot)$  and its corresponding computer model  $y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  even if the computer model is well calibrated. Kennedy and O’Hagan (2001) first tackle this discrepancy issue under a Bayesian framework, which has been influential among many other statisticians and quality control engineers. For an incomplete list of references, we refer to Higdon et al. (2004); Bayarri et al. (2007); Qian and Wu (2008); Joseph and Melkote (2009); Wang et al. (2009); Chang and Joseph (2014); Brynjarsdóttir and OHagan (2014); Storlie et al. (2015) among others.

Theoretical properties of calibration problem was not well understood until Tuo and Wu (2015, 2016), who pointed out that the calibrated computer models estimated by Kennedy and O’Hagan (2001) could lead to poor approximations to physical systems. Identifiability issue of the calibration parameter in Kennedy and O’Hagan (2001) was also noticed by Wong et al. (2017) and H. P. Wynn, among several other discussants, in their written discussion of Kennedy and O’Hagan (2001). In short, identifiability issue refers to the phenomenon that the distribution of the observed data from physical system does not uniquely determine the value of the corresponding calibration parameter given the computer model. In contrast to the Bayesian methods, which are traditionally applied to computer model calibration problems, Tuo and Wu (2015, 2016) and Wong et al. (2017) address the identifiability issue rigorously in frequentist frameworks and provide corresponding theoretical justifications.

We propose a Bayesian method for computer model calibration called Bayesian projected calibration. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first one in the literature that simultaneously achieves the following objectives:

- a) **Identifiability:** The proposed approach is formulated in an identifiable fashion. Tuo and Wu (2015, 2016) and Wong et al. (2017) define the “true” value of the calibration parameter to be the one that minimizes the  $L_2$  distance between the computer model  $y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and the physical system  $\eta(\cdot)$ . Following their work, the proposed Bayesian projected calibration provides a Bayesian method to estimate this “true” value of the

calibration parameter.

- b) **Uncertainty quantification:** The Bayesian projected calibration provides a natural way for uncertainty quantification of the calibration parameter through its full posterior distribution. [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) showed the asymptotic normality of the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate for uncertainty quantification of the calibration parameter, which may not work in practice, since the amount of physical data is usually very limited ([Tuo, 2017](#)). Hence a Bayesian approach is desired, especially when data are scarce.
- c) **Theoretical guarantee:** We show that the full posterior distribution of the calibration parameter is asymptotically normal with efficient covariance matrix. Earlier literatures either only provide asymptotic results of specific point estimators ([Tuo and Wu, 2015, 2016](#); [Wong et al., 2017](#); [Tuo, 2017](#)), or formulate a Bayesian methodology for calibration problem without large sample evaluation ([Plumlee, 2017](#)). Our method represents the first effort in providing the theoretical guarantee for the full posterior distribution of Bayesian methods in computer model calibration.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we formulate the calibration problem rigorously in an identifiable fashion and introduce the Bayesian projected calibration method. Section 3 elaborates on the asymptotic properties of the posterior distribution of the calibration parameter. In section 4, we demonstrate the advantages of the Bayesian projected calibration in terms of estimation accuracy and uncertainty quantification via simulation studies and two real-world data examples. Conclusion and further discussion of the paper are in section 5.

## 2 Problem Formulation

### 2.1 Background

We first briefly review the frequentist  *$L_2$ -projected calibration* approach proposed by [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) before introducing the proposed Bayesian projected calibration method, which can be regarded as the Bayesian version of the  $L_2$ -projected calibration.

Suppose one has collected responses  $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$  from a physical system  $\eta$  on a set of design points  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ , where  $\eta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a deterministic function, and the design space  $\Omega$  is the closure of a connect bounded convex open set in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . The physical responses  $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$  are noisy due to measurement or observational errors, and hence can be modeled by the following nonparametric regression model:

$$y_i = \eta(\mathbf{x}_i) + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $e_i$  are independent  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  noises. Such a model has been widely adopted in the literature of calibration ([Kennedy and O’Hagan, 2001](#); [Tuo and Wu, 2015](#); [Tuo, 2017](#); [Wong et al., 2017](#)).

Let  $\Theta$  be the parameter space of the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . We assume that  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q$  is compact. A computer model is a deterministic function  $y^s : \Omega \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that produces an output  $y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  given a controllable input  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ . The goal of calibration is to estimate  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  given the computer model  $y^s$  and the physical data  $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ , such that the calibrated computer model approximates the physical system well. However, as pointed out by [Tuo and Wu \(2016\)](#) and [Wong et al. \(2017\)](#), the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  cannot be identified without further restriction, in the sense that  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  cannot be uniquely determined by the distribution of  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . More precisely, by alternatively expressing the physical system  $\eta$  in terms of the computer model  $y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and a discrepancy  $\delta(\mathbf{x})$  as follows ([Kennedy and O’Hagan, 2001](#); [Wong et al., 2017](#); [Plumlee, 2017](#); [Tuo, 2017](#)):

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}) = y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \delta(\mathbf{x}),$$

where the discrepancy function  $\delta$  is completely nonparametric, it is clear that  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta)$  cannot be uniquely identified by the physical system  $\eta$ . Therefore, the “true” value of the calibration parameter that gives rise to the physical data is not well-defined.

To address the identifiability issue, [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) define the “true” value of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  through the  $L_2$ -projection:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})]^2 d\mathbf{x}. \quad (2.2)$$

The  $L_2$ -projected calibration method provides an estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$  using a two-step proce-

ture. First, an estimate  $\widehat{\eta}$  of the physical system  $\eta$  is obtained via the *kernel ridge regression* (Wahba, 1990) given the physical data  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ :

$$\widehat{\eta} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i)]^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\Psi : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a positive definite covariance function, and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)}$  is the native norm of the *reproducing kernel Hilbert space* (RKHS) associated with  $\Psi$ . We refer to Wahba (1990) and Wendland (2004) for detailed treatment of these concepts. Then, the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$  is given by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} := \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\widehat{\eta}(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (2.4)$$

The  $L_2$ -projected calibration has very nice theoretical properties:  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  is not only  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ , but is also semiparametric efficient (Tuo and Wu, 2016). In other words, it provides an optimal estimator to the “true” calibration parameter.

## 2.2 Bayesian Projected Calibration

The  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  enjoys nice asymptotic properties. Nevertheless, it is a frequentist approach, therefore uncertainty quantification needs to be assessed via additional procedures, *e.g.*, bootstrap (Wong et al., 2017), etc. In what follows, we address this issue by formulating its Bayesian counterpart.

We follow the definition of the “true” value  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$  of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  given in (2.2), as it minimizes the uncertainty beyond the computer model for explaining the physical system. There are two unknown parameters: the physical system  $\eta$ , taking values in some function space  $\mathcal{F}$ , and the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ . The statistical model for calibration can be defined by

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ \Psi_\sigma(y - \eta(\mathbf{x})) : \eta \in \mathcal{F}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \right\},$$

where  $\Psi_\sigma(\cdot)$  is the density function of  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ . Namely, the parameter  $(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$  is constrained on a manifold in  $\mathcal{F} \times \Theta$  defined by

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ (\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta : \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

It is therefore natural to treat the “true” calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$  as a functional  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \Theta$ ,

$\eta \mapsto \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$ , of a physical system  $\eta$ , and we denote this functional by  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ . To distinguish the parameter  $(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)$  and the truth that generates the data, we denote  $\eta_0$  to be the true physical system producing physical data  $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_0}^*$ .

We now introduce the *Bayesian projected calibration*. The unknown physical process  $\eta$  is imposed a mean-zero Gaussian process prior  $\Pi = \text{GP}(0, \tau^2\Psi)$ , where  $\Psi : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is a positive definite covariance function, and  $\tau > 0$  is a scaling factor. Let  $\mathcal{D}_n$  denote the physical data  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ , and  $\Pi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_n)$  denote the posterior distribution given  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . It is straightforward to show that the posterior distribution of  $\eta$  is also a Gaussian process with mean function  $\tilde{\eta}$  and covariance function  $\tilde{\Psi}$ , where

$$\tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) = \tau^2 \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x})^\top (\tau^2 \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x}_{1:n}) + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \tau^2 \Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') - \tau^2 \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x})^\top (\tau^2 \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x}_{1:n}) + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \tau^2 \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x}'). \quad (2.7)$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x}) = [\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}), \dots, \Psi(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x})]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}_{1:n}, \mathbf{x}_{1:n}) = [\Psi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)]_{n \times n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{y} = [y_1^p, \dots, y_n^p]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Notice here the predictive mean  $\tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{x})$  given physical data  $\mathcal{D}_n$  coincides with the kernel ridge regression estimate  $\hat{\eta}$  for some suitably chosen  $\tau$  (see, for example, [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006](#)). The Gaussian process prior  $\text{GP}(0, \tau^2\Psi)$  on  $\eta$  naturally induces a prior distribution on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  through the constrained manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  in (2.5). The Bayesian projected calibration can be regarded as a Bayesian version of the  $L_2$ -projected calibration method, because both methods estimate the “true” value of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  over the constrained manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  using Bayesian and frequentist approach, respectively. Furthermore, in Section 3 we will show that the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  under the Bayesian projected calibration is asymptotically centered at the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$ .

*Remark 1* (Expensive computer model). In the literature of computer experiments, it is common that the computer model  $y^s$  is not directly available to us or time-consuming to run, in which case the computer model can be only computed at given design points. Thus finding an emulator  $\hat{y}^s$  for  $y^s$  using the data from the computer outputs at given design points is needed. One first collects a set of data  $(\mathbf{x}_j^s, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^s, y_j^s)_{j=1}^m$  from  $m$  runs of the computer model, where  $y_j^s = y^s(\mathbf{x}_j^s, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^s)$  is the output at the design point  $\mathbf{x}_j^s$ , then estimate the emulator  $\hat{y}^s$  using the data  $(\mathbf{x}_j^s, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^s, y_j^s)_{j=1}^m$ . There are varieties of methods for constructing emulators for

computer experiments, including Gaussian process models (Santner et al., 2013), radial basis function interpolation (Wendland, 2004), polynomial chaos approximation (Xiu, 2010), or the smoothing spline ANOVA (Wahba, 1990). To perform computer model calibration when the computer model  $y^s$  is not directly available or time-consuming to run, the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  can be estimated by replacing  $y^s$  with the corresponding emulator  $\widehat{y}^s$ .

### 3 Theoretical Properties

In this section we provide large sample justifications of the proposed Bayesian projected calibration. In particular, asymptotic characterization of the posterior distribution  $\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_n)$  of the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  given the physical data  $\mathcal{D}_n$  is offered. The posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  has similar behavior as the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$ :  $\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_n)$  is not only  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent, but also asymptotically normal with efficient covariance matrix. The asymptotic normality of Bayesian posterior is also referred to as Bernstein-von Mises (BvM) limit (see, for example, chapter 10 in van der Vaart, 2000). The development of semiparametric BvM theorem had not been established until Bickel and Kleijn (2012). For a thorough treatment of BvM limits of smooth functionals in semiparametric models, we refer to Castillo and Rousseau (2015a).

Before proceeding to the main results, we introduce some notations and definitions. Given an integer vector  $\mathbf{k} = [k_1, \dots, k_p]^T$  and a function  $f(x_1, \dots, x_p) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote  $D^{\mathbf{k}}$  to be the mixed partial derivative operator defined by  $D^{\mathbf{k}}f = \partial^{|\mathbf{k}|}f / \partial x_1^{k_1} \dots \partial x_p^{k_p}$ , where  $|\mathbf{k}| := \sum_{j=1}^p k_j$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  be positive, and  $\underline{\alpha}$  be the greatest integer strictly smaller than  $\alpha$ . The  $\alpha$ -Hölder norm of a function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega)} := \max_{\mathbf{k}:|\mathbf{k}|\leq\underline{\alpha}} \|D^{\mathbf{k}}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \max_{\mathbf{k}:|\mathbf{k}|=\underline{\alpha}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}'} \frac{|D^{\mathbf{k}}f(\mathbf{x}) - D^{\mathbf{k}}f(\mathbf{x}')|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|^{\alpha-\underline{\alpha}}}.$$

The  $\alpha$ -Hölder space of functions on  $\Omega$ , denoted by  $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , is the set of functions with finite  $\alpha$ -Hölder norm. The  $\alpha$ -Sobolev space of functions, denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , is the set of functions  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that can be extended to  $\mathbb{R}^p$  such that the Fourier transform



$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{t}) = (2\pi)^{-p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{i\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$  satisfies (van der Vaart and Zanten, 2011)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} (1 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2)^\alpha \left| \widehat{f}(\mathbf{t}) \right|^2 d\mathbf{t} < \infty.$$

Denote  $\Psi_\alpha$  to be the Matérn correlation function with roughness parameter  $\alpha$

$$\Psi_\alpha(x, x') = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)2^{\alpha-1}} \left( \sqrt{2\alpha} \|x - x'\| \right)^\alpha K_\alpha(\sqrt{2\alpha} \|x - x'\|), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $K_\alpha$  is the modified Bessel function of the second kind.

To study the asymptotic behavior of the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ , we first explore convergence properties of the physical system  $\eta$ . For simplicity we assume that the design space  $\Omega$  is the unit hypercube  $[0, 1]^p$ , and the design points  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1}^n$  are independently and uniformly sampled from  $\Omega$ . The computer model  $y^s$  is assumed to be directly available to us or cheap to run. Such a simplified assumption is also adopted in Wong et al. (2017), and it does no harms to the theoretical analysis, as the amount of data from computer experiments is typically much larger than the sample size of the physical data. In addition, the computer data  $(\mathbf{x}_j^s, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^s, y_j^s)_{j=1}^m$  are deterministic, and the approximation error between  $y^s$  and  $\widehat{y}^s$ , when sufficiently small as  $m$  gets large, does not affect the stochastic analysis here. Therefore one may assume that the approximation error of  $\widehat{y}^s$  to  $y^s$  is negligible. The true but unknown physical system  $\eta_0$  is assumed to lie in the intersection of the  $\alpha$ -Hölder space  $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega)$  and  $\alpha$ -Sobolev space  $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$  for some  $\alpha > p/2$ . We assume that the prior  $\Pi$  for  $\eta$  is the mean-zero Gaussian process  $\text{GP}(0, \tau^2 \Psi_\alpha)$  and without loss of generality, the scaling factor  $\tau$  is fixed at 1.

**Theorem 1** (Convergence of  $\eta$ ). *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Gaussian process prior  $\Pi = \text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$ , and  $\eta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , where  $\alpha > p/2$ . Then for any sequence  $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \Pi \left( \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} > M_n n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

and there exists some constant  $M > 0$  such that

$$\Pi \left( \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} > M \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\mathbb{P}_0$ -probability.

The resulting rate  $n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}$  is proven to be optimal when the underlying true function

$\eta_0$  is an  $\alpha$ -Hölder or  $\alpha$ -Sobolev function (See, for example, [Stone, 1982](#), [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#), and [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017](#)).

We next discuss the property of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  as a functional:  $\eta \mapsto \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ . Under certain regularity conditions to be stated next,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  yields a first-order Taylor expansion with respect to  $\eta$  locally around  $\eta_0$ . Such a smooth property of the functional  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  serves as the building block to derive the asymptotic normality of the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ .

A1  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  is the unique solution to (2.2) and is in the interior of  $\Theta$  for  $\eta$  in an  $L_2$ -neighborhood of  $\eta_0$ .

A2  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)} < \infty$ .

A3 The Hessian matrix

$$\mathbf{V}_\eta = \int_{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)] \right\} d\mathbf{x}$$

is strictly positive definite in an  $L_2$ -neighborhood of  $\eta_0$ .

A4 For all  $j, k = 1, \dots, q$ , it holds that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} < \infty, \quad \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k}(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathfrak{C}_1(\Omega \times \Theta).$$

**Lemma 1** (Taylor Expansion). *Under conditions A1-A4, there exists some  $\epsilon > 0$  and some positive constants  $L_{\eta_0}^{(1)}$  and  $L_{\eta_0}^{(2)}$  depending on  $\eta_0$  only, such that  $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| \leq L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$  and*

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* - 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) d\mathbf{x} \right\| \leq L_{\eta_0}^{(2)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \quad (3.2)$$

whenever  $\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} < \epsilon$ , where  $\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{V}_{\eta_0}$ .

It follows immediately from the convergence results of the physical system  $\eta$  (theorem 1) and the Taylor expansion property of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  (lemma 1) that the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  is consistent.

**Corollary 1** (Consistency of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ ). *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Gaussian process prior  $\Pi = \text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$ , and  $\eta \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ . Then the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  is consistent, i.e.,  $\Pi(\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{D}_n) \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}_0$ -probability for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .*

Now we are in a position to characterize the asymptotic behavior of the posterior distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ , which is the main result of this paper. Under certain regularity conditions, the posterior distribution of  $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2})$  is asymptotically normal, where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  is the frequentist  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  proposed by [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) (see section 2). We describe the  $L_2$ -projected calibration procedure in our context for completeness:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= \arg \min_{f \in \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\nu}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i)]^2 + \lambda_n \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\nu}(\Omega)}^2, \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\nu = \alpha - p/2$ , and  $\lambda_n = O(n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)})$  is a sequence depending on the sample size of the physical data  $\mathcal{D}_n$ .

**Theorem 2** (Asymptotic Normality). *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Gaussian process prior  $\Pi = \text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$ , and  $\eta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , where  $\alpha > p/2$ . Under conditions A1-A4, it holds that*

$$\sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \text{N} \left( \mathbf{0}, 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right) (A) \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1),$$

provided that

$$\mathbf{W} = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] d\mathbf{x}$$

is strictly positive definite, where the supremum is taken over all measurable subsets in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ .

[Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) proved that the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  is also asymptotically normal:  $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \text{N}(\mathbf{0}, 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1})$ . Furthermore, the covariance matrix  $4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}$  achieves semiparametric efficiency in the sense that there does not exist a regular estimate with a smaller asymptotic covariance matrix (in spectrum). The posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  possesses a similar optimal behavior, since the covariance matrix of the asymptotic posterior of  $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2})$  coincides with that of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$ .

We finish this section with the following  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency result of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ , which is a refinement of corollary 1. It is a consequence of theorem 2 and the asymptotic normality of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$ .

**Corollary 2** ( $\sqrt{n}$ -Consistency of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$ ). *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Gaussian process prior  $\Pi = \text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$ , and  $\eta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , where  $\alpha > p/2$ . Under the conditions of theo-*

rem 2, the posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  is  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent, i.e., for any sequence  $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_0 [\Pi(\sqrt{n}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| > M_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] \rightarrow 0$ .

We defer the proof of Theorem 2 to the Appendix. The proofs of all other theorems, lemmas, and propositions are deferred to the supplementary material.

## 4 Numerical Examples

This section provides extensive numerical examples to evaluate the proposed Bayesian projected calibration. Subsection 4.1 presents simulation studies via three synthetic examples. Two real-world data examples are included in subsections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.

### 4.1 Simulation Studies

We consider three configurations.

- **Configuration 1.** The computer model is

$$y^s(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 7[\sin(2\pi\theta_1 - \pi)]^2 + 2[(2\pi\theta_2 - \pi)^2 \sin(2\pi x - \pi)],$$

and the physical system coincides with the computer model when  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* = [0.2, 0.3]^T$ , i.e.,  $\eta_0(x) = y^s(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*)$ . The design space  $\Omega$  is  $[0, 1]$ , and the parameter space  $\Theta$  for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is  $[0, 0.25] \times [0, 0.5]$ . We simulate  $n = 50$  observations from the randomly perturbed physical system  $y_i = \eta_0(x_i) + e_i$ , where  $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$  are uniformly sampled from  $\Omega$ , and the variance for the noises  $(e_i)_{i=1}^n$  is set to  $0.2^2$ .

- **Configuration 2.** We follow an example provided in Gu and Wang (2017). The computer model is  $y^s(x, \theta) = \sin(5\theta x) + 5x$ , and the physical system is  $\eta_0(x) = 5x \cos(15x/2) + 5x$ . The design space  $\Omega$  is  $[0, 1]$ , and the parameter space  $\Theta$  for  $\theta$  is  $[0, 3]$ . We simulate  $n = 30$  observations from  $y_i = \eta_0(x_i) + e_i$  with  $\text{var}(e_i) = 0.2^2$ , and  $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$  are equidistant on  $\Omega$ . The  $L_2$ -discrepancy  $\|\eta_0(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \theta)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$  between the computer model  $y^s$  and the physical system  $\eta_0$  as a function of  $\theta$  is depicted in Figure 1. The minimizer of the  $L_2$ -discrepancy is at  $\theta_0^* = 1.8771$ .

- **Configuration 3.** We use the pedagogical example in Plumlee (2017). The physical system is  $\eta_0(x) = 4x + x \sin(5x)$  and the computer model is  $y^s(x, \theta) = \theta x$ , where  $x \in \Omega = [0, 1]$  and  $\theta \in \Theta = [2, 4]$ . We take  $(x_i)_{i=1}^n = \{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, \dots, 0.8\}$ , and the responses are given by  $y_i = \eta_0(x_i) + e_i$  with  $\text{var}(e_i) = 0.02^2$ . The  $L_2$ -discrepancy as a function of  $\theta$  is given by

$$\|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \theta)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} = \sqrt{0.33(4 - \theta)^2 - 0.2898(4 - \theta) + 0.201714},$$

and is minimized at  $\theta_0^* = 3.5609$ .




Figure 1: The  $L_2$ -discrepancy  $\|\eta_0(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \theta)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$  between the computer model  $y^s$  and the physical system  $\eta_0$  as a function of  $\theta$  for configuration 2.

For the three configurations described above, we impose the Gaussian process prior  $\text{GP}(0, \tau^2 \Psi_\alpha)$  on  $\eta$ , where  $\Psi_\alpha$  is the Matérn covariance function given by (3.1) with  $\alpha = 5/2$ . Here the scaling factor  $\tau$  is set to  $\tau = 1$  for all 3 configurations for the ease of implementation. To draw posterior samples of  $\theta_\eta^*$ , we first draw posterior samples of  $\eta$  using formula (2.6) and (2.7), then compute  $\theta_\eta^*$  by  $\theta_\eta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \theta)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$ . For all three configurations, 1000 samples of  $\theta_\eta^*$  are drawn from the posterior distribution after burn-in for subsequent analysis.

For comparison, we implement the calibration method by Kennedy and O’Hagan (2001) (abbreviated as KO) and the orthogonal Gaussian process method by Plumlee (2017) (abbreviated as OGP). For both methods in all three configurations, Markov chain Monte Carlo is applied to draw 1000 posterior samples after discarding 1000 burn-in samples.

For configuration 1, the summary statistics of the posterior distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  are provided in Table 1, together with those using the KO method and the OGP method. We can see that both the Bayesian projected calibration and the OGP outperform the KO in terms of both accuracy of point estimates (posterior means) and uncertainty quantification (length of credible intervals and standard deviations of posterior samples). Although OGP provides similar posterior inference compared to the Bayesian projected calibration, the computation runtime is significantly longer than the other two methods. The computational bottleneck was also discussed in section 6 of Plumlee (2017). Figure 2(a) presents the scatter plot of

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Posterior of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  for Configuration 1 (the simulation truth is  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* = [0.2, 0.3]^T$ )

$\boldsymbol{\theta}$	Projected Calibration		KO Calibration		OGP Calibration	
	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$
Mean	0.1984	0.3009	0.1927	0.2953	0.2068	0.3024
Standard Deviation	0.0011	0.0013	0.0235	0.01537	0.0005	0.0006
97.5%-Quantile	0.2006	0.3034	0.2474	0.3360	0.2013	0.2999
2.5%-Quantile	0.1963	0.2984	0.1653	0.2722	0.1992	0.2975
Runtime	279s		0.834s		40562s	

the posterior samples of  $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2})$ . The level curves of the BvM limit shows that the asymptotic distribution of  $\Pi(\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \mid \mathcal{D}_n)$  developed in section 3 offers a decent approximation to the exact posterior. Comparing Figures 2 (a) and (b), the Bayesian projected calibration outperforms the KO in terms of uncertainty quantification. We also investigate the performance of the calibrated computer model in Figures 2 (c) and (d). The point-wise 95%-credible bands for the computer model also validate that Bayesian projected calibration provides a better estimate to  $y^s$  in contrast to the KO approach.

Similarly, for configuration 2, the advantages of the Bayesian projected calibration in terms of uncertainty quantification and computational cost can be summarized from the statistics reported in Table 2. We also provide the densities of the posterior using the proposed method and KO approach in Figures 3 (a) and (b), respectively. Again, it can be seen that the Bayesian projected calibration provides smaller uncertainty compared to the KO calibration. In addition, Figure 3 (c) shows that the asymptotic BvM limit approximates the exact posterior well even though the sample size is only  $n = 30$ .




Figure 2: Visualization of the posterior inference for configuration 1 in the simulation studies. Panel (a) shows the scatter plot of the posterior samples of  $\sqrt{n}(\theta_\eta^* - \hat{\theta}_{L_2})$  and the level curves of the corresponding BvM limit. Panel (b) presents the scatter plot of the posterior samples of  $\theta$  using the KO approach. Panels (c) and (d) display the calibrated computer models (in dashed lines) using the Bayesian projected calibration and the KO approach, respectively, together with their corresponding point-wise 95%-credible intervals (in shaded area).

The scenario for configuration 3 is slightly challenging due to the fact that no physical data are available on  $(0.8, 1]$ . We provide the corresponding summary statistics in Table 3. It can be seen that when the design points are not regularly spread over  $\Omega$ , the KO method provides a biased estimate of  $\theta_0^*$  compared to the Bayesian projected calibration and the OGP. For the uncertainty quantification performance measured by the width of credible intervals and standard deviation, the OGP method and the Bayesian projected calibration are similar, and both outperform the KO approach.

Table 2: Summary Statistics of Posterior of  $\theta$  for Configuration 2 (simulation truth is  $\theta_0^* = 1.8771$ )

	Projected Calibration	KO Calibration	OGP Calibration
Mean	1.8805	1.8805	1.8721
Standard Deviation	0.0048	0.0593	0.0023
97.5%-Quantile	1.8903	1.9832	1.8766
2.5%-Quantile	1.8712	1.7608	1.8678
Runtime	20.697s	1.034s	31843s




Figure 3: Simulation study configuration 2: The histogram of the posterior samples of  $\sqrt{n}(\theta_\eta^* - \hat{\theta}_{L_2})$ , together with the theoretical BvM limit density (red solid line).

## 4.2 Ion Channel Example

We apply the Bayesian projected calibration to the ion channel example used in Plumlee et al. (2016). The dataset involves measurements from experiments concerning ion channels of cardiac cells. Specifically, the output of the experiment is the current through the sodium channels in a cardiac cell membrane, and the input is the time. For detailed description of the experiment, we refer to Plumlee et al. (2016). Here we consider a subset of the original dataset, which consists of 19 normalized current records needed to maintain the membrane potential fixed at  $-35\text{mV}$ , together with the logarithm of the corresponding time as the inputs. The same dataset is also studied in Plumlee (2017). For the computer model,



Table 3: Summary Statistics of Posterior of  $\theta$  for Configuration 3 (simulation truth is  $\theta_0^* = 3.5609$ )

	Projected Calibration	KO Calibration	OGP Calibration
Mean	3.4064	3.1109	3.6001
Standard Deviation	0.0614	0.4760	0.0911
97.5%-Quantile	3.5964	3.9385	3.7733
2.5%-Quantile	3.3624	2.1467	3.4167

Clancy and Rudy (1999) suggests the following Markov model for ion channels:

$$y^s(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{e}_1^T \exp[\exp(x)A(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\mathbf{e}_4,$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is the column vector with 1 at the  $i$ th coordinate and 0 for the rest components, the outer  $\exp$  is the matrix exponential function, and

$$A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix} -\theta_2 - \theta_3 & \theta_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \theta_2 & -\theta_1 - \theta_2 & \theta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 & -\theta_1 - \theta_2 & \theta_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \theta_2 & -\theta_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We follow the Monte Carlo methods described in subsection 4.1 to collect 1000 posterior samples of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  using the Bayesian projected calibration and the KO calibration approach. The OGP calibration approach, however, fails to provide adequate samples from the posterior distribution for subsequent inference within 20 hours. The roughness parameter  $\alpha$  for the Matérn covariance function is set to 5/2, and we set  $\tau = 0.02$ ,  $\sigma = 0.001$ , as suggested by Plumlee (2017). Table 4 presents the corresponding comparison of summary statistics. The calibrated computer models are also visualized in Figure 4. Clearly, the Bayesian projected calibration provides better estimates to both the calibration parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and the computer model in terms of lower uncertainty (smaller standard deviation and thinner credible intervals). It can also be seen that the Bayesian projected calibrated computer model approximates to the physical data better than the KO method.

Table 4: Summary Statistics of Posterior of  $\theta$  for the Ion Channel Example

$\theta$	Projected Calibration			KO Calibration		
	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$
Mean	6.011166	5.578567	3.500813	3.4203734	0.5779939	7.4971337
Standard Deviation	0.000012	0.000006	0.000006	0.2671795	0.5668012	1.5645618
97.5%-Quantile	6.011191	5.578578	3.500824	2.963897	-0.4371212	4.718231
2.5%-Quantile	6.011143	5.578556	3.500802	4.023088	1.7700171	10.925112




Figure 4: Visualization of computer model calibration for the ion channel example. The left and right panels present the calibrated computer models (dashed lines) using the proposed approach and the KO calibration approach, respectively. The shaded area is the point-wise 95%-credible intervals for the KO calibrated computer model. The physical data (circles) and the Gaussian process (GP) estimates of the physical system (dashed lines) are also displayed.

### 4.3 Spot Welding Example

Now we consider the spot welding example studied in [Bayarri et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Chang and Joseph \(2014\)](#). Three control variables in the experiment are the load, current, and gauge. The physical experiments are only conducted for gauge being 1 and 2. Since the computer model fails to produce meaningful output when the gauge is set to 1, here we only consider the case where the gauge is 2, *i.e.*, the control variables are the load and the current only. The physical data are provided in Table 4 of [Bayarri et al. \(2007\)](#). For each fixed design point, the mean of the 10 replicates of the output is taken as the response.

The computer model for the spot welding system, on the other hand, is not directly available to us. In short, the computer model consists of a time-consuming finite element

method (FEM) for numerically solving a system of partial differential equations (PDEs). There are 21 available runs for the computer code, as is presented in Table 3 of [Bayarri et al. \(2007\)](#). As discussed in section 2, an emulator is needed as a surrogate for the computer model in such a situation where the code is expensive. Here we apply the **RobustGaSP** package ([Gu et al., 2018a](#)) to emulate the expensive FEM computer model. For theoretical background on the **RobustGaSP** emulator, we refer to [Gu et al. \(2018b\)](#).

We follow similar approach in subsections 4.1 and 4.2 to draw posterior samples using Bayesian projected calibration and the KO method. The only difference is that the non-available computer model  $y^s$  is replaced by the predictive mean of the **RobustGaSP** emulator based on the results of the 21 runs on the FEM computer code. The summary statistics are presented in Table 5, indicating that the Bayesian projected calibration outperforms the KO approach in terms of uncertainty quantification, *i.e.*, smaller standard deviation and thinner credible interval. The calibrated computer models using the Bayesian projected calibration and the KO approach, together with their corresponding point-wise 95%-credible intervals, are depicted in Figure 5. We can see that in terms of computer model calibration, both approaches behave similarly. The point-wise credible intervals, however, indicate that the Bayesian projected calibration method outperforms the KO approach regarding uncertainty quantification. The imperfection of the computer model can also be seen from the discrepancy presented on the right two panels of Figure 5.

Table 5: Summary Statistics of Posterior of  $\theta$  for the Spot Welding Example

	Projected Calibration	KO Calibration
Mean	4.385933	4.107683
Standard Deviation	0.08455849	1.333926
97.5%-Quantile	4.505187	6.880466
2.5%-Quantile	4.183981	1.439716

## 5 Conclusion and Discussion

We develop a novel Bayesian projected calibration method following the frequentist  $L_2$ -projected calibration method in [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#). The proposed approach is formulated




Figure 5: Visualization of computer model calibration for the spot welding example. The left and right panels present the calibrated computer models (red dashed lines) as a function of the current with the load fixed at 4N and 5.3N, respectively. The shaded areas are the point-wise 95%-credible intervals for the corresponding calibrated computer models. The physical data (circles) and the Gaussian process (GP) estimates of the physical system (solid lines) are also displayed.

in an identifiable way and naturally quantifies uncertainty in the calibration problem through the posterior distribution. Theoretical justification of the Bayesian projected calibration is provided: the marginal posterior distribution of the calibration parameter is not only  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent, but also asymptotically normal with efficient covariance matrix.

The estimation methods in this work and [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) can be viewed as the following two-step procedure: First estimate the physical system through Gaussian process models; Then estimate the calibration parameter using the  $L_2$ -projection criterion. On the other hand, it is possible to jointly estimate the calibration parameter and the discrepancy between the physical system and the computer model. For example, [Plumlee \(2017\)](#) proposes an orthogonal Gaussian process (OGP) model to tackle this joint estimation issue. The theoretical development for OGP, nevertheless, is only restricted to a point estimate ([Tuo, 2017](#)): the *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) estimate of  $\theta$  is asymptotically normal and semiparametric efficient. It will be non-trivial to apply the technical results developed here to the OGP calibration approach, and asymptotic characterization of the corresponding full posterior distribution will be an interesting topic.

Similar to the OGP calibration method, the Bayesian projected calibration also involves intractable integrals. [Plumlee \(2017\)](#) suggested that the intractable integrals can be numerically computed using Monte Carlo integration. However, this involves drawing  $N$  uniform samples from  $\Omega$ , and  $N$  is typically much larger than  $n$  for accurate evaluation of these integrals, adding heavy computational burden for posterior inference. In particular, the numerical integration yields extra  $O(N)$  operations. It is therefore desired that the computation barriers for the two approaches can be tackled via efficient algorithms.

## APPENDIX

### A Auxiliary Results

In this section we list some auxiliary results that are used to prove [theorem 2](#). The proofs of the lemmas stated in this section are deferred to the supplementary material. Before proceeding, we introduce some notions and definitions that are widely used in the study

of empirical processes. Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function space equipped with metric  $d$ . Given two functions  $l, u \in \mathcal{F}$ , a bracket  $[l, u]$  is a set of functions  $f$  such that  $l \leq f \leq u$  everywhere, and the size of the bracket is defined to be  $d(l, u)$ . The  $\epsilon$ -bracketing number of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to the metric  $d$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{N}_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, d)$ , is the minimum number of brackets of size  $\epsilon$  that are needed to cover  $\mathcal{F}$ . The bracketing integral  $J_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, d)$  is defined to be the integral of the logarithmic bracketing number as follows:

$$J_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, d) = \int_0^\epsilon \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, d)} d\delta.$$

Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is the space where random variables take values. Given a sequence  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1}^n$  of independent and identically distributed random variables, the empirical measure and the empirical process of a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denoted by  $\mathbb{P}_n f$  and  $\mathbb{G}_n f$ , are defined by

$$\mathbb{P}_n f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \mathbb{G}_n f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [f(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{x}_i)],$$

respectively. For two variables  $a$  and  $b$ , we use  $a \lesssim b$  and  $a \gtrsim b$  to denote the inequalities up to a universal multiplicative constant, and  $a \asymp b$  if  $a \lesssim b$  and  $a \gtrsim b$ .

In the empirical processes theory, maximum inequalities are widely adopted to study the asymptotic behavior of nonparametric estimates. Here we cite one of them that is used in the proof of theorem 2 (see, for example, lemma 19.36 in [van der Vaart, 2000](#)).

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1}^n$  be independent and identically distributed according to a distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a class of measurable functions  $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}})}^2 < \delta^2$  and  $\|f\|_\infty \leq M$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\delta$  and  $M$  does not depend on  $\mathcal{F}$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{G}_n f| \right] \lesssim J_{[\cdot]}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}})}) \left[ 1 + \frac{M}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} J_{[\cdot]}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}})}) \right].$$

The following lemma is the modification of a standard probabilistic theorem for Gaussian processes. For the related literature, we refer to [van der Vaart and van Zanten \(2008\)](#) and [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#).

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Matérn Gaussian process with roughness parameter  $\alpha$ , and  $\eta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , where  $\alpha > p/2$ . Let  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}$ . Then there exists a*

measurable set  $\mathcal{B}_n$  in  $\mathfrak{C}(\Omega)$  such that for sufficiently large  $n$ , the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(\mathcal{B}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n) &= 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1), \\ J_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon_n \log n, \mathcal{B}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\Omega)}) &\lesssim (\log n)^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2.\end{aligned}$$

Now denote

$$\ell_n(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \Psi_\sigma(y_i - \eta(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

to be the log-likelihood function of  $\eta$  given the physical data  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ . Define the event

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n\} \cap \{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M\} \cap \mathcal{B}_n,$$

where  $M_n = \log n$ ,  $M$  is given by theorem 1, and  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is given by lemma 2. Then by theorem 1 and lemma 2 we know that  $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose the conditions of theorem 2 hold. For each vector  $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^q$  and each  $\eta \in \mathcal{F}$  define*

$$\eta_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) = \eta(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{2\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*).$$

Then it holds that

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp[\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta) = [1 + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)] \left\{ \int \exp[\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta) \right\}.$$

The asymptotic normality result of the  $L_2$ -projected calibration estimate  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}$  from [Tuo and Wu \(2015\)](#) is also useful to study the asymptotic behavior of  $\Pi(\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_n)$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Under the conditions of theorem 2, it holds that*

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* = 2\mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(n^{-1/2}).$$

## B Proof of Theorem 2

By theorem 1 and lemma 2 we know that  $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ . Let  $\Theta_n = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* : \eta \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$ .

It follows directly that  $\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ . Denote

$$\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_n, \Theta_n) = \frac{\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \cdot \cap \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)}{\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)}.$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n, \Theta_n \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n, \Theta_n \right) - \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Denote  $B_n(A) = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* : \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A\}$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n, \Theta_n \right) \right| \\ & = \sup_A \left| \Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in B_n(A) \mid \mathcal{D}_n) - \frac{\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in B_n(A) \cap \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)}{\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \Theta_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)} \left[ \sup_A \Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in B_n(A) \cap \Theta_n^c \mid \mathcal{D}_n) + \Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* \in \Theta_n^c \mid \mathcal{D}_n) \right] \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

it suffices to show that

$$\sup_A \left| \Pi \left( \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_n, \Theta_n \right) - \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \right|.$$

We prove the result by the method of moment generating function, namely, showing that for any fixed vector  $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ , it holds that

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp \left[ \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} \left( \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} \right) \right] \Pi(d\eta \mid \mathcal{D}_n) \rightarrow \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top (4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \mathbf{t} \right]$$

in  $\mathbb{P}_0$ -probability. The rest part of the proof is completed by lemma 1 and lemma 2 in [Castillo and Rousseau \(2015b\)](#).

Let  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}$ . The left-hand side of the preceding display can be re-written as

$$\left\{ \int \exp[\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta) \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp \left[ \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} \left( \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} \right) + \ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0) \right] \Pi(d\eta) \right\}.$$

For the vector  $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ , define

$$\eta_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) = \eta(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{2\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*),$$

and for each  $\eta$ , define the remainder

$$R_n(\eta, \eta_0) = \frac{n}{2} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{P}_n(\eta - \eta_0)^2.$$



Then simple algebra shows

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0)] - [\ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0)] \\
&= -\frac{n}{2\sigma^2} [\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2] - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} [R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)] \\
&= 2\sqrt{n} \int_{\Omega} [\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top (4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \mathbf{t} \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} [R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)].
\end{aligned}$$

Denote the remainder of the Taylor expansion of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  at  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*$  by

$$\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* - 2 \int_{\Omega} [\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Then by theorem 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2}) + \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&= \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) + \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&= \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) - 2\sqrt{n} \int_{\Omega} [\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top (4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \mathbf{t} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} [R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)] + \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top (4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \mathbf{t} + \sqrt{n} \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} [R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)] \\
&\quad + \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) - \ell_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Now set  $M_n = \log n$ . By lemma 1 we see that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{A}_n} |\sqrt{n} \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)| \leq L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_0}^{(2)} \|t\| \sqrt{n} M_n^2 n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \lesssim M_n^2 n^{(p/2-\alpha)/(2\alpha+p)} = o(1).$$

In addition, simple algebra and the law of large numbers imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&= \frac{2\sigma^4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right]^2 - 2\sigma^4 \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{t} - 2\sigma^2 \mathbb{G}_n \left[ (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)(\cdot) \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -2\sigma^2 \mathbb{G}_n \left[ (\eta - \eta_0)(\cdot) \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1).$$

We now claim that

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}_n} |R_n(\eta, \eta_0) - R_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}, \eta_0)| = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1).$$

Since over  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , we know that  $\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n$ ,  $\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$ , and by lemma 2 it holds that

$$J_{[\cdot]}(M_n \epsilon_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)}) \lesssim M_n^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2 = (\log n)^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2,$$

it follows by the maximal inequality for empirical process (theorem 3) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}_n} \left| \mathbb{G}_n \left[ (\eta - \eta_0)(\cdot) \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] \right| \right\} \\ & \lesssim J_{[\cdot]}(M_n \epsilon_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\Omega)}) \left[ 1 + M \frac{J_{[\cdot]}(M_n \epsilon_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\Omega)})}{M_n^2 \epsilon_n^2 \sqrt{n}} \right] \\ & \lesssim M_n^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{M_n^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2}{M_n^2 \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2} \right] \\ & \lesssim M_n \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2 = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

and hence, it holds that  $\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}_n} |R_n(\eta, \eta_0) - R_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}, \eta_0)| = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ . Therefore by applying lemma 3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp \left[ \mathbf{t}^\top \sqrt{n} \left( \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_2} \right) + \ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0) \right] \Pi(d\eta) \\ & = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top \left( 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right) \mathbf{t} + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \right] \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp [\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta) \\ & = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top \left( 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right) \mathbf{t} + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \right] [1 + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)] \int \exp [\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta) \\ & = \left\{ \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{t}^\top \left( 4\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right) \mathbf{t} \right] + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \right\} \int \exp [\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)] \Pi(d\eta). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is thus completed.

## References

- Bayarri, M. J., Berger, J. O., Paulo, R., Sacks, J., Cafeo, J. A., Cavendish, J., Lin, C.-H., and Tu, J. (2007). A framework for validation of computer models. *Technometrics*, 49(2):138–154.
- Bickel, P. and Kleijn, B. (2012). The semiparametric Bernstein-von Mises theorem. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(1):206–237.
- Brynjarsdóttir, J. and OHagan, A. (2014). Learning about physical parameters: The importance of model discrepancy. *Inverse Problems*, 30(11):114007.
- Castillo, I. (2012). A semiparametric Bernstein–von Mises theorem for Gaussian process priors. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(1):53–99.
- Castillo, I. and Rousseau, J. (2015a). A Bernstein-von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2353–2383.
- Castillo, I. and Rousseau, J. (2015b). Supplement to “A Bernstein-von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models”.
- Chang, C.-J. and Joseph, V. R. (2014). Model calibration through minimal adjustments. *Technometrics*, 56(4):474–482.
- Clancy, C. E. and Rudy, Y. (1999). Linking a genetic defect to its cellular phenotype in a cardiac arrhythmia. *Nature*, 400(6744):566–569.
- Edmunds, D. E. and Triebel, H. (2008). *Function spaces, entropy numbers, differential operators*, volume 120. Cambridge University Press.
- Fang, K.-T., Li, R., and Sudjianto, A. (2005). *Design and modeling for computer experiments*. CRC Press.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*, volume 44. Cambridge University Press.

- Gu, M., Palomo, J., and Berger, J. O. (2018a). RobustGaSP: Robust Gaussian stochastic process emulation in R. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01874*.
- Gu, M. and Wang, L. (2017). An improved approach to bayesian computer model calibration and prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.08215*.
- Gu, M., Wang, X., and Berger, J. O. (2018b). Robust gaussian stochastic process emulation. *The Annals of Statistics*, In Press.
- Higdon, D., Kennedy, M., Cavendish, J. C., Cafoe, J. A., and Ryne, R. D. (2004). Combining field data and computer simulations for calibration and prediction. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 26(2):448–466.
- Hoffman, A. J. and Wielandt, H. W. (2003). The variation of the spectrum of a normal matrix. In *Selected Papers Of Alan J Hoffman: With Commentary*, pages 118–120. World Scientific.
- Joseph, V. R. and Melkote, S. N. (2009). Statistical adjustments to engineering models. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 41(4):362.
- Kennedy, M. C. and O’Hagan, A. (2001). Bayesian calibration of computer models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 63(3):425–464.
- Plumlee, M. (2017). Bayesian calibration of inexact computer models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(519):1274–1285.
- Plumlee, M., Joseph, V. R., and Yang, H. (2016). Calibrating functional parameters in the ion channel models of cardiac cells. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):500–509.
- Qian, P. Z. and Wu, C. F. J. (2008). Bayesian hierarchical modeling for integrating low-accuracy and high-accuracy experiments. *Technometrics*, 50(2):192–204.
- Rasmussen, C. E. and Williams, C. K. (2006). *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge.

- Santner, T. J., Williams, B. J., and Notz, W. I. (2013). *The design and analysis of computer experiments*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Sheridan, M., Bloebaum, C., Kesavadas, T., Patra, A., and Winer, E. (2002). Visualization and communication in risk management of landslides. *WIT Transactions on Modelling and Simulation*, 31.
- Stone, C. J. (1982). Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1040–1053.
- Storlie, C. B., Lane, W. A., Ryan, E. M., Gattiker, J. R., and Higdon, D. M. (2015). Calibration of computational models with categorical parameters and correlated outputs via Bayesian smoothing spline ANOVA. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(509):68–82.
- Tuo, R. (2017). Adjustments to computer models via projected kernel calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03422*.
- Tuo, R. and Wu, C. F. J. (2015). Efficient calibration for imperfect computer models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2331–2352.
- Tuo, R. and Wu, C. F. J. (2016). A theoretical framework for calibration in computer models: parametrization, estimation and convergence properties. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 4(1):767–795.
- van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- van der Vaart, A. and Zanten, H. v. (2011). Information rates of nonparametric gaussian process methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(Jun):2095–2119.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and van Zanten, J. H. (2008). Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on gaussian process priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1435–1463.

- Wahba, G. (1990). *Spline models for observational data*. SIAM.
- Wang, S., Chen, W., and Tsui, K.-L. (2009). Bayesian validation of computer models. *Technometrics*, 51(4):439–451.
- Wendland, H. (2004). *Scattered data approximation*, volume 17. Cambridge university press.
- Wong, R. K., Storlie, C. B., and Lee, T. (2017). A frequentist approach to computer model calibration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(2):635–648.
- Xie, F., Jin, W., and Xu, Y. (2017). A theoretical framework for Bayesian nonparametric regression: Orthonormal random series and rates of contraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05731*.
- Xiu, D. (2010). *Numerical methods for stochastic computations: a spectral method approach*. Princeton university press.

# Supplementary Material for “Bayesian Projected Calibration of Computer Models”

## A Proof of theorem 1

We first present a classic result regarding convergence rate of the Matérn Gaussian process regression from [van der Vaart and Zanten \(2011\)](#).

**Theorem A.1.** *Suppose  $\eta$  is imposed the Matérn Gaussian process with roughness parameter  $\alpha$ , and  $\eta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Omega)$ , where  $\alpha > p/2$ . Then there exists some constant  $C > 0$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2] \Pi(d\eta \mid \mathcal{D}_n) \right\} \leq C n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The first assertion follows immediately from the Markov’s inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \Pi \left( \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} > M_n n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M_n^2 n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}} \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2] \Pi(d\eta \mid \mathcal{D}_n) \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{C}{M_n^2} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The posterior distribution of  $\eta$  can be expressed by

$$\Pi(\eta \in \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = \left[ \int_{\mathcal{U}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta) \right] \left[ \int \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{-1},$$

where  $p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = \Psi_\sigma(y_i - \eta_0(\mathbf{x}_i))$  is the density of the true distribution. To prove the second assertion, we need the following result from [Xie et al. \(2017\)](#) to bound the denominator of the preceding display.

**Lemma A.1.** *Assume the conditions of theorem 1 hold. For any  $D > 0$ , define the event*

$$\mathcal{H}_n = \left\{ \int \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta) \geq \Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} < \epsilon_n) \exp \left[ - \left( D + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right) n \epsilon_n^2 \right] \right\}.$$

*Suppose  $(\epsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence such that  $n\epsilon_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c) \rightarrow 0$ .*

Since  $\alpha > p/2$ , we can some positive  $\beta$  such that  $\beta \in (\max\{\underline{\alpha}, p/2\}, \alpha)$ . Define  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\beta/(2\beta+p)}$ . Since the Matérn Gaussian process assigns prior probability one to the space

$\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)$  (see, for example, section 3.1 in [van der Vaart and Zanten, 2011](#)), then the Gaussian process prior on  $\eta$  can be regarded as a mean-zero Gaussian random element in the Banach space  $\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)$  equipped with the  $\beta$ -Hölder norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}$ . Therefore by the Borell's inequality (see, for example, [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017](#)) it holds that

$$\Pi \left( \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)} > 4x \left[ \int \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^2 \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{1/2} \right) \leq 2e^{-2x^2}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for any positive  $x$ .

By lemma 15 in [van der Vaart and Zanten \(2011\)](#) there exists a constant  $\tilde{M} > 0$  such that  $\|f\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{M} \|f\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^{p/(2\beta+p)} \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)}$  for any function  $f \in \mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)$ . Let  $s > 0$  be a constant determined later. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \right\} \cap \left\{ \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)} \leq 4s\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \left[ \int \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^2 \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{1/2} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{M} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^{p/(2\beta+p)} M_n^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)} n^{-(2\alpha\beta)/[(2\alpha+p)(2\beta+p)]} \right\} \\ & \quad \cap \left\{ \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)} \leq 4s\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \left[ \int \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^2 \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{1/2} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{M} (\|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)} + \|\eta_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)})^{p/(2\beta+p)} M_n^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)} n^{-2\alpha\beta/[(2\alpha+p)(2\beta+p)]} \right\} \\ & \quad \cap \left\{ \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)} \leq 4s\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \left[ \int \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}^2 \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{1/2} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_1 M_n^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)} n^{-2\alpha\beta/[(2\alpha+p)(2\beta+p)]} n^{p^2/[2(2\beta+p)^2]} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $M_1 > 0$  depending on  $\eta_0$  only when  $n$  is sufficiently large. Noticing that  $-\alpha/(2\alpha+p) < -\beta/(2\beta+p)$ , then taking  $M_n = \log n$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_1 M_n^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)} n^{-2\alpha\beta/[(2\alpha+p)(2\beta+p)]} n^{p^2/[2(2\beta+p)^2]} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_1 (\log n)^{2\beta/(2\beta+p)} n^{-(2\beta^2-p^2/2)/(2\beta+p)^2} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $M > 0$ , where the fact  $\beta > p/2$  is applied. Since by the first assertion  $\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = 1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi(\mathcal{U}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] \rightarrow$



0, where  $\mathcal{U}_n$  is the event

$$\mathcal{U}_n = \left\{ \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{E}_\beta(\Omega)} > 4s\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \left[ \int \|\eta\|_{\mathfrak{E}_\beta(\Omega)}^2 \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}_n$  be defined as in lemma A.1 with the constant  $D$  be determined later. Then  $\mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c) \rightarrow 0$ , and we directly compute by Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 [\Pi(\mathcal{U}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_0 [\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{H}_n) \Pi(\mathcal{U}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] + \mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{H}_n) \left[ \int \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta) \right]^{-1} \left[ \int_{\mathcal{U}_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta) \right] \right\} + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{\exp[(D + 1/\sigma^2)n\epsilon_n^2]}{\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} < \epsilon_n)} \int_{\mathcal{U}_n} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \right] \Pi(d\eta) + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{\exp[(D + 1/\sigma^2)n\epsilon_n^2] \Pi(\mathcal{U}_n)}{\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} < \epsilon_n)} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

By lemma 3 and lemma 4 in van der Vaart and Zanten (2011) we know that

$$\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_n) \geq \exp(-C\epsilon_n^{-p/\alpha}) \geq \exp(-Cn^{p\beta/[\alpha(2\beta+p)]}).$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ . Now take  $D = 1/(2\sigma^2)$ ,  $s = 1/\sigma$ , and we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0\{\Pi(\mathcal{U}_n \mid \mathcal{D}_n)\} &\leq \exp\left(\frac{3}{2\sigma^2}n\epsilon_n^2 + Cn^{p\beta/[\alpha(2\beta+p)]}\right) \Pi(\mathcal{U}_n) + o(1) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{3}{2\sigma^2}n\epsilon_n^2 + Cn^{(p\beta/[\alpha(2\beta+p)])} - \frac{2}{\sigma^2}n\epsilon_n^2\right) + o(1) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (A.2) and the fact  $\beta < \alpha$  is applied.

## B Proof of Lemma 1

Recall that  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$ . Since by condition A4 it is permitted to interchange the differentiation with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and the integral, it follows that

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*} = -2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)] \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Now define the function  $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{F} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  by

$$\mathbf{F}(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})] \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

It follows immediately that  $\mathbf{F}(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) = \mathbf{0}$ . The partial derivative of  $F$  with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{F}_\theta(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{F}(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int_{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})]^2 \right\} d\mathbf{x},$$

and the partial Fréchet derivative of  $\mathbf{F}$  with respect to  $\eta$  is a function  $\mathbf{F}_\eta : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  given by

$$[\mathbf{F}_\eta(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta})](h) = -2 \int_{\Omega} h(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{x},$$

since  $F$  is linear with respect to  $\eta$ . Therefore by the implicit function theorem on Banach space, there exists some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that over  $\{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} < \epsilon\}$ , the functional  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* : \eta \mapsto \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|\eta(\cdot) - y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$  is continuous, the Fréchet derivative  $\dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\eta^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*$  exists, and can be computed by

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\eta^*(h) = - [\mathbf{F}_\theta(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)]^{-1} [\mathbf{F}_\eta(\eta, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)](h) = 2\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1} \int_{\Omega} h(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Therefore we obtain by the fundamental theorem of calculus and the mean-value theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{du} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u]}^* du \\ &= \int_0^1 \dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\eta[u]}^* \left( \frac{d}{du} \eta[u] \right) du \\ &= 2 \int_0^1 \mathbf{V}_{\eta[u]}^{-1} \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u]}^*) d\mathbf{x} du \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{V}_{\eta[u']}^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u']}^*) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta[u] = \eta_0 + (\eta - \eta_0)u$  for  $0 \leq u \leq 1$  and  $u' \in [0, 1]$ . By condition A3, we know that the smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_\eta)$  of  $\mathbf{V}_\eta$  is strictly positive in an  $L_2$ -neighborhood of  $\eta_0$ , and we can without loss of generality require that  $\inf_{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_\eta) > 0$ . Hence we proceed by condition A4 and Jensen's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| &\leq 2 \sup_{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon} \|\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1}\| \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \int_{\Omega} |\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})| d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq 2 \left[ \inf_{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_\eta) \right]^{-1} \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})]^2 d\mathbf{x} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} > 0$  depending on  $\eta_0$  only.

We now analyze the property of  $\mathbf{V}_\eta$  as a functional  $\{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} < \epsilon\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ ,  $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{V}_\eta$ . For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ , denote  $[\mathbf{A}]_{ij}$  to be the  $(i, j)$ -th element of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Directly compute

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{V}_\eta]_{jk} - [\mathbf{V}_0]_{jk} &= 2 \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\Omega} \left\{ [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)] \left[ \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] \right\} dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\Omega} \left\{ [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x}) + y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)] \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\} dx \\ &:= 2V_1 - 2V_2 - 2V_3. \end{aligned}$$

For  $V_1$ , by condition A4 we know that  $\partial y^s / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\Omega \times \Theta$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |V_1| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) \right| \left| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right| dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right| \left| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right| dx \\ &\leq \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \left[ \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_k}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\|_{L_1(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\|_{L_1(\Omega)} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| \\ &\lesssim \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Condition A4 also implies that  $\partial^2 y^s / (\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\Omega \times \Theta$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |V_2| &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} [|\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})| + |\eta_0(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)|] \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| dx \\ &\leq L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \left\{ 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})]^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta_0(\mathbf{x}) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)]^2 dx \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \left( 2\epsilon^2 + 4\|\eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 + 4 \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \|y^s(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim L_{\eta_0}^{(1)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider  $V_3$ :

$$|V_3| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left| \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right| \int_{\Omega} [|\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})| + |y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) - y^s(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^*)|] dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left| \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right| \left[ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*\| \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left| \frac{\partial^2 y^s}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right| \left[ 1 + \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_{L_{\eta_0}^{(1)}} \right] \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $|\mathbf{V}_\eta]_{jk} - [\mathbf{V}_0]_{jk}| \leq C_{\eta_0} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$  for all  $j, k = 1, \dots, q$  for some constant  $C_{\eta_0} > 0$  depending on  $\eta_0$  only. By the fact that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q |\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{B})| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2$$

holds for any positive definite matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  (see, for example, [Hoffman and Wielandt, 2003](#)), we obtain

$$|\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_\eta) - \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_0)| \leq \|\mathbf{V}_\eta - \mathbf{V}_0\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=1}^q |[\mathbf{V}_\eta]_{jk} - [\mathbf{V}_0]_{jk}|^2 \leq q^2 C_{\eta_0}^2 \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2.$$

We may also assume without loss of generality that  $\epsilon$  is sufficiently small such that  $|\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_\eta) - \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_0)| \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}_0)/2$  whenever  $\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon$ , in which case it holds that  $\|\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1}\| \geq 2\|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\|$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\| &= \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}(\mathbf{V}_0 - \mathbf{V}_\eta)\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1}\| \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\| \|\mathbf{V}_0 - \mathbf{V}_\eta\| \|\mathbf{V}_\eta^{-1}\| \\
&\leq 2 \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\|^2 \|\mathbf{V}_\eta - \mathbf{V}_0\|_F \\
&\leq 2qC_{\eta_0} \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\| \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

whenever  $\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} < \epsilon$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{r}(\eta, \eta_0) &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^* - 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \left[ \mathbf{V}_{\eta[u']}^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u']}^*) - \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&= 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \left[ (\mathbf{V}_{\eta[u']}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}) \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u']}^*) \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + 2 \int_{\Omega} [\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})] \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \left[ \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta[u']}^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{r}(\eta, \eta_0)\| &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} |\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})| \left[ \left\| \mathbf{V}_{\eta^{[u]}}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right\| \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \Omega \times \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\| \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + 2 \int_{\Omega} |\eta(\mathbf{x}) - \eta_0(\mathbf{x})| \left[ \left\| \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta^{[u]}}^*) - \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\| \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&\lesssim \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} q^2 C_{\eta_0}^2 \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\| \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\| \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

implying that  $\|\mathbf{r}(\eta, \eta_0)\| \leq L_{\eta_0}^{(2)} \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$  for some constant  $L_{\eta_0}^{(2)}$  depending on  $\eta_0$  only.

The proof is thus completed.

## C Proof of Lemma 2

Before proceeding, we introduce the notion of *covering number* for a metric space  $(\mathfrak{X}, d)$ . The  $\epsilon$ -covering number of  $(\mathfrak{X}, d)$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ , is the smallest number of  $\epsilon$ -balls (with respect to the metric  $d$ ) that are needed to cover  $\mathfrak{X}$ .

Since  $\eta$  is imposed the Matérn Gaussian process with roughness parameter  $\alpha$ , it follows that the concentration function

$$\varphi_{\eta_0}(\epsilon) = \inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{H}: \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon} \frac{1}{2} \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 - \log \Pi(\|\eta\|_{L_{\infty}(\Omega)} < \epsilon)$$

satisfies  $\varphi_{\eta_0}(\epsilon) \leq C\epsilon^{-p/\alpha}$  for some constant  $C > 0$  for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then by theorem 2.1 in [van der Vaart and van Zanten \(2008\)](#), it holds that

$$\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_{\infty}(\Omega)} < \epsilon_n) \geq \exp(-C^2 n \epsilon_n^2), \tag{C.1}$$

where  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}$ . Pick  $\beta > 0$  such that  $\beta \in (\max\{\underline{\alpha}, p/2\}, \alpha)$ . Then we know that the Matérn Gaussian process  $\mathrm{GP}(0, \Psi_{\alpha})$  assigns prior probability one to  $\mathfrak{C}_{\beta}(\Omega)$ . Now set  $\mathcal{B}_n = \epsilon_n \mathfrak{C}_{\beta}^1(\Omega) + m_n \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_{\alpha}}^1(\Omega)$ , where

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\beta}^1(\Omega) = \{f \in \mathfrak{C}_{\beta}(\Omega) : \|f\|_{\mathfrak{C}_{\beta}(\Omega)} \leq 1\}, \quad \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_{\alpha}}^1(\Omega) = \{f \in \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_{\alpha}}(\Omega) : \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_{\alpha}}(\Omega)} \leq 1\},$$

$m_n$  is some sequence determined later, and  $\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_{\alpha}}(\Omega)$  is the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (abbreviated as RKHS) associated with the Matérn covariance function  $\Psi_{\alpha}$ . Denote  $\Phi$  to be the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution and set  $m_n =$

$-2\Phi^{-1}(\exp[-(2C + 1/\sigma^2)n\epsilon_n^2])$ . Since  $\eta \sim \text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$  can be viewed as a Gaussian random element in the Banach space  $\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta(\Omega)}$ , then by the Borell's inequality (van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2008) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathcal{B}_n) &\geq \Phi\left(\Phi^{-1}(\exp(-Cn\epsilon_n^2)) + m_n\right) \\ &= \Phi\left(\Phi^{-1}(\exp(-Cn\epsilon_n^2)) - 2\Phi^{-1}\left(\exp\left[-\left(2C + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2\right]\right)\right) \\ &\geq \Phi\left(-\Phi^{-1}\left(\exp\left[-\left(2C + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2\right]\right)\right) \\ &= 1 - \exp\left[-\left(2C + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Pi(\eta \in \mathcal{B}_n^c) \leq \exp\left[-\left(2C + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2\right]. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Now we prove the first inequality using (C.1) and (C.2). Let  $\mathcal{H}_n$  be defined as in lemma A.1. Denote  $M_n = \log n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0[\Pi(\mathcal{B}_n^c \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{H}_n)\Pi(\mathcal{B}_n^c \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] + \mathbb{P}_0(\mathcal{H}_n^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0\left\{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{H}_n)\left[\int \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta)\right]^{-1} \left[\int_{\mathcal{B}_n^c} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_\eta(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_0(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \Pi(d\eta)\right]\right\} + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{\exp[(D + \sigma^{-2})n\epsilon_n^2]}{\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} < \epsilon_n)} \Pi(\mathcal{B}_n^c) + o(1) \\ &\leq \exp\left[\left(D + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2 + Cn\epsilon_n^2 - \left(2C + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)n\epsilon_n^2\right] + o(1) \\ &\leq \exp[(D - C)n\epsilon_n^2] + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence taking  $D = C/2$  yields  $\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi(\mathcal{B}_n^c \mid \mathcal{D}_n)] \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally we prove the second inequality involving the bracketing integral. Since  $\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$  is the RKHS of the Matérn covariance function with roughness parameter  $\alpha$ , then  $\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$  coincides with the Sobolev space  $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha+p/2}(\Omega)$  (see, for example, corollary 1 of Tuo and Wu, 2016). The logarithm of the covering number of  $\rho\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}^1(\Omega)$  is bounded by (Edmunds and Triebel, 2008)

$$\log \mathcal{N}\left(\epsilon, \rho\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}^1(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)}\right) \lesssim \left(\frac{\rho}{\epsilon}\right)^{2p/(2\alpha+p)}$$

for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ . The metric entropy for the  $\alpha$ -Hölder space  $\epsilon_n \mathfrak{C}_\alpha^1(\Omega)$  is also known in the literature (see, for example, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)):

$$\log \mathcal{N} \left( \epsilon, \epsilon_n \mathfrak{C}_\beta^1(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \right) \lesssim \left( \frac{\epsilon_n}{\epsilon} \right)^{p/\beta}.$$

Hence for sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{B}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)}) \lesssim \left( \frac{m_n}{\epsilon} \right)^{2p/(2\alpha+p)} + \left( \frac{\epsilon_n}{\epsilon} \right)^{p/\beta},$$

and it follows by simple algebra that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{[\cdot]}(M_n \epsilon_n, \mathcal{B}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\Omega)}) &\leq \int_0^{M_n \epsilon_n} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{B}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)})} d\epsilon \\ &\lesssim m_n^{p/(2\alpha+p)} (M_n \epsilon_n)^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} + \epsilon_n^{p/2\beta} (M_n \epsilon_n)^{(2\beta-p)/(2\beta)} \\ &\asymp M_n^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2 + M_n^{(2\beta-p)/(2\beta)} \epsilon_n \\ &\lesssim M_n^{2\alpha/(2\alpha+p)} \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n^2 \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ .

## D Proof of Lemma 3

Before proceeding, we establish the following fact: if  $(\mathcal{W}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of event such that  $\Pi(\mathcal{W}_n | \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{W}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) &= \Pi(\mathcal{W}_n | \mathcal{D}_n) \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n), \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

where

$$D_n := \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta).$$

Recall that the RKHS  $\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$  of the Matérn Gaussian process with roughness parameter  $\alpha > p/2$  coincides with the Sobolev space  $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha+p/2}(\Omega)$  ([Wendland, 2004](#); [Tuo and Wu, 2016](#)), and the RKHS norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}$  is equivalent to the Sobolev norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha+p/2}(\Omega)}$ . Given a realization  $\eta$  of the Matérn Gaussian process  $\text{GP}(0, \Psi_\alpha)$ , define the following isometry

associated to  $\eta$ :

$$U : \mathbb{H}_0 = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K a_k \Psi(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_k) : \mathbf{t}_k \in \Omega, a_k \in \mathbb{R}, K \in \mathbb{N}_+ \right\} \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{P}_0),$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K a_k \Psi(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_k) \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^K a_k \eta(\mathbf{t}_k),$$

and extend  $U$  from  $\mathbb{H}_0$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}_0 = \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$  continuously. Then under the prior distribution  $\Pi$ , for any  $h \in \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$ ,  $U(h) \sim N(0, \|h\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)})$ . Hence by lemma 17 in [Castillo \(2012\)](#), for any measurable function  $T : \mathfrak{C}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , any  $g, h \in \mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)$ , and any  $\rho > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\Pi [\mathbb{1}\{|U(g)| \leq \rho\} \Psi(\eta - h)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\Pi \left\{ \mathbb{1} \left[ |U(g) + \langle g, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}| \leq \rho \right] T(\eta) \exp \left[ U(-h) - \frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Let  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+p)}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{A}_{1n} = \{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{2n} = \{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq M\}$ , and take

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = 2\sigma^2 \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*), \quad h(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*),$$

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \{|U(g)| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi}(\Omega)}\},$$

where  $L$  is some constant to be specified later. Since  $U(g/\|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)})$  follows the standard normal distribution under the prior, it follows that for sufficiently large  $L$ ,

$$\Pi(\mathcal{C}_n^c) = \Pi \left\{ \left| U \left( \frac{g}{\|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}} \right) \right| > L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{L}{2} n \epsilon_n^2 \right).$$

Then by the proof of lemma 2, we know that  $\Pi(\mathcal{C}_n^c | \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$  by taking a sufficiently large  $L$ . Furthermore, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle g, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}| &= \frac{4\sigma^4}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}^2 \\ &= \frac{4\sigma^4}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{t}\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^q \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}^2 = o(\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \{|U(g)| \leq (L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}\} &\subset \{|U(g) + \langle g, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}\} \\ &\subset \{|U(g)| \leq 2L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$



On the other hand,

$$\|h\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{2q\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\mathbf{t}\| \max_{j=1,\dots,q} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \theta_j}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)} = o(\epsilon_n),$$

implying that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{1n} &= \{ \|\eta_{\mathbf{t}} - \eta_0 + h\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n \} \\ &\subset \{ \|\eta_{\mathbf{t}} - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n + \|h\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \} \\ &\subset \{ \|\eta_{\mathbf{t}} - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq 2M_n \epsilon_n \} := \mathcal{A}_{1n}^u(\mathbf{t}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ , where the fact  $n^{-1/2} \leq \epsilon_n$  is applied. Similarly, for sufficiently large  $n$  it holds that

$$\mathcal{A}_{1n} \supset \{ \|\eta_{\mathbf{t}} - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n / 2 \} := \mathcal{A}_{1n}^l(\mathbf{t}). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Hence we can bound  $\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta)$  from above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_n) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n) \\ &\leq \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_{1n}^u(\mathbf{t})) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n). \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the preceding display can be further upper bounded using the change of measure formula (D.2), (D.3), and (D.4):

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_{1n}^u(\mathbf{t})) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\leq \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g) + \langle g, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq 2M_n \epsilon_n) \\ &\quad \times \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \exp \left[ U(-h) - \frac{2\sigma^4}{n} \left\| \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}^2 \right] \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\leq \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq 2L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq 2M_n \epsilon_n) \\ &\quad \times \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \exp \left[ U \left( -\frac{g}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right] \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq 2M_n \epsilon_n\}} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \exp(2L\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}) \Pi(d\eta) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq [1 + o(1)] \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta).$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) &\leq [1 + o(1)] \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n) \\ &= [1 + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)] \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

On the other hand, we need to bound  $\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta)$  from below:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_n) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{1n}} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_n) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathcal{A}_{1n}} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_{2n}^c \cup \mathcal{B}_n^c) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_n) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{1n}} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_n) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n) \\ &\geq \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_{1n}^l(\mathbf{t})) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n). \end{aligned}$$

We lower bound the first term in the preceding display using (D.2), (D.3), and (D.5):

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_{1n}^l(\mathbf{t})) \exp(\ell_n(\eta_{\mathbf{t}}) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta) \\ &= \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g) + \langle g, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}| \leq L\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1} \{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n / 2 \} \\ &\quad \times \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \exp \left[ U \left( -\frac{g}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - \frac{2\sigma^2}{n} \left\| \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \frac{\partial y^s}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)}^2 \right] \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\geq \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq (L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1} \{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n / 2 \} \\ &\quad \times \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |U(g)| \right) [1 - o(1)] \Pi(d\eta) \\ &\geq [1 - o(1)] \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq (L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\Psi_\alpha}(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1} \{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n \epsilon_n / 2 \} \\ &\quad \times \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0)) \Pi(d\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Pi(\|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} > M_n \epsilon_n / 2 \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ , and for sufficiently large  $L$ ,  $\Pi(|U(g)| >$

$(L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)} \mid \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$ , the last display can be further computed

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \mathbb{1} \{ |U(g)| \leq (L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)} \} \mathbb{1} \{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq M_n\epsilon_n/2 \} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) \\
& \geq \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) - \int_{\{ |U(g)| > (L/2)\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_\Psi(\Omega)} \}} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) \\
& \quad - \int_{\{ \|\eta - \eta_0\|_{L_2(\Omega)} > M_n\epsilon_n/2 \}} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) \\
& = \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) & \geq [1 - o(1)] \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta) - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(D_n) \\
& = [1 - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)] \int \exp(\ell_n(\eta) - \ell_n(\eta_0))\Pi(d\eta). \tag{D.7}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by combining (D.6) and (D.7).