

Complete Dynamics and Spectral Decomposition of the Ensemble Kalman Inversion

Leon Bungert* Philipp Wacker†

Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Department
Mathematics, Cauerstr. 11, 91058 Erlangen

Abstract

The Ensemble Kalman inversion (EnKI), proposed by Iglesias et al. for the solution of Bayesian inverse problems of type $y = Au + \varepsilon$, with u being an unknown parameter and y a given datum, is a powerful tool usually derived from a sequential Monte Carlo point of view. It describes the dynamics of an ensemble of particles $\{u^j(t)\}_{j=1}^J$, whose initial empirical measure is sampled from the prior, evolving over an artificial time t towards an approximate solution of the inverse problem.

Using spectral techniques, we provide a complete description of the dynamics of EnKI and their asymptotic behavior in parameter space. In particular, we debunk a common working assumption in the field, saying that in the linear Gaussian regime, the empirical measure at time $t = 1$ is a surrogate for the posterior, i.e., the correct Bayesian answer to the inverse problem. Furthermore, we show that residuals in parameter space do not decrease monotonously in the Euclidean norm and suggest a problem-adapted norm, where monotonicity can be proved. Finally, we derive a system of ordinary differential equations governing the spectrum and eigenvectors of the covariance matrix.

MSC classification: 62F15, 65N75, 34A05, 15A24, 34L05

1 Introduction

In this article we study the ensemble Kalman approach for solving an inverse problem of the form

$$y = Au + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma), \quad (1.1)$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unknown parameter of interest, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are noisy measurements, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a forward operator mapping the parameter space into the observation space, and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is a covariance matrix of the noise model in the measurement process which gives y . Following the Bayesian approach to inverse problems [15], we specify a prior measure μ_0 on the set of feasible parameters u . Bayes' theorem then shows a way of incorporating the data y into the prior, yielding a posterior measure μ such that

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\mu_0}(u) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|y - Au\|_{\Gamma}^2\right)$$

*email: leon.bungert@fau.de

†email: wacker@math.fau.de

The ensemble Kalman methodology for inverse problems, see [4, 14, 21, 23], generalized from a method for linear Gaussian state estimation [16], and originally derived in the field of data assimilation, see [12, 19, 20, 22], works by replacing all measures involved with an empirical measure generated by an ensemble of particles: An initial ensemble of particles $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$ (usually sampled from the prior μ_0) is considered a surrogate for the prior, and transitioning from prior to posterior amounts to moving the ensemble to new positions u_1^j , with the posterior ensemble $\{u_1^j\}_{j=1}^J$ standing in for the posterior. It can be shown that this particle update is given by the ensemble Kalman inversion (EnKI)

$$u_1^j = u_0^j - \mathfrak{C}(u_0)A^T(A\mathfrak{C}(u_0)A^T + \Gamma)^{-1}(Au_0^j - y), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathfrak{C}(u_0)$ is the sample covariance of the initial ensemble $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$.

Under linear and Gaussian assumptions, and for an initial ensemble with empirical covariance matching exactly the prior covariance, it can be shown that the empirical measure given by the final particles $\{u_1^j\}_{j=1}^J$ is exactly the Gaussian measure identical to the posterior. Although only exact in this linear and Gaussian regime (see [11]), the computational benefit of replacing measures by empirical measures has prompted usage of this methodology in a more broader context, for example for nonlinear observation operators and non-Gaussian priors.

If prior and posterior are very different from each other, then the particle updates (1.2) exhibit a large jump. Exchanging this one-step algorithm by a many-step iteration is supposed to yield a much smoother transition between prior and posterior, alongside a promise of computational improvements stemming from “easing into” the posterior. We will see, though, that via this route we actually cannot recover the posterior anymore, which casts doubt on the legitimacy of the time-continuous ensemble Kalman inversion in a strict Bayesian setting. Nevertheless, by introducing intermediate time steps (and thus intermediate measures μ_k “interpolating” between the prior μ_0 and the posterior μ), one obtains the iteration

$$u_{n+1}^j = u_n^j - \mathfrak{C}(u_n)A^T(A\mathfrak{C}(u_n)A^T + \tau^{-1}\Gamma)^{-1}(Au_n^j - \tilde{y}), \quad \tilde{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(y, \tau^{-1}\Sigma), \quad (1.3)$$

where $\tau > 0$ is a time step. The data y is used in a perturbed form \tilde{y} where the perturbation is done in such a way as to match the statistical properties of the observation noise. The idea is that perturbing the data additionally would help the dynamics explore the space state better. The case $\tau = 1$ corresponds to the “vanilla” ensemble Kalman inversion (1.2), assimilating the data y into the prior information given by the initial ensemble $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$, yielding the posterior given by the updated ensemble $\{u_1^j\}_{j=1}^J$. After some algebra it can be seen that (1.3) can be equivalently reformulated as solution of a variational regularization problem:

$$u_{n+1}^j = \arg \min_u \frac{\tau}{2} \|Au - \tilde{y}\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_n^j\|_{\mathfrak{C}(u_n)}^2. \quad (1.4)$$

Furthermore, by linearity of (1.3) the sample means $\mathbf{m}_n := \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J u_n^j$ also satisfy

$$\mathbf{m}_{n+1} = \arg \min_u \frac{\tau}{2} \|Au - \tilde{y}\|_\Gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u - \mathbf{m}_n\|_{\mathfrak{C}(u_n)}^2. \quad (1.5)$$

Hence the evolution of the whole ensemble and the sample means can be seen as minimizing movement discretization of the gradient flow of the functional $u \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|Au - \tilde{y}\|_\Gamma^2$ with respect to the varying norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{C}(u_n)}^2$, see for example the discussion in [1] and also [25].

Following [14, 23], sending $\tau \rightarrow 0$ we arrive at the continuous ensemble Kalman inversion method

$$\dot{u}^j(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Au^j(t) - y) + \mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}\sqrt{\Sigma}\dot{\mathbf{W}}(t) \quad (1.6)$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, where $t \mapsto \mathbf{W}(t)$ is a Wiener process and Σ is a symmetric positive definite matrix, with interesting special cases being $\Sigma = 0$ and $\Sigma = \Gamma$. Here,

$$\mathfrak{C}(t) := \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J (u^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)) \otimes (u^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)), \quad (1.7)$$

$$\mathbf{m}(t) := \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J u^j(t), \quad (1.8)$$

denote the *sample covariance* and *sample mean* of the particles $u^j(t)$ at time $t > 0$.

In this manuscript we consider the deterministic setting $\Sigma = 0$, i.e., we do not perturb the particle dynamics, in which case (1.6) becomes

$$\dot{u}^j(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Au^j(t) - y). \quad (1.9)$$

Apart from time-continuous limits of the ensemble Kalman inversion (1.3), another interesting limit is the *mean-field* limit as the number of particles $J \in \mathbb{N}$ in the ensemble goes to infinity. In this case, it is well known that the empirical measure $\rho_J(t) := \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{u^j(t)}$, where the particles $u^j(t)$ solve (1.9), converge to a solution of the Fokker-Planck equation [10, 18, 21]

$$\partial_t \rho(t, u) = \operatorname{div}(\rho(t, u)C(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Au - y)). \quad (1.10)$$

The mean and covariance matrix which are associated to this equation are defined as

$$m(t) = \int u \, d\rho(t, u), \quad (1.11)$$

$$C(t) = \int (u - m(t)) \otimes (u - m(t)) \, d\rho(t, u). \quad (1.12)$$

In this article we focus on the following two differential equations

$$\dot{\mathfrak{C}}(t) = -2\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}(t), \quad \mathfrak{C}(0) = \mathfrak{C}_0, \quad (1.13)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}}(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(A\mathbf{m}(t) - y), \quad \mathbf{m}(0) = \mathbf{m}_0, \quad (1.14)$$

which describe the evolution of the sample covariance and mean of the ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9) and, in fact, also of the quantities $m(t)$ and $C(t)$ which drive the mean-field partial differential equation (1.10). The quantities \mathfrak{C}_0 and \mathbf{m}_0 are the sample covariance and mean of the initial ensemble $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$, sampled from the prior measure μ_0 . In the whole article we assume that \mathfrak{C}_0 is symmetric and positive definite.

As can be easily checked the ordinary differential equation (1.13) has the explicit solution

$$\mathfrak{C}(t) = \mathfrak{C}_0(E + 2tA^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}_0)^{-1} = (E + 2t\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0. \quad (1.15)$$

It is very important to stress that the right hand side of (1.13) has a factor of 2 which cannot be rescaled away or set to 1. In [13] the authors (accidentally) omit the 2 in which case they

derive a solution of (1.14) as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}(t) &= \mathbf{m}_0 + t\mathfrak{C}_0(E + tA^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}_0)^{-1}A^T\Gamma^{-1}(y - A\mathbf{m}_0) \\ &= \mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}\mathbf{m}_0 + t\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y\end{aligned}\tag{1.16}$$

and identify the posterior mean associated to (1.2) for $t = 1$. Similarly, one could write down an explicit (but wrong) formula for the dynamics of all the particles.

We intentionally cross out the formula to emphasize that it *does not correctly* describe the sample mean of the ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9). Also, by dropping the factor of 2, $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ loses the property of being the empirical covariance of the particles. This means that we could in principle work with (1.16) in order to compute the posterior mean for $t = 1$, but then the ensemble covariance does not match the true posterior covariance. See Figure 1 for a demonstration of this mismatch.

The correct formula that we obtain is given by the more complicated expression

$$\mathbf{m}(t) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\mathbf{m}_0 + \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\int_0^t\sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\,ds\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y\tag{1.17}$$

and will be derived in Section 3.1. We want to point out, though, that this correction does not change the asymptotic behaviour of particles or covariance structure as $t \rightarrow \infty$, because we can show that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}\sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}$.

In Figure 1, we compare an ensemble of particles matching the true posterior with the result of the EnKI, both in the form derived in this manuscript, as well as in the form from [13], missing the factor of 2.

The set-up here is $A = \text{diag}(4, 1)$, the Gaussian prior has mean and covariance

$$\mathbf{m}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 4 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}, \mathfrak{C}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and data is given by $y = (0, 0)^T$.

Although we will use the explicit expression (1.15) for $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ in the following, we want to point out that many statements given can be rephrased in a form which only requires knowledge of the following fact: While $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ changes its diagonalization over time, the eigenvectors of $\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$ stay constant. This can be seen by defining $\mathfrak{C}^c(t) = \mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$, by which (1.13) becomes $\dot{\mathfrak{C}}^c(t) = -2\mathfrak{C}^c(t)\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}^c(t)$. If we diagonalize $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SDS^{-1}$ (which we justify in the following) and set $\mathfrak{C}^d(t) := S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}^c(t)S$, we obtain the matrix ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{\mathfrak{C}}^d(t) = -2\mathfrak{C}^d(t)D\mathfrak{C}^d(t).$$

This decouples into a set of n scalar ordinary differential equations since $\mathfrak{C}^d(0) = E$ and D is a diagonal matrix.

Related to the ensemble Kalman inversion is the Bayesian approach of solving the inverse problem $Au = y$ by computing the Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) estimator

$$u_{\text{MAP}}(t) = \arg \min \frac{t}{2} \|Au - y\|_{\Gamma}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u - \mathbf{m}_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2,\tag{1.18}$$

where the prior $u \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathfrak{C}_0)$ plays the role of a Tikhonov-type regularization. Using the optimality conditions of (1.18), one can explicitly compute the MAP estimator as

$$u_{\text{MAP}}(t) = \mathbf{m}_0 + t\mathfrak{C}_0(E + tA^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}_0)^{-1}A^T\Gamma^{-1}(y - A\mathbf{m}_0).\tag{1.19}$$




Figure 1: **Blue:** Ensemble matching the true posterior (triangles, dotted line). **Black:** Ensemble from EnKI for $t = 1$ (squares, solid line). **Red:** Ensemble from the variant of EnKI from [13] (circles, dash-dot line). The wrong EnKI dynamics indeed recovers the posterior mean but exaggerates the covariance contraction. On the other hand, the sample mean of the true EnKI dynamics does not coincide with the posterior mean but the empirical covariance is more similar to the posterior covariance. Axes are scaled for visualization purposes. Ellipses visualize one standard deviation of the empirical covariances involved.

Here $t > 0$ is a free parameter which is usually set to 1. The MAP estimator has some heuristic relations to the discrete ensemble Kalman inversion (1.3). In the light of (1.5) it is obvious that the MAP estimator can be seen as one-step explicit Euler discretization of ordinary differential equation (1.14) which drives the sample means $t \mapsto \mathbf{m}(t)$ of the time-continuous ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9). In particular, if one performs one iteration of (1.3) with $\tau = 1$ and $\Sigma = 0$, then the sample mean coincides with u_{MAP} for $t = 1$.

One might hope that a similar property is true for the ensemble mean $\mathbf{m}(t)$ of the time-continuous ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9) for $t = 1$, which is unfortunately not the case. In contrast, the *wrong* sample mean (1.16) indeed coincides with the MAP estimator (1.19) for all times $t \geq 0$. It can be seen that there is no time $t \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{m}(t)$ and $\mathbf{C}(t)$ constitute the mean and covariance of the posterior, even in the linear Gaussian setting, which means that one cannot recover the posterior by the continuous ensemble Kalman inversion.

The fundamental problem here is that a one-step time discretization of the gradient flow like ordinary differential equation (1.14) is generally not exact. For readers interested in this issue we refer to [7, 8], where it was classified when one-step time discretizations and

gradient flows of one-homogeneous functionals coincide.

This means that the EnKI dynamics cannot be understood as a way of recovering the posterior for $t = 1$, but in our opinion the success of this method still warrants a complete analysis of the EnKI's evolution and its asymptotic properties, which will be the goal of the remainder of this manuscript.

Besides sample covariance and mean it is also interesting to consider the *deviations* $e^j(t)$, the *residuals* $r^j(t)$, and the *residual mean* $r(t)$ of the EnKI dynamics, defined through

$$\begin{aligned} e^j(t) &:= u^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t), \\ r^j(t) &:= u^j(t) - u^\dagger, \\ r(t) &:= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J r^j(t) = \mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where we assume that u^\dagger solves $Au^\dagger = y$. Note that the residual mean is the difference between the ensemble mean and the ground truth solution u^\dagger , where u^\dagger has to be chosen appropriately: If A has a nontrivial kernel, there is a whole subspace of possible candidates for u^\dagger . We will see that there is a canonical choice (not corresponding to the minimum Euclidean norm solution for $Au^\dagger = y$!) depending on the initial ensemble $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$.

The three quantities above evolve according to the differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}Ax(t), \quad x \in \{e^j, r^j, r\}, \quad (1.20)$$

and differ only in their initialization. As we will see, the explicit solution to (1.20) with initial condition $x(0) = x_0$ is given by

$$x(t) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0. \quad (1.21)$$

Hence, for understanding the asymptotic behavior of the deviations, residuals, and residual mean, it suffices to characterize the asymptotic behavior of the covariance matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)$.

Of particular interest in the context of ensemble Kalman inversion are the ensemble and residual spreads, defined as

$$V_e(t) = \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|e^j(t)\|^2, \quad (1.22)$$

$$V_r(t) = \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|r^j(t)\|^2. \quad (1.23)$$

It is well-known that the ensemble spread V_e is monotonically decreasing (this is the deterministic analogue of Theorem 3.4 in [4]). In contrast, the residual spread V_r does not decrease monotonously in general and we devote Section 3.2 to a detailed study of this issue.

Mapping the deviations and residuals into observation space, one can define the functions

$$\mathfrak{V}_e(t) = \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|Ae^j(t)\|_\Gamma^2, \quad (1.24)$$

$$\mathfrak{V}_r(t) = \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|Ar^j(t)\|_\Gamma^2, \quad (1.25)$$

which indeed decrease monotonously, as, for example, shown in [23].

As far as the authors are aware, there has not been any exhaustive discussion of the convergence of the particle dynamics and of the residual of the ensemble Kalman inversion method for the infinite-time limit, in parameter space: The introduction of the ensemble Kalman methodology was carried out in [14], with no analysis of its dynamics for $t \rightarrow \infty$. In [17] it was proved (although in a more general data assimilation setting) that the dynamics do not blow up in finite time by bounding their growth exponentially, but numerical experiments soon suggested that a lot more would be feasible. The first long-time analysis of the EnKI for Bayesian inverse problems (outside of the physically time-dependent data assimilation domain) was conducted in [23], with a sequel in [24], but is constrained to the observation space which – for the case of lower-rank maps A – only allows control on a subspace of the parameter space (given by the orthogonal complement of A). Similarly, [3] and [4] proved convergence to zero of the ensemble spread but could prove convergence of the residuals only in observation space and under additional variance inflation. In [13], an expression for the solution of the particle dynamics is given, albeit it is not the correct one due to a missing factor of 2 (see above). The missing piece, i.e., a full convergence analysis of the ensemble Kalman inversion methodology for linear Bayesian inverse problems, is provided with this manuscript.

Our contributions are the following:

- Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2, Theorem 3.1: An explicit characterization of the dynamics of the empirical covariance, empirical mean, and each ensemble particle, together with a detailed convergence analysis of these quantities for $t \rightarrow \infty$. The main idea here is that the diagonalization of $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$ (where \mathfrak{C}_0 is the initial ensemble’s empirical covariance, A is the forward operator and Γ is the observation noise covariance) also diagonalizes $\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$ and thus allows a complete analysis of the dynamics of the EnKI.
- A negative answer to the question whether the residuals decrease monotonously, even for an optimal choice of ground truth parameter u^\dagger .
- Theorem 4.1: A spectral analysis of the empirical covariance $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ itself, leading to a coupled differential algebraic system characterizing the evolution of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the ensemble covariance.
- We also correct the common tacit assumption that the EnKI dynamics recovers the posterior for $t = 1$.

In [14], it was shown that the EnKI dynamics (both in deterministic and stochastic version) stays in the affine subspace spanned by the initial ensemble. This means that even for a infinite-dimensional inverse problem, the EnKI method lives in finite-dimensional space which is why we assume this a-priori. The setting of ensemble Kalman inversion on an infinite-dimensional parameter space can be rephrased as a finite-dimensional problem by describing all quantities involved by the span of the initial ensemble. By the subspace property, we never leave this finite-dimensional span. Most realistic measurement processes generate finite-dimensional even for infinite-dimensional parameter models. This means that assuming both parameter and observation to be finite-dimensional quantities is not a strong restriction in most contexts.

We also remark that the “time parameter” t rather corresponds to a regularization parameter and plays the role of supposedly (but not actually, see the example above!) interpolating

between prior ($t = 0$) and posterior ($t = 1$), with $t \rightarrow \infty$ corresponding to the limit of vanishing regularization. This means that t is not physical time and does also not keep track of data accumulating over time, as it is in the setting of data assimilation. For recent progress on the ensemble Kalman inversion in data assimilation, see for example [2, 9, 10, 26]. For a very well-written and extensive review of research on the ensemble Kalman methodology and its interpretation as metric gradient flow, we refer to [13] and the references therein.

2 Spectral Decomposition of Preconditioned Covariance

Since the explicit solution (1.15) of the covariance ordinary differential equation (1.13) does not provide us with sufficient insight about behavior of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$, we pursue a different strategy for constructing a solution. Additionally, we hope that the methods used will extend to cases where explicit solutions can not be constructed (e.g., the nonlinear or stochastic case).

The following two lemmas will be needed for the construction.

Lemma 2.1. *Given two symmetric matrices $V, W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with at least one of them being positive definite, the products VW and WV are diagonalizable. If the other matrix is also at least positive (semi)definite, then VW and WV are also positive (semi)definite.*

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that W is positive definite. Thus there exists a non-singular square root matrix $W^{1/2}$. Then

$$W^{-1/2}WVW^{1/2} = W^{1/2}VW^{1/2}.$$

The matrix $W^{1/2}VW^{1/2}$ is symmetric and thus diagonalizable. The left hand side is a similarity transform of the product WV . This shows that WV is diagonalizable. The statement is proven for VW by arguing the same way for $W^{1/2}VWW^{-1/2}$. For the other statement note that if V is positive (semi)definite in addition, then there also exists a square root $V^{1/2}$ and then $W^{1/2}VW^{1/2} = (W^{1/2}V^{1/2})(V^{1/2}W^{1/2})$ which is positive (semi)definite and hence this property holds for the matrices VW and WV . \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let M be diagonalizable with non-negative eigenvalues such that*

$$M = S \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0) S^{-1}.$$

The columns of $S = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ are the eigenvectors such that $Mw_i = \mu_i w_i$.

Then $R(t) = (E + tM)^{-1}$ exists for all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-\mu_1^{-1}, \dots, -\mu_n^{-1}\}$ and has the form

$$R(t) = S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{1}{1 + t\mu_i} \right)_{i=1}^n S^{-1}.$$

Also, $R_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R(t)$ exists and has the same eigenvectors as M , but with

$$R_\infty w_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k, \\ w_i & \text{for } i = k + 1, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The invertibility of $(E + tM)$ for $t \neq -\mu_i^{-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, follows directly from the spectral properties of M . Note that

$$R(t) = (E + tSDS^{-1})^{-1} = S(E + tD)^{-1}S^{-1} = S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{1}{1 + t\mu_i} \right)_{i=1}^n S^{-1}.$$

This proves that indeed $R(t)$ has the same spectral decomposition as M for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$R(t)w_i = \frac{1}{1+t\mu_i}w_i$$

and the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ as claimed. \square

2.1 Diagonalization of the Preconditioned Empirical Covariance

Now we are ready to formulate the first theorem of this section. The main idea here is that, while an eigenbasis of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ seems to behave erratically (stretching and rotating in a way to assimilate both the current covariance structure and the influence of the observation operator), the matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$ has fixed eigenvectors which equal those of $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$ (albeit with different eigenvalues). This is essentially what allows an explicit form of the solution of the EnKI dynamics.

Theorem 2.1 (Covariance Dynamics). *Let $\mathfrak{C}(t) = (E + 2t\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$ denote the solution of (1.13) with initial condition \mathfrak{C}_0 . Then it holds:*

- The matrix $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$ is diagonalizable, meaning that $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SDS^{-1}$ with $D = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0)$ where $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_k > 0$ for some $k \leq n$.
- Letting $E(t) := \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{1+2t\mu_i}\right)_{i=1}^n$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{C}(t) &= SE(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0, \\ \mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A &= SD(t)S^{-1}, \\ \mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}(t) &= SD(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0,\end{aligned}$$

where $D(t) := DE(t) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\mu_i}{1+2t\mu_i}\right)_{i=1}^n$. Note that $D(0) = D$ and $E(0) = E$.

- $\mathfrak{C}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{C}(t) = SE_\infty S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$, where $E_\infty = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1)$ has k zero entries and $n - k$ entries of one, has the property that

$$A\mathfrak{C}_\infty = 0.$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2.1 the matrix $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$ is positive semidefinite and diagonalizable as $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = S \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0)S^{-1}$. From (1.15) we have an explicit solution of the covariance ordinary differential equation (1.13) given by $\mathfrak{C}(t) = (E + 2t\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$. Hence, by Lemma 2.2 we can express this as $\mathfrak{C}(t) = SE(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$ for all $t \geq 0$, with

$$E(t) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{1+2t\mu_i}\right)_{i=1}^n$$

as claimed. The characterization of $\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$ follows directly by seeing that

$$\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SE(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SE(t)DS^{-1} = SD(t)S^{-1}.$$

Using $DE_\infty = 0$, one calculates

$$\mathfrak{C}_\infty A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SE_\infty S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SE_\infty S^{-1}SDS^{-1} = SE_\infty DS^{-1} = 0.$$

This means that, by transposing this equality, we also have $A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}_\infty = 0$, which is equivalent to $A\mathfrak{C}_\infty = 0$. \square

2.2 Asymptotic Profiles

In the previous section we have used a diagonalization to construct an explicit solution of the covariance matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ and understand its asymptotic behavior as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now we study “second-order” asymptotics by investigating the asymptotic behavior of the time derivative $\dot{\mathfrak{C}}(t)$ of the covariance. More precisely, we study asymptotic profiles of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ in the spirit of [5], which are defined as limit of the approximate time derivative at infinity

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t(\mathfrak{C}(t) - \mathfrak{C}_\infty),$$

typically solve a nonlinear eigenvalue problem, and constitute self-similar solutions of the dynamics.

To set the scene, we rewrite the covariance dynamics (1.13) in the abstract form

$$\dot{\mathfrak{C}}(t) = -\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{C}(t)), \quad \mathfrak{C}(0) = \mathfrak{C}_0,$$

where the nonlinear operator \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = 2\mathfrak{C}A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}. \quad (2.1)$$

We will show that the rescaled solutions $t(\mathfrak{C}(t) - \mathfrak{C}_\infty)$ converge to an eigenvector $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$ of \mathcal{A} , meaning $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} = \mathcal{A}(\hat{\mathfrak{C}})$

Note that eigenvectors of \mathcal{A} , i.e., matrices with $\lambda\hat{\mathfrak{C}} = \mathcal{A}(\hat{\mathfrak{C}})$ give rise to self-similar solutions of (1.13) (cf. [5] for a general study). Indeed if $\mathfrak{C}(0) = \hat{\mathfrak{C}}$ then $\mathfrak{C}(t) = a(t)\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$, where $a : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ solves the initial value problem $a'(t) = -2\lambda a(t)^2$, $a(0) = 1$. Hence, in this case

$$\mathfrak{C}(t) = \frac{1}{1 + 2\lambda t} \hat{\mathfrak{C}}. \quad (2.2)$$

In the context of the ensemble Kalman inversion this means that if the covariance matrix of the initial ensemble is an eigenvector of \mathcal{A} , then the shape of the ensemble remains unchanged during the flow. Hence, Theorem 2.2 means that the rescaled covariance matrix of the ensemble Kalman inversion approaches a matrix which is a self-similar solution to (1.13).

Theorem 2.2 (Asymptotic Profiles). *Let $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ denote the solution of (1.13) with initial condition \mathfrak{C}_0 . Then the limit*

$$\hat{\mathfrak{C}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t(\mathfrak{C}(t) - \mathfrak{C}_\infty) \quad (2.3)$$

exists, and satisfies $\mathcal{A}(\hat{\mathfrak{C}}) = \hat{\mathfrak{C}}$.

Proof. Plugging in the explicit representations $\mathfrak{C}(t) = SE(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$ and $\mathfrak{C}_\infty = SE_\infty S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$, where $E(t)$ and E_∞ are as in Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} t(\mathfrak{C}(t) - \mathfrak{C}_\infty) &= tS(E(t) - E_\infty)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 \\ &= S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{t}{1 + 2t\mu_1}, \dots, \frac{t}{1 + 2t\mu_k}, 0, \dots, 0 \right) S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 \\ &\rightarrow S \underbrace{\operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{1}{2\mu_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{2\mu_k}, 0, \dots, 0 \right)}_{\hat{D}} S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can define the matrix $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} := S\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\hat{\mathfrak{C}}) &= 2\hat{\mathfrak{C}}A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\hat{\mathfrak{C}} = 2S\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}AS\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 = 2S\hat{D}S^{-1}SDS^{-1}S\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 \\ &= 2S\hat{D}D\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 = S\hat{D}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0 = \hat{\mathfrak{C}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $2\hat{D}$ is the pseudo-inverse matrix of $D = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0)$. \square

Example 2.1. Let $A = (0, 1)$, $\Gamma = E$, and $\mathfrak{C}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & d \end{pmatrix}$. Then if $a \neq 0$ one can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}(t) &= \frac{1}{1+2td} \begin{pmatrix} a+2t\det\mathfrak{C}_0 & b \\ b & d \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathfrak{C}_\infty &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\det\mathfrak{C}_0}{d} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{\mathfrak{C}} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{b^2}{d} & b \\ \frac{b}{d} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality we can assume $d = 1$ which yields $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} b^2 & b \\ b & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This matrix has the eigenvectors $(1, -b)^T$ and $(b, 1)^T$ with eigenvalues 0 and $(b^2 + 1)/2$, respectively. This means that the ensemble approaches its limit in a tilted way if $b \neq 0$ and parallelly if $b = 0$. We illustrate this in Figure 2, where the first row shows the evolution of EnKI with an initial ensemble aligned to the subspace of solutions (depicted in red), and the second row shows the evolution of a rotated ensemble. The eigenvectors of the respective asymptotic profiles are depicted in the rightmost plots. Here the pink eigenvectors, corresponding to the non-zero eigenvalue of $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$, show the tilting with which the ensembles hits their limiting configurations.

3 Particle Dynamics

With a complete analysis of the covariance dynamics, we can now use the explicit form of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$, decouple the particle system $u^j(t)$ by means of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$, and analyse the long-time behaviour of the particles, their empirical mean, and the particle deviations and residuals.

3.1 Fundamental Dynamical Properties

We can treat all equations (1.9), (1.14), and (1.20) (which govern the dynamics of the particles, of the empirical mean, and the evolution of deviations and residuals, respectively) in a uniform way by considering the ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Ax(t) - y), \quad x(0) = x_0. \quad (3.1)$$

In the following proposition we derive the solution of this ordinary differential equation and its asymptotic behavior.

Proposition 3.1. *The solution of (3.1) is given by*

$$x(t) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} ds \mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y. \quad (3.2)$$




Figure 2: Asymptotic Profiles of ensemble Kalman inversion. From left to right: initial condition, intermediate time step, converged state. **Top row:** symmetric prior. **Bottom row:** asymmetric prior. Red and green arrows indicate eigenvectors of the empirical covariance matrix. Magenta and black arrows indicate eigenvectors of the asymptotic profile.

Proof. We define $L(t) := \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}^{-1} = S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}$ which satisfies

$$\dot{L}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}SE^{-3/2}(t)\dot{E}(t)S^{-1} = S \operatorname{diag}\left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_i}}\right)S^{-1} =: SM(t)S^{-1}.$$

The product $L(t)x(t)$ then satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}[L(t)x(t)] &= \dot{L}(t)x(t) + L(t)\dot{x}(t) \\ &= SM(t)S^{-1}x(t) - S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Ax(t) - y) \\ &= SM(t)S^{-1}x(t) - S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}SD(t)S^{-1}x(t) + S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= SM(t)S^{-1}x(t) - \underbrace{S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}D(t)S^{-1}x(t)}_{=M(t)} + S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= S\sqrt{E(t)}^{-1}S^{-1}SE(t)S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= S\sqrt{E(T)}S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y. \end{aligned}$$

We can integrate this equation to

$$L(t)x(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} ds \mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}y,$$

which is equivalent to (3.2). \square

If the datum y lies in the range of the forward operator A , we can simplify the formula (3.2) considerably. This also enables us to infer the asymptotic behavior of solutions to (3.1). In fact, in the finite-dimensional observation setting any datum $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ can be represented as $y = y^\dagger + y^\perp$ with $y^\dagger \in \text{ran}(A)$ and $y^\perp \in \text{ran}(A)^{\perp, \Gamma}$. Here the orthogonal complement with respect to the Γ -weighted inner product is defined as

$$\text{ran}(A)^{\perp, \Gamma} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle y, Au \rangle_\Gamma = 0, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n\}. \quad (3.3)$$

In fact, assuming $y^\perp = 0$ is no restriction as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $y = y^\dagger + y^\perp$ where $y^\perp \in \text{ran}(A)^{\perp, \Gamma}$. Then the ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9) with datum y^\dagger coincides with the one for y .*

Proof. The ensemble Kalman inversion (1.9) with datum y reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}^j(t) &= -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Aw^j(t) - y^\dagger - y^\perp) \\ &= -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Aw^j(t) - y^\dagger) + \mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Now the claim follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}y^\perp &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J (w^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)) \langle w^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t), A^T\Gamma^{-1}y^\perp \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J (w^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)) \langle A(w^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)), y^\perp \rangle_\Gamma = 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark 3.1. This technique does not work in the case of infinite-dimensional data, if the range of the forward operator is not closed, because then we cannot decompose y in the way presented above.

Now we provide the version of Proposition 3.1 which utilizes that the datum y has a preimage under the forward operator A .

For this, we recall the definition of the pseudo inverse of a diagonalizable matrix $M = U\Lambda U^{-1}$ as $M^+ = U\Lambda^+U^{-1}$ where $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_k, 0, \dots, 0)^+ = \text{diag}(a_1^{-1}, \dots, a_k^{-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that $y = A\xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the solution of (3.1) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)\xi \\ &= x_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)(\xi - x_0). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

The asymptotic behavior $x_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_\infty &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)\xi \\ &= x_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)(\xi - x_0), \\ &= x_0 + (A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^+A^T\Gamma^{-1}(y - Ax_0) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

and satisfies the equation $Ax_\infty = y$.

Remark 3.2. Let us remark that the solution $x(t)$ does not depend on the choice of ξ , which is unique up to a component in $\ker(A)$. Indeed, if one assumes that $A\xi = 0$ then $0 = \mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \xi = SDS^{-1}\xi$. Since S is invertible and $D = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0)$, we infer that $S^{-1}\xi = (0, \dots, 0, *, \dots, *)$ and therefore

$$\left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)\xi = S(E - \sqrt{E(t)})S^{-1}\xi = 0.$$

Proof. If $y = A\xi$, we can use Proposition 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \, ds \, \mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} y \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + S\sqrt{E(t)} \int_0^t \sqrt{E(s)} \, ds \, DS^{-1}\xi \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + S\sqrt{E(t)} \int_0^t \text{diag}\left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sqrt{1+2s\mu_i}}\right)_{i=1}^n \, ds \, S^{-1}\xi \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + S\sqrt{E(t)} \text{diag}\left(\sqrt{1+2t\mu_i} - 1\right)_{i=1}^n S^{-1}\xi \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + S\left(E - \sqrt{E(t)}\right)S^{-1}\xi \\ &= \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}x_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}\right)\xi, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (3.4).

The limiting expressions in (3.5) follows from $\mathfrak{C}(t) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\infty$. Only the last expression which involves the pseudo inverse of $A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$ needs some thought: We know $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A = SDS^{-1}$ and hence

$$(A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ = SD^+ S^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_0.$$

Using this together with the fact $\sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} = S\sqrt{E_\infty}S^{-1} = SE_\infty S^{-1}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ A^T \Gamma^{-1} A &= SD^+ S^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_0 \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} SDS^{-1} = SD^+ DS^{-1} \\ &= S(E - E_\infty)S^{-1} = E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We finally show that $Ax_\infty = y$. To this end we rewrite x_∞ as

$$x_\infty = SE_\infty S^{-1}x_0 + S(E - E_\infty)S^{-1}\xi = SE_\infty S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi) + \xi.$$

Applying the matrix $A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$ to this equation yields

$$\begin{aligned} A^T \Gamma^{-1} Ax_\infty &= A^T \Gamma^{-1} ASE_\infty S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi) + A^T \Gamma^{-1} A\xi \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} SDE_\infty S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi) + A^T \Gamma^{-1} A\xi \\ &= A^T \Gamma^{-1} A\xi \\ &= A^T \Gamma^{-1} y, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $DE_\infty = 0$. Since $\Gamma^{-1/2}A$ is trivially surjective on its range, the transpose $A^T\Gamma^{-1/2}$ is injective there. This implies $\Gamma^{-1/2}Ax_\infty = \Gamma^{-1/2}y$ and multiplication with $\Gamma^{1/2}$ shows that $Ax_\infty = y$. \square

Remark 3.3. If one tries to solve the integral in (3.2) on its own, without using that it is multiplied with the term $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} y$ for $y = A\xi$, one obtains

$$\int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} ds = S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_1}-1}{\mu_1}, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_k}-1}{\mu_k}, t, \dots, t \right) S^{-1}$$

and

$$\sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} ds = S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_1}}}{\mu_1}, \dots, \frac{1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_k}}}{\mu_k}, t, \dots, t \right) S^{-1}.$$

The diagonal matrix in expression blows up as $t \rightarrow \infty$ unless it is multiplied with $D = \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0, \dots, 0)$. This shows the need for diagonalizing $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A y = SDS^{-1}\xi$. While Lemma 3.1 shows that we can always write $y = A\xi$ for finite-dimensional data, this might give a glimpse on possible difficulties with EnKI for infinite-dimensional observation data.

As it can be expected from a regularization method for inverse problems, the time asymptotic limit (3.5) can be interpreted as projection of the initial datum x_0 onto the solution set of $\{Au = y\}$. In other words, $x(t)$ converges to a solution of $Au = y$ with minimal value of the prior $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|x - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2$, which can be interpreted as the formal limit of $t \rightarrow \infty$ of the variational regularization method (1.18), see [6] for a rigorous study of this phenomenon.

Proposition 3.3. *We can characterize*

$$x_\infty = \arg \min \{ \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0} : \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, A\xi = y \}. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. First we note that $\sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} = S\sqrt{E_\infty}S^{-1} = SE_\infty S^{-1} = \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$. This implies that $\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} = \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$ and hence $\mathfrak{C}_\infty = \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_\infty$. Next we compute for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $A\xi = y$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_\infty - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 &= \|(E - \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1})(\xi - x_0)\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 \\ &= \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 - 2 \langle \xi - x_0, \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0) \rangle_{\mathfrak{C}_0} + \|\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0)\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 \\ &= \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 - 2 \langle \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0), \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0) \rangle + \|\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0)\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\mathfrak{C}_\infty = \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_\infty$ and the symmetry of all covariance matrices, the inner product can be simplified as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0), \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0) \rangle &= \langle \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0), \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0) \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0), \mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0) \rangle \\ &= \|\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0)\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the previous equation yields

$$\|x_\infty - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 = \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 - \|\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}(\xi - x_0)\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2 \leq \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}^2,$$

which proves the statement since $Ax_\infty = y$ by Proposition 3.2 and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0}$ is strictly convex. \square

Let us now consider the case of noisy data, i.e., $y = y^\dagger + \varepsilon$, where $y^\dagger \in \text{ran}(A)$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes noise. Note that the interesting case is $\varepsilon \notin \text{ran}(A)^{\perp, \Gamma}$ since otherwise Lemma 3.1 would tell us that ε does not influence the evolution. As expected $x(t)$ converges to the solution u^\dagger of $Au^\dagger = y^\dagger$ with minimal prior up to a noise level, dependent on ε .

Proposition 3.4. *Let $y = y^\dagger + \varepsilon$ where $y^\dagger \in \text{ran}(A)$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then it holds*

$$x_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = x^\dagger + (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ (A^T \Gamma^{-1} \varepsilon), \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$x^\dagger \in \arg \min \{ \|\xi - x_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0} : A\xi = y^\dagger \}. \quad (3.8)$$

Remark 3.4. As seen in the proof of Proposition 3.2 it holds

$$(A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A) = E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} = S(E - E_\infty)S^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, one can express $\varepsilon = Ar^\dagger + \varepsilon^\perp$ with $\varepsilon^\perp \in \text{ran}(A)^{\perp, \Gamma} = \ker(A^T \Gamma^{-1})$. Noting that $E - E_\infty = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ (where the first k entries correspond to the 0-eigenvalues of $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$), equation (3.7) allows us to interpret the error $x_\infty - x^\dagger$ as the non-orthogonal projection of r^\dagger onto the eigenvectors of $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$ corresponding to the non-zero eigenvalues.

Proof. Using the last formula in (3.5) with $y = y^\dagger + \varepsilon$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} x_\infty &= x_0 + (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ A^T \Gamma^{-1} (y^\dagger + \varepsilon - Ax_0) \\ &= x_0 + (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ A^T \Gamma^{-1} (y^\dagger - Ax_0) + (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \varepsilon \\ &= x^\dagger + (A^T \Gamma^{-1} A)^+ A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 to identify x^\dagger . \square

Now we prove a rate at which $x(t)$ converges to its limit.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that $y \in \text{ran}(A)$ and let $x(t)$ and x_∞ be as in Proposition 3.2. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that it holds*

$$\|x(t) - x_\infty\| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\text{gap} \cdot t}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\|Ax(t) - y\|_\Gamma \leq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\mu_{\max}}{t}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Here $\text{gap} := \mu_k$ denotes the spectral gap and $\mu_{\max} := \mu_1$ the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $\mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} A$.

Proof. Diagonalizing and subtracting $x(t)$ and x_∞ given by (3.4) and (3.5), respectively, yields

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) - x_\infty &= S(\sqrt{E(t)} - E_\infty)S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi) \\ &= S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_1}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_k}}, 0, \dots, 0 \right) S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi), \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{gap} := \mu_k$ denotes the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of $A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$. Taking norms yields the convergence rate (3.9).

Using this expression for $x(t) - x_\infty$ and the diagonalization $A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}SDS^{-1}$ we also find

$$\begin{aligned} A^T\Gamma^{-1}A(x(t) - x_\infty) &= \mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}SD(\sqrt{E(t)} - E_\infty)S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi) \\ &= S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_1}}, \dots, \frac{\mu_k}{\sqrt{1+2t\mu_k}}, 0, \dots, 0 \right) S^{-1}(x_0 - \xi). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this with $x(t) - x_\infty$ and using $Ax_\infty = y$ shows (3.10). \square

By combining all statements in this section, we obtain our main result about the characterization of solution and long-term behaviour of the EnKI dynamics:

Theorem 3.1 (Particle Dynamics). *For $y = Au^\dagger + \varepsilon$ the ensemble Kalman dynamics are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} u^j(t) &= u_0^j + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \right) (u^\dagger - u_0^j) + \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \, ds \, \mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} \varepsilon \\ \mathbf{m}(t) &= \mathbf{m}_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \right) (u^\dagger - \mathbf{m}_0) + \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}(s)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \, ds \, \mathfrak{C}_0 A^T \Gamma^{-1} \varepsilon \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u^j(t) &= u^{j,\dagger} + (A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^+(A^T\Gamma^{-1}\varepsilon) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}(t) &= \mathbf{m}^\dagger + (A^T\Gamma^{-1}A)^+(A^T\Gamma^{-1}\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

where $u^{j,\dagger} = u_0^j + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \right) (u^\dagger - u_0^j)$ and $\mathbf{m}^\dagger = \mathbf{m}_0 + \left(E - \sqrt{\mathfrak{C}_\infty\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}} \right) (u^\dagger - \mathbf{m}_0)$ are equivalently characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} u^{j,\dagger} &= \arg \min \left\{ \|u - u_0^j\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0} : u \in \mathbb{R}^n, Au = Au^\dagger \right\}, \\ \mathbf{m}^\dagger &= \arg \min \left\{ \|m - \mathbf{m}_0\|_{\mathfrak{C}_0} : m \in \mathbb{R}^n, Am = Au^\dagger \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The order of convergence of all quantities involved is given by (3.9) and (3.10).

3.2 Convergence of Ensemble and Residual Spreads

Knowing from Theorem 3.1 that the sample mean converges, we now study the ensemble and residual spreads, defined in (1.22) and (1.23).

We recall from [4] that the ensemble spread $V_e(t)$ decreases monotonously with time. It does not necessarily converge to zero unless in the fully observed case of an invertible forward operator A , as we can only expect ensemble collapse along the components orthogonal to the kernel of A .

To see the decrease of V_e one computes

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_e(t) &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \dot{e}^j(t), e^j(t) \rangle = -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \mathfrak{C}(t) A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t), e^j(t) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{J^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^J \langle e^i(t), e^j(t) \rangle \langle e^i(t), A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t) \rangle \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where Lemma A.3. in [4] ensures that the last term is non-negative. For the ensemble spread in observation space, given by (1.24), one can even prove convergence to zero. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathfrak{V}}_e(t) &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t), \dot{e}^j(t) \rangle = -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t), \mathfrak{C}(t) A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{J^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^J \langle A^T \Gamma^{-1} A e^j(t), e^k(t) \rangle^2 = -\frac{1}{J^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^J \langle A e^j(t), A e^k(t) \rangle_{\Gamma}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We can bound this by removing all terms $j \neq k$ and applying Jensen's inequality for sums for the convex function $x \mapsto x^2$.

$$\dot{\mathfrak{V}}_e(t) \leq -\frac{1}{J^2} \sum_{j=1}^J \|A e^j(t)\|_{\Gamma}^4 \leq -\frac{1}{J} \left(\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|A e^j(t)\|_{\Gamma}^2 \right)^2 = -\frac{4}{J} \mathfrak{V}_e(t)^2.$$

An ordinary differential equation comparison principle then yields that

$$\mathfrak{V}_e(t) \leq \frac{1}{\frac{4}{J}t + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{V}_e(0)}}.$$

Monotonous decrease is not true for the residual spread, whose derivative in time is

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_r(t) &= \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle \dot{r}^j(t), r^j(t) \rangle = -\frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \langle A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \mathfrak{C}(t) r^j(t), r^j(t) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{2J^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^J \langle e^i(t), r^j(t) \rangle \langle e^i(t), A^T \Gamma^{-1} A r^j(t) \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

which does not carry a sign in general. Indeed, simple simulations (see Figure 3) show that the residual norms can increase in time. There are two issues at play here:

- Correct choice of u^\dagger in $r^j(t) = u^j(t) - u^\dagger$ and
- Skewness of the Euclidean norm with respect to the EnKI dynamics.

First, the residuals r^j and their mean r are defined via a choice of ground truth parameter u^\dagger such that $Au^\dagger = y$. While the degrees of freedom in this choice are irrelevant in the observation space, they are eminent in the parameter domain: For a given initial ensemble $\{u_0^j\}_{j=1}^J$, the mean $\mathfrak{m}(t)$ will converge to a well-defined limit $\mathfrak{m}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{m}(t)$ according to Proposition 3.2. It is exactly this parameter we need to choose as a candidate for our ground truth u^\dagger which can be seen from the following reformulation of V_r .

Proposition 3.6. *It holds*

$$V_r(t) = V_e(t) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger\|^2. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V_r(t) &= \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|r^j(t)\|^2 = \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\|u^j(t)\|^2 - 2\langle u^j(t), u^\dagger \rangle + \|u^\dagger\|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\|u^j(t)\|^2 - 2\langle u^j(t), \mathbf{m}(t) \rangle + \|\mathbf{m}(t)\|^2 - 2\langle u^j(t), u^\dagger - \mathbf{m}(t) \rangle + \|u^\dagger\|^2 - \|\mathbf{m}(t)\|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|u^j(t) - \mathbf{m}(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u^\dagger\|^2 - \langle \mathbf{m}(t), u^\dagger - \mathbf{m}(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{m}(t)\|^2 \\ &= V_e(t) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

We can see that $u^\dagger := \mathbf{m}_\infty$ is the canonical choice because it guarantees the particles dynamics to concentrate around this possible candidate for a ground truth $Au^\dagger = y$. We obtain the following trivial corollary that for $u^\dagger = \mathbf{m}_\infty$ the ensemble spread and the residual spread converge to the same value (which is not zero, in general).

Corollary 3.1. *Let $u^\dagger := \mathbf{m}_\infty$. Then it holds*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V_e(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V_r(t). \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. The proof follows from (3.11) together with the fact that $\mathbf{m}(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_\infty$ according to Proposition 3.2. □

However, even with this choice of u^\dagger , the residual spread V_r can still *fail to decrease* (see Figure 3 for an example). In contrast, the residual spread in observation space (1.25) does indeed decrease monotonously. Similar to above one can express $\mathfrak{V}_r(t)$ in terms of $\mathfrak{V}_e(t)$ and obtain monotonous convergence to zero.

Proposition 3.7. *The residual spread in parameter space $\mathfrak{V}_r(t)$ admits the expression*

$$\mathfrak{V}_r(t) = \mathfrak{V}_e(t) + \frac{1}{2} \|A\mathbf{m}(t) - y\|_\Gamma^2. \quad (3.13)$$

Furthermore $t \mapsto \mathfrak{V}_r(t)$ is non-increasing and converges to zero with rate $1/t$.

Proof. The proof of (3.13) work precisely as above for $V_r(t)$. Furthermore, one can easily compute that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \|A\mathbf{m}(t) - y\|_\Gamma^2 = -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^J \langle Ae^k(t), A\mathbf{m}(t) - y \rangle_\Gamma \leq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Hence, using that $t \mapsto \mathfrak{V}_e(t)$ converges to zero monotonously with rate $1/t$ and that the same holds true for $t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|A\mathbf{m}(t) - y\|_\Gamma^2$ (cf. (3.10)) we obtain the assertion. □

We emphasize again that monotone convergence of $t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \|A\mathbf{m}(t) - y\|_{\Gamma}^2$ does not mean that the quantities $\|\mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger\|$ or $V_r(t)$ decrease as well. First, the mapping of this quantity via A only keeps track of the data-informed parameter dimensions, i.e., those orthogonal to the kernel of A . And secondly, even invertibility of A still does not imply monotonicity of $\|\mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger\|$ as the mapping A can warp the coordinate system in such a way that this property is lost. This can be seen in an elementary example unrelated to the EnKI: Consider the curve $x(t) = (\cos(t), \sin(t))$ for which $V(t) := \|x(t)\|^2$ is constant, i.e., monotonously non-increasing. On the other hand, with $A = \text{diag}(2, 1)$, the mapping $\tilde{V}(t) = \|Ax(t)\|^2$ is not monotonous.

Example 3.1. As a concrete example for the non-monotonicity of the mean and the residual, we can consider the forward operator $A = \text{diag}(100, 1)$, observation $y = (0, 0)^T$, and an initial ensemble with mean $\mathbf{m}_0 = (100, 100)^T$ and empirical covariance

$$\mathfrak{C}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 25 & -24 \\ -24 & 25 \end{pmatrix},$$

whose eigenvectors are $(-1, 1)^T$ and $(1, 1)^T$ with eigenvalues 49 and 1, respectively.

Figure 3 shows the initial ensemble and the trajectories of the ensemble and its sample mean in the parameter space. Clearly, the sample mean and the whole ensemble move away from their final limit $(0, 0)^T$ for quite some time until they finally ‘change direction’ and converge towards their limit. The initial shearing of the ensemble combined with the strong weighting of the horizontal direction, which is encoded in the forward operator, leads to an initial movement of the ensemble along its principal axis to the top left.




Figure 3: Trajectories of the EnKI (black curve is the mean $\mathbf{m}(t)$) for $t \in [0, 1]$. Dotted sphere is the Euclidean sphere through \mathbf{m}_0 , demonstrating non-monotonicity of the mean.

Applied to the present setting, this means that the Euclidean norm is not the natural norm with respect to which we should view the dynamics of the ensemble. Hence, we need to either settle for *non-monotonous convergence* of $\|\mathbf{m}(t) - u^\dagger\|$, or we need to pick a more *problem-adapted norm*, as presented in the following.

3.3 Monotonicity in a Problem-adapted Norm

Now we see how to define a new norm on the parameter space with respect to which we can prove monotonous convergence of the residuals.

Recall the characteristic ordinary differential equation (3.1) for $y = A\xi$, given by

$$\dot{x}(t) = -\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}(Ax(t) - y) = -SD(t)S^{-1}(x(t) - \xi).$$

By defining $\rho(t) = S^{-1}x(t)$, we obtain the ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -D(t)(\rho(t) - S^{-1}\xi),$$

which decouples into n ordinary differential equations since $D(t)$ is a diagonal matrix. This allows us to prove the following Lyapunov type estimate.

Proposition 3.8. *Let S be such that $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SDS^{-1}$ from Theorem 2.1. Then*

$$L(x) := \frac{1}{2}\|S^{-1}(x - \xi)\|^2$$

is a Lyapunov function for the dynamics of x , meaning that $\dot{L}(t) \leq 0$.

Proof. We observe $L(x(t)) = \frac{1}{2}\|\rho(t) - S^{-1}\xi\|^2$ and compute

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(x(t)) = \langle \rho'(t), \rho(t) - S^{-1}\xi \rangle = -\left\|\sqrt{D(t)}\rho(t)\right\|^2 \leq 0.$$

□

Remark 3.5. A couple of remarks regarding this Lyapunov approach are in order.

- The strength of using the norm $\|S^{-1}\cdot\|$ instead of the Euclidean norm, is that it captures exactly the correct notion of convergence of x by respecting both the influence of the forward mapping A and the initial ensemble \mathfrak{C}_0 .
- The proof that the dynamics behave monotonously in this norm did not use the explicit solution for $x(t)$ derived in Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. Therefore, we hope that this Lyapunov approach might work similarly in the stochastic setting where an explicit solution is not readily available.
- Since S^{-1} is a regular matrix, the functional $L(x)$ is coercive which will turn out useful for showing existence of a limit of $x(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in more general settings.
- “Preconditioning” with S^{-1} also allows one to show that the matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A$ has the same eigenvectors for all times, without using the explicit solution for $\mathfrak{C}(t)$. From $\mathfrak{C}_0A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SDS^{-1}$ we see that $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ is diagonalized in the same way:

$$S^{-1}\dot{\mathfrak{C}}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}AS = -S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}AS,$$

i.e., if we set $D(t) := S^{-1}\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}AS$, we obtain the very simple ordinary differential equation $\dot{D}(t) = -D^2(t)$. This proves that $D(t)$ stays diagonal for all $t \geq 0$ and we obtain the diagonalization $\mathfrak{C}(t)A^T\Gamma^{-1}A = SD(t)S^{-1}$, which we have already derived in Theorem 2.1 with other techniques.

4 Spectral Decomposition of the Covariance

In the previous sections we have intensively used the diagonalization $\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1} = SE(t)S^{-1}$ to understand the dynamics of the EnKI. Remarkably, the eigenvectors of the matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)\mathfrak{C}_0^{-1}$ do not change in time and their associated eigenvalues have an explicit expression. None of this is true for the covariance matrix $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ itself and, in particular, its eigenvectors can change drastically in time.

In this section, we derive a coupled system of ordinary differential equations which is solved by the eigenvalue and eigenvectors of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$. To this end, denote by $\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_n(t)$ the eigenvalues of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$, with eigenvectors $v_1(t), \dots, v_n(t)$. Since $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ is symmetric, all eigenvectors can be chosen orthonormal and we can assume the ordering $\lambda_1(t) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(t)$ of the eigenvalues.

Theorem 4.1 (Eigenvector Dynamics). *Let $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ denote the solution of (1.13) with initial condition \mathfrak{C}_0 . Denote the eigenvalues and normalized eigenvectors of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ by $\lambda_i(t)$ and $v_i(t)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then it holds:*

- Any set of eigenvalues $\lambda_i(t)$ with corresponding eigenvectors $v_i(t)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, differentiable in time, solve the following differential algebraic system:

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = -2\lambda_i^2 \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}: \\ \lambda_j \neq \lambda_i}} \frac{2\lambda_i \lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma v_j, \quad (4.1b)$$

$$0 = \lambda_i^2 \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma, \quad \text{if } i \neq j \text{ but } \lambda_i = \lambda_j. \quad (4.1c)$$

- The eigenvalue adhere to the following bounds

$$\lambda_i(t) \geq \frac{\lambda_i(0)}{2 \|\Gamma^{-1/2} A\|^2 t \lambda_i(0) + 1}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\lambda_1(t) \geq \frac{\lambda_1(0)}{2 \|Av_1(0)\|_\Gamma^2 t \lambda_1(0) + 1}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\lambda_n(t) \leq \frac{\lambda_n(0)}{2 \|Av_n(0)\|_\Gamma^2 t \lambda_n(0) + 1}. \quad (4.4)$$

- The eigenvalues and eigenvectors have the following asymptotic behavior

$$(\forall i = 1, \dots, n) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i(t) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Av_i(t) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Remark 4.1. The case of eigenvalues with $\lambda_i(t^*) = \lambda_j(t^*)$ but $\lambda_i(t) \neq \lambda_j(t)$ for $t \neq t^*$ is a source of ambiguity for both the labelling of the eigenvalues and for the well-posedness of the system (4.1). We disregard this case by considering the differential equations only for $t < t^*$ and $t > t^*$, and then completing by continuity. If $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_j$ for all t in a proper interval, then the dynamics of the eigenvectors has an intrinsic ambiguity which we remove by setting $\langle \dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle = 0$.

Proof. From the explicit solution (1.15) it follows that $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ is symmetric and positive definite for all times and thus diagonalizable with orthonormal eigenvectors. We start with the defining equations for the eigenvectors and eigenvalues while enforcing normality:

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{C}(t) - \lambda_i(t)E)v_i(t) &= 0 \\ \|v_i(t)\|^2 &= 1\end{aligned}$$

By taking the time derivative in both equations (and dropping the explicit dependence on t for brevity), we obtain

$$(\mathfrak{C} - \lambda_i E)\dot{v}_i = \dot{\lambda}_i v_i - \dot{\mathfrak{C}}v_i, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\langle \dot{v}_i, v_i \rangle = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

By using (1.13) and $\mathfrak{C}v_i = \lambda_i v_i$, this means that

$$\mathfrak{C}\dot{v}_i - \lambda_i \dot{v}_i = \dot{\lambda}_i v_i + 2\mathfrak{C}A^T\Gamma^{-1}A\mathfrak{C}v_i = \dot{\lambda}_i v_i + 2\lambda_i \mathfrak{C}A^T\Gamma^{-1}Av_i.$$

Now we take the scalar product of both sides with v_j and obtain

$$\langle \mathfrak{C}\dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle - \lambda_i \langle \dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle = \dot{\lambda}_i \langle v_i, v_j \rangle + 2\lambda_i \langle \mathfrak{C}A^T\Gamma^{-1}Av_i, v_j \rangle,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\lambda_j - \lambda_i) \langle \dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle = \dot{\lambda}_i \delta_{i,j} + 2\lambda_i \lambda_j \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

We have three cases to consider: Firstly, in the case $i = j$, we get

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = -2\lambda_i^2 \|\Gamma^{-1/2}Av_i\|^2 = -2\lambda_i^2 \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2,$$

which proves (4.1a).

Secondly, if $i \neq j$ and v_i, v_j are two different eigenvectors for the same eigenvalue $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$, then (4.8) implies

$$\lambda_i^2 \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma = 0,$$

which proves (4.1c).

Thirdly, in the case $i \neq j$ and $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ we conclude from (4.8) that

$$\langle \dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle = \frac{2\lambda_i \lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma.$$

Using this equation together with (4.7) and orthonormality of the v_i , we can express \dot{v}_i in the basis $\{v_j\}_j$ as

$$\dot{v}_i = \sum_{\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i} \frac{2\lambda_i \lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma v_j.$$

where we set $\langle \dot{v}_i, v_j \rangle = 0$ for v_i, v_j in the same eigenspace for a joint eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_i = \lambda_j$.

The lower bound decay rate on the eigenvalues follows from the fact that the v_i have unit norm and we can bound $\|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 \leq \|\Gamma^{-1/2}A\|^2$. Furthermore, we see that

$$\Gamma^{-1/2}Av_i = \sum_{\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i} \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma \Gamma^{-1/2}Av_j$$

and thus

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 = \sum_{\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i} \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma^2,$$

from which we can similarly derive bounds for the cases $i = 1$, i.e., $\frac{d}{dt} \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 \leq 0$ and $i = n$, i.e., $\frac{d}{dt} \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 \geq 0$.

For the last pillar of Theorem 4.1 we argue as follows: From Theorem 2.1, we know that

$$A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \mathfrak{C}(t) = S \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{\mu_i}{1 + 2t\mu_i} \right)_{i=1}^n S^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

If we now multiply this from the right with an eigenvector $v_i(t)$ of $\mathfrak{C}(t)$ corresponding to an eigenvalue $\lambda_i(t)$, we obtain

$$\lambda_i(t) A^T \Gamma^{-1} Av_i(t) = A^T \Gamma^{-1} A \mathfrak{C}(t) v_i(t) \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

i.e., $\lambda_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ or $Av_i(t) \rightarrow 0$, as claimed. \square

Corollary 4.1. *The function $t \mapsto \lambda_1(t)$ is convex.*

Proof. We can take another derivative in (4.1a) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\lambda}_i &= -4\lambda_i \dot{\lambda}_i \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 - 4\lambda_i^2 \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^2 \\ &= 8\lambda_i^3 \|Av_i\|_\Gamma^4 - 8\lambda_i^3 \sum_{\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma^2 \\ &= 8\lambda_i^3 \left[\|Av_i\|_\Gamma^4 - \sum_{\lambda_j \neq \lambda_i} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \langle Av_i, Av_j \rangle_\Gamma^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $i = 1$ the second term is non-positive and one obtains $\ddot{\lambda}_i \geq 0$ which implies convexity. \square

References

- [1] Dieter Armbruster, Michael Herty, and Giuseppe Visconti. “A Stabilization of a Continuous Limit of the Ensemble Kalman Filter”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15390* (2020).
- [2] Kay Bergemann and Sebastian Reich. “An ensemble Kalman-Bucy filter for continuous data assimilation”. In: *Meteorologische Zeitschrift* 21.3 (2012), p. 213.
- [3] Dirk Blömker, Claudia Schillings, and Philipp Wacker. “A strongly convergent numerical scheme from ensemble Kalman inversion”. In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 56.4 (2018), pp. 2537–2562.

- [4] Dirk Blömker, Claudia Schillings, Philipp Wacker, and Simon Weissmann. “Well posedness and convergence analysis of the ensemble Kalman inversion”. In: *Inverse Problems* 35.8 (2019), p. 085007.
- [5] Leon Bungert and Martin Burger. “Asymptotic profiles of nonlinear homogeneous evolution equations of gradient flow type”. In: *Journal of Evolution Equations* 20.3 (2020), pp. 1061–1092. DOI: 10.1007/s00028-019-00545-1.
- [6] Leon Bungert and Martin Burger. “Solution paths of variational regularization methods for inverse problems”. In: *Inverse Problems* 35.10 (2019), p. 105012.
- [7] Leon Bungert, Martin Burger, Antonin Chambolle, and Matteo Novaga. “Nonlinear spectral decompositions by gradient flows of one-homogeneous functionals”. In: *Analysis & PDE* (2019). arXiv: 1901.06979 [math.AP]. In press.
- [8] Martin Burger et al. “Spectral decompositions using one-homogeneous functionals”. In: *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 9.3 (2016), pp. 1374–1408.
- [9] Neil K Chada, Andrew M Stuart, and Xin T Tong. “Tikhonov regularization within ensemble Kalman inversion”. In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 58.2 (2020), pp. 1263–1294.
- [10] Zhiyan Ding and Qin Li. “Mean-field limit and numerical analysis for Ensemble Kalman Inversion: linear setting”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05575* 5.9 (2019).
- [11] Oliver G Ernst, Björn Sprungk, and Hans-Jörg Starkloff. “Analysis of the ensemble and polynomial chaos Kalman filters in Bayesian inverse problems”. In: *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* 3.1 (2015), pp. 823–851.
- [12] Geir Evensen. *Data assimilation: the ensemble Kalman filter*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [13] Alfredo Garbuno-Inigo, Franca Hoffmann, Wuchen Li, and Andrew M Stuart. “Interacting Langevin diffusions: Gradient structure and ensemble Kalman sampler”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 19.1 (2020), pp. 412–441.
- [14] Marco A Iglesias, Kody JH Law, and Andrew M Stuart. “Ensemble Kalman methods for inverse problems”. In: *Inverse Problems* 29.4 (2013), p. 045001.
- [15] Jari Kaipio and Erkki Somersalo. *Statistical and computational inverse problems*. Vol. 160. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [16] Rudolph Emil Kalman. “A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems”. In: (1960).
- [17] David TB Kelly, Kody JH Law, and Andrew M Stuart. “Well-posedness and accuracy of the ensemble Kalman filter in discrete and continuous time”. In: *Nonlinearity* 27.10 (2014), p. 2579.
- [18] Kody JH Law, Hamidou Tembine, and Raul Tempone. “Deterministic mean-field ensemble Kalman filtering”. In: *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 38.3 (2016), A1251–A1279.
- [19] Kody Law, Andrew Stuart, and Kostas Zygalakis. “Data assimilation”. In: *Cham, Switzerland: Springer* 214 (2015).
- [20] Andrew J Majda and John Harlim. *Filtering complex turbulent systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

- [21] Giuseppe Visconti Michael Herty. “Kinetic methods for inverse problems”. In: *Kinetic & Related Models* 12.5 (2019), pp. 1109–1130.
- [22] Sebastian Reich and Colin Cotter. *Probabilistic forecasting and Bayesian data assimilation*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [23] Claudia Schillings and Andrew M Stuart. “Analysis of the ensemble Kalman filter for inverse problems”. In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 55.3 (2017), pp. 1264–1290.
- [24] Claudia Schillings and Andrew M Stuart. “Convergence analysis of ensemble Kalman inversion: the linear, noisy case”. In: *Applicable Analysis* 97.1 (2018), pp. 107–123.
- [25] Simon Weissmann. “Particle based sampling and optimization methods for inverse problems”. In: (2020).
- [26] Jana de Wiljes, Sebastian Reich, and Wilhelm Stannat. “Long-time stability and accuracy of the ensemble Kalman–Bucy filter for fully observed processes and small measurement noise”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 17.2 (2018), pp. 1152–1181.