

Data-driven stochastic Lie transport modelling of the 2D Euler equations

Sagy Ephrati¹, Paolo Cifani^{1,2}, Erwin Luesink¹, and Bernard J. Geurts^{1,3}

¹Multiscale Modeling and Simulation, Faculty EEMCS, University of Twente, P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands

²Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale F. Crispi, 7 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

³Multiscale Energy Physics, CCER, Faculty Applied Physics, Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 213, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands

Abstract

Stochastic modelling of coarse-grid SPDEs of the two-dimensional Euler equations, in the framework of Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport (SALT) [Cotter et al., 2019], is considered. We propose and assess a number of models as stochastic forcing. The latter is decomposed in terms of a deterministic basis (empirical orthogonal functions) multiplied by temporal traces, here regarded as stochastic processes. In particular, we construct the stochastic forcing from the probability density functions (pdfs) and the correlation times obtained from a fine-grid data set. We perform uncertainty quantification tests to compare the different stochastic models. In particular, comparison to Gaussian noise, in terms of ensemble mean and ensemble spread, is conducted. Reduced uncertainty is observed for the developed models. On short timescales, such as those used for data assimilation [Cotter et al., 2020a], the former models show a reduced ensemble mean error and a reduced spread. Estimating the pdfs yielded stochastic ensembles which rarely failed to capture the reference solution on short timescales, as is demonstrated by rank histograms. Overall, introducing correlation into the stochastic models improves the quality of the coarse-grid predictions with respect to white noise.

1 Introduction

A major challenge in geophysical and observational sciences is the representation and quantification of uncertainty in numerical predictions. Uncertainty stems from various sources, most relevantly from incomplete physics in the models and uncertainty in the initial conditions. Typical models for geophysical fluid dynamics, such as the two-dimensional Euler equations, quasi-geostrophic equations or rotating shallow water equations are derived from the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. A sequence of simplifying assumptions is applied in order to reduce the complexity of the problem, while retaining main flow physics [Zeitlin, 2018]. These models are nevertheless rich in dynamics and contain a wide range of spatial and temporal scales. Numerically resolving the entire spectrum of scales is often not computationally feasible, thus requiring a model of the sub-grid scales. An effective way to represent unresolved scales in numerical simulations is via stochasticity [Buizza et al., 1999]. The use of stochasticity as a means to represent the unresolved scales was introduced by [Majda et al., 2001]. In this paper, we embrace these ideas and we develop and assess stochastic data-driven models for the two-dimensional Euler equations.

Data-driven stochastic models in dynamical systems have been studied actively in recent years. For weather and climate models, stochasticity can be used as a tool to represent uncertainty in initial conditions and in the model, as shown in [Palmer, 2019]. A commonly used example to illustrate the data-driven stochastic approach is the Lorenz '96 (L96) system, introduced in [Lorenz, 1996] and originally proposed as a simplified model of the atmosphere that still incorporates the interaction between slow and fast scales. Data of the unresolved sub-grid scales may serve to construct a data-informed stochastic model. Examples are given in [Arnold et al., 2013] where the authors model sub-grid features using different types of noise including additive, multiplicative and state-dependent noise. This study found that stochastic parametrizations accurately accounted for modelling error, with a considerably improved forecasting skill when temporal correlation was included in the noise. Alternative ideas such as stochastic parametrization based on Markov chains inferred from data are presented by

[Crommelin and Vanden-Eijnden, 2008], where unresolved processes are represented as stochastic processes dependent on the state of the resolved variables. Using this approach, good agreement was found for the probability density functions and autocorrelation functions of resolved state variables.

More recently, additional data-driven methods such as machine learning have also been adopted to represent sub-grid tendencies for a large range of parameters [Gagne et al., 2020]. The authors found that several configurations of machine learning accurately reconstructed spatio-temporal correlations of the original system. These methods are not limited to simplified models such as the L96 system, but have also been successfully applied to more complete geophysical models. Examples include oceanic flows as considered in [Bolton and Zanna, 2019] and atmospheric processes as investigated in [O’Gorman and Dwyer, 2018]. Both studies obtain a parametrization using machine learning based on high-resolution model output and accurately predict the relation between unresolved turbulent processes.

In the seminal work [Holm, 2015], stochastic partial differential equations are derived for fluid dynamics by means of a stochastic variational principle. As a result, the solution of the SPDE respects the geometry of the underlying equations. This means that many conservation laws are maintained under the inclusion of stochastic perturbations. This approach goes by the name of stochastic Lie transport (SLT) or stochastic advection by Lie transport (SALT). In SALT, spatial correlations of observational data are used to model the unresolved scales in the numerical simulation. The spatial correlations can be decomposed into empirical orthogonal functions (EOFs or EOF modes) [Lumley, 1967, Hannachi et al., 2007], which are coupled to noise generated from stochastic processes. These terms constitute a stochastic forcing term for the coarse PDE, which models unresolved scales.

The SALT approach finds meaningful applications within geophysical fluid dynamics, since many geophysical fluid models can be derived from a variational point of view. To illustrate the SALT approach, [Cotter et al., 2019] apply SALT to the two-dimensional Euler equations. The authors perform a fine-grid simulation from which they extract the Lagrangian trajectories and the corresponding trajectories given by filtering of the velocity field. The difference between these trajectories is a measure of the unresolved scales to which the EOF decomposition is applied in order to form an optimal basis for this term. Subsequently, a coarse SPDE is constructed according to SALT where the amplitude of the EOF basis is regarded as a stochastic Gaussian process. It is shown that an ensemble of stochastically forced flows captures the true solution for physically reasonable time. In a follow-up study [Cotter et al., 2020b], the authors apply a particle filter to the SALT two-dimensional Euler equations as a means of data assimilation. They demonstrated that significant model reduction is possible without losing reliability of the results. Similar studies on the quasi-geostrophic equations has been done [Cotter et al., 2018], with a focus on data assimilation [Cotter et al., 2020a].

In this paper, we extend the work presented by [Cotter et al., 2019] for modeling uncertainty in the two-dimensional Euler equations, by considering two additional types of stochastic forcing. In particular, we generate signals that have the same probability distribution function as the measurements or the same temporal correlation. The overall procedure consists of reconstructing the measured sub-grid data in terms of an EOF basis and modeling the temporal coefficient of this basis as stochastic processes. The combination of the time series and the EOFs allows one to fully reconstruct the original signal, and no additional assumptions are required.

The following numerical experiments and findings are reported in this paper. We perform a direct numerical simulation (DNS) of the Euler equations and measure the difference between trajectories of particles advected by the velocity field and the filtered velocity field. EOFs and the corresponding time series are obtained from this data. Stochastic ensembles are generated using three stochastic processes: Gaussian noise, noise based on the underlying pdf of the EOF time series, and noise with a temporal correlation approximately equal to that of the EOF time series. The results presented in this paper show that using the EOF time series data to define the stochastic process leads to a reduction of the ensemble mean error and ensemble spread, compared to using Gaussian noise. This is further explored by performing statistical tests for ensemble solutions, on time scales relevant for data assimilation.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2.1 we introduce the deterministic and stochastic governing equations, followed by a description of the data acquisition procedure in section 2.2. The method used for generating random signals as a model for the measured data is described in section 2.3. The results of the numerical experiments are presented in section 3. In section 3.1 a maximal prediction horizon and an adapted reference solution are defined, followed by uncertainty quantification results in 3.2 for the measured prediction horizon. Short-time predictions are further assessed in section 3.3, by comparing ensemble statistics, rank histograms and conditional distributions. We conclude the paper in section 4 and specify future challenges.

2 SPDE formulation and stochastic models

This section illustrates the formulation of the stochastic Euler equations using the SALT approach, the data acquisition procedure and the derivation of the stochastic models.

2.1 Governing equations

The two-dimensional Euler equations are central to this work. These equations are determined fully by the evolution of the vorticity and describe vortex dynamics [Zeitlin, 2018]. The behaviour of the vorticity ω in terms of the velocity $\mathbf{u}$ and streamfunction ψ is given by

$$\partial_t \omega + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \omega = Q - r\omega, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \nabla^\perp \psi, \quad (2)$$

$$\Delta \psi = \omega, \quad (3)$$

which are solved on the unit square, denoted by $\mathcal{D}$. A forcing and a damping term are added to the equations in order to drive the flow to a statistically steady state. In particular, $Q(x, y) = 0.1 \sin(8\pi x)$ and $r = 0.01$. A slip boundary condition is applied via

$$\psi|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = 0. \quad (4)$$

The stochastic equations follow from the principle of stochastic advection by Lie transport (SALT) for ideal fluid dynamics [Holm, 2015]. In this approach, SPDEs are derived from a stochastic variational principle. A stochastically constrained functional is minimised to obtain an SPDE which retains some of the geometric properties as the corresponding PDE. The result is that quantities that are advected along an infinitesimal vector field $\mathbf{u}dt$ in the deterministic setting are advected along an infinitesimal vector field $\bar{\mathbf{u}}dt + \sum_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \circ dB_t^i$ in the stochastic setting. In this paper, $\bar{\cdot}$ denotes a filtered field representative of scales that can be resolved on a coarse numerical grid. The velocity fields $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ are defined as the eigenvectors of the velocity-velocity correlation tensor [Holm, 2015], B_t^i is a stochastic process and $\circ$ implies that the stochastic integral should be understood in the Stratonovich sense.

Since the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$ is divergence-free, each velocity field $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ is divergence-free [Cotter et al., 2019] and can be expressed by a potential function ζ_i via $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \nabla^\perp \zeta_i$. The advection velocity can then be written in terms of the potential as

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)dt + \sum_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \circ dB_t^i = \nabla^\perp \bar{\psi}(t)dt + \sum_i \nabla^\perp \zeta_i \circ dB_t^i. \quad (5)$$

The resulting SPDE then reads [Cotter et al., 2019]

$$d\bar{\omega} + \nabla^\perp \left(\bar{\psi}dt + \sum_i \zeta_i \circ dB_t^i \right) \cdot \nabla \bar{\omega} = (Q - r\bar{\omega})dt, \quad (6)$$

$$\Delta \bar{\psi} = \bar{\omega}. \quad (7)$$

2.2 Data acquisition

The numerical method for the solution of (6)-(7) and the flow parameters are the same as those used in earlier studies [Cotter et al., 2019, Cotter et al., 2020b]. A full description of the numerical implementation can be found in the former references. Here, for completeness, we illustrate the key aspects. A finite element method is employed to solve the system of equations (6) and (7). The Poisson equation for the streamfunction is discretized using a continuous Galerkin scheme, whereas the vorticity equation (1) is discretized using a discontinuous Galerkin scheme. The space of discontinuous test functions guarantees numerical conservation of energy in the absence of source terms [Bernsen et al., 2006].

Numerical time integration is performed by applying a third-order strong stability preserving Runge-Kutta (SSPRK3) method [Shu and Osher, 1988]. Writing the stochastic advection equation (6) in the general Stratonovich SPDE

$$d\bar{\omega} = L(\bar{\omega})dt + \sum_{i=1}^m G^i(\bar{\omega}) \circ dB_t^i, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L(\bar{\omega}) &= -\nabla^\perp \bar{\psi} \cdot \nabla \bar{\omega} + (Q - r\bar{\omega}), \\ G^i(\bar{\omega}) &= -\nabla^\perp \zeta_i \cdot \nabla \bar{\omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

the SPDE (8) is integrated in time via

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\omega}^{(1)} &= \bar{\omega}^n + \Delta t L(\bar{\omega}^n) + \sum_{i=1}^n G^i(\bar{\omega}^n) \Delta B^i, \\ \bar{\omega}^{(2)} &= \frac{3}{4} \bar{\omega}^n + \frac{1}{4} \left[\bar{\omega}^{(1)} + \Delta t L(\bar{\omega}^{(1)}) + \sum_{i=1}^n G^i(\bar{\omega}^{(1)}) \Delta B^i \right], \\ \bar{\omega}^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{3} \bar{\omega}^n + \frac{2}{3} \left[\bar{\omega}^{(2)} + \Delta t L(\bar{\omega}^{(2)}) + \sum_{i=1}^n G^i(\bar{\omega}^{(2)}) \Delta B^i \right].\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

The superscript n denotes the n^{th} numerical time step. The stages of the Runge-Kutta algorithm are denoted by the superscripts (1) and (2). The time step size is given by Δt . Here ΔB^i denote random samples drawn from a probability distribution with variance Δt . For deterministic systems, the functions G^i equal zero.

The term $\nabla^\perp(\sum_i \zeta_i \circ dB_t^i)$ in (6) is unknown and needs to be modelled. The latter is approximated as follows:

$$\mathbf{f}(x, t) dt := (\mathbf{u}(x, t) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}(x, t)) dt \approx \sum_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(x) \circ dB_t^i.\tag{11}$$

The left hand side of (11) accounts for the small-scale velocity fluctuations that are not resolved by coarse numerical grids. The right hand side incorporates these fluctuations as a stochastic forcing. The fluctuations are measured from high-resolution numerical data obtained from DNS of the deterministic system of equations (1)-(3).

A grid with 512^2 computational cells is adopted for the DNS and all subsequent stochastic results are obtained on a coarse grid of 64^2 computational cells. The filtered fields are obtained by applying a Helmholtz operator to the streamfunction. Given a streamfunction ψ , the filtered streamfunction $\bar{\psi}$ is obtained by solving

$$(I - c \nabla^2) \bar{\psi} = \psi,\tag{12}$$

where $c = 1/64^2$ to filter out length scales small than c . The filtered vorticity $\bar{\omega}$ and filtered velocity $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ are recovered from applying the relations (2) and (3) to $\bar{\psi}$.

A space-time sequence of measurements for determining $\mathbf{f}$ from (11) is obtained by computing the difference of Lagrangian trajectories of particles advected by the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$ and those advected by the filtered velocity field $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$. The difference is measured over a single coarse-grid time step. The particles are released on the coarse grid points and thus a difference in traveled distance can be related to each grid point. A velocity field is subsequently obtained by dividing the difference in trajectories by the coarse-grid time step. By doing so at each measuring instance, an array $\mathbf{f}(x, t)$ of velocity fields is constructed. This space-time array of measurements is decomposed into empirical orthogonal functions (EOFs or EOF modes) [Lumley, 1967, Hannachi et al., 2007]. Here, the first 225 out of 4096 EOFs are used, which account for 90% of the variance of the measurements. Application of the EOF algorithm yields

$$\mathbf{f}(x, t) = \boldsymbol{\xi}_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^N a_i(t) \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(x),\tag{13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_0(x)$ is the time-mean of the measurements, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i(x)$ are the EOF modes and $a_i(t)$ are the corresponding time series. The EOF modes are orthonormal with respect to the inner product, thus $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Due to the orthonormality, the coefficients $a_i(t)$ are readily obtained by projecting the measured velocity fields onto the basis of EOFs by

$$a_i(t) = (\mathbf{f}(x, t) - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0(x), \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(x)).\tag{14}$$

In order to have a self-contained model which allows to obtain predictions beyond the time span of the dataset, the time traces $a_i(t)$ need to be modelled. This will be described in Sec. 2.3.

2.3 Generating random signals

We will now described how we generate random signals for the modeling of the time traces (14). By comparing (13) with (11) it is clear that modelling $B_t^i(t)$ amounts to modelling $a_i(t)$. The following models are employed:

1. The stochastic process B_t^i in (11) is modelled by Gaussian noise. For its discrete increments ΔB^i in (10) we use $\Delta B^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t)$.

2. The pdf of $a_i(t)$ in (13) is estimated from the measured signals (14) and is subsequently used to draw uncorrelated samples to compute ΔB^i in (10).
3. The time series $a_i(t)$ in (13) is approximated by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU), using the correlation time obtained from the measurements (14). The constructed OU process is then used to compute ΔB^i in (10).

The pdfs of model 2 are estimated by fitting a histogram to the values of the corresponding time series. The histograms are fully determined by the smallest and largest measurements and the number of measurements. The number of bins is chosen as the smallest integer larger than $\sqrt[3]{2N_M}$, where N_M denotes the number of measurements. This choice minimizes the asymptotic mean squared error of the histogram as an estimator of the underlying pdf [Wilks, 2011]. Uncorrelated samples from these distributions are drawn using inverse transform sampling.

In model 3, the noise generated using the OU process mimics the temporal correlation of the measured time series. Denoting by $A(t)$ the approximation of the time series $a_i(t)$, the OU process is defined as [Pope, 2001]

$$dA(t) = -A(t)\frac{dt}{T} + \left(\frac{2\sigma^2}{T}\right)^{1/2} dW(t), \quad (15)$$

where dW are Wiener increments and we set T and σ to be the correlation time and the standard deviation of the measured time series.

In the next section, we assess the proposed stochastic models.

3 Assessment of forecast ensembles

In this section, we provide results of forecast ensembles using the aforementioned methods to generate stochastic signals. We first identify a maximal prediction horizon and define an adapted reference solution based on the measurements. Subsequently, we show results of forecast ensembles. Finally, statistics are computed and compared to the filtered DNS and the adapted reference solution to quantitatively compare the different stochastic forcing methods.

3.1 The maximal prediction horizon and the reference solution

In order to define the maximal prediction horizon we set up the following numerical experiment. Starting from an initial condition on the fine grid, we generate a set of perturbed initial conditions of which we then follow the evolution over time. The perturbations are applied in Fourier space by shifting the phase of the Fourier coefficients, while keeping the amplitudes the same. The phase shift is applied only to modes of wave lengths smaller than the smallest scale resolved by the corresponding coarse grid. That is, only unresolved scales of the coarse grid are perturbed, leaving the resolved modes unaltered. As time evolves, the perturbation increasingly affects the resolved scales, up to the point where the instantaneous resolved fields will be entirely different from each other. We define this point of divergence as the maximal prediction horizon $T_{\max}$, after which no model can be expected to give accurate point-wise predictions owing to the sensitivity of the initial conditions.

This behaviour is illustrated in Fig. 1. The evolution of the vorticity using the perturbed initial conditions has been measured on four points in the domain, at $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$ and $(0.75, 0.75)$, of which two points are shown in the figure. It can be seen that the evolution of the vorticity values at the measured points in the domain are initially indistinguishable. At $t = 10$ slight differences are visible and at $t = 20$ the measured values are markedly different. The latter result is especially clear at the point $(0.25, 0.25)$, in the left figure. Thus, we conclude that subsequent stochastic realizations can not be reasonably assessed after $t = 20$, which we set as the value for the maximal prediction time $T_{\max}$.

In order to compare the different stochastic models one has to define a reference solution. The choice of the latter is not unique and it depends on the objective one wants to achieve. In this work we define two reference solutions that are employed depending on the measure used. The first one is the filtered fine-grid solution, which is indicative of flow scales that can be resolved on the coarse grid. Next to the filtered fine-grid solution, we define a reference solution as the numerical solution of (6)-(7) where the exact reconstructed signal (13), (14) is used in (11). We call this the adapted reference solution. We note that the structure of the closure term (11) does not account for discretization error and is itself not an exact closure since the noise is introduced only in the advection velocity. Therefore, by comparing the stochastic ensembles against the adapted reference solution, one is able to distinguish between modelling error from the proposed stochastic models and other sources of error listed above.




Figure 1: Development of the vorticity on two points in the domain, obtained by DNS of perturbed fine-grid initial conditions. On the left, the vorticity is shown at $(0.25, 0.25)$ and on the right at $(0.75, 0.75)$. Each initial condition is obtained by phase-shifting small-scale modes of the streamfunction field.

3.2 Uncertainty quantification of ensemble predictions

The evolution of the vorticity and streamfunction on four points inside the domain is used for uncertainty quantification. Similar to [Cotter et al., 2019], for each point one ensemble standard deviation around the ensemble mean is shown and compared to the reference solution at the same point, here chose to be the adapted reference solution. The ensemble is initialized from a single initial condition in order to isolate the effects of the stochastic processes on the uncertainty of the numerical solution. The initial condition is obtained by injecting the DNS vorticity field to the coarse grid. Each SPDE is simulated up to $T_{\max} = 20$, and every ensemble is composed of 200 realizations of the SPDE. Our interest here lies in comparing the errors and spreads for the different types of stochastic processes used in the forcing (11).

The stochastic ensembles are quantified using the ensemble mean, ensemble standard deviation and ensemble mean error. Here, we denote an ensemble of N stochastic realizations by $\{X_{i,j}\}$, where $i = 1, \dots, N$ denotes the realization and $j = 0, \dots, T$ denotes the time index. Then, the ensemble mean at time instance j is defined as

$$\langle X_j \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_{i,j}, \quad (16)$$

and the standard deviation, here referred to as spread, is defined as

$$\text{Spread}(X_{i,j}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (X_{i,j} - \langle X_j \rangle)^2}. \quad (17)$$

A small spread indicates a sharp ensemble forecast and a large spread suggests an increased uncertainty in the forecast. The reference solution $Y_j, j = 0, \dots, T$ is computed at the same time instances as $\{X_{i,j}\}$. The ensemble mean error of $\{X_{i,j}\}$ is then defined as

$$\text{ME}(X_{i,j}, Y_j) = |\langle X_j \rangle - Y_j| \quad (18)$$

A small ensemble mean error indicates that the ensemble closely follows the reference solution, whereas a large value means that the ensemble and the reference solution have deviated from each other.

The evolution of the vorticity on four points in the domain is shown in Fig. 2. The points considered are $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$ and $(0.75, 0.75)$. In each of these plots, the solid black line is the adapted reference solution and the colored bands are the ensemble standard deviations around the corresponding ensemble mean. On all measured points, forcing based on Gaussian noise produces the largest spread. It is clearly visible that using the OU process yields the smallest ensemble spread and using the estimated pdfs only slightly increases the spread.

The ensemble mean error and the ensemble standard deviation are computed to allow a quantitative comparison of the methods. The results are shown in Fig. 3, where the ensemble mean error (18) is taken with respect to the adapted reference solution. It becomes evident that the mean error develops in a similar way for each ensemble. The

mean errors for ensembles using the estimated pdfs and the OU process are nearly indistinguishable until $t = 10$, after which some differences can be observed. In contrast, using Gaussian noise results in a larger spread.

Fig. 4 shows the development of the streamfunction on the aforementioned points in the domain. The streamfunction is a smoother function than the vorticity, which is reflected in the smooth evolution of the former. In this figure it can also be observed that all ensembles accurately capture the adapted reference solution, with the OU model performing slightly better. The plots in Fig. 5 show the ensemble mean error and the ensemble standard deviation for the same points in the domain. Analogously to the vorticity, we find that the ensembles using the OU process and the estimated pdfs result in a smaller spread than the ensemble using Gaussian noise. Furthermore, it is observed that the ensemble mean error does not exceed the ensemble standard deviation before $t = 10$ and only does so occasionally after this point in time.




Figure 2: Vorticity measured on four points in the domain. From left to right, $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$, $(0.75, 0.75)$. The black lines show the development of adapted reference solution. The green band is generated using Gaussian noise, the blue band uses the estimated pdfs and the purple band uses OU processes. The results for each method are generated from an ensemble of 200 realizations.




Figure 3: Ensemble mean error and ensemble standard deviation for the vorticity on four points in the domain. From left to right, $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$, $(0.75, 0.75)$. The ensemble mean error is depicted by the solid lines, the ensemble standard deviation by the dotted lines.




Figure 4: Streamfunction measured on four points in the domain. From left to right, $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$, $(0.75, 0.75)$. The black lines show the development of the adapted reference solution. The green band is generated using Gaussian noise, the blue band uses the estimated pdfs and the purple band uses OU processes. The results for each method are generated from an ensemble of 200 realizations.




Figure 5: Ensemble mean error and ensemble standard deviation for the streamfunction on four points in the domain. From left to right, $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$, $(0.75, 0.75)$. The ensemble mean error is depicted by the solid lines, the ensemble standard deviation by the dotted lines.

3.3 Statistical tests for ensemble forecasts

Additional ensemble statistics are collected in order to further assess the numerical results of the SPDEs. In particular, forecast ensembles are generated for short lead times, comparable to the time scales used in data assimilation [Cotter et al., 2020a].

Two sets of initial conditions are generated to assess the stochastic models by sampling from two reference solutions: the filtered DNS and the adapted reference solution as presented in section 3.1. The filtered DNS does not contain discretization and modelling error, therefore the use of both reference methods provides insight into the effects of these errors on the statistical quantities. The distinct sets of initial conditions are acquired by sampling the reference solutions at $t = 0, 5, 10, \dots, 350$. An ensemble forecast consisting of one hundred stochastic realizations is computed for each initial condition. Every stochastic realization is run for two time units and stored every 0.04 time units in order to study the results for short lead times. Subsequently, the statistics are computed by comparing the ensembles to the corresponding reference solution and are provided below for both sets of initial conditions separately.

As a first measure we employ the root mean square error (RMSE). The RMSE between the ensemble mean of the SPDE and the reference solution is computed by

$$\text{RMSE}(X_{i,j}, Y_j) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\langle X_j \rangle - Y_j)^2}. \quad (19)$$

This provides a measure for the average error of the ensemble [Leutbecher, 2009]. The plots in Fig. 6 show the development of the RMSE and the spread (17) for an increasing lead time for the different stochastic processes.

In the left figure the stochastic ensembles are compared to the filtered DNS, in the right figure the ensembles are compared to the adapted reference solution. The RMSE values in the left graph of Fig. 6 show rapid growth, indicating that the ensemble mean diverges quickly from the filtered DNS. In contrast, the RMSE values obtained using the adapted reference solution shows a significant error reduction. This suggests that the rapid error growth in the left figure is due to the fact that the gap between the coarse-grid SPDE and the filtered DNS contains not only the modelling error but also the discretization error and the closure error. In addition, the right plot in Fig. 6 shows that using the estimated pdfs and the OU process yield similar values of the RMSE and the spreads develop comparably as well.

The second statistical quantity that we compute are rank histograms, which are a common tool for measuring the reliability of an ensemble of forecasts [Hamill, 2001]. A rank histogram is obtained by plotting the number of occurrences of the outcome of the rank function. The rank function R keeps track of where the reference solution appears in the list of sorted ensemble members. That is, given a reference value Y_j and a list of N sorted ensemble members $\{X_{i,j}\}$, R is equal to the integer r that identifies the position of Y_j in the sorted list. It is defined as follows:

$$R(Y_j, \{X_{i,j}\}) = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } Y_j \geq X_{r,j}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

If the forecast is reliable, then the reference value and the stochastic realizations are indistinguishable. This means that the underlying distributions of the reference value and the stochastic realizations are the same, which implies that the reference value is equally likely to be larger than any number of ensemble members. Thus, the rank function is equally likely to take on any value between 1 and N for reliable forecast ensembles and should therefore produce a rank histogram which approximates a uniform distribution. Figures 7 and 8 show the rank histograms when using the filtered DNS and the adapted reference solution, respectively, as reference. The measurements at the points (0.25, 0.25), (0.25, 0.75), (0.75, 0.25) and (0.75, 0.75) at a lead time of 0.2 time units are used to generate the histograms. Only the rank histograms at this particular lead time are shown here, rank histograms at different lead times displayed similar results.




Figure 6: RMSE and spread as a function of time when comparing the stochastic ensembles to two different reference solutions. On the left, the filtered DNS is regarded as the reference solution and on the right the coarse simulation including the measured ξ_i is used. The data for each figure consists of 71 ensembles of 100 stochastic realizations each.

The rank histograms using the filtered DNS (Fig. 7) show clear peaks at the edges, caused by all ensemble members either overestimating or underestimating the truth. This effect is least pronounced when applying Gaussian noise, due to the larger spread in the ensemble. The rank histograms obtained when comparing the ensembles to the adapted reference solution (Fig. 8) show peaks around the center of the ensembles are a sign of underdispersion and are a direct result of the small mean error. The peaks at the edges are significantly reduced when using the

adapted reference solution. This is especially clear when using estimated pdfs, which indicates that these ensembles, while showing a small spread, more accurately capture the reference solution.




Figure 7: Rank histograms using measurements at the points $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$ and $(0.75, 0.75)$ at a lead time of $t = 0.2$. A total of 71 ensembles are computed, each consisting of 100 stochastic realizations and compared to the filtered DNS at the corresponding time.




Figure 8: Rank histograms using measurements at the points $(0.25, 0.25)$, $(0.25, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.25)$ and $(0.75, 0.75)$ at a lead time of $t = 0.2$. A total of 71 ensembles are computed, each consisting of 100 stochastic realizations and compared to the adapted reference solution at the corresponding time.

The third statistical quantity that is computed is the evolution of the vorticity over different time spans, conditioned to the vorticity value at a reference time. That is, the conditional probability distribution

$$P[\omega(t + \tau) - \omega(t) | \omega(t) = \omega_{\text{ref}}] \quad (21)$$

is estimated for different values of τ . This quantity describes the statistical evolution of the vorticity over a time interval of length τ , given a fixed initial configuration.

The conditional distributions are shown in Fig. 9, at lead time $\tau = 0.04$, and in Fig. 10, at lead time $\tau = 1$. In both figures, the conditional distributions of the reference solutions are shown in the left panel. Contour lines of the distributions of the reference solution have been overlaid in the conditional distributions of the stochastic models for comparison. The filtered DNS provides the reference for the top row of distributions, the adapted reference solution is used as a reference in the bottom row of distributions. In particular, the distributions of the stochastic models have been computed from a set of initial conditions sampled along the filtered DNS and the adapted reference solution, respectively. In these figures, a large spread in the vertical direction indicates a large uncertainty. This becomes especially clear for the shortest lead times considered. On such short timescales, the stochastic forcing adds considerable variance to the numerical solution. Applying Gaussian noise yields the largest spread, whereas using the estimated pdfs and the OU produce a visibly smaller spread, in accordance with previously presented results. At lead time $\tau = 1$ (Fig. 10), the differences between the stochastic conditional distributions do not show significant differences. To better judge the agreement between the stochastic conditional distributions and the reference distributions, we compute the Hellinger distance. This measure allows for a quantitative comparison between the different distributions. Given two discrete probability distributions $p = (p_1, \dots, p_K)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_K)$, we

compute the Hellinger distance

$$H^2(p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})^2. \quad (22)$$

The distance $H^2(p, q)$ of (21) is shown in Fig. 11 for the filtered DNS (left figure) and for the adapted solution (right figure). The initial conditions of the stochastic ensemble and the reference solutions are the same, therefore the Hellinger distance at $\tau = 0$ is zero. As τ increases, $\omega(t)$ diverges from its reference value and accumulation of error leads to larger values of $H^2(p, q)$. Using the filtered DNS as reference solution yields a comparable Hellinger distance for each method. In contrast, the comparison of the stochastic ensembles to the adapted reference solution clearly favours the models obtained by using the estimated pdfs and OU processes over those where Gaussian noise is employed. Moreover, an overall smaller rate of increase is observed when comparing to the adapted reference solution with respect to the filtered DNS. The latter findings underpin once more the benefits of using the adapted reference solution when assessing different stochastic models.




Figure 9: Conditional probability (21) for lead time $\tau = 0.04$. The top row shows the distributions using the filtered DNS as a reference, the bottom row uses the adapted reference solution. The contour lines of the reference conditional distributions are overlaid on the distributions obtained from the stochastic ensembles for easier qualitative comparison.




Figure 10: Conditional probability (21) for lead time $\tau = 1$. The top row shows the distributions using the filtered DNS as a reference, the bottom row uses the adapted reference solution. The contour lines of the reference conditional distributions are overlaid on the distributions obtained from the stochastic ensembles for easier qualitative comparison.




Figure 11: Hellinger distances as a function of time between the reference solution and the stochastic ensembles of distribution (21). On the left, the filtered DNS is used as a reference solution, on the right, the adapted reference solution provides the reference.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we have assessed three stochastic models for the simulation of the coarse-grained two-dimensional Euler equations. The closure is based on the so-called Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport (SALT). The resulting SPDE contains a stochastic forcing term which requires to be modelled in order to close the equations. In particular, the forcing is decomposed into a deterministic basis (empirical orthogonal functions, or EOFs) multiplied by temporal traces. This decomposition is, by construction, fully determined from a fine-grid (DNS) dataset. However, in order to simulate outside of the available dataset one has to model the time traces. In the framework of SALT [Cotter et al., 2019] the latter are regarded as Gaussian processes. Here we extend the stochastic forcing to more general processes, sampling from the data-estimated probability distribution functions (pdfs) and introducing correlation through Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) processes. The latter two methods used additional data already available from the EOF time series and generally showed favorable results compared to the former method, in terms of ensemble mean and ensemble spread.

In order to meaningfully compare the different stochastic models we defined a maximal prediction horizon and

an adapted reference solution. The prediction horizon sets the point in time beyond which a bundle of fine-grid solutions, starting from the same initial conditions on the coarse grid, diverges due to high sensitivity to the initial conditions. This defines the time frame on which to assess the statistical quality of the coarse-grid predictions. The adapted reference solution was defined as the coarse-grid solution using the exact measured time series of the EOFs for the forcing. The latter allowed to isolate the modelling error from other sources of error not taken into account in the considered model formulation, such as discretization error. Using either estimated pdfs or OU processes to define the forcing term yielded a smaller ensemble mean error and a smaller spread compared to using Gaussian noise.

Stochastic prediction ensembles on timescales relevant for data assimilation were further investigated by performing statistical tests, comparing ensembles of stochastic realizations to the adapted reference solution and the filtered DNS. A significantly smaller ensemble spread was found when using estimated pdfs or OU processes, compared to using Gaussian noise. Additionally, the observed mean ensemble error was lower for the former two methods. All three methods showed a rapid growth in ensemble error when compared to the filtered DNS, suggesting that the filtered DNS contains not only the modelling error but also the discretization error and the closure error. These results were further substantiated by rank histograms, showing that the ensembles were biased with respect to the filtered DNS, but were underdispersive compared to the adapted reference solution. In particular, using the estimated pdfs to define the stochastic forcing rarely resulted in the adapted reference solution not being contained in the ensemble. Finally, conditional distributions of the vorticity were computed and compared using the Hellinger distance. Here, using estimated pdfs or OU processes resulted in a smaller distance to the reference solution than using Gaussian noise, indicating a better statistical characterization of the vorticity dynamics.

The methods presented in this paper may be used in other flows where EOF-based stochastic modeling is used. These approaches are particularly appealing since all information used in these methods is readily available from the EOF decomposition and no additional data is required to construct the models. The presented techniques are purely data-driven, they require no further assumption about the governing equations and can therefore be applied to other geophysical fluids. The short-time results indicate that a mean error reduction and smaller ensemble spread can be obtained using these methods, which can complement methods employed in data assimilation. Furthermore, the definition of the adapted reference solution motivate further research of the SALT method using different closure models and incorporating the discretization error.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Wei Pan, at the Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, for his help preparing the numerical experiments. We are grateful to thank Darryl Holm and James-Michael Leahy, at the Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, for the many inspiring discussions we had in the context of the SPRESTO project, funded by the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) in their TOP1 program.

References

- [Arnold et al., 2013] Arnold, H., Moroz, I., and Palmer, T. (2013). Stochastic parametrizations and model uncertainty in the lorenz’96 system. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 371(1991):20110479.
- [Bernsen et al., 2006] Bernsen, E., Bokhove, O., and van der Vegt, J. J. (2006). A (dis) continuous finite element model for generalized 2d vorticity dynamics. *Journal of computational physics*, 211(2):719–747.
- [Bolton and Zanna, 2019] Bolton, T. and Zanna, L. (2019). Applications of deep learning to ocean data inference and subgrid parameterization. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(1):376–399.
- [Buizza et al., 1999] Buizza, R., Milleer, M., and Palmer, T. N. (1999). Stochastic representation of model uncertainties in the ecmwf ensemble prediction system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 125(560):2887–2908.
- [Cotter et al., 2020a] Cotter, C., Crisan, D., Holm, D., Pan, W., and Shevchenko, I. (2020a). Data assimilation for a quasi-geostrophic model with circulation-preserving stochastic transport noise. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 179(5):1186–1221.
- [Cotter et al., 2018] Cotter, C., Crisan, D., Holm, D. D., Pan, W., and Shevchenko, I. (2018). Modelling uncertainty using stochastic transport noise in a 2-layer quasi-geostrophic model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05711*.

- [Cotter et al., 2019] Cotter, C., Crisan, D., Holm, D. D., Pan, W., and Shevchenko, I. (2019). Numerically modeling stochastic Lie transport in fluid dynamics. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 17(1):192–232.
- [Cotter et al., 2020b] Cotter, C., Crisan, D., Holm, D. D., Pan, W., and Shevchenko, I. (2020b). A particle filter for stochastic advection by lie transport: A case study for the damped and forced incompressible two-dimensional euler equation. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 8(4):1446–1492.
- [Crommelin and Vanden-Eijnden, 2008] Crommelin, D. and Vanden-Eijnden, E. (2008). Subgrid-scale parameterization with conditional markov chains. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 65(8):2661–2675.
- [Gagne et al., 2020] Gagne, D. J., Christensen, H. M., Subramanian, A. C., and Monahan, A. H. (2020). Machine learning for stochastic parameterization: Generative adversarial networks in the lorenz’96 model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12(3):e2019MS001896.
- [Hamill, 2001] Hamill, T. M. (2001). Interpretation of rank histograms for verifying ensemble forecasts. *Monthly Weather Review*, 129(3):550–560.
- [Hannachi et al., 2007] Hannachi, A., Jolliffe, I. T., and Stephenson, D. B. (2007). Empirical orthogonal functions and related techniques in atmospheric science: A review. *International Journal of Climatology: A Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 27(9):1119–1152.
- [Holm, 2015] Holm, D. D. (2015). Variational principles for stochastic fluid dynamics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 471(2176):20140963.
- [Leutbecher, 2009] Leutbecher, M. (2009). Diagnosis of ensemble forecasting systems. In *Seminar on Diagnosis of Forecasting and Data Assimilation Systems*, pages 235–266.
- [Lorenz, 1996] Lorenz, E. N. (1996). Predictability: A problem partly solved. In *Proc. Seminar on predictability*, volume 1.
- [Lumley, 1967] Lumley, J. L. (1967). The structure of inhomogeneous turbulent flows. *Atmospheric turbulence and radio wave propagation*.
- [Majda et al., 2001] Majda, A. J., Timofeyev, I., and Vanden Eijnden, E. (2001). A mathematical framework for stochastic climate models. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 54(8):891–974.
- [O’Gorman and Dwyer, 2018] O’Gorman, P. A. and Dwyer, J. G. (2018). Using machine learning to parameterize moist convection: Potential for modeling of climate, climate change, and extreme events. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 10(10):2548–2563.
- [Palmer, 2019] Palmer, T. (2019). Stochastic weather and climate models. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 1(7):463–471.
- [Pope, 2001] Pope, S. B. (2001). Turbulent flows.
- [Shu and Osher, 1988] Shu, C.-W. and Osher, S. (1988). Efficient implementation of essentially non-oscillatory shock-capturing schemes. *Journal of computational physics*, 77(2):439–471.
- [Wilks, 2011] Wilks, D. S. (2011). *Statistical methods in the atmospheric sciences*, volume 100. Academic press.
- [Zeitlin, 2018] Zeitlin, V. (2018). *Geophysical fluid dynamics: understanding (almost) everything with rotating shallow water models*. Oxford University Press.