

Filtering of SPDEs: The Ensemble Kalman Filter and related methods

Sebastian Ertel, TU Berlin

July 18, 2023

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the derivation and mathematical analysis of continuous time Ensemble Kalman Filters (EnKBFs) and related data assimilation methods for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations (SPDEs) with finite dimensional observations. The signal SPDE is allowed to be nonlinear and is posed in the standard abstract variational setting. Its coefficients are assumed to satisfy global one-sided Lipschitz conditions.

We first review classical filtering algorithms in this setting, namely the Kushner–Stratonovich and the Kalman–Bucy filter, proving a law of total variance.

Then we consider mean-field filtering equations, deriving both a Feedback Particle Filter and a mean-field EnKBF for nonlinear signal SPDEs.

The second part of the paper is devoted to the elementary mathematical analysis of the EnKBF in this infinite dimensional setting, showing the well posedness of both the mean-field EnKBF and its interacting particle approximation. Finally we prove the convergence of the particle approximation. Under the additional assumption that the observation function is bounded, we even recover explicit and (nearly) optimal rates.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Problem setting, assumptions and notations	4
3	The Kushner-Stratonovich equation and the law of total variance	7
4	Linear and Gaussian Filtering	10
4.1	The classical Kalman–Bucy filter	11
4.2	The consistent mean field EnKBF	13
5	The Feedback Particle Filter	15
6	The mean field EnKBF for nonlinear signals	18
7	The EnKBF as an interacting particle system	25
7.1	Analysis of the particle approximations	26
7.2	Quantitative propagation of chaos	29

1 Introduction

In recent years the field of data assimilation, that is the (optimal) integration of real world data into mathematical models, has become an important tool for practitioners in various scientific fields. As it shares similar objectives to stochastic filtering, which is essentially the discipline of Bayesian estimation of dynamic processes from noisy, potentially incomplete data, many algorithms from

filtering are used for data assimilation tasks. Vice versa algorithms for data assimilation of dynamical processes can be viewed through the lens of filtering, the mathematical model is then referred to as the signal and the available data as the observations. To combine these two objects in an optimal manner one aims to compute/approximate the posterior distribution, that is the conditional distribution of the signal given all past observations.

One such algorithm is the Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF), which was introduced by Geir Evensen in 94 [22] and employs an ensemble of interacting particles to estimate the state of a dynamical system. Since its inception many different variants of the EnKF have been introduced. For an overview and historical context we refer to [13], [23] or [50]. The EnKF has by now become one of the most widely used techniques for data assimilation in high dimensional settings, particularly popular amongst practitioners in the geosciences and numerical weather forecasting. Besides its usage for state estimation in dynamical systems, the EnKF and related algorithms have also been applied to parameter estimation in inverse problems [36],[46].

While the original EnKF is a discrete time recursion, continuous time counterparts, referred to as Ensemble Kalman–Bucy Filters (EnKBFs) have by now been firmly established in the literature. In many cases they can also be shown to be the limit of their discrete time counterparts for vanishing step size, see e.g. [31] and the references found therein. In this paper we will only consider the basic continuous time framework. In this case the signal u is given by a stochastic (partial) differential equation

$$du_t = \mathcal{A}(u_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t)dW_t \quad (\text{S})$$

for a given initial datum u_0 . We allow for u to be an element of a possibly infinite dimensional Hilbert space, \mathcal{A} to be a general coercive operator and the signal noise W to be a Wiener process with a covariance of finite trace. The observations Y shall be given by the stochastic differential

$$dY_t = H(u_t)dt + \Gamma_t dV_t, \quad Y_0 = 0. \quad (\text{O})$$

We only consider finite dimensional observations taking values in \mathbb{R}^{d_y} for some $d_y \in \mathbb{N}$. This is the more practically relevant case and also avoids discussions of the regularity/degeneracy of the observation noise V , which in this work is assumed to be white, i.e. some finite dimensional standard Brownian motion. A more thorough discussion of the setting we consider, and the assumptions we have to make, is found in section 2.

In our setting the EnKBF we consider in this paper takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_t^j \left(H(u_t^j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N H(u_t^k) \right)' R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N H(u_t^k)}{2} dt \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$, where $(\bar{W}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ are independent copies of the Wiener process \bar{W} . The system (1) is often referred to as the deterministic EnKBF [6], which is the continuous time counterpart of the Ensemble Square Root Filter [32]. Our main results can be generalized to other types of EnKBFs, in particular the more classical version which involves randomness in the innovation term.

As already mentioned the task of filtering is to compute the posterior distribution $(\eta)_{t \geq 0}$, which in our setting is given by

$$\eta_t := \mathbb{P} (u_t \in \cdot \mid Y_s, s \leq t), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0. \quad (\text{P})$$

Even though the EnK(B)F has seen wide success in applications. Its mathematical foundations and connections to the filtering problem only started to emerge in last decade and still contain

many important gaps. The algorithm is so far best understood in the case of linear signal and observation dynamics under Gaussian noise perturbations and Gaussian initial conditions, henceforth called the linear Gaussian setting (see Assumption 4 in section 4). In this particular case the mean-field limit¹ of (1) is a McKean–Vlasov process with the property, that its mean and covariance evolve according to the Kalman–Bucy equations. Thus the time marginals of this mean-field limit coincide with the posterior for all times, which was first shown in [26] and [35]. Therefore quantitative propagation of chaos results are important in the Gaussian setting, as they provide error bounds for the EnK(B)F as an approximation of the true posterior (P). In the continuous time setting a quantitative convergence result that is even uniform in time was first obtained by [20]. By now there exists an extensive body of work on the mean-field theory of EnKBFs in the linear Gaussian setting, including very strong convergence and stability results. For more details we refer the reader to the survey paper [6] (see also Remark 43). Interestingly infinite dimensional signals do not seem to have been considered in this continuous time, linear Gaussian setting so far.

For nonlinear dynamics or non-Gaussian initial conditions the true posterior can not be expected to be given by the mean-field limit of the EnK(B)F. Therefore the mathematical foundations of the EnK(B)F and rigorous justifications for its usage in nonlinear regimes are still sparse and an ongoing research topic. Numerous works so far have focussed on investigating stability and accuracy. In particular we mention here the seminal paper [29], which investigated well posedness and accuracy of the EnK(B)F for finite ensemble size. The signals considered were allowed to be infinite dimensional (but deterministic) and included the (2D) Navier–Stokes equations. The perspective that was put forward in this paper was to view the EnK(B)F as a state estimator, rather than as an approximation of the true posterior.

Nevertheless the mean-field theory for EnK(B)Fs in finite dimensional settings has lately received increasing interest [13] as it allows to connect the EnK(B)F to the true posterior (P). Indeed one can obtain the mean-field limit of the EnK(B)F from a McKean–Vlasov representation of the posterior, called the Feedback Particle Filter [51][52] (also [49] for a survey), either by Gaussian approximation or by what is usually referred to as the constant gain approximation [48]. Even though these connections are well known in the literature, only recently [14] were able to derive error bounds for the inconsistency of the mean-field EnKF (as an approximation to the true posterior) under restricting conditions that ensure a near Gaussian setting.

This indicates the relevance of the mean-field theory to providing firm mathematical foundations for EnKBFs and their relation to the optimal filter. So far the mean-field theory of the (continuous time) EnKBF seems to only have been studied in a finite dimensional setting. [32] proved propagation of chaos with implicit rates for the EnK(B)F in discrete and continuous time for linear observations requiring the assumption that the mean-field limit actually exists. [15] investigated the EnKBF from a rough paths perspective. Treating the observation data as a continuous rough path they proved well posedness of the mean-field equation under the assumption of bounded observation functions. Under the additional assumption that the observation data is of bounded variation they were also able to derive propagation of chaos with logarithmic rates. [21] showed well posedness of the mean-field equation and propagation of chaos with implicit rates in a correlated noise setting. A good summary of the mean-field picture of EnK(B)Fs can be found in the recent survey paper [13].

In this paper we derive and analyse the EnKBF and its mean-field limit for signals that are given by SPDEs under finite dimensional observations. For the signal SPDEs we consider a variational setting (see [43]), which is in particular interesting for practical applications due to its relation to popular numerical approximation methods like Finite Elements or other Galerkin schemes. Nevertheless, to the best knowledge of the author, continuous time Ensemble Kalman methods for SPDEs do not seem covered by the existing literature. The problem setting and our basic assumptions are discussed in section 2. As we analyse the EnKBF from a Bayesian point of view, we first discuss the Kushner–Stratonovich equation describing the posterior distribution in section

¹That is the limiting process one obtains by taking the ensemble size $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in (1).

3. In particular we prove a priori bounds for the variance of the Kushner–Stratonovich equation that in the Bayesian literature are often referred to as the law of total variance. Similar bounds also hold for the EnKBF and are the main tool for its analysis. In section 4 we restrict our investigation to the linear Gaussian setting. After first reviewing a classical result by Bensoussan [5] on the Kalman–Bucy filter in infinite dimensions, we then introduce the mean-field EnKBF as McKean–Vlasov representation of the Kalman–Bucy filter and discuss its well posedness. In section 5 we then generalize this principle and derive the Feedback Particle Filter (FPF) as a McKean–Vlasov representation of the posterior in nonlinear filtering problems. We also show that the mean-field EnKBF for nonlinear signals is the constant gain approximation of the FPF. Section 6 is devoted to proving the well posedness of the mean-field EnKBF. Finally in section 7 we investigate the EnKBF as a particle approximation of the mean-field version, proving well posedness and a propagation of chaos result with implicit rates. Under the additional assumption of a bounded observation function we are able to improve on this convergence results, deriving (almost) optimal rates. While optimal rates are well established in the linear Gaussian setting [20], to our best knowledge this is the first result that shows such rates for general nonlinear signal dynamics even in finite dimensions.

2 Problem setting, assumptions and notations

For the signal we consider SPDEs in a variational setting as they are found in e.g. [39],[43]. To fix notation and for the convenience of the reader we repeat some key concepts and results of this field in this section, for a more detailed introduction to this topic we refer the reader to [43].

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and \mathcal{V} be a Banach space that form a Gelfand triple [43, Section 4.1] $\mathcal{V} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}'$. We assume that there exists an Orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} , denoted by $(\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that $\nu_k \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For a given separable real Hilbert space \mathcal{U} , we consider the \mathcal{U} -valued \mathcal{Q} -Wiener process $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with finite trace. To this end assume that \mathcal{Q} is a symmetric, positive semidefinite linear operator on \mathcal{U} with finite trace $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{Q} < +\infty$ and Eigenvalues $(q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with corresponding orthonormal Eigenbasis $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then there exist independent Brownian motions $(w^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$W_t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{q_k} e_k w_t^k \text{ for all times } t \geq 0.$$

Definition 1. We will always identify the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U} with their duals $\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{U}'$. For any operator B acting on Hilbert spaces we denote its adjoint by B' . The adjoint of an element $u \in \mathcal{H}$ is just its image under the Riesz embedding, i.e. $u' := \langle u, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. This notation is consistent with finite dimensional settings. We note that therefore $uu' \in \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H})$ defines a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{H} .

To rigorously formulate the signal (S) as a variational SPDE on the Gelfand triple $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}')$, we make the following standard assumptions [43, page 56] that shall hold throughout this paper.

Assumption 2 (Signal assumptions). Denote by $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$ the space of Hilbert–Schmidt operators, that is the space of all linear operators $B : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that their Hilbert–Schmidt norm $\|B\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|Be_k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ is finite.

We assume that $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ and $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$ satisfy the following conditions

1. **Hemicontinuity:** For all $u, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ the mapping

$$r \rightarrow {}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(v + ru), w \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \text{ is continuous.}$$

2. **Weak monotonicity/one-sided Lipschitz:** There exists $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$2 {}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(u) - \mathcal{A}(v), u - v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u) - \mathcal{B}(v)) \circ \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq \lambda \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (2)$$

3. **Coercivity:** There exist constants $\alpha_V > 0, \alpha_H, \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_p \in (1, +\infty)$, such that $u \in \mathcal{V}$

$$2_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(u), u \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \left\| \mathcal{B}(u) \circ \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq -\alpha_V \|u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{\alpha_p} + \alpha_H \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \alpha_0. \quad (3)$$

4. **Boundedness:** There exists a constant $c_A > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{A}(u)\|_{\mathcal{V}'} \leq c_A (1 + \|u\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Next let us briefly discuss which (S)PDEs can be treated in this variational framework.

Remark 3 (Possible Signals). A classical example of a differential operator that satisfies our Assumptions 2 is the p -Laplacian

$$\mathcal{A}(v) := \Delta (|v|^{p-2}v) \quad (4)$$

for any $p \in [2, +\infty)$ on a suitable domain Λ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In this case $\mathcal{V} := W_0^{1,p}(\Lambda)$ is the classical p -integrable, first order Sobolev space of functions that vanish on the boundary. The Hilbert space is then set to $\mathcal{H} := L(\Lambda)$. Neumann, or mixed boundary conditions can be treated as well. Thus we can allow for signals that are given by a (noisy) heat or porous media equation. Another differential operator satisfying our assumptions is given by

$$\mathcal{A}(v) := -\Delta v - \mathbf{a}v^3 + \mathbf{b}v + \mathbf{c},$$

where $\mathbf{a} \geq 0, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$, for Dirichlet, Neumann or mixed boundary conditions on suitable domains. Therefore we can treat signals evolving by a stochastic reaction diffusion equation with a double well potential. In particular Allen–Cahn and FitzHugh–Nagumo equations can be treated. For a more detailed discussion we refer to [43, Section 4.1].

Under Assumption 2 it can be shown [43] that for a given initial condition $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ the signal SPDE (S) has a unique solution, which will henceforth be referred to as the signal.

An important tool to our analysis is Itô's Lemma for variational SPDEs [39, page 136] first derived in [40]. For later reference let us specify in the following definition for which functions one can use Itô's Lemma.

Definition 4. Any function $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be an Itô function, if

1. ϕ is twice Fréchet differentiable, with the first two derivatives denoted by $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi$ and $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$.
2. All of $\phi, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi$ and $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$ are locally bounded.
3. For any operator $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ that is of trace class, the functional $v \mapsto \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathcal{Q} D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi(v)]$ is continuous on \mathcal{H} .
4. For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ it holds that $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v) \in \mathcal{V}$ and the map $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi|_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is continuous when the domain is equipped with the strong and the image is equipped with the weak topology.
5. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v)\|_{\mathcal{V}'} \leq C (1 + \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}})$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

If an Itô function ϕ is twice continuously Fréchet differentiable with compact support, we refer to it as an Itô testfunction.

One important example of an Itô function is the squared norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$. With the Itô Lemma it is easy to show the following basic identities for the signal distribution.

Lemma 5. *The signal mean $m_t := \mathbb{E}[u_t]$ satisfies*

$$\partial_t m_t = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(u_t)], \quad (5)$$

and the covariance $P_t := \text{Cov}[u_t] := \mathbb{E}[(u_t - m_t)(u_t - m_t)']$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \langle v, \text{Cov}[u_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \mathbb{E}[\langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), w \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), v \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}] \\ &\quad + \left\langle v, \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w \right] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for all $v, w \in \mathcal{Y}$. The generator of the signal, denoted by \mathcal{L} , is given by

$$\mathcal{L}\phi = \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) \mathcal{B}(\cdot) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(\cdot) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \quad (7)$$

for every Itô testfunction ϕ as per Definition 4.

Proof. The equation of the mean (5) is a simple consequence of the centeredness of the Wiener process W .

Using the fact that for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\langle v, \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t) dW_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \sqrt{q_k} \langle v, \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d\beta_k(t).$$

we derive by Itô's formula on Hilbert spaces [39, page 136] the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &d(\langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d \langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + d[\langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}]_t \\ &= (\langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(u_t)], w \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \gamma' \langle v, \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(u_t)] \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} q_k \langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{B}(u_t) dW_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) dW_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

for all $v, w \in \mathcal{Y}$. Now we note that we can also write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} q_k \langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \left\langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \left\langle w, \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} e_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} e_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \left\langle \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w, e_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} e_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Parseval, this gives us the identity

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} q_k \langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\langle v, \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (8)$$

By taking the expectation in the previous evolution equation of the product and using the projection properties of the expectation we then derive (6).

Finally we address the generator. Using Itô's formula [39, page 136] and taking the expectation, we see immediately that

$$\partial_t \mathbb{E} [\phi(u_t)] = \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \mathcal{A}(u_t), (D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi)(u_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi)(u_t) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} q_k ((\mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k)(\mathcal{B}(u_t) e_k)) \right] \right]$$

By using (8) again, we thus derive (7). \square

Let us address the observations next. As stated in the introduction we consider continuous, d_y -dimensional observations given by the differential equation (O). We make the following standard assumptions for the coefficients H and Γ .

Assumption 6 (Observation assumptions). *The observation function $H : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ is assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous, $\Gamma \in C^0([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_y})$ and V is a d_v -dimensional standard Brownian motion, independent of the signal u and its driving noise W . As usual we set $R_t := \Gamma_t \Gamma_t^T$ and assume that R_t is invertible for all times $t \geq 0$.*

In the following variance bounds for both the posterior (P) and the law of the EnKBF will play a crucial role in our analysis. That is why, besides the standard assumptions for the signal 2 and the observations 6, we make the following additional assumption, which will give us a priori bounds for the signal variance.

Assumption 7 (Bounded signal diffusion). *There exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(v) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(v) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \leq \beta.$$

3 The Kushner-Stratonovich equation and the law of total variance

In this section we investigate the Kushner-Stratonovich equation (KSE), which describes the evolution of the posterior distribution (P). We focus on proving bounds for the posterior covariance. Similar bounds will later on be key to the investigation of the EnKBF, and remarkably seem to be one of the few areas of consistency for general signals. By consistency we mean that it is a property that is shared by both the EnKBF and the optimal filter, regardless of whether the filter is (close to) a Gaussian. However first we note that in our setting with finite dimensional observations, the KSE can be derived just as for finite dimensional settings using an innovation process approach [4]. To this end we define the innovation Wiener process \hat{I} by

$$d\hat{I}_t := R_t^{-1/2} dY_t - R_t^{-1/2} \eta_t(H) dt.$$

By design \hat{I} is an \mathbb{R}^{d_y} -valued diffusion process with continuous sample paths. Its quadratic variation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{I}]_t &= \left[\int_0^t R_s^{-1/2} dY_s - \int_0^t R_s^{-1/2} \eta_s(H) ds \right]_t = \left[\int_0^t R_s^{-1/2} dY_s \right]_t \\ &= \int_0^t R_s^{-1/2} d[Y]_s R_s^{-1/2} = t \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}. \end{aligned}$$

3 THE KUSHNER-STRATONOVICH EQUATION AND THE LAW OF TOTAL VARIANCES

Next we show that \hat{I} is a $(Y_{0:t})_{t \geq 0}$ martingale. Let therefore $s < t$ and ϕ_s be a bounded and $Y_{0:s}$ -measurable function, then by the martingale property of V and the projection property of the posterior η , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{I}_t - \hat{I}_s \right) \phi_s \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t R_r^{-1/2} \Gamma_r dV_r \phi_s \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t R_r^{-1/2} (H(u_r) - \eta_r(H)) dr \phi_s \right] = 0.$$

Thus by Levys characterization of the Brownian motion, we know that \hat{I} is indeed a standard \mathbb{R}^{d_y} -valued Brownian motion.

Just as in the finite dimensional case [4], one can thus verify that the posterior (P) satisfies the Kushner–Stratonovich equation (KSE) in its weak form

$$d\eta_t(\phi) = \eta_t(\mathcal{L}\phi)dt + (\eta_t(\phi H) - \eta_t(\phi)\eta_t(H)) R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt), \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the generator of u defined in (7) and ϕ is an arbitrary Itô testfunction (see Definition 4).

Remark 8. *As mentioned, the path we took to derive the KSE is rather standard in finite dimensional settings [4]. There are various works establishing the nonlinear filtering equations in infinite dimensional settings, even in the more difficult case of correlated noise [2],[10]. In [53] an extension of the KSE to infinite dimensional filtering problems with infinite dimensional observations was derived.*

A key tool in the analysis of the EnKBF is an inequality that bounds its conditional variance by the (same upper bounds as the) variance of the signal, irrespective of the observations. This is a feature that is actually shared by the posterior distribution (P), as the projection properties of the conditional expectation imply

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}] \right] \leq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov} [u_t].$$

Now we note that by the covariance dynamics (6) and Parseval² we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov} [u_t] &= 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \nu_k, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \nu_k' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\langle \nu_k, \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \nu_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[2 \nu_k' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term we use the one-sided Lipschitz condition (2) and for the second term we use Assumption 7. This gives us

$$\partial_t \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov} [u_t] \leq \lambda \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov} [u_t] + \beta.$$

Which, by Grönwall, implies $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov} [u_t] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}$. Together with the variance bound for the posterior this gives us

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}] \right] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (10)$$

Remark 9 (Law of total variance). *In probability theory the identity*

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Var} [X|Y]] + \text{Var} [\mathbb{E} [X|Y]] = \text{Var} [X]$$

²One could have also directly looked at the dynamics of $\mathbb{E} [\|u_t - m_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2]$ and proved this via the well known Itô formula for the norm.

for any random variables X, Y is often referred to as the law of total variance. As we have seen, inequality (10) is a direct consequence of this identity. Thus in the following we also refer to (10) as the law of total variance. We will later see that it also holds for the variance of the EnKBF and is key to its analysis.

As one would expect, one can also show the law of total variance (10) for any sufficiently regular solution of the KSE without invoking its connection to a Bayesian estimation problem. While this may seem trivial at first glance, it is in fact a highly non trivial task to connect a given solution of the KSE or Zakai equation back to the posterior distribution (P) without using uniqueness arguments for these equations. We therefore formulate this fact in a separate Lemma. The proof only uses the dynamics of the KSE and does not require the connection to the conditional distribution, which makes the law of total variance (10) an attractive a priori estimate for the analysis of the KSE or related equations.

Lemma 10. *Let η be a solution to (9) and assume that at all times it's support lies in \mathcal{V} . Assume furthermore that $\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ are always integrable with respect to η_t , $t \geq 0$. Then the law of total variance (10) holds.*

To prove this Lemma one would be tempted to use $\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ as testfunctions in (9). However this is not allowed by the conditions of Itô's formula. Instead we make a Fourier argument, at the basis of which the following Lemma lies. This Lemma will also become useful in the next section.

Lemma 11. *For every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the i -th Fourier coefficient function by $\phi_i(v) := \langle v, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ and define the quadratic function $\chi_{ij}(v) := \langle v, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle v, \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. Then it holds that*

$$d\eta_t(\phi_i) = \eta_t(\langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}) dt + \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, H] R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt) \quad (11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & d(\eta_t(\chi_{ij}) - \eta_t(\phi_i)\eta_t(\phi_j)) \\ &= (\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, \langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}] + \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_j, \langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}]) dt \\ &+ \eta_t \left(\left\langle \nu_i, \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}) \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}})' \nu_j \right) \right)_{\mathcal{H}} \right\rangle \right) dt \\ &- \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, H] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[H, \phi_j] + \mathfrak{X}_{ij} R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\mathfrak{X}_{ij} := \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\chi_{ij}, H] - \eta_t(\phi_j)\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, H] - \eta_t(\phi_i)\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_j, H] \quad (13)$$

Proof. We note that $(D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi_i)(v) = \nu_i$ and $(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi_i)(v) = 0$, which implies $(\mathcal{L}\phi_i)(v) = \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$. This gives us (11).

Now we use (11) and Itô's product rule to derive

$$\begin{aligned} d(\eta_t(\phi_i)\eta_t(\phi_j)) &= (\eta_t(\phi_j)\eta_t(\langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}) + \eta_t(\phi_i)\eta_t(\langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}})) dt \\ &+ (\eta_t(\phi_j)\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, H] + \eta_t(\phi_i)\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_j, H]) R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt) \\ &+ \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_j, H] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[H, \phi_i]. \end{aligned}$$

Next we note that $(D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \chi_{ij})(v) = \langle v, \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \nu_i + \langle v, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \nu_j$ and $(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \chi_{ij})(v) = \nu_i (\nu_j)' + \nu_j (\nu_i)'$. Just as in (7), this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\chi_{ij}(v) &= \langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &+ \left\langle \nu_i, \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} q_k ((\mathcal{B}(v)e_k)(\mathcal{B}(v)e_k)') \nu_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (8), we thus derive

$$\begin{aligned} d\eta_t(\chi_{ij}) &= \left(\eta_t \left(\langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \right) + \eta_t \left(\langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \right) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \eta_t \left(\left\langle \nu_i, \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}) \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}})' \nu_j \right) \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\eta_t}[\chi_{ij}, H] R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by subtracting the equation for $\eta_t(\phi_i)\eta_t(\phi_j)$ from the evolution equation of $\eta_t(\chi_{ij})$, we derive (12). \square

Now we are able to prove the law of total variance (10) for the KSE.

Proof of Lemma 10. By Parseval we have

$$\left(\eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\eta_t(\chi_k) - \eta_t(\phi_k)\eta_t(\phi_k)).$$

Thus we can use (12). Now we note that in equation (12) the innovation term $dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt$ vanishes under the expectation and the contribution of $-\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_k, H] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\eta_t}[H, \phi_k]$ is indeed negative. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \mathbb{E} \left[\eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\eta_t}[\langle \nu_k, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}] + \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\eta_t}[\langle \nu_k, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(v), \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}] \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\eta_t \left(\left\langle \nu_k, \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}) \left((\mathcal{B}(\cdot)\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}})' \nu_k \right) \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then using Parseval in combination with the same bounds as before gives the desired inequality (10). \square

4 Linear and Gaussian Filtering

Only in this section we make the following assumption, which we refer to as the linear Gaussian setting.

Assumption 12. [*Linear Gaussian Setting*] We assume that

- $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ is linear
- $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$ is a constant linear operator, i.e. it is independent of the state u .
- $H \in \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ is a linear operator
- the initial condition (of the signal and posterior) u_0 is Gaussian in \mathcal{H} , i.e.

$$u_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(m_0, P_0) \text{ with } m_0 \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } P_0 \in \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}) \text{ is symmetric positive semidefinite.}$$

In this setting u and Y are jointly Gaussian and thus the posterior distribution is also Gaussian $\eta_t = \mathcal{N}(m_t, P_t)$, $t \geq 0$, meaning that it is completely described by its (conditional) mean m and covariance P . We refer to [38] for conditional Gaussian distributions on Hilbert spaces.

4.1 The classical Kalman–Bucy filter

It is well known that in finite dimensions m and P satisfy the Kalman–Bucy equations [4]

$$dm_t = \mathcal{A}m_t dt + P_t H' R_t^{-1} (dY_t - Hm_t dt) \quad (14a)$$

$$\frac{dP_t}{dt} = \mathcal{A}P_t + P_t \mathcal{A}' - P_t H' R_t^{-1} H P_t + \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right) \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' . \quad (14b)$$

This is also true in infinite dimensional settings, which is a direct consequence of the Kushner–Stratonovich equation, see [53, Section 3.3.1] (as well as [4] for the finite dimensional case). For the sake of completeness and since, for finite dimensional observations, it is a trivial consequence of Lemma 11, we also show the derivation here.

Lemma 13. *Assume that η is a Gaussian solution to the KSE, i.e. η_t is a Gaussian on \mathcal{V} with mean m_t and covariance P_t satisfying (9) for all times $t \geq 0$. Then m and P satisfy the Kalman–Bucy equations (14).*

Proof. The Kalman–Bucy filter is a direct consequence of Lemma 11. To show this we first note that for arbitrary $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the linearity of \mathcal{A} and H turns (11) into

$$\begin{aligned} d \langle \nu_i, m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= d\eta_t(\phi_i) \\ &= \eta_t \left({}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \right) dt + \mathbb{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\phi_i, H] R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt) \\ &= {}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}m_t, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} dt + \langle \nu_i, P_t H' R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the equation of the i -th Fourier coefficient of (14a). Thus m indeed satisfies (14a).

Similarly one verifies immediately that the linearity of \mathcal{A} and H turns (12) into

$$\begin{aligned} d \langle \nu_i, P_t \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \left({}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}P_t \nu_j, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + {}_{\mathcal{V}'} \langle \mathcal{A}P_t \nu_i, \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \right) dt \\ &\quad + \left\langle \nu_i, \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right) \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \nu_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt - \langle \nu_i, P_t H' R_t^{-1} H P_t \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt \\ &\quad + \mathfrak{X}_{ij} R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t(H)dt), \end{aligned}$$

for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus in order to prove (14b), it remains to show that for \mathfrak{X} , defined in (13), it holds that $\mathfrak{X}_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

The main idea is that this question reduces to identities for finite dimensional Gaussians. Let $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, but fixed. Define the linear map $\Psi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y+2}$ by

$$\Psi_t(v) := \begin{pmatrix} \langle v, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ \langle v, \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ H v \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now we take an arbitrary, η_t -distributed random variable $\bar{u}_t \sim \eta_t$, then

$$Z := \Psi_t(\bar{u}_t)$$

is an \mathbb{R}^{d_y+2} Gaussian vector, with

$$\mu := \mathbb{E}_Y[\Psi_t(\bar{u}_t)] = \begin{pmatrix} \langle m_t, \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ \langle m_t, \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ H m_t \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma := \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\Psi_t(\bar{u}_t)] = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \nu_i, P_t \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \langle \nu_i, P_t \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & (H P_t \nu_i)' \\ \langle \nu_j, P_t \nu_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \langle \nu_j, P_t \nu_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & (H P_t \nu_j)' \\ H P_t \nu_i & H P_t \nu_j & H P_t H' \end{pmatrix}.$$

With these definitions we see that

$$\mathfrak{X}_{ij} = \text{Cov}_Y [Z_1 Z_2, Z_3] - \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_2] \text{Cov}_Y [Z_1, Z_3] - \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_1] \text{Cov}_Y [Z_2, Z_3], \quad (15)$$

and since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_Y [Z_1 Z_2, Z_3] &= \mathbb{E}_Y [(Z_1 Z_2 - \mu_1 \mu_2) (Z_3 - \mu_3)'] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_1 Z_2 Z_3'] - \text{Cov}_Y [Z_1, Z_2] \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_3'] - \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_1] \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_2] \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_3'] \end{aligned}$$

we can write (15) as

$$\mathfrak{X}_{ij} = \mathbb{E}_Y [Z_1 Z_2 Z_3'] - \Sigma_{12} \mu_3' - \mu_2 \Sigma_{13} - \mu_1 \Sigma_{23} - \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3'. \quad (16)$$

Showing that $\mathfrak{X}_{ij} = 0$ is equivalent to a simple identity for third moments of finite dimensional Gaussians, which we prove here for the sake of completeness and the convenience of the reader. We use the moment generating function

$$\mathcal{M}(r) := \mathbb{E}_Y [\exp (r_1 Z_1 + r_2 Z_2 + r_3 \cdot Z_3)] = \exp \left(r \cdot \mu + \frac{r' \Sigma r}{2} \right),$$

where $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)^T$, $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$. Then clearly we have

$$\mathbb{E}_Y [Z_1 Z_2 Z_3] = \partial_{r_1} \partial_{r_2} \nabla_{r_3} \mathcal{M}(0) = \mu_1 \Sigma_{32} + \mu_2 \Sigma_{31} + \Sigma_{12} \mu_3 + \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3,$$

which in turn implies $\mathfrak{X}_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Remark 14 (Literature). *The first (mathematically rigorous) work treating the Kalman–Bucy Filter (14) for infinite dimensional SDEs seems to be by Falb [24] in 1967, which required A to be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space, thus not allowing for differential operators. In the 70s, several works, which also allowed for A to be a differential operator, expanded on this. For a good overview on the progress that has been made in this time period we refer the interested reader to an excellent survey paper by Curtain [17], who, in various papers treated semigroup approaches to (14). Very recent results for far more general infinite dimensional signals using a semigroup approach can be found in [30]. A variational approach, which is the one we use, was already developed in the 70s by Bensoussan [5]³. In this book Bensoussan studied two approaches for Kalman–Bucy filters, one introduced so called random linear functionals to mathematically describe model errors, the other one uses SPDEs. Many of the papers recited here, including the book by Bensoussan, actually allow for more general observations, taking values in Hilbert spaces.*

Note that in the infinite dimensional setting the Riccati equation (14b) is operator valued. Well posedness of such equations is a classical subject of infinite dimensional control theory. Given the well posedness of the Riccati equation (14b) the well posedness of the equation for the mean (14a) can be followed from such results for linear SPDEs. Indeed the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (14b) was shown by Bensoussan [5, Théorème 3.1],[37, Theorem 7.3.2]. For the convenience of the reader we recite this result in the following.

Theorem 15 (Bensoussan 1971,[5]). *Let T be an arbitrary timeframe, we denote the \mathcal{V} -valued Sobolev space on $[0, T]$ by*

$$\mathcal{W}([0, T]) := \{ y \in L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{V}) : \partial_t y \in L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{V}') \} \subseteq C^0([0, T]; \mathcal{H}),$$

where the last inclusion is a consequence of Sobolev embedding. We assume that A is coercive, i.e. that (3) holds for $\alpha_0 = 0$ and that both P_0 and Q are invertible.

³The book is written in French, an English text that also recites some of its results is [37].

Then there exists a unique family of operators $(P_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that for all testfunctions $\phi \in \mathcal{W}([0, T])$ that satisfy

$$\partial_t \phi + A' \phi \in L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{H}),$$

it holds that

$$P\phi \in \mathcal{W}([0, T]) \tag{17}$$

and that

$$\partial_t(P\phi) = P(\partial_t \phi + A' \phi) + \mathcal{A}P\phi + (\mathcal{B}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{B}')\phi - (PH'R^{-1}HP)\phi. \tag{18}$$

Remark 16. We remark that besides an appropriate well posedness of the Riccati equation (14b), [5, Théorème 3.1] also derives the optimal filter in a random linear functional framework. We did not recite this in Theorem 15 and refer the interested reader to [5, Théorème 3.1] or [37, Theorem 7.3.2]. We also remark that the invertibility conditions in Theorem 15 can be relaxed [17].

Remark 17. Condition (17) is a relaxed regularity condition, as for constant testfunctions $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$ the image of the adjoint $\mathcal{A}'\phi$ is not necessarily contained in \mathcal{H} and thus in (17) not all elements of \mathcal{V} are assumed to be mapped into the Sobolev space.

Remark 18 (Extended Kalman–Bucy). While the Kalman–Bucy filter provides a consistent representation of the posterior in the linear Gaussian setting, adaptations for nonlinear signals called Extended Kalman–Bucy filters (EKF) are often used in practice, in particular in engineering. Hereby the signal is (a priori) linearized by a Taylor expansion and the standard Kalman–Bucy algorithm (14) is then applied to these altered signal dynamics. There is a recent paper [1] that discusses the derivation of an EKF for semilinear SPDEs and the elementary mathematical analysis via a mild-solutions/semigroup approach.

4.2 The consistent mean field EnKBF

In the linear Gaussian setting, a representation of the posterior η by a stochastic process \bar{u} is given by the mean-field EnKBF. In the finite dimensional setting numerical approximations based on this equation have proven very successful in many practical applications, particular for high dimensional signals. One can also easily generalize this representation to our SPDE setting, resulting in the McKean–Vlasov SPDE

$$d\bar{u}_t = \mathcal{A}\bar{u}_t dt + \mathcal{B}d\bar{W}_t + \bar{P}_t H' R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - H \frac{\bar{u}_t + \bar{m}_t}{2} dt \right) \tag{19}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_t &:= \mathbb{E}[\bar{u}_t] \in \mathcal{V} \\ \bar{P}_t &:= \text{Cov}[\bar{u}_t] = \mathbb{E}[(\bar{u}_t - \bar{m}_t)(\bar{u}_t - \bar{m}_t)'] \in \mathbb{L}(\mathcal{V}'; \mathcal{V}). \end{aligned}$$

Before we investigate the well posedness of (19) we want to verify that it defines a consistent mean-field representation of the posterior η . As a first step towards this goal we verify that (19) reproduces the correct posterior mean and covariance that are given by the Kalman–Bucy filter (14).

Lemma 19 (moment consistency). *Let \bar{m} and \bar{P} denote the mean and covariance of \bar{u} , the solution to (19). Then \bar{m} and \bar{P} satisfy the Kalman–Bucy equations (14) and are thus identical to the mean and covariance of the posterior.*

Proof. Taking the expectation in (19) gives us the Kalman equation (14a). We thus only have to verify that the covariance matrix satisfies the Riccati equation (14b). Just as in the proof of Lemma 5, applying Itô's rule to the product $\langle v, \bar{u}_t - \bar{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \bar{u}_t - \bar{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ gives us by taking the (conditional) expectation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \langle v, \bar{P}_t w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A} \bar{P}_t w, v \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A} \bar{P}_t v, w \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} - \langle v, \bar{P}_t H' R_t^{-1} H \bar{P}_t w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \left\langle v, \mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus \bar{P} indeed satisfies the Riccati equation (14b). \square

We can use the moment consistency to prove the well posedness of (19) as the following Lemma shows. For the finite dimensional setting this can also be found in [20].

Lemma 20. *Under the assumptions of Theorem (15) there exists a unique solution of (19)*

Proof. The standard method for proving well posedness of McKean–Vlasov equations uses a fixed point argument with respect to the law. For (19) this argument simplifies substantially as we can use (14) to guess the right fixed point. To this end let P be the unique solution to (14b) and define \tilde{u} to be the unique solution to the linear equation

$$d\tilde{u}_t = \mathcal{A}\tilde{u}_t dt + \mathcal{B}d\bar{W}_t + P_t H' R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - H \frac{\tilde{u}_t + \mathbb{E}_Y [\tilde{u}_t]}{2} dt \right). \quad (20)$$

Then the covariance \tilde{P} of \tilde{u} satisfies the linear equation

$$\frac{d\tilde{P}_t}{dt} = \mathcal{A}\tilde{P}_t + \tilde{P}_t \mathcal{A}' - \frac{1}{2} P_t H' R_t^{-1} H \tilde{P}_t - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}_t H' R_t^{-1} H P_t + \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right) \left(\mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)'.$$

However, by definition, this equation must also be satisfied by the solution P to the Riccati equation (14b). Thus by uniqueness of solutions to the linear problem above, we conclude that $P = \tilde{P}$ and \tilde{u} is thus a solution to the EnKBF.

Uniqueness of solutions follows from the uniqueness of the Riccati equation. Given two solutions $\bar{u}^i, i = 1, 2$, their covariances $\bar{P}^i, i = 1, 2$ must both satisfy the Riccati equation and thus by uniqueness coincide $\bar{P} = \bar{P}^1 = \bar{P}^2$. Therefore \bar{u}^1 and \bar{u}^2 both satisfy the same linear equation (where \bar{P} is taken as a covariable/coefficient of the equation) and by uniqueness they too must coincide. \square

The fixed point argument in the proof of Lemma (20) can also be used to verify that the EnKBF is not just consistent with respect to the first two moments, but also with respect to its law. To this end we note that for given operator valued process P , equation (20) defines an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, and thus for Gaussian initial condition its solution \bar{u} will have Gaussian (time-)marginals. Therefore, since \bar{u} , the solution of (19), has consistent mean and covariance processes, its marginals are also consistent. We state this fact in the following Corollary.

Corollary 21 (consistency of the law). *Denote by $\bar{\eta}$ the time-marginals of the law of \bar{u} , i.e. $\bar{u}_t \sim \bar{\eta}_t$ for all times $t \geq 0$. Then, in the linear Gaussian setting, $\bar{\eta}_t = \eta_t$ for all times $t \geq 0$.*

With the fixed point equation (20) one can also derive an explicit formula for the solution to (19). As for given P , the equation (20) is a linear McKean–Vlasov equation we can use a Duhamel/Variation of Constants formula to derive that (for the fixed point $P = \bar{P}$) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(t) &= \exp(\mathcal{A}_{P_1}(t)) (\bar{u}_0 - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_0]) + \exp(\mathcal{A}_{P_2}(t)) \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_0] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \exp(\mathcal{A}_{P_1}(s, t)) \mathcal{B} dW_s + \int_0^t \exp(\mathcal{A}_{P_2}(s, t)) \bar{P}_s H' R_s^{-1} dY_s, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{P1}(s, t) &:= \int_s^t \mathcal{A} - \frac{\bar{P}_r H_r' R_r^{-1} H}{2} dr \\ \mathcal{A}_{P2}(s, t) &:= \int_s^t \mathcal{A} - \bar{P}_r H' R_r^{-1} H dr,\end{aligned}$$

and $\exp(\mathcal{A}_{P_i}(s, t))$, $i = 1, 2$ are the corresponding solution semigroups.

Remark 22. *One could also use (21) to formulate a mild solution theory for the EnKBF. This is out of the scope of this paper and we focus instead on a variational theory.*

5 The Feedback Particle Filter

In the linear Gaussian setting the mean field EnKBF (19) describes a diffusion process with the remarkable property, that its (time) marginal laws are given by the desired posterior distribution. In the general setting this attribute is achieved by the Feedback Particle Filter (FPF), it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}d\hat{u}_t &= \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\hat{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \left(dY_t - \frac{H(\hat{u}_t) + \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\hat{u}_t)]}{2} dt \right) + \frac{1}{2} \xi(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) dt,\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

where $\hat{\eta}_t$ denotes the conditional distribution of \hat{u}_t , the so called gain term $K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ is (not uniquely) determined by the weak differential equation

$$\hat{\eta}_t \left(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) = \hat{\eta}_t \left(\phi(H - \hat{\eta}_t(H))' \right) R_t^{-1} \text{ for all It\^o testfunctions } \phi \quad (23)$$

and the correctional drift term $\xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$\xi(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) := \left(\langle K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t), \nabla \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t)' \right) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \nu_j.$$

Remark 23. *In the one dimensional setting, i.e. $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}$, $d_y = 1$ the Kalman gain K can be determined explicitly. Let us not distinguish between $\hat{\eta}$ and its density function (assuming it exists) and denote its cumulative distribution function (cdf) by $\hat{\Xi}_t(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x \hat{\eta}_t(y) dy$, then the gain is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}K(x, \hat{\eta}_t) &= \frac{-\int_{-\infty}^x (H(y) - \hat{\eta}(H)) \hat{\eta}_t(y) dy}{\hat{\eta}_t(x)} R_t^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_Y[H(\hat{u}_t)] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\hat{u}_t) | \hat{u}_t \leq x]) \left(\partial_x \log \hat{\Xi}_t(x) \right)^{-1} R_t^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

In this setting the It\^o correction ξ also simplifies drastically, as

$$\partial_x K(x, \hat{\eta}_t) = -R_t^{-1} (H(x) - \hat{\eta}(H)) - K(x, \hat{\eta}_t) \partial_x \log \hat{\eta}_t(x),$$

and therefore

$$K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \partial_x K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) = -K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) (H(\hat{u}_t) - \hat{\eta}(H)) - K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t)^2 R_t \partial_x \log \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{u}_t),$$

which in turn gives us the 1D FPF

$$d\hat{u}_t = \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\hat{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t + K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \left(dY_t - \left(H(\hat{u}_t) + \frac{R_t K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \partial_x \log \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{u}_t)}{2} \right) dt \right). \quad (25)$$

In the finite dimensional setting the FPF was first derived in [51] with an optimal control approach, independently and prior to this work a similar mean-field optimal filter for smoothed noise and finite dimensional signals has been found in [16]. In [41] various finite dimensional consistent mean field filters, among them the original FPF, have been derived by matching the strong Fokker–Planck equation of a diffusion process to the strong form of the KSE (9). Building on this work we now extend the FPF to infinite dimensions by showing that it describes the optimal filter, in the sense that the (conditional) law of (22) propagates in time exactly according to the KSE (9). However, since we are working in the infinite setting, we do so by matching the weak Fokker–Planck equation to the weak KSE (9).

Remark 24. *The well posedness of the FPF (22) is an open problem, even in the much simpler finite dimensional case, and is thus just assumed in the following.*

Lemma 25. *Denote by $(\hat{\eta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the law of the FPF $(\hat{u}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, given by (22). We assume that for all times $t \geq 0$ both $K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$ and $\xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$ are well defined functions from \mathcal{H} into \mathcal{H} , that are integrable with respect to $\hat{\eta}_t$.*

Then $\hat{\eta}$ satisfies the weak form of the KSE (9) for all Itô testfunctions (according to Definition 4) $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following properties

- ϕ is integrable with respect to $\hat{\eta}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.
- For all $v \in H$ the Hessian $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi(v)$ is a self adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} .
- The map $\hat{\Phi} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, defined by $\hat{\Phi}(v) := \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v), K(v, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t$, is an Itô function (componentwise) that is also integrable with respect to η_t for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary, satisfying the properties specified above. We note by Itô's formula, that the Kolmogorov forward equation describing the evolution of $\hat{\eta}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{\eta}_t(\phi) &= \eta_t(\mathcal{L}\phi)dt + \hat{\eta}_t(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) (dY_t - \hat{\eta}_t(H)dt) \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{\eta}_t(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) + \hat{\eta}_t(\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'])}{2} dt \\ &\quad - \frac{\hat{\eta}_t(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)(H - \hat{\eta}_t(H)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})}{2} dt \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Due to (23), the first line of (26) is exactly the KSE and thus, to show consistency, we only have to prove that the second line is zero. To this end we note that by Parseval we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)' \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \end{aligned}$$

Next we note that since $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$ is self adjoint and by Parseval we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_k, D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle \partial_{\nu_k} D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us by again using Parseval

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \partial_{\nu_k} K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \partial_{\nu_k} D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T
\end{aligned}$$

Using the product formula in Hilbert spaces⁴, we thus derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \partial_{\nu_k} \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T.
\end{aligned}$$

The map $\hat{\Phi}$, defined in the statement of the Lemma, then allows us to again use Parseval to derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\partial_{\nu_k} \hat{\Phi}) \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \hat{\Phi} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \langle \nu_k, D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \hat{\Phi} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \delta_i \delta_i^T \langle \nu_k, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \hat{\Phi} \delta_i, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \delta_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where δ_i , $i = 1, \dots, d_y$ denotes the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^{d_y} . Thus, by the assumed regularity of $\hat{\Phi}$, we derive by using (23)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\eta}_t (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) + \hat{\eta}_t (\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)']) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t \left(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \hat{\Phi} \delta_i, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \delta_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t \left(\hat{\Phi} \delta_i (H - \hat{\eta}(H))' \right) R_t^{-1} \delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v), K(v, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) R_t \delta_i (H - \hat{\eta}(H))' R_t^{-1} \delta_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v), K(v, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) R_t \delta_i \delta_i^T R_t^{-1} (H - \hat{\eta}(H))' = \hat{\eta}_t (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v), K(v, \hat{\eta}_t) (H - \hat{\eta}(H)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}),
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn lets us conclude that (26) coincides with the KSE (9) and thus the FPF is indeed consistent. \square

The FPF is a true generalization of the EnKBF to general filtering problems and it even provides a connection between the EnKBF and the true posterior even in inconsistent setting as the following Lemma shows.

Lemma 26. *Let again $(\hat{\eta})_{t \geq 0}$ be the (conditional) marginal laws to the FPF (22). Assuming integrability of $K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$, then it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_Y [K(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t)] = \hat{\eta}_t (K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)) = \text{Cov}_{\hat{\eta}_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}, H] R_t^{-1} = \text{Cov}_Y [\hat{u}_t, H(\hat{u}_t)] R_t^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

If H is linear and $\hat{\eta}_t$ is Gaussian, one can even choose the gain term K such that $K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) = \text{Cov}_{\hat{\eta}_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}, H] R_t^{-1}$. In the linear Gaussian setting the EnKBF is thus just a special case of the FPF.

⁴More precisely the formula for the directional derivative of the scalar product of two differentiable functions.

Proof. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\phi_i(v) := \langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ as a testfunction in the gain equation (23), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_i, \hat{\eta}_t(K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \hat{\eta}_t \left(\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi_i, K(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) = \hat{\eta}_t \left(\phi_i(H - \hat{\eta}(H))' \right) R_t^{-1} \\ &= \langle \nu_i, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\hat{\eta}_t}[\text{id}_H, H] R_t^{-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ this indeed shows the validity of (27). The second claim follows from Gaussian integration by parts as in [11]. \square

Identity (27) is the reason why the extension of the mean field EnKBF to nonlinear signals is sometimes referred to in the literature as the constant gain approximation (to the FPF) [48]. The next section is concerned with the basic properties of this McKean–Vlasov equation, showing existence and uniqueness of solutions.

6 The mean field EnKBF for nonlinear signals

We consider the extension of the EnKBF to nonlinear signals

$$d\bar{u}_t = \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t + \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y[\bar{u}_t, H(\bar{u}_t)] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(\bar{u}_t) + \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_t)]}{2} dt \right), \quad (28)$$

with not necessarily Gaussian initial condition.

Note that for nonlinear signals, the mean field EnKBF (28) does not allow for a separate description of its covariance matrix via a Riccati equation. Thus we can not simply apply the same argument as in Lemma 20 for well posedness. Indeed due to missing growth conditions, as well as only local Lipschitz properties of the coefficients involved, the question of well posedness of (28) is non trivial.

Remark 27 (Literature). *In a finite dimensional setting well posedness of the nonlinear EnKBF (28) was shown in [15] for possibly correlated observation noises and bounded observation functions. For linear observation functions [21] showed well posedness of finite dimensional mean-field EnKBFs that may also include singular correction terms in the presence of correlated noise. This was done by a combination of a fixed point and a stopping argument with respect to the covariance $\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y[\bar{u}_t, H(\bar{u}_t)]$. The main tool was a law of total variance (30) that was made robust with respect to the fixed point argument via stopping times.*

In the infinite dimensional setting this argument does not work due to missing equivalence of norms. While using a Galerkin argument would thus seem tempting, it would also not imply the desired uniqueness of solutions, which is a property that is difficult to show, and sometimes does not even hold for McKean–Vlasov equations under local Lipschitz conditions [44].

So instead we use an adapted fixed point argument, that makes use of the same variance bounds as in section 3, that also hold for (28) and seem to be the only consistency of its distribution with respect to the actual posterior.

First we investigate the covariance structure in (28). We do this however in a more general form. Let $(h_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a given \mathbb{R}^{d_y} -valued, adapted stochastic process and assume that ξ^Y is an \mathbb{R}^{d_y} -valued semimartingale that is adapted to the natural filtration generated by Y . Then for a \tilde{u} satisfying

$$d\tilde{u}_t = \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t + \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \left(d\xi_t^Y - \frac{h_t + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_t]}{2} dt \right) \quad (29)$$

with mean $\tilde{m}_t := \mathbb{E}_Y [\tilde{u}_t]$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\langle v, \tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle w, \tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle v, \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] dt \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\langle v, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] - \langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [h_t, \tilde{u}_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

for every $v, w \in \mathcal{Y}$. Thus by the positivity of $\langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [h_t, \tilde{u}_t] v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ for every $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ we immediately derive

$$\partial_t \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \lambda \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \beta, \quad (30)$$

and therefore

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] = \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (31)$$

Thus the EnKBF satisfies the variance bound that is implied by the Bayesian filtering problem, it does so even in a stronger sense, as taking the expectation is not required. As implied by the law of total variance for the optimal filter, this bound is robust with respect to perturbations of both the modelled observation function H and the actual observation data Y .

Next we show that the robust variance bound (31) can be used to show well posedness of the EnKBF via a Picard argument as the following Lemma shows.

Theorem 28. *If the conditions in Assumption (2) and (7) are satisfied, there exists a unique (strong) solution to the nonlinear mean-field EnKBF (28).*

Proof. For proving well posedness it is enough to restrict ourselves to a small time frame $[0, T]$ with T chosen later on. The extension to arbitrary time frames can then be easily achieved by standard glueing arguments

The proof is separated into two steps. First we introduce partially stopped dynamics and show their well posedness via a fixed point argument. Next we show that these stopped dynamics must always coincide with solutions to the EnKBF on events that cover the whole probability space almost surely.

In the following we will make use of the semimartingale decomposition of the observation process Y . For better highlighting that the true signal process u plays the role of a parameter to the EnKBF and to easily distinguish it from other processes encountered in the proof we will denote it by u^{ref} . The observation process Y is thus given by

$$dY_t = H(u_t^{\text{ref}}) dt + \Gamma_t dV_t. \quad (32)$$

Step 1: *Well posedness for partially stopped dynamics.*

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k$ a smoothed version of the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{[0, k]}$, such that $\mathbb{1}_{[0, k]} \leq \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \leq \mathbb{1}_{[0, k+1]}$.

Define for $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and any \mathcal{H} -valued random variable v the stopped observation function H^k by

$$H^k(v) := \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [H(v)]|) H(v)$$

as well as the stopped observation process Y^l by

$$dY_t^l := \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right) dY_t.$$

In this step we show that there exists a unique solution \bar{u}^k of

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{u}_t^k &= \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k)dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t^k - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

via a fixed point argument with respect to the stopped modelled observations $(H(\bar{u}_t^k))_{t \in [0, T]}$.

To this end we consider for a given process h the unique solution \tilde{u} of

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{u}_t &= \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t^l - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t]|) \frac{h_t + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_t]}{2} dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Well posedness of (34) is assured by the standard (global) Lipschitz conditions. We define the map Ξ by

$$\Xi(h) := H(\tilde{u}).$$

The existence and uniqueness of solutions to (33) corresponds to the existence and uniqueness of fixed points of Ξ . We prove this via a Banach fixed point argument and thus have to show the contractivity of Ξ . Due to the Lipschitz continuity of H , this further reduces to the problem of showing that the solution map $h \mapsto \tilde{u}$ defined by the equation (29) is Lipschitz, with constant strictly smaller than $1/\text{Lip}(H)$.

Since (34) is of the form (29), the process \tilde{u} must also satisfy the uniform variance bound (31) corresponding to the law of total variance. Therefore, by the Lipschitz continuity of H , we can assume that any potential fixed point h satisfies

$$\text{Var}_Y[h_t] = \text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \text{Cov}_Y[h_t] \leq \text{Lip}(\mathcal{H})\beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (35)$$

To show the contractivity of Ξ , let h^i , $i = 1, 2$ be two given processes and denote by \tilde{u}^i , $i = 1, 2$ the corresponding solutions to (34). Using the uniform variance bounds (35) as well as the Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k$ and its boundedness $0 \leq \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \leq 1$, we derive first the following bound for the gain difference

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t^1, h_t^1] - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t^2, h_t^2] \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})} \\ & \leq \left| \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^1]|) - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^2]|) \right| \left\| \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t^1, h_t^1] \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})} \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_t^2 - \mathbb{E}_Y[\tilde{u}_t^2]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_t^1 - h_t^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \\ & \leq \left((\text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k) + 1) \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H)} + 1 \right) \beta e^{\lambda t} \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Using Itô's formula for the squared norm, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_s^2), \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2 \rangle_{\gamma'} ds \\
&+ 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^1]|)) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} dY_s^k \\
&- 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|)) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\quad \left. R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \frac{h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]}{2} \right\rangle ds \\
&- 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \left. \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) (h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]) - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) (h_s^2 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2])}{2} \right\rangle ds \\
&+ 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T ds \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^t q_n \langle \nu_k, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) e_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we note that by Parseval and the onesided Lipschitz condition (2) we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} q_n \langle \nu_k, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) e_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u) - \mathcal{B}(v)) \circ \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq \lambda \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (37)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\
&= \left\| (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1/2} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \\
&\leq \left((\text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) + 1) \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H) + 1} \right)^2 \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} \left| R_s^{-1/2} \right|^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right). \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) h_s^1 - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) h_s^2|^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|h_s^2|^2 \right] |\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|)|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right] + 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \left(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|^2 + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|h_s^2 - \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|^2 \right] \right) \text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) |\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1 - h_s^2]|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left(1 + ((k+1)^2 + \text{Lip}(H)\beta e^{\lambda t}) \text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \leq \mathbb{1}_{[0, k+1]}$ and the variance bound (35) to derive the last inequality.

The variance bounds (31) and (35) also imply that

$$\|\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]\|_{L(R^{d_x}, \mathcal{H})} \leq \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H)} \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (39)$$

If we now take the supremum on the time interval $[0, T]$ and the conditional expectation \mathbb{E}_Y , standard Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities, together with (37), (38) and the one-sided Lipschitz condition (2), we derive that there exists a constant $\kappa_1(T)$, that only depends on the timeframe T , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \kappa_1(T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + \kappa_1(T) \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \right) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left(|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} dY_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (B(\tilde{u}_s^1) - B(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Note that due to (35) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left(|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] & \leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|h_s^1 - \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + 8\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left(|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ & \leq 2\text{Lip}(H) \beta e^{\lambda t} + 8(k+1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we now use the specific form of the observations (32) and take the full expectation in (40) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \kappa_2(T, k) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right) H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \right] ds \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right) \Gamma_s dV_s \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\kappa_2(T, k)$, where we of course used that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_Y[\cdot]] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot]$.

To dominate the second term on the right hand side of the inequality we use (36) together with the fact that $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \leq (k+1)$. For the other two terms we use the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality together with (37) and (38) to derive that there exists a constant $\kappa_3(T, k, l) > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \kappa_3(T, k, l) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds,$$

which by the (deterministic) Grönwall Lemma implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \kappa_3(T, k, l) \exp(T \kappa_3(T, \|H\|_\infty)) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds,$$

and thus for T small enough we indeed have the desired contraction property.

Step 2: The stopping argument.

First we define the stopping times which we use for our argument by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^k &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : |\mathbb{E}_Y [H(u_t^k)]|^2 > k \right\} \\ \tau_{\text{ref}}^l &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] > l \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

and note that both are stopping times with respect to the filtration generated by Y , implying that for any stochastic process $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and any (suitably integrable) functions f, g , the identities

$$\begin{aligned} g \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[f(z_{\min\{\tau^k, t\}}) \right] \right) &= g \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[f(z_s) \right] \Big|_{s=\min\{\tau^k, t\}} \right) \\ g \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[f(z_{\min\{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l, t\}}) \right] \right) &= g \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[f(z_s) \right] \Big|_{s=\min\{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l, t\}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

hold and therefore \bar{u}^k is a solution to the EnKBF (28) on the random time interval $[0, \min\{\tau^k, \tau_{\text{ref}}^l\}]$. By the uniqueness of (34), \bar{u}^k and \bar{u}^{k+1} must even coincide on $[0, \min\{\tau^k, \tau_{\text{ref}}^l\}]$. Thus we can construct a solution to (28) using the solutions to (34) and in order to conclude existence and uniqueness of the EnKBF, we just have to show that

$$\bigcup_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau^k > T\} \cap \{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T\}$$

defines a covering of the sample space almost surely.

To this end we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} d \|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \langle \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} dt + \langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) d\bar{W}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt \\ &\quad + 2 \left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \text{Cov}_Y \left[\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) \right] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t^l - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\text{Cov}_Y \left[\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) \right] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y \left[H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation thus gives us

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] &= 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\langle \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] dt + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \right] dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \text{Cov}_Y \left[\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) \right] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t^l - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right)^2 \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\text{Cov}_Y \left[\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) \right] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y \left[H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \right] \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The first two terms on the right hand side can be bounded using the growth condition (3) and the diffusivity bound (7). The last term is just the squared shadow 2-norm of the operator

$\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1/2}$, which we can estimate using Parseval and the robust variance bound (31) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]] &\leq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]] \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, H(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k), \langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2] |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [|H(\bar{u}_t^k) - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [|H(\bar{u}_t^k) - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2]^2 \leq \text{Lip}(H) |R_t^{-1}| \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can bound (42) by

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left(2\alpha_H \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + 2\alpha_0 + \beta + \text{Lip}(H) |R_t^{-1}| \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} dY_t^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

We use (39) and $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \leq 1$ to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] \right| \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2) \|\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]\|_{L(R^{d_x}; \mathcal{H})}^2 |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [|H(\bar{u}_t^k)|^2] \\ &\leq (2 + \text{Lip}(H)^3 \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} |R_t^{-1}|) \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \text{Lip}(H) \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} |R_t^{-1}| |H(0)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we note that there exist constants $\kappa_4(T)$ and $\kappa_5(T)$, only depending on the timeframe T , such that

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left(\kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \kappa_5(T) \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} dY_t^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}], \end{aligned}$$

which by using the explicit form of the observations Y can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left(\kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \kappa_5(T) \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y [|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2] \right) H(u_t^{\text{ref}}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_l \left(\mathbb{E}_Y [|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2] \right) \Gamma_t dV_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Again using (39) and the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality we derive that there exist constants $\kappa_6(T)$, depending solely on T , and $\kappa_7(T, l)$, depending on T and l , such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right] = \kappa_6(T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] dt + \mathbb{E}_Y [\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + T\kappa_7(T, l). \quad (45)$$

Thus, by the Grönwall Lemma, we derive that for fixed l and T

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y [\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right] \leq \exp(T\kappa_6(T)) \left(\mathbb{E}_Y [\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + T\kappa_7(T, l) \right), \quad (46)$$

which, implies that almost surely there exists a k such that $\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_H^2 \right] \leq k$. By the Lipschitz continuity of H and the inequality $|\mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]| \leq |H(0)| + \text{Lip}(H) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]}$ this then in turn implies that

$$\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau^k > T\} \cap \{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T\} = \{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T\} \text{ almost surely.}$$

Since $\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[|H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right]$ is finite almost surely, we can thus indeed conclude that there exists a solution to the EnKBF (28), defined on every event $\{\tau^k > T\} \cap \{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T\}$ by the sequence of \bar{u}^k .

To conclude uniqueness of solutions to (28) one can simply employ stopping times (41) and the same Grönwall/contraction argument as in Step 1. \square

Remark 29. Note that even though in the proof above we used the specific form of the observations Y , it actually does not matter that the true observation function and the modelled observation function coincide, i.e. if $dY_t = \mathfrak{C}(\bar{X}_t)dt + \Gamma_t dV_t$ with $\mathfrak{C} \neq H$, then the proof would still hold, as long as \mathfrak{C} is assumed to be Lipschitz. Therefore, as an immediate corollary of our chosen fixed point argument, one derives the continuity of the EnKBF with respect to perturbations of the modelled observations H . The continuous dependence on the signal parameters \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} and the initial condition u_0 can easily be shown as well. Only the robustness with respect to the observation stream Y is a delicate matter due to the discontinuity of the Itô–Lyons map.

7 The EnKBF as an interacting particle system

For the sake of brevity in formulas we make the following definition.

Definition 30. For any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}] &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v^i, \quad \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(v^i) \\ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{v}] &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (v^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}]) (H(v^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}])'. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

We use the normalization by $1/N$ for the empirical covariance instead of the usual unbiased normalization by $1/(N-1)$ just for notational convenience in the calculations that are to follow.

The mean field EnKBF (28) is naturally approximated by a system of interacting S(P)DEs

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &+ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt \right), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where $(\bar{W}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ are independent copies of the Wiener process \bar{W} , u_0^i are independent copies of u_0 and $\mathbf{u}_t^N := (u_t^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$.

The interacting system of S(P)DEs (48) is often referred to as the deterministic EnKBF, which is the continuous time counterpart to the filter derived by Sakov and Oke [42].

7.1 Analysis of the particle approximations

While (48) is just a system of interacting ordinary SPDEs for which local one-sided Lipschitz conditions are enough to derive well posedness [34], it does not seem to satisfy the usual growth conditions for unbounded observation functions H . In [32] the well posedness was proven for the finite dimensional setting by showing that blow ups do not occur in finite times. This is of course not sufficient to conclude well posedness in infinite dimensions. Instead we employ a partial stopping argument, similar to the one employed in the proof of Theorem 28. The law of total variance will again play a key role, and so, to keep formulas simple we make the following definition.

Definition 31. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any ensemble $\mathbf{v} = (v^1, \dots, v^N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$ of N elements of \mathcal{H} , we define the empirical variance $\sigma^N[\mathbf{v}]$ by

$$\sigma^N[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|v_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

And similarly we define the empirical observed variance by

$$\sigma^{N,H}[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |H(v_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}]|^2.$$

We are now in the position to formulate and prove the following Lemma.

Lemma 32. If the conditions in Assumption (2) and (7) are satisfied, there exists a unique solution to the nonlinear EnKBF (48).

Proof. First we note that for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the system

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &+ \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \left(\|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \right) \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$, satisfies standard one-sided Lipschitz and growth conditions and thus has a unique solution. To keep formulas simple we will omit the argument of $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \left(\|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right)$ and instead simply write $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k$ in the rest of this proof.

We note that the ensemble mean $\mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$ satisfies

$$d\mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j)dt + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j)d\bar{W}_t^j + \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt). \quad (50)$$

This gives us the evolution equation for the centered particles

$$\begin{aligned} d(u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) &= \left(\mathcal{A}(u_t^i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j) \right) dt + \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j)d\bar{W}_t^j \right) \\ &- \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \frac{H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Parseval one easily verifies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_k, \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]^T \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Itô's formula we derive the following equation for the average deviation from the ensemble mean

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle \left(\mathcal{A}(u_t^i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j) \right), u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{V}} dt + d\mathbf{m}_t^N \\ &\quad - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]' \right] dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^3} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathcal{B}(u_t^j) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where \mathbf{m}^N denotes the local martingale given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{m}_t^N &:= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N], \left(\mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j) d\bar{W}_t^j \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \text{ with } \mathbf{m}_0^N = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

First we note that in (51) we can replace $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j)$ by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N])$. Thus by using the one-sided Lipschitz condition (2) and Assumption (7) as well as the positivity of the trace $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]' \right]$ we derive the inequality

$$d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \leq (2\lambda \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] + \beta) dt + d\mathbf{m}_t^N. \tag{53}$$

Since \mathbf{m}^N is a real valued local martingale we can deduce by the stochastic Grönwall Lemma [44, Theorem 4] that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_t^i - m_t^N\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]} \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \sqrt{\beta} e^{\lambda T}. \tag{54}$$

Due to the Lipschitz continuity of H , this also gives a uniform bound for $\|\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2$. Since (49) coincide with (48) on $\left\{ \|\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \leq k \right\}$ we have thus derived the well posedness of (48). \square

Remark 33 (Literature). *As already mentioned well posedness of the particle system (48) was proven in [32]. An extension of this proof to the correlated noise framework, which requires the control of singular terms can be found in [21].*

In the thesis [28] it was shown that the discrete EnKF is well defined in an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space setting.

Finally we mention that the seminal paper [29] considered the well posedness and accuracy of both discrete and continuous time EnKFs for a class of signals that included the 2D Navier-Stokes equation. Existence of strong solutions to the continuous time EnKF (48) with complete observations ($H = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$) was assumed and it was shown that solutions do not blow up.

The key identity in the proof of Lemma 32 was (52), which is a stochastic version of the law of total variance (30), i.e. the particle approximation (48) also satisfies (an empirical version of) the law of total variance up to martingale fluctuations. If (48) is to be a good approximation of (28) one would expect these fluctuations to become small as the number of particles is increased sufficiently. Indeed, this is the case, as due to Assumption 7, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d[\mathbf{m}^N]_t &= \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)' (u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt \\ &\leq \frac{2\beta}{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt = \frac{2\beta}{N} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The last inequality is a consequence of the fact that the trace is invariant under the change of the orthonormal basis and that for every nonzero vector one can find an orthonormal basis that contains this vector.

Since we were able to bound $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$ uniformly in time, the quadratic variation of \mathbf{m}^N will decrease to zero for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, an empirical version of the law of total variance is almost satisfied for large ensemble sizes N . For our convergence proof we will need a more rigorous quantification of this fact in the form of exponential moment bounds of the empirical variance. Such bounds are delicate as the ensemble \mathbf{u}^N will likely show some Gaussian (tail behaviour) and thus $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \leq T} \exp(r\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N])]$ might not be finite for all values of $r \geq 0$. However, as $N \rightarrow \infty$ one would expect σ^N to become deterministic and as such any exponential moment should exist for N sufficiently large. We prove this fact in the following Lemma by employing a Grönwall argument.

Lemma 34. *Let $q \geq 0$ be arbitrary. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N > 2\beta q e^{(2\lambda+1)T}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \exp(q \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left(\frac{q(e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right].$$

in particular the q -th exponential moment of the path of $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}^N]$ exists up to time T , if the $(2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T})$ -th exponential moment of the initial empirical variance $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}^N]$ exists.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a} := 2\lambda + 1$ (see Assumption 2) and $\mathbf{b} := qe^{\mathbf{a}T}$. We define the process $\mathfrak{s}_t := 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$. Then, using inequality (53), we derive the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathfrak{s}_t &= 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] - 2\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt \leq (2\lambda - \mathbf{a}) 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\mathbf{m}_t \\ &= (2\lambda - \mathbf{a}) \mathfrak{s}_t dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\mathbf{m}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we derive from (51) the form of the quadratic variation of \mathfrak{s} and from (55) the estimate

$$d[\mathfrak{s}]_t = (2\mathbf{b})^2 e^{-2\mathbf{a}t} d[\mathbf{m}^N]_t \leq (2\mathbf{b})^2 e^{-2\mathbf{a}t} \frac{2\beta}{N} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt = 2 \frac{2\beta\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t}}{N} \mathfrak{s}_t dt.$$

These inequalities together with Itô's formula give us the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) &= \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{s}_t + \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) \frac{1}{2} d[\mathfrak{s}]_t \\ &\leq (2\lambda - \mathfrak{a}) \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathfrak{b}\beta e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{m}_t + \frac{2\beta\mathfrak{b}e^{-2\mathfrak{a}t}}{N} \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt \\ &= \left(2\lambda - \mathfrak{a} + \frac{2\beta\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t}}{N} \right) \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathfrak{b}\beta e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{m}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Due to our assumptions we have $\mathfrak{a} > 2\lambda + \frac{2\beta\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t}}{N}$ and thus derive the stochastic inequality

$$d \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) \leq 2\mathfrak{b}\beta e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{m}_t.$$

Since $2\mathfrak{b}e^{-\mathfrak{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{m}_t$ defines a local martingale, the stochastic Grönwall inequality [44] gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \exp(q \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\exp(\mathfrak{s}_t)} \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left(q/2 e^{\mathfrak{a}T} \int_0^T e^{-\mathfrak{a}s} ds \right) \mathbb{E} [\exp(\mathfrak{s}_0/2)] \\ &\leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left(\frac{q (e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 35. In the proof of Lemma 34 we used a standard testfunction for our Grönwall argument. Since we have good controls for the quadratic variation of \mathfrak{m} , we also could have just used the standard Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality in combination with a deterministic Grönwall Lemma. The usage of the stochastic Grönwall inequality is not necessary in our setting, however in [27] a similar testfunction and a novel stochastic Grönwall–Lyapunov inequality were used to derive uniform exponential moment bounds for SDEs satisfying an appropriate Lyapunov condition.

7.2 Quantitative propagation of chaos

Next we show propagation of chaos, i.e. that the system of interacting SPDEs (48) indeed converges (in an appropriate sense) to the McKean–Vlasov SPDE (28). For this we use a standard synchronous coupling approach, i.e. we compare (48) to a tensorized version of (28) defined on the same probability space. To this end we define conditionally⁵ independent copies \bar{u}^i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$ of the mean field process (28) to be the solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{u}_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^i) dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &\quad + \mathbb{C}_{\text{ov}Y} [\bar{u}_t^i, H(\bar{u}_t^i)] R_t^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(\bar{u}_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^i)]}{2} dt \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{W}^i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are the same Wiener processes that also drive the particle system (48). Furthermore we set $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^N := (\bar{u}^1, \dots, \bar{u}^N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$ and make the following definition.

Definition 36. We define the empirical observed accuracy

$$\mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| H(u_s^i) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [u_s]}{2} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

We also define the corresponding hitting times for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\sigma^k &:= \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] > k \}, \quad \tau_\sigma^{k,H} := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \sigma^{N,H}[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t^N] > k \}, \\ \tau_{\mathcal{R}}^k &:= \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_t^N) > k \}. \end{aligned}$$

⁵Conditioned on Y .

Definition 37. Furthermore we define the error of the law of large numbers by

$$\text{LLN}_H^N(T) := \int_0^T \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 + \left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 ds.$$

Now we are able prove convergence of the particle system with implicit rates.

Theorem 38. Let $\tau^k := \min \{ \tau_\sigma^k, \tau_\sigma^k, \tau_{\mathcal{R}}^k \}$, then for any $p \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $\kappa(T, k, p)$, such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq \min\{T, \tau^k\}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| r_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}^i \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, k, p) \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{LLN}_H^N(\min\{T, \tau^k\}))^p \right]$$

Proof. We note that since u^i and \bar{u}^i share the same initial conditions we have for any $t \geq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ that

$$\begin{aligned} r_t^i &= u_t^i - \bar{u}_t^i = \int_0^t d(u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i) \\ &= \int_0^t \mathcal{A}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_s^i) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i) d\bar{W}_s^i \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \left(dY_t - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} ds \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] R_s^{-1} (H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by using the concrete form of the observation process $dY_t = H(u_t^{\text{ref}})dt + \Gamma_t dV_t$ we derive from Itô's Lemma

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{A}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_s^i), u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i)) d\bar{W}_s^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i)) \circ \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \Gamma_s dV_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \left\langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \left(H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left| \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1/2} \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] R_s^{-1} (H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by forming the average and using the Lipschitz assumptions (2), as well as elementary Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities we derive that there exists a constant $\kappa_1(T) > 0$, only depending on

time, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_1(T) \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds + \mathbf{m}_t \\
&+ \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \left(\left\| H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2|R_s^{-1}| \right) ds \\
&+ 2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \left(|H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i)|^2 + |\mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s^i)]|^2 \right) ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
d\mathbf{m}_t &:= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i)) d\bar{W}_s^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \Gamma_s dV_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}
\end{aligned}$$

is a local martingale. Its concrete form will not matter to our further calculations as we intend to use the stochastic Grönwall lemma [44].

First we note that the (conditional) covariance operator $\mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] = \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)]$ is independent of $i = 1, \dots, N$ and that it can be uniformly bounded on any finite time interval $[0, T]$ due to the variance bound (31), which helps us ignore the quadratic covariation of \mathbf{m} and is thus especially suited for the one-sided Lipschitz conditions we encounter.

Next we note that

$$|\mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s^i)]|^2 \leq 2\text{Lip}(H)^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2|\mathbb{E}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s)]|^2.$$

Finally we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} + \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]) (H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i))' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i) (H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N])' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\
&\quad + \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\
&\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{\text{Lip}(H)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]|^2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} \\
&\quad + \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the notation of Definition 36 this allows us to further estimate inequality (56). Thus there

exists a constant $\kappa_2(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t (1 + (\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] + \sigma^{N,H}[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]) \mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N)) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \, ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t \mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N) \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{OvY}}[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_Y}}^2 \, ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t |\mathbb{E}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s)]|^2 \, ds + \mathbf{Im}_t. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Using the stopping time τ^k we thus derive that there exists a constant $\kappa_3(T, k)$ only depending on timeframe T and the stopping level k such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_3(T, k) \int_0^{\min\{t, \tau^k\}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \, ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_3(T, k) \text{LLN}_H^N(\min\{t, \tau^k\}) + \mathbf{Im}_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the stochastic Grönwall Lemma [44, Theorem 4, equation (4)], the claim of this Lemma follows immediately. \square

From this theorem one can also deduce the convergence in probability [32].

We say the convergence rates derived in Theorem 38 are implicit, as they require the processes to be stopped and the stopping times depend on the converging particle system itself. However on the stopped time intervals the rates are optimal in the sense that they correspond to the rates of convergence given by the law of large numbers. This is certainly far from the convergence result one would ultimately desire, but, for general signals and observation functions, nevertheless seems to be the current state of the art, even in the finite dimensional setting, where the same coupling method was used by [32] to obtain similar results for Lipschitz signals and linear observation functions. For bounded observation functions and observation data Y that is given by a Lipschitz continuous (w.r.t. time) rough path⁶, [15] were able to prove explicit convergence rates. They used a similar stopping argument as above together with tail bounds for higher order empirical moments of the interacting ensemble. With this they were able to derive a logarithmic decay $\mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{-1})$ of the error w.r.t. ensemble size N without stopping, which is still far from the desired convergence rate of the law of large numbers.

Also assuming the boundedness of the observation function H , we are able to prove the asymptotically, (almost) optimal convergence rate based on our exponential moment bounds in Lemma 34 and the following additional assumption on the initial distribution.

Assumption 39. *We assume that for any $q > 0$ there exists an $N_0(q) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0(q)} \mathbb{E} [\exp(q \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N])] < +\infty.$$

Remark 40. *This assumption is always satisfied for deterministic initial conditions, as for $u_0 \sim \delta_{v_0}$ for some $v_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ one has $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] = 0$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For Gaussian initial conditions this relates to the domain of the moment generating function of χ^2 -distributions and for general random variables to large deviations of the empirical covariance matrix.*

We will not investigate further when this assumption is satisfied and just assume it holds. Then we are able to prove the following theorem.

⁶Thus excluding Brownian observation noise that we treat here.

Theorem 41. For any $T < +\infty$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and any $\nu \in (1, 1/p)$ there exists an $\mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $\kappa(T, p, \nu) < +\infty$ such that for all $N \geq \mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, p, \nu) \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{LLN}_H^N(T))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu}. \quad (58)$$

and as a consequence we have for $\kappa(T, p) := \inf_{\nu \in (1, 1/p)} \kappa(T, p, \nu)$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, p) \mathbb{E} [\text{LLN}_H^N(T)]^p, \quad (59)$$

which in turn implies that for some constant $C(T, p, \|H\|_\infty) > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq C(T, p, \|H\|_\infty) N^{-p}, \quad (60)$$

Proof. First we note that inequality (57), which was derived in the proof of Theorem 38, can be further simplified when the observation function H is assumed to be bounded, as then both $\sigma^{N, H}[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]$ and $\mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N)$ are uniformly bounded and thus there exists a constant $\kappa_4(T)$, such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \kappa_4(T) \int_0^t (1 + \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds + \kappa_4(T) \text{LLN}_H^N(t) + \mathfrak{m}_t.$$

The stochastic Grönwall inequality [44] thus tells us that for any $p \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu, \nu > 1$ with $\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\nu} = 1$ and such that $p\nu < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq (c_{p\nu} + 1)^{1/\nu} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(p\mu \kappa_4(T) \int_0^T (1 + \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]) ds \right) \right] \kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{LLN}_H^N(t))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where

$$c_{p\nu} := \min \{4, 1/(p\nu)\} \frac{\pi p\nu}{\sin(\pi p\nu)} \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1/p} +\infty.$$

Now we first note that $\mu = \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}$. Due to the exponential moment bounds in Lemma 34 we have that for $q := \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(p\mu \kappa_4(T) \int_0^T \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \right) \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left(\frac{q (e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right]$$

and by Assumption 39 there exists an

$$\mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu) := N_0(q) = N_0 \left(2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \right) = N_0 \left(2 \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T e^{(2\lambda+1)T} \right)$$

such that

$$\kappa_5(T, p\mu) := \sup_{N \geq \mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu)} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2 \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T e^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right] < +\infty$$

and therefore for any $N \geq \mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \underbrace{(c_{p\nu} + 1)^{1/\nu} e^{\left(\frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T\right)} \kappa_5 \left(T, \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \right) \kappa_4(T)}_{:= \kappa_5(T, p, \nu)} \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{LLN}_H^N(t))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu},$$

which proves our first claim. From this one can directly deduce (59) via the Hölder inequality and using the fact that for $\nu \rightarrow 1$ both $\mathcal{N}(T, p, \nu)$ and $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$ blow up, i.e.

$$\mathcal{N}(T, p, \nu), \kappa(T, p, \nu) \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1} +\infty,$$

as well the blow up $\kappa(T, p, \nu) \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1/p} +\infty$, which in turn implies that the minimizer of $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$ for every fixed T and P must lie inside the interval $(1, 1/p)$ and therefore (59) is proven. Finally we are left to show (60). By Definition 37 the term $\text{LLN}_H^N(T)$ consists of an error of the empirical mean and an error of the empirical covariance. First we estimate the error of the empirical mean. Using the conditional independence of $(\bar{u}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ and the law of total variance we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 \right] ds &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 \right] ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \frac{\text{Var}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]}{N} ds \right] \leq \int_0^T \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N} ds = \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta (e^{\lambda T} - 1)}{\lambda N}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Next we aim to dominate the error of the covariance. To this end we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Again we use the conditional independence of $(\bar{u}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right]}{N} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right]}{N} \leq \frac{\|H\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{u}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]}{N} \end{aligned}$$

By using the bound (46) with $k, l \geq \|H\|_\infty$ that was derived in the proof of Theorem 28 for the second absolute moments of \bar{u} , we can show that there exists a constant $C_1(T, \|H\|_\infty) > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] ds \leq \frac{C_1(T, \|H\|_\infty)}{N} \quad (63)$$

Finally we note that similar to (62) one can easily deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \left\| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \right\|^2 \right] + 2 \left\| \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)'] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\|H\|_\infty^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N} + \left\| \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we can thus derive by the boundedness (46) of the second absolute moment of \bar{u} , that there exists a constant $C_2(T, \|H\|_\infty) > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{u}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] ds \leq \frac{C_2(T, \|H\|_\infty)}{N} \quad (64)$$

By the definition of LLN_H^N (in Definition 37), combining the inequalities (62),(63),(64) with (59) concludes our proof. \square

Remark 42. *Since the constant $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$ blows up for $\nu \rightarrow 1$ or $\nu \rightarrow 1/p$, we can not simply take the limit $p \rightarrow 1$ in (59). As $p < 1$, the p -th power is concave and thus we can not deduce that (59) would also hold if the power on the left-hand-side of the inequality would be written outside! We thus say that (59) gives almost optimal rates in the sense that this inequality holds for all $p < 1$, but not for the optimal value $p = 1$, where the the expectations on both sides are indeed of the same nature. In a similar sense the stronger inequality (58) shows almost optimal rates, in the sense that it holds for all $\nu > 1$ but not for $\nu = 1$, the case where the moments on both sides are of the same order.*

Besides blowing up when $p \rightarrow 1$, the constant $\kappa(T, p)$ also grows hyperexponentially in T ! While Theorem 41 thus provides us with (almost) optimal convergence rates, the constants involved are far too large to give useful a priori error estimates even on moderate time intervals.

Remark 43 (Literature). *In the finite dimensional and linear Gaussian setting this problem has been tackled by a large number of papers. In this setting a first propagation of chaos result was achieved by [20], even showing uniform in time convergence for stable signals. This result has by now been followed up by several works [7],[8],[9] treating unstable signals by making use of the Riccati equation that appears in this setting. An alternative extension of the EnKBF to nonlinear signals using a Taylor-inspired linearization around the mean, similar to the extended Kalman–Bucy filter (Remark (18)), was considered in [19]. The linearization there also allowed for the use of a decoupled Riccati equation. While an extension of these uniform in time results to our nonlinear setting is certainly highly desirable, we do not investigate it in this paper.*

References

- [1] S. Afshar, F. Germ, K. Morris, *Extended Kalman filter based observer design for semilinear infinite-dimensional systems*. arXiv:2202.07797
- [2] N.U. Ahmed, M. Fuhrman, *On Filtering Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Journal of Functional Analysis 143, 180–204, 1997.
- [3] D. J. Albers, P.-A. Blancquart, M. E. Levine, E. E. Seylabi, A. M. Stuart, *Ensemble Kalman Methods With Constraints*. Inverse Problems, Vol. 35, Number 9, 2019.
- [4] A. Bain, D. Crisan, *Fundamentals of stochastic filtering*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability 60, Springer, 2009.
- [5] A. Bensoussan, *Filtrage optimal des systemes lineaires*. Dunod (1971).
- [6] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, *On the Mathematical Theory of Ensemble (Linear-Gaussian) Kalman-Bucy Filtering*. arxiv 2006.08843
- [7] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, *On the stability of matrix-valued Riccati diffusions*. Electronic Journal of Probability. Vol. 24, paper No. 24, 2019.
- [8] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, K. Kamatani, B. Remillard, *On one-dimensional Riccati diffusions*. Ann. Appl. Probab. 29 (2), pp. 1127 – 1187, 2019.

- [9] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, A. Niclas, *A perturbation analysis of stochastic matrix Riccati diffusions*. Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques. Vol. 56, No. 2., 884–916, 2020.
- [10] C. Boullanger, J. Schiltz, *Nonlinear filtering with an infinite dimensional signal process*. PORTUGALIAE MATHEMATICA, Vol. 56 Fasc. 3, 1999.
- [11] V. I. Bogachev, *DIFFERENTIABLE MEASURES AND THE MALLIAVIN CALCULUS*. Journal of Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 87, No. 4. 1997.
- [12] C. E. A. Brett, K. F. Lam, K. J. H. Law, D. S. McCormick, M. R. Scott and A. M. Stuart, *Accuracy and Stability of Filters for Dissipative PDEs*. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, Vol. 245 (1), pp. 34–45, 2013.
- [13] E. Calvello, S. Reich, A. M. Stuart, *Ensemble Kalman Methods: A Mean Field Perspective*. arxiv 2209.11371
- [14] J. A. Carrillo, F. Hoffmann, A. M. Stuart, U. Vaes, *The Ensemble Kalman Filter in the Near-Gaussian Setting*. arxiv 2212.13239
- [15] M. Coghi, T. Nilssen, N. Nüsken, S. Reich, *Rough McKean–Vlasov dynamics for robust ensemble Kalman filtering*. arXiv:2107.06621, 2021.
- [16] D. Crisan, J. Xiong *Approximate McKean–Vlasov representations for a class of SPDEs*. Stochastics, Vol. 82, 2010.
- [17] R. F. Curtain, *A survey of infinite-dimensional filtering*. SIAM Review Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 395–411 (1975)
- [18] G. Da Prato, *Direct Solution of a Riccati Equation Arising in Stochastic Control Theory*. Appl. Math. Optim. 11:191–208 (1984)
- [19] P. Del Moral, A. Kurtzmann, J. Tugaut, *On the Stability and the Uniform Propagation of Chaos of a Class of Extended Ensemble Kalman–Bucy Filters*. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, Vol. 55, No.1., 119–155, 2017
- [20] P. Del Moral, J. Tugaut, *On the stability and the uniform propagation of chaos properties of Ensemble Kalman-Bucy filters*. Annals of Applied Probability. Vol. 28, No. 2., 790–850 2018.
- [21] S. W. Ertel, W. Stannat, *Analysis of the Ensemble Kalman-Bucy Filter for correlated observation noise*. arxiv 2205.14253
- [22] G. Evensen, *Sequential data assimilation with a non-linear quasi-geostrophic model using Monte Carlo methods to forecast error statistics*. J. Geophys. Res 99(C5), Vol.10, 143–162, 1994
- [23] G. Evensen, *Data assimilation : The ensemble Kalman filter*. Springer, Berlin, 2007
- [24] P. L. Falb, *Infinite-dimensional filtering: The Kalman-Bucy filter in Hilbert space*. Information and Control 11 (1967) 102–137.
- [25] W. Hong, S.-S. Hu, W. Liu, *McKean-Vlasov SDEs and SPDEs with Locally Monotone Coefficients*. arXiv:2205.04043, 2022.
- [26] F. Le Gland, V. Monbet, V.D. Tran, *Large sample asymptotics for the ensemble Kalman filter*. The Oxford Handbook of Nonlinear Filtering, chapter 22, pp. 598–631, 2011.
- [27] A. Hudde, M. Hutzenthaler, S. Mazzonetto, *A stochastic Gronwall inequality and applications to moments, strong completeness, strong local Lipschitz continuity, and perturbation*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 57(2): 603–626 (May 2021). DOI: 10.1214/20-AIHP1064

- [28] I. Kasanický, *Ensemble Kalman filter on high and infinite dimensional spaces*. PhD-thesis at Charles University, 2016.
- [29] D. T.B. Kelly, K. J. H. Law, A. M. Stuart, *Well-Posedness And Accuracy Of The Ensemble Kalman Filter In Discrete And Continuous Time*. *Nonlinearity*. Vol. 27, No. 10.,2579–2603, 2014
- [30] V. Kubelka, B. Maslowski, *Filtering of Gaussian processes in Hilbert spaces*. arxiv 1903.11464
- [31] T. Lange, *Derivation of ensemble Kalman–Bucy filters with unbounded nonlinear coefficients*. *Nonlinearity* 35 (2), 1061–1092, 2021.
- [32] T. Lange, W. Stannat, *Mean field limit of Ensemble Square Root filters - discrete and continuous time*. *Foundations of Data Science*, Vol. 3, no. 3, 563–588, 2021.
- [33] J.-L. Lions, *Optimal Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1971
- [34] Wei Liu, Michael Röckner, *SPDE in Hilbert space with locally monotone coefficients*. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, Vol. 259, Issue 11, pages 2902–2922, 2010.
- [35] J. Mandel, L. Cobb, J.D. Beezeley, *On the convergence of the ensemble Kalman filter*. *Applications of Mathematics*, Vol. 56, pp. 533–541, 2011.
- [36] D. Oliver, A. Reynolds, N. Liu, *Inverse Theory for Petroleum Reservoir Characterization and History Matching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2008.
- [37] S. Omatu, J. Seinfeld
Distributed Parameter Systems: Theory and Applications. Oxford Mathematical Monographs, 1989.
- [38] H. Owhadi, C.- Scovel, T. Sullivan, *Brittleness of Bayesian inference under finite information in a continuous world*. *Electron. J. Statist.* 9(1): pp. 1-79 (2015).
- [39] E. Pardoux, *Stochastic partial differential equations and filtering of diffusion processes*. *Stochastics*, 1979, Vol. 3. pp. 127-167
- [40] E. Pardoux, *Equations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques non linéaires monotones*. Thèse, Université Paris XI, 1975.
- [41] S. Pathiraja, W. Stannat, S. Reich, *McKean-Vlasov SDEs in nonlinear filtering*. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol. 59 , no. 6, 4188—4215, 2021.
- [42] P. Sakov, P. R. Oke, *A deterministic formulation of the ensemble Kalman filter: an alternative to ensemble square root filters*. *Tellus A*. Vol. 60, No. 2., 361–371, 2008.
- [43] C. Prévôt, M. Röckner, *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1905. Springer, Berlin (2007).
- [44] M. Scheutzow, *A stochastic Gronwall lemma*. *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.*, Vol. 16, no. 2, 4 pp., 2013.
- [45] M. Scheutzow, *Uniqueness and non-uniqueness of solutions of Vlasov-McKean equations*. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, Vol. 43, Iss. 2, 2009.
- [46] C. Schillings, A. M. Stuart, *Analysis of the Ensemble Kalman Filter for Inverse Problems*. *SIAM J Numerical Analysis* 55(3), 1264-1290, 2017.
- [47] C. Schillings, A. M. Stuart, *Convergence Analysis of Ensemble Kalman Inversion: The Linear, Noisy Case*. *Applicable Analysis* 97, 107–123, 2018.

- [48] A. Taghvaei, J. de Wiljes, P. G. Mehta, S. Reich, *Kalman Filter and its Modern Extensions for the Continuous-time Nonlinear Filtering Problem*. ASME. J. Dyn. Sys., Meas., Control., 140, 030904–030904–11, 2017.
- [49] A. Taghvaei, P. G. Mehta, *A survey of feedback particle filter and related controlled interacting particle systems (CIPS)*. Annual Reviews in Control, 2023.
- [50] P. J. van Leeuwen, *A consistent interpretation of the stochastic version of the Ensemble Kalman filter*. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 146, 2815–2825, 2020.
- [51] T. Yang, P. G. Mehta, S. P. Meyn *Feedback particle filter with mean-field coupling*. Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 7909–7916, 2011.
- [52] T. Yang, P. G. Mehta, S. P. Meyn, *Feedback particle filter*. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Vol. 58, 2465–2480, 2013.
- [53] W. Yu, *Infinite dimensional affine term structure models under incomplete information*. PhD-thesis at Universitaet Freiburg, DOI: 10.6094/UNIFR/14218