

---

# Linearization Turns Neural Operators into Function-Valued Gaussian Processes

---

Emilia Magnani\*   Marvin Pförtner\*   Tobias Weber\*   Philipp Hennig

Tübingen AI Center  
University of Tübingen  
Tübingen, Germany

## Abstract

Modeling dynamical systems, e.g. in climate and engineering sciences, often necessitates solving partial differential equations. Neural operators are deep neural networks designed to learn nontrivial solution operators of such differential equations from data. As for all statistical models, the predictions of these models are imperfect and exhibit errors. Such errors are particularly difficult to spot in the complex nonlinear behaviour of dynamical systems. We introduce a new framework for approximate Bayesian uncertainty quantification in neural operators using function-valued Gaussian processes. Our approach can be interpreted as a probabilistic analogue of the concept of currying from functional programming and provides a practical yet theoretically sound way to apply the linearized Laplace approximation to neural operators. In a case study on Fourier neural operators, we show that, even for a discretized input, our method yields a Gaussian closure—a structured Gaussian process posterior capturing the uncertainty in the output function of the neural operator, which can be evaluated at an arbitrary set of points. The method adds minimal prediction overhead, can be applied post-hoc without retraining the neural operator, and scales to large models and datasets. We showcase the efficacy of our approach through applications to different types of partial differential equations.

## 1 Introduction

Partial differential equations (PDEs) are a powerful language for describing the complex interactions that arise in dynamical systems. Solving PDEs is therefore a crucial research topic for explaining the dynamics inherent in physical, biological, and engineering systems. In scientific machine learning, models predicting physical phenomena such as weather or climate are often trained to approximate the solution of an underlying PDE from data.

Learning to solve PDEs is closely related to operator learning: Instead of learning to solve a specific PDE, it can be beneficial to learn the operator that maps a functional parameter of the PDE (such as initial values, boundary conditions, force fields, or material parameters) to the solution associated with the given parameter. This approach is powerful because it learns to solve entire classes of PDEs simultaneously. Additionally, learning mappings between function spaces can make models discretization invariant [1], which is beneficial for training efficiency. This is in contrast to classical numerical solvers like finite difference or finite element methods that discretize the space on a mesh.

Neural operators, and in particular Fourier neural operators (FNOs), stand out among the deep architectures that are able to effectively learn operators and are now widely used in practice. Their applications span various domains such as weather forecasting [2, 3], fluid dynamics [4–6], and automotive aerodynamics [7].

---

\*Equal contribution.

The complex nature of dynamic systems makes errors in predictions difficult to detect. Uncertainty quantification aims to account for these errors by providing an estimate of prediction quality. However, current methods in operator learning are usually not able to provide such an estimate, hindering their utility in applications.

To address these issues, we develop the *neural operator Laplace approximation* (NOLA), a novel framework for approximate Bayesian uncertainty quantification [8] in neural operators using function-valued Gaussian processes. Our method leverages the concept of currying in functional programming to enable the application of the linearized Laplace approximation [9] to neural operators. We then show that the resulting approximate Bayesian posterior over the parameters of the neural operator induces a function-valued Gaussian process belief over the operator learned by the network. By considering Fourier neural operators, we show that NOLA provides a structured Gaussian process posterior, capturing the uncertainty in the neural operator’s output function and allowing for efficient evaluation at arbitrary points. NOLA is practical, introduces minimal additional computational overhead, and can be applied post-hoc, without the necessity to retrain the neural operator. Moreover, it scales efficiently to large models and datasets and, just as neural operators, is applicable to different types of PDEs.

In Section 2 we provide a brief overview of neural operators, (multi-output) Gaussian processes, and the linearized Laplace approximation. In Section 3 we first develop Gaussian processes taking values in (infinite-dimensional) Banach spaces of functions, as well as the notion of *Gaussian currying*, which formalizes their equivalence to multi-output Gaussian processes. We then use Gaussian currying to construct function-valued Gaussian processes from neural operators with Gaussian weight posteriors. We discuss related work in Section 4 and showcase the efficacy on different PDE datasets in Section 5.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Neural operators

*Neural operators* (NOs) [1] are neural network architectures that map between (infinite-dimensional) Banach spaces of functions. More precisely, a neural operator is a function  $\mathbf{F}: \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ , where

- $\mathbb{A}$  is a Banach space of functions  $\mathbf{a}: \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbb{A}'}}$  with domain  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{A}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbb{A}}}$ ,
- $\mathbb{U}$  is a Banach space of functions  $\mathbf{u}: \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbb{U}'}}$  with domain  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbb{U}}}$ ,
- $\mathbb{W}$  is a set of parameters (typically  $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  or  $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ ).

To keep the training process computationally tractable, neural operators are trained on datasets  $\{(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)}), \mathbf{u}^{(i)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{U}}^{(i)}))\}_{i=1}^n$  consisting of pairs of input and corresponding output functions  $(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{U}$  that are discretized at finitely many points  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)} \in (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{A}})^{n_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)}}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{U}}^{(i)} \in (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}})^{n_{\mathbb{U}}^{(i)}}$ , respectively. The training objective is typically given by the empirical risk

$$R(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{U}}^{(i)}), \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)}), \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{U}}^{(i)}))$$

or a regularized version of the empirical risk. Neural operators have originally been motivated and are commonly used to learn the solution operator of non-linear, parametric partial differential equations. In this case, we typically have  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{A}} = \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$ , the input functions  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{A}$  correspond to parameters and/or initial conditions of the PDE, and the output functions  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}$  are the corresponding solutions of the PDE (at later time points). There are many different realizations of the abstract neural operator framework, including low-rank neural operators [1], (multiple) graph neural operators [10, 11], and (spherical) Fourier neural operators [3, 12]. Due to their recent popularity, the later parts of this work specifically address Fourier neural operators.

#### 2.1.1 Fourier neural operators

In Section 3.2.1 we will focus in particular on *Fourier neural operators* (FNOs) [12], neural operator architectures that apply all spatially global operations in the spectral domain. An FNO  $\mathbf{F}$  transforms

a periodic input function  $\mathbf{a}$  into a periodic output function  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w}_q)$  with

$$\mathbf{v}_i^{(l+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := \sigma^{(l)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left( \left( \mathbf{R}_{kij}^{(l)} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_j^{(l)}) \right)_k \right)_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} \right) (\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{W}_{ij}^{(l)} \mathbf{v}_j^{(l)}(\mathbf{x})$$

for  $l = 1, \dots, L-1$  and  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w}_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_v}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the Fourier transform of a periodic function.<sup>2</sup>  $\mathbf{p}: \mathbb{R}^{d'_a} \times \mathbb{W}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'_v}$  and  $\mathbf{q}: \mathbb{R}^{d'_v} \times \mathbb{W}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'_v}$  are parametric functions called *lifting* and *projection*, respectively.  $\mathbf{R}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{C}^{k_{\max} \times d'_v \times d'_v}$  and  $\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_v \times d'_v}$ , and  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}_p, \mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \mathbf{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)}, \mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}, \mathbf{w}_q)$ . The map  $\mathbf{v}^{(l)} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}^{(l+1)}$  is the  $l$ -th *Fourier layer*. If the inputs  $\mathbf{a}$  are discretized on a regular grid,  $\mathcal{F}$  can be computed by a real fast Fourier transform (rfft).

## 2.2 (Multi-output) Gaussian processes

As we aim to generalize the notion of a Gaussian process later, we provide the formal definition of Gaussian processes from mathematical statistics that is not often used in machine learning. A *Gaussian process* (GP) with index set  $\mathbb{A}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  is a function  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\omega \mapsto (\mathbf{f}(a_1, \omega), \dots, \mathbf{f}(a_n, \omega))$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued Gaussian random variable for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ . We use the shorthand  $\mathbf{f}(a) := \mathbf{f}(a, \cdot)$ . The *mean function* of  $\mathbf{f}$  is given by  $a \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\mathbf{f}(a)]$  and the *covariance function* of  $\mathbf{f}$  is given by  $(a_1, a_2) \mapsto \text{Cov}_{\mathbb{P}}[\mathbf{f}(a_1), \mathbf{f}(a_2)]$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k)$  that  $\mathbf{f}$  is a Gaussian process with mean function  $m$  and covariance function  $k$ .

If  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{A}}$  is equipped with the product topology  $\tau$ , then  $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \omega)$  is a function-valued random variable with values in  $(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{A}}, \mathcal{B}(\tau))$ . This justifies interpreting GPs as probability measures over functions  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

It is common to extend the concept of a GP to finitely many output dimensions. A  $d'$ -*output Gaussian process* with index set  $\mathbb{A}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  is a function  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  such that  $\omega \mapsto (\mathbf{f}(a_1, \omega)^\top \ \dots \ \mathbf{f}(a_n, \omega)^\top)^\top$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d'}$ -valued Gaussian random variable for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ . We use the shorthand  $\mathbf{f}(a) := \mathbf{f}(a, \cdot)$ . The *mean function* of  $\mathbf{f}$  is given by  $a \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\mathbf{f}(a)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  and the *covariance function* of  $\mathbf{f}$  is given by  $(a_1, a_2) \mapsto \text{Cov}_{\mathbb{P}}[\mathbf{f}(a_1), \mathbf{f}(a_2)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d' \times d'}$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, \mathbf{K})$  that  $\mathbf{f}$  is a multi-output Gaussian process with mean function  $m$  and covariance function  $\mathbf{K}$ . While the notion of a multi-output Gaussian process might seem more general than the notion of a Gaussian process, it is possible to “emulate” a function with multiple outputs by augmenting the input space of a Gaussian process:

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space,  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ ,  $\mathbb{I} = \{1, \dots, d'\}$ , and  $\mathbf{f}: (\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{I}) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $(\mathbf{f}(a, \cdot))_i = \mathbf{f}((a, i), \cdot)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{I}$  ( $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely). Then  $\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, \mathbf{K})$  if and only if  $\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k)$ , where*

$$(m(a))_i = m(a, i)$$

for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , as well as

$$(\mathbf{K}(a_1, a_2))_{ij} = k((a_1, i), (a_2, j))$$

for all  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{I}$ .

## 2.3 Linearized Laplace approximation

The *linearized Laplace approximation* (LLA) [9, 13, 14] is a conceptually simple, yet effective [15] method for obtaining an approximate posterior distribution over the parameters  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  of a neural network  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ . It applies whenever the objective function  $R$  used to train the neural network is (equivalent to) a negative log-posterior

$$R(\mathbf{w}) = -\log p(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{D}) = -\log p(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \mid \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w})) + \text{const.}$$

<sup>2</sup>More precisely, the operator  $\mathcal{F}: L_2(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \ell_2(\mathbb{C})$  maps a real-valued square-integrable function on the  $d$ -dimensional torus to the coefficients of the corresponding Fourier series.

of the network parameters given data  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$ . It is common for the prior over the parameters to be Gaussian, in which case  $-\log p(\mathbf{w})$  acts as an L2-regularizer on the parameters. During training, we attempt to find a local minimum  $\mathbf{w}^*$  of the objective function  $R$ , i.e. a maximum a-posteriori (MAP) estimator of the network parameters given the data.

Following Immer et al. [9], we approximate the posterior of the network weights as follows: First, we linearize the model using a first-order Taylor approximation in the weights around the MAP estimator  $\mathbf{w}^*$

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) \approx \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}^*) + \text{D}_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)$$

Afterwards, we compute a second-order Taylor approximation of the negative log-posterior  $R_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}$  of the linearized network at the MAP  $\mathbf{w}^*$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{w}) &:= -\log p(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(\mathbf{y}^{(i)} | \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w})) + \text{const.} \\ &\approx R(\mathbf{w}^*) + \underbrace{\nabla R(\mathbf{w}^*)^\top}_{\approx 0}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) + \text{const.} \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

with  $\mathbf{P} := -\text{H}_{\mathbf{w}} \log p(\mathbf{w})|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*} + \mathbf{G}$ , where

$$\mathbf{G} := -\sum_{i=1}^n \text{D}_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w})\Big|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*} \text{H}_{\mathbf{f}} \log p(\mathbf{y}^{(i)} | \mathbf{f})\Big|_{\mathbf{f}=\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w}^*)} \text{D}_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w})\Big|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*}^\top$$

is the so-called *generalized Gauss-Newton* (GGN) matrix [16]. The GGN is guaranteed to be positive-semidefinite. Equation (2.1) is the negative log-density of a (potentially degenerate) multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mathbf{w}^*$  and covariance matrix  $\mathbf{P}^\dagger$ , i.e.

$$p(\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w} | \mathcal{D}) = \exp R(\mathbf{w}) \approx \exp R_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{w}) \approx \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{P}^\dagger).$$

This Gaussian distribution is referred to as the *linearized Laplace approximation* of  $p(\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w} | \mathcal{D})$ . Under the linearized model, the approximate Gaussian posterior over the weights induces a tractable posterior predictive over the output of the neural network [9, 17]. More precisely, using closure properties of Gaussian distributions under affine maps, one can show that the pushforward of the LLA posterior through  $\mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{w}^*}^{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$  defines a ( $d'$ -output) Gaussian process

$$\mathbf{f} | \mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{GP}\left(\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{w}^*), (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \mapsto \text{D}_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{w})\Big|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*} \mathbf{P}^\dagger \text{D}_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{w})\Big|_{\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{w}^*}^\top\right).$$

### 3 NOLA: The neural operator Laplace approximation

In this section, we develop the *neural operator Laplace approximation* (NOLA). NOLA constructs (approximate) Bayesian neural operators by applying linearized Laplace approximation to neural operators post training. It can be applied to existing trained models as a post-processing step and does not require expensive retraining. Furthermore, NOLA employs the framework of function-valued Gaussian processes to quantify uncertainty in the output of neural operators. To that end, we first develop the concept of a function-valued Gaussian process and draw an important parallel with currying in functional programming. Figure 1 illustrates the main steps comprising our methodology.

#### 3.1 Function-valued Gaussian processes and Gaussian Currying

As seen in Section 2.3, given a Gaussian belief over the parameters of a neural network  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ , model linearization yields a (multi-output) Gaussian process belief over the function learned by the neural network. However, this is not immediately applicable to neural operators, since their outputs do not lie in  $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$ , but in a potentially infinite-dimensional Banach space of functions. Hence, we need to generalize (multi-output) Gaussian processes to the notion of a *Banach-valued Gaussian process*.




Figure 1: Graphical illustration of the steps involved in computing a *neural operator Laplace approximation* (NOLA). A trained neural operator  $F$  (top left) is converted into an equivalent neural network  $f$  with outputs in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_U}$  using (reverse) carrying (top right). It is then possible to apply the linearized Laplace approximation to  $f$ , which produces a Gaussian process posterior  $f$  quantifying the uncertainty about the function learned by  $f$  (bottom right). Finally, we can use Gaussian carrying to transform  $f$  into a function-valued Gaussian process posterior  $F$  over the operator learned by the neural operator  $F$  (bottom left).

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a real separable Banach space. A  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued *Gaussian process* with index set  $\mathbb{A}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  is a function  $F: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  such that  $\omega \mapsto (F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega))$  is a joint<sup>3</sup>, i.e.  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n})$ -valued, Gaussian random variable for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ .

As above, we use the shorthand  $F(a) := F(a, \cdot)$ . Moreover, if we equip the vector space  $\mathbb{U}^{\mathbb{A}}$  of (linear and non-linear) operators  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  with the product topology  $\tau$ , then the map  $\omega \mapsto F(\cdot, \omega)$  is a Gaussian random variable with values in  $(\mathbb{U}^{\mathbb{A}}, \mathcal{B}(\tau))$ . This warrants the interpretation of  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian processes as *Gaussian random operators*.

In the context of neural operators,  $\mathbb{U}$  is a Banach space of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_U}$ -valued functions on a common domain  $\mathbb{D}_U$ . In this case, we can show that  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian processes are closely related to multi-output Gaussian processes with an augmented input space. This is in analogy to Lemma 2.1, but requires some additional technical assumptions.

**Theorem 3.1** (Proof in Appendix A.2). *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  be a probability space and  $\mathbb{U}$  a real separable Banach space of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_U}$ -valued functions with domain  $\mathbb{D}_U$  such that all evaluation maps  $\delta_x: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_U}, u \mapsto u(x)$  are continuous. Let  $F: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  and  $f: (\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{D}_U) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_U}$  such that  $F(a, \cdot)(x) = f((a, x), \cdot)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{D}_U$  ( $P$ -almost surely). Then*

(i)  $f$  is a  $d_U$ -output Gaussian process if  $F$  is a  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian process,

and, if Assumption A.1 holds for  $\mathbb{L}_\delta := \{u \mapsto \delta_x(u)_i : x \in \mathbb{D}_U \wedge i = 1, \dots, d_U\}$ ,

(ii)  $F$  is a  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian process if  $f$  is a  $d_U$ -output Gaussian process.

Theorem 3.1 provides a valuable insight into the abstract concept of function-valued Gaussian processes. It establishes that function-valued Gaussian processes are equivalent to (multi-output)

<sup>3</sup>See Remark A.1.

Gaussian processes with augmented input spaces. This equivalence enables the translation of abstract function-valued objects into computationally feasible structures (real-valued Gaussian processes).

**Gaussian Currying** As a useful intuition, we note that Theorem 3.1 constitutes a probabilistic analogue of the concept of *currying* from functional programming (and category theory more generally). The Theorem shows the equivalence of the (vector-valued) Gaussian random function  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  and the Gaussian random operator  $\mathbf{F}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'})$  with  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ .

*Example 3.1* (Currying a Continuous Bivariate Gaussian Process). Let  $f \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k)$  be a bivariate 2-output Gaussian process with index set  $\mathbb{R}^2$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  with ( $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely) continuous paths. For instance, this assumption is fulfilled if  $m$  is continuous and  $k$  is a multivariate Matérn covariance function [18]. Then  $a \mapsto f(a, \cdot)$  is a function-valued Gaussian process. More precisely, Theorem 3.1 shows that the map  $\mathbf{F}: \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R}), (a, \omega) \mapsto (x \mapsto f((a, x), \omega))$  is a  $C(\mathbb{R})$ -valued Gaussian process.

Thus, an intuitive way to understand function-valued Gaussian processes is as objects that, when evaluated, return a Gaussian process. Currying can also be used to relate the mean and covariance functions of function-valued (or more generally Banach-valued) Gaussian processes, and their counterparts defined on the corresponding multi-output Gaussian process. The rather technical definitions of mean and covariance functions of Banach-valued Gaussian processes are in Appendix A.2.

### 3.2 Linearization turns neural operators into function-valued Gaussian processes

Having introduced function-valued Gaussian processes in the previous section, we can now use the notion to build NOLA, i.e. construct (approximate) Bayesian neural operators. We delineate the key components of our methodology into different steps, which are visually represented in Figure 1.

**Step 0** Let  $\mathbf{F}: \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{U} \subset (\mathbb{R}^{d'_{\mathbb{U}}})^{\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}}$  be a neural operator as in Section 2.1 with  $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{R}^p$ .

**Step 1** Using currying on  $\mathbf{F}$ , we define the function

$$\mathbf{f}: (\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}) \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'_{\mathbb{U}}}, ((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w}) \mapsto \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}).$$

**Step 2** Assume that we have a posterior Gaussian belief  $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  over the parameters of the network. In this work, we will obtain the posterior over  $\mathbf{w}$  via Laplace approximation, but it could also have originated from other (approximate) inference schemes such as variational inference or (approximate) moment matching. Since  $\mathbf{f}$  has values in  $\mathbb{R}^{d'_{\mathbb{U}}}$ , we can, as in Section 2.3, linearize the model around  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ :

$$\mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w}) \approx \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\text{lin}}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\mu}) + \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{w})|_{\mathbf{w}=\boldsymbol{\mu}} (\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\mu})$$

to arrive at an induced approximate  $d'_{\mathbb{U}}$ -output Gaussian process belief with index set  $\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$

$$\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP} \left( \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\mu}), ((\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x}_1), (\mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)) \mapsto \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x}_1), \mathbf{w})|_{\mathbf{w}=\boldsymbol{\mu}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{x}_2), \mathbf{w})|_{\mathbf{w}=\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\top} \right).$$

**Step 3** Finally, we can use Gaussian currying to construct a Gaussian random operator from  $\mathbf{f}$ . Namely, we define the function

$$\mathbf{F}: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}, (\mathbf{a}, \omega) \mapsto (\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{f}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), \omega)).$$

Under some technical assumptions about  $\mathbb{U}$ , Theorem 3.1 then shows that  $\mathbf{F}$  is a  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian process. For the spaces  $\mathbb{U}$  considered in the context of neural operators, these assumptions are virtually always met. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})(\mathbf{x})] &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\mu})(\mathbf{x}), & \text{and} \\ \text{Cov}[\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_1)(\mathbf{x}_1), \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_2)(\mathbf{x}_2)] &= \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}_1)|_{\mathbf{w}=\boldsymbol{\mu}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}_2)|_{\mathbf{w}=\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\top}. \end{aligned}$$

### 3.2.1 Case study: Bayesian Fourier neural operators

The above exposition applies generally to operator-valued models. Applying it specifically to Fourier neural operators leads to a particularly efficient representation of the function-valued posterior process. For simplicity of exposition, we limit ourselves to a so-called last-layer Laplace approximation, in which only the parameters  $\mathbf{w}_{L-1} := (\mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}, \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)})$  are treated probabilistically [19]. However, we would like to point out that it is possible to proceed with a full Laplace approximation over all parameters  $\mathbf{w}$ . For an input  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{A}$ , we can factorize the FNO as

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}) = \underbrace{(\mathbf{q}(\cdot, \mathbf{w}_q) \circ \sigma^{(L-1)})}_{=:\tilde{\mathbf{q}}} \left( \mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_{L-1}) \right),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_i^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_{L-1}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left( \mathbf{R}_{:ij}^{(L-1)} \odot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{:j}^{(L-1)} \right) (\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \mathbf{W}_{ij}^{(L-1)} \mathbf{v}_j^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \sum_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{R}_{kij}^{(L-1)}) \underbrace{\operatorname{Re}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{kj}^{(L-1)}) \cos(\langle \omega_k, \mathbf{x} \rangle)}_{=:\phi_{kj}(\mathbf{x})} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \sum_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{R}_{kij}^{(L-1)}) \underbrace{(-1) \operatorname{Im}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{kj}^{(L-1)}) \sin(\langle \omega_k, \mathbf{x} \rangle)}_{=:\varphi_{kj}(\mathbf{x})} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{d'_v} \mathbf{W}_{ij}^{(L-1)} \underbrace{\mathbf{v}_j^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x})}_{=:\psi_j(\mathbf{x})}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{kj}^{(L-1)} := \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{v}_j^{(L-1)})_k \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_{\max}\}$ . We note that  $\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_{L-1})$  is linear in  $\mathbf{w}_{L-1}$ . Thus, assuming a Gaussian belief over  $\mathbf{w}_{L-1} \cong (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}), \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}), \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)})$  induces a (multi-output) Gaussian process belief  $\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)} \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}})$  with  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}} = \mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_{L-1}^*)$  over  $\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}$  is the sum of three (dependent) parametric Gaussian processes with feature functions  $\phi_{kj}$ ,  $\varphi_{kj}$ , and  $\psi_j$ , respectively. Consequently, the function-valued GP induced by the linearized FNO is given by

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x})) (\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x})),$$

i.e.  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathbf{m}_a, \mathbf{K}_a)$  with

$$\mathbf{m}_a(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w}^*)(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{K}_a(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{z}^{(L-1)}}(\mathbf{x}_2))^\top.$$

If the input function  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{A}$  is discretized on a grid  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)} \in (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{A}})^{n_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)}}$ , we set  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{kj}^{(L-1)} := \text{rfft}(\mathbf{v}_j^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)}))_k \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\psi_j(\mathbf{x})$  interpolates  $\mathbf{v}_j^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbb{A}}^{(i)})$  (e.g. spline interpolation or Fourier interpolation).

There are two practical benefits arising from this representation. First, note that computing the moments of and drawing samples from  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})$  only needs access to the hidden state  $\mathbf{v}^{(L-1)}$  of the neural operator. This means that we can evaluate the Gaussian process belief at arbitrary output points  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$  without the need to compute more than one forward pass of the neural operator. Secondly, due to the fact that the Gaussian process belief  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})$  over the output function is parametric, we can efficiently sample entire functions from it that can then be lazily evaluated at arbitrary points. This is in contrast to general non-parametric Gaussian processes, where one typically discretizes the GP before drawing samples of the function values at the given finite set of points. Such lazy functional samples can be used e.g. for active experimental design and Bayesian optimization [20].

### 3.3 Implementation

In the following, we focus on the linearized last-layer Laplace approximation for extracting a tractable Gaussian belief over the weights of the Fourier neural operator. Last-layer approximations,

where the feature map corresponding to the first  $L - 1$  layers is set to its MAP estimate [19, 21], allow the Laplace approximation to scale to deeper architectures and have proven effective in both theoretical and practical applications [15, 19]. Since the final standard (MLP) decoding layer  $w_q$  applies only pointwise and therefore lacks global characteristics, we consider the last spectral convolution with bias function instead. Specifically, we use the final Fourier layer weights  $w_{L-1} \cong (\text{Re}(\mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}), \text{Im}(\mathbf{R}^{(L-1)}), \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)})$ .

Common approaches for approximating the GGN of large layers - such as K-FAC or diagonal [15] - leverage a block-diagonal structure that trades cross-layer correlations for computational efficiency. However, since the Fourier convolution forms a collection of linear layers applied in parallel to different Fourier modes, such block approximations would yield a belief over the weights that is uncorrelated across these modes, which seems inaccurate due to the following inverse Fourier transformation. To address this issue, we focus instead on finding a low-rank approximation  $VV^T$  of the inverse GGN via Lanczos iterations (similar to a truncated SVD) [22]. The resulting low-rank plus scaled diagonal approximation of the posterior covariance yields an efficiently represented object suitable for matrix-free implementations, allowing for example for computationally cheap inversion via the Woodbury matrix identity.

The Gaussian belief of  $w$  is hence given by

$$w \sim \mathcal{N}(w^*, (n \cdot \mathbf{G} + \tau I)^{-1}),$$

where  $N$  is the number of input-output pairs following the Bayesian perspective. For a given discretization, this covariance can be pushed forward onto the output via efficiently implemented Jacobian-vector products following Step 2 in Section 3.2.

## 4 Related work

The literature on neural operators has been extensively reviewed, with Aizzadenesheli et al. [23] providing a comprehensive overview of various architectures. These include graph neural operators [11], physics-informed neural operators [24], multi-wavelet neural operators [25] and the widely used Fourier neural operators [12]. Lanthaler et al. [26] further contributes to this field by quantifying the aliasing error resulting from discretization of FNOs and obtaining algebraic rates of convergence in relation to grid resolution.

Despite the advancements in neural operator architectures, uncertainty estimation remains an underexplored area. Some progress has been made by Magnani et al. [27], Kumar et al. [28], Garg and Chakraborty [29]. Garg and Chakraborty [29] employs variational inference to estimate the Bayesian posterior over DeepONet predictions. The work in [27, 28] is more closely related to the present work. Magnani et al. [27] use Laplace approximation to provide uncertainty estimates for graph neural operators, but do not extend this to Fourier neural operators or consider a function space approach. Kumar et al. [28] incorporates a Gaussian Process prior with a mean function derived from a Wavelet Neural Operator, optimizing model hyperparameters by minimizing the negative log-marginal likelihood. Other Bayesian operator frameworks have been considered in Zou et al. [30] and Garg and Chakraborty [31]. Operator-valued kernels and function-valued Gaussian processes have been studied in the Hilbert space setting, e.g. by Micchelli and Pontil [32], Kadri et al. [33], and Owhadi [34]. Our approach, however, formulates the theory within the context of Banach spaces, as neural operators are defined as mappings between such spaces. Other relevant methods using Gaussian processes to solve partial differential equations (PDEs) include the works of Chen et al. [35], Battle et al. [36], and Chen et al. [37].

Laplace approximation, introduced to deep learning by Mackay [38], has gained popularity in the Bayesian deep learning community [8, 15, 19, 39]. This is also due to its scalability, achieved through various strategies including using log-posterior Hessian approximations [39, 40], treating only a subset of the model probabilistically [41], employing linearized Laplace [9, 42], or using scalable Gaussian processes methods [43, 44]. Other Bayesian deep learning methods include variational inference [45–48], Markov Chain Monte Carlo [49–51], or heuristic methods [52, 53].






Figure 2: Comparing NOLA, input perturbations, and weight perturbations at a single predicted time point of a sample trajectory of the KdV equation. The corresponding FNO has been trained on 32 training trajectories.

## 5 Experiments

We evaluate our approach by quantifying the uncertainty of Fourier neural operator predictions, that were trained on a limited amount of training samples. Following the experimental setup in Brandstetter et al. [54], we train multiple Fourier neural operators on varying numbers of training trajectories (i.e. 32, 64, and 128 training samples, each having 256 spatial and 140 temporal points) for the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV,  $\partial_t u + u\partial_x u + \partial_x^3 u = 0$ ), the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky (KS,  $\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u + \partial_x^4 u + u\partial_x u = 0$ ) and Burgers' ( $\partial_t u + u\partial_x u - \nu\partial_x^2 u = 0$  where  $\nu > 0$ ) equations. Each neural operator is trained to predict twenty future time steps based on the twenty previous ones. All models consist of four Fourier convolutional layers with 16 Fourier modes and 32 hidden channels. Using the above-outlined Laplace approximation, we model 33,824 parameters (more than one-fifth of all parameters) probabilistically.

We evaluate NOLA on each trained model against input perturbations and weight perturbations as baseline approaches, which can be seen as ensemble forecast: the former is given by  $\mathbf{F}_w(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon_x^{(k)})_{k \in K}$  with  $\epsilon_x^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^{-2}I_{|\mathbf{x}|})$ , and the latter by  $(\mathbf{F}_{w_{L-1} + \epsilon^{(k)}}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})))_k$  with  $\epsilon^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^{-2}I_{|w_{L-1}|})$ . For NOLA, we can estimate the standard deviation by the square root of the pushed-forward output variance, while for both perturbation-based methods, we take the empirical standard deviation of  $|K|$  ensemble members, setting  $|K| = 100$ .

To quantify and compare the uncertainty, we consider the negative log-likelihood (NLL), the root squared mean error (RMSE), and the q-statistic (Q) defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RMSE} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{c} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}, i \leq n} |\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_i)(x) - \mathbf{u}_i(x)|^2}, \\ \text{Q} &= \frac{1}{c} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}, i \leq n} \frac{|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_i)(x) - \mathbf{u}_i(x)|^2}{\mathbb{V}[(\mathbf{a}_i)(x)]}, \text{ and} \\ \text{NLL} &= \frac{1}{2c} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}, i \leq n} \left[ \log(2\pi \mathbb{V}[\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_i)(x)]) + \frac{|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_i)(x) - \mathbf{u}_i(x)|^2}{\mathbb{V}[(\mathbf{a}_i)(x)]} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $c$  is the number of summands and  $n$  is the number of input-output pairs considered for evaluation. The RMSE measures the accuracy of the GP/ensemble mean compared to the true target and should be close to zero. The Q estimate indicates posterior calibration and should be close to one. A lower NLL reflects a balance between low standard deviations and error calibration. For NOLA we compute the GGN on 128 input-output pairs of the training set. The hyperparameter  $\tau$  is calibrated for each method on the validation set and the metrics are compared on 100 samples of the test set, as shown in Table 1. A single sample prediction for a trajectory of the KdV equation can be found in Figure 2. While NOLA outperforms both baselines in the metrics sometimes only by a margin, we note that the overall prediction error in the experiment is already low and it is therefore important to test NOLA on more diverse tasks, where more uncertainty can be captured. Observations from Figure 2 suggest that NOLA's sample paths align more closely with the true target function than those from the baselines.

Table 1: Evaluation metrics on 100 test samples.

	KdV			KS			Burgers		
	NLL	RMSE	Q	NLL	RMSE	Q	NLL	RMSE	Q
32 training samples									
Input perturbations	0.795	<b>0.162</b>	3.32	-0.390	0.152	1.636	0.596	<b>0.331</b>	2.397
Weight perturbations	-0.306	0.169	1.929	-0.539	<b>0.148</b>	1.712	0.909	<b>0.34</b>	3.208
NOLA	<b>-0.577</b>	0.163	<b>1.152</b>	<b>-0.543</b>	<b>0.148</b>	<b>1.125</b>	<b>0.443</b>	0.335	<b>0.534</b>
64 training samples									
Input perturbations	-0.214	0.122	1.01	-0.767	0.108	1.664	-0.417	0.125	2.075
Weight perturbations	-0.691	0.121	1.422	-0.862	<b>0.106</b>	1.786	-0.322	0.126	2.565
NOLA	<b>-0.920</b>	<b>0.119</b>	<b>1.003</b>	<b>-0.872</b>	<b>0.106</b>	<b>1.273</b>	<b>-0.517</b>	<b>0.123</b>	<b>1.987</b>
128 training samples									
Input perturbations	-0.383	0.094	1.54	-1.108	0.082	1.476	-1.207	0.044	3.059
Weight perturbations	-0.913	0.095	0.558	-1.121	<b>0.081</b>	1.908	-1.397	<b>0.042</b>	2.505
NOLA	<b>-1.191</b>	<b>0.091</b>	<b>1.311</b>	<b>-1.158</b>	<b>0.081</b>	<b>1.417</b>	<b>-1.719</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>1.055</b>

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we developed a probabilistic framework for neural network-learned operators using Banach-valued Gaussian processes. Our approach extends Gaussian process theory into the domain of operators, facilitating the treatment of infinite-dimensional function spaces. By demonstrating the equivalence between Banach-valued Gaussian processes and multi-output Gaussian processes with an augmented input space, we establish *Gaussian currying*, a probabilistic analogue of currying in functional programming.

This currying process transforms complex operator mappings into more manageable and practically implementable forms, effectively modeling relationships between infinite-dimensional spaces. By applying linearization and Laplace approximation, neural operators can be viewed as function-valued Gaussian processes, providing analytic uncertainty estimates over an operator and yielding a continuous function that can be evaluated on any grid. This function can also be analytically propagated to downstream analyses.

In our experiments, we show improvements over perturbation-based methods in terms of common metrics. Especially, sample predictions generated with NOLA exhibit more realistic behaviour. Future directions for this work include investigating into the interpolation error that arises in constructing the feature functions of the parametric Gaussian process in the Bayesian Fourier neural operator. Moreover, we plan to apply our approach to a wider set of PDEs, including multidimensional problems.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support by the European Research Council through ERC CoG Action 101123955 ANUBIS ; the DFG Cluster of Excellence “Machine Learning - New Perspectives for Science”, EXC 2064/1, project number 390727645; the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) through the Tübingen AI Center (FKZ: 01IS18039A); the DFG SPP 2298 (Project HE 7114/5-1), and the Carl Zeiss Foundation, (project "Certification and Foundations of Safe Machine Learning Systems in Healthcare"), as well as funds from the Ministry of Science, Research and Arts of the State of Baden-Württemberg. The authors thank the International Max Planck Research School for Intelligent Systems (IMPRS-IS) for supporting Emilia Magnani, Marvin Pförtner and Tobias Weber.

## References

- [1] Nikola Kovachki, Zongyi Li, Burigede Liu, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operator: Learning maps between function spaces with applications to PDEs. *JMLR*, 24(89):1–97, 2023.

- [2] Jaideep Pathak, Shashank Subramanian, Peter Harrington, Sanjeev Raja, Ashesh Chattopadhyay, Morteza Mardani, Thorsten Kurth, David Hall, Zongyi Li, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, et al. Fourcastnet: A global data-driven high-resolution weather model using adaptive fourier neural operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11214*, 2022.
- [3] Boris Bonev, Thorsten Kurth, Christian Hundt, Jaideep Pathak, Maximilian Baust, Karthik Kashinath, and Anima Anandkumar. Spherical Fourier neural operators: Learning stable dynamics on the sphere. In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2806–2823. PMLR, 2023.
- [4] TJ Grady, Rishi Khan, Mathias Louboutin, Ziyi Yin, Philipp A Witte, Ranveer Chandra, Russell J Hewett, and Felix J Herrmann. Towards large-scale learned solvers for parametric PDEs with model-parallel fourier neural operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01205*, 2022.
- [5] Peter I Renn, Cong Wang, Sahin Lale, Zongyi Li, Anima Anandkumar, and Morteza Gharib. Forecasting subcritical cylinder wakes with fourier neural operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08290*, 2023.
- [6] Zhijie Li, Wenhui Peng, Zelong Yuan, and Jianchun Wang. Fourier neural operator approach to large eddy simulation of three-dimensional turbulence. *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics Letters*, 12(6):100389, 2022.
- [7] Zongyi Li, Nikola Kovachki, Chris Choy, Boyi Li, Jean Kossaifi, Shourya Otta, Mohammad Amin Nabian, Maximilian Stadler, Christian Hundt, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, et al. Geometry-informed neural operator for large-scale 3d PDEs. *NeurIPS*, 36, 2024.
- [8] Theodore Papamarkou, Maria Skoularidou, Konstantina Palla, Laurence Aitchison, Julyan Arbel, David Dunson, Maurizio Filippone, Vincent Fortuin, Philipp Hennig, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Aliaksandr Hubin, Alexander Immer, Theofanis Karaletsos, Mohammad Emtiyaz Khan, Agustinus Kristiadi, Yingzhen Li, Stephan Mandt, Christopher Nemeth, Michael A Osborne, Tim G. J. Rudner, David Rügamer, Yee Whye Teh, Max Welling, Andrew Gordon Wilson, and Ruqi Zhang. Position: Bayesian deep learning is needed in the age of large-scale AI. In *ICML*, 2024.
- [9] Alexander Immer, Maciej Korzepa, and Matthias Bauer. Improving predictions of Bayesian neural networks via local linearization. In *AISTATS*, 2020.
- [10] Zongyi Li, Nikola Kovachki, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Burigede Liu, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operator: Graph kernel network for partial differential equations. In *ICLR 2020 Workshop on Integration of Deep Neural Models and Differential Equations*, 2020.
- [11] Zongyi Li, Nikola Kovachki, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Burigede Liu, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Multipole graph neural operator for parametric partial differential equations. In *NeurIPS*, volume 33, pages 6755–6766. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [12] Zongyi Li, Nikola Borislavov Kovachki, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Burigede Liu, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Fourier neural operator for parametric partial differential equations. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [13] David JC MacKay. Bayesian interpolation. *Neural computation*, 4(3):415–447, 1992.
- [14] David JC MacKay. The evidence framework applied to classification networks. *Neural computation*, 4(5):720–736, 1992.
- [15] Erik Daxberger, Agustinus Kristiadi, Alexander Immer, Runa Eschenhagen, Matthias Bauer, and Philipp Hennig. Laplace redux-effortless bayesian deep learning. *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [16] Nicol Schraudolph. Fast curvature matrix-vector products for second-order gradient descent. *Neural computation*, 14:1723–38, 2002.
- [17] Mohammad Emtiyaz Khan, Alexander Immer, Ehsan Abedi, and Maciej Korzepa. Approximate inference turns deep networks into Gaussian processes. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [18] Nathaël Da Costa, Marvin Pförtner, Lancelot Da Costa, and Philipp Hennig. Sample path regularity of Gaussian processes from the covariance kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14886*, 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2312.14886.
- [19] Agustinus Kristiadi, Matthias Hein, and Philipp Hennig. Being bayesian, even just a bit, fixes overconfidence in relu networks. In *ICML*, pages 5436–5446. PMLR, 2020.

- [20] James T. Wilson, Viacheslav Borovitskiy, Alexander Terenin, Peter Mostowsky, and Marc Peter Deisenroth. Pathwise conditioning of Gaussian processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(105):1–47, 2021.
- [21] Jasper Snoek, Oren Rippel, Kevin Swersky, Ryan Kiros, Nadathur Satish, Narayanan Sundaram, Mostofa Patwary, Mr Prabhat, and Ryan Adams. Scalable bayesian optimization using deep neural networks. In *ICML*, 2015.
- [22] Felix Dangel, Lukas Tatzel, and Philipp Hennig. Vivit: Curvature access through the generalized gauss-newton’s low-rank structure. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=DzJ7JfPXkE>.
- [23] Kamyar Azzadenesheli, Nikola Kovachki, Zongyi Li, Miguel Liu-Schiaffini, Jean Kossaifi, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operators for accelerating scientific simulations and design. *Nature Reviews Physics*, pages 1–9, 2024.
- [24] Zongyi Li, Hongkai Zheng, Nikola Kovachki, David Jin, Haoxuan Chen, Burigede Liu, Kamyar Azzadenesheli, and Anima Anandkumar. Physics-informed neural operator for learning partial differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03794*, 2021.
- [25] Gaurav Gupta, Xiongye Xiao, and Paul Bogdan. Multiwavelet-based operator learning for differential equations. In *NeurIPS*, volume 34, 2021.
- [26] Samuel Lanthaler, Andrew M Stuart, and Margaret Trautner. Discretization error of fourier neural operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02221*, 2024.
- [27] Emilia Magnani, Nicholas Krämer, Runa Eschenhagen, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Philipp Hennig. Approximate bayesian neural operators: Uncertainty quantification for parametric PDEs, 2022.
- [28] Sawan Kumar, Rajdip Nayek, and Souvik Chakraborty. Neural operator induced gaussian process framework for probabilistic solution of parametric partial differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15618*, 2024.
- [29] Shailesh Garg and Souvik Chakraborty. Vb-deeponet: A bayesian operator learning framework for uncertainty quantification. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 118:105685, 2023. ISSN 0952-1976.
- [30] Zongren Zou, Xuhui Meng, Apostolos F Psaros, and George Em Karniadakis. Neuraluq: A comprehensive library for uncertainty quantification in neural differential equations and operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11866*, 2022.
- [31] Shailesh Garg and Souvik Chakraborty. Variational bayes deep operator network: a data-driven bayesian solver for parametric differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.05655*, 2022.
- [32] Charles A Micchelli and Massimiliano Pontil. On learning vector-valued functions. *Neural computation*, 17(1):177–204, 2005.
- [33] Hachem Kadri, Emmanuel Duflos, Philippe Preux, Stéphane Canu, Alain Rakotomamonjy, and Julien Audiffren. Operator-valued kernels for learning from functional response data. *JMLR*, 17(20):1–54, 2016.
- [34] Houman Owhadi. Do ideas have shape? idea registration as the continuous limit of artificial neural networks. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 444, 2023.
- [35] Yifan Chen, Bamdad Hosseini, Houman Owhadi, and Andrew M Stuart. Solving and learning nonlinear PDEs with gaussian processes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 447:110668, 2021.
- [36] Pau Battle, Matthieu Darcy, Bamdad Hosseini, and Houman Owhadi. Kernel methods are competitive for operator learning. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 496:112549, 2024.
- [37] Yifan Chen, Houman Owhadi, and Florian Schäfer. Sparse cholesky factorization for solving nonlinear pdes via gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01294*, 2023.
- [38] David John Cameron Mackay. *Bayesian methods for adaptive models*. California Institute of Technology, 1992.
- [39] Hippolyt Ritter, Aleksandar Botev, and David Barber. A scalable laplace approximation for neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [40] James Martens. New insights and perspectives on the natural gradient method. *JMLR*, 21(146): 1–76, 2020.

- [41] Erik Daxberger, Eric Nalisnick, James U Allingham, Javier Antoran, and Jose Miguel Hernandez-Lobato. Bayesian deep learning via subnetwork inference. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *PMLR*, 2021.
- [42] Andrew YK Foong, Yingzhen Li, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, and Richard E Turner. ‘In-Between’ uncertainty in bayesian neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11537*, 2019.
- [43] Zhijie Deng, Feng Zhou, and Jun Zhu. Accelerated linearized laplace approximation for bayesian deep learning. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [44] Luis A Ortega, Simón Rodríguez Santana, and Daniel Hernández-Lobato. Variational linearized laplace approximation for bayesian deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12565*, 2023.
- [45] Alex Graves. Practical variational inference for neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2011.
- [46] Charles Blundell, Julien Cornebise, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Daan Wierstra. Weight uncertainty in neural network. In *ICML*, 2015.
- [47] Mohammad Emtiyaz Khan, Didrik Nielsen, Voot Tangkaratt, Wu Lin, Yarin Gal, and Akash Srivastava. Fast and scalable Bayesian deep learning by weight-perturbation in adam. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [48] Guodong Zhang, Shengyang Sun, David Duvenaud, and Roger B. Grosse. Noisy natural gradient as variational inference. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [49] Radford M. Neal. *Bayesian Learning for Neural Networks*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996. ISBN 0387947248.
- [50] Max Welling and Yee Whye Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. In *ICML*, 2011.
- [51] Ruqi Zhang, Chunyuan Li, Jianyi Zhang, Changyou Chen, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Cyclical stochastic gradient MCMC for Bayesian deep learning. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [52] Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a Bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *ICML*, 2016.
- [53] Wesley Maddox, T. Garipov, Pavel Izmailov, Dmitry P. Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. A simple baseline for Bayesian uncertainty in deep learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [54] Johannes Brandstetter, Max Welling, and Daniel E Worrall. Lie point symmetry data augmentation for neural pde solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07643*, 2022.
- [55] Achim Klenke. *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course*. Universitext. Springer, London, second edition, 2014.
- [56] Marvin Pförtner, Ingo Steinwart, Philipp Hennig, and Jonathan Wenger. Physics-informed gaussian process regression generalizes linear pde solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12474*, 2022.

## Appendix

### A Theoretical Results

#### A.1 Gaussian measures on separable Banach spaces

We aim to quantify epistemic uncertainty about operators between (infinite-dimensional) Banach spaces of functions using a Gaussian process framework. To be able to define a Gaussian process belief over such operators, we hence need a notion of a Gaussian random variables with values in (separable) Banach spaces.

**Definition A.1** (Gaussian Measure on separable Banach space). Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a real separable Banach space. A probability measure  $\gamma$  on  $(\mathbb{U}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U}))$  is called *Gaussian* if every continuous linear functional  $\ell \in \mathbb{U}'$  is a univariate Gaussian random variable on  $(\mathbb{U}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U}), \gamma)$ . A  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued random variable is called *Gaussian* if its law is Gaussian.

*Remark A.1* (Jointly Gaussian Measure on separable Banach spaces). In this work, we frequently need to construct joint Gaussian measures on multiple separable Banach spaces. Fortunately, we can also leverage Definition A.1 for this. More formally, we aim to define a Gaussian measure on the iterated Cartesian product  $\mathbb{U}^n$  of a real separable Banach space  $\mathbb{U}$ . We equip  $\mathbb{U}^n$  with the product sigma algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n}$ . Since  $\mathbb{U}$  is Polish, we have  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n} = \mathcal{B}(\tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is the product topology on  $\mathbb{U}^n$  [55, Theorem 14.8]. Moreover,  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \tau)$  is Banachable, i.e. there is a norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{U}^n}$  that induces  $\tau$  such that  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{U}^n})$  is complete. Hence, as in Definition A.1, we call a probability measure  $\gamma$  on  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n})$  *Gaussian* if every  $\ell \in \mathbb{U}'$  is a univariate Gaussian random variable on  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n}, \gamma)$ .

Similar to their finite-dimensional counterparts, Gaussian measures with values in separable Banach spaces admit the definition of a mean and a (cross-)covariance operator.

**Proposition A.1** (Mean and Covariance Operator [see e.g. 56, Proposition B.2]). *Let  $\gamma$  be a Gaussian measure on a real separable Banach space  $\mathbb{U}$ . There is a unique  $m_\gamma \in \mathbb{U}$  with  $\ell(m_\gamma) = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \gamma}[\ell(u)]$  for every continuous linear functional  $\ell \in \mathbb{U}'$ , referred to as the mean of  $\gamma$ . Similarly, there is a unique bounded linear operator  $\mathcal{C}_\gamma: \mathbb{U}' \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  with  $\ell_1(\mathcal{C}_\gamma(\ell_2)) = \text{Cov}_{u \sim \gamma}[\ell_1(u), \ell_2(u)]$  for any  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathbb{U}'$ , the so-called covariance operator of  $\gamma$ . The mean and covariance operator of a Gaussian random variable with values in  $\mathbb{U}$  is defined accordingly.*

**Corollary A.2** (Cross-Covariance Operator). *Let  $u_1, u_2$  be jointly Gaussian random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  with values in real separable Banach spaces  $\mathbb{U}_1, \mathbb{U}_2$ , respectively. There is a unique bounded linear operator  $\mathcal{C}_{u_1, u_2}: \mathbb{U}'_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{U}'_2$  with  $\ell_1(\mathcal{C}_{u_1, u_2}(\ell_2)) = \text{Cov}_{\mathbb{P}}[\ell_1(u_1), \ell_2(u_2)]$  for all  $\ell_1 \in \mathbb{U}'_1$  and  $\ell_2 \in \mathbb{U}'_2$ . The operator  $\mathcal{C}_{u_1, u_2}$  is referred to as the cross-covariance operator between  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ .*

#### A.2 Banach-valued Gaussian processes

Now we have all the necessary preliminaries to define a Gaussian random process that takes values in real separable Banach spaces.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a real separable Banach space. A  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued *Gaussian process* with index set  $\mathbb{A}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  is a function  $F: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  such that  $\omega \mapsto (F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega))$  is a joint<sup>4</sup>, i.e.  $(\mathbb{U}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})^{\otimes n})$ -valued, Gaussian random variable for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ .

As for (multi-output) Gaussian processes, we can also define mean and covariance functions for Banach-valued Gaussian processes. However, their definition is more technically involved.

**Definition A.2.** Let  $F$  be a  $\mathbb{U}$ -valued Gaussian process with index set  $\mathbb{A}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ . The function

$$\mathcal{M}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}, a \mapsto m_{F(a, \cdot)}$$

is called the *mean function* of  $F$  and the function

$$\mathcal{K}: \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow (\mathbb{U}' \rightarrow \mathbb{U}), (a_1, a_2) \mapsto \mathcal{C}_{F(a_1, \cdot), F(a_2, \cdot)}$$

is referred to as the *covariance function* of  $F$ .

<sup>4</sup>See Remark A.1.

In the following, we aim to establish a correspondence between Banach-valued Gaussian processes and ( $\mathbb{R}$ -valued) Gaussian processes. Unlike in Lemma 2.1, we need additional technical assumptions for this to work both ways. Denote by  $\text{scl}_{w^*}(\mathbb{L}) := \{\ell \in \mathbb{U}' \mid \exists \{\ell_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{L} : \ell_i \rightarrow_{w^*} \ell\}$  the weak-\* sequential closure of a set  $\mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{U}'$ .

**Assumption A.1.** Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a real separable Banach space and  $\mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{U}'$  a set of continuous linear functionals on  $\mathbb{U}$  such that there is an  $n_{\text{scl}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $\text{scl}_{w^*}^{n_{\text{scl}}}(\text{span } \mathbb{L}) = \mathbb{U}'$ .

**Theorem A.3.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space,  $\mathbb{U}$  a real separable Banach space, and  $\mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{U}'$ . Let  $F: \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  and  $f: (\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{L}) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\ell(F(a, \cdot)) = f((a, \ell), \cdot)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{L}$  ( $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely). Then

$$(i) \quad F \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}) \text{ implies } f \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k),$$

and, if Assumption A.1 holds,

$$(ii) \quad f \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k) \text{ implies } F \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}),$$

where,

(iii) in both cases,

$$\ell(\mathcal{M}(a)) = m(a, \ell)$$

for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{L}$ , as well as

$$\ell_1(\mathcal{K}(a_1, a_2)(\ell_2)) = k((a_1, \ell_1), (a_2, \ell_2))$$

for all  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathbb{U}$ .

*Proof.* First of all, note that  $\ell \in (\mathbb{U}^n)'$  if and only if there are  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathbb{U}'$  such that

$$\ell(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(u_i),$$

where we equip  $\mathbb{U}^n$  with the product topology.

(i) Let  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathbb{U}'$ . By the above, the linear functionals

$$\tilde{\ell}_i: \mathbb{U}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u_1, \dots, u_n) \mapsto \ell_i(u_i)$$

are continuous w.r.t. the product topology on  $\mathbb{U}^n$ . Moreover,  $\omega \mapsto (F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega))$  is Gaussian by assumption. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \mapsto & \left( \tilde{\ell}_i(F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega)) \right)_{i=1}^n \\ & = (\ell_i(F(a_i, \omega)))_{i=1}^n \\ & = (f((a_i, \ell_i), \omega))_{i=1}^n \end{aligned}$$

is Gaussian with values in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(ii) Let  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ . We have to show that  $\omega \mapsto (F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega))$  is a Gaussian random variable with values in  $\mathbb{U}^n$ , i.e. that for every  $\ell \in (\mathbb{U}^n)'$ , the random variable  $\omega \mapsto \ell(F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega))$  is Gaussian with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ . By the above, we know that there are  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathbb{U}'$  such that

$$\omega \mapsto \ell(F(a_1, \omega), \dots, F(a_n, \omega)) = \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i(F(a_i, \omega)) = \sum_{i=1}^m f((a_i, \ell_i), \omega)$$

**Claim.** Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m \in \text{scl}_{w^*}^m(\text{span } \mathbb{L})$ . Then  $\omega \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m f((a_i, \ell_i), \omega)$  is Gaussian.

*Proof of Claim.* This is a straightforward modification of Theorem B.6 from [56].

By Assumption A.1, there is  $m = n_{\text{scl}}$  such that  $\text{scl}_{w^*}^m(\text{span } \mathbb{L}) = \mathbb{U}'$ . Hence, the statement follows from the claim.

(iii) Using the fact that Bochner integrals and bounded linear operators commute, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(\mathcal{M}(a)) &= \ell\left(\int_{\Omega} F(a, \omega) P(d\omega)\right) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \underbrace{\ell(F(a, \omega))}_{\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} f((a, \ell), \omega)} P(d\omega) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_P [f(a, \ell)] \\
&= m(a, \ell)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_1(\mathcal{K}(a_1, a_2)(\ell_2)) &= \ell_1\left(\int_{\Omega} \ell_2(F(a_2, \omega) - \mathcal{M}(a_2))(F(a_1, \omega) - \mathcal{M}(a_1)) P(d\omega)\right) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \ell_2(F(a_2, \omega) - \mathcal{M}(a_2)) \ell_1(F(a_1, \omega) - \mathcal{M}(a_1)) P(d\omega) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \underbrace{(\ell_1(F(a_1, \omega)) - \ell_1(\mathcal{M}(a_1)))}_{\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} f((a_1, \ell_1), \omega)} \underbrace{(\ell_2(F(a_2, \omega)) - \ell_2(\mathcal{M}(a_2)))}_{\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} f((a_2, \ell_2), \omega)} P(d\omega) \\
&= \text{Cov}_P [f(a_1, \ell_1), f(a_2, \ell_2)] \\
&= k((a_1, \ell_1), (a_2, \ell_2)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary A.4.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  be a probability space and  $\mathbb{U}$  a real separable Banach space of real-valued functions on a common domain  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$  with continuous point evaluation functionals  $\delta_x : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto u(x)$ . Let  $F : \mathbb{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$  and  $f : (\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $F(a, \cdot)(x) = f((a, x), \cdot)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$  ( $P$ -almost surely). Then*

(i)  $F \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K})$  implies  $f \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k)$ ,

and, if Assumption A.1 holds<sup>5</sup> for  $\mathbb{L}_{\delta} := \{\delta_x : x \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}\}$ ,

(ii)  $f \sim \mathcal{GP}(m, k)$  implies  $F \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K})$ ,

where,

(iii) in both cases,

$$\mathcal{M}(a)(x) = m(a, x)$$

for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$ , as well as

$$\mathcal{K}(a_1, a_2)(\ell_2)(x_1) = \ell_2(x_2 \mapsto k((a_1, x_1), (a_2, x_2)))$$

for all  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{A}$ ,  $\ell_2 \in \mathbb{U}$ , and  $x_1 \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$ .

Finally, Theorem A.3 from the main text is a corollary of the results developed above.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Follows from Corollary A.4 and Lemma 2.1. □

<sup>5</sup>For instance, this is the case if  $\mathbb{U}$  is a separable RKHS,  $\mathbb{U} = C(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}})$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}$  is a compact metric space, or  $\mathbb{U} = C^k(\overline{\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}}})$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{U}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , which follows from Propositions B.6, B.7, and B.10 in [56].