

MCMC-Net: Accelerating Markov Chain Monte Carlo with Neural Networks for Inverse Problems

Sudeb Majee^a, Anuj Abhishek^{b,*}, Thilo Strauss^c, Taufiqar Khan^{a,d}

^a*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, UNC Charlotte, Charlotte, 28223, NC, USA*

^b*Department of Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, 44106-7058, OH, USA*

^c*Department of AI and Advanced Computing, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, 215000, Jiangsu, China*

^d*Center for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence through Model Risk Management (TAIMing AI), UNC Charlotte, Charlotte, 28223, NC, USA*

Abstract

In many computational problems, using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) can be prohibitively time-consuming. We propose MCMC-Net, a simple yet efficient way to accelerate MCMC via neural networks. The key idea of our approach is to substitute the likelihood function of the MCMC method with a neural operator. We extensively evaluate the accuracy and speedup of our method on three different PDE-based inverse problems where likelihood computations are computationally expensive, namely electrical impedance tomography, diffuse optical tomography, and quantitative photoacoustic tomography.

MCMC-Net performs similar to the classical likelihood counterpart but with a significant, up to twelvefold, speedup. We conjecture that the method can be applied to any problem with a sufficiently expensive likelihood function. We also analyze MCMC-Net in a theoretical setting for the different use cases. We prove a universal approximation theorem-type result to show that the proposed network can approximate the mapping resulting from forward model evaluations to a desired accuracy. Furthermore, we establish convergence of the surrogate posterior to the true posterior under Hellinger distance.

Keywords: Deep learning, Convolutional neural network, Bayesian inverse problems, Markov Chain Monte Carlo

2000 MSC: 62G20, 35J15, 62F15

1. Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods have been used for almost six decades and have become the standard method for learning Bayesian complex models since the early 1990s [1]. These approaches are widely used across many scientific disciplines, including physics, biology, and economics, where they serve as powerful tools for sampling from complex probability distributions. MCMC methods based on the Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm [2, 3] construct Markov chains whose stationary distributions are the Bayesian posterior

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: smajee@unc.edu (Sudeb Majee), axa1828@case.edu (Anuj Abhishek), Thilo.Strauss@xjtlu.edu.cn (Thilo Strauss), taufiqar.khan@charlotte.edu (Taufiqar Khan)

distributions [4, 5]. A key component of MCMC methods is the evaluation of likelihood functions, representing the probability of observing data given a particular set of model parameters. In Bayesian inference, for example, the likelihood plays a crucial role in updating prior beliefs to posterior distributions. The accuracy and speed of MCMC algorithms are strongly dependent on the accurate computation and computational cost of the likelihood function. Our proposed method is to substitute the likelihood function with a neural network in order to speed up excessively slow computations. Furthermore, we evaluate this proposed approach on three different kinds of inverse problems where the evaluation of the likelihood function is computationally expensive.

1.1. Background

Inverse problems are a class of mathematical modeling problems that aim to determine the unknown causes from known consequences. In contrast to direct problems, which predict outcomes based on known parameters and inputs, inverse problems work backward to determine the underlying parameters that generate observable data. These problems arise in many real-world applications, including medical imaging, geophysics, astronomy, oceanography, weather prediction, and non-destructive testing, among others [6, 7]. They are often challenging to solve because they can be ill-posed, meaning that solutions may be non-existent, non-unique, or highly sensitive to data variations. To address these concerns, techniques such as regularization are used, making inverse problems a crucial area of research for obtaining meaningful information from complex systems. Many real-world inverse problems are governed by Partial Differential Equations (PDEs), with the system states described by PDE solutions. The properties of these systems, such as absorption coefficient, permeability, and thermal conductivity, are defined by model parameters that cannot be directly measured. Instead, these parameters are inferred from discrete and noisy observations of the states. Since inverse problems are generally ill-posed, solutions often rely on classical regularization theory [8] or Bayesian inference [9]. The Bayesian technique provides a flexible framework for solving inverse problems by imposing a prior distribution on the parameters, which allows the incorporation of prior knowledge, which can be thought of as regularization by itself, e.g., see [10]. In recent decades, this technique has gained significant attention for its benefits [6, 9]. A Bayesian approach compared to classical regularization is different in that the Bayesian approach only requires continuity of the solution with respect to parameters, whereas classical regularization methods typically require computing some type of gradient, which can be problematic on its own. Furthermore, the Bayesian approach is simple to implement. It can be used for a wide range of problems by practitioners who may not be experts in modeling and inverse problem theory to set up the analytical framework for computing gradients, etc.

The Bayesian inversion predicts the probability distribution of input parameters using measured data (corrupted by noise) and other available knowledge. Samples from this distribution are produced using MCMC methods. However, the formulation of Bayesian inverse problems (BIP) poses various issues, among these one is typically interested in first showing that the BIP of interest is well-posed and subsequently in providing theoretical guarantees for the Bayesian solution (i.e., the posterior density) to converge to the ‘truth.’ From an implementational perspective, dealing with the discretized (finite), albeit very high dimensional posterior distributions can be difficult due to the expensive-to-solve forward models and high-dimensional parameter spaces. As a result, direct sampling approaches, such as MCMC-based methods [11, 12, 13] will incur excessive computation costs.

Typical approaches to deal with these problems include *(i)*. model reduction methods [14, 15, 16, 17], which exploit the intrinsic low dimensionality; *(ii)*. direct posterior approximation methods, such as Laplace approximation and variational inference [18, 19]; and *(iii)*. surrogate modeling [20, 21, 22, 23], which substitutes the expensive model with a low-cost replacement.

Among the strategies listed above, surrogate modeling (for the forward model) offers an easy and principled approach to integrating deep learning-based methods into classical MCMC algorithms for efficiently accelerating the sampling of posterior distributions. Deep neural networks (DNN) have recently gained popularity in science and engineering as surrogate models due to their ability to approximate high-dimensional problems [24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In general, DNN employs the ability of neural networks to build a quick-to-evaluate surrogate model to approximate the parameter-to-observation maps [22, 29, 30].

Operator learning algorithms like Fourier Neural Operators (FNOs) [31] and DeepONets [32] can describe complex models in high-dimensional domains as infinite-dimensional approximations. Therefore, they are potential surrogates, as described in [33, 34]. Raonić et al. [35] proposed novel modifications of the Convolutional neural network (CNN) to enforce structure-preserving continuous-discrete equivalence and enable the genuine, alias-free learning of operators. The resulting architecture is called a Convolutional Neural Operator (CNO). However, employing approximate models directly may generate a discrepancy or modeling error, worsening an already ill-posed situation and resulting in a poor outcome. In this article, besides advocating for a fusion of deep-learning based methods with MCMC algorithms, we also provide asymptotic guarantees for the surrogate posterior to converge in an appropriate sense to the true posterior. We list our main contributions in this article below.

1.2. Contribution

- To our knowledge, this is the first time a *CNO* has been used to replace the forward model evaluator in Bayesian inverse problems to estimate coefficients of PDEs.
- From the theoretical point of view, the proposed network architecture replaces a mapping from function space to an operator space (e.g., Neumann-to-Dirichlet operators) in the cases of Electrical Impedance Tomography and Diffuse Optical Tomography. For Quantitative Photoacoustic tomography, we use the *CNO* as a surrogate model to replace the forward model between two function spaces. In addition, we analyze a universal approximation theorem-type result to show that the proposed network structure can approximate the respective forward maps in a suitable asymptotic sense. Following this, we also show that the surrogate posterior converges to the true posterior asymptotically in the Hellinger metric.
- In our numerical experiments, we show that MCMC-Net offers up to twelve times speed-up than when the likelihood is evaluated using a typical finite element solver. This is beneficial for practical applications.
- Even though we use the proposed technique to accelerate MCMC in Bayesian inverse problems, it also has broader implications. In particular, in any application where the posterior is explored by an MCMC based method and requires a computationally expensive likelihood function evaluation, one can effectively use deep learning based surrogate models to achieve substantial speed-up.

1.3. Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe Bayesian inverse problems, and in section 3, we discuss the inverse problems considered for computational investigation. In section 4, we delve into deep learning for operator approximation, establish universal approximation theorem-type results for forward operator learning in inverse problems, and present convergence results for the posterior distribution. Section 5 presents the numerical experiments. Finally, section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Bayesian Inverse Problems

2.1. Theoretical underpinnings of PDE-based inverse problems

To illustrate the theoretical underpinnings of our approach, we consider a steady-state physical system governed by the following PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}(u(x); q(x)) &= 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}(u(x)) &= 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{D} represents a general partial differential operator defined in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, \mathcal{B} denotes the boundary operator acting on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, q signifies the unknown parameter, and u describes the state field of the system, see e.g. [36]. Here, \mathcal{X} represents the space of the unknown parameter q , and \mathcal{Y} is the space of the observed data y , which consists of measurements collected from the system. We describe the relationship between the unknown parameter q and the observed data y as:

$$y = \mathcal{G}(q) + \eta, \quad (2)$$

where y represents the observed data, $\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is the forward operator that maps the unknown parameter q to the measurements y . Typically, $\mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{R}^k$ is some finite-dimensional space, and $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ is the measurement noise, modeled as a Gaussian random vector (RV) with zero mean and covariance matrix Σ . This forward problem models the physical process that generates the observable data y from the unknown parameter q . On the other hand, the inverse problem involves recovering q from y . Indeed, for the inverse problem at hand, as the observed data y lies in a finite-dimensional space, while the parameter of interest q lies in some appropriate (infinite-dimensional) function space, this inverse problem is severely ill-posed. Now we will describe the framework for Bayesian inversion developed in [9]. In the Bayesian approach, the parameter q and the observed data y are modeled as random variables. The Bayesian ‘solution’ to such an inverse problem is then the posterior measure of the random variable $q|y$. To evaluate this posterior measure, we begin by placing a prior probability measure on the space of parameters, i.e., we assume $q \sim \mu_0$ where μ_0 is some probability measure on the space \mathcal{X} . Let the noise be independent of q and be distributed according to the Gaussian measure, $\eta \sim \mathbb{Q}_0$, whose distribution is given by the multivariate normal $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Assuming that the data is given according to the additive noise model (2), we can say that the random variable $y|q$ is distributed according to the measure \mathbb{Q}_q , whose distribution function is given by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}(q), \Sigma)$. Furthermore, in this case, there exists a positive Radon-Nikodym density given by $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_q}{d\mathbb{Q}_0}(y) = \exp(-\Phi(q; y))$, where, $\Phi : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the ‘log-likelihood’ function, which is also sometimes referred to as a ‘potential.’ The likelihood term measures how well a given parameter q describes the observed data y . Now we consider

the following two product measures, $\nu_0 = \mu_0 \times \mathbb{Q}_0$ and $\nu = \mu_0 \times \mathbb{Q}_q$ on the product space $X \times Y$. Then, we have the following analogue of Bayes' theorem on infinite-dimensional spaces:

Theorem 1. [37, Theorem 14.] *Let $\Phi : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be ν_0 measurable and let Z_y defined as $\int_X \exp(-\Phi(q; y)) d\mu_0 := Z_y > 0$ for \mathbb{Q}_0 a.s. y , then the conditional distribution of $q|y$ denoted by μ^y exists under ν . Furthermore, $\mu^y \ll \mu_0$ and*

$$\frac{d\mu^y}{d\mu_0}(q) = \frac{1}{Z_y} \exp(-\Phi(q; y)). \quad (3)$$

Theorem 1 can be interpreted as a statement about the existence of a solution to a Bayesian inverse problem as it establishes conditions for the existence of the posterior density.

Overall, the Bayesian approach updates the prior about q based on the observed data, and Bayes' theorem helps us to combine the prior and likelihood to obtain the posterior knowledge about q .

2.2. Accelerating MCMC by using Operator Network surrogates

For complex inverse problems of the kind described above, typically, any discretized representation of the posterior distribution is very high-dimensional and difficult to sample directly. *MCMC* methods provide a solution by generating samples from the posterior distribution. In *MCMC*, a Markov chain is constructed whose stationary distribution is the target posterior $\mathbb{P}(q|y)$. The process involves iterating between proposing new samples and deciding whether to accept or reject them based on a criterion derived from the posterior distribution. One effective *MCMC* technique for sampling in high-dimensional spaces is the *preconditioned Crank–Nicolson (pCN) method*. This method proposes new samples by perturbing the current sample $q^{(t)}$ according to the following rule:

$$q^* = q^{(t)} + \sqrt{1 - p^2} z, \quad (4)$$

where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is a standard Gaussian random variable and $p \in (0, 1)$ controls the amount of perturbation. The term $\sqrt{1 - p^2}$ ensures that the proposal step maintains stability while allowing sufficient exploration of the parameter space. After proposing a new sample q^* , the *pCN* method evaluates the likelihood of the new sample using the acceptance probability:

$$\alpha = \min \left(1, \frac{\mathbb{P}(y|q^*)\mathbb{P}(q^*)}{\mathbb{P}(y|q^{(t)})\mathbb{P}(q^{(t)})} \right). \quad (5)$$

If a uniform random variable $u^* \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ is less than α , the new sample is accepted ($q^{(t+1)} = q^*$); otherwise, the current sample is retained ($q^{(t+1)} = q^{(t)}$). By adjusting the parameter p , the algorithm can tune the exploration-exploitation trade-off, facilitating faster convergence to the target posterior distribution. It is important to note that each likelihood evaluation requires a forward model \mathcal{G} evaluation, which can be computationally intensive, especially in complex real-world scenarios. To mitigate this, it is essential to replace the expensive forward model with a computationally inexpensive surrogate model. In this paper, we have discussed a deep learning-based surrogate to replace the traditional FEM solver, which *significantly* reduces computational costs. We have tested our proposed technique on three inverse problems introduced in the next **section**. Here, we describe the essential idea behind replacing the exact forward model with a (learned) surrogate model and the relation

of the ‘true’ posterior with the ‘surrogate’ (i.e., approximate) posterior. The idea behind surrogate modeling is to replace the forward model given by (2) with the following equation:

$$y = \mathcal{G}_\theta(q) + \eta, \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{G}_θ indicates a neural-network based surrogate with θ denoting the network parameters. If \mathcal{G}_θ is a ‘good approximation of \mathcal{G} , then, using the surrogate model gives rise to a surrogate likelihood, $\Phi_\theta(q; y)$. Substituting the surrogate likelihood in lieu of the true likelihood gives rise to a surrogate posterior μ_θ^y , which satisfies (see also Theorem 1):

$$\frac{d\mu_\theta^y}{d\mu_0}(q) = \frac{1}{Z_y^\theta} \exp(-\Phi_\theta(q; y)). \quad (7)$$

where $Z_y^\theta := \int_X \exp(-\Phi_\theta(q; y)) d\mu_0$. In such cases, we would further like to understand the ‘closeness’ of the surrogate posterior to the true posterior. One way to quantify this is to use the notion of Hellinger distance between the two posterior measures, which is defined by:

$$|\mu^y - \mu_\theta^y|_{\text{Hell}}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(\sqrt{\frac{\exp(-\Phi(q; y))}{Z(y)}} - \sqrt{\frac{\exp(-\Phi_\theta(q; y))}{Z^\theta(y)}} \right)^2 d\mu_0. \quad (8)$$

In subsequent sections, we will make the following notion precise: *If $\mathcal{G}(q) \cong \mathcal{G}_\theta(q)$ in some appropriate sense, then $|\mu^y - \mu_\theta^y|_{\text{Hell}}^2$ is also small.* This provides a principled rationale for replacing the FEM solver implementation of the forward model with a fast surrogate neural network implementation of the forward model instead.

3. The three imaging inverse problems.

We will describe here the mathematical formulation of the three imaging problems we propose to study in this work, namely Electrical Impedance Tomography, Diffuse Optical Tomography, and Quantitative Photoacoustic Tomography.

3.1. Electrical Impedance Tomography

Electrical Impedance Tomography (EIT) is a non-invasive imaging technique that estimates the electrical conductivity distribution of an object by injecting currents and measuring the resulting boundary voltages via electrodes. EIT is widely used in medical imaging, geophysical exploration, and industrial monitoring applications. Usually, the forward model for EIT is described by a Complete Electrode Model (CEM) [38], which we briefly describe below. Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$ be the region to be imaged with its boundary denoted by $\partial\Omega$. Assume that there are L electrodes, $\{e_l\}_{l=1}^L$, placed along $\partial\Omega$ where the boundary measurements of current and electric potential (voltage) can be made. Let $\sigma(x)$ be the conductivity coefficient, u denote the electric potential, $(I_l)_{l=1}^L$ be the applied current simulation pattern on the L electrodes, and $(U_l)_{l=1}^L$ be the corresponding voltages across the electrodes. Let z_l be the contact impedance of the l -th electrode. We assume that the parameter $\sigma(x)$ is a real valued, positive, bounded function in $L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. The CEM model corresponds to the following

mathematical formulation,

$$-\nabla \cdot (\sigma(x) \nabla u(x)) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega \quad (9)$$

$$\int_{e_l} \sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} dS = I_l, \quad l \in \{1, \dots, L\} \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^L e_l \quad (11)$$

$$u(x) + z_l \sigma(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = U_l, \quad x \in e_l, \quad l \in \{1, \dots, L\}. \quad (12)$$

We aim to solve the inverse problem of recovering the conductivity field using boundary measurements of voltages, $(U_l)_{l=1}^L$, corresponding to a series of applied boundary currents, $(I_l)_{l=1}^L$. Assume that J linearly independent current patterns are applied. For each $I^{(j)}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, let us represent the non-noisy voltage across L electrodes by $U^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^L$. Then, we can formally write,

$$U^{(j)} = G_j(\sigma), \quad (13)$$

where $G_{(j)}(\sigma) = R(\sigma)I^{(j)}$, and $R(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ is the resistivity matrix. Consider the case when the measured data is corrupted by a Gaussian noise. Let y_j represent the noisy voltage measurements taken on the boundary:

$$y_j = G_j(\sigma) + \eta_j, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, J\} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_j \sim N(0, \Gamma_0) \text{ i.i.d.} \quad (14)$$

Here $N(0, \Gamma_0)$ is used to denote a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance Γ_0 . Concatenating all the vectors $y_j \in \mathbb{R}^L$ we can write:

$$y = G(\sigma) + \eta \quad (15)$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^{JL}$ and $\eta \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Gamma)$ where $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_0)$. In typical experiments, $y \in \mathbb{R}^{16 \times 16}$ which corresponds to measurements taken across 16 electrodes. The statistical inverse problem can now be formulated as a recovery of the parameter, $\sigma(x)$, from observed (noisy) data y .

In this work, we will work with a particular level-set formulation for the EIT inverse problem that was considered in [39]. Thus, we will assume that the conductivity σ can be expressed with the help of level-set functions. In particular, we assume that $\sigma(x)$ is piecewise constant and can be expressed by:

$$\sigma(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M \sigma_i \mathbb{I}(\Omega_i) \quad (16)$$

for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, $\mathbb{I}(S)$ denotes the characteristic function of some set $S \subset \Omega$. Also, for $i \neq k$, $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_k = \emptyset$. Besides, $\cup_{i=1}^M \Omega_i = \Omega$. The constants σ_i are known, bounded, strictly positive numbers. Choose numbers $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^M$ with $c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_M$ and a continuous function, called a *level-set function* $w : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$\Omega_i = \{x \in \Omega : c_{i-1} \leq w(x) < c_i\}.$$

Now let H be an operator such that $H : H^s(\bar{\Omega}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\sigma(\Omega)$:

$$H(w) = \sum_{i=1}^M \sigma_i \mathbb{I}(\Omega_i) = \sigma(x)$$

Here, for $s > 1$, $H^s(\Omega)$ represents a space of Sobolev smooth functions, and $\mathcal{A}_\sigma(\Omega)$ denotes the space of admissible conductivities. In terms of the level set function, equation (15) can be rewritten as:

$$y = G(H(w)) + \eta =: \mathcal{G}(w) + \eta \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{G} = G \circ H$. For more details about EIT and its level-set formulation in the Bayesian setting, see [38, 39, 40, 41, 42] and the references therein. Our goal will be to replace the true forward operator \mathcal{G} (or, rather, its FEM implementation) with a neural network surrogate \mathcal{G}_θ . We will describe this in the **section 4**.

3.2. Diffuse Optical Tomography

Diffuse Optical Tomography (DOT) is an imaging technique that uses low-energy visible or near-infrared light to probe highly scattering media, including biological tissue. The forward problem in DOT is governed by the diffusion approximation of the radiative transfer equation, which models light transport in highly scattering media like biological tissue. It is often described by the following PDE:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\rho(x)\nabla u(x)) + \mu(x)u(x) &= h(x) && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x) + 2\rho(x)\frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial \nu} &= f(x) && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (18)$$

where u represents the photon density, ρ is the diffusion coefficient related to the scattering properties of the tissue, μ is the absorption coefficient, and h represents the source term corresponding to the injected light. The boundary condition reflects the relationship between the photon density and its flux at the boundary $\partial\Omega$, where f denotes the outgoing light on the surface. In DOT, the inverse problem involves reconstructing the tissue's optical properties (absorption and diffusion coefficients) from photon density measurements on the boundary. DOT is widely used in medical imaging for applications like brain function monitoring, breast cancer detection, and tissue oxygenation assessment. In the present work, we consider a simplified one-parameter DOT model. The governing equation for this model is given by:

$$-\nabla \cdot (\rho(x)\nabla u(x)) + \mu(x)u(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (19)$$

For this simplified model, we focus solely on reconstructing the absorption coefficient μ from boundary measurements of the photon density u while assuming that the diffusion coefficient ρ is known and fixed. For more details about DOT and its discrete measurement model, see [43, 44, 45] and the references therein. We note that the inverse problem of EIT is a close cousin of the inverse problem of DOT, especially for the one-parameter DOT inverse problem considered here. For the sake of brevity, we do not present the formulation of the discrete problem for DOT here, except to mention that in our simulations, we do not use a level-set formulation for the priors but instead the formulation prescribed in [43]. This is so that we can compare our reconstruction results against the ones shown in [43].

3.3. Quantitative photoacoustic tomography

We consider the inverse problem in Quantitative Photoacoustic Tomography (QPAT) as a third example. This imaging technique leverages the photoacoustic effect to assess the optical properties of target tissues. Light-absorbing molecules (chromophores) generate an acoustic pressure wave due to heat expansion by illuminating tissue with a short pulse of near-infrared light. The inverse problem reconstructs optical parameter images from acoustic pressure waves measured at the boundary of the tissue. QPAT has many applications in breast and skin cancer detection, small animal imaging, and vascular imaging.

In QPAT, light propagation through a scattering medium is often modeled using an elliptic PDE:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\rho(x)\nabla u(x)) + \gamma(x)u(x) &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x) &= g(x) && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (20)$$

where ρ and γ are the diffusion and absorption coefficients, respectively. The boundary condition $u = g$ defines the incoming radiation source. In the present study, the statistical inverse problem in QPAT aims to reconstruct the parameter γ , assuming $\rho \in L^2_{\Lambda\rho}(\Omega)$ is fixed, from the observed (noisy) data Y as described in (21). For this problem, we consider an observation model as

$$Y = G(\gamma) + \varepsilon_n \xi, \quad (21)$$

where the continuous forward map G is considered as

$$G : \gamma \mapsto H := \gamma u, \quad G : L^2_{\Lambda}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega). \quad (22)$$

Here the space of parameters, $L^2_{\Lambda}(\Omega) = \{f \in L^2(\Omega) : \Lambda^{-1} \leq f \leq \Lambda \text{ a.e.}\}$ and $\Lambda > 0$ is a constant, \mathcal{Y} denotes a real separable Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. ξ denotes ‘white noise’ in \mathcal{Y} , which can be defined as

$$\xi := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \xi_k e_k, \quad \xi_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, 1).$$

In the above, $\varepsilon_n = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{n}}$ is used to denote the noise level, where $\gamma > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The term Y is understood to depend on n and γ . A typical discrete observation model (e.g., see [46]) to the continuous observation model (21) for the numerical experiments is as follows:

$$Y_k = \langle G(\gamma), e_k \rangle_{L^2(D)} + \varepsilon \xi_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, N_d, \quad (23)$$

where $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ represents an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega)$, consisting of the eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacian on Ω , and $N_d \in \mathbb{N}$ is a suitable number. The observation $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_k\}_{k=1}^{N_d}$ is the collection of coefficients of the projection of Y from (21) to the span of $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{N_d}$. As $N_d \rightarrow \infty$, observing \mathbf{Y} is equivalent to observing Y ; see, for example, [[47], Theorem 26]. For further details on QPAT and the discrete observation model 23, we refer to [46, 48, 49] and references therein.

For this problem, we consider star-shaped prior for parametrization of the inclusions, that is, inclusions parametrized by their center and a radial function. In numerical simulations, it was shown in [46] that compared to level-set parametrization, star-shaped parametrization produced better reconstructions of the absorption parameter γ in QPAT, and we present that

formulation here. To begin, consider star-shaped sets in the plane. Let ψ be a continuously differentiable 2π -periodic function. We consider $\psi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a function defined on the one-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. First, we introduce the parametrization for a single inclusion. The boundary ∂A of the star-shaped set is a deformed unit circle: for a point $x \in \Omega$, it can be defined as

$$\partial A(\psi) = x + \{\exp(\psi(\vartheta))\nu(\vartheta), 0 \leq \vartheta \leq 2\pi\}, \quad (24)$$

where $\nu(\vartheta) := (\cos \vartheta, \sin \vartheta)$. The interior of the set is then given by

$$A(\psi) = x + \{s \exp(\psi(\vartheta))\nu(\vartheta) \mid 0 \leq s \leq 1, 0 \leq \vartheta \leq 2\pi\}. \quad (25)$$

Now, for positive constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$ we can define the map $\Phi : \Omega \times H^\beta(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\gamma(\Omega)$ by

$$\Phi(x, \psi) := \kappa_1 \mathbb{I}_{A(x, \psi)} + \kappa_2. \quad (26)$$

In the above, A is the Lebesgue measurable subset of Ω , and $\mathcal{A}_\gamma(\Omega)$ denotes the space of admissible absorption coefficients. For simplicity, we fix the center $x \in \Omega$ then $\Phi(\cdot, \psi)$ satisfies a Hölder continuity-type result; see [46, Lemma 4.1]. Additionally, $\Phi(\cdot, \psi)$ represents a star-shaped parametrization for a single inclusion. We can generalize this for multiple inclusions. Consider $N \geq 1$ disjoint inclusions, each parametrized by its respective center $x^{(i)} \in \Omega$ and radial function $\psi^{(i)}$. The boundary of the i -th inclusion is given as:

$$\partial A^{(i)}(\psi^{(i)}) = x^{(i)} + \{\exp(\psi^{(i)}(\vartheta))\nu(\vartheta) \mid 0 \leq \vartheta \leq 2\pi\},$$

where $\nu(\vartheta) = (\cos \vartheta, \sin \vartheta)$. The interior of the i -th inclusion is:

$$A^{(i)}(\psi^{(i)}) = x^{(i)} + \{s \exp(\psi^{(i)}(\vartheta))\nu(\vartheta) \mid 0 \leq s \leq 1, 0 \leq \vartheta \leq 2\pi\},$$

where $A_i(\psi)$ are some Lebesgue measurable subsets of Ω . To define the composite conductivity map for all N inclusions, we consider the map $\Phi : (\Omega \times H^\beta(\mathbb{T}))^N \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\gamma(\Omega)$ as:

$$\Phi(\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N, \{\psi^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \kappa_i \mathbb{I}_{A^{(i)}(\psi^{(i)})}, \quad (27)$$

where $\kappa_i > 0$ denotes the conductivity value in the i -th inclusion. If the background conductivity κ_{N+1} is included, the domain Ω is partitioned such that:

$$A^{(N+1)} = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N A^{(i)}(\psi^{(i)}),$$

and the map Φ can be written as:

$$\Phi(\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N, \{\psi^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} \kappa_i \mathbb{I}_{A^{(i)}(\psi^{(i)})}. \quad (28)$$

In this case, $\Phi(\psi)$ also satisfies a Hölder continuity-type result; see [46, Lemma 4.3], and $\Phi(\psi)$ represents a star-shaped parametrization for multiple inclusions.

If we *fix* the center of the inclusions in terms of the star-shaped set, the observation model (21) can be rewritten as:

$$Y = G(\Phi(\psi)) + \varepsilon_n \xi := \mathcal{G}(\psi) + \varepsilon_n \xi. \quad (29)$$

Similarly, as the EIT, our goal is to replace the true forward operator \mathcal{G} with a neural network surrogate \mathcal{G}_θ . We will describe this in the next section.

4. Deep Learning for Operator Approximation

Deep Learning for operator approximation is a cutting-edge approach that leverages the power of neural networks to approximate complex mathematical operators. These operators often arise in various scientific and engineering problems, such as solving PDEs, modeling dynamical systems, and simulating physical processes.

For many decades, well-established numerical techniques like finite differences, finite elements, finite volumes, and spectral methods [50] have been successfully used to approximate PDE solutions. Nevertheless, these methods are more computationally expensive, particularly for many query issues, including uncertainty quantification (UQ), inverse problems, PDE-constrained control, and optimization, as well as in high-dimensional settings. Hence, reducing the computational cost demands fast, robust, and accurate surrogate models. Consequently, data-driven machine-learning algorithms have become a popular method for solving PDEs [51].

A very selected list of architectures for operator learning includes operator networks [52], DeepONets [32] and its variants [53, 54], PCA-net [55], neural operators [56] such as graph neural operator [57], multipole neural operator [58] and the very popular Fourier Neural Operator [31] and its variants [59, 60], VIDON [61], the spectral neural operator [62], LOCA [63], NOMAD [64], De Hoop et al. [65, 66], Furuya et al. [67], and transformer-based operator learning architectures [68].

Deep learning, mainly through architectures like neural operator networks, offers a scalable and efficient alternative by learning the underlying mappings from input functions to output solutions. This approach not only accelerates computations but also enhances accuracy and generalization, making it a promising tool for tackling challenging problems in computational science and engineering. Neural Operator Networks, such as FNOs [31] and DeepONets [32], have shown significant promise in this field.

The advantage of using deep learning for operator approximation lies in its ability to generalize from training data to unseen scenarios, enabling rapid predictions without requiring extensive re-computation. This is particularly beneficial in real-time applications and scenarios requiring repeated evaluations of operators, such as in MCMC-based algorithms for posterior exploration.

4.1. Forward operator learning for EIT and QPAT

With respect to the algorithmic implementation as described in section 5.1, we note that our proposed method for accelerating the MCMC computations is to replace the accurate but slow FEM implementation of the forward operator with a learned Neural-Operator approximation of the corresponding forward operator.

Note that in the Bayesian inverse problem formulated in section 3 for EIT, the space $H^s(\bar{\Omega}) := X$ is a separable Hilbert space, and $H : X \rightarrow \Gamma$ is a level set map from the space X to the space of piecewise constant admissible conductivities. In this case, we denote the forward problem as:

$$y = \mathcal{G}_{\text{EIT}}(w) + \eta \tag{30}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\text{EIT}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ and w is the level set representation of the unknown parameter. The goal is to approximate the map \mathcal{G}_{EIT} by a neural operator $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_{\text{EIT}}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$. Similarly, for QPAT, when using star-shaped parametrizations, we have a map $\Phi : X \rightarrow L_{\Lambda}^2$ as described




Figure 1: The true map \mathcal{G} is approximated by a composition of two maps, encoder \mathcal{E} and approximator \mathcal{A} .

in [46, section 4.1.1]. As a result, we can again denote the forward problem for QPAT as:

$$y = \mathcal{G}_{\text{QPAT}}(w) + \eta \quad (31)$$

where we now have, $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N_d}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{QPAT}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_d}$, and w is the star set representation of the unknown parameter. Again, the goal will be to approximate the map $\mathcal{G}_{\text{QPAT}}$ by a neural operator $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_{\text{QPAT}}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_d}$. In the context of the present study, a neural operator can be understood as a parametric mapping (depending upon the parameter θ which constitutes the various design choices of the network in terms of weights and biases) that connects an input space (such as the separable Hilbert space X above) to an output space (like the space of matrices of size $\mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ corresponding to the N-t-D data). Depending upon the context, i.e., whether the inverse problem pertains to EIT or QPAT, let us denote the true map between the input space X and output space Y by \mathcal{G} , then we will denote a neural-operator approximation of the true map by \mathcal{G}_{θ} . The mapping \mathcal{G}_{θ} can be viewed as a composition of two distinct maps: an encoder and an approximator, shown in Figure 1. In our notation, $\mathcal{G}_{\theta} = \mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{E}_P$. Consequently, the overall upper bound on the error arising from the approximation of the true operator by a neural operator can be decomposed into distinct upper bounds corresponding to the errors of the encoder and the approximator.

We now focus on the DeepONet framework introduced in [32, 69] and will adopt a similar concept for our present research. In this context, we define the following operators, maintaining the same terminology used in [69].

Encoder

We define the encoder \mathcal{E}_P as an operator that maps the function $w \in X$ to a set of discrete values $\{w(\mathbf{x}_i)\}_{i=1}^P$ in \mathbb{R}^P at a set of regular grid points $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^P \in \Omega$. The encoder can be described as:

$$\mathcal{E}_P : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P, \quad \mathcal{E}_P(w) = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_P) := \bar{\mathbf{w}},$$

where $w_i = w(\mathbf{x}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, P$.

Decoder

While the encoder is a projection of an infinite-dimensional object (i.e., $w \in X$) into a finite-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^P , the decoder lifts a finite-dimensional object back into the infinite-dimensional space X . In this work, $\mathcal{D}_P(\bar{\mathbf{w}})$ is the unique trigonometric polynomial of degree P such that, $\mathcal{D}_P(\bar{\mathbf{w}})(x_j) = w(x_j)$.

Approximator

For EIT, the approximator \mathcal{A}_{EIT} maps the P -dimensional encoded vector in \mathbb{R}^P to an $L \times L$ matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$. This transformation can be described as:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{EIT}} : \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{EIT}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) = \Lambda_P,$$

where the vector $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_P)$ is the encoded representation of w , and $\Lambda_P \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ is the output of the approximator map. Using the above definitions and referring to 1, note that our neural operator can be written in the form $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_{\text{EIT}}} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\text{EIT}} \circ \mathcal{E}$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w) = \mathcal{A}_{\text{EIT}} \circ \mathcal{E}(w)$. For QPAT, the approximator $\mathcal{A}_{\text{QPAT}}$ maps the P -dimensional encoded vector in \mathbb{R}^P to a vector in \mathbb{R}^{N_d} . This transformation can be described as:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{QPAT}} : \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_d}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{EIT}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) = \mathbf{Y} = \{Y_k\}_{k=1}^{N_d},$$

where we again denote a finite-dimensional encoding of w by a vector $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_P)$. We note that this finite dimensional representation of w and, in particular, the dimension P may be different for QPAT and EIT, but we will denote both finite dimensional representations by \mathbb{R}^P , and it will be clear from the context whether we speak of EIT or QPAT. Using the above definitions and referring to 1, note that our neural operator for QPAT can be written in the form $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_{\text{QPAT}}} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\text{QPAT}} \circ \mathcal{E}$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_{\text{QPAT}}}(w) = \mathcal{A}_{\text{QPAT}} \circ \mathcal{E}(w)$.

Theorem 2. *Here and below, we will denote the true map between the input space of parameters X and the respective finite-dimensional output space of observations Y by \mathcal{G} , i.e. $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{\text{EIT}}$ for the EIT case and $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{\text{QPAT}}$ for the QPAT case. Furthermore, we will denote the corresponding neural operator approximation of the true map \mathcal{G} by \mathcal{G}_{θ} . Similarly, $Y = \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ for the EIT inverse problem and $Y = \mathbb{R}^{N_d}$ for QPAT inverse problem. Let μ_0 be a (prior) probability measure on X . We will show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite-dimensional spaces, \mathbb{R}^P and a continuous maps*

$$\mathcal{E} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow Y,$$

such that

$$\|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w)\|_{L^2(\mu)} = \left(\int_X \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w)\|_*^2 d\mu(w) \right)^{1/2} \leq \epsilon.$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ represents the Frobenius norm in $\mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ for the EIT inverse problem and it denotes the l^2 norm in \mathbb{R}^{N_d} for the QPAT inverse problem.

Proof: Let μ_0 be a Gaussian measure on X . If the neural operator architecture is given by $\mathcal{G}_{\theta} \equiv \mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{E}$, then the error $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ in representing the true operator $\mathcal{G}(w)$ by its approximation $\mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w)$ measured in the $L^2(\mu)$ -norm is given by:

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \left(\int_X \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w)\|_*^2 d\mu(w) \right)^{1/2} \quad (32)$$

We can split the term $\|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_{\theta}(w)\|_*$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{E}_P(w)\|_* &\leq \underbrace{\|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P \circ \mathcal{E}_P(w)\|_*}_{T_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\|\mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P \circ \mathcal{E}_P(w) - \mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{E}_P(w)\|_*}_{T_2} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where T_1 and T_2 will contribute respectively to encoding error and approximation error. Let us first consider the term T_1

$$T_1 = \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P \circ \mathcal{E}_P(w)\|_* \quad (34)$$

In the Bayesian formulations of the EIT/QPAT inverse problem, whether we use level-set or star-shaped priors, the forward map \mathcal{G} is a continuous and bounded map, see e.g. [39, 42, 46]. More precisely, $\|\mathcal{G}(w)\|_* \leq M$, (M is a fixed constant) see e.g. proof of [39, Proposition 3.10] or [46, section 3]. Furthermore, as X is a separable Banach space, by Lusin's theorem, there exists a compact set K such that $\mu_0(X \setminus K) < \frac{\epsilon}{8M^2}$, see [69, Lemma C.1]. Clearly, the map \mathcal{G} is uniformly continuous on K . We have defined the maps \mathcal{E}_P and \mathcal{D}_P as the ones used in trigonometric interpolation, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_P \circ \mathcal{E}_P := \mathcal{I}_P$ is the pseudo-spectral projection (trigonometric interpolation) as described in [[70], page 32]. From Theorems 39 and 40 in [70], for any $w \in X$, we have

$$\|(Id - \mathcal{I}_P)w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim P^{-\xi(s)} \quad \text{for some } \xi(s) > 0.$$

Now, consider the set $Z = X \cup_{P=1}^\infty \mathcal{I}_P(w)$. By [71][Lemma 21], Z is a compact set. Hence, there exists a modulus of continuity ω such that, $\|\mathcal{G}(w_1) - \mathcal{G}(w_2)\| \leq \omega(\|(w_1 - w_2)\|_X)$ for $w_1, w_2 \in Z$. Here and below, the symbol \lesssim will indicate that the inequality holds up to some constant. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_1\|_{L^2(\mu)} &= \int_K \|\mathcal{G}(Id - \mathcal{I}_P)w\|_*^2 d\mu(w) + \int_{X \setminus K} \|\mathcal{G}(Id - \mathcal{I}_P)w\|_*^2 \\ &\leq \int_Z \|\mathcal{G}(Id - \mathcal{I}_P)w\|_*^2 d\mu(w) + \frac{\epsilon}{8M^2} 4M^2 \\ &\leq \omega(P^{-\xi(s)}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \lesssim \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

for P large enough. Now, we look at

$$\|T_2\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{L \times L}} \|\mathcal{A}(\hat{w}) - \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P(\hat{w})\|_*^2 d(\mathcal{E}_\# \mu)(\hat{w}) \quad (36)$$

$$= \|\mathcal{A}(\hat{w}) - \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P(\hat{w})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_\# \mu)}^2. \quad (37)$$

Recall that \mathcal{G} is a continuous map and \mathcal{D}_P is Lipschitz continuous. As a result, the composition $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{D}_P$ is also continuous. For any given P (suitably chosen so that eq. (36) is satisfied), any continuous map can be well approximated by some ReLU DNN (see, e.g., [72, Theorem 2]) or a deep CNN [73, Theorem 1] \mathcal{A} . As a result, we can make $T_2 \lesssim \epsilon$. This concludes the proof.

Theorem 3. *Let us assume that the noise, η , is i.i.d. Gaussian. Let the true posterior measure, when using the true forward model, \mathcal{G} , be μ_d and the approximate posterior measure when using the Neural network surrogate, \mathcal{G}_θ , be μ_θ . Then $|\mu^y - \mu_\theta^y|_{Hell} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 2, where $|\cdot|_{Hell}$ denotes the Hellinger distance between the posterior densities.*

Proof: Define the potential (likelihood) functions, $\Phi(w; y)$ and $\Phi_\theta(w; y)$ for the true and approximate forward models respectively as:

$$\Phi(w; y) = \frac{1}{2} \|y - G(w)\|_*^2 \quad (38)$$

$$\Phi_\theta(w; y) = \frac{1}{2} \|y - G_\theta(w)\|_*^2. \quad (39)$$

Then following similar calculations as in [74, Lemma 4.2] and [42, Appendix 1], we get

$$|Z_y^\theta - Z_y| \lesssim \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(w)\|_{L^2(\mu)}. \quad (40)$$

where Z_y^θ and Z_y are the corresponding evidence terms as per (7). Thus for the Hellinger distance between the two posterior measures μ^y and μ_θ^y , see e.g. Theorem 1 or, [42], we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\mu^y - \mu_\theta^y|_{\text{Hell}}^2 &= \int_X \left(\sqrt{\frac{\exp(-\Phi(w; y))}{Z_y}} - \sqrt{\frac{\exp(-\Phi_\theta(w; y))}{Z_y^\theta}} \right)^2 d\mu_0 \\ &\leq I_1 + I_2 \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{2}{Z_y} \int_X \left(\sqrt{\exp(-\Phi(w; y))} - \sqrt{\exp(-\Phi_\theta(w; y))} \right)^2 d\mu_0 \quad \text{and} \\ I_2 &= 2|Z_y^{-1/2} - Z_y^{\theta-1/2}|^2 \int_X \exp(-\Phi_\theta(w; y)) d\mu_0 \end{aligned}$$

We note that Z_y is bounded below, and thus, by calculations similar to (40) and those in [74, Lemma 4.2], we have:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{2}{Z_y} \int_X \left(\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(w; y)) - \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi_\theta(w; y)) \right)^2 d\mu_0 \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(w)\|_{L^2(\mu)}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In addition, following [42, Appendix 1],

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\lesssim |Z_y^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z_y^{\theta-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 \int_X \exp(-\Phi_\theta(w; y)) d\mu_0 \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(w)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where we use the fact that

$$\Phi_\theta(w; y) \leq \|\mathcal{G}_\theta(w)\|^2 + \|y\|^2 \leq \|\mathcal{G}_\theta(w) - \mathcal{G}(w)\|^2 + \|\mathcal{G}(w)\|^2 + \|y\|^2. \quad (44)$$

is bounded if y is bounded. Thus as $\|\mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(w)\|_{L^2(\mu)} \rightarrow 0$, then both $I_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $I_2 \rightarrow 0$ and this concludes the proof.

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we discuss the computational method and inversion results to demonstrate the effectiveness and accuracy of the MCMC-Net for accelerating the MCMC method on slow likelihood functions. We start with the details of the algorithm, model training, and the CNN architecture for different inverse problems. Then, we compare the inversion results using MCMC-Net with the classical variant (MCMC-FEM) that does not involve a neural network. In this section, the terms ‘‘MCMC-Net’’ and ‘‘CNN’’ are used interchangeably, and both refer to the same concept within the context of our work.

5.1. Algorithmic Implementation

Here, we describe the MCMC algorithm used in the numerical simulations. The central concept is to draw samples from the posterior distribution to compute the Bayesian estimate for the unknown parameter q introduced in **section 2**. This estimate can be approximated by the Monte Carlo average $E_{\Pi}(q^* | \Lambda_{\text{true-noisy}}^*) \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^*$, where q^* represents the discretized random variable of q , q_i^* are the individual discrete samples of q^* , and Λ^* corresponds to a finite set of measurements. We utilize the pCN algorithm with a Gaussian process (GP) prior to sample from the posterior distribution. To begin, we define the log-likelihood function for the inverse problem for each sample q_i^* , where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$:

$$L(q_i^*) := -\frac{1}{2\sigma_{\text{noise}}^2} \|\Lambda_{\text{true-noisy}}^* - \Lambda_{q_i^*}^*\|_F^2,$$

where $\Lambda_{q_i^*}^*$ represents the solution to a single forward problem, and $\|\cdot\|_F^2$ denotes the squared Frobenius norm.

Let Π denote a Gaussian prior with mean zero and covariance matrix \mathcal{C} for q^* . Set the initial value q_0^* to the typical background value of q^* . Then, repeat the following steps until the required number of samples is obtained:

1. Sample $\Upsilon \sim \Pi$ and compute the proposal $q_{\text{Prop.}}^* := \sqrt{1 - 2\Delta}q_i^* + \sqrt{2\Delta}\Upsilon$, where $\Delta > 0$.
2. Update q_{i+1}^* as follows:

$$q_{i+1}^* = \begin{cases} q_{\text{Prop.}}^* & \text{with probability } \min(1, L(q_{\text{Prop.}}^*) - L(q_i^*)), \\ q_i^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is important to note that a substantial number of burn-in iterations is required before reaching the high-probability regions of the posterior distribution. Only then can the samples be used to compute the Monte Carlo average. To ensure faster convergence, it is recommended to select a parameter $\Delta > 0$, which is used to scale the covariance matrix of the proposal distribution to ensure that approximately 25% of the proposed samples are accepted after burn-in. In practice, this problem is not trivial. Therefore, we adjust Δ during the burn-in phase to maintain the acceptance rate near 0.25. This approach follows the method outlined in [47] or a similar strategy proposed in [75, 76]. Recall that the parameter of interest q is assumed to lie in an infinite-dimensional Sobolev space. In a computational setting, however, we approximate the parameter space by a finite, albeit very high-dimensional space, where functions are piecewise constant over each triangle in the finite element discretization. Traditional MCMC methods applied to such high-dimensional spaces suffer from the ‘‘curse of dimensionality,’’ which can lead to a large number of iterations being required for convergence. As discussed in [47, Section 4], it can be shown that q_{i+1}^* forms a Markov chain. For more information on how the pCN method enhances the algorithm and leads to significant computational speed-ups in Bayesian estimation, we direct readers to [11].

To achieve properly regularized reconstructions, we select the covariance matrix for Π to be defined by a Matérn kernel, with the parameters $\nu \geq 3$ and ℓ chosen heuristically. This Gaussian process prior imposes a regularization effect similar to a Sobolev-norm penalty, as discussed in [47]. The Matérn kernel is given by

$$k_{\nu, \ell}(d) := \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} \left(\frac{d\sqrt{2\nu}}{\ell} \right)^\nu K_\nu \left(\frac{d\sqrt{2\nu}}{\ell} \right),$$

where $d := \|x_i - x_j\|_2$ is the Euclidean distance between two PDE mesh centroids, and K_ν represents the modified Bessel function of the second kind. We ran all MCMC methods with 50,000 samples for burn-in and another 50,000 samples that we considered from the true posterior distribution samples.

5.2. Hardware and Training Parameters

We trained all the different neural networks used in this study on a high-performance computing (HPC) cluster utilizing the Slurm workload manager. Each training job was submitted to the GPU partition and allocated one node equipped with Dual 8-core Intel Xeon CPUs @ 3.20GHz and 1 NVIDIA Tesla V100S GPU with 32 GB HBM2 RAM. MATLAB R2022b was used for all training processes, with the necessary scripts executed in non-interactive mode. The same computing power was used during the EIT and DOT inversion (reconstruction) processes. For the QPAT inversion, all the computations were performed on a desktop running Windows 11 and MATLAB version R2023b. The hardware configuration includes an Intel Core i7 processor with 14 cores clocked at 2.30 GHz, 16 GB of RAM, and a dedicated NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3050 Ti GPU with 4 GB of VRAM.

5.3. Data Generation and Training

Since the inverse problems considered—EIT, DOT, and QPAT—differ in nature, we employ three distinct CNN architectures to replace the forward model evaluations in each respective problem. For training these CNNs, we generate datasets comprising input-output pairs: inputs represent problem-specific parameters (e.g., conductivity for EIT), and outputs correspond to measurements (e.g., boundary voltage measurements for EIT). Detailed descriptions of the data generation process, CNN architectures, and training methodologies for each inverse problem are provided in the subsequent sections. We systematically experimented with different CNN networks and training parameters to find the best setup (in terms of error and computation speed) for each problem.

EIT: In the case of EIT, to train the CNN, we generate a total of 7200 data pairs for conductivity distribution σ and boundary measurements Φ_b . In the dataset, we include σ with varying radii and locations in the finite element mesh. Also, we generate σ using the level set prior as described in section 3. For the prior knowledge, we use the probability distribution with mean zero and Matérn kernel ($\nu = 3, l = 0.4$) as a covariance matrix. In total, we compute 7200 conductivity (σ) values. Then based on all these σ values, we solve the forward EIT model using FEM to calculate the corresponding boundary measurements Φ_b . Then, using those data pair $\{\sigma, \Phi_b\}$, we train the CNN.

In this problem, the CNN architecture consists of a sequence of convolutional and fully connected layers interspersed with activation and max-pooling layers. The CNN structure starts with an input layer, then a fully connected layer with 16×16 neurons. This is reshaped into a 16×16 feature map, which is then passed through four convolutional blocks. Each block consists of a 3×3 convolutional layer with 16 filters, followed by an activation and max-pooling layer. After the final convolutional layer, the output is passed through a fully connected layer with 16×16 neurons. The network was trained for 2000 epochs with a mini-batch size of 128 and a learning rate of 0.001.

DOT: Similarly as EIT, in the case of the DOT inverse problem, we produce 6400 data pairs for the absorption coefficient μ and the boundary measurements Φ_b . Also, we generate μ using the probability distribution with mean zero and Matérn kernel ($\nu = 3, l = 0.2$) as a covariance matrix. However, in this case, we have not used the level set parametrization.

In this problem, CNN architecture starts with an input layer followed by a fully connected layer with 16×16 neurons. The output is reshaped into a 16×16 feature map and passed through four convolutional layers, each using a 3×3 filter with ‘same’ padding, followed by an activation layer. The network concludes with a fully connected layer. Training was conducted for 100 epochs with a mini-batch size of 8. The initial learning rate was 0.001, with a 0.1 drop every 50 epochs to optimize the learning process.

QPAT: For the case of QPAT, we generate a total of 4800 data pairs for the absorption coefficient γ and the measurement Φ_q . In this case, we generate circular-shaped γ with varying radii. Also, generate γ with a similar shape to the simulated ground truth absorption coefficient shown in Figure 6a. For diversity, the two inclusions in the ground truth are rotated independently by a random angle within the range $[-\pi, \pi]$. In addition, we generate the star-shaped priors for γ and include them in the data set. In total, we compute 4800 absorption coefficient (γ) values. Then based on all these γ values, we solve the forward QPAT model using FEM to calculate the corresponding measurements Φ_q . Then, using those data pair $\{\gamma, \Phi_q\}$, we train the CNN. The CNN architecture includes an input layer followed by a fully connected layer with 16×16 neurons. This output is reshaped into a 16×16 feature map, which then passes through four convolutional layers. Each convolutional layer uses a 3×3 filter with ‘same’ padding, followed by an activation layer and a max-pooling layer. The initial learning rate was set to 0.001, with a learning rate drop factor of 0.1 applied every 20 epochs to refine the training process.

In addition to the above-mentioned methodologies, we use the ReLU activation function across all three CNN architectures and train each network using the ADAM optimizer. The results for EIT, DOT, and QPAT are presented in the following three subsections.

5.4. Electrical Impedance Tomography

In Figure 2, we compare the electrical conductivity reconstruction results for the EIT inverse problem using FEM and CNN forward solver, considering one, two, and three anomalies. To visualize the convergence of the MCMC method for both FEM and CNN, see Figure 3. Table 1 presents the different errors calculated between the ground truth and the reconstructions for both FEM and CNN. The last column of Table 1 describes the corresponding computation times. In addition to the Bayesian estimates, the corresponding credible regions are shown in Figure 2.

In the one-dimensional case, a Bayesian credible interval of size $1 - \alpha$ is an interval (a, b) such that $P(a \leq \tau \leq b | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^n) = 1 - \alpha$, where τ is a random variable, and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are the given samples of τ . In this paper, a $1 - \alpha$ credible region refers to a two-dimensional extension of the Bayesian credible interval. Specifically, a region of $1 - \alpha$ credibility is defined over a set of non-overlapping triangles in the reconstruction mesh Ω_{discrete} covering Ω . For each triangle $t \in \Omega_{\text{discrete}}$, we have an interval $(a(t), b(t))$ such that $P(a(t) \leq \tau(t) \leq b(t) | \{X_i(t)\}_{i=1}^n) = 1 - \alpha$, where $\tau(t)$ is the random variable within the corresponding triangle.

By analyzing all the results described above, we can conclude that by replacing the FEM forward solver with CNN forward solver, we can reconstruct the internal conductivity using MCMC-Net with the same accuracy as the one using MCMC-FEM but at about twelvefold lower computing cost.

5.5. Diffuse Optical Tomography

In this section, we discuss the numerical simulation results of the inverse problem of DOT. This problem is solved using the MCMC-FEM approach and discussed in [43]. In this study,




Figure 2: Reconstruction of electrical conductivity using FEM and CNN for EIT (data obtained 1% relative noise). From left to right: First column: Ground-truth. Second column: Lower Bayesian credible bound (20 % percentile). Third column: Bayesian estimate in coarse reconstruction mesh. Fourth column: Upper Bayesian credible bound (80 % percentile). Figure 2a–2g for one anomaly. Figure 2h–2n for two anomalies.




Figure 3: EIT: Convergence of the MCMC method for FEM and CNN. Data obtained at 1 % relative noise. One anomaly.

Table 1: EIT: Comparison of reconstruction errors and computational times between FEM and CNN.

Anomaly type (Circular)	Mean absolute loss		Mean square error		CPU Time (in sec)	
	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN
One	0.071397	0.059502	0.285499	0.237916	8058.75	784.34
Two	0.154669	0.151695	0.618581	0.606685	7970.98	772.72
Three	0.282551	0.315265	1.130100	1.260960	9401.01	799.40

Table 2: DOT: Comparison of Reconstruction errors and computational times between FEM and CNN.

Anomaly type (Circular)	L^∞ -loss		Mean absolute loss		Mean square error		CPU Time (in sec)	
	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN
One	2.9909	2.1640	0.2818	0.2648	0.3632	0.2438	2362.2	351.95
Two	3.1235	2.4890	0.4863	0.4414	0.7260	0.4976	2379.6	348.62

Table 3: QPAT: Comparison of Reconstruction errors and computational times between FEM and CNN.

Anomaly type Star & Kite	Mean absolute loss		Mean square error		CPU Time (in sec)	
	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN	FEM	CNN
Noise Level 2 %	0.001329	0.001708	0.000101	0.000156	637.2	396.6
Noise Level 4 %	0.001467	0.001908	0.000102	0.000149	645.4	388.7
Noise Level 8 %	0.002121	0.002417	0.000195	0.000242	639.5	391.2

we replace the FEM forward solver with CNN and compute the reconstruction results for the absorption coefficient and represent the results in Figure 4. Similar to the previous case of EIT results, we can see that by replacing the FEM forward solver with CNN forward solver, we can reconstruct the absorption coefficient similarly well.

Different errors computed between the ground truth and the reconstructed results are presented in Table 2, further supporting our findings. The computational time for both approaches is shown in Column 4 of Table 2. The proposed approach takes approximately seven times less computational time to achieve similar accuracy as the FEM forward solver.

5.6. Quantitative Photoacoustic Tomography

In the final part of the numerical results, we describe the absorption coefficient reconstructions for the inverse problem of QPAT [46]. For this problem, we reproduced the results for FEM forward solver using the code as in [46]. Then we replaced the FEM forward solver with the proposed CNN solver. We display the reconstruction results in Figure 6 for various noise levels. The computed errors and computation times are summarized in Table 3. After analyzing all the results, we infer that replacing the FEM forward solver with the CNN solver enables us to reconstruct an absorption coefficient at a similar quality to that obtained with FEM but at a lowered computational cost.




Figure 4: Reconstruction of absorption coefficient (μ) using FEM and CNN for DOT (data obtained 1% relative noise). From left to right: First column: Ground-truth. Second column: Lower Bayesian credible bound (20 % percentile). Third column: Bayesian estimate in coarse reconstruction mesh. Fourth column: Upper Bayesian credible bound (80 % percentile). Figure 4a–4g for one anomaly. Figure 4h–4n for two anomalies.




Figure 5: DOT: Convergence of the MCMC method for FEM and CNN. Data obtained at 1 % relative noise. One anomaly.




Figure 6: Reconstruction of the absorption coefficient using FEM and CNN for QPAT. From left to right: First column: Ground truth. Second column: Reconstruction (data obtained 2 % relative noise). Third column: Reconstruction (data obtained 4 % relative noise). Fourth column: Reconstruction (data obtained 8 % relative noise).

6. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce a deep neural network-based surrogate model that significantly reduces the computational cost of likelihood evaluation in MCMC for Bayesian inverse problems. We further analyze a universal approximation theorem-type result to show that the proposed network structure can approximate the respective forward maps in a suitable asymptotic sense. We validated this approach on three distinct inverse problems and demonstrated that the proposed surrogate technique achieves up to twelve times the speed of traditional methods when considering posterior samples up to 100,000. Also, we establish an asymptotic result that shows that the surrogate posterior derived by using the MCMC-Net approaches the posterior using the traditional FEM forward solver in pCN based sampler while at the same time cutting down computational cost by an order of magnitude which justifies using the proposed method. Hence, the proposed technique is an important addition to the field of Bayesian inverse problems, offering both computational efficiency and reliability.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported through partial funding from the Center for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence through Model Risk Management (TAIMing AI) at UNC Charlotte which is funded through the Division of Research, the School of Data Science, and the Klein College of Science.

References

- [1] A. E. Gelfand, A. F. Smith, Sampling-based approaches to calculating marginal densities, *Journal of the American statistical association* 85 (410) (1990) 398–409.
- [2] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, E. Teller, Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines, *The journal of chemical physics* 21 (6) (1953) 1087–1092.
- [3] W. K. Hastings, *Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications* (1970).
- [4] C. P. Robert, G. Casella, *Monte carlo statistical methods* (springer texts in statistics) (2005).
- [5] G. O. Roberts, J. S. Rosenthal, *General state space markov chains and mcmc algorithms* (2004).
- [6] J. Kaipio, E. Somersalo, *Statistical and computational inverse problems*, Vol. 160, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [7] A. Tarantola, *Inverse problem theory and methods for model parameter estimation*, SIAM, 2005.
- [8] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, A. Neubauer, *Regularization of inverse problems*, Vol. 375, Springer Science & Business Media, 1996.
- [9] A. M. Stuart, Inverse problems: a bayesian perspective, *Acta numerica* 19 (2010) 451–559.
- [10] D. Calvetti, E. Somersalo, Inverse problems: From regularization to bayesian inference, *WIREs Computational Statistics* 10 (3) (2018) e1427. `arXiv:https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wics.1427`, `doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.1427`.
URL `https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/wics.1427`
- [11] S. Cotter, G. Roberts, A. Stuart, D. White, Mcmc methods for functions: Modifying old algorithms to make them faster, *Statistical Science* 28 (3) (2013) 424–446.
- [12] A. Gelman, W. R. Gilks, G. O. Roberts, Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk metropolis algorithms, *The annals of applied probability* 7 (1) (1997) 110–120.
- [13] J. Goodman, J. Weare, Ensemble samplers with affine invariance, *Communications in applied mathematics and computational science* 5 (1) (2010) 65–80.
- [14] T. Cui, Y. M. Marzouk, K. E. Willcox, Data-driven model reduction for the bayesian solution of inverse problems, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 102 (5) (2015) 966–990.
- [15] T. Cui, Y. Marzouk, K. Willcox, Scalable posterior approximations for large-scale bayesian inverse problems via likelihood-informed parameter and state reduction, *Journal of Computational Physics* 315 (2016) 363–387.

- [16] C. Lieberman, K. Willcox, O. Ghattas, Parameter and state model reduction for large-scale statistical inverse problems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 32 (5) (2010) 2523–2542.
- [17] Y. M. Marzouk, H. N. Najm, Dimensionality reduction and polynomial chaos acceleration of bayesian inference in inverse problems, *Journal of Computational Physics* 228 (6) (2009) 1862–1902.
- [18] T. Bui-Thanh, O. Ghattas, J. Martin, G. Stadler, A computational framework for infinite-dimensional bayesian inverse problems part i: The linearized case, with application to global seismic inversion, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 35 (6) (2013) A2494–A2523.
- [19] C. Schillings, B. Sprungk, P. Wacker, On the convergence of the laplace approximation and noise-level-robustness of laplace-based monte carlo methods for bayesian inverse problems, *Numerische Mathematik* 145 (2020) 915–971.
- [20] J. Li, Y. M. Marzouk, Adaptive construction of surrogates for the bayesian solution of inverse problems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 36 (3) (2014) A1163–A1186.
- [21] L. Yan, Y.-X. Zhang, Convergence analysis of surrogate-based methods for bayesian inverse problems, *Inverse Problems* 33 (12) (2017) 125001.
- [22] L. Y. Zhou, et al., An adaptive surrogate modeling based on deep neural networks for large-scale bayesian inverse problems, *Communications in Computational Physics* 28 (5) (2020) 2180–2205.
- [23] Z. Gao, L. Yan, T. Zhou, Adaptive operator learning for infinite-dimensional bayesian inverse problems, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17844* (2023).
- [24] J. Han, A. Jentzen, W. E, Solving high-dimensional partial differential equations using deep learning, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (34) (2018) 8505–8510.
- [25] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, G. E. Karniadakis, Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations, *Journal of Computational physics* 378 (2019) 686–707.
- [26] C. Schwab, J. Zech, Deep learning in high dimension: Neural network expression rates for generalized polynomial chaos expansions in uq, *Analysis and Applications* 17 (01) (2019) 19–55.
- [27] R. K. Tripathy, I. Billionis, Deep uq: Learning deep neural network surrogate models for high dimensional uncertainty quantification, *Journal of computational physics* 375 (2018) 565–588.
- [28] Y. Zhu, N. Zabaras, Bayesian deep convolutional encoder–decoder networks for surrogate modeling and uncertainty quantification, *Journal of Computational Physics* 366 (2018) 415–447.
- [29] T. Deveney, E. Mueller, T. Shardlow, A deep surrogate approach to efficient bayesian inversion in pde and integral equation models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01547* (2019).

- [30] L. Yan, T. Zhou, An acceleration strategy for randomize-then-optimize sampling via deep neural networks, *Journal of Computational Mathematics* 39 (6) (2021) 848–864.
- [31] Z. Li, N. Kovachki, K. Azizzadenesheli, B. Liu, K. Bhattacharya, A. Stuart, A. Anandkumar, Fourier neural operator for parametric partial differential equations, arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08895 (2020).
- [32] L. Lu, P. Jin, G. Pang, Z. Zhang, G. E. Karniadakis, Learning nonlinear operators via deeponet based on the universal approximation theorem of operators, *Nature machine intelligence* 3 (3) (2021) 218–229.
- [33] L. Cao, T. O’Leary-Roseberry, P. K. Jha, J. T. Oden, O. Ghattas, Residual-based error correction for neural operator accelerated infinite-dimensional bayesian inverse problems, *Journal of Computational Physics* 486 (2023) 112104.
- [34] M. Genzel, J. Macdonald, M. März, Solving inverse problems with deep neural networks—robustness included?, *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 45 (1) (2022) 1119–1134.
- [35] B. Raonić, R. Molinaro, T. De Ryck, T. Rohner, F. Bartolucci, R. Alaifari, S. Mishra, E. de Bézenac, Convolutional neural operators for robust and accurate learning of pdes, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [36] R. Nickl, *Bayesian Non-linear Statistical Inverse Problems*, Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, EMS, 2023. doi:10.4171/ZLAM/30.
URL <https://ems.press/books/zlam/260>
- [37] M. Dashti, A. M. Stuart, The Bayesian approach to inverse problems, in: *Handbook of uncertainty quantification*. Vol. 1, 2, 3, Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 311–428.
- [38] E. Somersalo, M. Cheney, D. Isaacson, Existence and uniqueness for electrode models for electric current computed tomography, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 52 (4) (1992) 1023–1040. doi:10.1137/0152060.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0152060>
- [39] M. M. Dunlop, A. M. Stuart, The Bayesian formulation of EIT: analysis and algorithms, *Inverse Probl. Imaging* 10 (4) (2016) 1007–1036. doi:10.3934/ipi.2016030.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3934/ipi.2016030>
- [40] M. Cheney, D. Isaacson, J. C. Newell, Electrical impedance tomography, *SIAM review* 41 (1) (1999) 85–101.
- [41] L. Borcea, Electrical impedance tomography, *Inverse problems* 18 (6) (2002) R99.
- [42] M. A. Iglesias, Y. Lu, A. Stuart, A Bayesian level set method for geometric inverse problems, *Interfaces Free Bound.* 18 (2) (2016) 181–217. doi:10.4171/IFB/362.
URL <https://doi.org/10.4171/IFB/362>
- [43] A. Abhishek, T. Strauss, T. Khan, An optimal bayesian estimator for absorption coefficient in diffuse optical tomography, *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 15 (2) (2022) 797–821.

- [44] F. Natterer, F. Wübbeling, *Mathematical methods in image reconstruction*, SIAM Monographs on Mathematical Modeling and Computation, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2001. doi:10.1137/1.9780898718324.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718324>
- [45] B. Harrach, On uniqueness in diffuse optical tomography, *Inverse problems* 25 (5) (2009) 055010.
- [46] B. M. Afkham, K. Knudsen, A. K. Rasmussen, T. Tarvainen, A bayesian approach for consistent reconstruction of inclusions, *Inverse Problems* 40 (4) (2024) 045004.
- [47] K. Abraham, R. Nickl, On statistical Calderón problems, *Math. Stat. Learn.* 2 (2) (2019) 165–216.
- [48] M. Suhonen, A. Pulkkinen, T. Tarvainen, Single-stage approach for estimating optical parameters in spectral quantitative photoacoustic tomography, *JOSA A* 41 (3) (2024) 527–542.
- [49] T. Tarvainen, B. T. Cox, J. Kaipio, S. R. Arridge, Reconstructing absorption and scattering distributions in quantitative photoacoustic tomography, *Inverse Problems* 28 (8) (2012) 084009.
- [50] A. Quarteroni, A. Valli, *Numerical approximation of partial differential equations*, Vol. 23, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [51] G. E. Karniadakis, I. G. Kevrekidis, L. Lu, P. Perdikaris, S. Wang, L. Yang, Physics-informed machine learning, *Nature Reviews Physics* 3 (6) (2021) 422–440.
- [52] T. Chen, H. Chen, Universal approximation to nonlinear operators by neural networks with arbitrary activation functions and its application to dynamical systems, *IEEE transactions on neural networks* 6 (4) (1995) 911–917.
- [53] S. Cai, Z. Wang, L. Lu, T. A. Zaki, G. E. Karniadakis, Deepm&mnet: Inferring the electroconvection multiphysics fields based on operator approximation by neural networks, *Journal of Computational Physics* 436 (2021) 110296.
- [54] Z. Mao, L. Lu, O. Marxen, T. A. Zaki, G. E. Karniadakis, Deepm&mnet for hypersonics: Predicting the coupled flow and finite-rate chemistry behind a normal shock using neural-network approximation of operators, *Journal of computational physics* 447 (2021) 110698.
- [55] K. Bhattacharya, B. Hosseini, N. B. Kovachki, A. M. Stuart, Model reduction and neural networks for parametric pdes, *The SMAI journal of computational mathematics* 7 (2021) 121–157.
- [56] N. Kovachki, Z. Li, B. Liu, K. Azizzadenesheli, K. Bhattacharya, A. Stuart, A. Anandkumar, Neural operator: Learning maps between function spaces with applications to pdes, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24 (89) (2023) 1–97.

- [57] Z. Li, N. Kovachki, K. Azizzadenesheli, B. Liu, K. Bhattacharya, A. Stuart, A. Anandkumar, Neural operator: Graph kernel network for partial differential equations, arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03485 (2020).
- [58] Z. Li, N. Kovachki, K. Azizzadenesheli, B. Liu, A. Stuart, K. Bhattacharya, A. Anandkumar, Multipole graph neural operator for parametric partial differential equations, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020) 6755–6766.
- [59] Z. Li, H. Zheng, N. Kovachki, D. Jin, H. Chen, B. Liu, K. Azizzadenesheli, A. Anandkumar, Physics-informed neural operator for learning partial differential equations, *ACM/JMS Journal of Data Science* 1 (3) (2024) 1–27.
- [60] J. Pathak, S. Subramanian, P. Harrington, S. Raja, A. Chattopadhyay, M. Mardani, T. Kurth, D. Hall, Z. Li, K. Azizzadenesheli, et al., Fourcastnet: A global data-driven high-resolution weather model using adaptive fourier neural operators, arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11214 (2022).
- [61] M. Prasthofer, T. De Ryck, S. Mishra, Variable-input deep operator networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11404 (2022).
- [62] V. S. Fanaskov, I. V. Oseledets, Spectral neural operators, in: *Doklady Mathematics*, Vol. 108, Springer, 2023, pp. S226–S232.
- [63] G. Kissas, J. H. Seidman, L. F. Guilhoto, V. M. Preciado, G. J. Pappas, P. Perdikaris, Learning operators with coupled attention, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23 (215) (2022) 1–63.
- [64] J. Seidman, G. Kissas, P. Perdikaris, G. J. Pappas, Nomad: Nonlinear manifold decoders for operator learning, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 5601–5613.
- [65] M. V. de Hoop, M. Lassas, C. A. Wong, Deep learning architectures for nonlinear operator functions and nonlinear inverse problems, *Mathematical Statistics and Learning* 4 (1) (2022) 1–86.
- [66] M. V. de Hoop, N. B. Kovachki, N. H. Nelsen, A. M. Stuart, Convergence rates for learning linear operators from noisy data, *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* 11 (2) (2023) 480–513.
- [67] T. Furuya, M. Puthawala, M. Lassas, M. V. de Hoop, Globally injective and bijective neural operators, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [68] S. Cao, Choose a transformer: Fourier or galerkin, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021) 24924–24940.
- [69] S. Lanthaler, S. Mishra, G. E. Karniadakis, Error estimates for deeponets: A deep learning framework in infinite dimensions, *Transactions of Mathematics and Its Applications* 6 (1) (2022) tnac001.
- [70] N. Kovachki, S. Lanthaler, S. Mishra, On universal approximation and error bounds for fourier neural operators, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22 (290) (2021) 1–76.

- [71] N. B. Kovachki, Machine Learning and Scientific Computing, California Institute of Technology, 2022.
- [72] D. Yarotsky, Optimal approximation of continuous functions by very deep relu networks, in: S. Bubeck, V. Perchet, P. Rigollet (Eds.), Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory, Vol. 75 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 2018, pp. 639–649.
URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v75/yarotsky18a.html>
- [73] D.-X. Zhou, Universality of deep convolutional neural networks, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis 48 (2) (2020) 787–794. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2019.06.004>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1063520318302045>
- [74] Y. Marzouk, D. Xiu, A stochastic collocation approach to Bayesian inference in inverse problems, Commun. Comput. Phys. 6 (4) (2009) 826–847.
URL https://global-sci.org/intro/article_detail/cicp/7708.html
- [75] S. Ahmad, T. Strauss, S. Kupis, T. Khan, Comparison of statistical inversion with iteratively regularized gauss newton method for image reconstruction in electrical impedance tomography, Applied Mathematics and Computation 358 (2019) 436–448.
- [76] T. Strauss, T. Khan, Statistical inversion in electrical impedance tomography using mixed total variation and non-convex ℓ_p regularization prior, J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. 23 (5) (2015) 529–542.