

REDUCED ORDER MODELS AND CONDITIONAL EXPECTATION

HERMANN G. MATTHIES

ABSTRACT. Systems may depend on parameters which one may control, or which serve to optimise the system, or are imposed externally, or they could be uncertain. This last case is taken as the "Leitmotiv" for the following. A reduced order model is produced from the full order model by some kind of projection onto a relatively low-dimensional manifold or subspace. The parameter dependent reduction process produces a function of the parameters into the manifold. One now wants to examine the relation between the full and the reduced state for all possible parameter values of interest. Similarly, in the field of machine learning, also a function of the parameter set into the image space of the machine learning model is learned on a training set of samples, typically minimising the mean-square error. This set may be seen as a sample from some probability distribution, and thus the training is an approximate computation of the expectation, giving an approximation to the conditional expectation, a special case of an Bayesian updating where the Bayesian loss function is the mean-square error. This offers the possibility of having a combined look at these methods, and also introducing more general loss functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Parameter dependent systems occur often in numerical simulations. These parameters may have different significance: they may be parameters which one may have to determine to tune the simulation, they may be used for control or to optimise the system, or they are imposed externally, or they could be uncertain and are described probabilistically. Such parameter dependent problems have received widespread attention in recent years, as evidenced by the survey [3] and the work described in e.g. [10, 8, 18, 57, 4, 12, 26]. For certain of these numerical procedures for producing reduced order models (ROMs), e.g. [61, 56, 13, 28, 11], it is of advantage if the parameter dependence appears in an affine or linear fashion. The parametrised ROM is typically found through some kind of least squares principle, which is normally equivalent to an orthogonal projection onto some approximating sub-manifold / subspace, or by more general projection procedures. Such parametrised problems can be analysed, and be helped in finding good approximations, by considering associated linear mappings [44, 45]. Such formally parametric problems appear also in the context of uncertainty quantification (UQ), and may be dealt with in an essentially similar manner [42].

Conditional expectation (CEX) on the other hand, which is the main ingredient in the Bayesian treatment of inverse problems [67, 16], also called Bayesian updating (BU) [59, 46, 47, 41] or data assimilation, is in its exact form [7] also described as an orthogonal projection onto a subspace, or in the more general form of a Fréchet mean onto a sub-manifold. This is behind many ideas in filtering, such as the Kalman filter (KF) [31], the Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF) [19], and the Gauss-Markov Kalman filter (GMKF) [60, 52, 53]. This approach of some kind of least squares principle is also prevalent in practically all forms of machine learning (ML) and neural network approximations, e.g.

Date: 31st December 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35B30, 35R30, 35R60, 41A45, 41A63, 60G20, 60G60, 60H15, 60H25, 62F15, 65J22, 65N21, 80A23, 93A30 .

Key words and phrases. reduced order models; parametric dependence; Karhunen-Loève expansion; conditional expectation; Bayesian loss function; uncertainty quantification; machine learning.

[62, 66, 65, 63, 58, 21, 50]. Its connection with probability and Bayesian updating has also long been recognised in the machine learning (ML) community [48]. Also, there are results concerning the connection of ML or deep learning and parametrised partial differential equations (PDEs) [36, 23].

The idea here is to combine these two approaches, and explicitly make the connection between ROM computation, Bayesian updating (BU) and conditional expectation (CEX), and machine learning (ML). Connections between ROMs and data assimilation have been explored also earlier [6]. To this end, the developments in [44, 45] will be briefly recalled in Section 2 for the convenience of the reader. Likewise, in Section 3 Kolmogorov's variational definition of the conditional expectation, and its connection with projections, least squares, and filtering is briefly sketched. Finally, in Section 4 the two concepts are brought together to investigate the connection between and interpretation of parametric ROMs and conditional expectation. This probabilistic interpretation then allows to introduce additional uncertainties in the consideration. Conclusions are in Section 5. Additionally, appendices are attached which very briefly recall the various forms of the spectral decomposition of self-adjoint operators in Appendix A, and the the resulting singular value decomposition (SVD) in Appendix B.

2. ANALYSIS BY LINEAR MAPS

Consider an operator equation, e.g. some physical system modelled and depending on a quantity q :

$$\frac{d}{dt}u + A(q; u) = f(q) \quad u \in \mathcal{V}, u(0) = u_0 \in \mathcal{V}; f \in \mathcal{V}^*, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{V} is the space of states, and \mathcal{V}^* is the dual space of actions / forcings. The parameter $p \in \mathcal{P}$ may be

$$p = q \quad | \quad p = (q, f) \quad | \quad p = (q, f, u_0) \quad | \quad p = (t, q, \dots) \dots,$$

or time t , frequency ν , or a random realisation ω , coupling conditions In total the solution $u(p)$ to Eq.(1) is dependent on the parameter $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

This is a typical example of a parameter dependent problem, which may be the abstract formulation of a parameter dependent partial differential equation (PDE). It is what will be called the high fidelity model (HFM) here, as an abstract mathematical model of a real-world solution with a hopefully small *modelling error*.

Often one will be interested in what will be termed a *quantity of interest* (QoI), say something like

$$Y(u) = \mathbb{A}(y(u(p), p)), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbb{A} may be some kind of averaging process of a function $y(u, p) : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ over the set \mathcal{P} , which picks up values of the solution u for specific values of the parameter p . The situation where \mathcal{P} is a probability space and $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{E}$ is the corresponding expectation operator is a typical example.

2.1. The parametric map.

As $A(p, \cdot)$, $f(p)$, $u(p)$, or $y(u(p), p)$ are all parameter dependent quantities, we shall *generically* refer to any of them as $r(p)$. Assume that for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$: $r(p) \in \mathcal{U}$ is in a linear space, and one wants to represent $p \mapsto r(p)$ computationally, i.e. find approximations or reduced order models (ROMs) $r_a(p) \approx r(p)$. To fix ideas, assume that $r(p)$ is explicitly given, or results from a general equation — like the evolution equation before — written as

$$F(r(p), p) = 0, \quad \text{implicitly defining } r(p); \quad (3)$$

well-posed in the sense that for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$ there is a unique solution $r(p) \in \mathcal{U}$ as implied by the implicit function theorem.

The parameter set \mathcal{P} is not assumed to have any structure, it will be replaced, using duality, by a vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ (the vector space of real functions on \mathcal{P}).

2.2. A Simple Example.

To make clear where we are going, take a look at a simple example: assume that the set $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ finite, and $\mathbf{r}(p) = [r_1(p), r_2(p), r_3(p), r_4(p)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^4 = \mathcal{U}$. Arranging gives

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1(p_1), r_2(p_1), r_3(p_1), r_4(p_1) \\ r_1(p_2), r_2(p_2), r_3(p_2), r_4(p_2) \\ r_1(p_3), r_2(p_3), r_3(p_3), r_4(p_3) \end{bmatrix},$$

a matrix, which corresponds to a linear map $\mathbf{R} : \mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$.

The action of \mathbf{R} for any $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4]^T \in \mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^4$ is given by

$$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{r}(\cdot)^T \mathbf{u} = [\phi(p_1), \phi(p_2), \phi(p_3)]^T = \phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} \cong \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where $\phi_k = \phi(p_k) = \sum_{n=1}^4 r_n(p_k)u_n$ — a weighted average. Obviously, knowing \mathbf{R} and knowing $\mathbf{r}(p)$ is equivalent. This is generally also true if \mathcal{P} is infinite, or \mathcal{U} is infinite dimensional. In fact, in those situations the description by a linear map is actually the theoretically more viable and more general concept, see e.g. [42]. The advantage of dealing with \mathbf{R} is that it is a linear map, where many tools for analysis exist, whereas $p \mapsto \mathbf{r}(p)$ is just a not very well characterised or specified function.

2.3. Associated Linear Map.

Thus, following [44, 45], to each such function $r(p)$ with values in \mathcal{V} , where for the sake of simplicity we assume that \mathcal{V} is a Hilbert space, one actually considers

$$r : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{U} := \text{span im } r = \text{span}\{r(p) \in \mathcal{V} \mid p \in \mathcal{P}\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}, \quad (4)$$

the map into the closed Hilbert subspace $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ which is actually “hit” by $r(p)$. This will make the associated linear map

$$R : \mathcal{U} \ni u \mapsto \langle r(p) \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} \quad (5)$$

injective or one-to-one by design, where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \text{im } R = R(\mathcal{U})$. More complicated situations, where \mathcal{V} is just a locally convex space, may be dealt with in an essentially similar manner [42] with some more effort.

One may use the injectivity of R to make $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ into a pre-Hilbert space by transferring the inner product of \mathcal{U} :

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}} : \langle \phi \mid \psi \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} := \langle R^{-1}\phi \mid R^{-1}\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}. \quad (6)$$

Denote the completion of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ with the resulting Hilbert norm as \mathcal{R} , then Eq.(6) shows that R^{-1} is unitary on this completion \mathcal{R} , which means that $R^{-1} = R^*$ and $R^*R = I_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $RR^* = I_{\mathcal{R}}$, where R^* is the adjoint of R , $I_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the identity on \mathcal{U} , and similarly for $I_{\mathcal{R}}$.

2.4. Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space.

It is not difficult to check that \mathcal{R} is a *reproducing kernel Hilbert space* [5, 29] (RKHS) with symmetric positive definite *reproducing kernel*

$$\varkappa(p_1, p_2) = \langle r(p_1) \mid r(p_2) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P}}; \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P} : \varkappa(p, \cdot) \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (7)$$

and the kernel function spans the whole space: $\overline{\text{span}}_{\mathcal{R}}\{\varkappa(p, \cdot) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}\} = \mathcal{R}$; which shows that \mathcal{P} is represented in \mathcal{R} through $\mathcal{P} \ni p \mapsto \varkappa(p, \cdot) \in \mathcal{R}$.

The reproducing property, which is the Riesz representation of the evaluation function — the *Dirac- δ_p* — is expressed as

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{R} : \langle \varkappa(p, \cdot) \mid \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}} = \phi(p) = \langle \delta_p, \phi \rangle = \delta_p(\phi), \quad (8)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the duality bracket between \mathcal{U} and its dual space.

In other settings (classification, machine learning, support vector machines), when different subsets of \mathcal{P} have to be classified, the space \mathcal{U} and the map $r : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is not given, but can be freely chosen — as factorisation of a kernel, cf. Eq.(7). It is then called the feature map, and the whole procedure is called the kernel trick.

What is important, is that up to now only the inner product on \mathcal{U} has been used; it determines the one on the RKHS \mathcal{R} , Eq.(6). The “correlation” $R^*R = I_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the identity — see Section 2.5 — and can thus not distinguish which part of \mathcal{P} is important.

But it is still possible to see that this construction allows a representation which is linear of affine in the parameters. To this end, assume for the sake of simplicity that \mathcal{R} — hence also \mathcal{U} — is separable, and choose a complete orthonormal system (CONS) — a Hilbert basis — $\{\eta_m\}_m \subset \mathcal{R}$ such that $\overline{\text{span}}\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots\} = \mathcal{R}$.

With R^{-1} unitary, this gives a CONS in \mathcal{U} : $u_m = R^{-1}\eta_m$, and with that a representation of $r(p)$ on the RKHS \mathcal{R} , one which is *linear* in these new parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \dots)$:

$$r(p) = \sum_m \eta_m(p)u_m =: r(\boldsymbol{\eta}), \quad (9)$$

as $Ru_m = \langle r(p) | u_m \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \eta_m(p)$ is the coefficient in the expansion of $r(p)$ in the CONS $\{u_m\}_m$. Observe that in this situation one can write the map R and R^* as

$$R = \sum_m \eta_m \otimes u_m, \quad \text{and} \quad R^{-1} = R^* = \sum_m u_m \otimes \eta_m, \quad (10)$$

a *singular value decomposition* (SVD) of R and R^* , see Appendix B — all singular values and numbers are equal to unity.

The functions $\eta_m : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be considered as “co-ordinates” on \mathcal{P} , or as new parameters in which the representation $r(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ on the RKHS \mathcal{R} is *linear*. Hence, one goal, that of a representation linear in the parameters, has been reached. Alternatively, one could have started with a CONS $\{u_m\}_m \subset \mathcal{U}$, and set $\eta_m = Ru_m$ to achieve the same end. But to find a *good* reduced order model one needs a criterion on which CONS is “good”, so that an expansion like Eq.(9) will give a good approximation with the first few terms.

2.5. Correlation.

To proceed towards the goal of finding a good CONS, assume that $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is another Hilbert space of real-valued functions on \mathcal{P} with an inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}}$. This inner product on \mathcal{Q} kind of “measures” what is important on \mathcal{P} resp. in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ — e.g. if (\mathcal{P}, μ) is a measure space, one may set $\mathcal{Q} := L_2(\mathcal{P}, \mu)$. Additionally, assume that the linear map $R : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and closed; although, again for the sake of simplicity, we shall mostly operate under the assumption that R is continuous / bounded, and hence can be defined on all of \mathcal{U} .

The linear map is now $R : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, but by slight abuse of notation we shall keep the same denotation for it. But its adjoint is now determined by the inner product on \mathcal{Q} , and to distinguish this from the situation in the previous Section 2.4 it will be denoted by R^\dagger ; and it will not be unitary any more.

To describe this situation with a new inner product in relation with the linear map R , an additional linear map $C_{\mathcal{U}}$ — the self-adjoint positive definite “correlation” — can be defined by the bilinear form

$$\forall u, v \in \mathcal{U} : \langle C_{\mathcal{U}}u | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} := \langle Ru | Rv \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}} = \langle R^\dagger Ru | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}; \quad R^\dagger \text{ w.r.t. } \mathcal{Q}, \quad (11)$$

so that $C_{\mathcal{U}} = R^\dagger R$. In the case $\mathcal{Q} = L_2(\mathcal{P}, \mu)$, one has $C_{\mathcal{U}} = \int_{\mathcal{P}} r(p) \otimes r(p) \mu(dp)$.

The singular value decomposition (SVD) — see Appendix A and Appendix B — of the adjoint map $R^\dagger : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is then the basis for a representation. Assuming again for the sake of simplicity of exposition a discrete spectrum for the correlation $C_{\mathcal{U}}$ in

Eq.(11) with positive eigenvalues ζ_j^2 and eigenvectors $v_j \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e. a spectral decomposition $C_{\mathcal{U}} = \sum_j \zeta_j^2 v_j \otimes v_j$ — see Appendix A — this gives for the SVD of R^\dagger and the linear representation of $r(p)$

$$R^\dagger = \sum_j \zeta_j v_j \otimes s_j, \quad r(p) = \sum_j \zeta_j s_j(p) v_j. \quad (12)$$

Here the $s_j \in \mathcal{Q}$ are the normalised eigenfunctions belonging to the eigenvalue ζ_j^2 of the associated “companion” correlation or kernel $C_{\mathcal{Q}} := RR^\dagger : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, recall that $C_{\mathcal{Q}}$ has the same spectrum as $C_{\mathcal{U}}$. The action of $C_{\mathcal{Q}}$ can still be described with the kernel function \varkappa like in Eq.(8), but now with the $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}}$ -inner product there replaced by the $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}}$ -inner product on \mathcal{Q} ; hence the kernel is *not* reproducing any more. As may be gleaned from the second member in Eq.(12), the parametric quantity $r(p)$ is now again represented linearly in the *new parameters* $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_j, \dots)$, i.e. $r(p) = r(\mathbf{s}(p))$. But in contrast to Eq.(9), now one has the singular values ζ_j to indicate what terms in Eq.(12) are important. The expansion of $r(p)$ in Eq.(12) is equivalent to the well known Karhunen-Loève-expansion (KLE) (see e.g. [40]), due to the SVD of R^\dagger .

Observe that R (or R^\dagger) leads to a factorisation of $C_{\mathcal{U}} = R^\dagger R \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U})$. To each such factorisation belongs a representation / re-parametrisation of $r(p)$, and vice versa [44]. Many other factorisations are possible, and any two factorisations are unitarily equivalent in a certain sense [44]. They lead to other linear expansions similar to Eq.(12), but we shall not dwell on this here and point the interested reader to [44, 45], see also Appendix A.

For the sake of brevity this development into more refined situations will not be continued here, where e.g. the space $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2$ is a tensor product, or likewise $\mathcal{Q} = \otimes_k \mathcal{Q}_k$, and from where the SVD may be seen as a low-rank tensor representation. Again the interested reader is pointed towards [44, 42, 45] and the literature cited therein. Finally we point out that such separated or tensor representations are intimately connected with deep artificial neural networks, which can also be used for functional approximation, i.e. to approximate similar separated representations of $r(p)$ as Eq.(12), see e.g. [15, 14] and the references cited there.

2.6. Reduced Order Models.

The example problem Eq.(1) can typically not be solved directly and has to be discretised in some way, a process in which the space \mathcal{V} is replaced by a finite dimensional subspace $\mathcal{V}_n \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, and the equation in Eq.(1) is replaced by its discretised version, what will be termed the *full order model* (FOM) here:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}(p; \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{f}(p), \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{V}_n. \quad (13)$$

The QoI Eq.(2) can then be evaluated on the FOM solution $\mathbf{u}(p)$:

$$Y(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{A}(y(\mathbf{u}(p), p)), \quad (14)$$

which hopefully is close to $Y(u) \approx Y(\mathbf{u})$.

Thus in general one looks at quantities $\mathbf{r} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_n \subset \mathcal{U}$, where $\dim \mathcal{U}_n = n$ is typically a large number. The preceding developments leading to Eq.(12) can now be repeated for the FOM quantities with a map $\mathbf{R} : \mathcal{U}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, yielding the analogue of Eq.(12):

$$\mathbf{R}^\top = \sum_j \zeta_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes s_j, \quad \mathbf{r}(p) = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{s}(p)) = \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j s_j(p) \mathbf{v}_j, \quad \mathbf{s} = [s_1, \dots, s_n]^\top; \quad (15)$$

where the $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{U}_n, j = 1, \dots, n$, are now eigenvectors of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},n} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$, and the functions $s_j(p) \in \mathcal{Q}$ are the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Q},n} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^\top$.

From Eq.(15) one can very easily build a reduced order model (ROM). Assume, as it is customary (cf. Appendix B), that the singular values ς_j are ordered by decreasing magnitude. By truncating the sum in Eq.(15) at some number $M \ll n$, one has a ROM

$$\mathbf{R}_M^\top = \sum_{j=1}^M \varsigma_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes s_j, \quad \mathbf{r}_M(p) = \mathbf{r}_M(\mathbf{s}(p)) = \sum_{j=1}^M \varsigma_j s_j(p) \mathbf{v}_j; \quad (16)$$

where the neglected terms produce an error which may be measured by $\sum_{j>M} \varsigma_j$. Obviously, the range

$$\text{im } \mathbf{R}_M^\top = \mathbf{R}_M^\top(\mathcal{Q}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M\} =: \mathcal{U}_M \subset \mathcal{U}_n \subseteq \mathcal{U} \quad (17)$$

is a M -dimensional subspace, hence $\mathbf{R}_M : \mathcal{U}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$. One may now compare $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},M} := \mathbf{R}_M^\top \mathbf{R}_M$ to $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},n}$, and this to $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$, to gauge the quality of the ROM.

Similarly, in case some vectors $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\} =: \mathcal{U}_a \subset \mathcal{U}$ are picked by some procedure, defining a finite-dimensional subspace \mathcal{U}_a on which to approximate $\mathbf{r}(p)$ by a separated representation ROM

$$\mathbf{r}_a(p) = \mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu}(p)) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j(p) \mathbf{u}_j \approx \mathbf{r}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}(p)) \approx \mathbf{r}(p), \quad (18)$$

where we do not go into details on how the vectors \mathbf{u}_j are picked nor how the coefficient functions $\boldsymbol{\mu} = [\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N]^\top$ are computed (e.g. consult [3], or [61, 10, 8, 18, 57, 4, 56, 13, 28, 12, 11, 26] for some possibilities), one can again use the above procedure and define a map $\mathbf{R}_a : \mathcal{U}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ by

$$\mathcal{U}_a \ni \mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_a \mathbf{w} := \langle \mathbf{r}_a(p) \mid \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{r}_a(p)^\top \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{Q}. \quad (19)$$

Again, one may form $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},a} := \mathbf{R}_a^\top \mathbf{R}_a$ and compare it to $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},n}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U}}$ to gauge the quality of the ROM. More generally, any approximation $\mathbf{r}_b(p) \approx \mathbf{r}(p) \approx \mathbf{r}_a(p)$, separated like Eqs.(18) and (19) or not, defines its linear map \mathbf{R}_b , and again one may form $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},b} := \mathbf{R}_b^\top \mathbf{R}_b$ to study the approximation properties on the easier subject of linear maps.

The forms Eqs.(15),(16) and (18) allow a slight reformulation: one regards the quantity $\mathbf{r}(p) \approx \mathbf{r}_M(\mathbf{s}(p)) \approx \mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu}(p))$ not as a function of $p \in \mathcal{P}$, but rather as functions of $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ or $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Taking the last case, one then looks at a mapping

$$\mathcal{U}_a \ni \mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_\mu \mathbf{w} := \langle \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (20)$$

where \mathcal{M} is an appropriate N -dimensional Hilbert space of real-valued functions in $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$; and again, one may form $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U},\mu} := \mathbf{R}_\mu^\top \mathbf{R}_\mu$ for the further computations, and especially $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{M},\mu} := \mathbf{R}_\mu \mathbf{R}_\mu^\top : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

It is possible to go even a step further, and, by choosing a basis in in the N -dimensional vector space \mathcal{U}_a , replace it by \mathbb{R}^N , and the parametric object $\mathbf{r}_\mu(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ hence by $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = [r_N^1(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \dots, r_N^N(\boldsymbol{\mu})] = \sum_{j=1}^N r_N^j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mathbf{e}_j$. Then Eq.(20) becomes

$$\mathbb{R}^N \ni \mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_N \mathbf{w} := \langle \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} = \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{w} = \sum_{j=1}^N r_N^j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) w^j \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (21)$$

As before, one forms $\mathbf{C}_{N,\mu} := \mathbf{R}_N^\top \mathbf{R}_N$ for further computations, and especially again $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{M},\mu} := \mathbf{R}_N \mathbf{R}_N^\top : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

One should point out once more that the establishment of a HFM Eq.(1) involves a modelling error, an uncertainty; the discretisation to a FOM Eq.(13) invokes the discretisation error, another uncertainty. Transitions to a ROM of whatever kind triggers an approximation error, an additional uncertainty. To deal with uncertainties is one of the uses of probability theory, and this will lead to the subject of conditional expectation.

3. CONDITIONAL EXPECTATION

The notion of conditional expectation (CEX) is normally based on the concept of conditional probability, which is also the background of Bayes's theorem. These concepts are basic to the probabilistic solution of *inverse* problems, and in our brief summary we follow [46, 47, 41]. Such inverse problems may arise when one wants to determine e.g. the value of the parameter $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in Eq.(13) by observing the function $y(u, p)$ which appears in the evaluation of the QoI Eq.(2). Knowing $\check{y} = y(u(p_o), p_o)$, one would like to determine $p_o \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e. to *invert* the map $p \mapsto y(u(p), p)$. Unfortunately, these observation maps are typically not invertible, the values \check{y} do usually not contain enough information to determine p_o , and the inverse problem is therefore typically *ill-posed*, and thus can not be approached directly in a numerical fashion.

It will be advantageous to look at conditional expectation from a variational perspective, an approach which is not so common in the literature. To see how this comes about, and how it is connected to the common treatment of conditional probabilities, a short excursion to the theorem of Bayes and Laplace and the problems connected with it is taken.

3.1. The Theorem of Bayes and Laplace.

By embedding the inverse problems in a probabilistic setting (e.g. [30, 68] and references therein), it usually becomes *well-posed* [67, 47, 37]. This comes about by considering $p \in \mathcal{P}$ as a random variable (RV) — the so-called *prior* — and not wanting to recover a particular p_o , but rather a *probability distribution* on \mathcal{P} — the so-called *posterior* — which signifies how probable it is that a particular $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is the sought element $p_o \in \mathcal{P}$. The change in the probabilistic description to the posterior model comes from additional information on the system through measurement or observation — like \check{y} .

Formally, assume that the uncertain parameters are given by

$$p : \Omega_p \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \text{ as a RV on a probability space } (\Omega_p, \mathfrak{A}_p, \mathbb{P}_p), \quad (22)$$

where the set of elementary events is Ω_p , \mathfrak{A}_p a σ -algebra of measurable events, and \mathbb{P}_p a probability measure. Additionally, also the situation / action / loading / experiment may be uncertain, and we model this by allowing also $f \in \mathcal{V}^*$ in Eq.(1) to be a random variable on some probability space $(\Omega_f, \mathfrak{A}_f, \mathbb{P}_f)$. The *expectation* or mean of a RV corresponding to \mathbb{P}_p will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)_p$, e.g. $\bar{p} := \mathbb{E}(p)_p := \int_{\Omega_p} p(\omega_p) \mathbb{P}_p(d\omega_p)$, and the zero-mean part is denoted by $\tilde{p} = p - \bar{p}$. The covariance of p and another RV q is written as $C_{pq} := \mathbb{E}(\tilde{p} \otimes \tilde{q})_p$, and for short C_p if $p = q$.

Since p and f in Eq.(1) are RVs, so is $u(p)$, and in the end also the prediction of the “true” observation $y(u(p), p)$ in the QoI Eq.(2). Additionally, it is commonly assumed that there is an observational uncertainty, given by a \mathcal{Y} -valued RV $\varepsilon(\omega_e)$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega_e, \mathfrak{A}_e, \mathbb{P}_e)$, so that the observed \check{y} is a sample from $z := y(u(p), p) + \varepsilon$. For simplicity, the three sources of uncertainty are often considered as *independent*, so that on the total probability space $\Omega = \Omega_p \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_e$ the probability measure is a product measure $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_p \otimes \mathbb{P}_f \otimes \mathbb{P}_e$.

Bayes's theorem is commonly accepted as a consistent way to incorporate new knowledge into a probabilistic description [30, 68]. The elementary textbook statement of Bayes's theorem by Laplace is about conditional probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_p | \mathcal{M}_z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z | \mathcal{I}_p)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_p), \quad \text{if } \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z) > 0, \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{P}$ is some subset of possible p 's on which we would like to gain some information, and $\check{y} \in \mathcal{M}_z \subset \mathcal{Y}$ is the information provided by the measurement. The term $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_p)$ is the so-called *prior*, it is what we know before the observation \mathcal{M}_z . The quantity $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z | \mathcal{I}_p)$ is the so-called *likelihood*, the conditional probability of \mathcal{M}_z assuming that \mathcal{I}_p is

given. The term $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z)$ is the so called *evidence*, the probability of observing \mathcal{M}_z in the first place, which sometimes can be expanded with the *law of total probability*, allowing one to choose between different models of explanation. This term is necessary to make the right hand side of Eq.(23) into a real probability — summing to unity — and hence the term $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_p|\mathcal{M}_z)$, the so-called *posterior* which reflects our knowledge on \mathcal{I}_p *after* observing $\check{y} \in \mathcal{M}_z$.

The statement in Eq.(23) runs into problems if the set of observations \mathcal{M}_z has vanishing probability measure, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z) = 0$, as is the case when we observe a *continuous* random variable z and \mathcal{M}_z is a one-point set. The statement Eq.(23) then has the indeterminate term $0/0$, and some form of limiting procedure is needed. As a sign that this is not so simple — there are different and inequivalent forms of doing it — one may just point to the so-called *Borel-Kolmogorov* paradox, see e.g. [55, 30].

The theorem may in the $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_z) = 0$ case under certain restrictive conditions be formulated in *densities*, or more precisely in probability density functions (pdfs), namely in the case that z and p have a *joint* pdf $\pi_{z,p}(z, p)$. In this case of a joint pdf, Bayes's theorem Eq.(23) may be formulated as

$$\pi_{p|z}(p|z) = \frac{\pi_{z,p}(z, p)}{Z_s(z)}, \quad (24)$$

where $\pi_{p|z}(p|z)$ is the *conditional* pdf, and Z_s (from German *Zustandssumme* — “sum over all states”) is a normalising term such that the conditional pdf $\pi_{p|z}(\cdot|z)$ integrates to unity;

$$Z_s(z) = \int_{\Omega} \pi_{z,p}(z, p) \mathbb{P}(dp).$$

The joint pdf may be split into the *likelihood density* $\pi_{z|p}(z|p)$ and the *prior* pdf $\pi_p(p)$

$$\pi_{z,p}(z, p) = \pi_{z|p}(z|p)\pi_p(p).$$

so that Eq.(24) has its familiar form ([68] Ch. 1.5)

$$\pi_{p|z}(p|z) = \frac{\pi_{z|p}(z|p)}{Z_s(z)}\pi_p(p). \quad (25)$$

These terms correspond directly with those in Eq.(23) and carry the same names.

In case one can establish a conditional measure $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|\mathcal{M}_z)$ or even a conditional pdf $\pi_{p|z}(\cdot|z)$, the *conditional expectation* (CEX) $\mathbb{E}(\cdot|z)$ may be defined as an integral over that conditional measure resp. the conditional pdf. Thus classically, the conditional measure or pdf implies the conditional expectation. But the question remains on how to use conditioning in these cases where Bayes's formula is not applicable. This was solved by Kolmogorov [33, 34] and is the subject of the next section Section 3.2, and will at the same time introduce the variational view on conditioning which will be used later in Section 4.

3.2. Variational Statement of Conditional Expectation.

The problem sketched in the previous Section 3.1 by conditioning on events of zero probability was addressed by Kolmogorov himself [33, 34]:

The concept of a conditional probability with regard to an isolated hypothesis whose probability equals zero is inadmissible.

Kolmogorov's solution was to turn things around and take as primary notion not conditional probability as in Eq.(23) or even conditional pdfs as in Eq.(24), but to first define *conditional expectation*, conditioned on a *sub- σ -algebra* $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathfrak{A}$ of a probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{P})$. It is most naturally approached in the L_2 -setting. For two RVs φ, ψ , define their inner product by $\langle \varphi | \psi \rangle_2 := \mathbb{E}(\varphi\psi)$, and set $\mathcal{S} := L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{P}) = \{\varphi | \langle \varphi | \varphi \rangle_2 < \infty\}$ to be the Hilbert space of (equivalence classes of) RVs with finite L_2 -norm $\|\varphi\|_2 := \sqrt{\langle \varphi | \varphi \rangle_2}$. The Hilbert space formed with a sub- σ -algebra \mathfrak{B} is a closed subspace, denoted by

$\mathcal{S}_\infty := L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}) \subset L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A})$. Denote the one-dimensional subspace of constants generated by the sub- σ -algebra $\mathfrak{B}_0 := \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$ as $\mathcal{S}_0 := \text{span}\{\mathbb{1}_\Omega\}$, where $\mathbb{1}_\Omega$ is the function or RV with constant value equal to unity on the set Ω .

To see the motivation behind Kolmogorov's next definition and what we are aiming at in the case of ROMs, observe first that the normal expectation of a RV $x \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}) = \mathcal{S}$, given the inner product and norm on \mathcal{S} , can be defined in a variational way as

$$\mathbb{E}(x) = \arg \min_{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_0} \Psi_x(\chi) = P_0 x \in \mathcal{S}_0, \quad (26)$$

where $\Psi_x(\chi) := \|x - \chi\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}((x - \chi)^2)$ is the x -based *variance*, and P_0 is the orthogonal projection onto \mathcal{S}_0 . This function is also known the Bayesian *loss function*, which the conditional expectation minimises. In this context the expectation operator $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ may be seen as the ‘‘prior’’. But this one could also say for the requirement that $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_0$, i.e. that it is a constant function $\chi = \alpha \mathbb{1}_\Omega$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

On such a Hilbert subspace given by a sub- σ -algebra \mathfrak{B} , Kolmogorov now gives a variational characterisation for the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B})$ of a RV $x \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A})$ w.r.t. that sub- σ -algebra \mathfrak{B} :

$$\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B}) := \mathbb{E}(x|\mathcal{S}_\infty) := \arg \min_{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_\infty} \Psi_x(\chi) = P_{\mathfrak{B}} x \in \mathcal{S}_\infty, \quad (27)$$

where we recall that $\mathcal{S}_\infty = L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$. One may immediately observe that this definition, which requires the minimisation of a continuous quadratic — a strictly convex functional — over a closed subspace, yields a unique RV $\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B}) \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$, and that $\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B}) = P_{\mathfrak{B}} x$ is the *orthogonal projection* — denoted by $P_{\mathfrak{B}}$ — of the RV x onto the closed subspace $L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$.

This implies a version of the theorem of Pythagoras:

$$\|x\|_2^2 = \|x - \mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B})\|_2^2 + \|\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B})\|_2^2, \quad (28)$$

as well as the *Galerkin* orthogonality condition

$$\forall \chi \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}) : \langle x - \mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B}) | \chi \rangle_2 = 0, \quad (29)$$

or equivalently, for all $\chi \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$ one has $\mathbb{E}(x\chi) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B})\chi)$. Note that this last statement can then be extended to all L_1 -functions by re-interpreting it in the $L_1 - L_\infty$ duality.

For an observation such as the one generated by the RV $z = y(x) + \varepsilon$, one would normally take as sub- σ -algebra \mathfrak{B} the one generated by these RVs. Thus in this case

$$L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}) = \{\varphi \in L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}) \mid \varphi = \chi(z) \text{ is a function of } z = y(u, p) + \varepsilon\},$$

i.e. all RVs which are functions of $z = y(x) + \varepsilon$ and are in L_2 . Thus for such a special sub- σ -algebra \mathfrak{B} one has

$$\mathbb{E}(x|\mathfrak{B}) = \phi_x(z) \quad (30)$$

for some measurable function $\phi_x(\cdot)$. This RV $\phi_x(z)$ gives the CEX as a function of all possible observations $z = y(x) + \varepsilon$. After an observation \check{y} , one may then compute the *constant*

$$\mathbb{E}(x|\check{y}) := \phi_x(\check{y}), \quad (31)$$

which we like to call the *conditioned* expectation or post-CEX.

So for each RV $x \in \mathcal{S} = L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A})$ one has an assignment like Eq.(31), which is linear in x as it results Eq.(26) from the orthogonal projection $P_{\mathfrak{B}} x$, and it easy to see that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_\Omega|\mathfrak{B}) = P_{\mathfrak{B}} \mathbb{1}_\Omega = \mathbb{1}_\Omega$, so that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_\Omega|\check{y}) = \phi_{\mathbb{1}_\Omega}(\check{y}) = 1$. This means that $\mathbb{E}(x|\check{y})$ in Eq.(31) satisfies all requirements one has for an expectation operator, which allows one to define a conditional probability, as one sets for all measurable $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \Omega$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}|\check{y}) := \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}}|\check{y}), \quad \mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (32)$$

The variational definition may be shown [7] to yield the classical definitions of Bayes and Laplace when those are applicable. It also allows two generalisations, which we briefly mention. For one, if the CEX is used in some decision process, one might incorporate the resulting gains or losses measuring the *risk* resulting from this decision under uncertainty, into the Bayesian loss function — like in Eqs.(26) and (27) — and hence minimise some notion of *risk*. Secondly, the definition Eq.(27) can be extended to more general metric spaces than Hilbert spaces: For a metric space \mathcal{Z} with metric δ and a \mathcal{Z} -valued RV ξ one may broaden the Bayesian loss function to something like $\Psi_{\delta,\xi}(\chi) := \mathbb{E}(\delta(\xi, \chi)^2)$ to minimise over all \mathcal{Z} -valued RVs to arrive at the so-called *Fréchet mean* and Fréchet conditional expectation.

3.3. Approximations of Conditional Expectation and Filtering.

It is worthwhile to recall which information went into establishing the post-CEX Eq.(31). It on one hand obviously the observation \check{y} of the RV z . But it is also on the other hand the subspace $\mathcal{S}_\infty = L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$ which is generated by *all* reasonable functions of the observed quantity z . So this is what might be called “prior” knowledge: for one the *expectation operator* \mathbb{E} which defines the probabilistic description of the RV x , but also the subspace \mathcal{S}_∞ , here generated by all functions of the observed quantity z . This defines the conditional expectation (CEX) Eq.(27). The second ingredient is the observation \check{y} of the RV z , from which one may then compute the *conditioned expectation* Eq.(31).

In any attempt to actually compute the CEX from Eq.(27) one is immediately hit with the realisation that in any realistic situation the subspace \mathcal{S}_∞ is in some sense too “big”, as it very difficult to handle it. This suggest the possibility of approximating Eq.(27) by choosing a m -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{S}_m \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\infty$ of \mathcal{S}_∞ for the minimisation. After all, this is also what is behind the original Bubnov-Galerkin idea of computing approximations to elliptic PDEs. One can interpret this also as some kind of additional prior information, in that we “know” that $\phi_x \in \mathcal{S}_m$, i.e. that ϕ_x is to be found in the subspace \mathcal{S}_m .

Behind many filtering concepts is the idea of not changing the probability measure $\mathbb{P} \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}|\check{y})$ resp. $\mathbb{E}(\cdot) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(\cdot|\check{y})$, but to change the RV x_f — the subscript f now means “forecast” — to another one x_a — here the subscript a now means “assimilated”, as it has *assimilated* the new information — i.e. $x_f \mapsto x_a$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}(\varphi(x_f)|\check{y}) = \mathbb{E}(\varphi(x_a)) \quad (33)$$

for any reasonable measurable function φ . The Eq.(33) means that any descriptor — given by the function φ — of the RV x_f according to the new probability assignment $\mathbb{E}(\cdot|\check{y})$ is equal to the same descriptor of the RV x_a according the original probability assignment $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$. These two ways of looking at BU may be compared to the Heisenberg and Schrödinger views on quantum mechanics evolution; in the Heisenberg picture it is the state which is evolving, i.e. the probability measure resp. expectation operator is changing while the observables (another word for RVs) stay as they are, whereas in the Schrödinger picture the it is the other way around. Thus the filtering idea corresponds to the Schrödinger picture.

To use the CEX in Bayesian updating (BU), as the first step one might want to construct a filter which will at least get the CEX for the identity right, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y})$. So one starts from the orthogonal decomposition underlying Pythagoras’s theorem in Eq.(28):

$$x_f = (x_f - P_{\mathfrak{B}}x_f) + P_{\mathfrak{B}}x_f = (I - P_{\mathfrak{B}})x_f + P_{\mathfrak{B}}x_f. \quad (34)$$

As the observation \check{y} of z contains information about the last term $P_{\mathfrak{B}}x_f \in \mathcal{S}_\infty$ in Eq.(34), one may proceed [46, 47, 43, 41], by modifying that last term from $\mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathfrak{B})$ to $\mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y})$,

and thus set for the filter equation:

$$x_a^{\text{CEX}} := (x_f - \mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathfrak{B})) + \mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y}) = x_f + (\mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y}) - \mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathfrak{B})) = x_f + x_i, \quad (35)$$

where $x_i = \mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y}) - \mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathfrak{B})$ is called the *innovation*. As Eq.(29) implies that $\mathbb{E}(x_i) = 0$, it is clear that $\mathbb{E}(x_a^{\text{CEX}}) = \mathbb{E}(x_f|\check{y})$, so that the new assimilated RV x_a^{CEX} has as expected value the correct conditional expectation of x_f .

But the exact minimisation over \mathcal{S}_∞ to obtain $\mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathfrak{B})$ is still typically not possible, so further approximations are necessary even for Eq.(35). Picking up the idea to approximate \mathcal{S}_∞ , one of the simplest possible approximations in Eq.(27) is to take instead $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{S} \mid \varphi(z) = Lz + b\mathbb{1}_\Omega\}$, i.e. the space of affine functions of z . The solution is not difficult to compute and is essentially given by the Gauss-Markov theorem [38]: the solution to

$$\mathbb{E}(x_f|\mathcal{S}_1) := \arg \min_{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_1} \Psi_{x_f}(\chi) \in \mathcal{S}_1, \quad (36)$$

minimising $\Psi_{x_f}(\cdot)$ over \mathcal{S}_1 is $\phi_{x,1}(z) = Kz + a$ with $K := C_{x_f z} C_z^{-1}$ and $a := \bar{x} - K(\bar{z})$, where where $C_{x_f z}$ is the covariance of x_f and z , and C_z is the auto-covariance of z . The linear operator K is also called the *Kalman gain* [31], and has the familiar form known from least squares projections.

Putting the CEX-filter Eq.(35) together with the linear approximation in Eq.(36) for a simple BU, one arrives at the Gauss-Markov-Kalman-filter (GMKF) [60, 52, 46, 47, 43, 41]:

$$x_a^{\text{GMKF}} := x_f + K(\check{y} - z). \quad (37)$$

As the GMKF operates on the usually infinite dimensional space $\mathcal{S} = L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A})$, it is still not readily computable and needs further discretisation. Using this equation Eq.(37) just for the means $\bar{x}_a^{\text{KF}} := \bar{x}_f + K(\check{y} - \bar{z})$ plus an update for the covariance C_{xx} gives the original Kalman filter (KF) [31]. One can show [60, 52] that the Kalman covariance update is automatically satisfied by Eq.(37), as it operates on RVs. Discretisations of Eq.(37) have been done via the Monte Carlo (MC) method, yielding [19] the Ensemble Kalman filter, one of the simplest *particle filters*, where Eq.(37) is sampled, and the covariances are computed from the samples, and the MC samples are also called “particles”. Another discretisation is possible by truncating polynomial chaos expansions of the RVs involved, and applying Eq.(37) on the truncated polynomial chaos expansions, or, equivalently, on the coefficients of the polynomial chaos expansion [60, 52], giving the polynomial chaos Kalman filter (PCKF). The covariances are in this instance computed from the truncated polynomial chaos expansions.

If in Eq.(36) larger subspaces $\mathcal{S}_m \supseteq \mathcal{S}_1$ are used, one arrives at non-linear filters [46, 47, 41]. It is also possible to design procedures [43] which, by computing the CEX of functions $\varphi(x_f)$ of x_f , will create a filter which recovers the RV x_a in the Schrödinger picture with arbitrary accuracy, i.e. such that Eq.(33) is satisfied by as many functions φ as possible. The hereby necessary CEX computations can be performed with high accuracy [69] on the basis of the Galerkin orthogonality statement Eq.(29).

Looking towards the building of ROMs, some of the methods — which originally come from geo-statistics — are built on the idea of predicting a Gaussian process from samples, where the covariance of the process is known. This is essentially using the expression Eq.(37), assuming that the covariances are known, leading to *Kriging* or *Gaussian process emulation* [32, 51]. To judge these procedures, one should point out that for the situation where all RVs involved in Eq.(37) are Gaussians, the BU in Eq.(37) is *exact* [29]; and as a Gaussian is fully described by mean and covariance, the original Kalman filter is also *exact*. Thus, using these Kriging procedures also in the non-Gaussian case can then be seen as using a linear approximation to BU to compute a ROM. Similar methods as Kriging essentially also use Eq.(37), but employ kernels which do not have to come

from covariances of random fields but rather from RKHS (cf. Section 2.4) or radial basis functions, e.g. [9].

4. PARAMETRIC ROMs AND CONDITIONAL EXPECTATION

As was already alluded to at the end of the preceding Section 3.3 that there are considerable similarities between Bayesian updating (BU) via linear filtering and building proxy models using kernels, where both types of methods use variants of Eq.(37). Thus in this case it is fairly obvious to draw conclusions on the connection between reduced order models and conditional expectation.

Since the time of Gauss, and possibly even before that, the least square error method was seen as a good method to do regression, leading to the Gauss-Markov theorem [38]. And regression is one of the more obvious connections with conditional expectation. While there are methods to address inverse ill-posed problems in a deterministic manner, in the ML and deep artificial neural network community [48, 62, 66, 21] the “learning task” has always been seen in a probabilistic light, e.g. [49]. Therefore here these learning methods will not be addressed further, as they are already formulated in a Bayesian probabilistic setting. Here the focus is rather on the traditionally deterministic formulations — one could say deterministic learning methods — to find ROMs, as the combination with the probabilistic Bayesian ideas sheds new light on these methods, and also allows one to consider additional uncertainties in a probabilistic sense.

4.1. Uncertainties in ROMs.

One of the advantages of a probabilistic view, which were already mentioned, is that other “uncertainties”, which appear in the whole process, can be incorporated in the picture. In Section 2.6 some of the different uncertainties were listed. These are:

- The uncertainties inherent in the system A in Eq.(1), described by a probability space $(\Omega_{p_r}, \mathfrak{F}_{p_r}, \mathbb{P}_{p_r})$. Here p_r are the part of the parameters which describes unresolved uncertainties in the system. The part of the parameters which we want to use and explicitly control somehow will be denoted by μ , like in Eq.(18). And likewise the uncertainties in the external action f in Eq.(1), described by a probability space $(\Omega_f, \mathfrak{F}_f, \mathbb{P}_f)$.
- The *modelling error* in going from the “real system” to its mathematical model (HFM) Eq.(1) resp. Eq.(3). One way to capture this in the simplest case is by adding an *additive* error either to the evolution equation Eq.(1) or to its solution $u(p)$. In the case of the implicit description Eq.(3), one could again in the simplest case add an error to the equation Eq.(3), or to $r(p)$. In any case, this uncertainty can be described with a probability space $(\Omega_{\text{HFM}}, \mathfrak{F}_{\text{HFM}}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{HFM}})$.
- The *discretisation error* in going from the HFM Eq.(1) resp. Eq.(3) to the discretised full-order model (FOM) Eq.(13). Such errors are usually described in the numerics community by the worst case situation, but for the purpose of this exposition, one might consider this again, like in the previous modelling error situation, to be described by an additive random variable on the probability space $(\Omega_{\text{FOM}}, \mathfrak{F}_{\text{FOM}}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{FOM}})$.
- The *numerical error* which is due to the numerical solution — down to some tolerance on finite precision hardware — of the FOM system like Eq.(13), or the same equation interpreted with the ROM approximations Eqs.(16) and (18). Again, this error is usually only described in the numerics community by the worst case situation, but one might again consider it to be described by an additive random variable on the probability space $(\Omega_{\text{NUM}}, \mathfrak{F}_{\text{NUM}}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{NUM}})$. This point is particularly relevant in the light of recent developments where one considers computations with less precision than the up to now usual 64 bit floating point format, in order to

speed up the computation. Some ideas even point in the direction of using *variable* precision in different parts of the algorithm.

- The *reduction error* in going from the FOM Eq.(13) to the reduced order model (ROM) Eqs.(16) and (18). This uncertainty can be described again by an additive random variable on the probability space $(\Omega_{\text{ROM}}, \mathfrak{F}_{\text{ROM}}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{ROM}})$. In case one interprets the ROM computation as a CEX, then at least two components of the reduction error can be named more clearly. One is the error which represents the “observation error” ϵ of the observed variable $z = y + \epsilon$ of the observable y in Eq.(30), modelled on a probability space $(\Omega_\epsilon, \mathfrak{F}_\epsilon, \mathbb{P}_\epsilon)$. The other is the error involved in approximating the CEX, e.g. as in Section 3.3, which introduces an error modelled on the probability space $(\Omega_{\text{CEX}}, \mathfrak{F}_{\text{CEX}}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{CEX}})$. Thus the probability space Ω_{ROM} can be envisaged as $\Omega_{\text{ROM}} = \Omega_\epsilon \times \Omega_{\text{CEX}} \times \Omega_r$, where Ω_r represents some possible left over residual error in Ω_{ROM} .

Describing the solution to Eq.(13) with an additive error means for example that instead of \mathbf{u} one deals with $\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\eta}$, or, more generally instead of having the parametric quantity $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ in the form of Eqs.(16) and (18) one deals with $\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\eta}$.

For the sake of simplicity, let us combine all the uncertainties inherent in the HFM to a new random variable $\boldsymbol{\eta}_M(\omega_M)$ defined on the probability space $\Omega_M := \Omega_{p_r} \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_{\text{HFM}}$ with a probability measure \mathbb{P}_M on a σ -algebra \mathfrak{F}_M of subsets of Ω_M , with $\omega_M = (\omega_{p_r}, \omega_f, \omega_{\text{HFM}})$. Similarly, combine *all* the additional numerical uncertainties from the transitions HFM \rightarrow FOM, FOM \rightarrow ROM, ROM \rightarrow numerical approximation, i.e. all uncertainties inherent in the numerical ROM solution of Eq.(13) or in the parametric quantity as in Eqs.(16) and (18) with a new random variable $\boldsymbol{\eta}_N(\omega_N)$ defined on the probability space $\Omega_N := \Omega_{\text{FOM}} \times \Omega_{\text{ROM}} \times \Omega_{\text{NUM}}$ with a probability measure \mathbb{P}_N on a σ -algebra \mathfrak{F}_N of subsets of Ω_N , with $\omega_N = \omega_{\text{FOM}} \times \omega_{\text{ROM}} \times \omega_{\text{NUM}}$.

It has to be pointed out that, although these different errors were described individually, they do not have to be stochastically independent, e.g. the probability measure describing *all* the uncertainties from numerical processes in the solution of the ROM, \mathbb{P}_N on $\Omega_N := \Omega_{\text{FOM}} \times \Omega_{\text{ROM}} \times \Omega_{\text{NUM}}$, does not have to be a product measure $\mathbb{P}_N = \mathbb{P}_{\text{FOM}} \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\text{ROM}} \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\text{NUM}}$. But it is not unreasonable to assume that the modelling error described on Ω_M , and the numerical error described on Ω_N , are independent. In that case one has that total probability measure $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_M \otimes \mathbb{P}_N$ on the total probability product space $(\Omega = \Omega_M \times \Omega_N, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a product measure, and expectations w.r.t. \mathbb{P} can be computed via Fubini’s theorem: $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_N \circ \mathbb{E}_M = \mathbb{E}_N(\mathbb{E}_M(\cdot))$.

This means finally, that instead of the ROM solution \mathbf{u} to Eq.(13) one deals with the RV $\mathbf{u}_{MN} = \mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_M + \boldsymbol{\eta}_N$, or, more generally, instead of having the parametric quantity $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ in the form of Eqs.(16) and (18) one deals with $\mathbf{r}_{MN}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N) = \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_M(\omega_M) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_N(\omega_N)$.

As an example of this implicit acknowledgement of a probabilistic interpretation of these errors, one may look at climate simulations as they are reported e.g. in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Working Group’s (IPCC WG I) contribution to the 6th Assessment Report [39]. As best estimates for the climate evolution predicted from different modelling groups, which differ from each other due to different modelling errors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_M(\omega_M)$ and different numerical errors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_N(\omega_N)$, there the average of these simulations is taken as the ‘best’ predictor. This arose initially by just noticing that this average was a better predictor, and apparently implicitly assumes that the different models form some kind of Monte Carlo sample of the variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_M, \boldsymbol{\eta}_N$.

4.2. Generalising conditional expectation.

To address the main topic in a unified way, recall that the conditional expectation (CEX) of a random variable (RV) x is a minimisations of a “loss functional” Ψ_x over some manifold \mathcal{S}_m . In fact, in Eqs.(26) and (27) one could see that the expectation and CEX

are defined in a very similar way, the only difference being the manifold \mathcal{S}_g . One could actually argue that all expectations are *conditional* expectations. The general expression looks like

$$\mathbb{E}_g(x|z) = \arg \min_{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_g(z)} \Psi_x(\chi), \quad (38)$$

where the manifold $\mathcal{S}_g(z) \subset \mathcal{S}$ is somehow determined by what is going to be the observation z . In most cases, and the only ones we consider here, the functional is the squared distance, $\Psi_x(\chi) = \|x - \chi\|^2$, in which case $\mathbb{E}_g(x|z)$ is a projection onto $\mathcal{S}_g(z)$, cf. Section 3. In the case of the normal expectation Eq.(26) one has $\mathcal{S}_g = \mathcal{S}_0 = \text{span}\{\mathbb{1}_\Omega\}$, i.e. the space of constants, whereas in the case of the CEX one has $\mathcal{S}_g(z) = \mathcal{S}_\infty = \{\phi \in L_2(\Omega) \mid \phi = \chi(z), \chi \text{ measurable}\}$, i.e. practically all possible functions of z .

As was already alluded to in Section 3.3, it is advantageous for our purpose to discern in Eq.(38) what is the *prior*, i.e. what do we know before making any observation, measurement, or evaluation of the RV x , and what is the *posterior*. In Eq.(38), what is known a priori is the RV x — or some function of x to compute some descriptor of x , but in our case the main interest is in x itself, i.e. when the function is the identity — and what we are going to observe, i.e. the RV z . Additionally what we know a priori is the structure of the manifold \mathcal{S}_g , as the examples Eqs.(26) and (27) show. And one knows a priori the type of Bayesian loss function Ψ_x , as well as the probability space $\mathcal{S} = L_2(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$ on which everything is described or modelled, cf. Section 4.1.

Together with the actual observation \check{y} , this then gives the new state or *conditioned* expectation functional $\mathbb{E}_g(\cdot|\check{y})$, as described previously in Section 3; this updated expectation functional describes the *posterior* probability description of any RV, especially also x . Our main interest is in the updated mean $\mathbb{E}_g(x|\check{y}) \in \mathcal{X}$, where \mathcal{X} is the Hilbert space in which x and χ live. In the expectation operator inherent in the functional in Eq.(38), one then uses this generalised expectation operator, i.e. $\Psi_x(\chi) = \|x - \chi\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \mathbb{E}_g(\|x - \chi\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the Hilbert norm of \mathcal{X} .

According to the results Eq.(18) in Section 2.6, the ROMs can all be put in the form $\mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j \mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \approx r(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N), \mu_j \in \mathcal{Q}$ may be seen as real-valued coordinates on the parameter set \mathcal{P} , and the ROM $\mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ may be regarded as a function of the new parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. This view will be the basis of consideration from here on.

Thus one considers $x = \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ in Eq.(38), with $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{U}$, and observations y resp. $z = y + \varepsilon$ which are some functions $z = \phi(\mathbf{r})$ of $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$; often linear functionals, e.g. samples $\mathbf{r}^k \in \mathcal{U}$ as measurement for $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k)$. The observation is then simply $z^k = \mathbf{r}^k + \boldsymbol{\eta}_M(\omega_k) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_N(\omega_k) \in \mathcal{U}$.

The functional used in Eq.(38) thus becomes

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{r}}(z) = \|\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \chi(z)\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \mathbb{E}_g(\|\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \cdot) - \chi(z, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2), \quad (39)$$

where we take the expectation operator \mathbb{E}_g which covers all the uncertainties as described in Section 4.1 in $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega)$ and $\chi(z(\mathbf{r}, \omega), \omega)$. The minimisation in Eq.(38) is carried out over \mathcal{S}_g , an a priori specified set of functions of $z(\mathbf{r}, \omega) = y(\mathbf{r}, \omega) + \varepsilon(\omega)$, which is peculiar to the specific ROM computation which is desired, so that the ROM $\mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, according to Eqs.(38) and (39), may be seen as the CEX of $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$:

$$\mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}_g(\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})|z). \quad (40)$$

This will be made a bit more concrete in the following sections, by specifying the observations z and the manifold \mathcal{S}_g . One advantage which arises from this “conditional expectation view”, and which concerns any ROM calculation which falls into this mould, is the possibility to include of all the uncertainties alluded to in Section 4.1 in the computation of the desired ROM $\mathbf{r}_a(\boldsymbol{\mu})$.

The view taken here, which coincides with current statistical or econometric thinking (e.g. [1]), is that practically any least squares procedure can be seen as a conditional expectation or approximation thereof. This is also particularly true of (deep) artificial neural networks (e.g. [66, 21]). This is even true for more general regressions, based on more general *loss functions*. The least squares method is also used in the updating of a *proper orthogonal decomposition* (POD) basis [12], which therefore can be seen also as a form of conditional expectation. The same can be said of the alternating minimisation procedures employed in the computation of the *proper generalised decomposition* (PGD), an extension of the proper orthogonal decomposition, e.g. [20].

4.3. Parametric ROM as a Random Field.

According to the results in Eqs.(18) and (20), one may computationally regard the parametric model $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ as a defined on $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. and as $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ lives in a N -dimensional vector space \mathcal{U}_a , we replace it with a \mathbb{R}^N by choosing a \mathcal{U} -orthonormal basis in it, cf. Eq.(21). Now the parametric model may be regarded as a map $\mathbf{r}_N : \mathbb{R}^N \ni \boldsymbol{\mu} \mapsto \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^N \cong \mathcal{U}_a$, given by $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{j=1}^N r_N^j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mathbf{e}_j$. The N -dimensional function space \mathcal{M} , the image of $\mathbf{R}_N : \mathbb{R}^N \ni \mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}$, is spanned by the N functions $r_N^j(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ ($j = 1, \dots, N$), linear in $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

For the sake of simplicity, assume that the inner product on the space \mathcal{M} of $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ functions is given by a measure ρ : $\langle \varphi | \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{M}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \psi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \rho(d\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then the correlation on $\mathcal{U} \cong \mathbb{R}^N$ according to Eqs.(11) and (21) in Section 2.6 is given by the matrix

$$\mathbf{C}_{N,\mu} = \mathbf{R}_N^\top \mathbf{R}_N = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \rho(d\boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (41)$$

where the ‘‘local correlation matrix’’ \mathbf{K}_N is given by $\mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) := \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \otimes \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\top$. The corresponding correlation on \mathcal{M} is

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{M},\mu} = \mathbf{R}_N \mathbf{R}_N^\top : \mathcal{M} \ni \psi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varkappa_N(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \psi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \rho(d\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (42)$$

where the kernel \varkappa_μ (cf. Eq.(7)) is

$$\varkappa_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = \langle \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) | \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}; \quad (43)$$

which is the trace of the local correlation matrix used in Eq.(41): $\varkappa_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = \text{tr} \mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)$.

One way to look at the whole situation, especially in light of all the uncertainties discussed in Section 4.1 and Eq.(39), is, for the purpose of establishing a ROM, to regard $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ as a *random field* on \mathbb{R}^N with values in \mathcal{U} . Now all the procedures to estimate random fields — usually based on conditional expectation — are at our disposal.

Here only a very simple version will be sketched, namely the simplest case of the aforementioned technique of Kriging or Gaussian process emulation (GPE) (e.g. [32, 51]). To start, assume that $r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is a zero-mean *scalar random field* on \mathbb{R}^N . The covariance kernel or function, according to Eq.(43), is also assumed to be known: $\varkappa_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) = \mathbb{E}(r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2))$. In practice, often the covariance function is *not known*, and assumed in a computationally convenient form. Now assume in addition that $r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is a Gaussian process, hence completely characterised by (the vanishing mean and) the covariance function.

Assume that the process has been observed at various locations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_m$, with values grouped as $\mathbf{z} = [r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1), \dots, r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_m)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$. To obtain a new generic location $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we assume the estimate $\chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ to be a regression on \mathbf{z} , i.e. to be in the linear manifold $\mathcal{S}_{\text{GPE}} = \{\chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid \chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{w}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$. Hence, following Eq.(38), we set

$$\hat{r}_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}_{\text{GPE}}(r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) | \mathbf{z}) = \arg \min_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{z})} \Psi_{r_s}(\chi_s) \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{z}), \quad (44)$$

where $\Psi_{r_s}(\chi_s) = \mathbb{E}((r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}))^2) = \text{var}(r_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}))$. It is a fairly standard computation to find the minimising $\chi_s(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ resp. the minimising weight vector $\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Setting $\mathbf{K}_{\text{GPE}} := (\boldsymbol{\varkappa}_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\mu}_j))_{i,j=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = [\boldsymbol{\varkappa}_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \dots, \boldsymbol{\varkappa}_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\mu})]^\top$, one obtains

$$\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{K}_{\text{GPE}}^{-1} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{r}_s(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{K}_{\text{GPE}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{z}. \quad (45)$$

It is now not difficult to see that the procedure in Eq.(45) can be performed for every component of $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = [r_N^1(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \dots, r_N^N(\boldsymbol{\mu})]^\top$, even taking into account non-zero correlations between the components of $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, contained in the correlation matrix $\mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) := \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \otimes \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\top)$.

Now the observations at the locations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_m$ are $\mathbf{Z} = [\boldsymbol{z}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{z}_m^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(Nm)}$ with $\boldsymbol{z}_j = \mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and the linear manifold is given by $\mathcal{S}_{N,\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \{\boldsymbol{\chi}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid \boldsymbol{\chi}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(Nm) \times N}\}$. Analogous to Eq.(44), we set

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}_{\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid \mathbf{Z}) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\chi}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{N,\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{Z})} \Psi_{r_N}(\boldsymbol{\chi}_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{N,\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{Z}) \quad (46)$$

with $\Psi_{r_N}(\boldsymbol{\chi}_N) = \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\chi}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2) = \sum_{n=1}^N \text{var}(r_N^n(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \chi_N^n(\boldsymbol{\mu}))$.

The minimising weight matrix $\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is

$$\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{K}_{N,\text{GPE}}^{-1} \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{K}_{N,\text{GPE}}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}; \quad (47)$$

where $\mathbf{K}_{N,\text{GPE}} = (\mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\mu}_j))_{i,j=1}^m$ and $\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = [\mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \dots, \mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\mu})]^\top$. Compare this to Eq.(36), whence it becomes clear that Eq.(47) is a special case of Eq.(36). This also indicates how to simply extend Eq.(47) for the case that one the process \boldsymbol{z} is assumed to have a non-zero mean $\bar{\mathbf{r}}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Again, the Bayesian interpretation is that the prior knowledge is the Gaussian process $\mathbf{r}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ with *known* covariance matrix $\mathbf{K}_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)$, as well as the mathematical form of the manifold $\mathcal{S}_{N,\text{GPE}}(\mathbf{Z})$ which is used in the computation of the CEX in Eq.(46). For a recent error analysis of such GPE methods for parametric problems using kernel methods, see [2]. While it is conceivable — with the connection to conditional expectation as elaborated in Section 4.2 — to extend the Kriging sketched here in the direction of the filters used in the approximation of the Bayesian update as described in Section 3.3, to the author's knowledge this has not yet been done.

The *Reduced Basis Method* (RBM) (e.g. [56, 28]) is another example which may be given the interpretation of a conditional expectation. In this context, compare Eq.(38) with Propositions 3.1 and 3.3 in [56]. Let us remark here also that the computational efficiency of the RBM is often tied to an affine dependence of the operator on the parameters $p \in \mathcal{P}$. In Section 2 and the following developments, it was shown that any such parametric problem can be *re-parametrised*, so that in the new parameters — $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ in the truncated and discretised form — the problem is indeed *linear resp. affine*.

While an assumed connection with Gaussian processes is used in the procedures sketched above in order to construct the ROM for new values of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, it had been noted [49] that broad *artificial neural networks* — such networks, as already mentioned several times, are an important and increasingly used class of functions the evaluate the ROM for new values of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ [48, 62, 66, 63, 58, 36, 23, 21, 50] — at initialisation behave like Gaussian processes. This has been come known as the neural network—Gaussian process correspondence [71, 70], and is used in conjunction with kernel methods [2] in the analysis of deep artificial neural networks.

4.4. Parametric ROM as a random variable.

While in the previous Section 4.3 the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ were interpreted as elements of a set with which random vectors were parametrised — a Gaussian random field resp. process — it is possible to take a different interpretation of a parametric ROM as regards the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. To this we continue with the assumptions made at the beginning of Section 4.3, namely that the inner product on the space \mathcal{M} of $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ functions is given

by a measure ρ : $\langle \varphi | \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{M}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \psi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \rho(d\boldsymbol{\mu})$; and additionally we assume that ρ is normalised ($\rho(\mathbb{R}^N) = 1$), so that it can be regarded as a probability measure. Now (\mathbb{R}^N, ρ) is a probability space, so $\mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ can be regarded as a \mathbb{R}^N -valued random variable. Going back to the last paragraphs in Section 4.1, there the additional uncertainties modelled on $\Omega_M \times \Omega_N$ were defined. So, in total, one now has a \mathbb{R}^N -valued random variable $\mathbf{r}_{MN}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N)$ on the total probability space $\Omega_t = \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega_M \times \Omega_N$ as already described there. Thus there is a new expectation operator \mathbb{E}_t which is an integration over this total probability space.

This means, that all the developments described in Section 2 can now be applied here, with $\mathcal{U} \cong \mathbb{R}^N$ and a new $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega_M \times \Omega_N$ which is a probability space, and as $\mathcal{Q} = L_2(\mathcal{P})$ one takes the L_2 -Hilbert space defined by the total probability measure. This means that one has the descriptions as detailed in Sections 2.5 and 2.6 with the mappings \mathbf{R}_N , $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{U}, \mu}$, and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mu}$. And one may use the SVD methods there to find good approximations. See Eq.(69) in Appendix B for the definition of singular values resulting from low-rank approximations, and Eq.(12) in Section 2.5 to arrive at the SVD of $\mathbf{R}_N^\top = \sum_{j=1}^N \varsigma_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes s_j$. It is well known that the truncated SVD is the approximation to this expression by limiting the rank of the approximate mapping. Written as a CEX, this becomes

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,N} = \sum_{j=1}^n \varsigma_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes s_j = \mathbb{E}_{t,F}(\mathbf{R}_N | \mathbf{Z}_n) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{SVD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n)} \Psi_{\mathbf{R}_N}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{SVD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n), \quad (48)$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_n = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$, the manifold over which to minimise is

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,\text{SVD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n) = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbb{R}^N) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Z}_n \boldsymbol{\xi}_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{v}_j \otimes \xi_j, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n = [\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]^\top \in \mathcal{Q}^n\},$$

and $\Psi_{\mathbf{R}_N}(\mathbf{X}) = \|\mathbf{R}_N - \mathbf{X}\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2$. The novelty now is that in $\Psi_{\mathbf{R}_N}$ the mapping norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}}$ is used, which is not a Hilbert norm. Therefore $\mathbb{E}_{t,F}$ has to be seen as a more general *Fréchet mean*, and also the minimisation is not like for a normal CEX over a subspace as in Section 3.2, as the manifold $\mathcal{S}_{n,\text{SVD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n)$ — these are special rank- n maps — is not a subspace; so that Eq.(48) may be classed as a Fréchet CEX.

But for the ROM approximation $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_n$ of \mathbf{r}_N , this is the best n -term approximation in $\mathcal{U} \cong \mathbb{R}^N$, also known as the Karhunen-Loève expansion (KLE):

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_n = \mathbb{E}_t(\mathbf{r}_N | \mathcal{Z}_n) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\chi} \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{KLE}}(\mathcal{Z}_n)} \Psi_{\mathbf{r}_N}(\boldsymbol{\chi}) \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{KLE}}(\mathcal{Z}_n) \quad (49)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_n = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$, the manifold over which to minimise is

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,\text{KLE}}(\mathcal{Z}_n) = \{\boldsymbol{\chi} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \boldsymbol{\chi} = \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \mathbf{v}_j, \xi_j \in \mathcal{Q}\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\},$$

and $\Psi_{\mathbf{r}_N}(\boldsymbol{\chi}) = \mathbb{E}_t(\|\mathbf{r}_N - \boldsymbol{\chi}\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2)$; so in total again a standard CEX.

The closely related POD technique uses $n < N$ samples resp. *snapshots* grouped as $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Z}_n = [\mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1), \dots, \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_n)]$ to construct a ROM basis. In case from these n samples one desires a $k < n$ ROM basis, that approximation ([12] Eq.(4)) may be approached similarly as CEX in the following way: with a manifold

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,\text{POD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n) = \{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n} \mid \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{Z}_n, \mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_k(\mathbb{R}^N)\},$$

— $\mathcal{V}_k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the Stiefel manifold of orthogonal $N \times k$ matrices — as well as $\Psi_{\mathbf{Z}_n}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbb{E}_t(\|\mathbf{Z}_n - \mathbf{A}\|_F^2)$ ($\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm), the POD basis is again given as a CEX:

$$\mathbf{V}_{k,\text{POD}} = \mathbb{E}_t(\mathbf{V} | \mathbf{Z}_n) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{POD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n)} \Psi_{\mathbf{Z}_n}(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{POD}}(\mathbf{Z}_n) \quad (50)$$

The reduced basis method (RBM) [12] (cf. also the monographs [56, 28], as well as [3] and the work described in e.g. [61, 8, 18, 57, 13, 4]) is for our purposes best considered in the context of solving a linear elliptic coercive parametric PDE, i.e. finding the solution $u(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$a(\boldsymbol{\mu}, u(\boldsymbol{\mu}), v) = \langle A(\boldsymbol{\mu})u(\boldsymbol{\mu}), v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = F(v) = \langle f, v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{RBM}}, \quad (51)$$

where A is the self-adjoint operator $A : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^*$ associated to the bilinear form $a(\boldsymbol{\mu}; \cdot, \cdot)$. It is well known that this is equivalent to minimising the functional $E(v) = \frac{1}{2} \langle A(\boldsymbol{\mu})v, v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} - \langle f, v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$, but also the quadratic form $Q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \langle A(\boldsymbol{\mu})(v - u(\boldsymbol{\mu})), (v - u(\boldsymbol{\mu})) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$, where symbolically $u(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = A^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu})f$. Having computed the snapshots $\mathcal{Z}_n = \{u(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1), \dots, u(\boldsymbol{\mu}_n)\}$, the RBM solution for a new value $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is computed by minimising $E(v)$ over $\mathcal{S}_{n,\text{RBM}}(\mathcal{Z}_n) = \text{span } \mathcal{Z}_n$, which is the Galerkin solution of Eq.(51) with $\mathcal{U}_{\text{RBM}} = \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{RBM}}(\mathcal{Z}_n)$. Taking into account the other uncertainties, define the quadratic functional $\Psi_{u(\boldsymbol{\mu}),\text{RBM}}(v) = \mathbb{E}_g(Q_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(v))$. Then the RBM solution is given by the CEX

$$u_{n,\text{RBM}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}_t(u(\boldsymbol{\mu}) | \mathcal{Z}_n) = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{RBM}}(\mathcal{Z}_n)} \Psi_{u(\boldsymbol{\mu}),\text{RBM}}(v) \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\text{RBM}}(\mathcal{Z}_n). \quad (52)$$

minimisation over rank- k matrices (rank-1 updates)

As a last example, we would like to mention the low-rank tensor computation of a ROM; for general material related to low-rank tensor representation see [27]. As seen previously, a parametric solution to Eq.(51) is a function $u(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N)$, where the short-hand notation of the uncertainties coded with (ω_M, ω_N) has been kept for the sake of brevity. With the repeated application of methods from Section 2, one can see that this can be written as a tensor product $u(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N) = \sum_j v_j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) s_{j,M}(\omega_M) s_{j,N}(\omega_N)$, with $v_j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{U}$ and RVs $s_{j,M}(\omega_M)$ and $s_{j,N}(\omega_N)$. One way of approximating this kind of solution [20] is to define the nested sequence of sub-manifolds $\mathcal{S}_k = \{w \mid w = \sum_{j=1}^k v_j(\boldsymbol{\mu}) s_{j,M}(\omega_M) s_{j,N}(\omega_N)\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

From the functional $\Psi_{u(\boldsymbol{\mu}),\text{RBM}}(v)$ from Eq.(52), let us define the new functional Ψ_k on \mathcal{S}_k . Assuming the minimisation Ψ_{k-1} on \mathcal{S}_{k-1} given with result the rank- $(k-1)$ approximation $u_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we now define

$$\Psi_k(v_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) s_{k,M}(\omega_M) s_{k,N}(\omega_N)) = \Psi_{u_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}),\text{RBM}}(w_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N)),$$

where $w_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega_M, \omega_N) := u_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) + v_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) s_{k,M}(\omega_M) s_{k,N}(\omega_N)$, on \mathcal{S}_k . Then the rank- k approximation is computed as

$$u_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}_t(u(\boldsymbol{\mu}) | u_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu})) = \arg \min_{v_k s_{k,M} s_{k,N} \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{Z}_n)} \Psi_{u_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu})}(v_k s_{k,M} s_{k,N}) \in \mathcal{S}_k(\mathcal{Z}). \quad (53)$$

The minimisation in Eq.(53) is often computed as an *alternating minimisation*. Let us also point out that there are other ways of defining possible low-rank tensors, cf. [27].

5. CONCLUSIONS

Here the main goal was to try and formulate a few ways of computing parametric reduced order models (ROMs) as a conditional expectation (CEX). To this end in Section 2 a connection has been made between parametric elements and linear maps in general. This led, with the help of spectral theory (summarised in Appendix A) and the singular value decomposition (SVD) (summarised in Appendix B) to various other decompositions and expansion like the Karhunen-Loève expansion (KLE). The variational theory of expectation and conditional expectation was sketched in Section 3.

Connecting everything in Section 4, we first analysed all the uncertainties inherent in establishing a ROM, and then showed that many different ROM computations could be interpreted as a CEX computation. Specifically, attention was focused on Gaussian process emulation (GPE) and kernel methods, as well as the reduced basis methods (RBM),

the truncated SVD and the proper orthogonal decomposition (POD), and, last but not least, low-rank tensor approximations.

The main advantage in this point of view is seen in the possibility to explicitly account for many other uncertainties in the computation of the ROM, just by defining the CEX in a proper way.

Acknowledgments.

The research reported in this publication was partly supported by a Gay-Lussac Humboldt Research Award.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. D. Angrist and J.-S. Pischke, *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [2] P. Batlle, Y. Chen, B. Hosseini, H. Owhadi, and A. M. Stuart, *Error Analysis of Kernel/GP Methods for Nonlinear and Parametric PDEs*, arXiv:2305.04962 [math.NA], 2023, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04962>, arXiv:2305.04962.
- [3] P. Benner, S. Gugercin, and K. Willcox, *A survey of projection-based model reduction methods for parametric dynamical systems*, SIAM Review **57** (2015), 483–531, doi:10.1137/130932715.
- [4] P. Benner, M. Ohlberger, A. T. Patera, G. Rozza, and K. Urban (eds.), *Model Reduction of Parametrized Systems*, MS&A — Modeling, Simulation & Applications, vol. 17, Berlin, Springer, 2017, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-58786-8.
- [5] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan, *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*, Springer, Berlin, 2004, doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-9096-9.
- [6] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk, *Data assimilation in reduced modeling*, SIAM/ASA Journal of Uncertainty Quantification **5** (2017), no. 1, 1–29, doi:10.1137/15M1025384.
- [7] A. Bobrowski, *Functional analysis for probability and stochastic processes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [8] A. Buffa, Y. Maday, A. T. Patera, C. Prud'homme, and G. Turinici, *A priori convergence of the greedy algorithm for the parametrized reduced basis method*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis (M2AN) **46** (2012), 595–603, doi:10.1051/m2an/20111056.
- [9] M. D. Buhmann, *Radial basis functions: Theory and implementations*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, vol. 12, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511543241.
- [10] T. Bui-Thanh, K. Willcox, and O. Ghattas, *Model reduction for large-scale systems with high-dimensional parametric input space*, SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing **30** (2008), 3270–3288, doi:10.1137/070694855.
- [11] P. Chen and C. Schwab, *Model order reduction methods in computational uncertainty quantification*, in Ghanem et al. [25], pp. 937–990, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-12385-1.
- [12] F. Chinesta, A. Huerta, G. Rozza, and K. Willcox, *Model reduction methods*, Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics (E. Stein, R. de Borst, and T. J. R. Hughes, eds.), vol. 1, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2nd ed., 2017, Part 1. Fundamentals. Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics, doi:10.1002/9781119176817.ecm2110.
- [13] A. Cohen and R. DeVore, *Approximation of high-dimensional parametric pdes*, Acta Numerica **24** (2015), 1–159, doi:10.1017/S0962492915000033.
- [14] N. Cohen, O. Sharir, Y. Levine, R. Tamari, D. Yakira, and A. Shashua, *Analysis and design of convolutional networks via hierarchical tensor decompositions*, arXiv:1705.02302 [cs.LG], 2018, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.02302>, arXiv:1705.02302.
- [15] N. Cohen, O. Sharir, and A. Shashua, *On the expressive power of deep learning: A tensor analysis*, arXiv: 1509.05009 [cs.NE], 2016, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.05009>, arXiv:1509.05009.
- [16] M. Dashti and A. M. Stuart, *The bayesian approach to inverse problems*, in Ghanem et al. [25], pp. 311–428, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-12385-1.
- [17] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions, *Spectral theory and applications*, Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology, vol. 3, Springer, Berlin, 1990, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-61529-0.

- [18] M. Drohmann, B. Haasdonk, and M. Ohlberger, *Reduced basis approximation for non-linear parametrized evolution equations based on empirical operator interpolation*, SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing **34** (2012), A937–A969, doi:10.1137/10081157X.
- [19] G. Evensen, *Data assimilation: The ensemble kalman filter*, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [20] A. Falcó and A. Nouy, *A proper generalized decomposition for the solution of elliptic problems in abstract form by using a functional Eckart-Young approach*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **376** (2011), 469–480, doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2010.12.003.
- [21] F. Fleuret, *The little book of deep learning*, v1.1.1 ed., Université de Genève, 2023, Available from: <https://fleuret.org/public/lbdl.pdf>.
- [22] M. S. Floater, C. Manni, E. Sande, and H. Speleers, *Best low-rank approximations and Kolmogorov n-widths*, 2021, Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.13196>, arXiv:2007.13196.
- [23] S. Fresca, L. Dede, and A. Manzoni, *A comprehensive deep learning-based approach to reduced order modeling of nonlinear time-dependent parametrized pdes*, 2020, Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.04001>, arXiv:2004.04001.
- [24] I. M. Gel'fand and N. Y. Vilenkin, *Applications of harmonic analysis*, Generalized Functions, vol. 4, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1964.
- [25] R. Ghanem, D. Higdon, and H. Owhadi (eds.), *Handbook of uncertainty quantification*, Springer, Berlin, 2017, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-12385-1.
- [26] L. Giraldi and A. Nouy, *Weakly intrusive low-rank approximation method for nonlinear parameter-dependent equations*, SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing **41** (2019), A1777–A1792, doi:10.1137/17M1136924.
- [27] W. Hackbusch, *Tensor spaces and numerical tensor calculus*, Springer, Berlin, 2012, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28027-6.
- [28] J. S. Hesthaven, G. Rozza, and B. Stamm, *Certified reduced basis methods for parametrized partial differential equations*, Springer, Berlin, 2016, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-22470-1.
- [29] S. Janson, *Gaussian Hilbert spaces*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, doi:10.1017/CB09780511526169.
- [30] E. T. Jaynes, *Probability theory, the logic of science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [31] R. E. Kálmán, *A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems*, Transactions of the ASME—J. of Basic Engineering (Series D) **82** (1960), 35–45.
- [32] M. C. Kennedy and A. O'Hagan, *Bayesian calibration of computer models*, J. Royal Statist., Series B (2001), no. 63(3), 425–464.
- [33] A. Kolmogoroff, *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, Springer, 1933.
- [34] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Foundations of the Theory of Probability*, Chelsea Pub. Comp., 1950.
- [35] M. A. Kowalski, K. A. Sikorski, and F. Stenger, *Selected Topics in Approximation and Computation*, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [36] G. Kutyniok, P. Petersen, M. Raslan, and R. Schneider, *A theoretical analysis of deep neural networks and parametric PDEs*, 2019, Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.00377>, arXiv:1904.00377.
- [37] J. Latz, *Bayesian inverse problems are usually well-posed*, SIAM Review **65** (2023), no. 3, 831–865, doi:10.1137/23M1556435.
- [38] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by vector space methods*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1969.
- [39] V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou (eds.), *Ipc, 2021: Climate change 2021: The physical science basis*, Cambridge University Press, 2021, Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, doi:10.1017/9781009157896.
- [40] H. G. Matthies, *Uncertainty quantification with stochastic finite elements*, Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics (E. Stein, R. de Borst, and T. J. R. Hughes, eds.), vol. 1, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2007, Part 1. Fundamentals. Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics, doi:10.1002/0470091355.ecm071.
- [41] ———, *Uncertainty quantification and Bayesian inversion*, Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics (E. Stein, R. de Borst, and T. J. R. Hughes, eds.), vol. 1, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2nd ed., 2017, Part 1. Fundamentals. Encyclopaedia of Computational Mechanics, doi:10.1002/9781119176817.ecm2071.
- [42] H. G. Matthies, *Analysis of probabilistic and parametric reduced order models*, Quantification of Uncertainty: Improving Efficiency and Technology (M. D'Elia, M. Gunzburger, and G. Rozza, eds.), Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, vol. 137, Springer, 2020, pp. 129–152, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-48721-8_6.

- [43] H. G. Matthies, A. Litvinenko, B. V. Rosić, and E. Zander, *Bayesian parameter estimation via filtering and functional approximations*, arXiv:1611.09293 [math.NA], 2016, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09293>, arXiv:1611.09293.
- [44] H. G. Matthies and R. Ohayon, *Analysis of parametric models: Linear methods and approximations*, Advances in Computational Mathematics **45** (2019), 2555–2586, doi:10.1007/s10444-019-09735-4.
- [45] ———, *Parametric models analysed with linear maps*, Adv. Model. and Simul. in Eng. Sci. **7** (2020), 41, doi:10.1186/s40323-020-00172-3.
- [46] H. G. Matthies, E. Zander, B. V. Rosić, and A. Litvinenko, *Parameter estimation via conditional expectation: a Bayesian inversion.*, Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences **3** (2016), 24, doi:10.1186/s40323-016-0075-7.
- [47] H. G. Matthies, E. Zander, B. V. Rosić, A. Litvinenko, and O. Pajonk, *Inverse problems in a Bayesian setting*, Computational Methods for Solids and Fluids — Multiscale Analysis, Probability Aspects and Model Reduction (A. Ibrahimbegović, ed.), Computational Methods in Applied Sciences, vol. 41, Springer, Berlin, 2016, pp. 245–286, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-27996-1_10.
- [48] K. P. Murphy, *Machine learning: A probabilistic perspective*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2012.
- [49] R. M. Neal, *Bayesian learning for neural networks*, LNS, vol. 118, Springer, 1995, doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-0745-0.
- [50] N. H. Nelsen and A. M. Stuart, *Operator learning using random features: a tool for scientific computing*, 2024, Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.06526>, arXiv:2408.06526.
- [51] A. O’Hagan and M. West (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Bayesian Analysis*, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [52] O. Pajonk, B. V. Rosić, A. Litvinenko, and H. G. Matthies, *A deterministic filter for non-Gaussian Bayesian estimation — applications to dynamical system estimation with noisy measurements*, Physica D **241** (2012), 775–788, doi:10.1016/j.physd.2012.01.001.
- [53] O. Pajonk, B. V. Rosić, and H. G. Matthies, *Sampling-free linear Bayesian updating of model state and parameters using a square root approach*, Computers and Geosciences **55** (2013), 70–83, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2012.05.017.
- [54] A. Pinkus, *n-Widths in Approximation Theory*, Springer, 1985.
- [55] D. Pollard, *A user’s guide to measure theoretic probability*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [56] A. Quarteroni, A. Manzoni, and F. Negri, *Reduced basis methods for partial differential equations: An introduction.*, Springer, Berlin, 2015, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-15431-2.
- [57] A. Quarteroni and G. Rozza (eds.), *Reduced order methods for modeling and computational reduction*, MS&A — Modeling, Simulation & Applications, vol. 9, Berlin, Springer, 2014, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02090-7_8.
- [58] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and 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, doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045.
- [59] B. V. Rosić, A. Kučerová, J. Sýkora, O. Pajonk, A. Litvinenko, and H. G. Matthies, *Parameter identification in a probabilistic setting*, Engineering Structures **50** (2013), 179–196, doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2012.12.029.
- [60] B. V. Rosić, A. Litvinenko, O. Pajonk, and H. G. Matthies, *Sampling-free linear Bayesian update of polynomial chaos representations*, Journal of Computational Physics **231** (2012), 5761–5787, doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2012.04.044.
- [61] G. Rozza, D. Huynh, and A. Patera, *Reduced basis approximation and a posteriori error estimation for affinely parametrized elliptic coercive partial differential equations: Application to transport and continuum mechanics*, Arch. Comput. Methods Eng. **15** (2008), 229–275.
- [62] J. Schmidhuber, *Deep learning in neural networks: An overview*, 2014, Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7828>, arXiv:1404.7828.
- [63] C. Schwab and J. Zech, *Deep learning in high dimension: Neural network expression rates for generalized polynomial chaos expansions in UQ*, Anal. Appl. **17** (2019), 19–55, doi:10.1142/S0219530518500203.
- [64] I. E. Segal and R. A. Kunze, *Integrals and operators*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 1978.
- [65] C. Soize and R. Ghanem, *Physics-constrained non-Gaussian probabilistic learning on manifolds*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering (2019), published online, doi:10.1002/nme.6202.
- [66] G. Strang, *Linear Algebra and Learning from Data*, Wellesley - Cambridge Press, 2019.
- [67] A. M. Stuart, *Inverse problems: A Bayesian perspective*, Acta Numerica **19** (2010), 451–559, doi:10.1017/S0962492910000061. MR 2652785

- [68] A. Tarantola, *Inverse problem theory and methods for model parameter estimation*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2004.
- [69] J. Vondřejc and H. G. Matthies, *Accurate computation of conditional expectation for highly non-linear problems*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification **7** (2019), 1349–1368, doi:10.1137/18M1196674.
- [70] G. Yang, *Tensor programs I: Wide feedforward or recurrent neural networks of any architecture are gaussian processes*, arXiv:1910.12478v3 [cs.NE], 2021, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.12478>, arXiv:1910.12478.
- [71] G. Yang and H. Salman, *A fine-grained spectral perspective on neural networks*, arXiv:1907.10599v1 [cs.LG], 2020, Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.10599>, arXiv:1907.10599.

APPENDIX A. SPECTRAL DECOMPOSITION

Reminder of the finite dimensional theory: Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\top$ be a self-adjoint $n \times n$ -matrix. Then the spectrum $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is real and here it is assumed that the eigenvalues $\lambda_k \in \sigma(\mathbf{A})$ are ordered as a subset of \mathbb{R} , i.e. $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ with corresponding CONS of eigenvectors \mathbf{u}_k . Observe that $\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top$, so that the projection on the eigen-space of λ_m is $\mathbf{\Pi}_m = \sum_{\lambda_k=\lambda_m} \mathbf{u}_k \otimes \mathbf{u}_k =: \Delta \mathbf{E}_m$; and thus $\mathbf{I} = \sum_{m=1}^\ell \mathbf{\Pi}_m$ (where ℓ is the number of distinct eigenvalues). As a side remark, the projection $\mathbf{\Pi}_m$ is in fact a polynomial in \mathbf{A} , easily seen to equal the elementary Lagrange polynomial $\mathbf{L}_m(\mathbf{A}) = \prod_{\lambda_k \neq \lambda_m} \frac{1}{\lambda_m - \lambda_k} (\mathbf{A} - \lambda_k \mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{\Pi}_m$. Then there are three common ways of writing the spectral decomposition:

Sum of projections:: Set $\mathbf{E}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and for the orthogonal spectral projections onto the eigen-spaces with $\lambda_k \leq \lambda_m$: $\mathbf{E}_m = \mathbf{E}_{m-1} + \Delta \mathbf{E}_m = \mathbf{E}_{m-1} + \mathbf{\Pi}_m$ ($1 \leq m \leq \ell$; $\mathbf{E}_\ell = \mathbf{I}$). This can also be written as $\mathbf{E}_m = \mathbb{1}_{] -\infty, \lambda_m]}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{k \leq m} \mathbf{L}_k(\mathbf{A})$, it is a polynomial in \mathbf{A} . Then the spectral decomposition of \mathbf{A} can be written as a sum of orthogonal projections

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \lambda_m \Delta \mathbf{E}_m = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \lambda_m \mathbf{\Pi}_m. \quad (54)$$

Diagonalisation:: Collect the eigenvectors \mathbf{u}_k as the k -th column into the orthogonal resp. unitary matrix \mathbf{U} , and the eigenvalues into the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_k)$. Then \mathbf{A} is unitarily equivalent to multiplication by a diagonal matrix:

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{U}^\top. \quad (55)$$

Tensor decomposition:: This is simply a component-wise expansion of Eq.(55):

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k \mathbf{u}_k \otimes \mathbf{u}_k. \quad (56)$$

Now let \mathbf{R} be a $m \times n$ -matrix with $\ker \mathbf{R} = \{0\}$ (this implies $m \geq n$), $\mathbf{C}_U = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $\mathbf{C}_Q = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Then their spectral- and singular value-decomposition (SVD) as diagonalisation follows from Eq.(55):

$$\mathbf{C}_U = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Lambda}_U \mathbf{V}^\top, \quad \mathbf{C}_Q = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{S}^\top, \quad \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^\top, \quad (57)$$

where $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are orthogonal resp. unitary, $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix of singular values, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_U = \mathbf{\Sigma}^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q = \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Sigma}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are the diagonal matrices of eigenvalues $\lambda_k = \varsigma_k^2$, with ς_k ($1 \leq k \leq n$) the k -th singular value. These diagonalisations immediately suggest other factorisations of \mathbf{C}_U (or \mathbf{C}_Q) and resulting representations of $r(p)$, namely

$$\mathbf{C}_U = (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2}) (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2})^\top, \quad \mathbf{C}_U = \mathbf{C}_U^{1/2} \mathbf{C}_U^{1/2}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{C}_U^{1/2} = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2} \mathbf{V}^\top. \quad (58)$$

The variant of Eq.(56) based on Eq.(57) is

$$C_U = \sum_{k=1}^n \zeta_k^2 \mathbf{v}_k \otimes \mathbf{v}_k, \quad C_Q = \sum_{k=1}^n \zeta_k^2 \mathbf{s}_k \otimes \mathbf{s}_k, \quad R = \sum_{k=1}^n \zeta_k \mathbf{s}_k \otimes \mathbf{v}_k. \quad (59)$$

The decomposition according to Eq.(54) is rarely used in the finite-dimensional theory. But in the infinite-dimensional case [64, 17], when A is assumed to be a self-adjoint linear operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , where the spectrum may have continuous parts, it is the most commonly known form of the spectral decomposition:

Spectral measure:: On the (Borel) space $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B})$ there is a measure $E : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ whose values are commuting orthogonal projections — a projection valued measure — with $E(\emptyset) = 0$, $E(\mathbb{R}) = I$, $E(]a, b]) = \mathbb{1}_{]a, b]}(A)$, such that — corresponding to Eq.(54) —

$$A = \int_{\sigma(A)} \lambda E(d\lambda). \quad (60)$$

In case of a purely discrete spectrum with the distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_k \in \sigma(A)$, and with $\Delta E_k := \mathbb{1}_{] \lambda_{k-1}, \lambda_k]}(A)$, one has the direct equivalent of Eq.(54), the discrete version of Eq.(60):

$$A = \sum_{\lambda_k \in \sigma(A)} \lambda_k \Delta E_k. \quad (61)$$

Diagonalisation:: Less known than Eq.(60) but still fairly standard is: The self adjoint $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is unitarily equivalent to a multiplication operator $M_k \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(\mathcal{T}))$ by a real-valued function $k(t)$ on some $L_2(\mathcal{T}) \ni \xi(t) \mapsto (M_k \xi)(t) = k(t)\xi(t) \in L_2(\mathcal{T})$, where \mathcal{T} is some measure space. The spectrum $\sigma(A)$ is the (essential) range of $k : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This is the direct analogue of Eq.(55):

$$A = U M_k U^\dagger, \quad (62)$$

where $U \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{H})$ is unitary, U^\dagger is its adjoint, and the multiplication operator M_k may be seen as a “diagonal” operator.

Nuclear Spectral Theorem:: In case $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ has a partly continuous spectrum, a nuclear Gel’fand triple $\Phi \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \Phi^*$ (a “rigged” Hilbert space) with $A\Phi \subseteq \Phi$ and generalised eigenvectors in Φ^* are needed, e.g. [24, 17]. Here we restrict ourselves for the sake of brevity and simplicity to the discrete case where each spectral value $\lambda_k \in \sigma(A)$ is an eigenvalue, counted according to multiplicity, with orthonormal eigenvectors $u_k \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the analogue of Eq.(56) is:

$$A = \sum_k \lambda_k u_k \otimes u_k. \quad (63)$$

Let $R : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ be an injective linear map as in Section 2.5. The statement Eq.(60) is typically not used to factor R via $C_U = R^\dagger R \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U})$, see Section 2.5. But the statement Eq.(62) is. So one has, together with $C_Q = R R^\dagger \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q})$, a spectral- and singular value-decomposition (SVD) as analogue of the diagonalisation Eq.(57):

$$C_U = V M_\zeta^2 V^\dagger, \quad C_Q = S M_\zeta^2 S^\dagger, \quad R = S M_\zeta V^\dagger, \quad R^\dagger = V M_\zeta S^\dagger, \quad (64)$$

where $V \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(S), \mathcal{U})$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{Q})$ are unitary, and $M_\zeta \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(\mathcal{T}))$ is a multiplication operator with the positive function $\zeta(t)$. The essential range of ζ may be seen as a possible continuous generalisation of the singular values, which is possible due to the fact that R was assumed injective, so that S is unitary instead of just a partial isometry.

Now define $s \in \mathcal{Q}$ via $s(p) := S M_\zeta^{-1} V^\dagger r(p)$. Then the continuous SVD of R^\dagger leads to the following representation of $r(p)$, linear in $s(p)$:

$$r(p) = R^\dagger s(p) = V M_\zeta S^\dagger s(p). \quad (65)$$

To use this Eq.(65) to define a ROM, set on $L_2(\mathcal{T})$ for $0 < a < \|\varsigma\|_\infty$ as a cut-off: $\zeta_a(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\varsigma \geq a\}}(t)\varsigma(t)$. Then the approximation

$$r_a(p) = VM_{\zeta_a} S^\dagger s(p) \approx r(p). \quad (66)$$

is a kind of continuous ROM.

Again, the diagonalisations Eq.(64) immediately suggest other factorisations, as in Eq.(58), of C_U (or C_Q) and resulting representations of $r(p)$, namely

$$C_U = (VM_\varsigma)(VM_\varsigma)^\dagger, \quad C_U = C_U^{1/2} C_U^{1/2}, \quad \text{where } C_U^{1/2} = VM_\varsigma V^\dagger. \quad (67)$$

In case C_U (and C_Q) has a purely discrete spectrum with eigenvalues σ_m^2 and eigenvectors v_m (and eigenfunctions s_m of C_Q), the variant of Eq.(59) based on Eq.(63) is

$$C_U = \sum_m \zeta_m^2 v_m \otimes v_m, \quad C_Q = \sum_m \zeta_m^2 s_m \otimes s_m, \quad R = \sum_m \zeta_m s_m \otimes v_m. \quad (68)$$

APPENDIX B. SINGULAR VALUES AND SINGULAR NUMBERS

In Eq.(64) a kind of continuous SVD of R on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces was possible due to the special nature of R . In the finite-dimensional setting one is reduced to Eq.(59), or even in the purely discrete case to Eq.(68), and those singular values coincide with the *singular numbers* (s-numbers) to be defined below, e.g. [35, 29].

These *singular numbers* (s-numbers) are defined via low-rank approximations, another possibility to produce a ROM. Let $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ be a bounded linear operator between Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$, with the operator norm is defined as $\|A\|_{1,2} = \sup_{0 \neq x \in \mathcal{H}_1} \|Ax\|_2 / \|x\|_1$.

Recalling that the rank of a linear map $B : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ is $\text{rank } B = \dim(\text{im } B)$, one defines the singular numbers (s-numbers) $\{\zeta_k(A)\}_{k=1,\dots}$ of such a $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ as:

$$\zeta_k(A) := \inf\{\|A - B\|_{1,2} \mid B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2), \text{rank } B < k\}, \quad k = 1, \dots \quad (69)$$

This implies

$$\|A\|_{1,2} = \zeta_1(A) \geq \zeta_2(A) \geq \dots \geq 0, \quad \text{and } \zeta_k(A) = \zeta_k(A^\dagger), \quad (70)$$

as well as the following: If A is compact, then $\zeta_k(A) \rightarrow 0$, and $\zeta_k(A)^2$ is an eigenvalue of $A^\dagger A$ and AA^\dagger . Additionally, in each of the two Hilbert spaces there exists a CONS $\{e_k^\ell\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\ell$ such that

$$\zeta_k(A) = \left\| A - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \zeta_j(A) e_j^2 \otimes e_j^1 \right\|_{1,2}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$Ae_k^1 = \zeta_k(A) e_k^2; \quad A^\dagger e_k^2 = \zeta_k(A) e_k^1.$$

Obviously the CONS $\{e_k^1\} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ is an eigenvector basis for $A^\dagger A$, and the CONS $\{e_k^2\} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ is an eigenvector basis for AA^\dagger . This means that for compact operators the singular numbers (s-numbers) and singular values coincide.

Let us mention that the (s-numbers) are connected with the so-called n-widths in approximation theory, see e.g. [35, 54, 22]; an important topic which for the sake of brevity will not be pursued further here.