

LOCAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS FOR BAYESIAN INVERSE PROBLEMS

JÜRGEN DÖLZ AND DAVID EBERT

ABSTRACT. We present an extension of local sensitivity analysis, also referred to as the perturbation approach for uncertainty quantification, to Bayesian inverse problems. More precisely, we show how moments of random variables with respect to the posterior distribution can be approximated efficiently by asymptotic expansions. This is under the assumption that the measurement operators and prediction functions are sufficiently smooth and their corresponding stochastic moments with respect to the prior distribution exist. Numerical experiments are presented to illustrate the theoretical results.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. One of the key goals in Bayesian inverse problems is to update prior beliefs on the distribution of random variables by additional knowledge. These random variables often correspond to physical phenomena, where the additional knowledge is given by measurements [42]. The updated information is then given as a posterior distribution, which can be used to compute statistical quantities of interest such as stochastic moments. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \pi)$ be a probability space, X a Banach space, and $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow X$ a random variable. Given an observable mapping $Q : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$, a prior distribution $\pi_\xi = \pi \circ \xi^{-1}$, and data η^δ observed under additive Gaussian noise with covariance matrix Σ , the posterior distribution π_ξ^δ takes the form

$$(1) \quad \pi_\xi^\delta(x) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\eta^\delta - Q(x)\|_\Sigma^2\right) \pi_\xi(x)}{\int_X \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\eta^\delta - Q(x)\|_\Sigma^2\right) d\pi_\xi(x)},$$

cf. [61]. Stochastic moments of a quantity of interest R defined on X according to the posterior distribution, the *posterior moments*, are given by

$$(2) \quad \int_X R(x) \otimes \cdots \otimes R(x) d\pi_\xi^\delta(x).$$

Approximating the latter computationally is a nontrivial task, especially since Q and R are often the solution operators of partial differential equations and thus computationally expensive when implemented. Nevertheless, approximating (2) numerically has been subject to intensive research efforts over the past years.

1.2. Numerical methods for Bayesian inverse problems. The common approach to compute stochastic moments (2) computationally are sampling based methods. Among these, *Markov Chain Monte Carlo* (MCMC) *methods* [17, 33] aim at drawing samples from the posterior distribution to estimate (2) by a Monte

INSTITUTE FOR NUMERICAL SIMULATION, UNIVERSITY OF BONN, FRIEDRICH-HIRZEBRUCH-ALLEE 7, 53115 BONN, GERMANY

E-mail addresses: doelz@ins.uni-bonn.de, ebert@ins.uni-bonn.de.

Date: March 27, 2025.

The work of the authors was partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), project 501419255. The authors also received support from the DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy, project 390685813.

Carlo estimator. Like all Monte Carlo estimators they provide a relatively slow convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ with respect to number of samples N . While Monte Carlo estimators are naturally robust to the dimension d of the parameter space X , finding a proposal kernel for MCMC estimators that is robust as $d \rightarrow \infty$ is often a nontrivial task, cf. [11, 50, 53, 63]. Over the years MCMC methods have seen various proposals for designing efficient proposal kernels for the Markov chain. Examples are multilevel MCMC [14, 35, 45], adaptive MCMC [28, 51], Hamiltonian Monte Carlo [17, 26, 36], and hybrid Monte Carlo [6, 17], which all aim to improve the way and at which computational cost proposals for the chain are generated.

MCMC methods to compute stochastic moments can be considered as quadrature methods and, thus, a natural approach to overcome the MCMC's slow convergence rate is to employ improved quadrature formulas. To do so (1) is commonly substituted into (2) and a quadrature formula for the prior measure is employed. In comparison to MCMC methods, this approach requires the normalization constant of the posterior measure to be numerically calculated explicitly. Exploiting this perspective and additionally available smoothness of the integrand, *sparse grid methods* [46, 55], *polynomial chaos (PC) methods* [48, 49, 52], and (higher-order) *quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) methods* [12, 13, 25, 54] can be employed to improve the convergence rate. These methods can be further accelerated when they are combined to a *multilevel quadrature* algorithm [12, 21, 54].

As an alternative to quadrature algorithms, *Kalman Filters* [43] and their extensions such as *ensemble Kalman Filters* [24] and *polynomial chaos Kalman Filters* [52] are methods which are designed to provide a quick estimate of the mean and variance of certain parameters. Computational speed is favored in these methods and, except for linear systems and Gaussian noise, the approximation properties of Kalman Filters are often not well understood. However, there is some progress being made in the context of Bayesian inverse problems [22, 38, 44, 52, 58].

Besides the above mentioned sampling based methods, an alternative approach for the numerical approximation of (2) is to first approximate the posterior density by analytical approximation methods and then to approximate the analytical approximation by means of numerical methods. Significant gains can be made if the analytical approximation can be more efficiently approximated than the original expression (2). The most prominent example is the *Laplace approximation* [64], which approximates the posterior distribution by a Gaussian distribution centered at the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate. The covariance of this Gaussian distribution is based on a second-order Taylor expansion of the logarithm of the posterior density around the MAP estimate. It can be shown that this approximation converges to the true posterior when the posterior distribution is unimodal and the *noise level* decreases [34, 57]. Otherwise, when the approximation of the posterior distribution by a Gaussian distribution is an insufficient approximation, the Laplace approximation can be used to improve quadrature algorithms such as Monte Carlo, QMC methods, or sparse grids [56, 57]. In this situation, there hold similar considerations as for sampling based methods.

1.3. Local sensitivity analysis for forward problems. For forward problems in uncertainty quantification, i.e., computing statistical quantities of interest of some quantity with random input data, *local sensitivity analysis* is an attractive alternative to sampling based methods [60]. In the context of partial differential equations local sensitivity analysis is also referred to as the *perturbation approach*, see, e.g., [7, 9, 18, 19, 23, 30, 32]. Local sensitivity analysis assumes that the input data are modeled as random fluctuations around a reference state $x_0 \in X$, i.e., as

$$(3) \quad x(\omega) = x_0 + \xi(\omega) \in X,$$

and expand the uncertainty-to-solution map into a truncated Taylor expansion around x_0 . Computing the corresponding derivatives is often not more expensive than the model evaluation itself. As the Taylor expansion admits an asymptotic truncation error with respect to amplitude of the uncertainty $\xi(\omega)$, local sensitivity analysis is most suited to efficiently calculate stochastic quantities of interest in applications with small scale uncertainty to high precision. In this regime it often outperforms sampling based algorithms. As it turns out, this is highly relevant in engineering applications [3, 20, 47, 37, 40, 59]. Compared to many sampling based approaches, local sensitivity analysis can be considered to be immune to the curse of dimensionality.

To the best of our knowledge, the local sensitivity analysis has only been considered for forward uncertainty quantification. An analogue for Bayesian inverse problems is missing so far.

1.4. Contributions. In this article, we extend and analyze the framework of local sensitivity analysis for forward problems to Bayesian inverse problems. I.e., assuming random input data of the form eq. (3), a prior distribution for the perturbations, and Gaussian measurement noise, we provide approximations of posterior moments in terms of Taylor expansions. More precisely, the contributions of this paper are as follows.

- (1) Given asymptotic expansions for Q and R , we provide and analyze asymptotic expansions of (2), i.e., we derive a local sensitivity analysis with respect to the posterior measure.
- (2) As local sensitivity analysis is sensitive to the reference point, we discuss how the reference point can be iteratively improved and how this connects to classically regularized inverse problems for the specific case of the posterior mean of the parameter.
- (3) We discuss the numerical implementation and provide extensive numerical examples for the Darcy flow log-normal permeability and small noise level, illustrating the validity of our numerical examples.

We note that a similar concept based on a perturbation analysis of the posterior measure with respect to the prior measure, i.e., how the posterior is affected by changes in the prior, is known in the context *robust Bayesian analysis* [4, 5, 39]. This is different from the local sensitivity analysis we consider here, as we consider the prior as fixed and given and our investigations focus on perturbations of Q and R and how these perturbations affect (2).

1.5. Outline. The rest of this article is organized as follows. In the following section 2, we recall the basics of Bayesian inverse problems, statistical moments, and Taylor expansions in Banach spaces. Then, in section 3, we introduce and analyze local sensitivity analysis for posterior moments in Bayesian inverse problems. In section 4.1 we discuss how the reference point of the expansions for the posterior mean can be improved and how it relates to classically regularized inverse problems. Section 5 is concerned with remarks on implementation when using affinely parametrized random variables. Finally, in section 6, we illustrate our theoretical findings with numerical examples, before we draw our conclusions in section 7.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Bayesian inverse problems. In the following we consider a *forward response map* $G: X \rightarrow Y$ between two Banach spaces from which we refer to X as the *parameter space* and Y as the *observable space*. With Y being possibly infinite dimensional, we assume to have a bounded and linear *observation operator* $O \in \mathcal{L}(Y; \mathbb{R}^K)$ to our disposal which allows us to perform K “measurements” on the observation




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the mapping properties considered for computing stochastic moments with respect to the posterior distribution.

space. We refer to the concatenation $Q = O \circ G: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ as the *measurement operator* which maps parameters from X to K “measurements”. As common for Bayesian inverse problems we assume that the measurements are subject to additive Gaussian noise $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, with $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ being a symmetric, positive definite covariance matrix, and that the parameters in X are X -valued random variable ξ defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \pi)$. We call $\pi_\xi = \pi \circ \xi^{-1}$ the *prior* distribution of ξ . Given this model, the “physically” accessible measurements are given as realizations $\eta^\delta \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of the random variable

$$(4) \quad \eta = Q(\xi) + \varepsilon, \quad (\xi, \varepsilon) \sim \pi_\xi \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma).$$

Given a realization $\eta^\delta \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of this random variable we define the (*unnormalized*) *likelihood* $\Theta: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\Theta(x) = \exp(-\Phi(x)),$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Sigma = \langle \Sigma^{-1} \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^K}$ is a scalar product that induces the norm $\| \cdot \|_\Sigma^2 = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Sigma$ and we refer to

$$(5) \quad \Phi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \| \eta^\delta - Q(x) \|_\Sigma^2$$

as the *potential* of the likelihood. The following theorem allows to condition the prior distribution π_ξ to the measurements η^δ . We call distributions conditioned on the measurements η^δ *posterior* distributions.

Theorem 2.1 ([61, Theorems 6.29 and 6.31]). *Assume that the potential (5) is π_ξ -measurable. Then the posterior distribution of ξ conditioned to η^δ exists and is denoted by $\pi_\xi^\delta = \pi_\xi|_{\eta=\eta^\delta}$. It is absolutely continuous with respect to π_ξ and given by*

$$(6) \quad \pi_\xi^\delta(x) = \frac{\Theta(x) \pi_\xi(x)}{\int_X \Theta(x) d\pi_\xi(x)}.$$

2.2. Stochastic moments. Let $R: X \rightarrow Z$ be a *prediction function* taking values in some Hilbert space Z and mapping parameters to some *quantity of interest*. An illustration of the prediction function and the quantities of the Bayesian setting is given in fig. 1. For $R \in L^1_{\pi_\xi}(X; Z)$ the *mean* or *expected value* in terms of the prior distribution is defined as

$$(7a) \quad \mathbb{E}[R] = \int_X R(x) d\pi_\xi(x),$$

and the posterior mean is the mean conditioned on realization η^δ of η

$$(7b) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R] = \mathbb{E}[R | \eta = \eta^\delta] = \mathbb{E} \left[R \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta]} \right].$$

For $R_1, R_2 \in L^2_{\pi_\xi}(X; Z)$, and with \otimes denoting the Hilbertian tensor product, we obtain the correlations

$$(7c) \quad \text{Cor}[R_1, R_2] = \mathbb{E}[R_1 \otimes R_2],$$

$$(7d) \quad \mathbb{C}\text{or}_{\pi^\delta}[R_1, R_2] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_1 \otimes R_2],$$

and covariances

$$(7e) \quad \text{Cov}[R_1, R_2] = \mathbb{E}[(R_1 - \mathbb{E}[R_1]) \otimes (R_2 - \mathbb{E}[R_2])],$$

$$(7f) \quad \text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_1, R_2] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[(R_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_1]) \otimes (R_2 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_2])].$$

Additionally, for $R = R_1 = R_2$, we introduce the shorthand notation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[R] &= \text{Cov}[R, R], \\ \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\pi^\delta}[R] &= \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_{\pi^\delta}[R, R], \\ \text{Cor}[R] &= \text{Cor}[R, R], \\ \mathbb{C}\text{or}_{\pi^\delta}[R] &= \mathbb{C}\text{or}_{\pi^\delta}[R, R]. \end{aligned}$$

For the rest of this article, if expected values or covariances are not indexed, they are to be understood in the sense of the prior distribution.

Remark 2.2. We assume Z to be a Hilbert space to avoid technicalities using the tensor product occurring in the definitions of correlation and covariance. We refer to [41] for a discussion concerning the details when Z is a Banach space.

2.3. Taylor expansions in Banach spaces. For a Banach space W , an open, convex subset $U \subset X$ and $f \in C^{k+1}(U; W)$ we denote the k -th Fréchet derivative at $x_0 \in U$ evaluated in direction $[h_1, \dots, h_k] \in X^k$ by $D_{x_0}^k f[h_1, \dots, h_k]$. For $[h_1, \dots, h_k] = [h, \dots, h]$ we abbreviate $D_{x_0}^k f[h]$ and we write $D_{x_0} f[h] = D_{x_0}^1 f[h]$. We recall that $D_{x_0}^k f \in \mathcal{L}^{(k)}(U; W)$, i.e., $D_{x_0}^k f$ is a bounded k -linear mapping on X^k . The Taylor expansion of f at $x_0 \in U$ in direction $h \in X$ with $x_0 + h \in U$ is given by

$$f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + D_{x_0} f[h] + \dots + \frac{1}{k!} D_{x_0}^k f[h] + R_k(x_0, h)$$

with remainder

$$R_k(x_0, h) = \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)^k}{k!} D_{x_0+th}^{k+1} f[h] dt.$$

The assumption $f \in C^{k+1}(U; W)$ implies

$$\|D_{x_0+th}^{k+1} f\|_{\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(U; \mathbb{R})} \leq \|f\|_{C^{k+1}(U; W)} < \infty$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$, implying

$$\|R(x_0, h)\|_W \leq \frac{\|f\|_{C^{k+1}(U; W)}}{(k+1)!} \|h\|_X^{k+1}$$

and thus $R(x_0, h) \in \mathcal{O}(\|h\|_X^{k+1})$ for all $x_0 \in U$, $h \in X$ with $x_0 + h \in U$, cf., e.g., [66, Chapter 4.6].

The following lemma is an immediate consequence and we state it for later reference but without proof.

Lemma 2.3. *Let X, W Banach spaces, $U \subset X$ an open convex subset, and $f \in C^{k+1}(U; W)$. Let $x_0 \in U$, $h, g \in X$ and $x_0 + h, x_0 + g \in U$. Then it holds*

$$f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0 + g) + D_{x_0} f[h - g] + \dots + \frac{1}{k!} D_{x_0+g}^k f[h - g] + R_k(x_0 + g, h - g)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(x_0 + g, h - g)\|_W &\leq \frac{\|f\|_{C^{k+1}(U;W)}}{(k+1)!} \|h - g\|_X^{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{C_k \|f\|_{C^{k+1}(U;W)}}{(k+1)!} \max\{\|h\|_X, \|g\|_X\}^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$R(x_0 + g, h - g) = \mathcal{O}\left(\max\{\|h\|_X, \|g\|_X\}^{k+1}\right),$$

with the constant in the \mathcal{O} -notation only depending on f and k .

3. LOCAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS FOR BAYESIAN INVERSE PROBLEMS

3.1. Perturbation model. The common assumption for local sensitivity analysis is that the uncertainty of the data in the parameter space can be modeled as fluctuations around a reference value $x_0 \in X$, i.e., as

$$(8) \quad x_\xi(\omega) = x_0 + \xi(\omega).$$

Remark 3.1. We note that local sensitivity analysis often scales the perturbation ξ by an additional parameter, i.e., $\xi(\omega) = \alpha \tilde{\xi}(\omega)$, yielding convergence rates in α . We will see that for the Bayesian setting the unscaled version is preferable, yielding convergence rates in $\|\xi\|_X$.

Assuming $Q \in C^4(X; \mathbb{R}^K)$ and $R \in C^4(X; Z)$, the mappings of our Bayesian setting can be expressed as

$$(9a) \quad Q_{x_\xi} = Q(x_\xi) = Q_{x_0} + D_{x_0} Q[\xi] + \frac{1}{2} D_{x_0}^2 Q[\xi] + \frac{1}{6} D_{x_0}^3 Q[\xi] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_X^4),$$

$$(9b) \quad R_{x_\xi} = R(x_\xi) = R_{x_0} + D_{x_0} R[\xi] + \frac{1}{2} D_{x_0}^2 R[\xi] + \frac{1}{6} D_{x_0}^3 R[\xi] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_X^4).$$

Accordingly, the likelihood $\Theta \in C^4(X; \mathbb{R})$ can be expressed as

$$(9c) \quad \Theta_{x_\xi} = \Theta(x_\xi) = \Theta_{x_0} + D_{x_0} \Theta[\xi] + \frac{1}{2} D_{x_0}^2 \Theta[\xi] + \frac{1}{6} D_{x_0}^3 \Theta[\xi] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_X^4),$$

where

$$(10a) \quad \Theta_{x_0} = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|\eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}\|_\Sigma^2\right),$$

$$(10b) \quad D_{x_0} \Theta[\xi] = \Theta_{x_0} \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma,$$

$$(10c) \quad D_{x_0}^2 \Theta[\xi] = \Theta_{x_0} \left(\langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma^2 - \|D_{x_0} Q[\xi]\|_\Sigma^2 + \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0}^2 Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma \right),$$

$$(10d) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{x_0}^3 \Theta[\xi] &= D_{x_0}^2 \Theta[\xi] \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma \\ &\quad + \Theta_{x_0} \left(2 \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma \left(\langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0}^2 Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma - \|D_{x_0} Q[\xi]\|_\Sigma^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 3 \langle D_{x_0} Q[\xi], D_{x_0}^2 Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma + \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0}^3 Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that only the derivatives eqs. (10b) to (10d) depend on the random variable ξ . To simplify presentation we drop the argument $[\xi]$ from our notation.

3.2. Expansions for first and second moments. Inserting the series expansions (9) into the posterior moments (7b) and (7f), we can formulate series approximations for these quantities of interest. In the following we do this up to second order, noting that there is no obstruction other than additional regularity requirements to go even higher order.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\xi \in L^3_\pi(\Omega; X)$, $Q \in C^3(X; \mathbb{R}^K)$, and $R \in C^3(X; Z) \cap L^2_{\pi_\xi}(X; Z)$. Then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
(11a) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} + \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L^3_\pi(\Omega; X)}^3), \\
(11b) \quad \text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} \otimes R_{x_0} + \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L^3_\pi(\Omega; X)}^3), \\
(11c) \quad \text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L^3_\pi(\Omega; X)}^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. To show the assertion for the mean eq. (11a), we need to calculate the derivatives of

$$R_{x_\xi} = R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_\xi}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_\xi}]} \in C^3(X; \mathbb{R})$$

with respect to ξ and then take the mean. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{x_0} \left(R \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta]} \right) &= (D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} + R_{x_0} \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2}, \\
D_{x_0}^2 \left(R \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta]} \right) &= (D_{x_0}^2 R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} + 2(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - 2(D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \\
&\quad + R_{x_0} \frac{D_{x_0}^2 \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - 2R_{x_0} \frac{(D_{x_0} \Theta)(D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \\
&\quad - R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0}^2 \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} + 2R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])^2}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, since the k -th Fréchet derivative acts as a bounded k -linear operator in its directions of evaluation it holds

$$D_{x_0}^k \mathbb{E}[\Theta] = D_{x_0}^k \int_X \Theta d\pi_\xi = \int_X D_{x_0}^k \Theta d\pi_\xi = \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^k \Theta] \quad k = 1, 2,$$

and $\xi \in L^2_\pi(\Omega)$ implies

$$|\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^k \Theta]| \leq \mathbb{E}[|D_{x_0}^k \Theta|] \leq \|D_{x_0}^k \Theta\|_{\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(X; \mathbb{R})} \|\xi\|_{L^2_\pi(\Omega; X)} < \infty, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

i.e., these quantities are well defined. Further, (10a) implies $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}] = \Theta_{x_0}$, such that applying the mean, exploiting $D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta] = \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} \Theta]$, and (10b), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[D_{x_0} R] &= \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[D_{x_0}^2 R] &= \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0}^2 R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] \\ &\quad - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{D_{x_0}^2 \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{(D_{x_0} \Theta) (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0}^2 \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])^2}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^3} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\Theta_{x_0}} \right] - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta]}{\Theta_{x_0}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \mathbb{E}[(D_{x_0} R) \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \\ &\quad - 2 \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} Q] \rangle_\Sigma \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by applying the mean to the Taylor expansion of $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}]$ we get (11a). The approximation (11b) is obtained by considering $\tilde{R}_\xi = R_{x_\xi} \otimes R_{x_\xi}$ and the approximation (11c) is found when deducting the approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] \otimes \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}]$ from (11b). \square

The expressions simplify further if the prior distribution is centered and skewless and we have some additional smoothness available.

Corollary 3.3. *Let the assumptions of theorem 3.2 hold and assume that ξ is centered, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\xi] = 0$. Then it holds*

(12a)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3) \end{aligned}$$

(12b)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} \otimes R_{x_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \text{Cor}[(D_{x_0} R \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R), \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3), \end{aligned}$$

(12c)

$$\text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] = \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3).$$

If $\xi \in L^4_\pi(\Omega; X)$ and ξ is centered and additionally skewless, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\xi \otimes \xi \otimes \xi] = 0$, $Q \in C^4(X; \mathbb{R}^K)$, and $R \in C^4(X; Z) \cap L^2_{\pi_\xi}(X; Z)$, then the error term improves to $\mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L^4_\pi(\Omega; X)}^4)$.

Proof. To show the assertion eq. (12a) for the mean, continuing the derivations of theorem 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_{x_0}^3 \left(R \frac{\Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta]} \right) &= (D_{x_0}^3 R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0}}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} + 3(D_{x_0}^2 R) \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - 3(D_{x_0}^2 R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \\ &\quad + 3(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0}^2 \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - 6(D_{x_0} R) \frac{(D_{x_0} \Theta)(D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \\ &\quad - 3(D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0}^2 \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} + 6(D_{x_0} R) \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])^2}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^3} \\ &\quad + R_{x_0} \frac{D_{x_0}^3 \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} - 3R_{x_0} \frac{(D_{x_0}^2 \Theta)(D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} \\ &\quad - 3R_{x_0} \frac{(D_{x_0} \Theta)(D_{x_0}^2 \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} + 6R_{x_0} \frac{(D_{x_0} \Theta)(D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])^2}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^3} \\ &\quad - R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} D_{x_0}^3 \mathbb{E}[\Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^2} - 6R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])^3}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^4} \\ &\quad + 6R_{x_0} \frac{\Theta_{x_0} (D_{x_0} \mathbb{E}[\Theta])(D_{x_0}^2 \mathbb{E}[\Theta])}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, since the Fréchet derivative acts as a linear operator in its direction of evaluation, $\mathbb{E}[\xi] = 0$ implies $\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} Q] = 0$, and thus also $\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} \Theta] = 0$. Since the third Fréchet derivative acts as a trilinear operator in its directions of evaluation, the same arguments as in theorem 3.2 yield $\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^3 R] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^3 \Theta] = 0$. Similarly, the multiplication of second derivatives (bilinear in direction of evaluation) and first derivatives (linear) is also trilinear in the direction of evaluation, so that we find

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0}^2 R) \frac{D_{x_0} \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(D_{x_0} R) \frac{D_{x_0}^2 \Theta}{\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{x_0}]} \right] = 0.$$

Thus first- and third-order terms vanish under the assumptions of the corollary. The assertions for the correlation eq. (12b) and covariance eq. (12c) follow in complete analogy. \square

4. ITERATIVE IMPROVEMENT OF THE REFERENCE VALUE

4.1. Iterative approximation of the posterior mean. The estimates of the previous section show that the reference point x_0 (and thus $R_{x_0} = R(x_0)$) for the series approximations is one of the most influential parameters for local sensitivity analysis for Bayesian inverse problems. For local sensitivity analysis for the forward problem, x_0 is often considered as an inherent property of the perturbation model eq. (8), which is specified by x_0 and the distribution of ξ . However, we may change x_0 by introducing a bias in the probability distribution of ξ , i.e., for any \tilde{x}_0 we may write

$$(13) \quad x_\xi(\omega) = x_0 + \xi(\omega) = \tilde{x}_0 + (\xi(\omega) + x_0 - \tilde{x}_0) = \tilde{x}_0 + \tilde{\xi}(\omega).$$

We thus have changed the point of reference. The asymptotic expansions for the statistical quantities of interest from section 3 hold verbatim, with the moments in the expansions now taken with respect to the probability measure of $\tilde{\xi}$. The question is how we can exploit this flexibility in choosing the reference point to

improve our asymptotic expansions. The starting point for our considerations is the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Under the assumptions of theorem 3.2 it holds*

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi] = x_0 + \mathbb{E}[\xi] + \mathbb{Cov}[\xi, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[\xi] \rangle_\Sigma] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3).$$

Proof. Set $R_{x_\xi} = x_\xi$ in (11a) from theorem 3.2. \square

Being a new and hopefully improved approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi]$ when compared to x_0 , we may take the result of this series approximation as a new point of reference for a series expansion of $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi]$. Iterating this process motivates the iteration

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} x^{(n+1)} &= \Phi_{\text{approx}}(x^{(n)}) \\ &= x^{(n)} + \mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] + \mathbb{Cov}[\xi^{(n)}, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x^{(n)}}, D_{x^{(n)}} Q[\xi^{(n)}] \rangle_\Sigma], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{aligned}$$

with starting value $x^{(0)} = x_0$ and the modified perturbation model

$$x_\xi = x^{(n+1)} + \xi^{(n+1)},$$

with

$$(16) \quad \xi^{(0)} = \xi, \quad \xi^{(n+1)} = \xi^{(n)} + x^{(n)} - x^{(n+1)} = \xi^{(0)} + x^{(0)} - x^{(n+1)}.$$

This yields the series expansion

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi] &= x^{(n)} + \mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] + \mathbb{Cov}[\xi^{(n)}, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x^{(n)}}, D_{x^{(n)}} Q[\xi^{(n)}] \rangle_\Sigma] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\max\{\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(X; W)}, \|x^{(0)} - x^{(n)}\|_X\}^3), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{aligned}$$

with the constant in the \mathcal{O} -notation depending on η^δ , Σ , Q , and x_0 , cf. also lemma 2.3.

If the sequence eq. (15) converges, then the approximation estimate from corollary 4.1 becomes as follows.

Corollary 4.2. *Let the assumptions of theorem 3.2 hold and let x^* be a fixed point of eq. (15). Then it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi] = x^* + \mathcal{O}(\max\{\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(X; W)}, \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_X\}^3)$$

with the constant in the \mathcal{O} -notation depending on η^δ , Σ , Q , and x_0 .

4.2. Connection to Tikhonov regularization. In the following we show that the iteration eq. (15) can also be motivated from a classical inverse problem perspective, if we allow X to be a Hilbert space. In this situation it holds $\mathbb{Cov}[\xi] \in X \otimes X$, with \otimes denoting the Hilbertian tensor product, and the covariance operator

$$\mathcal{C}: X \rightarrow X, \quad \mathcal{C}x = (\text{Id} \otimes \langle \cdot, x \rangle_X) \mathbb{Cov}[\xi]$$

is well defined. It is easy to check that \mathcal{C} is continuous and self-adjoint w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$. We moreover assume that $\mathbb{Cov}[\xi]$ is positive, implying that \mathcal{C} is invertible.

With notation in place, we are in the position to introduce the Tikhonov-regularized classical inverse problem

$$(18) \quad \min_{x \in X} F(x),$$

with $F: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given as

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\eta^\delta - Q(x)\|_\Sigma^2 + \|x - x^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}[\xi]\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \right)$$

and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 = \langle \mathcal{C}^{-1} \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$. Now, its Fréchet derivative $D_x F: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in X$ evaluated in direction $y \in X$ is given by

$$(D_x F)[y] = -\langle \eta^\delta - Q_x, (D_x Q)[y] \rangle_\Sigma + \langle \mathcal{C}^{-1}(x - x^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}[\xi]), y \rangle_X,$$

implying that its gradient $\nabla_x F: X \rightarrow X$ at $x \in X$ is given by

$$\nabla_x F = -(\mathbb{D}_x Q)^* \Sigma^{-1} (\eta^\delta - Q_x) + \mathcal{C}^{-1} (x - x^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}[\xi]).$$

Here, $(\mathbb{D}_x Q)^*$ is the adjoint taken with respect to the \mathbb{R}^K inner product. Now, upon observing that eq. (16) implies $\text{Cov}[\xi_n] = \text{Cov}[\xi_0] = \text{Cov}[\xi]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] = \mathbb{E}[\xi] + x^{(0)} - x^{(n)}$, the descent algorithm

$$(19) \quad x^{(n+1)} = x^{(n)} + d^{(n)}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} d^{(n)} &= -\mathcal{C} \nabla_{x^{(n)}} F \\ &= (\text{Id} \otimes \langle \cdot, (\mathbb{D}_{x^{(n)}} Q)^* \Sigma^{-1} (\eta^\delta - Q_{x^{(n)}}) \rangle_X) \text{Cov}[\xi] + \mathbb{E}[\xi] + x^{(0)} - x^{(n)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] + \text{Cov}[\xi^{(n)}, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x^{(n)}}, \mathbb{D}_{x^{(n)}} Q[\xi^{(n)}] \rangle_\Sigma] \end{aligned}$$

coincides with eq. (15). Our assumptions on $\text{Cov}[\xi]$ guarantee that \mathcal{C} is such that

$$\langle d^{(n)}, \nabla_{x^{(n)}} F \rangle_X = -\langle \mathcal{C} \nabla_{x^{(n)}} F, \nabla_{x^{(n)}} F \rangle_X < 0,$$

implying that $d^{(n)}$ is a descent direction for F . It is well known that, even with $d^{(n)}$ being a descent direction, convergence of the iteration can only be proven if $d^{(n)}$ is scaled with a sufficiently small step length $\alpha^{(n)}$. Still, if the iteration does indeed converge, i.e., $x^{(n)} \rightarrow x^*$, then also $d^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ and our assumptions on $\text{Cov}[\xi]$ imply that $\nabla_{x^{(n)}} F \rightarrow 0$. Thus, if our iteration eq. (15) converges, then its limit x^* is a (local) minimizer of eq. (18). Vice versa, if the descend algorithm eq. (19) of the minimization problem eq. (18) converges, then it is a fixed point of our iteration eq. (15) and we obtain the improved approximation estimate of corollary 4.2.

5. COMPUTATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1. Affine-parametric representation of random variables. For the purpose of numerical computations we assume in the following that the random variable ξ can be parametrized over a sequence of real numbers. That is, we assume that

$$(20) \quad \xi(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^M x_j z_j(\omega),$$

with $M \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and where $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^M \subset X$ and the $z_j: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are pairwise uncorrelated random variables. This implies the representation

$$(21) \quad x_\xi(\omega) = x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^M x_j z_j(\omega)$$

for the input parameters in X . The most prominent example for such affine-parametric representations of x_ξ are (truncated) Karhunen–Loève expansions. However, one can show that such expansions exist whenever x_ξ attains values in a compact subset of a Banach space, see [10, Section 1.2] for a discussion and examples. For numerical purposes, the expansion eq. (20) is truncated to a finite number of terms according to some tolerance.

5.2. Computation of asymptotic expansions. With the affine-parametric representation eq. (21) available, the series representations from (9) now read

$$(22a) \quad Q_{x_\xi} = Q_{x_0} + \sum_{i=1}^M z_i D_{x_0} Q[x_i] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M z_i z_j D_{x_0}^2 Q[x_i, x_j] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_X^3),$$

$$(22b) \quad R_{x_\xi} = R_{x_0} + \sum_{i=1}^M z_i D_{x_0} R[x_i] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M z_i z_j D_{x_0}^2 R[x_i, x_j] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_X^3).$$

The directional derivatives occurring in (22) can often be calculated conveniently if $Q(x), R(x)$ are explicitly available, as illustrated in the references in the literature review and in the numerical examples in section 6. The following lemma shows that computing the entities in (22) is sufficient to obtain approximations to the posterior moments.

Corollary 5.1. *Let the assumptions of theorem 3.2 hold and assume that the prior distribution of x_ξ is given in the form as in eq. (21) with $\{z_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ being pairwise uncorrelated random variables satisfying $z_j \in L_\pi^2(\Omega)$. Then the expansions in theorem 3.2 read*

(23a)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} + \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] D_{x_0} R[x_i] + \frac{1}{2} D_{x_0}^2 R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M \text{Cov}[z_i] D_{x_0} R[x_i] \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[x_i] \rangle_\Sigma + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3), \end{aligned}$$

(23b)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &= R_{x_0} \otimes R_{x_0} + D_{x_0} R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{x_0}^2 R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0}^2 R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \right) \\ &\quad + D_{x_0} R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \otimes D_{x_0} R \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[z_i] x_i \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M \text{Cov}[z_i] \left(D_{x_0} R[x_i] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R[x_i] \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q[x_i] \rangle_\Sigma \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3), \end{aligned}$$

(23c)

$$\text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] = \sum_{i=1}^M \text{Cov}[z_i] D_{x_0} R[x_i] \otimes D_{x_0} R[x_i] + \mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^3(\Omega; X)}^3).$$

As for corollary 3.3, the first order correction terms vanish, if we assume that the z_j are centered, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[z_j] = 0$. Further, if $\xi \in L_\pi^4(\Omega; X)$ and ξ is centered and additionally skewless, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\xi \otimes \xi \otimes \xi] = 0$, $Q \in C^4(X; \mathbb{R}^K)$, and $R \in C^4(X; Z) \cap L_{\pi_\xi}^2(X; Z)$, then the error term improves to $\mathcal{O}(\|\xi\|_{L_\pi^4(\Omega; X)}^4)$.

Proof. Insert eq. (20) into theorem 3.2 and corollary 3.3. \square

Remark 5.2. As for the deterministic case, this approach can be extended to arbitrary high order of the correction terms. However, when implemented in practice, the computational cost grow, if done naively, exponentially with the order of the

derivatives. The efficient numerical solution of the arising *moment equations* has been subject to intensive research, see, e.g., [9, 30], with an emphasis on being put on corrections up to second order. In the latter context, the moment equations are referred to as *correlation equations* [8, 15, 16, 29, 31, 65].

5.3. Iterative approximation of the posterior mean. In the following we discuss how the iterative approximation of the posterior mean from section 4.1 can be computationally implemented when the random variable and input data are given in the affine-parametric representations eq. (20) and eq. (21). To this end, we assume that X is a separable Hilbert space, which implies that we can assume without loss of generality that $\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in eq. (20) is an orthonormal basis. Thus,

$$x_\xi(\omega) = x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^M x_j z_j(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^M x_j (z_j(\omega) + \underbrace{\langle x_j, x_0 \rangle_X}_{=: y_j}) = \sum_{j=1}^M x_j (z_j(\omega) + y_j).$$

Now, since for any $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots]$ and $\beta = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots]$ it holds

$$\left\langle \sum_{j=1}^M x_j \alpha_j, \sum_{j=1}^M x_j \beta_j \right\rangle_X = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{\ell^2},$$

the iteration from section 4.1 can be transferred to \mathbb{R}^M equipped with the Euclidean ℓ^2 -inner product. To this end, set $y^{(0)} = [y_1, y_2, \dots]$ and $z^{(0)} = [z_1, z_2, \dots]$ and iterate

$$y^{(n+1)} = y^{(n)} + \mathbb{E}[z^{(n)}] + \left[\mathbb{V}[z_j^{(n)}] \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x^{(n)}}, D_{x^{(n)}} Q[x_j] \rangle_{\Sigma} y_j^{(n)} \right]_{j=1}^M,$$

where

$$z^{(n+1)} = z^{(n)} + y^{(n)} - y^{(n+1)} = z^{(0)} + y^{(0)} - y^{(n+1)}$$

and

$$x^{(n)} = x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^M x_j z_j^{(n)}.$$

6. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

6.1. Darcy flow with log-normal permeability. As an example problem we consider the Darcy flow problem with permeability given by a log-normal random field, fixed load, and homogeneous boundary conditions, i.e.,

$$(24a) \quad -\operatorname{div}(\exp(b(\omega)) \nabla u(\omega)) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D} := [0, 1]^2,$$

$$(24b) \quad u(\omega) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{D},$$

where $b(\omega)$ is a Gaussian random field taking values in $L^2(\mathcal{D})$ and ω is a random event in a probability space. This is an important situation in the geosciences [2, 27, 62], where it is practically impossible to obtain complete knowledge on the permeability of the medium via direct measurements. Instead, practitioners are required to rely on measurements of the pressure u at selected points in \mathcal{D} . The situation corresponds to our framework when choosing $X = L^2(\mathcal{D})$, $Y = H_0^1(\mathcal{D})$, and G as the forward response map $b(\cdot, \omega) \mapsto u(\cdot, \omega)$ given through eq. (24). As observation operator $O: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ we choose $K = 5$ point evaluations of u at the locations

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right), \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4} \right), \left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{4} \right), \left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \right), \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \right) \right\} \subset \mathcal{D},$$

see fig. 2 for an illustration. We note that these point evaluations are well defined if u is a pathwise sufficiently smooth function. To satisfy this requirement, we choose

b as a random field with mean $\mathbb{E}[b] \equiv 1$ and covariance operator $\mathcal{C}: L^2(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{D})$ given through

$$(25) \quad (\mathcal{C}\phi)(\vec{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{D}} \exp\left(-\frac{20\|\vec{x} - \vec{y}\|_2^2}{3}\right) \phi(\vec{y}) d\vec{y},$$

and representation

$$(26) \quad b(\vec{x}, \omega) = b_0(\vec{x}) + \alpha \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i(\vec{x}) z_i(\omega)}_{=: \xi(\omega)},$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $b_0 = \mathbb{E}[b]$, $\{(b_i, \lambda_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are the $L^2(\mathcal{D})$ -orthonormal eigenpairs of \mathcal{C} organized such that $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is decreasing. We choose $z_i \sim \mathcal{U}[-\sqrt{\lambda_i}, \sqrt{\lambda_i}]$ for experiments with centered random fields and $z_i \sim \mathcal{U}[-\sqrt{\lambda_i}, \sqrt{\lambda_i}] + 0.1$ for experiments with uncentered random fields. It is well known that this setting implies pathwise smoothness of u , such that O is well defined. As prediction function we consider on the one hand the identity operator $R_1: X \rightarrow X =: Z_1$ and on the other hand the forward response map $R_2 = G: X \rightarrow Y =: Z_2$. Finally, the k -th derivative of the forward response map G is given as the solution of

(27a)

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\exp(b_0) \nabla D_{b_0}^k G[\xi]\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \binom{k}{\ell} \operatorname{div}\left(\exp(b_0) \xi(\omega)^\ell \nabla D_{b_0}^{k-\ell} G[\xi]\right) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D},$$

$$(27b) \quad D_{b_0}^k G[\xi] = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D},$$

see, e.g., [1, 7, 27, 62]. Using the linearity of the observation operator and the definition of the prediction functions we obtain

$$D_{b_0}^k Q[\xi] = O(D_{b_0}^k G[\xi]), \quad D_{b_0}^k R_2[\xi] = D_{b_0}^k G[\xi], \quad D_{b_0}^1 R_1[\xi] = \xi, \quad D_{b_0}^{1+k} R_1[\xi] = 0,$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. An illustration of the log-normal random field, corresponding forward response, i.e., solution of the diffusion problem eq. (24), its derivative and the evaluation points of the measurement operator can be found in fig. 2. We assume that the measurement noise has covariance

$$[\Sigma]_{ij} = \frac{1}{1000} \begin{cases} 5 & i = j, \\ 1 & i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 5.$$

We note that this noise level is quite small, and would be quite a challenge for most sampling based methods.

With the mathematical model set, we obtain measurement data η^δ through eq. (4), i.e., we pick a random realization of $\xi(\omega)$, take it to be our ground truth, evaluate $Q(\xi(\omega))$, and add a realization of the measurement noise $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$.

6.2. Computational setup. We discretize the covariance operator eq. (25) and the Darcy flow problem eq. (24) and its derivatives (27) using continuous, piecewise linear finite elements on a triangular grid, leading to 481 degrees of freedom for the Darcy flow problem and its derivatives and 545 degrees of freedom for the perturbations. It is important to note that the limiting factor for the number of degree of freedoms is the computational cost of the Monte Carlo method (details below), which serves as a reference solution. The perturbation approach can easily deal with more degrees of freedom. As usual, to obtain an expansion of the form eq. (20), we compute the eigendecomposition of the arising covariance matrix, and select the eigenfunctions corresponding to the largest eigenvalues with tolerance of 10^{-5} , which yields an expansion of the form eq. (20) with $M = 45$ terms. As a




FIGURE 2. Top left: reference solution. Top right: realization of random field. Bottom left: perturbed solution according to random field top right. Bottom right: Derivative in direction of random field top right. Evaluation points highlighted.

reference solution for our sensitivity analysis we use a QMC approximation of the variables of interest using 10^8 Halton points.

All calculations were performed using MATLAB on a compute server with four Intel Xeon Gold 6136 CPU with each with twelve 3 GHz cores, hyper-threading disabled and 384 GB RAM. Calculations of the summed terms of corollary 5.1 as well as sampling were both done in parallel.

6.3. Local sensitivity analysis for Bayesian inverse problems. To confirm the theoretical convergence rates we consider in the following a scaled version of $\xi(\omega)$, i.e., we replace $\xi(\omega)$ in eq. (26) by $\alpha\xi(\omega)$ with $\alpha \in \{2^{-n} : n = 0, \dots, 15\}$ and compare the approximations obtained through local sensitivity analysis with the

QMC reference solution for each α . We calculate the approximations

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &\approx \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] \\
&:= R_{x_0} + \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right), \\
\text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &\approx \text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] \\
&:= R_{x_0} \otimes R_{x_0} + \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0} R] \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right), \\
\text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &\approx \text{Cov}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] := \text{Cov}[D_{x_0} R],
\end{aligned}$$

for the case of uncentered prior distributions and whose approximation properties are given by of theorem 3.2. For centered prior distributions we compute the simplified approximations for mean and correlation according to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &\approx \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] = R_{x_0} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R, \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right) \\
\text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] &\approx \text{Cor}_{\pi^\delta}[R_{x_\xi}] \\
&= R_{x_0} \otimes R_{x_0} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}[D_{x_0}^2 R] + 2 \text{Cor}[D_{x_0} R] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \text{Cor}[(D_{x_0} R \otimes R_{x_0} + R_{x_0} \otimes D_{x_0} R), \langle \eta^\delta - Q_{x_0}, D_{x_0} Q \rangle_\Sigma] \right),
\end{aligned}$$

with approximation properties given by corollary 3.3. As error measure we use the $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ -norm, for the mean and the $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}) \otimes L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ -norm, for the covariance and the correlation. We note that computing the approximation using local sensitivity analysis for all α requires 2 seconds in total, most of which was spent building the system matrices, whereas the QMC reference solution requires 89 minutes for each α . The plots of the error are shown in fig. 3 for the uncentered case and in fig. 4 for the centered and skewless case compared to the predicted rates. The predicted rates are confirmed, albeit for some small perturbations, the error of the reference solution is still too large to see the actual error of the perturbation approximation.

6.4. Iterative improvement of the reference point. In the following we aim to show that the iteration from section 4, if convergent, can indeed improve the reference value of the Taylor expansion and that the approximation rate from corollary 4.2 indeed holds. To this end, as in section 6.3, we consider a scaled version of $\xi(\omega)$ and run the iteration eq. (15) for each scaled version of $\xi(\omega)$. The magnitude of the updates to the reference values is illustrated in fig. 5. The result after 100 iterations is then compared to the QMC reference solution for each α , the error being measured in the $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ -norm and plotted in fig. 6. We can see that the iteration diverges for the largest two perturbation values since the default step size is too large. The other iterations are converging with the larger perturbations showing significantly faster rates of convergence. The smallest calculated perturbations are still very far from their fixed point relative to the expected error. For intermediate sizes of perturbations the rate predicted in corollary 4.2 can be confirmed.




FIGURE 3. Convergence of the local sensitivity analysis for Bayesian inverse problems for uncentered prior distributions.

7. CONCLUSION

In this article we combined asymptotic expansions from local sensitivity analysis with the framework of Bayesian inverse problems, i.e., we derived Taylor-like expansions for first and second moments of predictions functions with respect to the posterior measure. To mitigate the influence of the a-priorily chosen reference point, we derived an iterative scheme to improve this reference point for the case when the prediction function is the identity and discussed its connection to classical inverse problems and Tikhonov regularization. The analysis was carried out in infinite dimensional spaces, and is thus applicable to a large class of problems, particularly to partial differential equations. We provided such an example in our numerical experiments, where our numerical examples for the Darcy flow with log-normal permeability confirmed our analytical approximation rates.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. BABUŠKA, F. NOBILE, AND R. TEMPONE, *A stochastic collocation method for elliptic partial differential equations with random input data*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 45 (2007), pp. 1005–1034, <https://doi.org/10.1137/050645142>.
- [2] J. BEAR AND A. H.-D. CHENG, *Modeling Groundwater Flow and Contaminant Transport*, no. 23 in Theory and Applications of Transport in Porous Media, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6682-5>.
- [3] H. BENAROYA AND M. REHAK, *Finite element methods in probabilistic structural analysis: A selective review*, Applied Mechanics Reviews, 41 (1988), pp. 201–213, <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1115/1.3151892>.
- [4] J. O. BERGER, *Robust Bayesian analysis: Sensitivity to the prior*, Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 25 (1990), pp. 303–328, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758\(90\)90079-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758(90)90079-A).




FIGURE 4. Convergence of the local sensitivity analysis for Bayesian inverse problems for centered prior distributions.




FIGURE 5. $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ -norm of updates $d^{(n)}$ for each α for 100 iterations.




FIGURE 6. Error $x^{(100)}$ compared to QMC approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[R_2] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^\delta}[x_\xi]$ in $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ -norm.

- [5] J. O. BERGER, E. MORENO, L. R. PERICCHI, M. J. BAYARRI, J. M. BERNARDO, J. A. CANO, J. DE LA HORRA, J. MARTÍN, D. RÍOS-INSÚA, B. BETRÒ, A. DASGUPTA, P. GUSTAFSON, L. WASSERMAN, J. B. KADANE, C. SRINIVASAN, M. LAVINE, A. O'HAGAN, W. POLASEK, C. P. ROBERT, C. GOUTIS, F. RUGGERI, G. SALINETTI, AND S. SIVAGANESAN, *An overview of robust Bayesian analysis*, Test, 3 (1994), pp. 5–124, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02562676>.
- [6] A. BESKOS, F. PINSKI, J. SANZ-SERNA, AND A. STUART, *Hybrid Monte Carlo on Hilbert spaces*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 121 (2011), pp. 2201–2230, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2011.06.003>.
- [7] F. BONIZZONI AND F. NOBILE, *Perturbation analysis for the Darcy problem with log-normal permeability*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 2 (2014), pp. 223–244, <https://doi.org/10.1137/130949415>.
- [8] H.-J. BUNGARTZ AND M. GRIEBEL, *Sparse grids*, Acta Numerica, 13 (2004), pp. 147–269, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492904000182>.
- [9] A. CHERNOV AND C. SCHWAB, *First order k -th moment finite element analysis of nonlinear operator equations with stochastic data*, Mathematics of Computation, 82 (2013), pp. 1859–1888, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-2013-02692-0>.
- [10] A. COHEN AND R. DEVORE, *Approximation of high-dimensional parametric PDEs*, Acta Numerica, 24 (2015), pp. 1–159, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492915000033>.
- [11] S. L. COTTER, G. O. ROBERTS, A. M. STUART, AND D. WHITE, *MCMC methods for functions: Modifying old algorithms to make them faster*, Statistical Science, 28 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-STS421>.
- [12] J. DICK, R. N. GANTNER, Q. T. LE GIA, AND C. SCHWAB, *Multilevel higher-order quasi-Monte Carlo Bayesian estimation*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 27 (2017), pp. 953–995, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021820251750021X>.
- [13] A. DJURDJEVAC, V. KAARNIOJA, M. ORTEU, AND C. SCHILLINGS, *Quasi-Monte Carlo for Bayesian shape inversion governed by the Poisson problem subject to Gevrey regular domain deformations*, Feb. 2025, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.14661>.
- [14] T. J. DODWELL, C. KETELSEN, R. SCHEICHL, AND A. L. TECKENTRUP, *Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, SIAM Review, 61 (2019), pp. 509–545, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M126966X>.
- [15] J. DÖLZ, H. HARBRECHT, AND M. D. PETERS, *\mathcal{H} -matrix based second moment analysis for rough random fields and finite element discretizations*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 39 (2017), pp. B618–B639, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1074813>.

- [16] J. DÖLZ, H. HARBRECHT, AND C. SCHWAB, *Covariance regularity and \mathcal{H} -matrix approximation for rough random fields*, Numerische Mathematik, 135 (2017), pp. 1045–1071, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-016-0825-y>.
- [17] S. DUANE, A. KENNEDY, B. J. PENDLETON, AND D. ROWETH, *Hybrid Monte Carlo*, Physics Letters B, 195 (1987), pp. 216–222, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(87\)91197-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(87)91197-X).
- [18] J. DÖLZ, *A higher order perturbation approach for electromagnetic scattering problems on random domains*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 8 (2020), pp. 748–774, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1274365>.
- [19] J. DÖLZ AND D. EBERT, *On uncertainty quantification of eigenvalues and eigenspaces with higher multiplicity*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 62 (2024), pp. 422–451, <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1529324>.
- [20] J. DÖLZ, D. EBERT, S. SCHÖPS, AND A. ZIEGLER, *Shape uncertainty quantification of Maxwell eigenvalues and -modes with application to TESLA cavities*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 428 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2024.117108>.
- [21] J. DÖLZ, H. HARBRECHT, C. JEREZ-HANCKES, AND M. MULTERER, *Isogeometric multilevel quadrature for forward and inverse random acoustic scattering*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 388 (2022), p. 114242, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2021.114242>.
- [22] O. G. ERNST, B. SPRUNGK, AND H.-J. STARKLOFF, *Analysis of the ensemble and polynomial chaos Kalman filters in Bayesian inverse problems*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 3 (2015), pp. 823–851, <https://doi.org/10.1137/140981319>.
- [23] P. ESCAPIL-INCHAUSPÉ AND C. JEREZ-HANCKES, *Helmholtz scattering by random domains: First-order sparse boundary element approximation*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 42 (2020), pp. A2561–A2592, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1279277>.
- [24] G. EVENSEN, *Sequential data assimilation with a nonlinear quasi-geostrophic model using Monte Carlo methods to forecast error statistics*, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 99 (1994), pp. 10143–10162, <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JC00572>.
- [25] R. N. GANTNER AND M. D. PETERS, *Higher-order quasi-Monte Carlo for Bayesian shape inversion*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 6 (2018), pp. 707–736, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1096116>.
- [26] M. GIROLAMI AND B. CALDERHEAD, *Riemann manifold Langevin and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 73 (2011), pp. 123–214, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00765.x>.
- [27] A. GUADAGNINI AND S. P. NEUMAN, *Nonlocal and localized analyses of conditional mean steady state flow in bounded, randomly nonuniform domains: 1. Theory and computational approach*, Water Resources Research, 35 (1999), pp. 2999–3018, <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999WR900160>.
- [28] H. HAARIO, E. SAKSMAN, AND J. TAMMINEN, *An adaptive Metropolis algorithm*, Bernoulli, 7 (2001), pp. 223–242, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3318737>.
- [29] H. HARBRECHT, M. PETERS, AND R. SCHNEIDER, *On the low-rank approximation by the pivoted Cholesky decomposition*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 62 (2012), pp. 28–440, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2011.10.001>.
- [30] H. HARBRECHT, M. PETERS, AND M. SIEBENMORGEN, *Combination technique based k -th moment analysis of elliptic problems with random diffusion*, Journal of Computational Physics, 252 (2013), pp. 128–141, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2013.06.013>.
- [31] H. HARBRECHT, R. SCHNEIDER, AND C. SCHWAB, *Multilevel frames for sparse tensor product spaces*, Numerische Mathematik, 110 (2008), pp. 199–220, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-008-0162-x>.
- [32] H. HARBRECHT, R. SCHNEIDER, AND C. SCHWAB, *Sparse second moment analysis for elliptic problems in stochastic domains*, Numerische Mathematik, 109 (2008), pp. 385–414.
- [33] W. K. HASTINGS, *Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications*, Biometrika, 57 (1970), pp. 97–109, <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.1.97>.
- [34] T. HELIN AND R. KRETSCHMANN, *Non-asymptotic error estimates for the Laplace approximation in Bayesian inverse problems*, Numerische Mathematik, 150 (2022), pp. 521–549, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-021-01266-9>.
- [35] V. H. HOANG, C. SCHWAB, AND A. M. STUART, *Complexity analysis of accelerated MCMC methods for Bayesian inversion*, Inverse Problems, 29 (2013), p. 085010, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/29/8/085010>.
- [36] M. D. HOFFMAN AND A. GELMAN, *The no-U-turn sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 15 (2014), pp. 1593–1623, <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/hoffman14a.html>.
- [37] R. A. IBRAHIM, *Structural dynamics with parameter uncertainties*, Applied Mechanics Reviews, 40 (1987), pp. 309–328, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3149532>.

- [38] M. A. IGLESIAS, K. J. H. LAW, AND A. M. STUART, *Ensemble Kalman methods for inverse problems*, Inverse Problems, 29 (2013), p. 045001, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/29/4/045001>.
- [39] D. R. INSUA AND F. RUGGERI, *Robust Bayesian Analysis*, vol. 152 of Lecture Notes in Statistics, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1306-2>.
- [40] R. IYENGAR AND P. DASH, *Random vibration analysis of stochastic time-varying systems*, Journal of Sound and Vibration, 45 (1976), pp. 69–89, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-460X\(76\)90668-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-460X(76)90668-4).
- [41] S. JANSON AND S. KALJSER, *Higher moments of Banach space valued random variables*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 238 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1127>.
- [42] J. KAIPIO AND E. SOMERSALO, *Statistical and Computational Inverse Problems*, Springer, New York, 2005, <https://doi.org/10.1007/b138659>.
- [43] R. E. KÁLMÁN, *A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems*, Journal of Basic Engineering, 82 (1960), pp. 35–45, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3662552>.
- [44] K. J. H. LAW, H. TEMBINE, AND R. TEMPONE, *Deterministic mean-field ensemble Kalman filtering*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 38 (2016), pp. A1251–A1279, <https://doi.org/10.1137/140984415>.
- [45] M. B. LYKKEGAARD, T. J. DODWELL, C. FOX, G. MINGAS, AND R. SCHEICHL, *Multilevel delayed acceptance MCMC*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 11 (2023), pp. 1–30, <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1476770>.
- [46] X. MA AND N. ZABARAS, *An efficient Bayesian inference approach to inverse problems based on an adaptive sparse grid collocation method*, Inverse Problems, 25 (2009), p. 035013, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/25/3/035013>.
- [47] C. S. MANOHAR AND R. A. IBRAHIM, *Progress in structural dynamics with stochastic parameter variations: 1987-1998*, Applied Mechanics Reviews, 52 (1999), pp. 177–197, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3098933>.
- [48] Y. M. MARZOUK AND H. N. NAJM, *Dimensionality reduction and polynomial chaos acceleration of Bayesian inference in inverse problems*, Journal of Computational Physics, 228 (2009), pp. 1862–1902, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2008.11.024>.
- [49] Y. M. MARZOUK, H. N. NAJM, AND L. A. RAHN, *Stochastic spectral methods for efficient Bayesian solution of inverse problems*, Journal of Computational Physics, 224 (2007), pp. 560–586, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2006.10.010>.
- [50] G. O. ROBERTS AND J. S. ROSENTHAL, *Optimal scaling for various Metropolis-Hastings algorithms*, Statistical Science, 16 (2001), <https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1015346320>.
- [51] J. S. ROSENTHAL, *Optimal Proposal Distributions and Adaptive MCMC*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York, 1 ed., May 2011, pp. 93–112, <https://doi.org/10.1201/b10905-5>.
- [52] 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), pp. 5761–5787, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2012.04.044>.
- [53] D. RUDOLF AND B. SPRUNGK, *On a generalization of the preconditioned Crank–Nicolson metropolis algorithm*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 18 (2018), pp. 309–343, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-016-9340-x>.
- [54] R. SCHEICHL, A. M. STUART, AND A. L. TECKENTRUP, *Quasi-Monte Carlo and multilevel Monte Carlo methods for computing posterior expectations in elliptic inverse problems*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 5 (2017), pp. 493–518, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1061692>.
- [55] C. SCHILLINGS AND C. SCHWAB, *Sparse, adaptive Smolyak quadratures for Bayesian inverse problems*, Inverse Problems, 29 (2013), p. 065011, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/29/6/065011>.
- [56] C. SCHILLINGS AND C. SCHWAB, *Scaling limits in computational Bayesian inversion*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 50 (2016), pp. 1825–1856, <https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an/2016005>.
- [57] C. SCHILLINGS, B. SPRUNGK, AND P. WACKER, *On the convergence of the Laplace approximation and noise-level-robustness of Laplace-based Monte Carlo methods for Bayesian inverse problems*, Numerische Mathematik, 145 (2020), pp. 915–971, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-020-01131-1>.
- [58] C. SCHILLINGS AND A. M. STUART, *Analysis of the ensemble Kalman filter for inverse problems*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 55 (2017), pp. 1264–1290, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M105959X>.

- [59] G. SILVA-OELKER, R. AYLWIN, C. JEREZ-HANCKES, AND P. FAY, *Quantifying the impact of random surface perturbations on reflective gratings*, IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 66 (2018), pp. 838–847, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAP.2017.2780902>.
- [60] R. C. SMITH, *Uncertainty Quantification: Theory, Implementation, and Applications*, Computational Science and Engineering Series, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 2013.
- [61] A. M. STUART, *Inverse problems: A Bayesian perspective*, Acta Numerica, 19 (2010), pp. 451–559, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492910000061>.
- [62] D. M. TARTAKOVSKY AND S. P. NEUMAN, *Transient flow in bounded randomly heterogeneous domains: 1. Exact conditional moment equations and recursive approximations*, Water Resources Research, 34 (1998), pp. 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1029/97WR02118>.
- [63] L. TIERNEY, *A note on Metropolis-Hastings kernels for general state spaces*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 8 (1998), <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoap/1027961031>.
- [64] L. TIERNEY AND J. B. KADANE, *Accurate approximations for posterior moments and marginal densities*, Journal of the American Statistical Association, 81 (1986), pp. 82–86, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1986.10478240>.
- [65] T. VON PETERSDORFF AND C. SCHWAB, *Sparse finite element methods for operator equations with stochastic data*, Applications of Mathematics, 51 (2006), pp. 145–180, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10492-006-0010-1>.
- [66] E. ZEIDLER, *Fixed-point Theorems*, vol. 1 of Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Its Applications, Springer, New York, 1992.