Impact of non-stationarity of prior covariances on hybrid ensemble filters: A study with a doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model of truth

Michael Tsyrulnikov and Alexander Rakitko

(michael.tsyrulnikov@gmail.com)

October 4, 2018

Abstract

In order to isolate effects of non-stationarity from effects due to nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity, a doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model (DSADM) is proposed. The model (defined on the 1D circular spatial domain) is hierarchical: it is a linear stochastic partial differential equation whose coefficients are transformed spatio-temporal random fields that by themselves satisfy their own stochastic partial differential equations with constant coefficients. The model generates conditionally Gaussian random fields that have complex spatio-temporal covariances with the tunable degree of non-stationarity in space and time. In numerical experiments with hybrid ensemble filters and DSADM as the “model of truth”, it is shown that the degree of non-stationarity affects the optimal weights of ensemble vs. climatological covariances in EnVar and the optimal weights of ensemble vs. time-smoothed recent past covariances in the Hierarchical Bayes Ensemble Filter (HBEF) by Tsyrulnikov and Rakitko, 2017. The stronger is the non-stationarity, the less useful is the static covariance matrix and the more beneficial are the time-smoothed recent past covariances as the building block of the filter’s analysis covariance matrix. A new hybrid-HBEF filter (HHBEF), which combines EnVar and HBEF, is proposed. HHBEF is shown to outperform EnKF, EnVar, and HBEF in non-stationary filtering regimes.
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1 Introduction

Non-stationarity of actual prior (background-error) covariances is necessary for ensemble based data assimilation schemes to outperform variational and optimum interpolation...
schemes that employ static flow independent prior covariances. Indeed, with stationary actual (i.e., true) prior covariances, all we need to do is to carefully estimate their spatial covariance matrix (say, by averaging ensemble sample covariance matrices or innovation-based covariances or any other proxy to prior covariances over time, maybe in overlapping subdomains) or to fit a parametric model. In the Gaussian case, the estimated static covariance matrix will be unbeatable and there will be no need in flow dependent covariances and thus in the ensemble.

Actual background-error covariances in a data assimilation scheme are non-stationary either if the system is governed by a non-stationary model or if the observation network is changing in time (or both, of course). We focus in this study on non-stationarity caused by the model.

1.1 “Toy” models

The model we propose in this study belongs to the class of so-called “toy models” intended, on the one hand, to serve as quick testbeds, and on the other hand, to facilitate thorough exploration of fundamental features of data assimilation and related techniques. A number of evolutionary toy models of increasing complexity has been proposed. Most of them are nonlinear. The simplest such models have just a few variables, like the logistic map (e.g. Mitchell and Houtekamer, 2009), the Henon map (e.g. Du and Smith, 2012), the Ikeda model (e.g. Hansen and Smith, 2001), the double well model (e.g. Miller et al., 1994), and the most popular three-variable Lorenz’63 model (Lorenz, 1963). Models defined on a 1D spatial domain include, among others, the viscous Burgers equation (e.g. Apte et al., 2010), the Korteweg–de Vries equation (Muccino and Bennett, 2002), and the most popular Lorenz’96 and Lorenz’2005 models (Lorenz and Emanuel, 1998; Lorenz, 2005).

In nonlinear models, the model operator, generally, varies in time, giving rise to non-stationarity (flow-dependence) of filtering probability distributions.

1.2 Nonlinearity, non-Gaussianity, and non-stationarity

However, nonlinear models appear to be not well suited to explore effects due to non-stationarity of background errors. The reason is that with those models, non-stationarity is intertwined with nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity through the degree the system is observed.

Indeed, on the one hand, Apte and Jones (2013) found in a simple nonlinear model of Lagrangian drifters that nonlinearity, which manifests itself as non-Gaussianity of forecast error distributions, is less important if the system is better observed (more frequent observations or smaller initial uncertainty). Similarly, Miller et al. (1994) (their Fig.1) noticed that the Extended Kalman Filter better copes with nonlinearity of the Lorenz’63 model if the observation noise or the time interval between the consecutive analyses are reduced. This effect can be readily explained by noting that better observability of the system leads
to smaller assimilation errors, that is, smaller deviations of the filter estimates from the true system states. This reduces the role of nonlinear terms as it follows from the Taylor expansion of the filtered system state around the true state. Thus, the less observations and/or the poorer their quality, the stronger nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity.

On the other hand, Thépaut et al. (1996) noted that the flow-dependence in evolved 4D-Var background error covariances is more prominent in longer forecasts. Chung et al. (2013) showed that in an operational class convective-scale model an initially spatially homogeneous (stationary in space) and isotropic perturbation becomes more and more inhomogeneous and anisotropic with the growing forecast lead time (see their Figs. 5–8). That is, the farther in the past are the observations, the more non-stationary in space are the errors in the system estimates produced by the filter. Hamill and Snyder (2000) found that flow-dependent background error covariances are more beneficial for a hybrid ensemble-variational filter in areas with fewer observations, which also suggests that the worse the system is observed the larger is the non-stationarity.

Thus, we see that, in a data assimilation system with a nonlinear forecast model, the degree to which the system is actually observed (determined by the observation density in space and time as well as by the observation noise magnitude) simultaneously impacts the three aspects of the filtering: (i) nonlinearity, (ii) non-Gaussianity of forecast (background) errors, and (iii) flow-dependence (non-stationarity) of background error covariances (distributions).

To disentangle non-stationarity (flow-dependence) from nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity, we propose here a model that gives rise to non-stationary prior covariances while being linear and Gaussian.

1.3 Doubly stochastic linear modeling

We build our model on the time-discrete scalar (i.e., one-variable) model introduced by Tsyrulnikov and Rakitko (2017). That one-variable model is doubly stochastic (e.g. Tjøstheim, 1986):

$$ξ_k = F_k ξ_{k-1} + σ_k α_k,$$

where $ξ_k$ is the (scalar) true system state, $k$ labels the time instant, $F_k$ is the (scalar) model operator, $σ_k$ is the standard deviation of the forcing, and $α_k ∼ N(0, 1)$ is the driving white noise. The double stochasticity means that not only $α_k$ is random, the coefficients $F_k$ and $σ_k$ are random sequences by themselves, each satisfying its own linear stochastic model similar to Eq. (1) but with a constant operator and a constant magnitude of the forcing. Conditionally on the coefficient processes $F_k$ and $σ_k$ (that is, after their realizations are computed and kept fixed), Eq. (1) is a linear model with variable coefficients, whose solution is a non-stationary random process.

In this research we extend the model Eq. (1) to a spatio-temporal random field on the circle by replacing $F_k$ with a sum of advection, diffusion, and decay operators whose coefficients are spatio-temporal random fields by themselves. The result is the new linear
doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model (DSADM), whose solutions are non-stationary conditionally Gaussian random fields with a tunable degree of non-stationarity. The general idea of non-stationary random field modeling by assuming that parameters of a spatial or spatio-temporal model are random fields themselves was discussed by several authors, including Lindgren et al. (2011); Katzfuss (2013); Cressie and Wikle (2015). Banerjee et al. (2015, sec. 11.6) mentioned possibilities of formulating a stochastic differential equation for parameters of another (stochastic) differential equation, with the intention to add randomness to the process that satisfies the latter equation. Piterbarg and Ostrovskii (2013) studied an edvection-diffusion model whose coefficients are random fields. Our innovation is the conditionally non-stationary hierarchical model with spatio-temporal stochastic partial differential equations at two levels in the hierarchy. The particular pattern of the non-stationarity (that is, how the field’s variance, local space and time scales, etc. vary in space-time) is random, its spatio-temporal structure is highly tunable by the model’s hyperparameters.

1.4 Hybrid ensemble filters

Traditional hybrid ensemble-variational filters (EnVar) (Hamill and Snyder, 2000; Lorenc, 2003; Buehner et al., 2013) combine ensemble (sample) covariances with static (“climatological”) covariances (e.g. Wang et al., 2007):

\[ B_k = w_e B^e_k + (1 - w_e) B^c, \]  

(2)

where \( B_k \) is the resulting covariance matrix effectively used in the analysis, \( B^e_k \) the localized ensemble covariance matrix, \( B^c \) the climatological covariance matrix, and \( w_e \) is the specified weight of the ensemble covariances.

Tsyrulnikov and Rakitko (2017) developed, building on Myrseth and Omre (2010); Bocquet (2011), their Hierarchical Bayes ensemble Kalman filter (HBEF) that accounts for the uncertainty in the specified prior covariance matrix. The uncertainty is unavoidable for finite-size ensembles and can be large if the ensemble size is small. HBEF has a secondary filter that updates prior covariances using current ensemble members as generalized observations and the estimated covariances at the previous analysis time (cycle) as the background. More specifically, the secondary filter relies, at the analysis step, on the inverse Wishart matrix variate distribution as the prior distribution for the unknown, and thus assumed random, covariance matrices.

HBEF updates the model-error and the predictability-error covariance matrices, but here we consider a simplified design in which it is the background-error covariance matrix \( B_k \) that is cyclically updated in the HBEF’s secondary filter. In the simplest version of the HBEF, the mean-square optimal posterior (analysis) estimate \( B^a_k \) of the unknown true matrix \( B_k \) is the linear combination of a background \( B^b_k \) and the ensemble covariance matrix \( B^e_k \) (see Eq.(29) and Appendix B in Tsyrulnikov and Rakitko (2017)):

\[ B^a_k = \frac{\partial B^b_k + NB^e_k}{\partial + N}, \]  

(3)
where $N$ is the ensemble size and $\vartheta > 0$ the so-called sharpness parameter of the inverse Wishart distribution. The background $B_k^f$ is provided by the secondary filter’s forecast step, at which the persistence forecast is employed:

$$B_k^f = B_{k-1}^a.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The HBEF’s primary filter, again in the simplest formulation, is the traditional Kalman filter analysis that updates the state vector with the prior covariance matrix set to be the estimate $B_k^a$ provided by the current-cycle secondary-filter’s analysis, Eq.(3).

Tsyrulnikov and Rakitko (2017) showed that with the one-variable non-stationary model of truth outlined above in section 1.3 the HBEF significantly outperformed EnKF and the HBEF’s predecessor HEnKF by Myrseth and Omre (2010) in a wide range of filtering regimes.

From Eqs.(3) and (4) it follows that $B_k^a$ satisfies the first-order autoregressive equation

$$B_k^a = \mu B_{k-1}^a + (1 - \mu) B_k^e,$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\mu = \vartheta / (\vartheta + N)$. Equation (5) with $\mu < 1$ implies that $B_{k-1}^a$ is effectively the time-smoothed (i.e., averaged) recent past ensemble covariance matrix, $B_k^r$. The role of $B_k^r$ in HBEF is two-fold. First, if the spatial non-stationarity has some memory (which is highly likely in realistic systems), then $B_k^r$ brings this past memory to the current assimilation cycle, improving the accuracy of the resulting estimate of the true background error covariance matrix $B_k$. Second, due to the time averaging (smoothing), the sampling noise (inevitable in sample covariances for finite-size and often small-size ensembles) is reduced in $B_k^r$, leading to a less noise-contaminated estimate $B_k^a$.

Concerning the use of recent past ensemble covariances, we note that related ideas and techniques are already in use in practical systems. Gustafsson et al. (2014) use time-lagged ensemble members, Berre et al. (2015) make use of ensemble members from the past 4 days to increase the ensemble size, Bonavita et al. (2016) use ensemble covariances from previous 12 days to estimate their parametric covariance model, Lorenc (2017) found that using time-lagged and time-shifted perturbations increases the effective ensemble size.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In sections 2–4 we motivate, describe, and examine in numerical experiments the new DSADM model. In section 5 we introduce a new hybrid HBEF (named HHBEF) filter, which combines EnVar and HBEF with regard to the way the filter’s effective prior covariance matrix is built. In section 6 we present results of numerical experiments with the hybrid ensemble filters showing a crucial impact of the non-stationarity on the filters’ performance and optimal design. We do not consider numerical implementation aspects of the hybrid filters in this paper.

The R code of the doubly stochastic model and the R scripts that produced this paper’s numerical results are available from https://github.com/cyrulnic/NoStRa. More detailed texts on the DSADM’s numerical scheme, generation of initial conditions that reduce the initial transient period, and specification of model parameters can also be found there.
2 Stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model with constant coefficients

To introduce notation and motivate the new doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model, in this section we theoretically examine statistics of solutions to a stationary stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model with non-stochastic and constant coefficients (parameters). Specifically, we identify how model parameters affect the variance, a spatial scale, and a temporal scale of the solution.

2.1 Model

The model is the following stochastic partial differential equation ([Whittle (1986, Ch. 20, Sec. 3), Lindgren et al. (2011, Eq.(17)), Sigrist et al. (2015)]:

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial s} + \rho \xi - \nu \frac{\partial^2 \xi}{\partial s^2} = \sigma \alpha, \tag{6}
\]

where \(t\) is time, \(s\) is the spatial coordinate on the circle \(S^1(R)\) of radius \(R\), \(U\) is the advection velocity, \(\rho\) is the decay (damping) parameter, \(\nu\) is the diffusion parameter, \(\alpha(t, s)\) is the standard white in time and space noise, and \(\sigma\) is the intensity of the forcing. The four parameters \(\theta = (U, \rho, \nu, \sigma)\) are constant in space and time.

2.2 Stationary spatio-temporal statistics

We start with rewriting Eq.(6) using the material time derivative (i.e., along the characteristic \(s = s_0 + Ut\)), or, equivalently, switching to the Lagrangian frame of reference by making the change of variables \((t, s) \mapsto (t, s - Ut)\):

\[
\frac{d\xi}{dt} + \rho \xi - \nu \frac{\partial^2 \xi}{\partial s^2} = \sigma \alpha. \tag{7}
\]

Next, we employ the spectral expansion in space,

\[
\xi(t, s) = \sum_{m=-n/2}^{n/2} \tilde{\xi}_m(t) e^{ims/R} \tag{8}
\]

and

\[
\alpha(t, s) = \sum_{m=-n/2}^{n/2} \tilde{\alpha}_m(t) e^{ims/R}, \tag{9}
\]

where \(n\) denotes the size of the (uniform) grid on the circle, \(i\) is the imaginary unit, and \(\tilde{\xi}_m(t)\) and \(\tilde{\alpha}_m(t)\) are the (complex) spectral coefficients.

It can be shown (e.g. Tsyrulnikov and Gayfulin (2016, Appendix A.4)) that \(\tilde{\alpha}_m(t)\) are independent Gaussian complex standard white noise processes \(\omega_m(t)\) with the common intensity \(a = 1/\sqrt{2\pi R}\):

\[
\tilde{\alpha}_m(t) = a \omega_m(t). \tag{10}
\]
Now, we substitute Eqs. (8)–(10) into Eq. (7), getting
\[ \frac{d\tilde{\xi}_m}{dt} + (\rho + \nu R^2 m^2)\tilde{\xi}_m = a\sigma_\omega \omega_m(t). \]

(11)

This is the spectral space form of the model Eq. (7). It is easily seen that if \( \rho + \nu R^2 m^2 > 0 \), the solutions to Eq. (11) for different \( m \) become, after an initial transient, mutually independent stationary zero-mean random processes\(^1\).

This implies that the physical-space solution \( \xi(t, s) \) becomes a zero-mean stationary in time and space random field. Note that by definition, the (zero-mean) space-time random field (process) \( \xi(t, s) \) is (second-order) stationary if its spatio-temporal covariance function
\[ B(t, s_1; t_2, s_2) = E[\xi(t_1, s_1) \xi(t_2, s_2)] = E[\xi(t_1 + u, s_1 + v) \xi(t_2 + u, s_2 + v)] \]
and thus is a function of the space and time shifts only: \( B(t, s) = E[\xi(t_1, s_1) \xi(t_1 + t, s_1 + s)] \). Here periodicity in the spatial coordinate \( s \) is of course assumed, \( \xi(t, s) = \xi(t, s + 2\pi R) \).

Each elementary stochastic process \( \tilde{\xi}_m(t) \) is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (e.g. Arnold, 1974, sec. 8.3) with the stationary covariance function
\[ B_m(t) = b_m e^{-|t|/\tau_m}, \]
(12)
where the spectral variances \( b_m \) are
\[ b_m = \frac{a^2 \sigma^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\rho + \nu R^2 m^2} \]
(13)

and the spectral time scales \( \tau_m \) are
\[ \tau_m = \frac{1}{\rho + \nu R^2 m^2}. \]
(14)

Note that Eq. (14) provides the motivation for the inclusion of the decay term in the model. Indeed, with \( \rho = 0 \), the time scale \( \tau_0 \) would be infinitely large, which, on the finite sphere, is unphysical (specifying \( b_0 = 0 \) could resolve the problem but only at the expense of nullifying \( \tilde{\xi}_0 \), which is also unphysical).

The stationary in space-time covariance function \( B(t, s) \) of the random field \( \xi(t, s) \) can be easily derived from Eq. (8) while utilizing the independence of the spectral processes \( \tilde{\xi}_m(t) \), the spectral-space temporal covariance functions given in Eq. (12), and returning to the Eulerian frame of reference:
\[ B(t, s) = \sum_{m=-n/2}^{n/2} b_m e^{-|t|/\tau_m} e^{im(s-Ut)/R}. \]
(15)

This equation implies that the space-time correlations are non-separable, i.e., they cannot be represented as a product of purely spatial and purely temporal correlations. Moreover,

\(^1\) Indeed, the influence of the initial condition on \( \tilde{\xi}_m(t) \) exponentially decays in time, leaving \( \tilde{\xi}_m(t) \) dependent only on \( \omega_m(t') \) for \( 0 \leq t' \leq t \). The mutual independence of \( \tilde{\xi}_m(t) \) for different \( m \) then follows from the mutual independence of the driving noises \( \omega_m(t) \).
according to Eq. (14), smaller spatial scales (i.e., larger wavenumbers \( m \)) correspond to smaller temporal scales \( \tau_m \). This feature of space-time correlations (“proportionality of scales”) is physically reasonable—as opposed to the simplistic and unrealistic separability of space-time correlations—and widespread in the real world, see Tsyroulnikov (2001); Tsyrunlnikov and Gayfulin (2017) and references therein.

Finally, from Eq. (15), the stationary (steady-state) variance of \( \xi(t, s) \) is

\[
\text{Var} \xi \equiv (\text{SD}(\xi))^2 = \sum_{m=-n/2}^{n/2} b_m = \frac{a^2 \sigma^2}{2} \sum_{m=-n/2}^{n/2} \rho + \frac{1}{\rho^2 m^2},
\]

where SD stands for the standard deviation.

### 2.3 Roles of model parameters

Firstly, we note that \( U \) does not impact the variance spectrum and the spectral time scales of \( \xi \) (see Eqs. (13) and (14)), its role is just to rotate the solution with the constant angular velocity \( U/R \).

Secondly, Eq. (13) implies that the shape of the spatial spectrum is

\[
b_m \propto \frac{1}{\rho + \frac{\nu}{R^2} m^2} \propto \frac{1}{1 + (\frac{m}{m_0})^2},
\]

where \( m_0 = R \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\nu}} \) is the characteristic non-dimensional wavenumber, which defines the width of the spectrum and thus the spatial length scale. Therefore, the latter can be defined as the inverse dimensional wavenumber \( m_0/R \):

\[
L = \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{\rho}.
\]

Thus, the ratio \( \nu/\rho \) controls the spatial length scale \( L \). In addition, \( \nu/\rho \) impacts the temporal correlations. Indeed, a higher \( L \) implies a redistribution of the variance towards larger spatial scales (i.e., lower wavenumbers \( m \)). But as we noted, in the model Eq. (6), larger spatial scales correspond to larger temporal scales \( \tau_m \). As a result, a higher \( \nu/\rho \) leads to a larger time scale as well as the spatial length scale \( L \).

Thirdly, using Eq. (18), we can rewrite Eq. (14) as

\[
\tau_m = \frac{1}{\rho} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\frac{Lm}{R})^2}
\]

This equation implies that with \( L \) being fixed, all spectral time scales \( \tau_m \) are inversely proportional to \( \rho \), which, thus, determines the physical-space Lagrangian time scale \( T \) of the spatio-temporal random field \( \xi \). We define \( T \) as the macroscale (e.g. Yaglom 1987 Eq.(2.88)) along the characteristic,

\[
T = \frac{1}{2 \text{Var} \xi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} B(t, Ut)dt = \frac{\sum b_m \tau_m}{\sum b_m} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\sum [1 + (\frac{Lm}{R})^2]^{-2}}{\sum [1 + (\frac{Lm}{R})^2]^{-1}},
\]

One can show that for a dense enough spatial grid, thus defined length scale \( L \) almost coincides with the macroscale \( \Lambda_\xi \) defined below in Eq. (32).
where the second equality is due to Eq.(15), the third equality is due to Eqs.(13) and (19), and the summations are over \(m\) from \(-n/2\) to \(n/2\).

Technically, Eqs.(18), (20), and (16) allow us to compute the internal model parameters \(\rho, \nu,\) and \(\sigma\) from the externally specified parameters \(L, T,\) and \(\text{SD}(\xi)\). Conceptually, we summarize the above conclusions as follows.

- \(U\) does not affect the Lagrangian spatio-temporal covariances. It tilts the Eulerian spatio-temporal correlations towards the direction \(ds = U dt\) in space-time.
- The ratio \(\nu/\rho\) determines the spatial length scale \(L\) and impacts the time scale \(T\).
- With the ratio \(\nu/\rho\) being fixed, \(\rho\) controls the temporal length scale \(T\).
- With \(\rho\) and \(\nu\) being fixed, \(\sigma\) determines the resulting process variance \(\text{Var}\xi\).

These relationships provide us with guidance about which local properties of the spatio-temporal statistics are going to be impacted if the parameters \(\theta = (U, \rho, \nu, \sigma)\) become variable in space and time.

3 Doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model (DSADM)

Here, we allow the parameters \(\theta = (U, \rho, \nu, \sigma)\) of the model Eq.(6) to be spatio-temporal random fields by themselves. The resulting model becomes, thus, a three-level hierarchical model (Wikle et al., 1998; Banerjee et al., 2015). At the first level is the random field in question \(\xi(t, s)\) modeled conditionally on second-level fields \(\theta(t, s)\). At the second level are the random fields \(\theta(t, s) = (U(t, s), \rho(t, s), \nu(t, s), \sigma(t, s))\) controlled by the hyperparameters \(\gamma\) (which are on the third level). So, to compute a realization of the pseudo-random field \(\xi(t, s)\), we, first, specify the hyperparameters \(\gamma\). Then, we compute realizations of the second-level (secondary) fields \(\theta(t, s)\). Finally, we substitute the secondary fields for the respective parameters in Eq.(6) and solve the resulting equation for the primary field \(\xi(t, s)\).

The idea behind this extension of the basic model Eq.(6) is the following. If the secondary fields \(\theta(t, s)\) vary smoothly in space and time, then, locally, in a vicinity of some point in space-time \((t_0, s_0)\), the statistics of the field \(\xi(t, s)\) will resemble that for the stationary model Eq.(6) with constant parameters equal to \(\theta(t, s)\) frozen at the point \((t_0, s_0)\) (see also Lindgren et al., 2011, sec. 3.2). As the statistics of the model Eq.(6) with constant parameters do depend on the parameters \(\theta\) (see section 2), the resulting solution \(\xi(t, s)\) to the model Eq.(6) with variable parameters becomes non-stationary in space-time, with the degree of non-stationarity controlled by the variability in the secondary fields \(\theta(t, s)\).
3.1 First level of the hierarchy: the field in question $\xi$

At the first level, $\xi(t, s)$ satisfies the basic Eq. (6) with variable in space and time coefficients,

$$\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + U(t, s) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial s} + \rho(t, s) \xi - \nu(t, s) \frac{\partial^2 \xi}{\partial s^2} = \sigma(t, s) \alpha(t, s).$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

3.2 Second level of the hierarchy: the parameter fields $\theta$

Each secondary field $\theta(t, s)$ (that is, one of the coefficients $U(t, s)$, $\rho(t, s)$, $\nu(t, s)$, $\sigma(t, s)$ of the first-level Eq. (21)) is modeled as the transformed Gaussian field: $\theta = g_{\theta}(\theta^*, \ldots)$. Here $g_{\theta}$ is the transformation function, the ellipsis “…” stands for additional parameters defined below, and $\theta^*(t, s)$ is the generating (pre-secondary) zero-mean Gaussian random field satisfying its own stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model Eq. (6) with constant and non-random coefficients, the hyperparameters $U_{\theta}$, $\rho_{\theta}$, $\nu_{\theta}$, and $\sigma_{\theta}$.

The point-wise transformation $g_{\theta} : \theta^*(t, s) \mapsto \theta(t, s)$ depends on the field: it is specified to be linear for $U$ and nonlinear for the other three parameter fields, see the subsections below in this section. The transformation function involves additional hyperparameters: the “unperturbed” value of $\theta$ (a scalar) denoted by the overbar, $\bar{\theta}$ (such that $\theta(t, s) = \bar{\theta}$ if $\text{Var} \theta^* = 0$), and a few additional secondary-field-specific hyperparameters as described below.

Since the pre-secondary fields $\theta^*(t, s)$ are governed by the models with constant coefficients, $\theta^*(t, s)$ are stationary in space-time. The transforms $g_{\theta}$ are defined to be independent of $(t, s)$, therefore the secondary fields $\theta(t, s)$ are stationary in space-time, too.

3.2.1 $U(t, s)$

The generating zero-mean Gaussian field $U^*(t, s)$ satisfies the basic stochastic model Eq. (6):

$$\frac{\partial U^*}{\partial t} + U_U \frac{\partial U^*}{\partial s} + \rho_U U^* - \nu_U \frac{\partial^2 U^*}{\partial s^2} = \sigma_U \alpha_U(t, s),$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where $U_U$, $\rho_U$, $\nu_U$, and $\sigma_U$ are the constant and non-random hyperparameters and $\alpha_U$ is the independent from $\alpha$ white noise.

The transformation $U^*(t, s) \mapsto U(t, s)$ is simply

$$U(t, s) = \bar{U} + U^*(t, s),$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $\bar{U}$ is the unperturbed value of $U$ (a scalar).

From the linearity of Eqs. (22) and (23), $U(t, s)$ is, obviously, a Gaussian random field.

3.2.2 $\sigma(t, s)$

The generating Gaussian field $\sigma^*(t, s)$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial t} + U_\sigma \frac{\partial \sigma^*}{\partial s} + \rho_\sigma \sigma^* - \nu_\sigma \frac{\partial^2 \sigma^*}{\partial s^2} = \sigma_\sigma \alpha_\sigma(t, s).$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)
where $U_\sigma, \rho_\sigma, \nu_\sigma, \sigma_\sigma$, and $b$ are the hyperparameters and $\alpha_\sigma$ is the independent white noise field.

The transformation $\sigma^*(t, s) \mapsto \sigma(t, s)$ is motivated by the requirements that the field $\sigma(t, s)$ be positive and having zero probability density at $\sigma = 0$. To meet these requirements, we postulate that

$$\sigma(t, s) = \bar{\sigma} \cdot g(\sigma^*(t, s)),$$

(25)

where $\bar{\sigma}$ is the unperturbed value of $\sigma$ and $g(z)$ is the transformation function selected to be the scaled and shifted logistic function (also known as the sigmoid function in machine learning):

$$g(z) := \frac{1 + e^b}{1 + e^{b-z}},$$

(26)

where $b$ is the constant. The function $g(z)$ has the following property: it behaves like the ordinary exponential function everywhere except for $z \gg b$, where the exponential growth is tempered (moderated). Indeed, it tends to zero as $z \to -\infty$ in the same way the exponential does. Moreover, like $\exp(z)$, it is equal to 1 at $z = 0$. With $b > 0$, $g(z)$ saturates for $z \gg 0$ at the level $1 + e^b$; this is the main difference of $g$ from the exponential function and the reason why we replace $\exp(z)$ by $g(z)$: to avoid too large values in $\sigma(t, s)$, which can give rise to unrealistically large spikes in $\xi$. We will refer to $b$ as the $g$-function saturation hyperparameter. For $b = 1$, the function $g(z)$ in plotted in Fig.1 alongside the exponential function.

Due to the nonlinearity of the transformation function $g$, the field $\sigma(t, s)$ is non-Gaussian.

3.2.3 $\rho(t, s)$ and $\nu(t, s)$

The remaining two secondary fields $\rho(t, s)$ and $\nu(t, s)$ (denoted here generically by $\psi$) are modeled in a way similar to $\sigma(t, s)$, the only difference being the transformation function.

Figure 1: Modified logistic function $g(z)$ with $b = 1$ and exponential function.
Specifically, the generating Gaussian field $\psi^*$ satisfies
\[
\frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial t} + U_\psi \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial s} + \rho_\psi \psi^* - \nu_\psi \frac{\partial^2 \psi^*}{\partial s^2} = \sigma_\psi \alpha_\psi(t, s),
\]
where, again, $U_\psi, \rho_\psi, \nu_\psi$, and $\sigma_\psi$, are the hyperparameters and $\alpha_\psi$ is the independent white noise field.

The transformation function is defined here to be
\[
\psi(t, s) = \tilde{\psi} \cdot [(1 + \varepsilon_\psi) \cdot g(\psi^*(t, s)) - \varepsilon_\psi],
\]
where $\tilde{\psi}$ is the unperturbed value of $\psi$, the function $g$ is the same as in section 3.2.2 and controlled by the same saturation hyperparameter $b$, and $\varepsilon_\psi$ is the small positive constant. The hyperparameter $\varepsilon_\psi$ is introduced to allow for small negative values of $\psi$ (that is, of $\rho$ and $\nu$). This will take place if the generating Gaussian field $\psi^*$ happens to take a large negative value, which will lead to a vanishingly small value of $g(\psi^*)$ (see Eq.(26) and Fig.1) and thus to a negative value of $\psi$ due to Eq.(28).

Allowing for negative values of $\rho$ and $\nu$ is motivated by the desire to introduce an intermittent instability into the model.

Like $\sigma(t, s)$, the fields $\rho(t, s)$ and $\nu(t, s)$ are non-Gaussian.

### 3.3 Third level of the hierarchy: hyperparameters and external parameters

In contrast to the Lorenz’96 model, which has only one parameter $F$, the DSADM has many parameters as discussed above (in total, there are 23 hyperparameters). It is convenient to specify the hyperparameters using a set of more sensible external parameters as described next.

The advection velocities $\bar{U}$ and $U_\theta$ (for $\theta = U, \rho, \nu, \sigma$) are specified directly as they have a clear physical meaning.

The unperturbed hyperparameters $\bar{\theta} = \bar{\rho}, \bar{\nu}, \bar{\sigma}$ are specified from the unperturbed external parameters $\bar{L}, \bar{T}$, and $\text{SD}(\xi)$ using Eqs.(20), (18), and (16). They determine the typical variance and the typical spatial and time scales of the field $\xi(t, s)$.

Likewise, for any generating Gaussian field $\theta^*$ (that is, for $U^*, \rho^*, \nu^*, \sigma^*$), the respective hyperparameters $\rho_\theta$ and $\nu_\theta$ are calculated from the external parameters $L_\theta$ and $T_\theta$ using Eqs.(20) and (18). $L_\theta$ and $T_\theta$ determine the spatial and temporal scales of the non-stationarity pattern.

The hyperparameters $\sigma_\theta$ are specified as follows. $\sigma_U$ is calculated from the external parameter $\text{SD}(U^*)$ using Eq.(16). For each of the other three secondary fields, $\theta = \rho, \nu, \sigma$, we select $\kappa_\theta = \exp(\text{SD}(\theta^*))$ as the respective external parameter. This choice is motivated by the fact that these three latter fields are nonlinearly transformed Gaussian fields. As

---

3 Note that for any secondary field $\theta = U, \sigma, \rho$, or $\nu$, the unperturbed value $\bar{\theta}$ can be shown to be the median of the pointwise probability distribution of $\theta(t, s)$.
$g(z)$ (defined by Eq.(26) and shown in Fig.1) is a “tempered” exponential function, it is worth measuring the standard deviation of, say, the $\sigma^*$ field on the log scale: $\text{SD}(\sigma^*) = \log \kappa_{\sigma}$, so that the typical deviation of the transformed field $\sigma$ from its unperturbed value $\bar{\sigma}$ is $\kappa_{\sigma}$ times. The hyperparameters $\sigma_\theta$ determine the magnitude of the non-stationarity pattern.

Finally, for the fields $\psi = \rho, \nu$, we parameterize $\varepsilon_\psi$ (which, we recall, controls the occurrence of negative field values) using the probability $\pi_\psi$ that $\psi(t, s)$ is negative:

$$P(\psi(t, s) < 0) = \pi_\psi. \quad (29)$$

Substituting $\psi$ from Eq.(28) to Eq.(29) and utilizing the monotonicity of the transformation function $g$ (see Eq.(26)) and the Gaussianity of the field $\psi^*$, we easily come up with a relation between $\pi_\psi$ and $\varepsilon_\psi$ (the elementary formulas are omitted). The external parameters $\pi_\rho$ and $\pi_\nu$ determine how often and how strong local instabilities can be.

For some applications, the above external parameters can be too many, so we introduce a reduced set as follows.

(i) By default, the unperturbed advection velocity $\bar{U}$ and the advection velocities $U_\theta$ that enter the model for the respective generating Gaussian field $\theta^*$, are all equal to each other.

(ii) The spatial length scale hyperparameters $L_\theta$ for all secondary generating fields $\theta^*$ are selected to be equal to the common value $L^*$.

(iii) The time scale hyperparameters $\bar{T}$ and $T_\theta$ are specified to be equal to $\bar{L}/V_{\text{char}}$ and $L_\theta/V_{\text{char}} = L^*/V_{\text{char}}$, respectively, where $V_{\text{char}}$ is the characteristic velocity.

(iv) The $g$-function saturation hyperparameter $b$ is set to 1.

Thus, the reduced set of the external parameters contains $\text{SD}(\xi)$, $\bar{U}$, $\bar{L}$, $L^*$, $V_{\text{char}}$, $\text{SD}(U^*)$, $\kappa_{\sigma}$, $\kappa_\rho$, $\kappa_\nu$, $\pi_\rho$, and $\pi_\nu$, i.e., 11 parameters.

### 3.4 Properties and capabilities of DSADM

Here, we discuss features of the DSADM that can be useful for data assimilation applications.

#### 3.4.1 Non-stationary field (signal) covariances

It is worth stressing that the DSADM Eq.(21), like the scalar doubly stochastic model Eq.(1), is intended to be used as a model of truth with random but fixed (in an experiment) secondary fields. In other words, we consider the conditional probability distribution of the random field $\xi$ given the fields $\theta$. In this setting, the space-time covariances (and, more generally, the probability distribution) of $\xi(t, s)$ are non-stationary in space-time.

Indeed, given the fields $\theta(t, s)$, Eq.(21) becomes a linear evolutionary state-space stochastic model,

$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} = \Phi(t)\xi + \varepsilon, \quad (30)$$
where the boldface $\xi$ and $\varepsilon$ stand for the vectors of the spatially gridded fields $\xi(t, s)$ and $\sigma(t, s)\alpha(t, s)$, respectively, and $\Phi(t)$ is the linear spatial operator dependent on the fields $\theta(t, s)$. Discretizing Eq.(30) in time yields the equation for the signal $\xi$:

$$\xi_k = F_k \xi_{k-1} + \varepsilon_k$$

(31)

(where $k = 1, 2, \ldots$). Now we note that knowing the secondary fields $\theta$ implies that we know the operator $F_k$ and the probability distribution of the forcing $\varepsilon_k$. This entails that, starting from a random zero-mean initial condition with known covariance matrix, we can compute the covariance matrix of $\xi_k$ at any time instant $k$. The dependence of the operator $F_k$ and the forcing $\varepsilon_k$ on the random fields $\theta$ makes the covariances of $\xi_k$ non-stationary in space-time. It can be shown that if $\rho(t, s) > 0$ and $\nu(t, s) > 0$ (for small enough $\pi_\rho$ and $\pi_\nu$ this is true most of the time), then the operator $F_k$ is stable, so that the dependence of the field covariances on their initial conditions fades out and only the secondary fields $\theta$ determine the covariances of $\xi(t, s)$.

The spatio-temporal covariance function of the non-stationary field $\xi(t, s)$ is a function of four arguments, $B(t_1, t_2; s_1, s_2) = \mathbb{E}\xi(t_1, s_1)\xi(t_2, s_2)$. We will be particularly interested in the following two aspects of $B(t_1, t_2; s_1, s_2)$: the time and space specific field variance $\text{Var}\xi(t, s) = B(t, t; s, s)$ and a time and space specific spatial length scale defined to be, say, the local macroscale:

$$\Lambda_\xi(t, s) = \frac{1}{2 \text{Var}\xi(t, s)} \int_{S^\prime(R)} B(t, t; s, s') ds'. \quad (32)$$

Then, it follows that both $\text{Var}\xi(t, s)$ and $\Lambda_\xi(t, s)$ are deterministic functions of the secondary fields $\theta$. Moreover, since the fields $\theta$ are stationary in space-time, so are the fields $\text{Var}\xi(t, s)$ and $\Lambda_\xi(t, s)$, whose variances and length scales are thus determined by the variances and space/time scales of the pre-secondary fields $\theta^*$, which are controlled by the model’s external parameters (see section 3.3).

### 3.4.2 Estimation of true covariances

Instead of the recursive computation of the field (signal) covariances using Eq.(31), one can estimate them as accurately as needed by running the DSADM Eq.(21) $M$ times with independent realizations of the forcing $\alpha(t, s)$ and with the fields $\theta(t, s)$ held fixed. The spatial covariance $B(t, t; s_1, s_2)$ can then be estimated from the resulting sample $\xi^{(m)}(t, s)$, $m = 1, \ldots, M$, as the usual sample covariance. In the same way, time and space specific error covariances can be estimated for any filter in question.

### 3.4.3 Instability

The nonlinear deterministic models mentioned in the Introduction are chaotic, that is, having unstable modes (positive Lyapunov exponents), whereas the DSADM is stochastic but experiencing intermittent instabilities due to the possibility for $\rho$ and $\nu$ to attain
negative values. In the deterministic models instabilities are curbed by nonlinearity, whereas in the DSADM, these are limited by the time the random fields $\rho$ and $\nu$ remain negative.

### 3.4.4 Gaussianity

Conditionally on $\theta$, the DSADM is linear, hence $\xi(t, s)$ is conditionally Gaussian. Unconditionally, $\xi(t, s)$ is a continuous mixture of zero-mean Gaussian distributions and so should have a non-Gaussian distribution with heavy tails.

### 3.4.5 Unbeatable benchmark filter

The conditional linearity of the DSADM makes it possible to use the exact Kalman filter and thus to know how far from the optimal performance the filter in question is, which is always useful but often not possible with nonlinear deterministic models of truth.

### 4 Behavior of the model

In this section we numerically examine spatio-temporal non-stationarity of solutions to the DSADM. Non-stationarity of the space-time covariances is examined conditionally on the secondary fields $\theta$. The unconditional probability distribution of $\xi$ is considered only when we analyze non-Gaussianity of $\xi(t, s)$.

The model’s differential equations were solved numerically using an implicit upwind finite difference scheme.

### 4.1 Setup

The experiments were carried out with the spatial grid size $n = 60$ on the circle of radius $R = 6370$ km. The model integration time step was $\Delta t = 6h$. The time span was 600 time steps. The default external parameters were the following:

1. $\bar{U} = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ — the characteristic wind speed in the atmosphere.

2. $\bar{L} = 5\Delta s = 3300$ km (where $\Delta s = 2\pi R/n$ is the spatial grid spacing) — about twice the length scale of meteorological fields in the atmosphere. Selected larger than a meteorological length scale in order for the spatial correlations be adequately represented on a low-resolution grid with only 60 points on the circle.

3. $L^* = 2L$ — it is meaningful to assume that the structural change in the field occurs at a larger space and time scale than the change in the random field itself.

---

4 Indeed, one can prove using the Jensen inequality that the kurtosis of a non-degenerate mixture of this kind is always greater than 3 (the Gaussian kurtosis). A positive excess kurtosis means, normally, more probability mass in the tails of the distribution than in the tails of the Gaussian distribution with the same mean and variance.
4. \(\text{SD}(\xi) = 5\) — selected arbitrarily and does not impact any conclusions.

5. The parameters that affect the magnitude of the non-stationarity were selected as follows: \(\text{SD}(U^*) = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}\), \(b = 1\), \(\kappa_\rho = \kappa_\nu = \kappa_\alpha = 3\), \(\pi_\rho = 0.02\), and \(\pi_\nu = 0.01\).

6. \(V_{\text{char}} = 3 \text{ ms}^{-1}\) — tuned to give rise to the mean temporal correlations that are about twice as large as realistic meteorological time correlations (in order to be consistent with the spatial correlations, see item 2 above in this list).

### 4.2 \(\xi(t, s)\) plots

Figure 2 compares typical spatio-temporal segments of the solutions to: the stationary stochastic model Eq.\((6)\) (panel a) and the DSADM Eq.\((21)\) (panel b). One can see that, indeed, the non-stationary field in Fig.2(b) was substantially less regular than the stationary field in Fig.2(a). In particular, one can spot areas where the non-stationary field experienced more small-scale (large-scale) fluctuation than in the rest of the plot. These spots correspond to small (large) values of the local length scale shown below in Fig.3(b).

### 4.3 Non-stationarity

Figure 3 shows characteristics of the non-stationarity pattern: the local log-variance \(\log_{10}(\text{Var}\xi(t, s))\) and the local length scale \(\Lambda_\xi(t, s)\) computed following section 3.4.1 with the same realizations of the secondary fields that were used to compute \(\xi\) depicted in Fig.2(b). One can see the substantial degree of non-stationarity (note that in the stationary case both \(\text{Var}\xi\) and \(\Lambda_\xi\) are constant). Specifically, in Fig.3(a), the ratio of the maximum to the minimum field variance \(\text{Var}\xi(t, s)\) is seen to be as large as about two
orders of magnitude. The same ratio for the spatial length scale $\Lambda_\xi(t,s)$ (see Fig.3(b)) was about 5, which also indicates a significant degree of variation.

The magnitude of the spatio-temporal variation in both $\text{Var} \xi(t,s)$ and $\Lambda_\xi(t,s)$ (and thus the degree of non-stationarity in $\xi$) can be increased/decreased by increasing/decreasing the variances of the secondary fields, that is, the external parameters $\text{SD}(U^*)$, $\kappa_\rho$, $\kappa_\nu$, $\kappa_\sigma$, $\pi_\rho$, and $\pi_\nu$ (not shown). The space and time scales of the non-stationarity pattern (seen in Fig. 3) can be conveniently tuned by changing the length scales of the generating fields $\theta^*$, that is, the external parameter $L^*$ (not shown).

Figure 4 illustrates how diverse the true spatial correlations were. Note, however, that the diversity was, in a sense, limited. In particular, there were no negative lobes in the correlations. This point is discussed in section 4.5.2.

Thus, the DSADM is capable of generating significantly non-stationary random fields. The degree of the spatio-temporal non-stationarity is highly tunable.

### 4.4 Gaussianity

As noted above, conditionally on the secondary fields, $\xi(t,s)$ is Gaussian by construction. This is the way DSADM is used in this study. In principle, it can be used for other purposes without conditioning on the secondary fields, so that in each model run both the forcing and the model coefficients are random. In this setting, the generated field $\xi$ is no longer Gaussian because the secondary fields are non-Gaussian and because of the multiplications of the secondary fields and $\xi$ (and its derivatives). Numerical experiments confirmed that the unconditional distribution of $\xi(t,s)$ was indeed non-Gaussian with heavy tails (as we anticipated in section 3.4.4). The non-Gaussianity was stronger for larger magnitudes of the secondary fields (not shown).
Figure 4: Spatial correlations of the field $\xi$ with respect to 30 randomly selected points in space-time.

4.5 Discussion on DSADM

4.5.1 Spatial correlations

The DSADM is shown to be capable of producing tunable non-stationarity in the conditional (given the secondary fields $\theta$) probability distribution of the random field $\xi$ in space-time. But there are limitations. In section 4.3 we noticed that negative spatial correlations were rare. This is because the shape of the local (i.e., with the “frozen” $\rho$ and $\nu$) spatial spectrum, see Eq.(17), remains the same whatever the local values of the fields $\rho$ and $\nu$ (as well as $U$ and $\sigma$) are: effectively, only $m_0$ (i.e., the inverse length scale) changes. To obtain more diverse shapes of the correlations, one can extend the DSADM by introducing to it higher-order spatial derivatives ($\partial^3/\partial s^3, \partial^4/\partial s^4$ etc.). Specifically, the terms $\rho \xi + U \partial \xi/\partial s - \nu \partial^2 \xi/\partial s^2$ in the model Eq.(6) can be regarded as a second-order polynomial of the derivative operator $\partial/\partial s$, $P(\partial/\partial s) = \rho + U\partial/\partial s - \nu (\partial/\partial s)^2$. So, one can increase the order of the polynomial. This will give rise to a much richer class of correlation functions. Even more diverse correlations can be obtained if one introduces another polynomial, $Q(\partial/\partial s)$, and applies it to the white noise in the right-hand side of the model.

4.5.2 Forward and inverse modeling

Building the DSADM can be called the forward hierarchical modeling. That is, we formulated a (hopefully) reasonable hierarchical model and gave an algorithm to compute realizations of the first-level random field $\xi(t,s)$ given the third-level hyperparameters $\gamma$. A harder problem is the inverse modeling, that is, the inference about the model parameters—in our case the parameter fields $\theta(t,s)$—from a number of realizations (an ensemble) of the field $\xi$. This is the classical hierarchical Bayesian problem, which is be-
yond the scope of this research but can be relevant in a broader context of non-stationary spatial and spatio-temporal field modeling. In particular, it can be used—with a conceptually similar hierarchical model—for Bayesian estimation of flow dependent background error covariances from the ensemble, e.g., in the hierarchical filter by Tsyrunnikov and Rakitko (2017).

5 A new hybrid HBEF (HHBEF) filter

In the rest of the paper, we use the above DSADM to study the impact of the non-stationarity on the performance of filters which employ static and ensemble based specified prior covariances. We start with formulating a new filter that combines EnVar and HBEF. The idea is to replace the HBEF’s persistence forecast for the covariance matrix $B$ (see Eq.(4)) with a regression-to-the-mean forecast:

$$B_k^f = wB_{k-1}^a + (1 - w)B^c. \quad (33)$$

Here, $B^c$ is the climatological (time-mean) covariance matrix and $w \in [0, 1]$ is the scalar weight. Combining Eq.(33) with Eq.(3) yields the secondary filter of the new hybrid-HBEF (HHBEF) filter (an analog of the HBEF’s Eq.(5)):

$$B_k^a = \mu wB_{k-1}^a + (1 - \mu)B_k^e + \mu(1 - w)B^c, \quad (34)$$

where, we recall, $\mu = \vartheta/(\vartheta + N)$ is weight of $B_k^e$ relative to $B_k^f$, see Eq.(3). Solving Eq.(34) (a forced linear difference equation; the derivation is omitted) shows that, for $\mu w < 1$ and after an initial transient, $B_k^a$ has the three components:

$$B_k^a = w_eB_k^e + w_rB_k^r + w_cB^c, \quad (35)$$

where $w_e = 1 - \mu$ is the weight of the current ensemble covariances $B_k^e$,

$$w_c = \frac{\mu(1 - w)}{1 - \mu w} \quad (36)$$

is the weight of the climatological covariances $B^c$, and $w_r = 1 - w_e - w_c$ is the weight of the time-smoothed recent past ensemble covariances denoted by $B_k^r$ in Eq.(35):

$$B_k^r = \frac{B_{k-1}^e + \mu wB_{k-2}^e + (\mu w)^2B_{k-3}^e + \ldots}{1 + \mu w + (\mu w)^2 + \ldots}. \quad (37)$$

It is easy to see that the smoothing time scale (measured in assimilation cycles) is $-1/\log(\mu w)$. From Eq.(34), it is obvious that setting $w = 1$ reduces HHBEF to HBEF, $w = 0$ to EnVar, $\mu = 0$ to EnKF, and $w = 0, \mu = 1$ recovers the filter with static background error covariances (which we call Var to simplify terminology).
6 Performance of filters under non-stationarity

In this section we examine performance of the following filters: (i) the exact Kalman filter (KF), (ii) the filter with static prior covariances (Var), (iii) the ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF), (iv) the hybrid filter with a mixture of static and ensemble prior covariances (EnVar), (v) the Hierarchical Bayes ensemble Kalman filter (HBEF), and (vi) the hybrid HBEF (HHBEF).

6.1 Setup

The default DSADM’s setup was the same as in section 4.1. The default ensemble size was $N = 10$. Observations were generated every assimilation cycle at every 10th spatial grid point. The observation error standard deviation ($\sigma_o = 6$) was selected to ensure that the mean forecast error variance reduction in an analysis was close to the value of 10% reported by Errico and Privé (2014, section 8) for a realistic data assimilation system.

In all the ensemble filters, covariance inflation and covariance localization were implemented and manually tuned to get the best performance in each experiment. The localization was performed using the popular function by Gaspari and Cohn (1999, Eq.(4.10)).

The climatological prior covariance matrix $B_c$ was specified to be the time mean KF’s background-error covariance matrix in a run with 50,000 assimilation cycles (for simplicity and to mimic the realistic situation in which only a proxy to $B_c$ is normally available).

The filters’ performance was assessed as the background-error root-mean-square error (beRMSE) with respect to the known truth in runs with 5000 assimilation cycles. The performance of any filter $f$ was measured as the beRMSE relative to that of the KF:

$$\text{rel.err}(f) = \frac{\text{beRMSE}(f) - \text{beRMSE}(KF)}{\text{beRMSE}(KF)}.$$ (38)

The time interval between the consecutive analyses, $T_a$, was selected to mimic realistic temporal correlations of meteorological fields at the 6-h time shift (the most widely used in operational practice assimilation cycle in global schemes) as follows.

The time correlations (averaged over space and time) for solutions of the DSADM with the default parameters were estimated to be about 0.9 for the 12h time shift. On the other hand, the mid-tropospheric 6-h time correlations were estimated using radiosonde data to be about 0.8 for the wind fields (Fig.1(b) Seaman, 1975) and can be interpolated to the value of about 0.95 for geopotential (Olevskaya, 1968) (that is, about 0.9 on average). Thus, we chose $T_a = 12h$, which implies that the time correlations between the consecutive analyses were roughly the same as in practical global data assimilation schemes. Both time and space correlation length scales in our system were, thus, roughly twice as large as their atmospheric counterparts (cf. item 2 in section 4.1).
6.2 Role of strength of non-stationarity

As we noted in section 4.3, the non-stationarity grows with the growing magnitudes of the secondary fields, that is, with the increasing external parameters $\text{SD}(U^*)$, $\kappa$, and $\pi$. Here we compare the filters in the four different regimes described in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>SD($U^*$)</th>
<th>$\kappa$ = $\kappa_{\nu}$ = $\kappa_{\sigma}$</th>
<th>$\pi$</th>
<th>$\pi_{\nu}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weakly non-stationary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Default non-stationary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly non-stationary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: External parameters of DSADM in the four non-stationary regimes

The relative background RMSEs defined in Eq.(38) are shown in Fig.5. One can see that in the stationary regime, Var was the best filter (EnVar and HHBEF reduce to Var in this regime). As compared with EnKF, Var remained competitive in the weakly and medium (default) non-stationary regime, but became much worse than all the other filters in the strongly non-stationary regime. EnVar significantly outperformed EnKF in all regimes and Var in all non-stationary regimes. The advantage of EnVar over EnKF was larger (smaller) under weak (strong) non-stationarity. HBEF was very successful for the highest degree of non-stationarity while became slightly inferior to EnVar in low non-stationarity. HHBEF was never worse than the other filters and better in the non-stationary regimes. In general, the advantage of HBEF and HHBEF was most pronounced for high non-stationarity strengths, as expected.

It is also of interest to find out what were the weights of ensemble covariances, $w_e$, recent past covariances, $w_r$, and static climatological covariances, $w_c$, see Eq.(35), in the best HHBEF filter (i.e., the optimal weights). These are plotted in Fig.6 for the four strengths of the non-stationarity specified in Table 1 and referenced in Fig.5. We see that static covariances dominated in the stationary and weakly non-stationary regimes whereas recent past covariances prevailed in the medium (default) and strongly non-stationary regimes. The weight $w_e$ of current ensemble covariances remained stable in all non-stationary regimes. Thus, the stronger the non-stationarity the larger the weight of the time-smoothed recent past covariances as compared with the weight of climatological covariances.

6.3 Role of time scale of non-stationarity

Here, we explore how the filters behave if the time (and space) scale of the non-stationarity pattern changes. The latter is determined by the external parameter $L^*$ (the common spatial scale for all the generating Gaussian fields $\theta^*$). As noted in section 3.3, the time scale of all the pre-secondary (generating) random fields was $T^* = L^*/V_{\text{char}}$. So, we ran
Figure 5: Filters’ performance scores (the lower the better) relative to KF as functions of the strength of non-stationarity. The numbers on the x-axis correspond to the numbers in the first column of Table 1.

Figure 6: Optimal weights of climatological, ensemble, and recent past covariances. The numbers on the x-axis correspond to the numbers in the first column of Table 1.
Figure 7: Filters’ performance scores (the lower the better) relative to KF as functions of time scale of non-stationarity. The numbers on the x-axis are proportional to the time scale of the non-stationarity pattern.

the filters with $L^* = L$, $L^* = 2\bar{L}$ (the default value), and $L^* = 3\bar{L}$. The results are displayed in Fig. 7. It can be seen from this figure that Var and EnKF were significantly worse than the other filters for all time scales. EnVar was competitive with HBEF and HHBEF for small and medium non-stationarity time scales and lagged behind them for the large time scale. The significant advantage of HBEF and HHBEF over EnVar for larger non-stationarity time scales can be explained by noting that if the local variance and local length scale vary slowly in time (i.e., when $L^* > \bar{L}$), then HBEF (and therefore HHBEF) have more time to “adapt” to this local values and accumulate in $B_r$ the more accurate statistics. The optimal weights $w_e, w_c, w_r$ changed accordingly: for small (large) $T^*$, $w_c$ was larger (smaller) at the expense of $w_r$; $w_e$ was stable.

6.4 Role of ensemble size

Here, we show results for different ensemble sizes: $N = 10$ (default), $N = 20$, and $N = 30$, see Fig. 8. The figure shows that all filters, except (obviously) Var, performed better for larger $N$, but the advantage of HBEF and HHBEF over EnKF remained significant even for larger $N$. The EnVar’s performance scores were in between EnKF on the one hand and HBEF and HHBEF on the other hand. The optimal weights $w_e, w_c, w_r$ were relatively stable.
Figure 8: Filters’ performance scores (the lower the better) relative to KF as functions of ensemble size.

6.5 Role of observation coverage

Finally, we examine how the degree to which the system is observed impacts the performance of the filters. To this end, we changed the time interval $T_a$ between the consecutive portions of observations from 12 h (default) to 6 h and 24 h. The results are given in Fig. 9, where again the advantage of HBEF and HHBEF over the other filters is noticeable. The optimal weights $w_e, w_c, w_r$ did not exhibit significant changes.

It is worth remarking that the improvement in the performance of most filters seen in Fig. 9 for larger $T_a$ does not mean the reduction in their respective background-error RMSEs. The latter did increase for less frequent observations (as it should be), it is the relative errors (shown in Fig. 9 and defined in Eq. (38)) that decreased. The smaller relative RMSEs, that is, the reduced gap seen in Fig. 9 for larger $T_a$ between KF on the one hand and EnKF, HBEF, and HHBEF on the other hand can be explained by noting that with less frequent observations, prior filter’s covariances “have more time” to develop complex flow dependent structures (as we discussed in section 1.2 and mentioned in section 6.3) captured by ensemble based filters. Obviously, Var has no such capability due to its static prior covariances, hence its deteriorating performance scores for larger $T_a$ seen in Fig. 9.

6.6 Summary of experimental results

We found that in all non-stationary filtering regimes:

1. EnVar was significantly better than EnKF, with the difference being smaller under strong non-stationarity and with low observation density.
Figure 9: Same as Fig. 8 but as functions of the time interval between consecutive observations.

2. HBEF was slightly worse than EnVar under low non-stationarity, slightly better under medium non-stationarity, and substantially better under strong non-stationarity and with low observations density.

3. HHBEF was uniformly better than EnVar and slightly but uniformly better than HBEF.

4. HBEF/HHBEF were most successful when the time scale of the non-stationarity pattern was larger than the time scale of the background error field itself.

5. The optimally tuned weight of recent past covariances, $w_r$, grew under stronger non-stationarity and larger space and time scale of the non-stationarity pattern, while being relatively stable in response to changes in ensemble size and observation density.

It is also worth mentioning that the optimally tuned covariance localization length scale was always larger for HHBEF than for EnKF (typically, by the factor of 1.5) and other less accurate filters, whereas the optimally tuned covariance inflation factor was relatively stable (1.03–1.05).

7 Conclusions

In this paper we have presented a new doubly stochastic advection-diffusion-decay model (DSADM) on the circle. Doubly stochastic means that not only the model’s forcing is stochastic, the model’s coefficients (parameters) are random as well. Moreover, the
parameters are specified to be transformed Gaussian random fields that satisfy their own stochastic advection-diffusion-decay models with constant coefficients. Thus, the DSADM is hierarchical, built of linear evolutionary stochastic partial differential equations at two levels in the hierarchy. In numerical experiments, the DSADM is shown to produce non-stationary spatio-temporal fields with conveniently tunable structure.

The main advantage of DSADM is its capability of generating spatio-temporal random fields with the tunable degree of non-stationarity in space and time, while maintaining linearity and Gaussianity. This allows, first, to separate effects of non-stationarity from effects of nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity (which is impossible with nonlinear models of “truth”). Second, linearity and Gaussianity allow the use of an unbeatable benchmark (the Kalman filter in this case) for approximate filters, which, again, is rarely possible with nonlinear models.

We have used DSADM to study the impact of non-stationarity on the performance of the following approximate filters: the filter with static prior covariances (Var), the ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF), the hybrid filter with a mixture of static and ensemble prior covariances (EnVar), the Hierarchical Bayes ensemble Kalman filter (HBEF), and the new hybrid HBEF (HHBEF). We found that HBEF and HHBEF (which make use of time-smoothed recent past covariances) significantly outperformed Var, EnKF, and EnVar in filtering regimes with medium and strong non-stationarity and with the time scale of the non-stationarity pattern larger than the typical time scale of the background error field itself. The advantage of HBEF and HHBEF was stable for all ensemble sizes in the range 10–30 (for the system with 60 degrees of freedom) and for different observational densities. This supports the idea of HBEF to build a secondary filter for the prior covariance matrix and to propagate its updated estimate forward in time.

HBEF provides a theoretical justification for the temporal smoothing of ensemble covariances but not yet for their spatial averaging (as in Ménétier et al., 2015). Accommodating the spatial smoothing will require a replacement of the HBEF’s hyperprior inverse Wishart distribution with a more sophisticated and data-driven probability distribution. Work on this is under way. Like the optimal degree of temporal averaging of prior covariances depends on characteristics of temporal non-stationarity (as shown in sections 6.2 and 6.3), the optimal degree of spatial averaging should depend on characteristics of spatial non-stationarity.

How large is the non-stationarity of the spatio-temporal background-error field in practical data assimilation systems, how large are the time and space scales of the non-stationarity pattern as compared to the respective scales of the background error field itself, how the non-stationarity depends on the weather situation, season, scale, altitude, meteorological field, observation density and accuracy—all these questions remain open. Addressing these questions may help design hybrid filters that will accommodate time and space smoothed ensemble covariances along with climatological covariances in an optimized way, adapting to changing local characteristics of the non-stationarity in space and time.
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