

Numerical Gaussian process Kalman filtering

Armin Küper and Steffen Waldherr *

* *Department of Chemical Engineering, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*
(e-mail: {armin.kuper, steffen.waldherr}@kuleuven.be).

Abstract: Numerical Gaussian processes have recently been developed to handle spatiotemporal models. The contribution of this paper is to embed numerical Gaussian processes into the well established recursive Kalman filter equations. This enables us to do Kalman filtering for infinite-dimensional systems with Gaussian processes. This is possible because i) we are obtaining a linear model from numerical Gaussian processes, and ii) the states of which are by definition Gaussian distributed random variables. Convenient properties of the numerical GPKF are that no spatial discretization is necessary, and setting up of the Kalman filter, namely the process and measurement noise levels, need not be fine-tuned by hand, as they are hyper-parameters of the Gaussian process and learned online on the data stream. We showcase the capability of the numerical GPKF in a simulation study of a heterogeneous cell population displaying cell-to-cell variability in cell size.

Keywords: Kalman filters, Gaussian processes, infinite-dimensional systems, state estimation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Monitoring physical, chemical, and biological systems, or systems in general, requires sensors to obtain measurements. These measurements are subjected to stochastic noise. In addition, technical or financial restrictions might prevent measuring all properties of interest. State estimation methods help to overcome both of these obstacles. They filter signal from noise, hence also the name stochastic filtering, and reconstruct latent properties by leveraging mathematical models of the process at hand. The most known state estimator is the Kalman filter, see Kalman (1960). It gives the optimal, in an expected squared error sense, state estimate for a linear system that is subjected to additive Gaussian noise. State estimation methods for infinite-dimensional systems, that is systems described through partial differential equations (PDEs), are not that well established. Usually, the PDEs are spatially discretized into large ODE systems that can be incorporated into the recursive Kalman filter equations.

In this work, we take a different route founded on Gaussian process (GP) regression, see Williams and Rasmussen (2006), and more importantly the recent work of Raissi et al. (2018) who introduced numerical GPs. These are machine learning methods that unlike in a first principles derivation of a state space model, work with non-parametric models that adapt to the data. A GP is a Gaussian distribution over functions and it is fully defined by a mean function and covariance function. In regression a GP prior is placed on the regressor function. The posterior distribution of the GP is then calculated by conditioning on measurements and estimating the hyper-parameters of the covariance function. Numerical GPs are an elegant extension to traditional GP regression to solve time-dependent PDEs. First, the

PDE is temporally discretized, hence the name numerical. This leads to an equation of the regressor at different time steps whose exact structure depends on the temporal discretization method. Through smart placement of a GP prior, one can then formulate a multi-output GP, whose covariance functions are informed by the structure of the discretized PDE. Propagation through time is then simply done by iteratively calculating the posterior GP distribution between the different time steps.

Our contribution lies in embedding numerical GP regression into the recursive Kalman filter equations. This is possible because the outputs of the numerical GP are, by definition, Gaussian distributed, and they depend linearly on the operator resulting from the temporal discretization. We therefore obtain a Kalman filter for infinite-dimensional systems, whose process model is derived from a first principles informed machine learning technique. Tedious manual tuning of the Kalman filter is greatly simplified as the process and measurement noise variance are learned dynamically on the data stream.

This paper is structured as follows: we start by introducing Kalman filtering and (numerical) GP regression in the methods section. Next, we show how numerical GP regression can be embedded into the recursive Kalman filter equations to obtain the numerical Gaussian process Kalman filter (GPKF). Before giving a conclusion we showcase the numerical GPKF using a simulation case study of a heterogeneous cell population. Heterogeneity occurs in the cell size and all cells grow linearly with the same growth rate.

Related works: Infinite-dimensional Kalman filtering via Gaussian process regression has been done previously by

Särkkä and Hartikainen (2012) and Särkkä et al. (2013). Therein, spatiotemporal GP regression setups are converted into infinite-dimensional state space models. These can then be used for infinite-dimensional Kalman filtering. In numerical Gaussian process regression, the spatiotemporal model is first discretized in time and then formulated as a multi-output GP with the spatial coordinates as inputs. Finite-dimensional filtering with Gaussian processes has been done, among others, by Deisenroth et al. (2009), Deisenroth and Ohlsson (2011), and Ko and Fox (2009).

2. METHODS

We give a brief introduction to Kalman filtering and (numerical) Gaussian process regression. We use the respective traditional notations for Kalman filtering (state space models) and GP regression. Both sections should therefore be read as separate entities. The notation of numerical GP regression is oriented after the original work of Raissi et al. (2018) where the focus lies on spatiotemporal models. In section 3 we will unify both frameworks.

2.1 Kalman filtering

Kalman filtering can be used for stochastic filtering of a signal from noisy online measurements. Furthermore, it can also be employed to reconstruct non-measurable states. It does so by using a probabilistic process and measurement model. In case of linear process dynamics and an identical, independent Gaussian distributed noise acting on the process and measurements, the Kalman filter gives the optimal estimate of the states. That is, optimal in an expected squared error.

There are multiple angles from which the Kalman filter can be derived. We take the Bayesian view as presented in Särkkä (2013). Although this paper is concerned with infinite-dimensional state estimation, we derive the Kalman filter here for finite-dimensional models.

Suppose the process and measurement equations are given as a state space model

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_t &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{q}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{r}_t.\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Here, $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is the state at time t and $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ is the measurement at time t . Process dynamics of the model are given by $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x}$ and the measurement model matrix is $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_x}$. Process noise $\mathbf{q}_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and measurement noise $\mathbf{r}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ are both modeled as white, additive Gaussian noise with covariance matrices $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x}$ and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_y}$, respectively, with uncorrelated dimensions. We formulate (1) as probability density functions from which the Bayesian viewpoint of Kalman filtering naturally arises

$$\begin{aligned}p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{Q}), \\ p(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{x}_t) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{R}).\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

Here the first equation describes the stochastic dynamics of the system, while the second equation gives the distribution of the current measurement given the current state. All distributions are Gaussian because the noise is Gaussian distributed and the process and measurement equations are linear.

The goal in Bayesian filtering is to compute the marginal posterior distribution of the state \mathbf{x}_t at each time step given the history of the measurements up to the current time step. The term marginal refers here to the marginalization over the previous state \mathbf{x}_{t-1} . Using Bayes' theorem we have

$$p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{x}_t)p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t-1})}{\int p(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{x}_t)p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t-1})d\mathbf{x}_t}.\quad (3)$$

With a constant data stream of measurements this quickly becomes intractable as the measurement history grows ever larger. The Kalman filter circumvents this problem by solving this equation recursively starting from a prior mean \mathbf{m}_0 and covariance \mathbf{P}_0 . The predictive, posterior, and normalizing distribution of (3) can be calculated in closed form. They are

$$\begin{aligned}p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t-1}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{m}_t^-, \mathbf{P}_t^-), \\ p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{m}_t, \mathbf{P}_t), \text{ and} \\ p(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{y}_{1:t-1}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{m}_t^-, \mathbf{S}_t),\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

respectively. Moments of the above distributions are calculated in a prediction step

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}_t^- &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{m}_{t-1}, \\ \mathbf{P}_t^- &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{t-1}\mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{Q},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

and update step

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_t &= \mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m}_t^-, \\ \mathbf{S}_t &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}_t^-\mathbf{C}^T + \mathbf{R}, \\ \mathbf{K}_t &= \mathbf{P}_t^-\mathbf{C}^T\mathbf{S}_t^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{m}_t &= \mathbf{m}_t^- + \mathbf{K}_t\mathbf{v}_t, \\ \mathbf{P}_t &= \mathbf{P}_t^- - \mathbf{K}_t\mathbf{S}_t\mathbf{K}_t^T.\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

One can derive these equations by formulating the required joint and marginal distributions of the states and measurements. This procedure can be found in Särkkä (2013) and we will use it later to derive the numerical Gaussian process Kalman filter equations.

2.2 Gaussian process regression

Here we give a brief introduction into Gaussian process regression where we take the function-space view presented in Williams and Rasmussen (2006). Afterwards we explain how numerical GP regression by Raissi et al. (2018) is used to solve time-dependent partial differential equations.

A GP is a Gaussian distribution over a random function $f(\mathbf{x})$. It is fully defined through its mean function $m(\mathbf{x})$ and covariance function $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$

$$\begin{aligned}m(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x})] \\ k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') &= \mathbb{E}[(f(\mathbf{x}) - m(\mathbf{x}))(f(\mathbf{x}') - m(\mathbf{x}'))^T].\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

Any finite dimensional collection of random variables $f(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, f(\mathbf{x}_l)$ is jointly Gaussian distributed

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_l) \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} m(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ m(\mathbf{x}_l) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) & \cdots & k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_l) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ k(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{x}_1) & \cdots & k(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{x}_l) \end{pmatrix} \right).\quad (8)$$

Here, we introduce the notation $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X})$, with $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_l)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{ij} = k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$. In regression we want to learn the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ from possibly noisy observations of its outputs and inputs

$$y(\mathbf{x}_i) = f(\mathbf{x}_i) + \epsilon_i, \quad \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2).\quad (9)$$

For GP regression we place a GP prior on $f(\mathbf{x}) \sim \text{GP}(m(\mathbf{x}), k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$ and formulate the conditional distribution of the function values to be predicted $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_*) = (f(\mathbf{x}_{*1}), \dots, f(\mathbf{x}_{*p}))$ at test points \mathbf{X}_* , given the observations $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = (y(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, y(\mathbf{x}_l))$. To obtain the conditional distribution, we first formulate the joint Gaussian distribution of the prediction and observation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_*) \\ \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) \end{pmatrix} \sim \text{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} m(\mathbf{X}_*) \\ m(\mathbf{X}) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{**} & \mathbf{K}_* \\ \mathbf{K}_*^T & \mathbf{K}_y \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (10)$$

from which we get the conditional distribution using Lemma 2

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_*) | \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) \sim \text{N} \left(m(\mathbf{X}_*) + \mathbf{K}_* \mathbf{K}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) - m(\mathbf{X})), \mathbf{K}_{**} - \mathbf{K}_* \mathbf{K}_y^{-1} \mathbf{K}_*^T \right). \quad (11)$$

Here, measurement noise is accounted for inside $\mathbf{K}_y = \mathbf{K} + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I}$. The covariance matrices in (10) and (11) are $\mathbf{K}_{**} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_*, \mathbf{X}_*) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\mathbf{K}_* = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}_*, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times l}$.

Although GP regression is non-parametric, meaning that we do not need to define a structure for $f(\mathbf{x})$, we incorporate prior information through our choice of the kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and its hyper-parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Oftentimes, the squared exponential kernel (SE) is employed. For scalar inputs it is

$$k(x, x') = \sigma^2 \exp \left(-\frac{(x - x')^2}{2l^2} \right). \quad (12)$$

The hyper-parameters are the variance σ^2 and the length-scale l .

The hyper-parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be estimated from the measurement data by minimizing the negative log marginal likelihood function

$$-\log p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I}| + \frac{l}{2} \log 2\pi.$$

This provides a good compromise between data fit, first term, and model complexity, second term.

Numerical Gaussian processes: In Raissi et al. (2018) numerical GPs have been introduced and used to solve spatiotemporal models. Numerical GPs combine the data-driven machine learning nature of GPs with first principles knowledge from a spatiotemporal model. We will introduce numerical GPs here using the explicit Euler discretization. For a general formulation, regardless of the discretization method, readers are referred to the original work of Raissi et al. (2018). Consider a linear partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t}(t, x) = \mathcal{L}_x n(t, x), \quad (13)$$

where \mathcal{L}_x is a linear operator acting on n with respect to $x \in \mathcal{R}$. Discretization of (13) in time with the explicit Euler scheme yields

$$\begin{aligned} n_t &= n_{t-1} + \Delta t \mathcal{L}_x n_{t-1} \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_x n_{t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We now place a GP prior of our choice on n_{t-1}

$$n_{t-1} \sim \text{GP} \left(0, k_{t-1, t-1}^{nn}(x, x') \right). \quad (15)$$

It follows that

$$n_t = \mathcal{Q}_x n_{t-1} \sim \text{GP} \left(0, k_{t, t}^{nn}(x, x') \right), \quad (16)$$

since a linear transformation of a GP is still a GP but with a different kernel that is informed by the linear transformation, see Särkkä (2011) for example. Using the

definition of the covariance function (7) and (14), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} k_{t, t} &= \text{E} \left[n_t(x) (n_t(x'))^T \right] \\ &= \text{E} \left[\mathcal{Q}_x n_{t-1}(x) (\mathcal{Q}_x n_{t-1}(x'))^T \right] \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_x k_{t-1, t-1}^{nn} \mathcal{Q}_x^T, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} k_{t, t-1}^{nn} &= \text{E} \left[n_t(x) (n_{t-1}(x'))^T \right] \\ &= \text{E} \left[\mathcal{Q}_x n_{t-1}(x) (n_{t-1}(x'))^T \right] \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_x k_{t, t-1}^{nn}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that if we place the prior on n_t , we would have to invert the linear operator. Choosing where to place the GP prior is therefore crucial.

To perform temporal propagation, we first formulate the following multi-output GP

$$\begin{bmatrix} n_t \\ n_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} \sim \text{GP} \left(0, \begin{bmatrix} k_{t, t}^{nn} & k_{t, t-1}^{nn} \\ k_{t-1, t}^{nn} & k_{t-1, t-1}^{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (19)$$

Starting from the initial condition, we now recursively calculate the conditional posterior distribution

$$p(n_t | n_{t-1}) = \text{N}(\mu_t, \Sigma_{t, t}). \quad (20)$$

The posterior mean and covariance are calculated as in (11).

Before formulating the conditional posterior distribution, the hyper-parameters have to be learned. In the first time step, this is done on the initial and boundary data, and in the succeeding steps on artificially generated data, i.e. test points $\mathbf{X}_{t-1, *}$, $\mathbf{X}_{t, *}$, and the current boundary data. This artificial data then has to be marginalized out from the posterior distribution to assure correct propagation of uncertainty. The reader is referred to Raissi et al. (2018) for exact details of this procedure.

Numerical GPs can handle explicit and implicit numerical methods. Merely (19) changes depending on the outputs and kernels introduced through the discretization method. Furthermore, numerous types of boundary conditions and their combinations can be handled within this framework.

3. NUMERICAL GAUSSIAN PROCESS KALMAN FILTERING

We start by extending numerical GPs to include online measurements and stochastic noise. Then, we embed this structure into the traditional Kalman filter equations.

3.1 Inclusion of a measurement equation and noise

Consider a linear stochastic partial differential equation (PDE)

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t}(t, x) = \mathcal{L}_x n(t, x) + q(t, x), \quad (21)$$

with \mathcal{L}_x being a linear operator acting on the solution of the PDE $n(t, \cdot) \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R})$, $x \mapsto n(t, x)$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$. Process noise $q(t, x)$ is white, additive Gaussian noise. To make the derivation easily accessible and without loss of generality, we use the explicit Euler time stepping scheme to derive the numerical GPKF. Forward Euler discretization of (21) results in

$$\begin{aligned} n_t(x) &= n_{t-1}(x) + \Delta t \mathcal{L}_x n_{t-1}(x) + \Delta t q_{t-1}(x), \\ &= \mathcal{F}_x n_{t-1}(x) + \Delta t q_{t-1}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Table 1. Kernels of the multi-output explicit Euler GP (27). For readability we write k instead of $k_{t-1,t-1}^{nn}$.

Kernel	Structure
$k_{t-1,t-1}^{nn}$	k
$k_{t,t-1}^{nn}$	$\mathcal{F}_x k$
$k_{t,t}^{nn}$	$\mathcal{F}_x k \mathcal{F}_{x'}^T + \Delta t^2 k_{t-1,t-1}^{qq}$
$k_{t,t-1}^{yn}$	$\mathcal{H}_x \mathcal{F}_x k$
$k_{t,t}^{yn}$	$\mathcal{F}_x k (\mathcal{F}_{x'} \mathcal{H}_{x'})^T + \Delta t^2 k_{t-1,t-1}^{qq}$
$k_{t,t}^{yn^y}$	$\mathcal{H}_x \mathcal{F}_x k (\mathcal{F}_{x'} \mathcal{H}_{x'})^T + \mathcal{H}_x \Delta t^2 k_{t-1,t-1}^{qq} \mathcal{H}_{x'}^T + k_{t,t}^{rr}$

where \mathcal{F}_x is again a linear operator summarizing the structure of the discretized PDE. The right-hand side of (21) is not continuous, and one should therefore use the Euler-Maruyama method instead. However, the covariance of the noise term q_{t-1} will depend on the step size Δt , much like in the Euler-Maruyama method. This is because of the fundamental idea behind numerical GPs, which is to use the PDE structure to derive the covariance functions. We place mutually independent GP priors on n_{t-1} and q_{t-1}

$$n_{t-1} \sim \text{GP}(0, k_{t-1,t-1}^{nn}(x, x')), \quad (23)$$

$$q_{t-1} \sim \text{GP}(0, k_{t-1,t-1}^{qq}(x, x')), \quad (24)$$

with a kernel of our choice for n_{t-1} and a white noise kernel $k_{t-1,t-1}^{qq}(x, x') = \delta(x - x')\sigma_q^2$ for q_{t-1} .

We introduce a measurement equation

$$n_t^y(y) = \mathcal{H}_x n_t(y) + r_t(y), \quad (25)$$

with the measurement operator $\mathcal{H}_x : L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathbb{R})$, $n^t \mapsto n_t^t$, the measurement $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, and additive, white noise $r_t(y)$ modeled as a GP with kernel $k_{t,t}^{rr}(y, y') = \delta(y - y')\sigma_r^2$. Since n_{t-1} is a GP, so is n_t , as already established, but so is also n_t^y . Boundary conditions are usually a linear transformation of the state and are hence treated in the same fashion

$$n_t^b(x_b) = \mathcal{B}_x n_t(x_b). \quad (26)$$

We write the complete multi-output GP as

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_t \\ n_t^y \\ n_t^b \\ n_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} \sim \text{GP} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} k_{t,t}^{nn} & k_{t,t}^{yn} & k_{t,t}^{nn^b} & k_{t,t-1}^{nn} \\ k_{t,t}^{yn} & k_{t,t}^{yn^y} & k_{t,t}^{yn^b} & k_{t,t-1}^{yn} \\ k_{t,t}^{nn^b} & k_{t,t}^{nn^y} & k_{t,t}^{nn^b} & k_{t,t-1}^{nn^b} \\ k_{t-1,t}^{nn} & k_{t-1,t}^{yn} & k_{t-1,t}^{nn^b} & k_{t-1,t-1}^{nn} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (27)$$

All kernels are listed in Table 1. With this structure we are equipped to write down the recursive Kalman Filter equations. This is possible because we have a linear system and we are working with random variables that are Gaussian distributed, i.e. a Gaussian process.

3.2 The numerical Gaussian process Kalman filter

In this subsection we only work with finite-dimensional collections of the Gaussian process random variables. We indicate this with bold lowercase letters for the random variables. The kernels become covariance matrices, indicated by bold capital letters, as already introduced in subsection 2.2. We therefore also write $\text{N}(\cdot, \cdot)$ instead of $\text{GP}(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Recall that in Kalman filtering we want to calculate the posterior distribution of a dynamic state given model

predictions and measurements up to the current time. According to Bayes' rule the posterior is given by

$$p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t}^y) = \frac{p(\mathbf{n}_t^y | \mathbf{n}_t) p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y)}{p(\mathbf{n}_t^y | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y)}. \quad (28)$$

Here we omitted the boundary data $\mathbf{n}_t^b(x_b)$ for readability. We assume the states to be Markovian, i.e. the current state \mathbf{n}_t is conditionally independent of anything that happened before $t-1$. Furthermore, the current measurement given the current state is conditionally independent of the measurement and state histories. The individual terms can be calculated in closed form

- prior $p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{t-1}^y) = \text{N}(\mathbf{n}_t | \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^-, \mathbf{P}_t^-)$,
- posterior $p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_t^y) = \text{N}(\mathbf{n}_t | \boldsymbol{\mu}_t, \mathbf{P}_t)$,
- normalizing constant $p(\mathbf{n}_t^y | \mathbf{n}_{t-1}^y) = \text{N}(\mathbf{n}_t^y | \mathcal{H}_x \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^-, \mathbf{P}_t)$.

To calculate the prior distribution, we first calculate the joint distribution of the states \mathbf{n}_{t-1} and \mathbf{n}_t conditioned on the measurement and boundary data history. Marginalizing over the previous state gives us the prior distribution. The joint distribution is

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{n}_{t-1}, \mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b) &= p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{t-1}) \\ &\quad \times p(\mathbf{n}_{t-1} | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b) \\ &= \text{N}(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{A} \mathbf{n}_{t-1}, \mathbf{P}_t^{GP,nn}) \\ &\quad \times \underbrace{\text{N}(\mathbf{n}_{t-1} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1}, \mathbf{P}_{t-1})}_{\text{previous posterior}} \\ &= \text{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{n}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{n}_t \end{pmatrix} \middle| \boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{P}' \right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Note that the Gaussian distribution in the last line is *not* the same as $p(\mathbf{n}_{t-1}, \mathbf{n}_t)$ as it is conditioned on previous measurements and boundary data. We introduced

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{K}_{t,t-1}^{nn} (\mathbf{K}_{t-1,t-1}^{nn})^{-1}, \quad (30)$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}_t^{GP,nn} = \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn} - \mathbf{K}_{t,t-1}^{nn} (\mathbf{K}_{t-1,t-1}^{nn})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{t-1,t}^{nn}. \quad (31)$$

These two equations are obtained by forming the conditional $\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{t-1}$ of the multi-output GP (19). We can think of (30) as the equivalent to the dynamic matrix in a state space model with the difference that its entries depend on the test points $A(\mathbf{X}_{t,*}, \mathbf{X}_{t-1,*})$. Using Lemma 1, the joint mean is

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}' = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (32)$$

and the covariance is

$$\mathbf{P}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{t-1} & \mathbf{P}_{t-1} \mathbf{A}^T \\ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_{t-1} & \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_{t-1} \mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP,nn} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Now, the conditional marginal distribution is

$$p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{t-1}^y) = \text{N}(\mathbf{n}_t | \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^-, \mathbf{P}_t^-), \quad (34)$$

with prior mean and covariance

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- = \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1}, \quad (35)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_t^- = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_{t-1} \mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP,nn}. \quad (36)$$

Equipped with this, we can calculate the joint distribution $p(\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b)$. This will allow us to write down the posterior distribution later. We start by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b) &= p(\mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{n}_t) \\
&\quad \times p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b) \\
&= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{C} \mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, n^y n^y}) \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{n}_t | \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^-, \mathbf{P}_t^-) \\
&= \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{n}_t \\ \mathbf{n}_t^y \\ \mathbf{n}_t^b \end{pmatrix} \middle| \boldsymbol{\mu}'' , \mathbf{P}'' \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Here we introduced

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n^y} & \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n^b} \\ \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^b n^y} & \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^b n^b} \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn})^{-1}, \tag{38}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_t^{GP, n^y n^y} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n^y} & \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n^b} \\ \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^b n^y} & \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^b n^b} \end{bmatrix} \\
&\quad - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n} \\ \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^b n} \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn})^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn^y} & \mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn^b} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

These two expressions are obtained in the similar fashion as \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{P}_t^{GP, nn}$ by forming $\mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{n}_t$ from (27). We can think of (38) as the equivalent to the measurement matrix in a state space model, albeit its entries depend on the measurement, boundary, and test points $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{X}_{t,b}, \mathbf{X}_{t,*})$. Using Lemma 1 one more time, the joint mean is

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}'' = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- \\ \mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- \end{pmatrix}. \tag{40}$$

The covariance is

$$\mathbf{P}'' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}_t^- & \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T \\ \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^- & \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, n^y n^y} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

To get the posterior $p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t}^b)$, we need to condition the above joint distribution $p(\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b | \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b)$ on the current measurement and boundary data. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_t^y, \mathbf{n}_t^b, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t-1}^b) &= p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{n}_{1:t}^y, \mathbf{n}_{1:t}^b) \\
&= \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_t, \mathbf{P}_t).
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

The posterior mean is

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\mu}_t &= \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- + \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T \\
&\quad \times \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, nn} \right)^{-1} \left([\mathbf{n}_t^y \ \mathbf{n}_t^b]^T - \mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

and the corresponding variance is

$$\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}_t^- - \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, n^y n^y} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^-. \tag{44}$$

To summarize the numerical GPKF, we have the prediction step as

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- = \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1}^-, \tag{45}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_t^- = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_{t-1}^- \mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, nn}. \tag{46}$$

The update step is

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{n}_t^y - \mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^-, \tag{47}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T + \mathbf{P}_t^{GP, n^y n^y}, \tag{48}$$

$$\mathbf{K}_t = \mathbf{P}_t^- \mathbf{C}^T (\mathbf{S}_t)^{-1}, \tag{49}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^- + \mathbf{K}_t \mathbf{v}_t, \tag{50}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}_t^- - \mathbf{K}_t \mathbf{S}_t (\mathbf{K}_t)^T. \tag{51}$$




Fig. 1. Temporal snapshots of the true number density function in black, and the posterior estimate of the numerical GPKF in blue along with two times the standard deviation. Blue circles indicate measurements. For the first time step there are 41 training points, from then on 5 noisy measurements for each time step $\Delta t = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$.

The covariances of process and measurement noise are added to the kernels $\mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{nn}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{t,t}^{n^y n^y}$, as shown in Table 1. They therefore enter the algorithm as in the traditional Kalman filter.

By minimizing the negative log-marginal likelihood, hyperparameters are estimated in every time step from the current measurement and boundary, as well as previous test data.

4. SIMULATION STUDY

We will look at a population balance model (Ramkrishna (2000)) describing cell-to-cell variability in cell size. Cells grow but do not divide or die, a scenario that is reasonable for short time horizons. The population balance equation that describes the dynamics of this heterogeneity has the form

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t}(t, x) + \text{div}(n \dot{x}) = 0. \tag{52}$$

Here, the number density function $n(t, x)$ describes the number of cells at time t for a specific cell size $x \in \Omega$, with Ω being a subset of \mathbb{R} . The total number of cells is $N(t) = \int_{\Omega} n(t, x) dx$. This number is constant as no proliferation occurs. The single cell growth dynamics are assumed to be linear $\dot{x} = 1.5$. This renders (52) to the advection equation for which we can write down the analytical solution. We impose a no-flux boundary condition $n(t, x_b) \dot{x}_b = 0$ at $x_b = 0$. The initial number density function is a Gaussian distribution $n(0, x) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$, with mean $\mu_0 = 2.25$ and variance $\sigma_0^2 = 0.5$.

Flow cytometry analysis allows us to quantify cell population heterogeneity. For this numerical case study we assume to obtain the full number density function from flow cytometry and be able to evaluate it at specific locations y_i

$$n_t^y(y_i) = n_t(y_i) + \epsilon_i. \tag{53}$$




Fig. 2. Estimation of the process and measurement noise standard deviation.

Here ϵ is generated from a zero mean Gaussian with variance $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$. Artificial measurements are created from the analytical solution. Process noise is set to zero. We discretize (52) using the implicit Euler method with a step size of $\Delta t = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. This is also used as the sampling time for measurements. A GP prior with a zero-mean function and squared exponential kernel is placed on $n_t(x)$. From this, the entire structure of the full numerical GPKF is build up. The initial estimate of the number density function is $n(0, x) = N(\mu_0 + 0.5, \sigma_0^2 + 0.3)$ with a variance of $\mathbf{P}_0 = 0.01 \cdot \mathbf{I}$, where $\mathbf{P}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{tr} \times N_{tr}}$ and $N_{tr} = 41$ is the number of initial training points. The initial values for the squared exponential hyper-parameters are $l_{SE} = 1$ and $\sigma_{SE}^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_q^2 = 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ for the process white noise kernel, and $\sigma_r^2 = 0.04$ for the measurement white noise kernel.

Fig. 1 shows temporal snapshots of the true number density function and the posterior estimate of the numerical GPKF along with two times the standard deviation. Convergence of the estimate in terms of the mean integrated squared error (MISE) can be seen in Fig. 3. Adaptation of the noise hyper-parameters is shown in Fig. 2. At around $t = 0.6$ the true noise levels are found and kept at those levels. At roughly the same time the MISE reaches zero.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced numerical Gaussian process Kalman filtering (GPKF), with which we can do state estimation for infinite-dimensional systems, as well as adaptive estimation of noise levels. Numerical Gaussian processes by Raissi et al. (2018) solve spatiotemporal models with Gaussian process regression by discretizing in time and leveraging the resulting structure for kernel design. We embedded this into the well known recursive Kalman filter equations.

Future work should seek to formalize this framework irrespective of the temporal discretization method, something that has already been done in Raissi et al. (2018) for the numerical GP regression. More importantly, instead of a derivation using the finite-dimensional mean vectors and




Fig. 3. Mean integrated squared error between the posterior estimate and the ground truth.

covariance matrices, one should work with the mean functions and kernels directly. Questions regarding observability analysis based on the kernels are also of interest and should be addressed.

Future simulation studies should investigate multivariate models such as a population balance equation describing heterogeneity over the growth rate and cell size where only the latter can be measured. Another interesting application is the joint estimation of states and model parameters using the numerical GPKF. This can be done by introducing the model parameters as hyper-parameters of the GP.

Learning the noise hyper-parameters online on the data stream is a two-sided sword. No fine-tuning of process and measurement noise by hand is required, but if the likelihood function has a complicated contour with many local minima, this could lead to numerical issues reducing the performance of the numerical GPKF.

REFERENCES

- Deisenroth, M.P., Huber, M.F., and Hanebeck, U.D. (2009). Analytic moment-based gaussian process filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, 225–232. ACM.
- Deisenroth, M.P. and Ohlsson, H. (2011). A general perspective on gaussian filtering and smoothing: Explaining current and deriving new algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2011 American Control Conference*, 1807–1812. IEEE.
- Kalman, R.E. (1960). A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems.
- Ko, J. and Fox, D. (2009). Gp-bayesfilters: Bayesian filtering using gaussian process prediction and observation models. *Autonomous Robots*, 27(1), 75–90.
- Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., and Karniadakis, G.E. (2018). Numerical gaussian processes for time-dependent and nonlinear partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(1), A172–A198.
- Ramkrishna, D. (2000). *Population balances: Theory and applications to particulate systems in engineering*. Elsevier.

- Särkkä, S. (2011). Linear operators and stochastic partial differential equations in gaussian process regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, 151–158. Springer.
- Särkkä, S. (2013). *Bayesian filtering and smoothing*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press.
- Särkkä, S. and Hartikainen, J. (2012). Infinite-dimensional kalman filtering approach to spatio-temporal gaussian process regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 993–1001.
- Särkkä, S., Solin, A., and Hartikainen, J. (2013). Spatiotemporal learning via infinite-dimensional bayesian filtering and smoothing: A look at gaussian process regression through kalman filtering. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 30(4), 51–61.
- Williams, C.K. and Rasmussen, C.E. (2006). *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, volume 2. MIT Press Cambridge, MA.

Appendix A. PROPERTIES OF GAUSSIAN DISTRIBUTIONS

The following is taken from Särkkä (2013).

Lemma 1. (Joint distribution of Gaussian variables) If random variables $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ have the Gaussian probability distributions

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{P}) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{R}), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

than the joint distribution of \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} and the marginal distribution of \mathbf{y} are given as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{H}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{P}\mathbf{H}^T \\ \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P} & \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R} \end{pmatrix}\right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Lemma 2. (Conditional distribution of Gaussian variables) If the random variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} have the joint Gaussian probability distribution

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{C}^T & \mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix}\right), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

than the conditional distribution is

$$\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{C}^T). \quad (\text{A.6})$$