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Abstract. Parameter identification determines the essential system parameters required to build real-world dynamical systems by fusing crucial physical relationships and experimental data. However, the data-driven approach faces many difficulties, such as discontinuous or inconsistent time trajectories and noisy measurements. The ill-posedness of the inverse problem comes from the chaotic divergence of the forward dynamics. Motivated by the challenges, we shift from the Lagrangian particle perspective to the state space flow field’s Eulerian description. Instead of using pure time trajectories as the inference data, we treat statistics accumulated from the Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) as the observable. The continuous analog of the latter is the physical invariant probability measure which is a distributional solution of the stationary continuity equation. Thus, we reformulate the original parameter identification problem as a data-fitting, PDE-constrained optimization problem. A finite-volume upwind scheme and the so-called teleportation regularization are used to discretize and regularize the forward problem. We present theoretical regularity analysis for evaluating gradients of optimal transport costs and introduce two different formulations for efficient gradient calculation. Numerical results using the quadratic Wasserstein metric from optimal transport demonstrate the robustness of the novel approach for chaotic system parameter identification.
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1. Introduction. The problem of parameter identification in dynamical systems is common in many areas of science and engineering, such as signal processing [22], optimal control [25, 42], secure communications [48, 22], as well as and biology [47, 26], to mention a few. The main idea of parameter identification for a dynamical system is to identify a mathematical model of the real-world system and adapt its parameters until the simulations obtained with the mathematical model are close to experimental data. The models usually represent time-dependent processes with numerous state variables and many interactions between variables. In many applications, one can derive the form of the mathematical model from some knowledge about the process under investigation, but in general, the parameters of such a model must be inferred from empirical observations of time series data. The initial parameter values are usually using, for instance, some preliminary knowledge of the real-world system. The type of mathematical model and the parameter identification algorithm chosen strongly influence the accuracy of the estimates.

Many parameter estimation techniques have been developed for nonlinear dynamical systems. The most common method is the least-squares approach and its generalizations. However, the least-squares estimator often overfits measurement errors [36, 34]. Another common approach to parameter estimation is the shooting
method. The single shooting method [41] applied to parameter estimation uses a single initial condition to produce a trajectory that attempts to fit the noisy data points. However, when working with chaotic systems, which are very sensitive to initial data, relying only on one trajectory may not result in meaningful approximations of the desired solution. The multiple shooting algorithm deals with this issue by using multiple trajectories to estimate parameters [6]. Because of their universal approximation abilities, neural networks and combinations of the above methods with neural networks have also been used recently for parameter identification for dynamical systems [7, 38]. For a more complete review we refer to [1] and [39].

The data-driven approaches listed above are based on a Lagrangian particle perspective: the inference data comprises pure observations of time trajectories. This perspective incurs many difficulties such as lack of observational data, discontinuous or inconsistent time trajectories, and noisy measurements [10]. The difficulties are particularly severe for chaotic systems. Although unstable with respect to initial conditions, chaotic dynamical systems often have a well-defined basin of attraction and statistical properties such as physical invariant measures [57, 55]. For this reason, a successful way to deal with the issues described above is to shift from the Lagrangian particle perspective to the Eulerian description of the state space flow field [9, 3]. Instead of using time trajectories as the inference data, one uses statistics estimated by their accumulation through Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) over a single long-time trajectory. Due to the stability of the statistical steady state, the use of Eulerian coordinates results in noise-robust algorithms that can produce high-quality parameter estimates even when the pure time-trajectory data is of low quality, discontinuous, or not well sampled.

The first main contribution of the paper is performing parameter identification for chaotic systems under the Eulerian coordinates, with the motivation as described above. Since the continuous analog of our DNS-generated statistics is a distributional solution of the stationary continuity equation (2.3), we reformulate the original inverse problem as a data-fitting PDE-constrained optimization problem (5.2). We use the finite volume method to discretize the continuity equation [37, 9] and obtain an explicit time evolution equation of the probability density. More specifically, we use a first-order split upwind discretization on a \( d \)-dimensional uniform mesh in space and time, which enforces the positivity of the probability density. To enforce strict mass conservation, we combine this discretization with a zero flux condition on the boundary. To ensure the uniqueness of the solution and also improve the conditioning of the resulting Markov matrix, we apply the so-called teleportation technique [27] as a regularization of the forward problem.

Following [29], we use the Wasserstein metric from optimal transportation as the objective function; see (5.2). The Wasserstein metric has been actively studied since the late 20th century [56]. Recently, it is proved to have unique features as a loss function in numerous applied fields, such as image processing [31], machine learning [5], large-scale inverse problems [20] and statistical inference [8], only to mention a few. The research development of optimal transportation in applied mathematics is so rapid that we do not attempt to give a comprehensive overview. Interested readers may further refer to [45]. The benefits of using the Wasserstein metric for our inverse problem are threefold. First, instead of time trajectories, the datasets are probability densities, the exact subject of study for optimal transport. Second, the physical invariant measure for these chaotic dynamics is compactly supported on a low-dimensional subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \). The Wasserstein metric is well-defined for measures of different support as it not only considers the local intensity differences but also incorporates the global
geometry mismatches \cite{20}, which is not the case of Kullback–Leibler divergence. The $L^p$ norm also suffers if the supports are disjoint and may produce wrong or random update directions if supports only partially intersect. Third, recent work in both deterministic and Bayesian inverse problems have demonstrated that the $W_2$ metric is robust to noise \cite{19, 17}, a preferred property when we have noisy time trajectories.

Our second main contribution is the rigorous regularity analysis of the optimal transport cost with respect to the inference parameter. Although the gradient formula is well known in the literature, its validity analysis seems to be missing except in special cases where the optimal transport cost can be calculated explicitly \cite[Lemma 2.4]{46}. In the non-parametric setting, such analysis can be found in \cite[Theorem 2.4]{52} for probability measures on finite spaces and in \cite[Proposition 7.17]{49} for probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Similar to related results in the literature, we rely on Kantorovich’s linear programming formulation of the optimal transportation problem and the regularity theory of optimal value functions \cite{11}. Under rather mild conditions, we prove that the transportation cost is directionally differentiable everywhere. In general, the directional derivative is nonlinear and depends on the structure of Kantorovich potentials. To this end, we find a sufficient condition in terms of the geometry of the optimal transport plans that guarantees the linearity of the directional derivative providing a descent direction for the optimal transport cost. To the best of our knowledge, this condition is new in the literature.

A key aspect of our analysis is that our assumptions on the dependence of probability measures on the inference parameter are rather mild. In particular, we allow for disconnected supports for the measures, which is new in the literature. Additionally, our assumptions allow for non-smooth “probability manifolds” in the total variation or Wasserstein metric. Indeed, in Proposition 4.7 we provide an example of a non-smooth curve in a Wasserstein for which methods based on Wasserstein calculus \cite{15} do not apply. The same example shows that our sufficient condition is sharp enough to isolate non-differentiability points of the transport cost precisely. We also prove that the transport cost is generically differentiable: almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesgue measure, without extra conditions on the geometric structure of optimal transport maps. Finally, we provide a qualitative error analysis for the gradient.

The paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we review challenges of the chaotic dynamics, the advantages provided by the Eulerian perspective, and a short introduction to optimal transport. In Section 3, we describe a different forward problem based on the Eulerian perspective and discuss the numerical scheme that enforces positivity and strict mass conservation. The solution to the forward problem is computed as finding the dominant eigenvector of a Markov matrix. In Section 4, we present theoretical regularity analysis for evaluating gradients of optimal transport costs with respect to the model parameters. In Section 5, we introduce two different ways to compute gradients for our PDE-constrained optimization problem. Numerical results for the Lorenz, Rössler, and Chen systems are presented in Section 6. In Section 7, we summarize our results and describe a few future research directions.

2. Background. In this section, we present the motivation of this work as well as the essential background of dynamical systems and optimal transportation theory.

2.1. Motivation. The classical laws of physics are governed by autonomous differential equations. In this causal framework, perfect knowledge of the initial state of the system and boundary conditions are sufficient to predict all future states. While the advent of quantum mechanics has complicated this view of the universe,
for macroscopic phenomena, models of the universe generally conform to this predominately causal conceptual framework. While macroscopic systems are generally composed of vast numbers of constituent parts, entropic relaxation towards equilibrium enables invocation of the machinery of statistical mechanics to describe these very high dimensional phenomena as lower-dimensional causal phenomena such as the laws of thermodynamics and classical mechanics.

Steady-state physical phenomena converge to a single stable fixed-point solution. Physical systems, however, often exhibit a range of more complex, emergent behaviors such as periodic oscillations that may proceed through a sequence of bifurcations onto chaotic behaviors. A classic example of this sequence of vortex shedding behaviors is exhibited by the flow around a cylinder as the Reynolds number is increased from the laminar flow up to turbulence. While perfectly Hamiltonian systems may exhibit an infinite number of nearby stable orbits, the driven nonlinear dissipative physical systems tend instead to exhibit nontrivial emergent solutions only when one or more system eigenmode is unstable in some locally-linearized region of state space. These systems are then unstable in a region of the phase space until nonlinearities are sufficiently strong to dampen the solution and restabilize the system. While these unstable situations may appear rare, the ubiquity of dissipation due to entropy production in real physical systems implies that this is the predominant case throughout science and engineering for systems that exhibit finite-amplitude long time oscillations of interest.

Chaotic systems exhibit only finite-time convergence of numerical solutions due to the exponential divergence of nearby solution trajectories. Coupled with uncertainty of initial and boundary conditions and model parameters, this type of divergence implies the impossibility of accurate long-time forward predictions for systems exhibiting chaotic behavior even with perfect knowledge of the system. In these situations, the verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification communities tend to drop the prerequisite of asymptotic model convergence in favor of statistical convergence arguments as described in [44]. In doing so, the nature of any underlying causal physical models tends to be compromised in favor of an assumed statistical model. An over-reliance on normal distributions is often then introduced even in problems where the system measurements are neither identical nor independent, violating key premises of the central limit theorem.

Poor model fit is often seen as Gaussian models applied to distributions that exhibit fat-tail phenomena. While the introduction of additional distribution shapes and moments to identified model parameterization in this regime may improve fits, these approaches tend not to address the root cause of the significant non-Gaussianity exhibited. Validation using only distribution means and several low-order moments for few “quantities of interest” can result in an underconstrained identification of models. This issue of underconstrained validation is only exacerbated by the highly over-parameterized models that are ubiquitous throughout machine learning. A tremendous amount of information that could potentially be used to constrain model calibration has been lost in the process of discarding the knowledge that the data-generating process was originally the result of some predominately causal underlying process.

This work aims to reintroduce non-random causal state-space flow information inherent to emergent physical phenomena to the parameter identification problem as applied to chaotic systems that elude asymptotic trajectory convergence. Though methods such as sparse identification of nonlinear dynamics (SINDy) [51, 13, 50] can be used to estimate parameters for chaotic systems composed from a library of assumed functional forms, the longer-term goal of this effort is to make rigorous the empirically motivated black-box calibration methodology proposed in [29] for
general state-space dynamics. While the techniques developed here are applied to simpler dynamical systems to demonstrate the approach, these are intended only as illustrative examples to describe the proposed process and necessary inputs required to extend this theoretical framework to the general case in subsequent efforts.

2.2. Dynamical Systems. This section reviews some basic terminologies in the field of dynamical systems that will appear throughout the paper.

2.2.1. Chaotic Dynamical Systems. A continuous-time dynamical system represents the behavior of a system in which the time-dependent flow of a point in a geometrical state space, $\mathbf{x}$, is governed by a function of that state, $v(\mathbf{x})$, such that

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \dot{\mathbf{x}} = v(\mathbf{x}).$$

(2.1)

This first-order ordinary differential equation (ODE) can be viewed as the trajectory of a point in Lagrangian coordinates. While linear first-order dynamical systems, $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x}$, admit only stable, unstable, and periodic solutions, the more general class of nonlinear dynamical systems can exhibit a range of more complex long-time behaviors due to locally bounded regions of instability. It is this local region of instability that enables the emergence of chaotic behavior.

While a formal definition of chaos remains elusive, it is generally characterized by bifurcation and sequences of period doubling, transitivity and dense orbit, sensitive dependence to initial conditions, and expansivity; see [18] for more details. In particular, it is this sensitive dependence on initial conditions that results in the apparent randomness characteristic of chaotic systems. This randomness results from a combination of local instability causing exponential divergence of nearby trajectories and state-space mixing that occurs when this exponential divergence is re-stabilized such that a nontrivial attractor forms. This combination makes long-time predictions impossible despite the purely causal nature of the governing system. It is also this sensitivity that makes the classical trajectory-based parameter inference problem challenging when the observed dynamics are obscured by noise, slow sampling, and other corruption, as described in Section 1.

2.2.2. From Lagrangian to Eulerian Dynamics. The Lagrangian characterization of a dynamical system of the prior section describes dynamics where the observer follows an individual parcel as it moves through state space and time. To remedy stability issues arising from considering time trajectories as the inference data, we shift the attention from this “particle” perspective to the Eulerian specification of the system. Thus, in the spirit of statistical physics, we focus on statistical properties of the dynamical system that by design should be more robust and tractable.

Mathematically, statistical properties of (2.1) can be characterized by occupation measures $\mu_{x,T}$ defined as

$$\mu_{x,T}(B) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T 1_B(\mathbf{x}(s))ds = \frac{\int_0^T 1_B(\mathbf{x}(s))ds}{\int_0^T 1_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathbf{x}(s))ds},$$

(2.2)

where $T > 0$, $1$ is the indicator function, $B$ is any Borel measurable set, and $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ is the time-dependent trajectory starting at $x$. System (2.1) has robust statistical properties if there exists a set of positive Lebesgue measure $U$ and an invariant probability measure $\mu^*$ such that $\mu_{x,T}$ converges weakly to $\mu^*$ for all initial conditions $x \in U$. Such $\mu^*$ are called physical and related to Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen (SRB) measures.
In general, the existence and properties of such measures are rather intricate and require careful analysis. For a more detailed account on these topics, we refer to [57] for general systems, and [55, 54] for the Lorenz system. Furthermore, in some cases, one can recover \( \mu^* \) as the zero-noise limit of stationary measures of the corresponding stochastic dynamical systems [16, 32].

The discussion above suggests that physical measures might be a suitable choice for inference data [29]. However, as explained in Section 3, direct simulation of \( \mu^* \) for parameter identification faces the difficulty of not having access to the gradients of the loss function. Consequently, one has to rely on gradient-free space-search methods. Motivated by tackling this challenge, we take a PDE perspective on \( \mu^* \) and formulate the parameter inference problem as a PDE constrained optimization.

More precisely, physical measures are stationary distributional solutions of the continuity equation

\[
\frac{\partial \rho(x,t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v(x)\rho(x,t)) = 0.
\]

In general, (2.3) does not admit absolutely continuous stationary solutions [57, 55], and a regularization on discrete or continuous levels is necessary. We choose to regularize (2.3) on a discrete level by first building its Markov chain approximation via first-order upwind scheme and then applying teleportation regularization from Google’s PageRank method [27]. This regularized Markov chain then admits a unique stationary distribution that can be efficiently recovered via linear solvers; see Section 3.

Remark 2.1. Stationary solutions of (2.3) might be extremely complicated admitting intricate supports. We do not claim that our regularization yields an effective approximation of these solutions. Rather, our regularization serves as a suitable forward model specifically for the parameter identification problem. Indeed, we only need the resulting inverse problem to be well-posed. Numerical experiments in Section 6 demonstrate that we can recover the parameters of Lorenz, Chen, and Rössler systems via this regularization.

2.2.3. Stochastic Chaotic Dynamics. While Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 describe the purely causal system dynamics and conversion to a PDE representation, it is important to note that these descriptions extend to the stochastically driven case as well. This is particularly important as the noise in the observed dynamics likely includes not only extrinsic observational errors, but may also include intrinsic physical fluctuations. This is particularly true if the observed dynamics result from observations of real physical systems as the low dimensional system dynamics are then likely to be coarse-grained approximations of some emergent phenomena resulting from many-body interactions.

In this framework, a more general form for the dynamical system can be obtained by extending the system dynamics to include time- and spatial-dependent stochastic forcing term \( \omega(x,t) \), resulting in a differential equation in the form of [3]

\[
\dot{x} = f(x) + \omega(x,t),
\]

or as a system of stochastic differential equation

\[
d\dot{x} = f(x)dt + \tilde{\omega}(x,t)dw(t),
\]

where \( w(t) \) is a standard \( d \)-dimensional Wiener process, and \( \tilde{\omega}(x,t) \) is a matrix-valued function. They can be considered as continuous time instantiation analogous to the
stochastically-forced iterative map \( x_{n+1} = g(x_n) + \omega_n \) [53]. The Eulerian description of the stochastic dynamical system then follows a Fokker–Planck equation [32]

\[
\frac{\partial \rho(x,t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left( v(x)\rho(x,t) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 D_{ij} \rho(x,t)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = 0,
\]

where the summation over repeated indices is implied. Here, \( D_{ij} \) is the \((i,j)\)-th element of the spectral density \( D \) of the state disturbances. When \( D \) is diagonal, and the state disturbance is independent of \( x \), it reduces to a simple diffusion term [9]. As mentioned above, we focus on \( D = 0 \) case in this work.

Finally, we note that even in the deterministic case, (2.4) might be a useful regularization device for (2.3) both on discrete and continuous levels. Teleportation regularization is much similar in this sense. Indeed, one adds stochasticity to the dynamics by a random placement according to a fixed underlying distribution.

2.3. Optimal Transport. In this subsection, we give a brief overview of the topic of optimal transportation, first brought up by Monge in 1781.

We first introduce the original Monge’s problem. Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) be an arbitrary domain, and \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \) arbitrary probability measures supported in \( \Omega \). A transport map \( T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega \) is mass-preserving if for any measurable set \( B \subseteq \Omega \)

\[
\mu(T^{-1}(B)) = \nu(B).
\]

If this condition is satisfied, \( \nu \) is said to be the push-forward of \( \mu \) by \( T \), and we write \( \nu = T \# \mu \). In case \( \mu, \nu \) are absolutely continuous; that is, \( d\mu(x) = f(x)dx \) and \( d\nu(y) = g(y)dy \), we have that \( T \) is a mass-preserving map if

\[
f(x) = g(T(x)) \cdot | \det (\nabla T(x)) | , \quad x \in \Omega.
\]

The transport cost function \( c(x,y) \) maps pairs \((x,y) \in \Omega \times \Omega \) to \( \mathbb{R} \cup \{ +\infty \} \), which denotes the cost of transporting one unit mass from location \( x \) to \( y \). The most common choice of \( c(x,y) \) is \( |x-y|^p \), \( p \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( |x-y| \) denotes the Euclidean distance between vectors \( x \) and \( y \). Given a mass-preserving map \( T \), the total transport cost is

\[
\int_{\Omega} c(x,T(x))f(x) \, dx.
\]

While there are many maps \( T \) that can perform the relocation, we are interested in finding the optimal map that minimizes the total cost. So far, we have informally defined the optimal transport problem, which induces the so-called Wasserstein distance defined below, associated to cost function \( c(x,y) = |x-y|^p \).

**Definition 2.2 (The Wasserstein distance).** We denote by \( \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega) \) the set of probability measures with finite moments of order \( p \). For all \( p \in [1, \infty) \),

\[
W_p(\mu, \nu) = \left( \inf_{T_{\mu,\nu} \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{\Omega} |x - T_{\mu,\nu}(x)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega),
\]

where \( \mathcal{M} \) is the set of all maps that push forward \( \mu \) into \( \nu \).

The definition (2.5) is the original static formulation of the optimal transport problem with a specific cost function. In mid 20th century, Kantorovich relaxed the constraints, turning it into a linear programming problem, and also formulated the
dual problem [49]. Instead of searching for a map \( T \), a transport plan \( \pi \) is considered, which is a measure supported in the product space \( \Omega \times \Omega \). The Kantorovich problem is to find an optimal transport plan as follows:

\[
T_c(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} c(x, y) d\pi \mid \pi \geq 0 \text{ and } \pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu) \right\},
\]

where \( \Pi(\mu, \nu) = \{ \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \Omega) \mid (P_1)_\sharp \pi = \mu, (P_2)_\sharp \pi = \nu \} \). Here, \( \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \Omega) \) stands for the set of all the probability measures on \( \Omega \times \Omega \), functions \( P_1(x, y) = x \) and \( P_2(x, y) = y \) denote projections over the two coordinates, and \( (P_1)_\sharp \pi \) and \( (P_2)_\sharp \pi \) are two measures obtained by pushing forward \( \pi \) with these two projections.

Since every transport map determines a transport plan of the same cost, Kantorovich’s problem is weaker than the original Monge’s problem. If the cost function \( c(x, y) \) is of the form \( |x - y|^p \) and \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, solutions to the Kantorovich and Monge problems coincide under certain conditions. When \( p > 1 \), the strict convexity of \( |x - y|^p \) guarantees that there is a unique solution to Kantorovich’s problem (2.6) which is also the unique solution to Monge’s problem (2.5).

### 3. A Different Forward Model.

While matching shadow state-space density in [29] provided a potential route to resolve the issue of chaotic divergence of state-space trajectories, the direct estimation of state-space density from trajectory data still retained two major challenges. The most significant issue with using this approach to parameter inference revolved around the inability to calculate a gradient of the Wasserstein metric with respect to the system parameters forcing the reliance on evolutionary or other gradient-free optimization methods. Another major issue related to the time required to converge to the density estimate asymptotically, as particularly highlighted in [29, Fig. 7], where the self-self Wasserstein metric for the directly binned DNS shadow density of the Lorenz system is observed to oscillate as it converges with additional ODE time steps. This slow convergence is related to the long and intermittent switching times between lobes of the butterfly attractor. While the invariant measure of the Lorenz system has been shown to exist [54], the long measurement times with respect to the switching times complicate the parameter inference problem.

To address these challenges, we instead directly solve for the steady-state solution to the continuity equation (2.3) in the parameter inference problem. This choice not only removes the issue of slow convergence with respect to the slowest system processes but provides a forward model that can be differentiated for building the required gradients needed to tackle the parameter inference problem directly. This alternative forward model follows the approach described in [9] in converting from a Lagrangian to an Eulerian model for the Bayesian estimation problem, as detailed in Subsection 3.1, but then recasts this forward operator as a Markov process for determining the steady-state solution as described in Subsection 3.3.

#### 3.1. From Linear Advection to Stationary Eigenvectors.

In converting the dynamical system from Lagrangian to Eulerian dynamics, the governing equation is converted from a nonlinear ODE for the system state “point”, \( x \), to a linear PDE (2.3) for the state space density \( \rho(x) \).

Note that a causal dynamical system includes no diffusion, i.e., \( D_{ij} = 0 \) in (2.4). It then corresponds to (2.3), a linear advection of probability density in state space. Subsection 3.2 describes a particular simple low-order discretization of this linear
advection problem. While adding physical diffusion is a relatively simple modification of the numerical method, the more significant issue with this approach relates to excess diffusion. Although the zero diffusion case can be relaxed for stochastic dynamical systems where \( D_{ij} \neq 0 \), the upwinding scheme required to stabilize the advection introduces an artificial diffusion, which is the predominant numerical error as described in [9]. This numerical diffusion is expected to dominate physical diffusion for the moderate spatial resolution that is tractable for the forward model unless the dynamics of the system are highly stochastic. As this numerical diffusion is irreducible at finite computational cost, the addition of finite diffusion to the ODE model is explored in Subsection 6.2 when attempting to understand the class of problems for which inference with respect to the binned direct ODE solution is viable.

### 3.2. Finite Volume Discretization

A finite volume discretization of the resulting continuity equation defined on the domain \( \Omega \), as described in [9], is then obtained. The finite volume discretization combined with a zero-flux boundary condition, \( v = 0 \) on the boundaries \( \partial \Omega \), enforces strict mass conservation whenever the discrete integration by parts formulation is used [23]. Only the first-order operator split upwind discretization is used in this work to enforce positivity of the probability density, as will be shown to be a consequence of the form of the discrete operator.

We first discretize (2.3) on a \( d \)-dimensional uniform mesh in space and time with no added diffusion, which gives us the following equation for the explicit time evolution of the probability density,

\[
\frac{\rho^{(l+1)}(x_i) - \rho^{(l)}(x_i)}{\Delta t} = - \sum_{i_d=1}^{d} \frac{F_{(i_d)}^{(l)}(x_i + \Delta x_{(i_d)}/2) - F_{(i_d)}^{(l)}(x_i - \Delta x_{(i_d)}/2)}{\Delta x_{(i_d)}}.
\]

Here, the point \( x_i \) refers to the \( i \)-th cell center vector and \( \Delta x_{(i_d)} \) refers to the mesh spacing in the \( i_d \)-th direction, \( i_d = 1, \ldots, d \). The upwind \( i_d \)-direction flux at the \( t \)-th time step, \( F_{(i_d)}^{(l)} \), is then approximated using face center velocity assuming uniform density within the cell centered at \( x_i \) as follows:

\[
F_{(i_d)}^{(l)} \left( x_i - \frac{\Delta x_{(i_d)}}{2} \right) = v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{+} \rho_{(i_d)}^{(l)}(x_i - \Delta x_{(i_d)}) + v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{-} \rho_{(i_d)}^{(l)}(x_i),
\]

where the upwind velocities \( v_{(i_d)}^{+} = \max(v_{(i_d)}, 0) \) and \( v_{(i_d)}^{-} = \min(v_{(i_d)}, 0) \) refer to the \( i_d \)-th component of the velocity vector split between positive and negative values, and

\[
v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{+} := v_{(i_d)}^{+} \left( x_i - \frac{\Delta x_{(i_d)}}{2} \right), \quad v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{-} := v_{(i_d)}^{-} \left( x_i - \frac{\Delta x_{(i_d)}}{2} \right).
\]

Inserting these fluxes into the discrete equation yields the following expression for the future time density, \( \rho^{(l+1)} \).

\[
\rho^{(l+1)} = \rho^{(l)} + \Delta t \sum_{i_d=1}^{d} \left( \frac{v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{+} \rho_{(i_d)}^{(l)} + v_{(i_d - \frac{1}{2})}^{-} \rho_{(i_d)}^{(l)}}{\Delta x_{(i_d)}} - \left( \frac{v_{(i_d + \frac{1}{2})}^{+} \rho_{(i_d + \frac{1}{2})}^{(l)} + v_{(i_d + \frac{1}{2})}^{-} \rho_{(i_d + \frac{1}{2})}^{(l)}}{\Delta x_{(i_d)}} \right) \right)
\]

which can be rewritten as a matrix-vector format:

\[
\rho^{(l+1)} = \rho^{(l)} + K_{\text{mat}} \rho^{(l)} = (I + K_{\text{mat}}) \rho^{(l)}.
\]
For steady state distributions, \( \rho^{(l+1)} = \rho^{(l)} = \rho^a \). This corresponds to finding a nonzero solution \( \rho^{(eq)} \) to the following linear system

\[
K_{mat}\rho^{(eq)} = \left[ \sum_{i_d=1}^{d} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_{(i_d)}} K_{(i_d)} \right] \rho^{(eq)} = 0
\]

where

\[
(3.1) \quad K_{(i_d)} = \begin{bmatrix}
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
-v_{(i_d-\frac{1}{2})} & v_{(i_d-\frac{3}{2})} & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
+ v_{(i_d+\frac{1}{2})} & -v_{(i_d+\frac{3}{2})} & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

We remark that each \( K_{(i_d)}, i_d = 1, \ldots, d \), is a tridiagonal matrix, while the offsets for the three diagonals vary for different \( i_d \). For example, consider the case that \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3 \) is a cuboid, discretized with grid size \( n_x, n_y, n_z \) in the \( x, y, z \) dimension, respectively. Then, \( K_{(1)} \) is nonzero at the first lower diagonal, the main diagonal, and the first upper diagonal; \( K_{(2)} \) is nonzero at the \( n_x \)-th lower diagonal, the main diagonal, and the \( n_x \)-th upper diagonal; \( K_{(3)} \) is nonzero at the \( (n_x \times n_y) \)-th lower diagonal, the main diagonal, and the \( (n_x \times n_y) \)-th upper diagonal.

We highlight that the solution \( \rho^{(l)} \) at any \( l \)-th time step satisfies the mass conservation property. That is,

\[
\rho^{(l)} \cdot 1 = \rho^{(l+1)} \cdot 1 = \rho^{(eq)} \cdot 1,
\]

where \( 1 = [1, 1, \ldots, 1]^T \).

It is a direct consequence of the fact that columns of \( K_{mat} \) sum to zero. Note also that the off-diagonal terms are all positive or zero while the diagonal terms are all negative or zero by construction. One can construct a column-stochastic matrix \( M \)

\[
M = I + cK_{mat}.
\]

\( M \) can be positive definite if we ensure that \( c \) is small enough.

Since the main focus of this paper is parameter identification, the velocity field \( v \) is parameter-dependent. Thus, we will highlight the dependency on the parameter \( \theta \) by using notation \( v(\theta), K_{mat}(\theta), K_{(i_d)}(\theta), \) and \( \rho^{(eq)}(\theta) \) hereafter.

The upper bound on \( c \) unsurprisingly also depends on \( \theta \). Nevertheless, if we assume that \( v \) depends continuously on \( \theta \) and we operate in a bounded domain \( \Omega \), we can choose \( c \) small enough to serve all \( \theta \)-s of interest. For instance, we can choose

\[
0 < c < \min_{i_d} \frac{\Delta x_{(i_d)}}{2\Delta t} \max_{x \in \Omega, \theta \in \Theta} \left| v_{(i_d)}(x, \theta) \right|.
\]
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3.3. Finding the Stationary Distribution of a Markov Chain. From the previous section, we learned that $\rho(\theta)$ is the solution of

$$M(\theta)\rho = \rho, \quad \rho \cdot 1 = 1,$$

where

$$M(\theta) = I + cK_{\text{mat}}(\theta), \quad K_{\text{mat}}(\theta) = \sum_{id=1}^{d} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_{(id)}} K_{(id)}(\theta),$$

with $K_{(id)}(\theta)$ given in (3.1), and $c$ is chosen to satisfy (3.2). While the matrix, $M$, was built from a finite volume causal flow model, it was noted that this flux also approximates a discrete cell-to-cell transition probability for a point randomly sampled from the volume of one cell to its neighbor cells, which mirrors the propagator of a Markov chain as described in [35].

A priori we have that the off-diagonal entries of $M(\theta) = (I + cK_{\text{mat}}(\theta))$ are non-negative. Additionally, we know that $M(\theta)$ is column stochastic. Thus, by Gershgorin’s theorem [28] we have that the spectral radius of $M$ is not greater than one. On the other hand, we know $1 = [1, 1, \cdots, 1]^T$ is an eigenvector for $M^T$ which is a row-stochastic matrix, and so $\lambda = 1$ is an eigenvalue for both $M$ and $M^T$. The spectral radius of $M$ has to be equal to 1. Furthermore, by a limiting argument, we can show that the eigenspace of $M$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$ contains vectors with non-negative entries.

However, the dimension of this eigenspace may be bigger than one, which complicates our analysis. Thus, we regularize $M$ via the so-called teleportation trick, which is well-known from Google’s PageRank method [27]. That is, given a small positive constant $\epsilon$, we consider

$$M_{\epsilon}(\theta) = (1 - \epsilon)(I + cK_{\text{mat}}(\theta)) + \frac{\epsilon}{n} 1 1^T.$$

Note that the off-diagonal entries of $M_{\epsilon}$ are at least $\frac{\epsilon}{n} > 0$. The regularization also connects all cells, achieving similar regularizing effects by having a diffusion term. Moreover, $M_{\epsilon}$ is still column-stochastic. Based on the following Perron–Frobenius Theorem, the spectral radius of $M_{\epsilon}$ must be 1.

**Theorem 3.1 (Perron–Frobenius Theorem [40]).** If all entries of a Markov matrix $A$ are positive, then $A$ has a unique equilibrium: there is only one eigenvalue equal to 1. All other eigenvalues are strictly smaller than 1.

Consequently, the eigenspace $\{\rho : M_{\epsilon}(\theta)\rho = \rho\}$ is one-dimensional and has a generator with all positive entries. Hence, the equation

$$M_{\epsilon}(\theta)\rho = \rho, \quad \rho \cdot 1 = 1, \quad \rho > 0,$$

has a unique solution that converges to a solution of (3.3) as $\epsilon \to 0$. Numerically, the problem (3.5) can be solved by mature tools from numerical linear algebra such as the power method and the Richardson iteration [27].

4. Optimal Transport for Parameter Inference. Here, we discuss gradient evaluation of optimal transport-based costs with respect to the inference parameters. Assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact set, and $c : \Omega^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous cost function. The main goal of this section is to discuss the differentiability of the objective function

$$f(\theta) = T_c(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*), \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$
where \( \{\rho(\cdot, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \) is a family of parameter-dependent probability measures on \( \Omega \), and \( T_c \) is the optimal transport cost defined in (2.6). Throughout the paper, we assume that \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is compact, \( \rho^* \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \) is an arbitrary probability measure, and

A1. \( \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m \) is an open set, and \( \{\rho(\cdot, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \) is a family of absolutely continuous probability measures.

A2. For a.e. \( x \in \Omega \) the mapping \( \theta \mapsto \rho(x, \theta) \) is differentiable, and \( |\nabla \rho(x, \theta)| \leq \eta(x), \ \theta \in \Theta, \) for some \( \eta \in L^1(\Omega) \). Note that by slightly abusing the notation, we use the same notation for probability measures and their densities.

A3. \( c: \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is continuous and nonnegative. Occasionally, we need the following hypothesis.

A4. For a.e. \( x \in \Omega \) the mapping \( \theta \mapsto \rho(x, \theta) \) is locally semiconvex, and \( \nabla^2 \rho(x, \theta) \geq -h(x), \ \theta \in \Theta, \) for some \( h \in L^1(\Omega) \).

Proofs for results of this section can be found in Appendix A.

4.1. Preliminaries. First, we recall preliminary results from the optimal transportation (OT) theory that can be found in [56, 4, 49]. A key tool in OT is the Kantorovich duality [56, Theorem 1.3] that states

\[
T_c(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{(\phi, \psi) \in \Phi_c(\mu, \nu)} \int_\Omega \phi(x) d\mu(x) + \int_\Omega \psi(y) d\nu(y), \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega),
\]

where \( \Phi_c(\mu, \nu) \subset C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega) \) is the set of pairs \((\phi, \psi)\) such that \( \phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y) \) for all \((x, y) \in \Omega^2\). The maximizing pairs \((\phi, \psi)\) in (4.1) are called Kantorovich potentials. The \( c \)-transform of a function \( x \mapsto \phi(x) \) is defined as

\[
\phi^c(y) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} \{c(x, y) - \phi(x)\}.
\]

Similarly, the \( c \)-transform of a function \( y \mapsto \psi(y) \) is defined as

\[
\psi^c(x) = \inf_{y \in \Omega} \{c(x, y) - \psi(y)\}.
\]

A function \( x \mapsto \phi(x) \) (resp. \( y \mapsto \psi(y) \)) is called \( c \)-concave if there exists a function \( \psi \) (resp. \( \phi \)) such that \( \phi = \psi^c \) (resp. \( \psi = \phi^c \)).

Since \( \Omega \) is compact and \( c \) is continuous, we obtain that \( c \) is bounded. Thus, the set \( \Phi_c(\mu, \nu) \) in (4.1) can be further restricted to uniformly bounded pairs of conjugate \( c \)-concave functions; that is, pairs of \((\phi, \phi^c) \in \Phi_c(\mu, \nu)\), where \( \phi = \phi^c \), and \( 0 \leq \phi \leq \|c\|_{\infty}, -\|c\|_{\infty} \leq \phi^c \leq 0 \) [56, Remarks 1.12-13]. We denote this set by \( K_c \).

Since the modulus of continuity of \( \phi \) (resp. \( \psi \)) is bounded by that of \( c \) for all \( x \) (resp. \( y \)), \( K_c \) is uniformly equicontinuous, uniformly bounded, and, consequently, precompact in \( C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega) \) by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem [49, Section 1.2]. Additionally, since \( c \)-transform is continuous under the uniform convergence, \( K_c \) is compact in \( C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega) \), and the existence of Kantorovich potentials in \( K_c \) is guaranteed [49, Proposition 1.11].

4.2. The Differentiability of the Transport Cost in the Parameter Space. Here, we heavily rely on the Kantorovich duality (4.1) and the regularity theory of optimal value functions [11, Chapter 4]. Recall that \( f \) is directionally differentiable at \( \theta_0 \in \Theta \) if

\[
\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(\theta_0 + t\Delta \theta) - f(\theta_0)}{t} = f'(\theta_0, \Delta \theta)
\]
for all $\Delta \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ [11, Section 2.2]. Furthermore, if $\Delta \theta \mapsto f'(\theta_0, \Delta \theta)$ is linear, we say that $f$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\theta_0$ and denote by $\nabla f(\theta_0)$ the generator of this linear map.

Next, denote by $S(\theta) \subset K_e$ the set of Kantorovich potentials for the optimal transportation from $\rho^0$ to $\rho^*$. Furthermore, denote by $\Gamma$ and $\text{supp}(\cdot)$.

**Proposition 4.1.** Assume that $A1$-$A3$ hold.

(i) $f$ is everywhere directionally differentiable, and

\[(4.2) \quad f'(\theta_0, \Delta \theta) = \sup_{(\phi, \phi^*)} \int_\Omega \phi(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) \, dx \cdot \Delta \theta \]

for all $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, and $\Delta \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

(ii) $f$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ if and only if

\[(4.3) \quad \int_\Omega \phi_1(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) \, dx = \int_\Omega \phi_2(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) \, dx \]

for all $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in S(\theta_0)$. In this case, we have that

\[(4.4) \quad \nabla f(\theta_0) = \int_\Omega \phi(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) \, dx \]

for an arbitrary pair of Kantorovich potentials $(\phi, \psi) \in \Phi_e(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0), \rho^*)$.

The proof is in Appendix A.1.

**Theorem 4.2.** Assume that $A1$-$A3$ hold. Then $f$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, and $(4.4)$ holds a.e. Additionally, if $A4$ holds, then $f$ is locally semiconvex, and $(4.4)$ holds up to a set of Hausdorff dimension $d - 1$.

The proof can be found in Appendix A.2.

There is a natural degree of freedom for Kantorovich potentials given by the addition of constants; that is, $(\phi, \phi^*)$ is a pair of Kantorovich potentials if and only if $(\phi + \lambda, \phi^* - \lambda)$ is such for an arbitrary constant $\lambda$. As a corollary of Proposition 4.1 we obtain that the Gâteaux differentiability of $f$ is guaranteed if the addition of constants is the only degree of freedom for Kantorovich potentials.

**Corollary 4.3.** Assume that $A1$-$A3$ hold, and $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ is such that $\phi_2 - \phi_1$ is constant $\rho(\cdot, \theta_0)$ a.e. for all pairs of Kantorovich potentials $(\phi_1, \psi_1)$, $(\phi_2, \psi_2)$. Then $f$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\theta_0$, and $(4.4)$ holds.

In general, Kantorovich potentials are not unique up to constants. In what follows, we provide a sufficient condition for such uniqueness. Essentially, the optimal transportation should not amount to transportation between disjoint parts of $\text{supp}(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0))$ and $\text{supp}(\rho^*)$.

More formally, assume that $\rho, \rho^* \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ are such that $\text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho)) \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, denote by $\Gamma_0(\rho, \rho^*)$ the set of optimal transport plans; that is, minimizers
in (2.6). We have that
\begin{equation}
\text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho)) = \bigcup_k O_k,
\end{equation}
where $O_k$ are disjoint open and connected sets. Next, denote by
\begin{equation}
E_k = \text{cl}(\{y : (x, y) \in \text{supp}(\pi) \text{ for some } x \in \text{cl}(O_k), \pi \in \Gamma(\rho, \rho^*)\}).
\end{equation}
In other words, $E_k$ is the set where the mass from $\text{cl}(O_k)$ is transported to.

**Definition 4.4.** We say that $\text{cl}(O_k)$ and $\text{cl}(O_l)$ are linked in the optimal transportation from $\rho$ to $\rho^*$ with a transport cost $c$, if there exist $\{i_j\}_{j=1}^m$ such that $k = i_1, l = i_m$, and $E_{i_j} \cap E_{i_{j+1}} \neq \emptyset$, $1 \leq j \leq m$.

**Theorem 4.5.** Assume that $c \in C^1(\Omega^2)$, $\rho, \rho^* \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, and
\begin{equation}
\text{supp}(\rho) = \text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho))).
\end{equation}
Furthermore, suppose that $\{O_k\}$ and $\{E_k\}$ are defined as in (4.5) and (4.6), respectively. Assume that all $\{\text{cl}(O_k)\}$ are mutually linked. Then $\phi_2 - \phi_1$ is constant $\rho$-a.e. for all pairs of Kantorovich potentials $(\phi_1, \psi_1)$, $(\phi_2, \psi_2)$.

The proof is presented in Appendix A.3. Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.3 yield the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.6.** Assume that A1-A3 hold, and $\rho = \rho(\cdot, \theta_0)$ satisfies the hypotheses in Theorem 4.5. Then $f$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\theta_0$.

In particular, if $\rho(\cdot, \theta_0)$ is supported on a closure of an open connected set, then $f$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\theta_0$.

The following proposition illustrates the sharpness of Corollary 4.6. Incidentally, the same example illustrates that a smooth dependence on $\theta$ with respect to the flat $L^2$ metric does not guarantee smooth dependence on $\theta$ with respect to the Wasserstein metric.

**Proposition 4.7.** Assume that $\Omega = [0, 4]$ and $c(x, y) = |x - y|^p$ for some $p > 1$ (so that $T_c = W^p_p$). Consider
\begin{align*}
\rho(x, \theta) &= (0.5 + \theta) \chi_{[0,1]}(x) + (0.5 - \theta) \chi_{[2,3]}(x), \ |\theta| < 0.5, \\
\rho^*(y) &= 0.5\chi_{[1,2]}(y) + 0.5\chi_{[3,4]}(y),
\end{align*}
where $\chi_A$ is the characteristic function of set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then we have that
1. $\{\rho(\cdot, \theta)\}$ satisfies A1-A3.
2. $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$ is not absolutely continuous in $\mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$.
3. $\rho \mapsto W^p_p(\rho, \rho^*)$ is not Gâteaux differentiable at $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$ for all $|\theta| < 0.5$.
4. $[0, 1]$ and $[2, 3]$ are linked in the optimal transportation from $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$ to $\rho^*$ for all $|\theta| < 0.5$ except $\theta = 0$.
5. $\theta \mapsto W^p_p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*)$ is differentiable for all $|\theta| < 0.5$ except $\theta = 0$.

The proof can be found in Appendix A.4.

**4.3. Qualitative Error Analysis for the Gradient.** In this subsection, we prove that the almost-optimal solutions of Kantorovich’s dual problem would provide accurate approximations of $\nabla f$. 
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Proposition 4.8. Assume that A1-A3 hold, and \( f \) is Gâteaux differentiable at \( \theta_0 \in \Theta \). For every \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists a \( \delta > 0 \) such that for all \( (\phi, \psi) \in \Phi_c(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0), \rho^*) \) satisfying \( I(\phi, \psi, \theta_0) > f(\theta_0) - \delta \) one has that
\[
\left| \nabla_{\theta} f(\theta_0) - \int_{\Omega} \phi^c(x) \nabla_{\theta} \rho(x, \theta_0) dx \right| < \epsilon.
\]

The proof is presented in Appendix A.5.

Remark 4.9. Proposition 4.8 asserts that one needs to calculate \( c \)-transforms of suboptimal \( \phi \) for accurate gradients. This can be done very efficiently for costs of the form \( c(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} h_i(x_i - y_i) \), where \( h_i \) are even and strictly convex functions [33, Section 4.1]. For OT algorithms that produce \( c \)-concave iterates, such as in [33], no further considerations are necessary.

5. Gradient Calculation. Our parameter-dependent synthetic data obtained through the forward model is given by a finite-volume approximation
\[
\rho(x, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i(\theta) \frac{\chi_{C_i}(x)}{|C_i|},
\]
where \( n = n_x n_y n_z \) is the total grid size, each \( C_i \) is the finite volume cell, the parameter \( \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m \), and \( \rho(\theta) = (\rho_i(\theta))_{i=1}^{n} \) is the solution to (3.5) for some fixed \( c, \epsilon > 0 \). Furthermore, after discretization, our reference data is given by
\[
\rho^*(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i^* \frac{\chi_{C_i}(y)}{|C_i|}.
\]
By slightly abusing the notation we denote by \( \rho^* = (\rho_i^*)_{i=1}^{n} \). Our goal is to solve
\[
\min_{\theta} f(\theta) = T_c(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*)
\]
by gradient-based algorithms, where \( T_c \) is the optimal transport cost defined in (2.6).

To apply Corollary 4.6, which will guarantee the differentiability of \( f \), we need to verify A2 for (5.1) and that the connected components of \( \text{supp } \rho(\cdot, \theta) \) are linked according to Definition 4.4. Since in all our experiments in Section 6, \( \text{supp } \rho(\cdot, \theta) = \bigcup_{i: \rho_i(\theta) > 0} C_i \) is connected, the latter condition is satisfied. Therefore, we just need to verify A2, which is equivalent to the differentiability of \( \theta \mapsto \rho(\theta) \). This verification is part of Subsection 5.1.

Once all assumptions are verified, we have that
\[
\nabla_{\theta} \rho(x, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_{\theta} \rho_i(\theta) \frac{\chi_{C_i}(x)}{|C_i|}.
\]

Therefore,
\[
\nabla f(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_{\theta} \rho_i(\theta) \phi_i(\theta), \quad \text{where } \phi_i(\theta) = \frac{\int_{C_i} \phi(x, \theta) dx}{|C_i|}.
\]
Here, \( \phi(\cdot, \theta) \) is a Kantorovich potential for an OT from \( \rho(\cdot, \theta) \) to \( \rho^* \). Kantorovich potentials can be calculated by one of many available OT solvers such as [33, 24]. Hence, we focus on calculating \( \nabla_{\theta} \rho_i(\theta) \).
5.1. Gradient Descent via Implicit Function Theorem. First, we verify \(\text{A2}\); that is, the differentiability of \(\theta \mapsto \rho(\theta)\).

**Lemma 5.1.** Assume that \(\theta \mapsto A(\theta), \theta \in \Theta\) is a \(C^1\) matrix valued function such that \(A(\theta)\) is column stochastic with strictly positive entries for all \(\theta \in \Theta\). Then the system of equations

\[
\begin{align*}
A(\theta)\rho &= \rho, \quad \rho \cdot 1 = 1, \\
(A(\theta) - I)\zeta_k &= -\partial \rho_k A(\theta)\rho(\theta), \\
\zeta_k \cdot 1 &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

has a unique solution \(\rho = \rho(\theta)\) for all \(\theta \in \Theta\). Moreover, \(\theta \mapsto \rho(\theta)\) is continuously differentiable with \(\zeta_k(\theta) = \partial \rho_k(\theta)\) being the unique solution of

\[
\zeta_k \cdot 1 = 0
\]

where \(\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \cdots, \theta_m)\).

**Proof.** The existence and uniqueness of \(\rho(\theta)\) is a consequence of the Perron–Frobenius Theorem as explained in Subsection 3.3. Denote by \(B(\theta)\) the matrix obtained from \(A(\theta) - I\) by adding a \((n + 1)\)-st row vector \(1^T\). Then we have that \(\ker(B(\theta)) = \{0\}\), and so \(\ker(B(\theta)) = n\), and \(n\) rows of \(B(\theta)\) are linearly independent. Moreover, since \(\ker(A(\theta) - I) = \text{span}\{\rho(\theta)\}\), we have that \(\text{rank}(A(\theta) - I) = n - 1\). Thus, the first \(n\) rows of \(B(\theta)\) are linearly dependent, and any list of \(n\) independent rows must contain the last row \(1^T\). Since \(\theta \mapsto A(\theta)\) is continuous, linearly independent vectors stay so in a neighborhood of each \(\theta\). Hence, we fix \(\theta\) and without loss of generality assume that the rows of \(B(\theta)\) from 2 to \(n + 1\) are linearly independent in a neighborhood of \(\theta\).

Denote by

\[
F(\theta, \rho) = \widetilde{B(\theta)}\rho - e_n,
\]

where \(\widetilde{B(\theta)}\) is the matrix obtained from \(B(\theta)\) by dropping the first row and \(e_n\) is the \(n\)-th standard basis vector. Then we have that \(\rho(\theta)\) is the unique solution of \(F(\theta, \rho) = 0\), and \(D\rho F(\theta, \rho) = \widetilde{B(\theta)}\) is non-degenerate. Thus, the Implicit Function Theorem applies and we obtain that \(\theta \mapsto \rho(\theta)\) is continuously differentiable. Therefore, we can differentiate (5.4) and obtain (5.5). Moreover, \(\ker(B(\theta)) = \{0\}\) yields that the solution of (5.5) is unique. \(\square\)

Applying Lemma 5.1 to \(A(\theta) = M_e(\theta)\) we obtain that the solution of (3.5) is differentiable and (5.3) holds. Thus, we can devise a gradient descent algorithm as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
M_e(\theta^l)\rho^l &= \rho^l, \quad \rho^l \cdot 1 = 1, \\
(M_e(\theta^l) - I)\zeta_k^l &= -\partial \rho_k M_e(\theta^l)\rho^l, \quad \zeta_k^l \cdot 1 = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m, \\
(\phi^l, \psi^l) &\in \text{argmax}_{\phi, \psi \leq (x_i, x_i)} [\phi \cdot \rho^l + \psi \cdot \rho^*], \\
\theta_{k+1}^l &= \theta_k^l - \tau^l \phi_k^l \cdot \zeta_k^l, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\tau^l > 0\) is a proper step size to for the gradient descent algorithm.
5.2. Gradient Descent via Adjoint Method. Here we discuss an alternative approach to calculate the gradient (5.3) via the adjoint-state method.

**Lemma 5.2.** Assume that \( \theta \mapsto A(\theta) \) satisfies the hypotheses in Lemma 5.1, \( \rho(\theta) \) is the solution of (5.4), and \( \phi \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is an arbitrary vector. Then the linear system

\[
(A(\theta)^\top - I)\lambda = -\phi + \phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1}
\]

is consistent with a one-dimensional solution set. Moreover, for any solution \( \lambda \) one has that

\[
\partial_{\theta_k}(\phi \cdot \rho(\theta)) = \lambda \cdot \partial_{\theta_k}A(\theta)\rho(\theta).
\]

**Proof.** Since \( \text{im}(A(\theta)^\top - I) = \ker(A(\theta) - I)^\perp \), we have to show that

\[
-\phi + \phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1} \in \ker(A(\theta) - I)^\perp = \text{span}\{\rho(\theta)\}^\perp.
\]

A simple calculation yields the result:

\[
(-\phi + \phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1}) \cdot \rho(\theta) = -\phi \cdot \rho(\theta) + \phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1} \cdot \rho(\theta) = 0.
\]

Furthermore, since \( \ker(A(\theta)^\top - I) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\} \), the solution set of (5.7) is a one-dimensional coset of \( \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\} \).

Finally, assume that \( \lambda \) is an arbitrary solution of (5.7). Then applying (5.5) we obtain that

\[
\partial_{\theta_k}(\phi \cdot \rho(\theta)) = \phi \cdot \zeta_k = (\phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1} - (A(\theta)^\top - I)\lambda) \cdot \zeta_k = \phi \cdot \rho(\theta) \mathbf{1} \cdot \zeta_k - \lambda \cdot (A(\theta) - \mathbf{1})\zeta_k = \lambda \cdot \partial_{\theta_k}A(\theta)\rho(\theta)
\]

\[
\square
\]

Applying Lemma 5.2 to \( A(\theta) = M(\theta) \), we obtain an alternative, but equivalent, gradient descent algorithm:

\[
\begin{align*}
M(\theta^l)\rho^l &= \rho^l, \quad \rho^l \cdot \mathbf{1} = 1, \\
(\phi^l, \psi^l) &\in \text{argmax}_{\phi^0 + \psi^0 \leq c(x_i, x_j)} [\phi^l \cdot \rho^l + \psi^l \cdot \rho^*], \\
(M(\theta^l)^\top - I)\lambda^l &= -\phi^l + \phi^l \cdot \rho^l \mathbf{1}, \quad \lambda^l \cdot \mathbf{1} = 0, \\
\theta^l_{k+1} &= \theta^l_k - \tau^l \lambda^l \cdot \partial_{\theta_k}M(\theta^l)\rho^l, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.
\end{align*}
\]

(5.8)

Here, \( \tau^l > 0 \) is a chosen step size to guarantee enough decrease in the objective function. Note that we add a condition \( \lambda^l \cdot \mathbf{1} \) to ensure the uniqueness of \( \lambda^l \).

We present a numerical scheme for efficiently solving systems of equations (5.6) and (5.8) in Appendix B.1.

5.3. The Gradient of the \( M_\epsilon(\theta) \). For both algorithms (5.6) and (5.8) we need to evaluate \( \partial_{\theta_q}M_\epsilon(\theta) \). Denote by \( H(x) = e^x \) the Heaviside function. We then have

\[
\partial_{\theta_q} v^+ = H(v)\partial_{\theta_q} v, \quad \partial_{\theta_q} v^- = (1 - H(v))\partial_{\theta_q} v.
\]

We can also consider smoothed versions of \( H \) such as

\[
H_k(x) = \frac{d}{dx}k \log(1 + e^x) = \frac{e^x}{1 + e^x}.
\]
It is not hard to show that $H_k$ is smooth and $\lim_{k \to 0^+} H_k(x) = H(x)$. Based on (3.4), we derive that
\[
\partial_\theta M_c = (1 - c) \cdot \partial_\theta K_{\text{mat}} = (1 - c) \cdot \sum_{i_d=1}^{d} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x(i_d)} \partial_\theta K(i_d)(\theta)
\]
where each matrix $\partial_\theta K(i_d)(\theta)$ has three nonzero diagonals for each pair of $(i, i_d)$ where $1 \leq i \leq m$, $1 \leq i_d \leq d$, while the offsets of the diagonals depend on $i_d$, as we have discussed earlier regarding (3.1). We emphasize that $\partial_\theta K(i_d)(\theta)$ shares the same tridiagonal structure with $K(i_d)(\theta)$ for each $i_d$ as illustrated below.

\[
\partial_\theta K(i_d)(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix}
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & - (1 - H_k(v_{i_d} - \frac{1}{2})) & \partial_\theta v_{i_d - \frac{1}{2}} & & & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & \vdots & \vdots & 0 & 0 & \vdots \\
H_k(v_{i_d} + \frac{1}{2}) & \partial_\theta v_{i_d + \frac{1}{2}} & & & & \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

One can also compute $\partial_\theta K(i_d)(\theta)$ through automatic differentiation; see Appendix B.2 for details of implementation and performance comparison.

6. Numerical Results. In this section, we show several numerical results on dynamical system parameter identification, following the methodology described in the earlier sections. The forward problem is to solve for the steady state of the corresponding Eulerian dynamics (2.3) rather than the Lagrangian dynamic (2.1). The objective function that compares the observed and the synthetic invariant measures is the quadratic Wasserstein metric ($W_2^2$) from optimal transportation. The optimization algorithm implemented for all inversion tests is the gradient descent method with backtracking line search to control the step size [43].

6.1. Classic Chaotic Systems. We test our proposed method on three classic chaotic systems: the Lorenz system, the Rössler system, and the Chen system. The true parameters are selected such that the dynamical systems exhibit chaotic behaviors; see the illustration through the time trajectories in Figure 1.

6.1.1. Lorenz System. Consider the following Lorenz system.

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= \sigma(y - x), \\
\dot{y} &= x(\rho - z) - y, \\
\dot{z} &= xy - \beta z.
\end{aligned}
\] (6.1)

The equations form a simplified mathematical model for atmospheric convection, where $x, y, z$ denote variables proportional to convective intensity, horizontal and vertical temperature differences. The parameters $\sigma, \beta, \rho$ are proportional to the Prandtl
number, Rayleigh number, and a geometric factor. The true parameter values that we will try to infer are $\sigma = 10$, $\beta = 8/3$, $\rho = 28$. These are well-known parameter values for which Lorenz system shows a chaotic behaviour.

6.1.2. Rössler System. Consider the following Rössler System.

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= -y - z, \\
\dot{y} &= x + ay, \\
\dot{z} &= b + z(x - c).
\end{align*}$$

Here $x, y, z$ denote variables, while $a, b, c$ are the parameters we want to infer. The system exhibits continuous-time chaos and is described by the above three coupled ODEs. The Rössler attractor behaves similarly to the Lorenz attractor, but it is easier to analyze qualitatively since it generates a chaotic attractor having a single lobe rather than two. The true parameters that we try to infer are $a = 0.1$, $b = 0.1$, $c = 14$.

6.1.3. Chen System. Consider the following Chen System [14].

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= a(y - x), \\
\dot{y} &= (c - a)x - xz + cy, \\
\dot{z} &= xy - bz.
\end{align*}$$

Again, $x, y, z$ are variables and $a, b, c$ are parameters we will infer. The system has a double-scroll chaotic attractor, which is often observed from a physical, electronic chaotic circuit. The true parameters that we will infer are $a = 40$, $b = 3$, $c = 28$.

6.1.4. Stochastically Forced Dynamics. Random events occur in the physical world. Thus, taking stochastic effects into account is instrumental for the development of mathematical models of complex phenomena. Dynamical systems in the form of differential equations contain randomness in many ways.

We first consider the additive noise $\gamma$ that is extrinsic to the modeling of the dynamical system. This particular noise assumption assumes that the observation of the time trajectory suffers from noise instead of its governing dynamics. That is,

$$x_\gamma = x + \gamma, \quad \text{where} \quad \dot{x} = f(x).$$

The scenario may occur from measurement noise.
We characterize another type of randomness: additive noise $\omega$ that is space-independent but intrinsic to the modeling of the dynamical system, where the noise occurs on the right-hand side of the Lagrangian dynamic formulation as the following.

$$\dot{x} = f(x) + \omega.$$ 

The scenario of suffering from intrinsic noise occurs when we do not have an accurate model of the dynamical system. It can be seen as a type of model discrepancy.

### 6.2. The Invariant Measures.

The invariant measure is one significant statistical quantity that describes the Eulerian specification of the same dynamics [3], which we have discussed in detail in Subsection 2.2.2. Here, we follow the numerical scheme described in Subsection 3.3 and calculate the invariant measure, represented by the corresponding probability density function (PDF), for the three dynamical systems at the given sets of parameters.

We compare PDFs obtained through the steady-state solution to (2.3) with the histogram accumulated from long-time trajectories from Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS). That is, we solve systems (6.1)–(6.3) forward in time using the explicit Euler scheme with time step $\Delta t$ from $t = 0$ to its final time $t = T$. We then compute the physical invariant measure following (2.2). Moreover, we use time trajectories that are enforced with either the intrinsic or the extrinsic noises, as detailed in Subsection 6.1.4.

#### 6.2.1. Numerical Illustrations.

Comparisons for the Lorenz system (6.1) are displayed in Figure 2. The three plots in the top row show the $x$–$y$, $x$–$z$, and $y$–$z$ projections of the dominant eigenvector of the Markov matrix $M_\epsilon$. The grid size for the finite volume discretization of (2.3) is $93 \times 153 \times 143$. The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. In the second row, we see the corresponding three projections of the physical invariant measure from noise-free time trajectory for total time $T = 2 \times 10^6$. The third row and the bottom row show three projections of the physical invariant measure from time trajectories of the same total time $T$ but with intrinsic noise $\omega \sim N(0, I)$ and extrinsic noise $\gamma \sim N(0, I)$, respectively. The bin size for all three histograms is a cube of volume $0.5^3$.

Similar plots for the Rössler system (6.2) are presented in Figure 3. Top row shows the steady-state solution to (2.3) computed on a grid size is $94 \times 87 \times 106$. The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. For the bottom row, the Rössler system time trajectory runs for a total time $T = 1 \times 10^6$ with an intrinsic noise $\omega \sim N(0, 0.2I)$. The bin size for the histogram is a cube of volume $0.6^3$.

Figure 4 shows the comparisons for the Chen system (6.3). The first row displays the three projections of the steady-state solution to (2.3) on a $104 \times 104 \times 69$ grid. The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. The bottom row shows the projections of the physical invariant measure accumulated from time trajectory with intrinsic noise for a total time $T = 5 \times 10^5$. The bin size for the histogram is a cube of volume $0.5^3$. The intrinsic noise $\omega \sim N(0, 0.2I)$.

#### 6.2.2. Discussions.

It is important to understand the fundamental limitations and challenges of converging the low-order solver for (2.3), particularly the role that the addition of the extrinsic and intrinsic noises play here as an approximation of the diffusive errors expected in the PDE solver.

After the ODE is solved, the extrinsic noise applied to the trajectory corresponds to an effective Gaussian blur of the DNS results. In the limit of long time DNS simulation, the true density is the result of taking every point on the invariant measure, represented by a delta function in state space based on the DNS solution, and then...
replacing it with a Gaussian ball of equal integral mass with width defined by the standard deviation of the noise. This process is equivalent to the Gaussian blur common in image processing.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig2.png}
\caption{Lorenz system. Top row: the steady state on the grid size $93 \times 153 \times 143$ by solving (2.3). The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. Second row: projections of physical invariant measure from noise-free time trajectory for $T = 2 \times 10^6$. Third row: projections of physical invariant measure from time trajectory with \textit{intrinsic} noise $\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. Last row: projections of physical invariant measure from time trajectory with \textit{extrinsic} noise $\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$.}
\end{figure}

The \textit{intrinsic} noise case is more complicated, which corresponds to transforming the perfectly causal dynamical system into an underdamped Langevin equation with
Fig. 3: Rössler system. Top row: the steady-state solution to (2.3) on the grid size $94 \times 87 \times 106$. The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. Bottom row: the histogram accumulated from Rössler system time trajectory for total time $T = 1 \times 10^6$ with intrinsic noise $\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.2I)$.

Fig. 4: Chen system. Top row: the steady-state solution to (2.3) on the grid size $125 \times 125 \times 83$. The teleportation parameter is $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. Bottom row: the histogram accumulated from Chen system time trajectory with $T = 5 \times 10^5$ and intrinsic noise $\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.2I)$. 
Fig. 5: The $W_2$ metric and the $L^2$ difference between the PDF accumulated from DNS with bin volume $(\Delta x)^3$ and the PDF solved as the steady-state solution to (2.3) with spatial spacing $\Delta x$. The PDFs are for the Lorenz system at the true parameters.

finite non-zero temperature. Since the three examples we have all admit non-trivial basins of attraction, the accumulation of energy resulting from the addition of noise is balanced by the dissipation inherent to the dynamics for directions that are orthogonal to the attractor manifold. While the *extrinsic* noise corresponds to a spatially uniform low pass filter, the blurring resulting from the *intrinsic* noise depends more on the local stability of the attractor in state space. This is particularly highlighted by the retention of the empty “eye” region in Figure 2c when compared to Figure 2d.

While of a form dominated by diffusion, numerical errors of the PDE solver have a dependence on the flow velocity $\propto v^2 \Delta t$, as described in [9]. This is the well-known numerical diffusion that motivates running CFD solvers with a Courant-Friedrich-Lewy condition (CFL) number as close to 1 as possible for low-order methods to minimize the numerical diffusivity. While in this work, we seek a steady-state solution, the time step of the forward operator has effectively been selected to comply with this CFL restriction in the act of ensuring that the forward operator is at least positive semi-definite in (3.2). Substituting the CFL restriction, $\Delta t = \Delta x/v_{max}$, into the expression for the numerical diffusivity, it can be seen that numerical diffusion in the PDE solver is effectively $\propto v^2 \Delta x/v_{max}$, which is bounded by $v_{max} \Delta x$, suggesting first-order convergence with $\Delta x$ if $v_{max}$ is bounded. The linear convergence is also seen in Figure 5, where we compare the differences between the PDF accumulated from the Lorenz system DNS with again $T = 2 \times 10^6$ and the steady-state solution to (2.3), both evaluated at the true parameters for the Lorenz system. The histogram bin size changes as we use different $\Delta x$ in the finite volume discretization.

However, as a steady-state problem, the error due to this numerical diffusion, similar to the *intrinsic* noise added to the DNS solution, accumulates until balanced by the dissipation of the attractor dynamics is balanced. This, too, depends on how dissipative the basin is.

6.3. Parameter Inference. One main goal of this work is to perform parameter identification using the invariant measure, a macroscopic statistical quantity, as the data, rather than inferring the parameter directly through the time trajectories. All steady-state distributions in this section are solved on a mesh with spacing $\Delta x = 3$.

6.3.1. Single Parameter Inference. We first focus on the single-parameter reconstruction by assuming that the other parameters in the dynamical systems are accurately known. Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8a show single-parameter inversions for the Rössler, Chen, and Lorenz systems, respectively. All experiments use the squared $W_2$ metric as the objective function; see (5.2). One can see that both the
objective function that measures the data mismatch and the relative error of the reconstructed parameters decay to zero rapidly.

We remark that in these tests, the target invariant measure (our reference data) is simulated as the steady-state solution to (2.3) at the true parameters, using the same PDE solver that produces the synthetic data. Later, to mimic the realistic scenarios, we will show numerical inversion tests where the reference data directly comes from time trajectories and thus contains both noise and model discrepancy.

6.3.2. Multi-Parameter Inference via Coordinate Gradient Descent.

For numerical tests we consider here, all dynamical systems have three parameters, while our observation is the invariant measure \( \rho(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \). Under certain assumptions for the continuous dependency on the parameters, the first-order variation gives

\[
\delta \rho = \rho_{\theta_1} \delta \theta_1 + \rho_{\theta_2} \delta \theta_2 + \rho_{\theta_3} \delta \theta_3,
\]

which discloses the issue of multi-parameter inversion. In the forward problem, a small perturbation in each parameter causes a corresponding perturbation in the data \( \rho \), but in the inverse problem, the observed misfit in \( \rho \) could be contributed from any of the parameters, causing nonzero and possibly wrong gradient updates.

Numerical strategies exist to reduce the inter-parameter trade-off. One may mitigate the inter-parameter dependency either from the formulation of the optimization problem or through the optimization algorithm. Here, we take the second pathway: separate the parameters in the optimization algorithm by using the coordinate gradient descent by only updating one parameter at one iteration.

Figure 8b shows the Lorenz system multi-parameter inversion. We remark again that the reference data in these tests are produced by the same PDE solver that
Fig. 8: Top row: Lorenz system single-parameter inference starting with $\sigma = 5$ (left), $\rho = 10$ (middle), $\beta = 1$ (right), respectively. Bottom row: multi-parameter inference by updating three parameters simultaneously (bottom left) and using coordinate gradient descent (bottom right) with initial guess $(\sigma, \rho, \beta) = (5, 20, 1)$. The reference PDF is generated through the same numerical solver producing the synthetic PDF.

produces the synthetic data and thus contains no modeling discrepancy. The left plot in Figure 8b shows the convergence history of simultaneously updating all three parameters, but the iterates get stuck at an incorrect set of values with no feasible descent direction. On the other hand, the right plot shows the convergence result using coordinate gradient descent. The gradient descent algorithm quickly converges to the true value $(\sigma, \rho, \beta) = (10, 28, 8/3)$ starting from $(5, 20, 1)$. The different convergence behaviors of the two plots in Figure 8b demonstrate that the reconstruction process is affected by the inter-parameter interaction.

6.3.3. Parameter Inference for Chaotic Systems with Noise. In this work, we formulate an inverse problem into a nonlinear regression problem, usually subject to at least three sources of errors: model discrepancy, data noise, and optimization error. As discussed earlier, the almost perfect reconstructions in the previous section are achieved under the so-called “inverse crime” regime and thus are immune to the first two types of errors. Here, we set up tests to avoid the “inverse crime” regime. We first solve the Lorenz system (6.1) forward in time with a fixed time step $\Delta t$ from $t = 0$ to $T = 2 \times 10^6$, achieving the DNS solution. The reference data, i.e., the target estimated invariant measure, is obtained from the histogram that results from binning the DNS time trajectory into cubic boxes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, we also use time trajectories affected by intrinsic and extrinsic noises, as detailed in Subsection 6.1.4. The multi-parameter inversion with the extrinsic noise converges to $(\sigma, \rho, \beta) = (10.63, 28.82, 3.04)$, and the test with the intrinsic noise converges to $(10.58, 27.83, 2.97)$, while the true values are $(10, 28, 8/3)$. We compare the dynamics associated with these three sets of parameters and the initial parameter $(5, 20, 1)$ in Figure 9. Plots for the convergence history and more discussions are in Appendix C.

Earlier in Subsection 6.2.2, we have analyzed the numerical error between the
Fig. 9: Lorenz system DNS starting with $[1, 1, 1]^T$ and $T = 100$ with initial parameter (red); true parameter (green); reconstruction (blue) where reference data contains either intrinsic (left) or extrinsic (right) noise.

6.3.4. Discussions. We have presented several preliminary numerical results to illustrate the effectiveness and the feasibility of our proposed method. There are quite a few future directions that we wish to pursue to improve efficiency and accuracy.

Similar to all computational inverse problems solved as PDE-constrained optimization problems, the major bottleneck in memory and computational cost is solving the forward problem repetitively throughout the gradient- or Hessian-based optimization algorithms. It takes from a few hours to a few days on a single computer to produce the stationary distribution once on a fine grid as in Figure 2a, Figure 3a and Figure 4a, which is unrealistic for solving inverse problems. In the tests for parameter estimation, we use a much more coarse grid for the PDE solver, which gives us a much smaller Markov matrix so that it is feasible to compute the stationary distribution repetitively. The corresponding histograms of the time trajectory are also accumulated on the coarsened grid. It is essential to understand the error incurred in parameter estimation by producing the synthetic data on a coarsened grid. One may expect some balance between the computation time of solving the inverse problem and the error contributed by the numerical solver.
Besides a proper choice of the grid size, we only use a first-order finite volume discretization for (2.3) in this paper. It directly affects the resulting Markov matrix and the computed steady-state solution to (2.3). It also directly contributes to the model discrepancy, a major source of error in the parameter inversion, as discussed earlier. A more accurate discretization of (2.3), such as those including the corner transport and second-order terms [9, 37], could reduce the model discrepancy and mitigate the overfitting phenomenon. Beyond higher-order discretizations, exploring different approaches to exploit the inherent sparsity of the problem will be particularly advantageous or even necessary for higher-dimensional state spaces.

7. Conclusion. In this paper, we propose a data-driven approach for parameter estimation of chaotic dynamical systems. There are two significant contributions. First, we shift from the Lagrangian particle perspective of the dynamics to the Eulerian description of the state-space flow field. Instead of using pure time trajectories as the inference data, we treat statistics accumulated from the direct numerical simulation as the observable, whose continuous analog is the steady-state solution to (2.3). As a result, the original parameter identification problem is translated into a data-fitting, PDE-constrained optimization problem. We then use an upwind scheme based on the finite volume method to discretize and solve the forward problem. Second, we use the quadratic Wasserstein metric from optimal transportation as the data fidelity term measuring the difference between the synthetic and the reference datasets. We first provide a rigorous analysis of the differentiability regarding the Wasserstein-based parameter estimation and then derive two ways of calculating the Wasserstein gradient following the discretize-then-optimize approach. In particular, the adjoint approach is efficient as the computational cost of gradient evaluation is independent of the size of the unknown parameters. Finally, we show several numerical results to demonstrate the robustness of this novel approach for chaotic dynamical system parameter identification.
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Appendix A. Proofs from Section 4.


Proof. We fix \( \theta_0 \in \Theta \) and firstly prove that (i) implies (ii). Note that (4.3) follows immediately from (4.2). Furthermore, assume that \((\phi, \psi) \in \Phi_\epsilon(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0), \rho^*)\) is an arbitrary pair of Kantorovich potentials. Note that \((\phi, \psi)\) are not necessarily from
$S(\theta_0)$. Since $\int_{\Omega} \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx = 0$, we can add an arbitrary constant to $\phi$ and assume that $\sup \phi = ||c||_\infty$. In that case, we obtain that $(\phi^{cc}, \phi^c) \in S(\theta_0)$, and

$$\phi^{cc}(x) = \phi(x), \ x \in \text{supp}(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0)), \ \text{and} \ \phi^c(y) = \psi(y), \ y \in \text{supp}(\rho^*) .$$

Next, we have that $\text{supp}(\nabla_\theta \rho(\cdot, \theta_0)) \subset \text{supp}(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0))$. Therefore, we have that

$$\int_{\Omega} \phi(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx = \int_{\Omega} \phi^{cc}(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx,$$

and (4.4) follows from (4.2) and (4.3).

Next, we prove (i). We apply [11, Proposition 4.12] with $U = \Theta$, $X = C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega)$, $\Phi = \Theta$, and (4.4) follows from (4.2) and (4.3).

Finally, assume that $t_n \to 0^+$, $(\phi_n, \psi_n) \in K_c$, $\Delta \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $(\phi_n, \psi_n) \to (\phi, \psi) \in K_c$. Then by the dominated convergence theorem we have that

$$I(\phi, \psi, \Theta) = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) \rho(x, \theta_0) dx + \int_{\Omega} \psi(y) \rho^*(y) dy.$$

For $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ such that $[\theta_1, \theta_2] \subset \Theta$, we have that

$$|I(\phi_2, \psi_2, \theta_2) - I(\phi_1, \psi_1, \theta_1)| \leq ||\phi_2 - \phi_1||_\infty + ||\psi_2 - \psi_1||_\infty + ||\phi_1||_\infty ||\eta||_1 |	heta_2 - \theta_1|,$$

and so $I$ is continuous. Since $K_c$ is compact, the sup-compactness condition holds. Furthermore, A2 and the dominated convergence theorem yield the directional differentiability of $I(\phi, \psi, \cdot)$ with

$$I'(\phi, \psi, \theta_0, \Delta \theta) = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx \cdot \Delta \theta.$$

Thus, all conditions in [11, Proposition 4.12] are satisfied and (4.2) follows.

A.2. Proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof. Assume that A1-A3 hold. Then (A.1) yields that $\theta \mapsto I(\phi, \psi, \theta)$ is locally Lipschitz for all $(\phi, \psi) \in C(\Omega) \times C(\Omega)$. Invoking (4.1), we conclude that $f$ is locally Lipschitz and a.e. differentiable by Rademacher’s theorem [21, Section 3.1].

Next, assume that A4 also holds and denote by $C_0 = ||c||_\infty ||h||_1$. For arbitrary $(\phi, \phi^c) \in K_c$ we have that

$$I(\phi, \phi^c, \theta) + \frac{C_0|\theta|^2}{2} = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) \left( \rho(x, \theta) + \frac{h(x)|\theta|^2}{2} \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} \phi^c(y) \rho^*(y) dy$$

$$+ \left( ||c||_\infty ||h||_1 - \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) h(x) dx \right) \frac{|\theta|^2}{2} .$$
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Indeed, we have that
\[ (A.2) \]
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Since both } \psi_1 \text{ and } y \mapsto \rho(x, \theta) + \frac{\lambda(x)\theta^2}{2} \text{ is convex for a.e. } x, \text{ we obtain that } \\
\theta \mapsto I(\phi, \phi^c, \theta) + C_0|\theta|^2/2 \text{ is convex. Invoking Kantorovich duality again, we obtain that } \\
f(\theta) + C_0|\theta|^2/2 = \sup_{(\phi, \phi^c) \in K_c} I(\phi, \phi^c, \theta) + C_0|\theta|^2/2
\end{align*} \]
is convex. Thus, by a theorem of Anderson and Klee [2] \( f \) is differentiable up to a set of Hausdorff dimension \( d - 1 \).

A.3. Proof of Theorem 4.5.

Proof. Fix an arbitrary pair of Kantorovich potentials \((\phi_1, \psi_1), (\phi_2, \psi_2)\). Note that (4.7) guarantees that \( \text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho)) \neq \emptyset \), and \( \{O_k\}, \{E_k\} \) are well defined.

First, we prove that \( \phi_2 - \phi_1 \) is constant on \( \text{cl}(O_k) \) for all \( k \). Fix an optimal plan \( \pi_0 \in \Gamma_0(\rho, \rho^*) \). For all \( x \in \text{supp}(\rho) \) there exists \( y \in \Omega \) such that \( (x, y) \in \text{supp}(\pi_0) \). Therefore \( \phi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) = c(x, y) \), and so \( \phi_i(x) = \psi_i^c(x) \) for all \( x \in \text{supp}(\rho) \). Furthermore, since \( c \in C^1(\Omega^2) \) is locally Lipschitz continuous, \( \phi_i \) are locally Lipschitz continuous in \( O_k \). Thus, by Rademacher’s theorem we have that \( \phi_i \) are a.e. differentiable in \( O_k \), and by [49], Proposition 1.15 we obtain that \( \nabla \phi_2 = \nabla \phi_1 \) a.e. in \( O_k \). Since \( O_k \) are connected and \( \phi_i \) are continuous, we obtain that \( \phi_2 - \phi_1 = \lambda_k \) in \( \text{cl}(O_k) \) for some constants \( \lambda_k \).

Next, we show that \( \lambda_k = \lambda_l \) for all \( k, l \). We start with a claim that
\[ (A.2) \]
\[ \psi_i(y) = \inf_{x \in \text{cl}(O_k)} \{ c(x, y) - \phi_i(x) \}, \quad y \in E_k. \]

Indeed, we have that \( y = \lim_{n \to \infty} y_n \) where \( y_n \) are such that \( (x_n, y_n) \in \text{supp}(\pi_n) \) for some \( \pi_n \in \Gamma_0(\rho, \rho^*) \), and \( x_n \in \text{cl}(O_k) \). Therefore, for all \( n \) we have that \( \phi_i(x_n) + \psi_i(y_n) = c(x_n, y_n) \), and so
\[ \psi_i(y_n) = \inf_{x \in \text{cl}(O_k)} \{ c(x, y_n) - \phi_i(x) \}. \]

Since both \( \psi_i \) and \( y \mapsto \inf_{x \in \text{cl}(O_k)} \{ c(x, y) - \phi_i(x) \} \) are continuous, we deduce (A.2).

Next, \( \phi_2 - \phi_1 = \lambda_k \) in \( \text{cl}(O_k) \), and (A.2) yields that \( \psi_2 - \psi_1 = -\lambda_k \) in \( E_k \).

Now fix arbitrary \( k, l \). Since \( \text{cl}(O_k), \text{cl}(O_l) \) are linked, there exist \( \{i_j\}_{j=1}^m \) such that \( k = i_1, l = i_m \), and \( E_{i_j} \cap E_{i_{j+1}} \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq j \leq m \). Since \( \psi_2 - \psi_1 = -\lambda_{i_j} \) in \( E_{i_j} \), and \( \psi_2 - \psi_1 = -\lambda_{i_{j+1}} \) in \( E_{i_{j+1}} \), we obtain that \( \lambda_{i_{j+1}} = \lambda_{i_j} \) for all \( j \). Thus, \( \lambda_k = \lambda_l \) and, consequently, \( \phi_2 - \phi_1 = \lambda \) in \( \text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho)) = \bigcup_k O_k \). Finally, (4.7) and the continuity of \( \phi_i \) yield that \( \phi_2 - \phi_1 = \lambda \) in \( \text{supp}(\rho) \).


Proof. The proof is based on the following points.

1. We have that \( |\theta_0 \rho(x, \theta)| = |\chi_{[0, \theta_1]}(x) - \chi_{[\theta_1, 0]}(x)| \leq 1 \), for all \( x \in \Omega \).
2. Assume that \(-0.5 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < 0.5 \). In \( \mathbb{R} \), OT maps are precisely the order-preserving ones [56, Section 2.2]. The total mass of \([0, 1]\) with respect to \( \rho(\cdot, \theta_1) \) and \( \rho(\cdot, \theta_2) \) is \( 0.5 + \theta_1 \) and \( 0.5 + \theta_2 \), respectively. Since \( 0.5 + \theta_1 < 0.5 + \theta_2 \), all of the mass of \( \rho(\cdot, \theta_1) \) from \([0, 1]\) has to be transported to \([0, 1]\) with a linear transport map \( T(x) = \frac{0.5 + \theta_2}{0.5 + \theta_1} x \). Meanwhile, the excess mass of \( \rho(\cdot, \theta_2) \) in \([0, 1]\), supported on \( \left[ \frac{0.5 + \theta_2}{0.5 + \theta_1}, 1 \right] \), has to be transported from \([2, 3]\), and therefore has to travel a distance \( \geq 1 \). Since the excess mass of \( \rho(\cdot, \theta_2) \) in \([0, 1]\) is equal...
to 0.5 + \theta_2 - (0.5 + \theta_1) = \theta_2 - \theta_1, we obtain that the transport cost is at least $(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \cdot 1^\rho$. Thus,

$$W_p(\rho(\cdot, \theta_1), \rho(\cdot, \theta_2)) \geq |\theta_2 - \theta_1|^2,$$

which means that $\theta \mapsto \rho(\cdot, \theta)$ is not absolutely continuous with respect to $W_p$ metric.

3. Fix an arbitrary $|\theta| < 0.5$. We only use the fact that supp$(\rho(\cdot, \theta)) \subset [0, 4]$. Assume by contradiction that $\rho \mapsto W_p^p(\rho, \rho^*)$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$ in the sense of [49, Definition 7.12]; that is, there exists a measurable function $g$ such that

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta) + \epsilon(\tilde{\rho} - \rho(\cdot, \theta)), \rho^*)|_{\epsilon=0^+} = \int_0^4 g(x)(\tilde{\rho}(x) - \rho(x, \theta))dx$$

for all $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let $\phi \in C([0, 4])$ be an arbitrary Kantorovich potential. From [49, Proposition 7.17] we have that $\phi$ is in the subdifferential of $\rho \mapsto W_p^p(\rho, \rho^*)$ at $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$, and so

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta) + \epsilon(\tilde{\rho} - \rho(\cdot, \theta)), \rho^*)|_{\epsilon=0^+} \geq \int_0^4 \phi(x)(\tilde{\rho}(x) - \rho(x, \theta))dx$$

Combining this inequality with the preceding equality, we obtain

$$\int_0^4 (\phi(x) - g(x))\rho(x, \theta)dx \geq \int_0^4 (\phi(x) - g(x))\tilde{\rho}(x)dx$$

for all $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and Kantorovich potentials $\phi$. Fix an arbitrary potential $\phi_0$ and take $\tilde{\rho}(x) = \chi_{(1,2)}(x)$. Furthermore, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ consider

$$\phi_{\lambda}(x) = \phi_0(x) + \lambda(x - 1)(1 - x)\chi_{(1,2)}(x)$$

Note that $\phi_{\lambda}$ is continuous and $\phi_{\lambda} = \phi_0$ in supp$\rho(\cdot, \theta)$. Thus, if $(\phi_0, \psi_0)$ is a pair of Kantorovich potentials, then $(\phi_{\lambda}, \psi_0)$ is also a pair of Kantorovich potentials. Plugging in $\phi = \phi_{\lambda}$ in the inequality above we obtain

$$\int_0^4 (\phi_0(x) - g(x))\rho(x, \theta)dx \geq \int_1^2 (\phi_0(x) - g(x))dx + \lambda \int_1^2 (x - 1)(2 - x)dx$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, which is a contradiction.

4. For this and the following item, we need an explicit characterization of the OT map, $T_0$, from $\rho(\cdot, \theta)$ to $\rho^*$. For $\theta = 0$, we have that $\rho^*$ is a translation of $\rho(\cdot, 0)$. Thus, we have that

$$T_0(x) = x + 1, \quad W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, 0), \rho^*) = 1.$$
For $\theta < 0$ we have that $\rho([0, 1], \theta) = 0.5 + \theta < 0.5 = \rho^*([1, 2])$. Therefore,

(A.4) $T_\theta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{0.5+\theta}{0.5}x, & x \in [0, 1] \\ 1 + \frac{0.5-\theta}{0.5}x + \frac{0.5-\theta}{0.5}(x - 2), & x \in [2, 2 - \frac{\theta}{0.5-\theta}] \\ 3 + \frac{0.5+\theta}{0.5}(x - 2 + \frac{\theta}{0.5-\theta}), & x \in [2 - \frac{\theta}{0.5-\theta}, 3] \end{cases}$

For all $\theta$, the connected components of $\text{int}(\text{supp}(\rho(\cdot, \theta)))$ are $O_1 = (0, 1)$, $O_2 = (2, 3)$

Furthermore, using the definition (4.6) and invoking (A.3), (A.4) we obtain

$$E_1 = \begin{cases} [1, 2], & \theta = 0 \\ [1, 2] \cup [3, 3 + \frac{\theta}{0.5}], & \theta > 0 \\ [1, 1 + \frac{0.5+\theta}{0.5}], & \theta < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$E_2 = \begin{cases} [3, 4], & \theta = 0 \\ [3 + \frac{\theta}{0.5}, 4], & \theta > 0 \\ [1 + \frac{0.5+\theta}{0.5}, 2] \cup [3, 4], & \theta < 0 \end{cases}$$

Thus, we have that

$$E_1 \cap E_2 = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \theta = 0 \\ \{3 + \frac{\theta}{0.5}\}, & \theta > 0 \\ \{1 + \frac{0.5+\theta}{0.5}\}, & \theta < 0 \end{cases}$$

which means that $\text{cl}(O_1), \text{cl}(O_2)$ are linked for all $|\theta| < 0.5$ except $\theta = 0$.

5. The differentiability of $\theta \mapsto W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*)$ at $\theta \neq 0$ follows from Corollary 4.6, and Item 4 above.

Recall that $W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, 0), \rho^*) = 1$. Next, assume that $\theta > 0$. Then from (A.3) we have that

(A.5) $W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \int_{I_k} |T_\theta(x) - x|^p \rho(x, \theta) dx$,

where

$I_1 = [0, \frac{0.5}{0.5+\theta}], \quad I_2 = [\frac{0.5}{0.5+\theta}, 1], \quad I_3 = [2, 3]$.

For $x \in I_1 \cup I_3$ we use the elementary inequality

$$|T_\theta(x) - x|^p \geq 1 + p(T_\theta(x) - x - 1)$$

For $x \in I_2$, we have that

$$|T_\theta(x) - x|^p \geq 2^p$$

Plugging these inequalities in (A.5) and using (A.3) for evaluating elementary integrals, we obtain

$$W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) \geq 1 + (2^p + p - 1)\theta - p\theta^2, \quad 0 < \theta < 0.5,$$
and so
\[ \liminf_{\theta \to 0^+} \frac{W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) - W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, 0), \rho^*)}{\theta} \geq 2^p + p - 1 \]

For \( \theta < 0 \), we have that
\[ W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \int_{J_k} |T_\theta(x) - x|^p \rho(x, \theta) dx, \]

where
\[ J_1 = [0, 1], \quad J_2 = [2, 2 - \frac{\theta}{0.5 - \theta}], \quad J_3 = [2 - \frac{\theta}{0.5 - \theta}, 3]. \]

Furthermore,
\[ |T_\theta(x) - x|^p \geq 1 + p(T_\theta(x) - x - 1), \quad x \in J_1 \cup J_3, \]
\[ |T_\theta(x) - x|^p \geq 0, \quad x \in J_2. \]

Plugging these inequalities in (A.6), we obtain
\[ W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) \geq 1 + (p + 1)\theta + p\theta^2, \quad -0.5 < \theta < 0, \]

and so
\[ \limsup_{\theta \to 0^-} \frac{W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) - W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, 0), \rho^*)}{\theta} \leq p + 1. \]

Since \( 2^p + p - 1 > p + 1 \) for \( p > 1 \), we obtain that \( \theta \mapsto W_p^p(\rho(\cdot, \theta), \rho^*) \) is not differentiable at \( \theta = 0 \). \( \square \)


Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exist \((\phi_n, \psi_n) \in \Phi_c(\rho(\cdot, \theta_0), \rho^*)\) and \(\epsilon_0 > 0\) such that \(I(\phi_n, \psi_n) > f(\theta_0) - \frac{1}{n}\) and
\[ \left| \nabla_\theta f(\theta_0) - \int_\Omega \phi_n^{cc}(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx \right| \geq \epsilon_0. \]  

Note that by adding a suitable constant to \(\phi_n\), we can assume that \(\sup \phi_n = \|c\|_\infty\).

Thus, \((\phi_n^{cc}, \psi_n^{cc}) \in K_c\) and
\[ f(\theta_0) \geq I(\phi_n^{cc}, \psi_n^{cc}, \theta_0) \geq I(\phi_n, \psi_n, \theta_0) > f(\theta_0) - \frac{1}{n}. \]

Since \(K_c\) is compact, we have that \((\phi_n^{cc}, \psi_n^{cc}) \to (\phi, \phi^c) \in K_c\) at least through a subsequence. Thus,
\[ I(\phi, \phi^c, \theta_0) = \lim_{n \to \infty} I(\phi_n^{cc}, \psi_n^{cc}, \theta_0) = f(\theta_0), \]
and so \((\phi, \phi^c) \in S(\theta_0)\). Hence, from Proposition 4.1 we have that
\[ \left| \nabla_\theta f(\theta_0) - \int_\Omega \phi_n^{cc}(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx \right| = \int_\Omega \phi(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx - \int_\Omega \phi_n^{cc}(x) \nabla_\theta \rho(x, \theta_0) dx \leq \|\phi - \phi_n^{cc}\|_\infty \|\eta\|_1. \]
which contradicts to (A.7) and finishes the proof. □

Appendix B. Numerical schemes for computing the gradient.

B.1. Numerical Scheme for (5.6) and (5.8). Earlier in Subsection 3.3, we have discussed two numerical methods on how to solve the forward problem, which corresponds to the first equation in both (5.6) and (5.8), in order to obtain a stationary distribution that is parameter-dependent. Here, we briefly describe a relatively cheaper way to solve the dual or adjoint linear system showing up in the second equation of (5.6) and the third equation of (5.8).

Although with different right-hand sides, the second equation of (5.6) and the third equation of (5.8) share the same left-hand side matrix $M - I$. Thus, we consider the general linear system as below to solve for $\zeta$ given $b$ where

$$
(M_e - I) \zeta = b.
$$

Since $M_e$ is a regularized $M$ through the teleportation technique, we know that

$$
M_e - I = (1 - \epsilon)M - I + \frac{\epsilon}{n}11^T,
$$

where $1 = [1, 1, \ldots, 1]^T$. There are two observations. First, the solution $\zeta$ is not unique because the matrix $(M_e - I)$ has a null space with dimension one. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 as the eigenspace of $M_e$ corresponding to eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$ has dimension one. As a result, to avoid nonuniqueness of the solution, we restrict our solution to have zero sum. That is, $\zeta \cdot 1 = 0$. Second, the Markov matrix $M$ derived from the finite volume scheme has a sparse structure: a summation of several tridiagonal matrices. However, the regularized matrix $M_e$ is no longer equipped with the structure since a dense rank-one matrix $\frac{\epsilon}{n}11^T$ is added to $M$. It significantly increases the computational cost of solving the linear system if one directly uses LU factorization or inverts the dense matrix.

We will do the following small changes to tackle the nonuniqueness. We modify the first row of the left-hand side matrix $(M_e - I)$ to enforce that the solution will satisfy the mean-zero condition:

1. Replace the first row of $(1 - \epsilon)M - I$ by $[1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0]$. The resulting matrix is denoted as $\tilde{M}_e$.
2. Replace $\frac{\epsilon}{n}11^T$ by a rank-two matrix $UV$, $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$, and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times n}$, where

   $$
   U^T = \begin{bmatrix}
   \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \ldots & \frac{\epsilon}{n}
   \\
   1 & 0 & \ldots & 0
   \end{bmatrix},
   V = \begin{bmatrix}
   1 & 1 & \ldots & 1
   \\
   0 & 1 & \ldots & 1
   \end{bmatrix}.
   $$

   Therefore,

   $$
   UV = \begin{bmatrix}
   \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} + 1 & \frac{\epsilon}{n} + 1 & \ldots & \frac{\epsilon}{n} + 1
   \\
   \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \ldots & \frac{\epsilon}{n}
   \\
   \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots
   \\
   \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \frac{\epsilon}{n} & \ldots & \frac{\epsilon}{n}
   \end{bmatrix}
   = \frac{\epsilon}{n}11^T + \begin{bmatrix}
   0 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 \\
   0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0
   \end{bmatrix}.
   $$

Combining the above two steps, $\tilde{M}_e + UV$ is the same as the original left-hand side matrix $M_e - I$ except the first row is replaced by $[1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1]$. Correspondingly, we would replace the first entry in the right-hand vector $b$ by 0, denoting $\tilde{b}$. As a result,
the original system (B.1) is transformed into a slightly modified new system (by only allowing inaccuracies from the first row)

\[(\tilde{M}_e + UV)\zeta = \tilde{b}.\]

The above modification tackles the difficulty from the first observation. Next, we tackle the challenge from the second observation by separating the sparse components and the dense components of the left-hand matrix. Note that \(\tilde{M}_e\) is a sparse matrix, while \(UV\) is a dense matrix (but with rank 2!). In order to solve it efficiently, we apply the Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula [28]:

\[(\tilde{M}_e + UV)^{-1} = \tilde{M}_e^{-1} - \tilde{M}_e^{-1}U(I + V\tilde{M}_e^{-1}U)^{-1}V\tilde{M}_e^{-1}.\]

Therefore,

\[\zeta = y - Z(I + VZ)^{-1}Vy, \text{ where } Z = \tilde{M}_e^{-1}U, \ y = \tilde{M}_e^{-1}\tilde{b}.\]

The benefit of doing so is to invert only the nonsingular high-dimensional sparse matrix \(\tilde{M}_e\) and the invertible extremely low-dimensional 2-by-2 matrix \(I + VZ\) while avoiding inverting the high-dimensional dense matrix \(\tilde{M}_e + UV\) directly.

The other components in (5.6) and (5.8) are rather straightforward once we solve the forward problem and the dual or the adjoint linear systems.

B.2. Automatic Differentiation. In the previous sections, we explained how to directly compute \(\nabla_\theta K_{\text{mat}}(\theta)\) (or equivalently \(\nabla_\theta M_e(\theta)\)), which is necessary to calculate \(\nabla_\theta \rho(\theta)\). However, if the numerical scheme for the forward problem changes, the structure of \(K_{\text{mat}}(\theta)\) changes, and consequently, one has to re-derive the explicit form of \(\nabla_\theta K_{\text{mat}}(\theta)\). Such situations occur when using a higher-order finite volume method or switching to other standard numerical schemes such as the discontinuous Galerkin method. In order to make our code more flexible, we also implemented an automatic differentiation version using the Python library JAX [12].

Automatic differentiation techniques have been used since the 1990s for optimization, parameter identification, nonlinear equation solving, the numerical integration of differential equations, and combinations of these (see for example [43, 30]). However, it is only after the advent of high-speed computers and modern deep learning algorithms that automatic differentiation became extremely popular and largely used; automatic differentiation techniques made the computation of derivatives for functions defined by evaluation programs both easier and faster, especially for complicated functions with thousands of parameters like neural networks.

We compute the full Jacobian matrices of \(K_{\text{mat}}(\theta)\) using the `jacfwd` function. This uses forward-mode automatic differentiation, which is the most efficient choice when working, like in our case, with “tall” matrices. The improvement in flexibility, however, comes with a considerable increase in computational time: the computation by pre-calculated formulae of the derivative is roughly 3 times faster than the JAX computation; it also comes with a slight decrease in accuracy: on average, the difference between the derivative matrices computed by hand and with JAX is of the order of \(10^{-14}\). This is because the code that generates \(K_{\text{mat}}\) contains many element-wise manipulations, which results in a large computation graph for automatic differentiation. For this reason, it may be preferable when working with synthetic data to use the other two approaches. In Figure 10, We report the plot of the computational time needed to compute the derivative matrices by using pre-calculated formulae and using JAX for the Lorenz system as the grid resolution increases from 3 to 0.2.
Remark B.1. This approach is extremely valuable when working with real-world data despite the increase in computational time and the decrease in terms of accuracy. In many realistic situations, such as weather forecast, we do not have access to the underlying dynamical system, and thus we cannot compute $\nabla_\theta K_{mat}(\theta)$ directly. In future work, we plan on using neural networks to approximate the dynamical system from data. Given the large number of parameters and the complex functional form of a deep neural network, it would be impossible to derive $\nabla_\theta K_{mat}(\theta)$ explicitly, making the automatic differentiation approach necessary.

Appendix C. Convergence history of parameter inference with noisy time trajectories. Figure 11 and Figure 12 are the inversion results where the Lorenz time trajectory is polluted by intrinsic and extrinsic noises, respectively. The properties of the time trajectories that are affected by the intrinsic and extrinsic noises are the same as the ones in Figure 2. As one can see from all the single-parameter and multi-parameter inversions, it gets more challenging to achieve reconstruction with high accuracy than the previous noise-free cases. In particular, the over-fitting phenomenon occurs, which can be directly observed for $\beta$ in the single-parameter inversion (the top right plot in both figures) and the three-parameter joint inversion (the bottom plots). As the number of iterations increases, the reconstructed $\beta$ first reaches the actual value but immediately deviates away as the objective function keeps being minimized to fit the noise. The gradient-based iterative optimization algorithm reaches the local minima long before “successfully” minimizing the objective function to zero. It is the main reason we can obtain parameters that are not severely corrupted by noise and still within a small neighborhood of the true value.
Fig. 11: Top row: Lorenz system single-parameter inference starting with $\sigma = 5$ (left), $\rho = 10$ (middle), $\beta = 1$ (right), respectively. Bottom row: Multi-parameter inference using coordinate gradient descent with initial guess $(\sigma, \rho, \beta) = (5, 20, 1)$. The reference PDF is the accumulated histogram from the dynamical system time trajectory with intrinsic noise for a total time of $T = 2 \times 10^6$ at the true parameter $(10, 28, 8/3)$.

Fig. 12: Top row: Lorenz system single-parameter inference starting with $\sigma = 5$ (left), $\rho = 10$ (middle), $\beta = 1$ (right), respectively. Bottom row: Multi-parameter inference using coordinate gradient descent with initial guess $(\sigma, \rho, \beta) = (5, 20, 1)$. The reference PDF is the accumulated histogram from the dynamical system time trajectory with extrinsic noise for a total time of $T = 2 \times 10^6$ at the true parameter $(10, 28, 8/3)$. 