

Bayesian Inversion of Log-normal Eikonal Equations

Zhan Fei Yeo and Viet Ha Hoang

Division of Mathematical Sciences,
School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences,
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 637371

Abstract

We study the Bayesian inverse problem for inferring the log-normal slowness function of the eikonal equation given noisy observation data on its solution at a set of spatial points. We study approximation of the posterior probability measure by solving the truncated eikonal equation, which contains only a finite number of terms in the Karhunen-Loeve expansion of the slowness function, by the Fast Marching Method. The error of this approximation in the Hellinger metric is deduced in terms of the truncation level of the slowness and the grid size in the Fast Marching Method resolution. It is well known that the plain Markov Chain Monte Carlo procedure for sampling the posterior probability is highly expensive. We develop and justify the convergence of a Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo method. Using the heap sort procedure in solving the forward eikonal equation by the Fast Marching Method, our Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo method achieves a prescribed level of accuracy for approximating the posterior expectation of quantities of interest, requiring only an essentially optimal level of complexity. Numerical examples confirm the theoretical results.

Keywords— eikonal equation, fast marching method, Markov chain Monte Carlo, multilevel, lognormal coefficients, Gaussian prior, optimal convergence

1 Introduction

We consider the inverse problem to infer the slowness function of the eikonal equation given noisy observations on the solution. We follow the Bayesian approach with the Gaussian prior probability measure, where the slowness function is of the log-normal form. We infer the posterior probability which is the conditional probability of the slowness function given the noisy observations.

Eikonal equation plays an important role in areas such as seismic tomography. From observation information on the solution of the forward eikonal equation, which models the shortest travel time of a wave from a source, the inverse problem infers the slowness function. In Deckelnick et al. [4] and Dunbar and Elliott [6], the observation noise is assumed to be deterministic and the best fit approach, which finds the best candidate for the slowness function that minimizes the difference between the forward map and the observation data, is studied. Deckelnick et al. [4] assume that the slowness function is a linear expansion of known functions and find the coefficients of the expansion. While Dunbar and Elliott [6] assume a binary slowness. The Bayesian approach to inverse problems (see, e.g., Kaipio and Sommersalo [11], Stuart [13]) regards the observation noise as a random variable which follows a known distribution. The desired physical property (the slowness in our case) is assumed to belong to a prior probability space. The posterior probability is the solution of the inverse problem. While the deterministic approach may need regularization to be well-posed, Bayesian inverse problems always possess a unique solution as long as the forward observation map is measurable ([13]). For the eikonal equation, the Bayesian framework is employed in the context of a binary slowness function in Dunbar et al. [5] where the phase-field penalization and the level set approaches are studied. Chada et al. [2] employ the ensemble Kalman inversion approach with Tikhonov regularization.

In this paper, we consider the case where the slowness function is of the log-normal form, where its natural logarithm follows a Gaussian prior probability distribution, and depends on a countable number of normal random variables as in the Karhunen-Loeve expansion. We study approximation of the posterior probability measure by approximating the forward eikonal equation by the truncated forward problem where only a finite number of terms in the expansion of the slowness function is considered. Assuming a decaying rate for the sup norm of the coefficient functions of the expansion, an explicit error estimate in the Hellinger metric for the approximation of the posterior in terms of the finite number of chosen expansion terms is derived. We then approximate the posterior probability by solving the truncated eikonal equation by the Fast Marching Method (FMM). The error estimate for the approximation of the posterior obtained from the numerical solution of the truncated forward eikonal equation is deduced, which is the sum of the finitely truncated error of the slowness function and the error of the FMM. We utilize the $O(h^{1/2})$ convergence rate of the FMM with the mesh size h established in Deckelnick et al. [4]. However, as shown in [4], this error only holds when the discretization mesh is smaller than a threshold which is realization dependent and can get arbitrarily small in this case of the Gaussian prior. The dependence of this threshold on the realization needs to be carefully identified.

As analyzed in Hoang et al. [10] and Hoang et al. [8] in the context of linear elliptic forward equations, the plain Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling procedure, which solves a large number of realizations of the forward equation with equally high levels of accuracy, is highly expensive. This is also the case for the MCMC sampling procedure of the forward eikonal equation which is solved by the FMM. We develop in this paper the Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MLMCMC) method, which achieves an optimal convergence rate using the FMM with multi resolution levels. The method is based on the MLMCMC method developed for elliptic forward equations with log-normal coefficients in Hoang et al. [8], which is an essential modification of the method developed for the uniform prior case in Hoang et al. [10]. The error analysis relies on the analysis of the FMM in Deckelnick et al. [4], where it is necessary to quantify the realization dependence of the multiplying constant of the $O(h^{1/2})$ convergence rate and the upper limit of the mesh size h for this rate to hold. When the heap sort algorithm is employed in solving the forward eikonal equation by the FMM (see [12]), we show that the complexity of the MLMCMC is essentially optimal. Our numerical examples confirm the theoretically established convergence rate and complexity of the MLMCMC method.

The paper is organized as follows.

In the next section, we present the setting up of the Bayesian inverse problem with the Gaussian prior probability measure where the slowness function depends on a countable number of mutually independent normal random variables. We prove the existence and the well-posedness of the problem. Section 3 approximates the posterior probability measure by first truncating the slowness function taking into account only a finite number of normal random variables, and then by solving the resulting truncated forward eikonal equation by the FMM. We show the error estimate for the approximation in the Hellinger distance, which depends on the finite truncating level of the slowness function and the discretization mesh of the FMM. In Section 4, we develop the MLMCMC method for approximating the expectation of quantities of interest with respect to the posterior measure, with the forward eikonal equation being solved by the FMM. Derivation of the MLMCMC method is presented in Appendix B; and we justify the convergence rate in Appendix C. Numerical examples are presented in Section 5 which confirm the theoretical error estimates and complexity.

Throughout the paper, by c and C , we denote generic constants whose values can change between different appearances.

2 Bayesian inverse problem of the eikonal equation

2.1 Setting up of the problem

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz domain. Let (U, Θ, γ) be a probability space. We consider the eikonal equation with a random slowness function. Let the slowness function $s : \bar{\Omega} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be continuous with respect to $x \in \Omega$. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be the point source. We consider the eikonal equation under the Soner boundary condition

$$|\nabla T(x, u)| = s(x, u), \quad (2.1)$$

$$T(x_0, u) = 0,$$

$$\nabla T(x, u) \cdot n(x) \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where n is the outward unit normal vector. The boundary condition (2.2) prevents reflection from the boundary back into the domain. Formally, we consider the parametric slowness function of the form

$$s(x, u) := s_*(x) + \exp\left(\bar{s}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i \psi_i(x)\right), \quad (2.3)$$

where s_* , \bar{s} and ψ_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) belong to $L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The function $s_*(x)$ is assumed to be non-negative, i.e. the case where $s_*(x)$ is identically zero is possible, so the slowness function $s(x, u)$ can be arbitrarily close to 0 and arbitrarily large. We assume that the random variables u_i in (2.3) are mutually independent and are distributed according to the normal distribution $N(0, 1)$ for all i . We define $\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N} \ni u = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$. We make the following assumption on the functions ψ_i .

Assumption 2.1. *The functions ψ_i satisfies $\|\psi_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < ci^{-p}$ where $p > 1$, $c > 0$ are constants. In particular, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|\psi_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ is finite.*

For conciseness, we denote by $b_i = \|\psi_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. The space $U \subset \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$U := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i < \infty \right\}.$$

Equipping $\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ with the product σ -algebra $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ where $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{R} , we define in $\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ the probability measure ([1], [14])

$$\gamma = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{\infty} N(0, 1). \quad (2.4)$$

With Assumption 2.1, $\gamma(U) = 1$ (see, e.g., [14], [8]). We then define the σ -algebra Θ as the restriction of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ to U , and the prior measure on U as the restriction of the measure defined in (2.4) to U , still denoted as γ .

We consider the Bayesian inverse problem where noisy observations on the solution T of the eikonal equation (2.1) at a finite number of spatial points in $\bar{\Omega}$ are available. Let $\{x^i \in \bar{\Omega} : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ be the set of N sampling points. We consider the forward operator $G : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$

$$G(u) := (T(x^1, u), \dots, T(x^N, u)). \quad (2.5)$$

Let ϑ be a random noise which follows the Gaussian distribution $N(0, \Sigma)$ in \mathbb{R}^N where the $N \times N$ positive definite covariance matrix Σ is known. Given the noisy observation

$$\delta = G(u) + \vartheta$$

of the forward functional $G(u)$, our purpose is to determine the posterior probability $\gamma^\delta = P(u|\delta)$ on the measurable space (U, Θ) . Let the mismatch function be

$$\Phi(u, \delta) := \frac{1}{2} |\delta - G(u)|_\Sigma^2,$$

where $|\cdot|_\Sigma = |\Sigma^{-1/2} \cdot|$ with $|\cdot|$ denoting the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^N . We show in the next section that γ^δ is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior γ ; and that the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\gamma^\delta}{d\gamma}(u) \propto \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) \quad (2.6)$$

holds.

2.2 Existence and well-posedness of the Bayesian inverse problem

We first recall the variational formulation for the solution of the eikonal equation (2.1) ([4]). We denote by

$$\Xi_{x_0}(x) := \{\xi \in W^{1,\infty}([0, 1], \bar{\Omega}) \mid \xi(0) = x_0, \xi(1) = x\}. \quad (2.7)$$

The solution of the eikonal equation (2.1) is represented by

$$T(x, u) = \inf_{\xi \in \Xi_{x_0}(x)} \int_0^1 s(\xi(r), u) |\xi'(r)| dr. \quad (2.8)$$

We denote by

$$s_{\max}(u) = \text{esssup}_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} s_* + \exp\left(\text{esssup}_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \bar{s} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right),$$

and

$$s_{\min}(u) = \text{essinf}_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} s_* + \exp\left(\text{essinf}_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \bar{s} - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right).$$

For all $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$s_{\min}(u) \leq s(x, u) \leq s_{\max}(u).$$

We recall the following result on the Lipschitzness of the solution T of (2.1) (see [4]).

Proposition 2.2. *The solution T of the eikonal equation (2.1) is Lipschitz. The Lipschitz constant of T satisfies*

$$\text{Lip}(T) \leq c \text{esssup}_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} s(x), \quad (2.9)$$

where c depends only on the domain Ω .

We have the following bound for the minimizer of (2.8).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\xi \in \Xi_{x_0}(x)$ be a minimizer of (2.8). We have*

$$\int_0^1 |\xi'(r)| dr \leq c \exp\left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right), \quad (2.10)$$

where the constant c only depends on the domain Ω .

Proof.

From (2.9), as $T(x_0) = 0$ we have $T(x, u) \leq c s_{\max}(u)$. On the other hand, from (2.8)

$$s_{\min}(u) \int_0^1 |\xi'(r)| dr \leq T(x, u) \leq c s_{\max}(u).$$

Thus

$$\int_0^1 |\xi'(r)| dr \leq c s_{\max}(u) / s_{\min}(u).$$

The conclusion then follows. \square

We next show the existence of the solution of the Bayesian inverse problem.

Proposition 2.4. *The posterior probability γ^δ is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior probability γ . Further, the Radon-Nikodym derivative (2.6) holds.*

Proof.

From Theorem 2.1 in [3], it is sufficient to show that the forward map $G : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is measurable. Let $u, v \in U$. Let ξ_u and ξ_v be the minimizers of (2.8) for $s(\cdot, u)$ and $s(\cdot, v)$ respectively. We then have from (2.8), using the inequality $|\exp(a) - \exp(b)| \leq |a - b|(\exp(a) + \exp(b))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & T(x, u) - T(x, v) \\ & \leq \int_0^1 s(\xi_v(t), u) |\xi_v'(t)| - s(\xi_v(t), v) |\xi_v'(t)| dt \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \exp(\text{esssup} \bar{s}) \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (u_i - v_i) \psi_i(\xi_v(t)) \right| \left[\exp\left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} u_i \psi_i(\xi_v(t))\right) + \exp\left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} v_i \psi_i(\xi_v(t))\right) \right] |\xi_v'(t)| dt \\ & \leq c \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i - v_i| b_i \right) \left(\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right) + \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_i| b_i\right) \right) \int_0^1 |\xi_v'(t)| dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq c \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i - v_i| b_i \right) \left(\exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right) + \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_i| b_i \right) \right) \exp \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_i| b_i \right).$$

By the same procedure, we get a similar bound on $T(x, v) - T(x, u)$. Thus

$$|T(x, u) - T(x, v)| \leq c \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i - v_i| b_i \right) \left(\exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right) + \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_i| b_i \right) \right) \left(\exp \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right) + \exp \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_i| b_i \right) \right). \quad (2.11)$$

For $J \in \mathbb{N}$, for $u \in U$, we define

$$u^J := u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_J, 0, \dots).$$

We now show that for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $T^J(x, u) := T(x, u^J)$ is measurable as a map from U to \mathbb{R} . From (2.11), $T^J(x, \cdot)$ regarded as a map from \mathbb{R}^J to \mathbb{R} is continuous. For each $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, there is a set $X^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^J)$ such that the preimage $(T^J)^{-1}(X)$ is the set of $u \in U$ such that $u^J \in X^{-1}$ which is in the sigma algebra Θ . Thus T^J as a map from U to \mathbb{R} is measurable. From (2.11),

$$\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} |T^J(x, u) - T(x, u)| = 0.$$

Thus $T(x, \cdot)$ is the pointwise limit of a sequence of measurable function, and is thus measurable. Hence, the forward map G is measurable. We get the conclusion. \square

We now show that the Bayesian inversion is well-posed. The well-posedness proof below follows the proofs for similar results (see, e.g., [3], [8]). We recall the definition of the Hellinger distance

$$d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^\delta, \gamma^{\delta'})^2 := \frac{1}{2} \int_U \left(\sqrt{\frac{d\gamma^\delta}{d\gamma}} - \sqrt{\frac{d\gamma^{\delta'}}{d\gamma}} \right)^2 d\gamma. \quad (2.12)$$

Proposition 2.5. *For $|\delta| < r$ and $|\delta'| < r$, we have*

$$d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^\delta, \gamma^{\delta'}) < c(r) |\delta - \delta'|_\Sigma. \quad (2.13)$$

Proof.

First we show that the normalizing constant

$$Z(\delta) = \int_U \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) d\gamma(u)$$

in (2.6) is uniformly bounded from zero for all δ such that $|\delta| < r$. We note that

$$\Phi(u, \delta) \leq c(|\delta|_\Sigma^2 + |G(u)|_\Sigma^2).$$

As $T(x, u) \leq c s_{\max}(u)$,

$$|G(u)|_\Sigma \leq c \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right). \quad (2.14)$$

Using Lemma A.1, $\int_U |G(u)|_\Sigma^2 d\gamma(u)$ is finite. Thus

$$\int_U \Phi(u, \delta) \leq c(r)$$

when $|\delta| < r$. Let M be a sufficiently large constant. We note that

$$P(u \mid \Phi(u, \delta) \leq M) \geq 1 - \frac{C}{M},$$

so

$$Z(\delta) = \int_U \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) d\gamma(u) \geq \left(1 - \frac{C}{M} \right) \exp(-M).$$

Thus $Z(\delta)$ is uniformly bounded from 0 for all δ such that $|\delta| < r$. From (2.12)

$$2d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^\delta, \gamma^{\delta'})^2 \leq I_1 + I_2$$

where:

$$I_1 := \frac{2}{Z(\delta)} \int_U \left[\exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Phi(u, \delta) \right) - \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Phi(u, \delta') \right) \right]^2 d\gamma(u),$$

$$I_2 := 2 \left| Z(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z(\delta')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 \int_U \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta')) d\gamma(u).$$

Using the inequality $|\exp(-a) - \exp(-b)| \leq |a - b|$ for $a, b > 0$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta')\right) \right| &\leq c|\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma} |\delta + \delta' - 2G(u)|_{\Sigma} \\ &\leq c(r + |G(u)|_{\Sigma}) |\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \left| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta')\right) \right|^2 d\gamma(u) &\leq c|\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma}^2 \int_U (r + |G(u)|_{\Sigma})^2 d\gamma(u) \\ &\leq c(r) |\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As $Z(\delta)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 when $|\delta| < r$, $I_1 \leq c(r) |\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma}^2$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 = 2 \left| Z(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z(\delta')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 Z(\delta') &\leq 2 \max\{Z(\delta)^{-3}, Z(\delta')^{-3}\} |Z(\delta) - Z(\delta')|^2 Z(\delta') \\ &\leq c(r) |Z(\delta) - Z(\delta')|^2. \end{aligned}$$

With

$$|Z(\delta) - Z(\delta')| \leq \int_U |\exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta'))| d\gamma(u) \leq c(r) |\delta - \delta'|_{\Sigma},$$

we have $I_2 \leq c|\delta - \delta'|^2$. We then get the conclusion. \square

3 Approximation of the posterior probability measure

In this section, we approximate the posterior probability measure by first approximating the forward eikonal equation by the truncated problem which only takes into account the first J terms in the expansion (2.3) of the slowness function. We then consider the numerical approximation of the resulting truncated eikonal equation by the FMM.

3.1 The truncated problem

For $J \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the truncated slowness function

$$s^J(x, u) := s_*(x) + \exp\left(\bar{s}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^J u_i \psi_i(x)\right). \quad (3.1)$$

Let T^J be the unique viscosity solution to the truncated eikonal equation

$$|\nabla T^J(x, u)| = s^J(x, u) \text{ for } x \in \bar{\Omega} \quad (3.2)$$

with $T^J(x_0, u) = 0$ and the Soner boundary condition $\nabla T^J(x, u) \cdot n(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$. We define the truncated forward operator G^J as

$$G^J(u) := (T^J(x^1, u), \dots, T^J(x^N, u)), \quad (3.3)$$

where x^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are the sample points in (2.5). We define the truncated potential Φ^J as

$$\Phi^J(u, \delta) := \frac{1}{2} |\delta - G^J(u)|_{\Sigma}^2. \quad (3.4)$$

We define the approximated posterior probability corresponding to the truncated eikonal equation as

$$\frac{d\gamma^{J, \delta}}{d\gamma}(u) \propto \exp(-\Phi^J(u, \delta)). \quad (3.5)$$

From [4] Theorem 2.2, the solution T^J of the truncated eikonal equation (3.2) is Lipschitz. As $T^J(x_0) = 0$,

$$T^J(x) \leq c s_{\max}^J(u) \leq c \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right).$$

We thus have the following bound for the truncated forward map $G^J(u)$

$$|G^J(u)| \leq c \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right). \quad (3.6)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumption 2.1,*

$$d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{J,\delta}, \gamma^\delta) \leq C(r)J^{-q} \quad (3.7)$$

where $q = p - 1$.

Proof.

We use a similar procedure as in the proof of Proposition 2.5. We have

$$2d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{J,\delta}, \gamma^\delta) \leq I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \frac{2}{Z(\delta)} \int_U \left| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) \right|^2 d\gamma(u), \\ I_2 &:= 2 \left| Z(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z^J(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right| Z^J(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) \right|^2 &\leq c|2\delta - G(u) - G^J(u)|_\Sigma^2 |G^J(u) - G(u)|_\Sigma^2 \\ &\leq c(|\delta|_\Sigma^2 + |G(u)|_\Sigma^2 + |G^J(u)|_\Sigma^2) |G^J(u) - G(u)|_\Sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.11), we note that for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$

$$|T(x, u) - T^J(x, u)| \leq c \left(\sum_{i>J} |u_i| b_i \right) \exp\left(3 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right). \quad (3.8)$$

From (2.14) and (3.6), we have

$$\left| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) \right|^2 \leq c(\delta) \left(\sum_{i>J} |u_i| b_i \right)^2 \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right).$$

Thus

$$I_1 \leq cJ^{-2q}. \quad (3.9)$$

We show this inequality in Appendix A. For I_2 , we observe that

$$I_2 := 2 \left| Z(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z^J(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 \int_U \exp(-\Phi^J(u, \delta)) d\gamma(u) \leq 2 \left| Z(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z^J(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2.$$

From (3.6), $\int_U \Phi^J(u, \delta) d\gamma(u)$ is uniformly bounded for all J . The same proof as for bounding $Z(\delta)$ in the proof of Proposition 2.5 shows that $Z^J(\delta)$ is uniformly bounded below from 0 for all J . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq 2 \max\{Z(\delta)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, Z^J(\delta)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\} \left| Z(\delta) - Z^J(\delta) \right|^2 \\ &\leq C(\delta) \left| Z(\delta) - Z^J(\delta) \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| Z(\delta) - Z^J(\delta) \right|^2 &= \left| \int_U \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) d\gamma(u) - \int_U \exp(-\Phi^J(u, \delta)) d\gamma(u) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \int_U \left| \exp(-\Phi(u, \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^J(u, \delta)) \right|^2 d\gamma(u) \leq cJ^{-2q}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$2d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^\delta, \gamma^{J,\delta})^2 \leq C(r)J^{-2q}$$

□

3.2 Numerical approximation of the truncated forward equation by the FMM

We consider approximating the posterior probability measure by numerically approximating the truncated forward eikonal equation (3.2) by the FMM ([4], [12]). We assume further in this section that the domain Ω satisfies the following properties (see [4]): There is a continuous function $\eta \in C(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and a positive value $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $B_{\varepsilon\alpha}(x + \alpha\eta(x)) \subset \Omega$ for all $0 < \alpha < \varepsilon$ where $B_r(y)$ denotes the open ball centred at y with radius r .

We now describe the FMM for the eikonal equation. Let $h > 0$ denote the mesh size. Let $\Omega_h := \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ be the set of internal grid points. Let Γ_h be the set of points on $\partial\Omega$ of the form $x_\alpha + s\sigma e_k \in \partial\Omega$ where $s \in (0, 1]$,

e_k for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ is a unit vector in the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d , $x_\alpha \in \Omega_h$ and $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}$. We denote by $G_h = \Omega_h \cup \Gamma_h$. We consider the discrete eikonal equation : Find $T^{J,h} : G_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$T^{J,h}(x_0, u) = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\sum_{x_\beta \in N_\alpha} \left[\left(\frac{T^{J,h}(x_\alpha, u) - T^{J,h}(x_\beta, u)}{h_{\alpha\beta}} \right)^+ \right]^2 = s^J(x_\alpha, u)^2, \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$G_h \supseteq N_\alpha := \begin{cases} \{x_\beta \in G_h : x_\beta \text{ is a neighbour of } x_\alpha\} & \text{if } x_\alpha \in \Omega_h \\ \{x_\beta \in \Omega_h : x_\beta \text{ is a neighbour of } x_\alpha\} & \text{if } x_\alpha \in \Gamma_h; \end{cases}$$

and $h_{\alpha\beta} = |x_\alpha - x_\beta|$. We note the following result (see [4] Lemma 2.3)

Lemma 3.2. *Problem (3.11) with condition (3.10) has a unique solution which satisfies:*

$$\forall x_\alpha \in G_h, T^{J,h}(x_\alpha, u) \geq 0$$

and

$$\forall x_\alpha, x_\beta \in G_h, \left| T^{J,h}(x_\alpha, u) - T^{J,h}(x_\beta, u) \right| \leq c \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \{s^J(x, u)\} |x_\alpha - x_\beta|, \quad (3.12)$$

where the constant c only depends on the domain Ω .

The Fast Marching Method determines the solution $T^{J,h}(\cdot, u) : G_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The algorithm terminates in $\mathcal{O}(|G_h| \log |G_h|)$ operations when the heap sort procedure is employed (see [12]). To determine the convergence rate of the FMM, we assume that the functions in (2.3) satisfies $s_* \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, $\bar{s} \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $\psi_i \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $\bar{b}_i = \|\psi_i\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$. We assume further that

Assumption 3.3. *The functions ψ_i in (2.3) satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{b}_i < \infty$.*

The set of all u such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| \bar{b}_i$ is finite has γ measure 1. To simplify notation, from now on, we identify the prior space U with this set. Deckelnick et al. [4] show that for a fixed slowness function, the convergence rate of the FMM is $\mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$. Examining the proof of [4], we find that .

Proposition 3.4. *There is a constant c such that with*

$$C(u) := c \exp \left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (b_i + \bar{b}_i) |u_i| \right), \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$h_0(u) = \frac{1}{c} \exp \left(-c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (b_i + \bar{b}_i) |u_i| \right), \quad (3.14)$$

for all $u \in U$, if $h \in (0, h_0(u)]$, then

$$\max_{x_\alpha \in G_h} \left| T^J(x_\alpha, u) - T^{J,h}(x_\alpha, u) \right| \leq C(u) h^{1/2}. \quad (3.15)$$

We then define the approximated forward map

$$G^{J,h}(u) := (T^{J,h}(x^1, u), \dots, T^{J,h}(x^N, u)), \quad (3.16)$$

where x^i for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ are the sample points in (2.5), which, for simplicity, we assume to belong to G_h . The J^{th} term truncated, discrete Bayesian potential with mesh size h $\Phi^{J,h}$ is defined as

$$\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta) := \frac{1}{2} |\delta - G^{J,h}(u)|_{\Sigma}^2. \quad (3.17)$$

We define the approximated posterior probability $\gamma^{J,h,\delta}$ as

$$\frac{d\gamma^{J,h,\delta}}{d\gamma} \propto \exp \left(-\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta) \right), \quad (3.18)$$

where the normalizing constant is

$$Z^{J,h}(\delta) := \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta) \right) d\gamma(u). \quad (3.19)$$

From Lemma 3.2, we have $T^{J,h}(x_\alpha, u) \leq c \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} s^J(x, u)$, where the constant c only depends on the domain Ω . Thus

$$|G^{J,h}(u)|_{\Sigma} \leq c \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^J |u_i| b_i \right). \quad (3.20)$$

A proof similar to that for $Z(\delta)$ in Proposition 2.5 shows that $Z^{J,h}(\delta)$ is uniformly bounded below from 0.

Lemma 3.5. *We have the following estimate*

$$d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{J,h,\delta}, \gamma^{J,\delta}) \leq c(\delta)h^{1/2}. \quad (3.21)$$

Proof.

We have

$$2d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{J,h,\delta}, \gamma^{J,\delta})^2 \leq I_1 + I_2$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \frac{2}{Z^J(\delta)} \int_U \left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta)\right) \right]^2 d\gamma(u), \\ I_2 &:= 2 \left| Z^J(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - Z^{J,h}(\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 \int_U \exp\left(-\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta)\right) d\gamma(u). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta)\right) \right]^2 \leq c \left(2|\delta|_{\Sigma}^2 + |G^J(u)|_{\Sigma}^2 + |G^{J,h}(u)|_{\Sigma}^2 \right) |G^{J,h}(u) - G^J(u)|_{\Sigma}^2. \quad (3.22)$$

Fix a mesh size $h > 0$. Let

$$U' := \{u \in U : h \leq h_0(u)\}.$$

From Proposition 3.4, if $u \in U'$, then

$$|G^{J,h}(u) - G^J(u)|_{\Sigma} \leq c \max_{x_{\alpha} \in G_h} |T(x_{\alpha}, u) - T^{J,h}(x_{\alpha}, u)| \leq cC(u)h^{1/2}.$$

From Lemma A.1, this together with estimates (3.6), (3.20) and (3.22) give

$$\int_{U'} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta)\right) \right]^2 \leq ch.$$

From Lemma A.1, we have that

$$\int_U \frac{1}{h_0(u)} d\gamma(u) < \infty.$$

Thus there is a constant c such that $\gamma(U \setminus U') < ch$. As $\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(u, \delta)) \leq 1$ and $\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)) \leq 1$,

$$\int_{U \setminus U'} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^J(u, \delta)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi^{J,h}(u, \delta)\right) \right]^2 \leq ch.$$

Thus $I_1 \leq c(r)h$. Similarly, we have $I_2 \leq c(r)h$. Therefore,

$$2d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{J,h,\delta}, \gamma^{J,\delta})^2 \leq c(r)h.$$

This implies the final result. \square

From Lemmas 3.1 and 3.5, we have the following approximation

Theorem 3.6. *If $|\delta|_{\Sigma} < r$, then*

$$d_{\text{Hell.}}(\gamma^{\delta}, \gamma^{J,h,\delta}) \leq C(r)(J^{-q} + h^{1/2}) \quad (3.23)$$

where $C(r)$ is a constant depending on r .

4 Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo

We develop the multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MLMCMC) approach for sampling quantities of interest in this section. Let $x^* \in \Omega$. We approximate the posterior expectation of $T(x^*, u)$. For simplicity, we assume that x^* belongs to the approximating grid in the FMM. The method follows from that developed for elliptic equations with log-normal coefficients in Hoang et al. [8]. However, as the convergence rate of the FMM is $O(h^{1/2})$, the number of samples chosen for each resolution level to achieve an optimal convergence rate needs to be adjusted correspondingly. We summarize here the MLMCMC approach with the detailed derivation being presented in Appendix B and justification of the convergence rate in Appendix C.

For the mesh size $h = h_l = O(2^{-l})$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ in the FMM, to balance the different sources of errors in (3.23), we choose $J = J_l = \lceil 2^{l/(2q)} \rceil$. For conciseness, we denote the approximated solution $T^{J_l, h_l}(x_{\alpha}, u)$ of the truncated eikonal equation with J_l terms in the expansion (2.3) and mesh size h_l in the FMM as $T^l(x_{\alpha}, u)$. The mismatch function Φ^{J_l, h_l} in (3.17) is denoted as Φ^l ; and the approximated posterior probability $\gamma^{J_l, h_l, \delta}$ in (3.18) as γ^l . Now

we consider the MLMCMC for the case of the Gaussian prior. The MLMCMC estimator $E_L^{MLMCMC}[T(x^*, \cdot)]$ of $\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^\delta}[T(x^*, \cdot)]$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_L^{MLMCMC}(T(x^*, \cdot)) \\
&= \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l)} \left[E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_1^{ll'}] + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_2^{ll'}] + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_3^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_4^{ll'} + A_8^{ll'}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_5^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_6^{ll'} + A_7^{ll'}] \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \left[E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_1^{ll_0}] + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_2^{ll_0}] + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_3^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_4^{ll_0} + A_8^{ll_0}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_5^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_6^{ll_0} + A_7^{ll_0}] \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l_0)} E_{M_{l_0l'}}^{\gamma^{l_0}} [T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u)] + E_{M_{l_0l_0}}^{\gamma^{l_0}} [T^{l_0}(x^*, u)]
\end{aligned}$$

with $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ being a starting level, where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1^{ll'} &= \left(1 - \exp\left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)\right) \right) Q(u) I^l(u), \\
A_2^{ll'} &= \left(\exp\left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta)\right) - 1 \right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right), \\
A_3^l &= \left(\exp\left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)\right) - 1 \right) I^l(u), \\
A_4^{ll'} &= Q(u) I^l(u), \\
A_5^l &= \left(1 - \exp\left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta)\right) \right) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right), \\
A_6^{ll'} &= \exp\left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)\right) Q(u) I^l(u), \\
A_7^{ll'} &= Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right), \\
A_8^{ll'} &= \exp\left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta)\right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

with $Q = T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u)$ when $l' \geq l_0 + 1$ and $Q = T^{l_0}(x^*, u)$ when $l' = l_0$. Here to handle the unboundedness of the solution of the eikonal equation and the mismatch function Φ , we use the truncation function

$$I^l(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \leq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) > 0. \end{cases}$$

We denote by $E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l}$ the MCMC sample average of the Markov chain generated by MCMC sampling procedure with the acceptance probability

$$\alpha^l(u, u') = 1 \wedge \exp\left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u'; \delta)\right), \quad u, u' \in U, \quad (4.1)$$

for the independence sampler and the pCN sampler (see, e.g., Hairer [7]). From (3.12), there are positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that for all $u \in U$

$$\Phi^{J,h}(u; \delta) \leq c_1 + c_2 \exp\left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right).$$

We define the probability measure $\bar{\gamma}$ on U as

$$\frac{d\bar{\gamma}}{d\gamma} \propto \exp\left(-c_1 - c_2 \exp\left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right)\right).$$

Let \mathbf{E}_L be the expectation with respect to the probability space generated by the Markov chains in the MLMCMC sampling procedure with the acceptance probability (4.1), and the initial sample $u^{(0)}$ of each Markov chain being distributed accordingly to $\bar{\gamma}$. With the following sampling choices,

$$\begin{aligned}
L'(l) &:= L - l, \quad \text{and} \quad M_{ll'} := 2^{L-(l+l')} \quad \text{for } l \geq 1, l' \geq 1 \\
M_{ll_0} &= M_{l_0l} = 2^{L-l}/L^2 \quad \text{and} \quad M_{l_0l_0} = 2^L/L^4
\end{aligned}$$

the error estimate is

$$\mathbf{E}_L[|\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^\delta}[T(x^*, \cdot)] - E_L^{MLMCMC}[T(x^*, \cdot)]|] \leq C(\delta)L^22^{-L/2}. \quad (4.2)$$

To reduce the effect of the L^2 multiplying factor in (4.2), we can slightly enlarge the sample size $M_{ll'}$ as

$$M_{ll'} = (l + l')^a 2^{L-(l+l')} \quad (4.3)$$

for $a > 0$. The error of the MLMCMC sampling procedure is recorded in Table 1 for some values of a . We

Table 1: Total MLMCMC error with different sample sizes

a	$M_{ll'}, l, l' > 1$	$M_{ll_0} = M_{l_0l}$	$M_{l_0l_0}$	Total error
0	$2^{L-(l+l')}$	$2^{L-l}/L^2$	$2^L/L^4$	$O(L^22^{-L/2})$
2	$(l + l')^2 2^{L-(l+l')}$	2^{L-l}	$2^L/L^2$	$O(L \log L 2^{-L/2})$
3	$(l + l')^3 2^{L-(l+l')}$	$l 2^{L-l}$	$2^L/L$	$O(L^{1/2} 2^{-L/2})$
4	$(l + l')^4 2^{L-(l+l')}$	$l^2 2^{L-l}$	$2^L/(\log L^2)$	$O(\log L 2^{-L/2})$

recapitulate the derivation of the MLMCMC procedure and present the proof of the convergence rate in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Remark 4.1. Using the heap sort algorithm, the number of operations required for solving the eikonal equation on a grid with m total points is $O(m \log m)$ ([12]). The total number of operations in the MLMCMC algorithm with the number of samples $M_{ll'} = (l + l')^a 2^{L-(l+l')}$ in (4.3) is

$$\lesssim \sum_{l=l_0}^L \sum_{l'=l_0}^{L-l} (l 2^{dl} + l' 2^{d'l'}) (l + l')^a 2^{L-(l+l')} \lesssim L^{a+1} 2^{dL}.$$

5 Numerical Experiments

We consider the slowness function of the form

$$s((x', x''), u) := \exp(u \sin(0.8\pi x') \sin(0.5\pi x'')), \quad (5.1)$$

where $x = (x', x'')$ belongs to the two dimensional domain $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$. The slowness depends on the random variable $u \sim N(0, 1)$. We choose 8 data points in (2.5): $(1/4, 0)$, $(3/4, 0)$, $(1/4, 1)$, $(3/4, 1)$, $(0, 1/4)$, $(0, 3/4)$, $(1, 1/4)$, $(1, 3/4)$. To generate the observation data δ , we choose a value $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and solve the forward eikonal equation with mesh size $h = 2^{-12}$ and then add a randomly generated realization of the noise ϑ which follows the Gaussian distribution $N(0, 0.1)$. The quantity of interest is $T(x^*)$ where $x^* = (0.5, 0.5)$. To compute the reference posterior expectation, we solve the forward equation with the mesh size $h = 2^{-12}$ and use a highly accurate Gauss-Hermite quadrature rule to approximate the integrals with respect to the Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R} . As the FMM converges with the reasonably weak rate $O(h^{1/2})$ when the grid size is h , we choose larger values of a in (4.3) to obtain good convergence. In order for all the data points to belong to the approximating grid at all resolution levels, we choose the coarsest level $l_0 = 2$. Figures 1 and 2 plot the average absolute errors of the posterior expectation of the quantity of interest $T(0.5, 0.5)$ by the MLMCMC algorithm, using independence sampler, compared to the reference posterior expectation for the values $a = 3$ and $a = 4$ respectively in (4.3). The plotted error is the average of the absolute errors of 32 independent runs of the MLMCMC algorithm. The gradient of the best fit straight line to the absolute errors of the MLMCMC algorithm is 0.524 and 0.516 respectively. These are in agreement with the theoretical error estimates for the MLMCMC established in Table 1.

Next, in Figure 3 we plot the cpu time for one typical run of the MLMCMC algorithm where the heap sort procedure is employed in solving the forward eikonal equation by the FMM, for the case $a = 3$ in (4.3), against the finest resolution grid size 2^{-L} . We plot also the bound $L^4 2^{2L}$ established in Remark 4.1 for comparison. The figure clearly indicates that the cpu time required is in agreement with the bound in Remark 4.1.

Acknowledgement Zhan Fei Yeo's research is supported by the Nanyang President's Graduate Scholarship. Viet Ha Hoang's research is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 2 grant MOE2017-T2-2-144. We thank Dr Jia Hao Quek for assisting with the Matlab code for implementing the Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithm.

References

- [1] Vladimir I. Bogachev. *Gaussian measures*, volume 62 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

Figure 1: MLMCMC error for a=3




Figure 2: MLMCMC error for a=4





Figure 3: CPU time for a=3



- [2] Neil K. Chada, Andrew M. Stuart, and Xin T. Tong. Tikhonov regularization within ensemble Kalman inversion. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 58(2):1263–1294, 2020.
- [3] S. L. Cotter, M. Dashti, J. C. Robinson, and A. M. Stuart. Bayesian inverse problems for functions and applications to fluid mechanics. *Inverse Problems*, 25(11):115008, 43, 2009.
- [4] Klaus Deckelnick, Charles M. Elliott, and Vanessa Styles. Numerical analysis of an inverse problem for the eikonal equation. *Numer. Math.*, 119(2):245–269, 2011.
- [5] Oliver R. A. Dunbar, Matthew M. Dunlop, Charles M. Elliott, Viet Ha Hoang, and Andrew M. Stuart. Reconciling Bayesian and perimeter regularization for binary inversion. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 42(4):A1984–A2013, 2020.
- [6] Oliver R. A. Dunbar and Charles M. Elliott. Binary recovery via phase field regularization for first-arrival traveltime tomography. *Inverse Problems*, 35(9):095004, 2019.
- [7] Martin Hairer, Andrew M. Stuart, and Sebastian J. Vollmer. Spectral gaps for a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm in infinite dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(6):2455–2490, 2014.
- [8] Viet Ha Hoang, Jia Hao Quek, and Christoph Schwab. Analysis of a multilevel Markov chain Monte Carlo finite element method for Bayesian inversion of log-normal diffusions. *Inverse Problems*, 36(3):035021, 46, 2020.
- [9] Viet Ha Hoang and Christoph Schwab. Convergence rate analysis of mcmc-fem for bayesian inversion of log-normal diffusion problems. In *Research reports/Seminar for Applied Mathematics*, volume 2016. ETH Zurich, 2016.
- [10] Viet Ha Hoang, Christoph Schwab, and Andrew M Stuart. Complexity analysis of accelerated mcmc methods for bayesian inversion. *Inverse Problems*, 29(8):085010, 2013.
- [11] Jari Kaipio and Erkki Somersalo. *Statistical and computational inverse problems*, volume 160 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [12] J. A. Sethian. A fast marching level set method for monotonically advancing fronts. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 93(4):1591–1595, 1996.
- [13] Andrew M Stuart. Inverse problems: a bayesian perspective. *Acta numerica*, 19:451, 2010.
- [14] Y. Yamasaki. *Measures on infinite-dimensional spaces*, volume 5 of *Series in Pure Mathematics*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 1985.

A Some inequalities

Lemma A.1. *Let $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We have the following inequalities.*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2} + |z|t\right) \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2}{2}\right) \exp\left(t\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} z^2 \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2} + |z|t\right) \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq C \exp\left(\frac{t^2}{2}\right) (1+t^2), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |z| \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2} + |z|t\right) \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq C \exp\left(\frac{t^2}{2}\right) (1+t). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We refer to [9] for the proofs of these inequalities.

Proof of inequality (3.9) We note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_U \left(\sum_{i=J+1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right)^2 \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i\right) d\gamma(u) \leq \\ & \sum_{i=J+1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(c|u_i| b_i) u_i^2 \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2}{2}\right) \frac{du_i}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(cb_k |u_k|) \exp\left(-\frac{u_k^2}{2}\right) \frac{du_k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i,j=J+1 \\ i \neq j}}^{\infty} \left[b_i b_j \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(c|u_i| b_i) |u_i| \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2}{2}\right) \frac{du_i}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(c|u_j| b_j) |u_j| \exp\left(-\frac{u_j^2}{2}\right) \frac{du_j}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \prod_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ k \neq i,j}}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(c|u_k| b_k) \exp\left(-\frac{u_k^2}{2}\right) \frac{du_k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.1, this is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & C \sum_{i=J+1}^{\infty} b_i^2 2 \exp\left(\frac{c^2 b_i^2}{2}\right) (1+b_i^2) \prod_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ k \neq i}} \exp\left(\frac{c^2 b_k^2}{2}\right) \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} c b_k\right) \\ & + C \sum_{\substack{i,j=J+1 \\ i \neq j}}^{\infty} b_i b_j 2 \exp\left(\frac{c^2 b_i^2}{2}\right) (1+b_i) 2 \exp\left(\frac{c^2 b_j^2}{2}\right) (1+b_j) \cdot \prod_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ k \neq i,j}} \exp\left(\frac{c^2 b_k^2}{2}\right) \exp\left(c \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} b_k\right) \\ & \leq C \sum_{i=J+1}^{\infty} b_i^2 (1+b_i^2) + C \sum_{\substack{i,j=J+1 \\ i \neq j}}^{\infty} b_i b_j (1+b_i) (1+b_j) \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{i=J+1}^{\infty} b_i \right)^2 \leq C J^{-2q} \end{aligned}$$

B Derivation of MLMCMC method

We present the derivation of MLMCMC for the Gaussian prior in this appendix. We follow the derivation of [8] for forward elliptic equations with log-normal coefficients. We use the setting in Section 2.2. There is a positive constant C independent of L such that

$$|\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^\delta} [T(x^*, \cdot)] - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^L} [T(x^*, \cdot)]| \leq C 2^{-L}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Before we derive the MLMCMC, we introduce the following indication function to deal with the unboundedness of $\exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))$. We denote by

$$I^l(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \leq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the telescoping sum

$$\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^L} [T(x^*, \cdot)] = \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}}) [T(x^*, \cdot)] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}} [T(x^*, \cdot)]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

For each $l = l_0, \dots, L$ with a discretization level $L'(l)$ to be determined later, we get an approximation of $\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^L} [T(x^*, \cdot)]$ by

$$\sum_{l=l_0+1}^L (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}}) [T^{L'(l)}(x^*, \cdot)] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}} [T^{L'(0)}(x^*, \cdot)]. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For each l we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[\ell(s^{L'(l)})] &= \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l)} (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[T^{l'}(x^*, \cdot) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, \cdot)] \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[T^{l_0}(x^*, \cdot)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[\ell(s^{L'(l_0)})] = \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l_0)} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[T^{l'}(x^*, \cdot) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, \cdot)] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[T^{l_0}(x^*, \cdot)].$$

We approximate the posterior expectation of the quantity of interest $T(x^*, \cdot)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=l_0+1}^L (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[T^{L'(l)}(x^*, \cdot)] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[T^{L'(l_0)}(x^*, \cdot)] \\ &= \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l)} (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[T^{l'}(x^*, \cdot) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, \cdot)] + \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L (\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}})[T^{l_0}(x^*, \cdot)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l_0)} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[T^{l'}(x^*, \cdot) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, \cdot)] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}}[T^{l_0}(x^*, \cdot)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We denote by Z^l the normalizing constant in (3.19) for $h = 2^{-l}$ and $J = \lceil 2^{l/q} \rceil$. We denote by Q the quantity of interest. For $l \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l}[Q(u)] - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}}[Q(u)] \\ &= \frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U (\exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{Z^l} - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \right) \int_U \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U (\exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta))) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{Z^l} - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \right) \int_U \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let $A_1^l = (1 - \exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))) Q(u) I^l(u)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U (\exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[(1 - \exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))) Q(u) I^l(u) \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} [A_1^l]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $A_2^l = (\exp(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta)) - 1) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u))$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U (\exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta))) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[(\exp(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta)) - 1) Q(u) (1 - I^l(u)) \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_2^l]. \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z^l} - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} &= \frac{1}{Z^l Z^{l-1}} \int_U (\exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) - \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta))) (I^l(u) + 1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z^l Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^l(u; \delta)) (\exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) - 1) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{Z^l Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)) (1 - \exp(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta))) (1 - I^l(u)) d\gamma(u) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[\left(\exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) - 1 \right) I^l(u) \right] + \\
&+ \frac{1}{Z^l} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[\left(1 - \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) \right) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{Z^l} - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \right) \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[\left(\exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) - 1 \right) I^l(u) \right] \cdot \\
&\frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[\left(1 - \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) \right) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) \right] \cdot \\
&\frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) \exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) I^l(u) d\gamma(u) \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_3^l \right] \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_4^l \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_5^l \right] \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_6^l \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3^l &= \left(\exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) - 1 \right) I^l(u) \\
A_4^l &= Q(u) I^l(u) \\
A_5^l &= \left(1 - \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) \right) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) \\
A_6^l &= \exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) I^l(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, defining for $l \geq 1$

$$A_7^l = Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) \text{ and } A_8^l = \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{Z^l} - \frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \right) \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) d\gamma(u) \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[\left(1 - \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) \right) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) \right] \cdot \\
&\frac{1}{Z^l} \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) d\gamma(u) \\
&+ \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[\left(\exp \left(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) - 1 \right) I^l(u) \right] \cdot \\
&\frac{1}{Z^{l-1}} \int_U \exp \left(-\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) \right) \exp \left(\Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta) - \Phi^l(u; \delta) \right) Q(u) \left(1 - I^l(u) \right) d\gamma(u) \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_5^l \right] \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_7^l \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_3^l \right] \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_8^l \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that, for every $l \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} [Q(u)] - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [Q(u)] = \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_1^l \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_2^l \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_3^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_4^l + A_8^l \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_5^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_6^l + A_7^l \right].$$

When $Q = T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u)$, we denote A_1^l as $A_1^{l'}$, A_2^l as $A_2^{l'}$, A_4^l as $A_4^{l'}$, A_6^l as $A_6^{l'}$, A_7^l as $A_7^{l'}$ and A_8^l as $A_8^{l'}$. In the case of $Q = T^{l_0}(x^*, u)$, we denote A_1^l as $A_1^{l_0}$, A_2^l as $A_2^{l_0}$, A_4^l as $A_4^{l_0}$, A_6^l as $A_6^{l_0}$, A_7^l as $A_7^{l_0}$ and A_8^l as $A_8^{l_0}$.

We therefore approximate $\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^\delta} [T(x^*, u)]$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{l'-1} \left[\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'}} \left[A_1^{l'} \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'-1}} \left[A_2^{l'} \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'}} \left[A_3^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'-1}} \left[A_4^{l'} + A_8^{l'} \right] \right. \\
&+ \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'-1}} \left[A_5^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l'}} \left[A_6^{l'} + A_7^{l'} \right] \left. \right] \\
&+ \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \left[\mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_1^{l_0} \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_2^{l_0} \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_3^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_4^{l_0} + A_8^{l_0} \right] \right. \\
&+ \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l-1}} \left[A_5^l \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l} \left[A_6^{l_0} + A_7^{l_0} \right] \left. \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l_0)} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}} \left[T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u) \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^{l_0}} \left[T^{l_0}(x^*, u) \right].$$

The Multilevel Markov Chain Monte Carlo estimator is now defined by replacing the expectations in the preceding expression by finite sample MCMC averages, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & E_L^{MLMCMC}(T(x^*, \cdot)) \\ &= \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l)} \left[E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_1^{ll'}] + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_2^{ll'}] + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_3^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_4^{ll'} + A_8^{ll'}] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_5^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l} [A_6^{ll'} + A_7^{ll'}] \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{l=l_0+1}^L \left[E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_1^{ll_0}] + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_2^{ll_0}] + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_3^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_4^{ll_0} + A_8^{ll_0}] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^{l-1}} [A_5^l] \cdot E_{M_{ll_0}}^{\gamma^l} [A_6^{ll_0} + A_7^{ll_0}] \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{l'=l_0+1}^{L'(l_0)} E_{M_{l_0l'}}^{\gamma^{l_0}} \left[T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u) \right] + E_{M_{l_0l_0}}^{\gamma^{l_0}} \left[T^{l_0}(x^*, u) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $E_{M_{ll'}}^{\gamma^l}$ denotes the $M_{ll'}$ sample average of the MCMC chain.

C Justification of MLMCMC convergence rates

We present the main points in the proof of the MLMCMC convergence rate in this appendix. We adapt the proof of [8] for the case of elliptic equations with log-normal coefficients to the eikonal equation in this paper. The main differences are that the weaker convergence rate $O(h^{1/2})$ of the FMM in comparison to the finite element convergence rate in [8], and that this $O(h^{1/2})$ convergence rate holds when $h < h_0(u)$ in (3.14).

We note that

$$|1 - \exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))| \leq |\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)| |1 + \exp(\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta))|.$$

Thus

$$|A_1^{ll'}| \leq c(|\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)|)(T^{l'}(x^*, u) - T^{l'-1}(x^*, u)).$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^l(u; \delta) - \Phi^{l-1}(u; \delta)| &\leq c|2\delta - G^l(u) - G^{l-1}(u)|_{\Sigma} |G^l(u) - G^{l-1}(u)|_{\Sigma} \\ &\leq c(|\delta|_{\Sigma} + |G^l(u)|_{\Sigma} + |G^{l-1}(u)|_{\Sigma}) |G^l(u) - G^{l-1}(u)|_{\Sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $U_1^{ll'} \subset U$ be the set of $u \in U$ such that $2^{-\min\{l, l'\}} \leq h_0(u)$. Let $U_2^{ll'} \subset U$ be the set of $u \in U$ such that $2^{-\max\{l, l'\}} \leq h_0(u)$ and $2^{-\min\{l, l'\}} > h_0(u)$. Let $U_3^{ll'} = U \setminus (U_1^{ll'} \cup U_2^{ll'})$ be the set of $u \in U$ such that $2^{-\max\{l, l'\}} > h_0(u)$. From (3.8) and (3.15), there is a constant c such that when $u \in U_1^{ll'}$,

$$|A_1^{ll'}| \leq c \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| (b_i + \bar{b}_i) \right) (2^{-l} + \sum_{i>J_{l-1}} |u_i| b_i) (2^{-l'} + \sum_{i>J_{l'-1}} |u_i| b_i).$$

Let $\varepsilon = \sum_{i>J_{l-1}} b_i$ and $\varepsilon' = \sum_{i>J_{l'-1}} b_i$. Using the inequality $x \leq \varepsilon \exp(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$, we have

$$|A_1^{ll'}| \leq c 2^{-(l+l')/2} \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| (b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i>J_{l-1}} |u_i| b_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} \sum_{i>J_{l'-1}} |u_i| b_i \right).$$

When $u \in U_2^{ll'}$, from (2.9), (3.8), (3.12) and (3.15) we have

$$|A_1^{ll'}| \leq c 2^{-\max\{l, l'\}/2} \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| (b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{1}{\min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}} \sum_{i>\max\{J_{l-1}, J_{l'-1}\}} |u_i| b_i \right).$$

When $u \in U_3^{ll'}$,

$$|A_1^{ll'}| \leq c \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i| b_i \right).$$

Thus for all $u \in U$,

$$|A_1^{l,l'}| \leq c2^{-(l+l')/2} \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|(b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i>J_{l-1}} |u_i|b_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} \sum_{i>J_{l'-1}} |u_i|b_i\right) + c2^{-\max\{l,l'\}/2} \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|(b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{1}{\min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}} \sum_{i>\max\{J_{l-1}, J_{l'-1}\}} |u_i|b_i\right) \mathcal{I}_{U_2^{l,l'}}(u) + c \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|b_i\right) \mathcal{I}_{U_3^{l,l'}}(u),$$

where \mathcal{I} is the indicator function. We have similar estimates for other terms $A_j^{l,l'}$ for $j = 2, 4, 6, 7, 8$ and A_j^l for $j = 3, 5$. First we consider the independence sampler. Let $\mathcal{E}^{\bar{\gamma}}$ be the expectation over the space of all the Markov chains generated by the MCMC process with the acceptance probability (4.1), and with the initial sample $u^{(0)}$ being distributed according to the probability $\bar{\gamma}$. We then have the following result.

Lemma C.1. For $g \in L^2(U, \gamma)$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\bar{\gamma}} \left[\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M g(u^{(k)}) - \mathbb{E}^{\gamma^l}[g] \right|^2 \right] \leq cM^{-1} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma}[g^2].$$

We refer to [8] Lemma B2 for a proof. We note that

$$\int_U \left[\exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|(b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i>J_{l-1}} |u_i|b_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} \sum_{i>J_{l'-1}} |u_i|b_i\right) \right]^2 d\gamma(u)$$

is finite by using inequality (A.1) (see also [8] Proposition B4). As $h_0(u) < 2^{-\min\{l,l'\}}$ for $u \in U_2^{l,l'}$ and $\int_U (h_0(u))^{-2} d\gamma(u)$ is finite, $\gamma(U_2^{l,l'}) \leq c2^{-2\min\{l,l'\}}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_U \exp\left(2c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|(b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{2}{\min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}} \sum_{i>\max\{J_{l-1}, J_{l'-1}\}} |u_i|b_i\right) \mathcal{I}_{U_2^{l,l'}}(u) d\gamma(u) \\ & \leq \left(\int_U \exp\left(4c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|(b_i + \bar{b}_i) + \frac{4}{\min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}} \sum_{i>\max\{J_{l-1}, J_{l'-1}\}} |u_i|b_i\right) d\gamma(u) \right)^{1/2} \gamma(U_2^{l,l'})^{1/2} \leq c2^{-\min\{l,l'\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as $\int_U h_0(u)^{-4} d\gamma(u)$ is finite, $\gamma(U_3^{l,l'}) \leq c2^{-4\max\{l,l'\}}$. Thus

$$\int_U \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_i|b_i\right) \mathcal{I}_{U_3^{l,l'}} d\gamma(u) \leq c2^{-2\max\{l,l'\}} \leq c2^{-(l+l')}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}^{\gamma}[|A_1^{l,l'}|^2] d\gamma(u) \leq c2^{-(l+l')}$. We have similar estimates for other terms in (B.7). The proof of the convergence of the MLMCMC sampling procedure follows exactly from that in Appendix A of [8]. For the pCN sampler, if we assume the spectral gap result of Hairer et al. [7], then the convergence rate of the MLMCMC sampling procedure holds.