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ABSTRACT

Stochastic inverse problems (SIP) address the behavior of a set of objects of the same kind but with variable properties, such as a population of cells. Using a population of mechanistic models from a single parametric family, SIP explains population variability by transferring real-world observations into the latent space of model parameters. Previous research in SIP focused on solving the parameter inference problem for a single population using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. Here we extend SIP to address multiple related populations simultaneously. Specifically, we simulate control and treatment populations in experimental protocols by discovering two related latent spaces of model parameters. Instead of taking a Bayesian approach, our two-population SIP is reformulated as the constrained-optimization problem of finding distributions of model parameters. To minimize the divergence between distributions of experimental observations and model outputs, we developed novel deep learning models based on generative adversarial networks (GANs) which have the structure of our underlying constrained-optimization problem. The flexibility of GANs allowed us to build computationally scalable solutions and tackle complex model input parameter inference scenarios, which appear routinely in physics, biophysics, economics and other areas, and which can not be handled with existing methods. Specifically, we demonstrate two scenarios of parameter inference over a control population and a treatment population whose treatment either selectively affects only a subset of model parameters with some uncertainty or has a deterministic effect on all model parameters.

Keywords Statistical inference · Bayesian inference · Inverse surrogates · Likelihood-free inference · Generative adversarial networks · Simulation-based inference · Stochastic inference · Populations of models · Active learning

1 Introduction

Many common research scenarios revolve around a similar problem of identification of input parameters for a model that simulates the behavior of subjects with varying properties, grouped into sets, as considered in the following real-world examples. First, to find the effect of some drug compound, a researcher might record characteristics of two sets of isolated cells, one under control conditions and another under the effects of the drug. Variable cell properties within each population exist, and the researcher therefore needs to construct two parametric families of a mechanistic model of the cell to fit the distributions of features derived from the two sets of experimental observations (i.e., control and drug) thus addressing the variability. In a second common scenario, an intervention with a known effect serves as a perturbation to test a response to the intervention and to infer model input parameters based on the response. Instead of
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cells, the set may comprise other subjects such as patients in clinical trials. In this paper, we refer to a general problem of finding input parameters of the model for multiple conditions distinguished by some factor (e.g., drug action, age, disease state, etc.) as an intervention problem. We present computational methods to address intervention problems of these and other related types. To proceed further and provide context for our study, we first give a brief review of existing methods that are employed to solve problems of inference of model input parameters restricted to a single set of observations.

The problem of constructing populations of deterministic models and identifying distributions of model input parameters from stochastic observations is known under different names, including “Stochastic Inverse Problem” (SIP) and “populations of models” [2, 3, 4, 5]. In the setup of a typical SIP, we are given sets of experimental signal waveforms \( \{ s_r(t) : r \in J \} \subseteq S \) recorded from objects in a population and solutions \( \{ f(t; x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \} \subseteq S \) of model differential equations, where \( J \) is an index set, \( x \) is a vector of input model parameters and \( S \) is a functional space of continuous time signals. Feature vectors \( L(s_r(\cdot)) \) and \( L(f(\cdot; x)) \) (also referred to as quantities of interest) are extracted from experimental and simulated signals using some map \( L : S \to \mathbb{R}^m \). In the SIP analysis, we don’t directly use the model but a function \( y = M(x) \) that is defined as \( M(x) = L(f(\cdot; x)) \). The goal of SIP is to find the distribution of model input parameters \( Q_x \), which, if passed through \( M \), generates a distribution of model outputs that match the distribution of features \( Q_y \) extracted from experimental signals \( s_r(t) \). The model function \( M \) could be in a closed form or obtained by extracting features from numerical solutions of model differential equations. Since, in analysis we always use only \( M \) rather than the original mechanistic model, we will simply refer to \( M \) using the term “model”.

Two theoretical frameworks based on the work of Poole and Raftery [6] and conditional probabilistic models are used to solve standard SIP. **Poole and Raftery formulation.** Poole and Raftery showed that given a mechanistic model \( M \), which is a function with input parameters as a random variable \( X \) and outputs as a random variable \( Y \), linked deterministically by \( y = M(x) \), the density of experimentally observed features \( q_Y(y) \) can be mapped to the density of model input parameters \( q_X(x) \) coherent to the experimental data using the equation:

\[
q_X(x) \equiv q_Y(y) \frac{p_X(x)}{p_Y(y)} \bigg|_{y=M(x)},
\]

where \( p_X(x) \) is the prior density on the input parameters, and \( p_Y(y) \) is the model induced prior density obtained upon sampling from \( p_X(x) \) and applying the model \( M \) to the samples (push-forward of the prior). The formula (1) was proposed as an alternative to an ill-defined formulation based on Bayesian inference, which was subject to Borel’s paradox for deterministic models. For invertible models, the ratio \( p_X(x) / p_Y(M(x)) \) is simply the Jacobian of the function \( M \). The work of Poole and Raftery went mostly unnoticed by the computational modeling community in biophysics. Current research is either focused on linear models [7] or considers the inversion of deterministic models as a classical Bayesian inference problem [8, 9, 10] implementing methods based on sequential Monte Carlo methods [5] that produce solutions consistent with (1). Recent work [1], which rediscovered Poole and Raftery’s formulation, outlines direct parallels between (1) and classical Bayesian inference and provides measure theoretic proofs of important properties of (1), such as solution stability. **Conditional probabilistic models.** Alternative methods to solve SIP include constructing conditional probabilistic models for amortized inference. These methods are inspired by work in simulation-based inference [11], wherein models are non-deterministic (i.e., solutions of stochastic differential equations) and input parameters are usually identified for the individual subjects. Conditional probabilistic models, in the form of either conditional Gaussian mixtures [12] or normalizing flow networks, have recently been proposed for likelihood-free methods [13, 14, 15, 16] and applied in active learning [15]. To build the conditional model for deterministic models, a stochastic map could be introduced. Notice that the likelihood \( p_{Y|X}(y|x) \) and the posterior \( p_{X|Y}(x|y) \) would be ill-defined for a deterministic model \( y = M(x) \). This problem can be resolved by introducing a small Gaussian noise \( \epsilon \) to model outputs \( y' = M(x) + \epsilon, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_m) \), where \( m \) is the dimension of the model output \( y \). The forward model takes the form of \( p_{Y|X}(y'|x; \theta) \), with \( \theta \) as parameter vector (i.e., neural network weights), is trained on a set of pairs \( \{ x_i, y'_i \} \), taking \( x_i \) from the prior distribution \( P_X \) and calculating \( y'_i \) from the forward model. In many cases the prior is simply the bounds of input parameters, giving the uniform \( P_X \) in these bounds. Once trained, the inverse surrogate model can provide amortized inference by sampling with \( y \sim q_Y(y), \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_m), y' = y + \epsilon, x \sim p_{X|Y'}(x|y'; \theta) \). In practice, the noise addition is not even required due to regularization used in computations of probabilistic models.

\( ^2 \)Here, and throughout the text, \( \theta \) and \( \eta \) are used for any parameter set of statistical or surrogate models in contrast to the mechanistic model input parameters, \( x \).
1.1 Inferring model input parameters with generative adversarial networks

In previous research, parameter inference is based on Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods and conditional probabilistic models. Here, we extend the methodology of inference of model input parameters to two deep learning network structures, conditional generative adversarial networks (c-GAN) [17] and novel, regularized r-GAN, and its extension t-GAN (t stands for transport).

**Conditional generative adversarial networks.** Conditional generative network (c-GAN) [17] is a simple and highly competitive alternative to normalizing flow networks used in simulation-based inference, as will be shown in our work. The typical c-GAN structure for a probabilistic model of $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is shown in Figure 1A. The power of c-GANs is that they define logical structures that are not necessarily based on probability measures such as probability density. Notice that noise needs to be added to the output of the deterministic model to construct a conditional probabilistic model only because the support of the likelihood density $p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ is a low dimensional manifold defined by $y = M(x)$, and the density is ill-defined. However, we are still able to construct a GAN generator that produces points in the low-dimensional manifold by reducing the dimensionality of the base random variable $Z$ in the generator (see Figure 1A). For the opposite effect, we can use a higher dimensional $Z$ to potentially increase entropy of the results produced by the generator, while the standard loss function for GAN discriminators remains valid.

**Regularized generative adversarial networks.** The prior distribution density $p_X(x)$ in [1], as in Bayes formula, is used as the relative likelihood of model input parameter values. In our novel formulation of regularized generative adversarial networks (r-GAN), prior information is used differently in a constrained-optimization problem. The main idea is to minimize the divergence between the prior $P_X$ and the distribution $Q_{X_d}$ produced by a generator in a GAN, with a generator network from some parametric family $G_{\theta} \in \{G_{\theta}(\cdot)|\theta \in \Theta\}$ enforcing that the density of model output be $q_Y(y)$. Thus, the problem is formulated as

$$\begin{align*}
given & \quad P_X, \; Q_Y, \; M \\
\text{minimize} & \quad D(P_X \| Q_{X_d}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \text{supp}(X_g) \subseteq \text{supp}(X), \; D(Q_Y \| Q_{Y_d}) = 0 \\
\text{where} & \quad y_g = M(x_g) \sim Q_{Y_d}, \; x_g \sim Q_{X_d}.
\end{align*}$$

In (2) $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$ is an f-divergence measure such as Jensen-Shannon (JS) divergence. To solve (2) with GAN, we minimize the divergence $D(P_X \| Q_{X_d})$ over $\theta$ in the generator: $z \sim P_Z, \; x_g = G_\theta(z) \sim Q_{X_d}$, where $P_Z$ is a base distribution, usually Gaussian. This reformulation of the problem provides another way to account for the prior. We are looking for not just any distribution of model input parameters that produces $Q_Y$, but the distribution with the minimal divergence from the prior. The additional constraint $\text{supp}(X_g) \subseteq \text{supp}(X)$ ensures that the distribution of the generated input parameters $X_g$ is within the prior bounds. To solve (3), we have developed the GAN with a novel structure, r-GAN (see Figure 1B). The r-GAN has two discriminators, and the generator loss is composed of a weighted sum of losses due to both discriminators. The constraint $D(Q_Y \| Q_{Y_d})$ is enforced by minimizing the distance between the distributions in the penalty-like method in r-GAN, where the weight for generator loss due to discriminator $D_X$ is much smaller than the weight due to $D_Y$. Different f-divergence measures could be applied using different GAN loss functions [18]. r-GAN does not have the advantage of amortized inference as does c-GAN. However, our problem reformulation provides new benefits. First, minimization of $D(P_X \| Q_{X_d})$ could be viewed as a regularization. Another advantage of the constrained-optimization reformulation emerges in active learning, as we will describe below. Finally, r-GAN could be extended to complex simulation configurations as discussed in the next section.

1.2 Modeling interventions

Next, we will return to the intervention problems defined at the beginning of the Introduction, wherein we set the goal of simultaneously inferring model input parameters for two sets of observations. In what follows, we discuss how our methods that produced r-GAN in previous sections can now be adapted to solve SIP in intervention studies.

Let us denote by $x_c \sim Q_{X_c}, \; x_d \sim Q_{X_d}$ samples of model input parameters for the control population and treatment populations, respectively. Our goal is to evaluate distributions $Q_{X_c}$ and $Q_{X_d}$ given distributions of observations $Q_{Y_c}$ and $Q_{Y_d}$ for the control and treatment populations. Note that we consider the situation where we do not have pairwise observations for each object under both control and intervention conditions. Such a scenario is widely prevalent in the healthcare and life sciences, and one example of it is randomized clinical trials. Note that inference of model input parameters for pairwise data, on the other hand, can be solved with simpler networks such as c-GAN.

To proceed, we define a joint probability distribution between $X_c$ and $X_d$ with marginals $Q_{X_c}$ and $Q_{X_d}$. We consider two examples of intervention SIP with either different knowledge available on the joint distribution or a deterministic map, each of which relates model input parameters in control and intervention populations.

3
**Independent parameters.** Our first option is to assume a joint distribution on model input parameters for the two populations that factorizes into the product \( q_{X_c, X_d}(x_c, x_d) = q_{X_c}(x_c)q_{X_d}(x_d) \). This factorization results in a corresponding factorization of the observation densities. The SIP could be solved by any of the methods for a single population. Variables \( X_c \) and \( X_d \), as well as \( Y_c \) and \( Y_d \), are independent, and the problem could be simply solved independently for each population, as was done in [5].

**Shared parameters.** The factorization of the joint probability density could be extended to a more realistic scenario. Interventions rarely affect the whole set of model input parameters. Often, input parameter vectors can be split into the components \( x_c \) that are not affected by the drug (shared parameters) and components \( x_d \) forming two vectors of input parameters \( x_c = [x_s, x_c], x_d = [x_s, x_d] \) for the control and treatment groups, respectively. The split results in the factorization \( q_{X_c, X_d|X_s}(x_c, x_d|x_s) = q_{X_c|X_s}(x_c|x_s)q_{X_d|X_s}(x_d|x_s) \). This problem could not be solved independently for the two populations. It is not possible to adapt the conditional probabilistic models due to unknown joint distribution \( Y_c \) and \( Y_d \). However, the extension of r-GAN to the new network is straightforward:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{given} & \quad \mathcal{P}_{X_c}, \mathcal{P}_{X_d}, \mathcal{Q}_{Y_c}, \mathcal{Q}_{Y_d}, M \\
\text{minimize} & \quad D(\mathcal{P}_{X_c} || \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,c}}) + D(\mathcal{P}_{X_d} || \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,d}}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \text{supp}(X_{g,c}) \subseteq \text{supp}(X_c), \text{supp}(X_{g,d}) \subseteq \text{supp}(X_d), \\
& \quad D(\mathcal{Q}_{Y_c} || \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,c}}) = 0, D(\mathcal{Q}_{Y_d} || \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,d}}) = 0 \\
\text{where} & \quad [z_s, z_c, z_d] \sim \mathcal{P}_Z, \\
& \quad x_s = G_{\theta_s}(z_s), \quad x_c = G_{\theta_c}(z_c, x_s), \quad x_d = G_{\theta_d}(z_d, x_s), \\
& \quad x_c = [x_s, x_c], \quad x_d = [x_s, x_d], \\
& \quad x_c \sim \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,c}}, \quad x_d \sim \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,d}}, \\
& \quad M(x_c) \sim \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,c}}, \quad M(x_d) \sim \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,d}}.
\end{align*}
\]

The graph of the t-GAN is shown in Figure 2A. The number of different t-GAN structures that corresponds to different information on the joint distribution is virtually infinite. To simplify the material in this paper, we consider only one additional structure with a known deterministic map.

**Explicitly known deterministic map.** To demonstrate the flexibility of t-GANs, we simulate the deterministic map \( x_d = T(x_c) \) that is known explicitly. Such a t-GAN will be useful for the scenario wherein the effect of the perturbation is known, as discussed in the Introduction. For example, a drug with known effects on one particular channel conductance may be employed to test the response of the cell in the experiment. A suitable t-GAN to solve this intervention SIP (see Figure 2B) is then:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{given} & \quad \mathcal{P}_{X_c}, \mathcal{Q}_{X_c}, \mathcal{Q}_{Y_d}, M \\
\text{minimize} & \quad D(\mathcal{P}_{X_c} || \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,c}}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \text{supp}(X_{g,c}) \subseteq \text{supp}(X_c), \\
& \quad D(\mathcal{Q}_{Y_c} || \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,c}}) = 0, D(\mathcal{Q}_{Y_d} || \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,d}}) = 0 \\
\text{where} & \quad z \sim \mathcal{P}_Z, \quad x_c = G_{\theta}(z), \\
& \quad x_c \sim \mathcal{Q}_{X_{g,c}}, \quad x_d = T(x_c), \\
& \quad M(x_c) \sim \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,c}}, \quad M(x_d) \sim \mathcal{Q}_{Y_{g,d}}.
\end{align*}
\]

2 Methods

In this work, we test different methods on a synthetic example, in which the Rosenbrock function plays the role of the test mechanistic model. We compare performance of MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN in a first example with a single population, and then test t-GAN in the intervention example with shared input parameters across two populations. Finally, t-GAN is tested in the same intervention example but with an assumption that the deterministic map is known. We use the Rosenbrock function in the paper for illustration of the methods. Please see the Appendix for a test of MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN on additional single population examples from [1].
Figure 1: Generative adversarial models for inference of model input parameters. A. Conditional GAN (c-GAN). The GAN generator $G$ converts a random variable $Z$ of some base distribution, usually Gaussian, to a random variable $X_g$ given some input variable $Y$. The discriminator $D$ is trained to distinguish real samples $X$ from $X_g$. In c-GAN, the input to a discriminator is augmented with $Y$. B. Regularized GAN (r-GAN) then solves the constrained-optimization problem using the penalty method. r-GAN has two discriminators. The loss of the generator is the weighted sum of losses due to two discriminators. The inset shows an example of $P_X$ and $Q_{X_g}$ for a periodic function. r-GAN enforces the equality of $Q_Y$ and $Q_{Y_g}$ and maximizes the overlap between $P_X$ and $Q_{X_g}$. The dashed box in A and B denotes the sub graph with the generator components used for inference of input parameters after training.
2.1 Test function, prior, and synthetic data

Test function of two variables. The mechanistic model was represented by the Rosenbrock function of two input parameters,

\[ M(x) = (a - x_1)^2 + b(y - x_2^2)^2, \]  

with \( a = 1, b = 100 \). We used a single prior \( P_X \) in all tests for input parameters, taken as uniformly distributed in the range \([0, 2] \times [0, 2]\) such as \( x_1 \sim U(0, 2) \) and \( x_2 \sim U(0, 2) \). MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN were tested on the synthetic distribution of observation \( \mathbb{Q}_Y \), a Gaussian with parameters \( \mu = 250, \sigma = 50 \) truncated to the interval \((0, 1000)\).

To generate observations for the intervention study, we sampled input parameters of the model for the same Gaussian distribution of observation \( \mathbb{Q}_Y \) by training c-GAN and sampling the corresponding input parameters. These samples were used as \( x_e \), and we applied a linear transformation \( x_d = A x_e \) with diagonal matrix \( A \) with entries along the diagonal 1.0 and 0.6. Finally, we applied the model in (5) to samples \( x_e \) and \( x_d \) to obtain \( \mathbb{Q}_{Y_e} \) and \( \mathbb{Q}_{Y_d} \) for use in the intervention problem.

High dimensional model. To mimic the complexity of most biophysical models, we also considered a Rosenbrock function with multidimensional inputs,

\[ f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} [b(x_{i+1} - x_i^2)^2 + (a - x_i)^2]. \]  

In (6) \( a = 1, b = 100 \) and the dimension \( N \) is set to 8. To generate a model \( M \) with a vector of outputs \( y \) rather than a scalar, we performed 5 randomly chosen permutations of the coordinates \( \{x_1\} \) in (6), yielding the 5 dimensional output vector (i.e., the dimensions of \( X \) and \( Y \) were 8 and 5, respectively),

\[ M(x) = [f(x^1), f(x^2), \ldots, f(x^5)], \]  

where \( x^i \) are the vector \( x \) after permutations. Similar to the Rosenbrock function of two input parameters, we consider a uniformly distributed prior for the high dimensional model, \( x_i \sim U(0, 2) \).

2.2 GANs

All GAN models in this paper could be represented as graphs with one or more generator and discriminator nodes. Examples of GAN graphs are shown in the Figures[1] and [2]. For discriminators in all GAN models, the standard loss

\[ L_D(D, G) = E_{x \sim P_X} \log[D(x)] + E_{z \sim P_z} \log[1 - D(G(z))] \]  

was maximized, where \( D \) and \( G \) is a discriminator and a generator, respectively. \( P_R \) is the target distribution for the particular node of the graph. For generators, the non-saturating loss was tested. However, we found that the next modification of the standard non-saturating loss produced a better quality of sampling,

\[ L_G(D, G) = E_{z \sim P_z} \log[D(G(z))] - E_{x \sim P_X} \log[1 - D(x)]. \]  

The total loss for a generator was a sum of losses due to all discriminators,

\[ L_{Gt}(D_1, \ldots, D_n, G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \times L_G(D_i, G). \]  

In the GAN models, we used the numerical scheme of Unrolled GAN [19] with 4-8 iterations of the unrolled Adam method with step size 0.0005. The step of the Adam optimizer for the generator networks was 0.0001, and the step of the Adam optimizer for the discriminators was 0.00002. The \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \) parameters of the Adam optimizer were set to default values of 0.9 and 0.999, respectively as suggested in the paper [20]. The mini-batch size was 100, and training sets consisted of 10, 000 samples. We used feedforward neural networks with 8 hidden layers and 180 nodes per layer and the ReLU activation function for the generator and the discriminator nodes. The number of epochs was 200. Trained parameters, i.e. weights of the generator network, were saved every 10 iterations and used to compare the distributions produced by the generator and the prior \( P_X \), given synthetic observations. The divergence between the distributions was tested with JS-divergence calculated using a Gaussian mixture model of 100 components. Note that we did not show in Figures[1] and [2] that inputs to the discriminators were passed through linear normalization transformations.
(centering, scaling, PCA) trained on the target distributions, and that forward and inverse log-transformations were used to ensure that input parameters were within the prior bounds.

**c-GAN.** The structure of the c-GAN is shown in Figure 1A. Briefly, the c-GAN has a single discriminator node, and the structure almost replicates the structure of the basic GAN model, but inputs to the discriminator and the generator are augmented by values of $Y$. In the test with the function of two input parameters, the dimension of the normal random variable $Z$ fed to the generator was set to 1 in order to generate $x$ in a low-dimensional manifold. In the high-dimensional model, the dimension of $Z$ was the same as for $X$.

**r-GAN and t-GAN.** The GAN structures to solve the constrained-optimization problems are presented in the Figures 1B and 2. These GANs have multiple discriminators. To enforce the constraint, the penalty was set through different weights for each of the generator loss functions due to the different discriminators in (10). Training of GANs was performed in two stages. Let us denote the part of the GAN that produces $X_g$ (or $X_{c,g}$, $X_{d,g}$), including discriminators for priors, as $GAN_X$. At the first stage, we separately trained $GAN_X$ on the prior distribution and saved the generator and the discriminator networks (i.e., network weights). At the second stage, t-GANs with complete structure were trained on the given $Q_Y$ with initialization of $GAN_X$ from trained networks at the first stage. The weights $w_i$ of the loss function in (10) were taken as 0.01 and 1 for $D_X$ and $D_Y$ in Figure 1B and analogously for t-GAN in Figures 2A and 2B. We found constructing GANs with complex graphs having multiple generators and discriminators to be quite involved and, hence, constructed a software layer that allowed us to build these complex networks easily via programming graphs of GANs. The software layer was implemented using the TensorFlow library ([21]) (version 2.2.0).

### 2.3 Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling

To compare the performance of our GANs with standard methods, we devised a simple MCMC method that leverages tensor calculations and runs efficiently with libraries like TensorFlow. In the first step of the algorithm, the No U-Turn Sampler ([22], [23]), an adaptive variant of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo implemented in the TensorFlow Probability library (version 0.10.0), was used to generate the initial set of points. In the second step, a distribution of generated points was approximated with the Gaussian mixture that was used as a proposal similar to the adaptive algorithm in [24]. Rejection sampling was performed as a subsequent refinement step to obtain the final samples.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Standard SIP for Rosenbrock function of two variables

Figures 3A and 3B show the surface and contour plots, respectively, of the Rosenbrock test function of two input parameters over the selected prior range ($x_1 \sim U(0, 2)$ and $x_2 \sim U(0, 2)$). We used MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN as described in the Methods section to infer the distribution of input parameters of the test function. The goal was to infer the joint distribution of parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$, which, when forwarded through the model, results in a function output distribution that matches the desired target distribution. Intuitively, it is clear that for a normal distribution of observations $Q_Y$, high density regions would align with the contour lines. For instance, for $Q_Y$ with mean of 250, points would be concentrated along contour lines in the left top corner and the right bottom corner of the graph shown in Figure 3B.

In the example, the desired target output distribution $Q_Y$ was set as a normal distribution with mean $\mu = 250$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 50$. Figure 4A shows the desired target distribution $Q_Y$ in green. The joint distribution of the parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$ obtained using the c-GAN is shown in Figure 4B. MCMC and r-GAN give almost identical results to c-GAN (results not shown). Forwarding through the model the inferred input parameter samples results in the model output distribution shown by the cyan distribution $Q_{Y_g}$ in Figure 4A. The generated output distribution almost perfectly matches the desired target distribution. To quantify the performance of the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN methods, we determined the proximity of the generated output distribution $Q_{Y_g}$ to the target output distribution $Q_Y$ and also the closeness of the generated distribution of input parameters $Q_{X_g}$ to the prior $P_X$ via JS-divergence. Figure 4C shows the plot of JS-divergence for both $Q_{Y_g}$ and $Q_{X_g}$ as a function of the training epoch number for c-GAN. The epoch number used to select the final weights of the c-GAN for sampling is denoted by the red dot. Figure 4D compares the performance of MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN. All three methods perform well in estimating model input parameters coherent to the target distribution.

#### 3.2 Standard SIP for the high dimensional Rosenbrock function

Next, we applied the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN methods to infer the distribution of input parameters of the high dimensional Rosenbrock function ([7]) with multidimensional outputs ([7]) as described in the methods. In the example, the
Figure 2: GANs to analyze data in intervention SIP. A. t-GAN to simulate intervention with the input parameters $x_s$, which are not affected by an intervention, and with independence of the other input parameters. The joint distribution is enforced in the links between multiple generators. Dimensions of $Z_i$ variables independently generated from the base distributions are 1. B. t-GAN graph to simulate intervention with known explicit map $T$. The dashed box in A and B denote the sub graph with generator components used for input parameter inference after the training. $G, G_1, G_2$ and $G_3$ are the generator networks and $D_1, D_2, D_3$, and $D_4$ are the discriminator networks.
Figure 3: Rosenbrock test function of two variables. A. 3D surface plot. B. Contour plot.

Figure 4: Inference of the distribution of input parameters for the Rosenbrock function of 2 variables (model input parameters) for $Q_Y = \mathcal{N}(250, 50^2)$ by MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN methods. A. Kernel density estimation (KDE) of the desired target output distribution $Q_Y$ (in green) and the generated (inferred) output distribution $Q_{Y_g}$ using c-GAN (in cyan). Results for MCMC and r-GAN are almost identical and not shown. B. Joint distribution of the inferred model input parameters generated by c-GAN and visualized using KDE. The dashed rectangle denotes the bounds set by the prior $P_X$. Note that KDE in the visualization produces artifacts which result in the density extending outside of the prior bounds. C. Plot of JS-divergence vs epoch number for the c-GAN method. The solid line in black quantifies the divergence between the target output distribution $Q_Y$ and the inferred output distribution $Q_{Y_g}$. The solid line in cyan quantifies the closeness of the inferred distribution of input parameters $Q_{X_g}$ to the prior $P_X$. D. Bar-plot of JS-divergence estimated to compare the performance of MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN.
desired target output distribution \( Q_Y \) was set as a multivariate normal distribution with means \( \mu_i = 250, i = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 \) and diagonal covariance matrix with standard deviation of each individual features \( \sigma_i = 50, i = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 \). The performance of c-GAN, r-GAN, and MCMC was evaluated similarly to the example with the function of two variables by quantifying the proximity of the generated output distribution \( Q_Y \) to the desired target output distribution \( Q_Y \). Figure 5A shows a bar plot of the JS-divergence measure estimated in the input space for each of the methods. Each of the three methods performs well in estimating model input parameters coherent to the target distribution. Unlike r-GAN and MCMC methods, the c-GAN needs to learn the multidimensional output function over the entire support of the prior. Amortized inference with a limited number of training samples (\( n = 10,000 \)) to capture the inverse surrogate of the model is the likely reason for the worse performance of c-GAN versus the other methods. Figures 5C, 5D and 5E show plots of the marginal distributions of each of the generated output features (green solid lines) upon propagating the inferred input parameters through the model for MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN, respectively.

### 3.3 Two-population SIP

Next, we consider a synthetic dataset that follows an intervention scenario. In the example, the Rosenbrock function of two input parameters is used as the mechanistic model. We generated samples of observations with distribution \( Q_Y \) corresponding to the control conditions from a Gaussian distribution with mean \( \mu = 250 \) and standard deviation of \( \sigma = 50 \) as shown in Figure 6A black solid line. The ground-truth distribution of input parameters \( G_X \) coherent to the \( Q_Y \) is shown in Figure 6C as the black contour lines. Next, we sampled from the distribution of ground truth input parameters \( G_X \) and applied linear scaling to the \( x_2 \) parameter as described in the methods \((x_{2,c} = 0.6 x_{2,d})\) to generate the ground truth input parameter set for observations under intervention conditions. Note that the input parameter \( x_1 \) is considered to be the shared input parameter, \( x_s \). The ground-truth distribution of input parameters after intervention \( G_X_{d} \) is shown in Figure 6D as red contour lines. The intervention input parameters were forwarded through
We tested the t-GAN with shared variables as shown in Figure 2A and described in (3) to infer the distribution of model waveforms extracting features $y$. The preliminary step to construct populations of models in SIP is to obtain the summary information from signal $Q_Y$, and $Q_Y$, where $\eta$ is that upon training, one immediately obtains the inverse surrogate of the mechanistic model, which then provides

$$Q_Y(\eta) = \int q_Y(y) \, dy,$$

the Rosenbrock function to obtain the intervention target output distribution $Q_Y$, that is shown by the red solid line in Figure 6B. We reemphasize here that we do not have pairwise data for each object under control and after intervention conditions, i.e., we do not have information on the joint distribution of observations across the two sets but only the marginal distributions $Q_Y$, and $Q_Y$, of the separate observations.

We tested the t-GAN with shared variables as shown in Figure 2A and described in (3) to infer the distribution of model input parameters that produces output distributions with marginals matching the target output observation distributions $Q_Y$, and $Q_Y$. The distribution of the inferred input parameters obtained via the t-GAN (Figure 2A) is shown in Figures 6C and 6D by the blue contour maps. The generated distributions of input parameters resulted in the output observation distributions shown by the dotted density in Figures 6A and 6B. The generated output distribution closely matches the desired target distribution. Not accounting for additional prior information results in relatively poor prediction in this particular example.

Next, we considered a t-GAN shown in Figure 2A in which we used an explicitly known deterministic map (4). This t-GAN produces distributions of input parameters as shown in Figures 6E and 6F by the blue contour maps, which closely match the ground truth distribution of input parameters (shown by the black and the red contour lines in Figures 6C and 6F, respectively). The output distribution of the function corresponding to the generated input parameters is shown by the dashed-dotted density line in Figures 6A and 6B.

4 Discussion

Standard statistical analysis is usually performed in the space of experimental observations. However, predictions made by statistical models often lack sufficient interpretability and require a large amount of data. One of the solutions to boost interpretability of statistical models is to carry out statistical analysis in the latent parameter space of mechanistic models. Mechanistic models have already been widely employed in patient diagnostics, for example, in cancer research for classification of patients based on parameters of mechanistic models [25]. However, parameter inference in biological models is not trivial due to their complexity. We presented novel methods that drastically simplify model parameter inference. Given the model $y = M(x)$, the prior distribution of model input parameters $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ and observations with distribution $Q_Y$, our methods allowed us to evaluate distributions of model input parameters $Q_X$ that are coherent with the given distribution of observations. The main novelty of this work is reformulation of SIP as a constrained-optimization problem and design of the novel GANs, r-GAN and t-GAN, that could be employed for standard SIP in biological models and missed normalizing term $p_Y(y)$. A second refinement step was considered in [5], where some samples were rejected to reshape the distribution to match $q_Y(y)$. Another option is to directly approximate the prior density in the formula (4) using some density model such as a Gaussian mixture, to use the density ratio trick to approximate the ratio $r_Y(y) = q_Y(y) / p_Y(y)$ and to sample from $p_X(x) r_Y(M(x))$. For further discussion on possible algorithms, refer to [1].

As we have shown (Figures 4 and 5), c-GAN and r-GAN could be substitutes for MCMC. The advantage of c-GAN is that upon training, one immediately obtains the inverse surrogate of the mechanistic model, which then provides

$$Q_Y(\eta) = \int q_Y(y) \, dy,$$

the Rosenbrock function to obtain the intervention target output distribution $Q_Y$, that is shown by the red solid line in Figure 6B. We reemphasize here that we do not have pairwise data for each object under control and after intervention conditions, i.e., we do not have information on the joint distribution of observations across the two sets but only the marginal distributions $Q_Y$, and $Q_Y$, of the separate observations.

We tested the t-GAN with shared variables as shown in Figure 2A and described in (3) to infer the distribution of model input parameters that produces output distributions with marginals matching the target output observation distributions $Q_Y$, and $Q_Y$. The distribution of the inferred input parameters obtained via the t-GAN (Figure 2A) is shown in Figures 6C and 6D by the blue contour maps. The generated distributions of input parameters resulted in the output observation distributions shown by the dotted density in Figures 6A and 6B. The generated output distribution closely matches the desired target distribution. Not accounting for additional prior information results in relatively poor prediction in this particular example.

Next, we considered a t-GAN shown in Figure 2A in which we used an explicitly known deterministic map (4). This t-GAN produces distributions of input parameters as shown in Figures 6E and 6F by the blue contour maps, which closely match the ground truth distribution of input parameters (shown by the black and the red contour lines in Figures 6C and 6F, respectively). The output distribution of the function corresponding to the generated input parameters is shown by the dashed-dotted density line in Figures 6A and 6B.
Figure 6: t-GAN intervention example. A. Kernel density estimate of the target distribution under control conditions $Q_{Y_c}$ (black solid) line and the generated (inferred) output distribution $Q_{Y_c,g}$ via t-GAN with shared variables (dashed line) and the t-GAN with explicit mapping (dashed dotted line). B. Kernel density estimate of the target distribution after intervention, $Q_{Y_d}$ (red solid line) and the inferred output distribution $Q_{Y_d,g}$ via the t-GAN with shared variables (dashed line) and the t-GAN with explicit mapping (dashed dotted line). C. Joint distribution of the model input parameters inferred via t-GAN with shared variables (contour map in blue) for the control observations with distribution $Q_{Y_c}$. D. As in C., but for joint distribution after intervention (contour map in blue) for $Q_{Y_d}$. E. Joint distribution of the model input parameters inferred via t-GAN with explicitly known map (contour map in blue) for control observations $Q_{Y_c}$. F. As in E., but for joint distribution after intervention (contour map in blue), for $Q_{Y_d}$. The distribution of the ground truth input parameters $G_{X_c}$ and $G_{X_d}$ used to generate the synthetic data population before intervention are shown by the black contour lines in (C) and (E) and the distribution of input parameters used to generate the synthetic data population after intervention is shown by red contours lines in (D) and (F) for comparison.
We examined cases at two extremes. In the first case, independent input parameters imposed the weakest possible constraint on the joint distribution. We emphasize that despite the factorization, the joint density does not necessarily assume that no correlation between $X_c$ and $X_d$ exists. It is possible to construct an infinite number of joint distributions for input parameters $x_c$ and $x_d$, each of which yields exactly same marginal distributions $Q_{X_c}$, $Q_{X_d}$ of the input parameters and generates the same distributions of output observations $Q_{Y_c}$ and $Q_{Y_d}$. The factorization of joint density only implies the degree of uncertainty about the joint distribution, with independent treatment of the two populations. The joint distribution of input parameters $Q_{X_c}$, $Q_{X_d}$ in the final solution can then be chosen based on some additional criteria, e.g., by solving the optimal transport problem [26] on inferred marginals $Q_{X_c}$, $Q_{X_d}$. Since results using the extreme case of independent input parameters is trivial, we instead demonstrated results for a slightly more complex configuration of shared input parameters. In this case, the t-GAN model did not show impressive prediction capabilities for the example with the Rosenbrock function (see Figures 6C and 6D) due to insufficient constraints.

To construct the second extreme case, we assumed a t-GAN with the strongest constraint, i.e., we treated the relationship between input parameters in two groups as a known deterministic map. The t-GAN with the known deterministic map showed satisfactory performance (Figures 6E and 6F). For simplicity of the presentation, we provided only these two extreme examples, leaving other configurations for future works. However, it is also possible to construct joint distributions that lie between the two extremes using a t-GAN configuration that accounts for smooth responses to the intervention. Smooth response might be implemented using different configurations of generator networks with additional regularization, e.g., enforcing Lipschitz continuity in neural networks [27][28].

### 4.3 Building the surrogates and active learning in SIP

In the test examples, we used a closed form mechanistic model. The model is differentiable and could be directly incorporated as part of a deep learning network. However, a numerical solution of differential equations cannot be treated in the same way. The solution is to build forward model surrogate $y = M(x)$ trained on samples from model calculations on the input parameters sampled from the prior. However, from the Poole and Raftery formula, it can be seen that sampling from the prior produces $p_Y(y)$, which is biased to some locations in the output space. For instance, for the model with 1-dimensional output, these locations are near the points where the gradient of $y = M(x)$ is vanishing. Unfortunately, bias may result in few points being sampled in the actual region of interest induced by the observations. The sampling bias is also a problem for surrogates of inverted models as conditional probabilistic models. For example, c-GAN needs to learn the multidimensional function over the entire support of the prior during training in order to create the inverse surrogate. Some algorithm of smart sampling should be adopted to incrementally improve
the surrogate models (both forward and inverse). In our biophysical studies, we applied Algorithm 1, which is similar to the algorithm for active learning that has recently been proposed in Bayesian inference [15].

**Algorithm 1: r-GAN for active learning**

**Input:** \( P_X, M \) and \( Q_Y \) prior, deterministic mechanistic model and observed data

**Output:** \( Q_{Xg} \) generated model parameters coherent to the data

1. \( D \leftarrow D_{\text{initial}}^{\text{N}_{\text{initial}}} = \{ [x_n \sim P_X, y_n = M(x_n)] \}_{n=1}^{\text{N}_{\text{initial}}} \)
2. **do**
3. Train the forward surrogate model \( M_\theta(x) \) on \( D \)
4. Train r-GAN to produce input parameters coherent to the observed data \( Q_Y \)
5. Generate \( N_{\text{samples}} \) input parameters \( x_{g,n} \) from trained r-GAN
6. Acquire new data points \( D^* = \{ [x_{g,n}, y_{g,n} = M(x_{g,n})] \}_{n=1}^{N_{\text{samples}}} \)
7. \( D \leftarrow D \cup D^* \)
8. **while not converged**;

The advantage of using r-GAN in the algorithm for active learning, as compared to conditional model as in [15], is that new samples improve the forward surrogate model without affecting the prior. Further improvements to this type of algorithm could be made by incorporating an exploration strategy as in Bayesian optimization.

5 Future Directions

We used the numerical schemes of Unrolled GAN [19] to stabilize and improve the training of GANs. Regularization of the discriminator [29, 30], application of autoencoder loss [31], and maximization of the entropy of generated samples [32] could aid in further improvements in training of our proposed GANs for parameter inference. In our ongoing study of the methods described here, we are testing the c-GANs and t-GANs to solve inverse problems using mechanistic cardiac models and real-world datasets. In cardiac mechanics, we are evaluating the mechanism of action of various cardiac inotropes using unloaded contraction cell data and our cardiac mechanics cellular model [33]. The methods are also being explored for analysis of cardiac and neuronal electrophysiology datasets as in [34] and [35].
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We tested MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN on a few other test examples in addition to the Rosenbrock function shown in Figure 7A. The generated output distributions almost perfectly match the desired target distribution for each of the methods. To quantify the performance of the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN, we determined the proximity of the generated output distribution $Q_Y$ to the target output distribution $Q_{Y^o}$ and also the closeness of the generated distribution of input parameters $Q_{X_q}$ to the prior $P_X$ via JS-divergence. Figure 7C compares the performance of MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN. All three methods perform well in estimating model input parameters coherent to the target distribution.

Next, we inferred the distribution of input parameters for the same nonlinear system of equations but choosing a different prior on input parameters as in [1]. The prior was defined by a 4 parameter Beta distribution with $x_1 \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5, 0.79, 0.99)$ and $x_2 \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5, 1 - 4.5\sqrt{0.1}, 1 + 4.5\sqrt{0.1})$. The distribution of the target observation $y$ was inferred using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN for a synthetic observation dataset with distribution $P_X$. The prior was defined by a 4 parameter Beta distribution with $x_1 \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5, 0.79, 0.99)$ and $x_2 \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5, 1 - 4.5\sqrt{0.1}, 1 + 4.5\sqrt{0.1})$. The distribution of the target observation $y$ was inferred using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN for a synthetic observation dataset with distribution $P_X$.

Examples

We tested MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN on a few other test examples in addition to the Rosenbrock function shown in Figure 7A. The methods were tested on examples from [1, 36], which include a simple parameterized nonlinear system of equations with two input parameters, a two-dimensional piecewise discontinuous function and an ordinary differential equation model with two inputs. For all the examples in the supplement, we intentionally increased the dimensionality of $Z$ and set it to 3 in the r-GAN in order to increase the entropy.

Nonlinear system of equations

For one of the examples, the mechanistic model is represented by the nonlinear system of equations with two input parameters $(x_1$ and $x_2)$,

$$x_1y_1^2 + y_2^2 = 1$$
$$y_1^2 - x_2y_2^2 = 1$$

The output feature of interest is $y_2$. Two different prior distributions, $P_X$ were tested. First, a uniform prior was considered with $x_1 \sim U(0.79, 0.99)$ and $x_2 \sim U(1 - 4.5\sqrt{0.1}, 1 + 4.5\sqrt{0.1})$ as in [1]. The distribution of input parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$ was inferred using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN for a synthetic observation dataset with distribution $Q_Y$, a Gaussian with parameters mean $\mu = 0.3$, and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.025$ truncated to the interval $(0, 0.6)$. Figure 7B shows the desired target distribution $Q_Y$ in green. The joint distribution of the parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$ obtained using the c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC is plotted in Figure 7D, E and F, respectively. Forwarding through the model the inferred input parameter samples results in the model output distribution shown by the red, blue and black distributions ($Q_{Y_{i}}, i \in \{"MCMC", "c-GAN", "r-GAN"\}$) as shown in Figure 7B, for the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN, respectively. The generated output distributions almost perfectly match the desired target distribution for each of the methods. To quantify the performance of the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN, we determined the proximity of the generated output distribution $Q_{Y_o}$ to the target output distribution $Q_Y$ and also the closeness of the generated distribution of input parameters $Q_{X_{q_o}}$ to the prior $P_X$ via JS-divergence. Figure 7C compares the performance of MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN. All three methods perform well in estimating model input parameters coherent to the target distribution.
Figure 7: Inference of the distribution of input parameters for the system of nonlinear equation with 2 input parameters for $Q_Y = \mathcal{N}(0.3, 0.0025^2)$ and uniform prior by MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN methods. A. Contour plot of observation feature of interest $y_2$ over the prior. B. Kernel density estimation (KDE) of the desired target output distribution $Q_Y$ (in green) and the generated (inferred) output distribution $Q_{Y_g}$ using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN (in red, blue and black, respectively). C. Bar-plot of JS-divergence estimated to compare the performance of c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC. Joint distribution of the inferred model input parameters generated by D. c-GAN, E. r-GAN and F. MCMC and visualized using 2D histogram plots. The dashed rectangle denotes the bounds set by the prior $P_X$.

$Q_Y$ was considered as before to be Gaussian with parameters $\mu = 0.3$, and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.025$. Figure 8A shows the contour plots of the feature of interest $y_2$ over the selected prior. The joint distribution of the parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$ obtained using the c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC is plotted in Figures 8D, E and F, respectively. As can be seen from the results, the inferred parameter distribution is influenced by the selected input parameter prior. Forwarding through the model, the inferred input parameter samples matches the target observation density for both the distinct priors (Figures 7B and 8).

An ordinary differential equation model

Finally, we tested the MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN methods on a model represented by an ordinary differential equation with 2 input parameters $x = (x_1, x_2)$.

$$\frac{df(t; x_1, x_2)}{dt} = x_1 \sin(x_2 f(t; x_1, x_2)), \quad 0 < t < 2 \text{ and } f(t = 0) = 1$$

(12)

The target feature of interest is $y(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^2 f(t; x) dt$. Since the model is an ordinary differential equation it cannot be directly incorporated into the deep learning networks used for inference. One option is to solve analytically the differential equation and use the closed form solution in the deep learning network. However, as described in the manuscript, we built a forward model surrogate. To train the surrogate model we sampled 10,000 points from the prior and obtained the target feature of interest for all the training points by solving numerically the differential equation using the Python scipy module. Figure 9A shows the contour plot of feature of interest estimated via the trained surrogate forward model over the prior.

The distribution of the target observation $Q_Y$ was considered to be Gaussian with parameters $\mu = 1.8$, and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.05$. The input parameters were considered to have uniform prior distribution with $x_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(0.8, 1.2)$ and $x_2 \sim \mathcal{U}(0.1, \pi - 0.1)$ as in [36]. The joint distribution of the parameters $x_1$ and $x_2$ obtained using the c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC is plotted in Figures 9D, E and F, respectively. Similar to other examples, forwarding through the model the inferred input parameter samples matches the target observation density for all the three methods (Figure 9B).
Figure 8: Inference of the distribution of input parameters for the system of nonlinear equation with 2 input parameters for $Q_Y = \mathcal{N}(0.3, 0.0025^2)$ and Beta prior by MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN methods. A. Contour plot of observation feature of interest $y_2$ over the prior. B. Kernel density estimation (KDE) of the desired target output distribution $Q_Y$ (in green) and the generated (inferred) output distribution $Q_Y^g$ using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN (in red, blue and black, respectively). C. Bar-plot of JS-divergence estimated to compare the performance of c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC. Joint distribution of the inferred model input parameters generated by D. c-GAN, E. r-GAN and F. MCMC, visualized using 2D histogram plots. The dashed rectangle denotes the bounds set by the prior $P_X$.

Figure 9: Inference of the distribution of input parameters for the ordinary differential equation model with 2 input parameters for $Q_Y = \mathcal{N}(1.8, 0.05^2)$ and uniform prior by MCMC, c-GAN, and r-GAN methods. A. Contour plot of observation feature of interest $y$ over the prior. B. Kernel density estimation (KDE) of the desired target output distribution $Q_Y$ (in green) and the generated (inferred) output distribution $Q_Y^g$ using MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN (in red, blue and black, respectively). C. Bar-plot of JS-divergence estimated to compare the performance of c-GAN, r-GAN and MCMC. Joint distribution of the inferred model input parameters generated by D. c-GAN, E. r-GAN and F. MCMC and visualized using 2D histogram plots. The dashed rectangle denotes the bounds set by the prior $P_X$. 
A piecwise smooth function

We also examine the performance of the methods on a piecewise smooth function as in [1] with two input parameters,

\[
y = M(x) = \begin{cases} 
q_1(x) - 2 & 3x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 0 \text{ and } -x_1 + 0.3x_2 < 0 \\
2q_2(x) & x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 0 \text{ and } -x_1 + 0.3x_2 \geq 0 \\
q_1(x) + 4 & (x_1 + 1)^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2 < 0.95^2 \\
q_1(x) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(13)

where, \(q_1(x) = e^{-(x_1^2 - x_2^2)} - x_1^3 - x_2^3\) and \(q_2(x) = 1 + q_1(x) + \frac{1}{8}(x_1^2 + x_2^2)\).

Similar to ordinary differential equation we also create a forward surrogate of the model for the piecwise smooth function. Figure 2A shows the plot of feature of interest estimated via forward surrogate model over the prior. The distribution of the target observation \(Q_Y\) was considered to be Gaussian with parameters \(\mu = -2.0\) and standard deviation \(\sigma = 0.25\). The input parameters were considered to have uniform prior distribution with \(x_1 \sim U(-1, 1)\) and \(x_2 \sim U(-1, 1)\). Figure 8A shows the contour plots of the target feature of interest \(y\) over the selected prior. Similar to the nonlinear system of equations example, forwarding through the model the inferred input parameter samples obtained via MCMC, c-GAN and r-GAN (Figures 10) matches the target observation density (Figure 10B) demonstrating the consistency of the methods over different synthetic tests.