

# Urysohn forest for aleatoric uncertainty quantification

M. Poluektov<sup>1</sup> and A. Polar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>International Institute for Nanocomposites Manufacturing, WMG, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

<sup>2</sup>Independent Software Consultant, Duluth, GA, USA

DRAFT: December 8, 2021

## Abstract

This paper focuses on building models of stochastic systems with aleatoric uncertainty. The main novelty is an algorithm of boosted ensemble training of multiple models for obtaining a probability distribution of an individual output as a function of the system input. The second novel contribution is a new regression model to be used in the ensemble. The model is a multi-layered tree of hierarchically-connected discrete Urysohn operators (or generalised additive models, which are mathematically equivalent to the discrete Urysohn operators in this case). Since multiple models (trees) are trained in the ensemble, the authors refer them as an Urysohn forest. The source code is freely available online.

**Keywords:** discrete Urysohn operator, generalised additive models, Kolmogorov-Arnold representation, Urysohn tree, Urysohn forest, uncertainty quantification, deep machine learning.

## 1 Introduction

It is not that hard to find a real-life example when the model prediction as a real number is useless, even when accurate. For example, suppose a gambler is trying to win money by betting on a football match outcome, having a model that predicts the match score. Obviously, such score can only be an expected value at best and it will not tell the gambler whether it is worth betting on a particular outcome. To obtain a statistical monetary profit, the gambler needs a probabilistic model providing probabilities of possible outcomes.

The problem above falls into the category of uncertainty quantification problems. A dataset is considered with recorded vector inputs  $X^i$  of a system and corresponding scalar outputs  $y^i$ . Different records (indexed as  $i$ ) are considered to be independent and can be used in modelling in any order. Finally, the object has an aleatoric uncertainty, which means that the output may take different values if an experiment is repeated with the identical inputs. The goal is to obtain the probability distribution of the output of each individual record, even when there are no identical inputs in the entire training dataset. Such goal is generally hard to achieve, and, in this paper, it is loosened to obtaining multiple estimations  $\hat{y}_1^i, \hat{y}_2^i, \dots, \hat{y}_n^i$  for each individual output — a sample from the probability distribution of the output. Thus, the first aim of this paper is to propose an algorithm that builds such estimations, which will be referred to as the *divisive data resorting* (DDR). Briefly, this is achieved by partitioning data into disjoints and building an ensemble of models  $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n$  that convert an input into a vector of the estimations.

The common modelling choices for this type of data are Bayesian neural networks (BNN) and data partitioning with ensemble training [1]. The usual approaches for the latter include so-called bagging [2,3], boosting [4,5] and stacking [6,7]. As will be evident later, the approach proposed in this paper (based on obtaining a vector of output estimations) falls into the boosting category, since a series of models is built sequentially. It has similarities to some known methods, but, in the form proposed here, it is novel to the best knowledge of the authors. A possibly close concept is called anticlustering [8–10], where clusters are built to have maximum similarity, while having maximum diversity of the elements within them. In

the anticlustering approach, the records with the same inputs and different outputs are partitioned to appear in different disjoints and different models are trained on these different disjoints. This is expected to lead to multiple outputs that somehow should represent the values that the real output takes.

Another important element of the problem is the choice of the model itself. The authors of this paper have previously published on the Urysohn and the Kolmogorov-Arnold models (the latter can be viewed as the generalisation of the former). These models are covered in separate section 3 to make this paper self-contained. The Kolmogorov-Arnold model has relatively good descriptive capabilities [11], but there is a room for improvement/simplification. Thus, the second aim of this paper is to propose another model — the binary Urysohn tree. It is introduced and described in section 4. This new model is tested on multiple publicly available datasets and compared to the previously proposed models. Finally, this model and the DDR algorithm are tested using an example of a stochastic system. The source codes for the simulations and some used experimental datasets are shared by the authors online<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Divisive data resorting

The uncertainty quantification problem for a stochastic system consists in building the input-dependent probability density function of the output. To solve this problem, a novel algorithm is proposed — divisive data resorting (DDR). First, the general idea is described using simple terms, and a more strict mathematical description is given in subsection 2.1.

A dataset with independent records  $(X^i, y^i)$  and with aleatoric uncertainty of the data is considered. Independence in this case implies that each individual record is not related to other records<sup>2</sup>. Suppose some model  $\mathcal{M}$  can be built using some error minimisation process

$$\min_{\mathcal{M}} \|y^i - \mathcal{M}(X^i)\|^2.$$

The simplest version of the method starts by building one model for the entire dataset  $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}$  (the first subscript is the step number and the second is the index of the model). Then, the data is resorted according to residual error

$$e^i = y^i - \mathcal{M}_{1,1}(X^i)$$

and divided into two even clusters over the median error in the sorted list. Then, the second step is performed, where two models are built for each cluster  $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{2,2}$ . The records are resorted by the residual error within each cluster and the process is continued in the same way — at the third step, models  $\mathcal{M}_{3,1}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{3,2}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{3,3}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{3,4}$  are obtained, etc. The average residuals should decline for each cluster in the division process, as the data subsets are reduced by half at each step; therefore, the models can become near 100% accurate, at which point the divisive clustering with resorting should stop. The ensemble of models obtained at the last divisive step can be now used to approximate the distribution of the output for each individual record — the ensemble of model outputs can be handled as a sample from the probability distribution of the real output.

The intuitive justification of such divisive data resorting can be explained using the following elementary example. Assume that all inputs in the entire dataset are identical and all outputs take any of two values  $C_1$  or  $C_2$ . A single model minimises the error and will give a prediction between these values, but after division into clusters, the records with different outputs will fall into different disjoints. Thus, the ensemble of models, built on these disjoints, will return a collection of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  values in a proportion that should be close to the proportion in the original dataset.

From a physical perspective, it is assumed that the outputs of training dataset  $(X^i, y^i)$  are generated by stochastic system  $\mathcal{S}$  that has a finite number of random states (denoted as  $\mathcal{S}_k$ ). At each particular state, the system is deterministic and produces the same output for the same input, if transformation  $y_k^i = \mathcal{S}_k(X^i)$  is repeated. It is assumed that properties of  $\mathcal{S}_k$  are gradually changing with the index. The data used for the training are recorded for different and unknown states. The introduced DDR algorithm generates a set of deterministic models  $\mathcal{M}_k$ , which cannot be regarded to be identical to  $\mathcal{S}_k$ , but aims at approximating the distribution of the output as if the same input was passed into unknown but existing  $\mathcal{S}_k$ .

### 2.1 Detailed description of the algorithm

A set of data records  $(X^i, y^i)$  of the stochastic system is considered, where  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $X^i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . The stochasticity implies that output  $y$  of the system is a random variable with cumulative distribution

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/andrewpolar>

<sup>2</sup>For example, when the inputs are demographic parameters and the output is a human choice.

function  $F(y)$  dependent on input  $X$ . An individual deterministic model is denoted as  $\mathcal{M}$ , the calculated model output is denoted as  $\hat{y}^i = \mathcal{M}(X^i)$  and the discrepancy between the model and the real output is denoted as  $e^i = y^i - \hat{y}^i$ .

To construct the disjoint subsets, it is necessary to describe the data resorting procedure as follows. First, it is assumed that there is already a vector of data record orders, which is denoted as  $Q$  and which is obtained by a permutation of numbers from 1 to  $N$ . A number of disjoint sets, into which the dataset will be split, is denoted as  $w$ . Next, the models  $\mathcal{M}^l$ ,  $l \in \{1, \dots, w\}$  are built, such that each model  $\mathcal{M}^l$  uses data records  $(X^i, y^i)$  for identification with

$$i \in \{Q_k\}, \quad k \in \{dl - d + 1, dl - d + 2, \dots, dl\}, \quad d = \text{floor}\left(\frac{N}{w}\right).$$

It is easy to see that all models  $\mathcal{M}^l$  are indeed identified on disjoint sets of data<sup>1</sup>. Next, for each  $i$ , discrepancies  $e^i$  are calculated using the corresponding model  $\mathcal{M}^l$ . Finally, new vector  $Q^*$  is obtained from  $Q$  by permutation of its components such that

$$\text{if } i = Q_k^* \text{ and } j = Q_{k+1}^*, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, N - 1\}, \quad \text{then } e^i \leq e^j.$$

Thus,  $w$  models have been used to sort the data based on the discrepancy between each model and the real output.

The proposed algorithm of constructing the ensemble starts with  $Q = [1 \ 2 \ \dots \ N]$  indicating the initial order of the data records. Then, the dataset is sorted several times using the procedure described above with  $w$  increasing each time up to  $W$ . It is implied that at the end of one sorting procedure,  $Q^*$  becomes  $Q$  for the subsequent sorting procedure. At the end, the algorithm results in  $W$  models, which constitute the ensemble.

Now, given some input  $X$ , the models of ensemble can be used to calculate  $W$  different outputs. These outputs can be used to calculate some statistics, for example, the mean or the standard deviation. Furthermore, these outputs can be used to build the so-called empirical cumulative distribution function (ECDF) of the output. This ECDF will obviously be input-dependent and is the ultimate goal of the considered uncertainty quantification problem for a stochastic system.

It should be noted that if  $W$  is relatively small, ECDF will be rather coarse and the following technique can be used to build a finer ECDF. Having final order vector  $Q$ , after the final sorting, additional models  $\mathcal{M}^l$ ,  $l \in \{1, \dots, W_{\text{cdf}}\}$  can be built, such that each model  $\mathcal{M}^l$  uses data records  $(X^i, y^i)$  for identification with

$$i \in \{Q_k\}, \quad k \in \{dl - d + 1, dl - d + 2, \dots, dl - d + r\}, \quad d = \text{floor}\left(\frac{N-r}{W_{\text{cdf}}-1}\right),$$

where  $W_{\text{cdf}} \gg W$  and  $r$  is some non-negative integer. It can be seen that these additional models are no longer identified on disjoint subsets, but rather on a ‘sliding’ window applied to a set of data records. Given some input  $X$ , a finer ECDF can be then constructed using the outputs of these additional models (or the additional ensemble).

### 3 Urysohn and Kolmogorov-Arnold models

For testing of the DDR algorithm, a particular model must be chosen. One possible choice is a hierarchical tree of the discrete Urysohn operators, introduction of which requires some prerequisites that are summarised in this section.

The Urysohn operator has originally been introduced within the theory of non-linear integral equations [12]. It remained largely a theoretical concept until 1970s, when it has been picked up by researchers from the theory of automatic control and has been reintroduced as a continuous-time integral operator that transforms function  $x(t)$  to function  $z(t)$  in the following way [13]:

$$z(t) = \int_0^T V(s, x(t-s)) ds, \tag{1}$$

where  $x : [-T, +\infty) \rightarrow [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$ ,  $z : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $V : [0, T] \times [x_{\min}, x_{\max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous almost everywhere functions,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $T \geq 0$  and  $x_{\min}, x_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Function  $V(s, x)$  is the kernel of the continuous-time Urysohn operator.

---

<sup>1</sup>Due to the way  $k$  is introduced, it is not possible to have the same  $k$  for different  $l$ . Also, by definition of  $Q$ , its components are unique. Therefore, it is not possible to have the same  $i$  for different  $l$ .

Since digital equipment collects continuous signals in a form of numeric series, the discrete-time Urysohn operator has also been introduced [13]:

$$z_i = \sum_{j=1}^m g^j(x_{i-j+1}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2)$$

where  $x_i \in [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$  is the series of input values,  $z_i \in \mathbb{R}$  is the series of output values,  $m$  is the memory depth of the operator and  $g^j : [x_{\min}, x_{\max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous almost everywhere functions. It can be seen that equation (2) results from a numerical quadrature of equation (1).

An interesting property of the discrete-time form of the Urysohn operator is that it can be used not only for control systems (i.e. mapping series  $x_i$  to series  $z_i$ ), but also for a general task of data modelling. Given a set of data records<sup>1</sup>  $(X^i, y^i)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , where  $X^i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the input of the  $i$ -th record,  $y^i \in \mathbb{R}$  is the output of the  $i$ -th record and  $N$  is the number of records, operator  $\mathcal{U} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  can be introduced as [11]:

$$\mathcal{U}(X^i) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^m g^j(X_j^i), \quad (3)$$

where functions  $g^j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are functions of one variable and  $X_j^i$  denote the  $j$ -th component of vector  $X^i$ . For consistency of the notation, it is assumed that  $X_j^i \in [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$ . The operator notation can now be used to formulate the Urysohn model:

$$\hat{y}^i = \mathcal{U}(X^i), \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{y}^i$  is the calculated model output of the  $i$ -th record.

In 1950s, Andrei Kolmogorov and Vladimir Arnold showed that any continuous multivariate function can be represented as a composition of functions of a single variable [14, 15]. More precisely, function  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C([0, 1]^m)$  can be represented as

$$F(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m) = \sum_{k=1}^{2m+1} \Phi^k \left( \sum_{j=1}^m f^{kj}(X_j) \right), \quad (5)$$

where  $f^{kj} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C[0, 1]$  and  $\Phi^k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C(\mathbb{R})$ . This decomposition can be used for a general problem of data modelling, where the output is the continuous function of the inputs<sup>2</sup>. Using the notation of the discrete Urysohn operator and given a set of data records  $(X^i, y^i)$ , an intermediate variable  $\theta^i \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+1}$  is introduced for each data record and the Kolmogorov-Arnold model for the input-output relationship is then written as [11]:

$$\hat{y}^i = \mathcal{U}^0(\theta^i), \quad \theta_k^i = \mathcal{U}^k(X^i), \quad k = \{1, \dots, 2m+1\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{U}^0$  is the operator containing functions  $\Phi^k$  and  $\mathcal{U}^k$  are the operators containing functions  $f^{kj}$ . For consistency of the notation, the domains of functions  $f^{kj}$  have been extended to  $[x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$  in equation (6). This model can also be interpreted as an Urysohn tree with particular hierarchy, containing 1 ‘root’ and  $2m+1$  ‘branch’ operators. Intermediate variables  $\theta$  can then be interpreted as a hidden layer in the model.

It is useful to note that the Kolmogorov-Arnold model can also be viewed as a generalisation of the so-called ‘ridge functions’ [17]:

$$F(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m) = \Phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^m c_j X_j \right),$$

where  $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$  are some constants and  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is some function. The ridge function models are used in some areas of data modelling and even are suggested as an approximate replacement of the Kolmogorov-Arnold model and neural networks [17].

It is also useful to highlight the relationship between the discrete Urysohn operator and the generalised additive model (GAM). The latter is mathematically equivalent to the discrete Urysohn operator written for the case of data modelling, equation (3). GAMs have been introduced and researched independently

<sup>1</sup>Data records are also called ‘instances’ or ‘entries’ in literature.

<sup>2</sup>More recently the restrictions on continuity have been somewhat relaxed, e.g. see discussion in [16].

[18]. One possible reason for this is that the Urysohn operators have been introduced originally for dynamical systems, equation (2), and most research have been done within the field of automatic control and signal processing. In the original definition of the discrete Urysohn operator, the inputs are discrete values of the same signal; therefore, all functions are defined on the same domain and the adjacent functions are expected to be similar. In the data modelling case, equation (3), each function can have different field of definition and each argument can be either continuous or quantised.

### 3.1 Discretisation and identification

To handle the models computationally, the underlying functions of the Urysohn operators must be represented in some discretised form. One option is to use the piecewise-linear functions, which are defined by the position of the nodes (i.e. points where the functions change the slope). Equally-spaced nodes are introduced as

$$x_l = x_{\min} + \frac{l-1}{n-1}(x_{\max} - x_{\min}), \quad l = \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $n$  is the number of nodes. For convenience, these nodes are combined in set  $P = \{x_l\}$ . Now, functions  $g^j$  can be represented as

$$g^j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^n U_{jl} \phi^l(x), \quad (8)$$

where  $U_{jl}$  are the model parameters (also nodal values of  $g^j$ ) and  $\phi^l : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C[x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$  are the nodal basis functions. These functions are continuous, are linear between the nodes, are exactly 1 at node  $l$  and are exactly 0 at all other nodes:

$$\phi^l(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in P \text{ and } x \neq x_l, \\ 1, & \text{if } x = x_l, \\ \text{linear,} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Substituting equation (8) into (3), it can be seen that the Urysohn operator is defined by its parameters  $U_{jl}$ , which can also be understood as elements of  $m$ -by- $n$  matrix  $U$ .

The identification problem for the Urysohn model (4) is finding parameters  $U_{jl}$  given set of records  $(X^i, y^i)$ , such that the discrepancy between  $\hat{y}^i$  and  $y^i$  is minimised. This problem and its properties (e.g. non-uniqueness of the solution) have been studied in detail in [19]. Briefly, it can be seen that  $\hat{y}^i$  is a linear function of the parameters (but not a linear function of the inputs). Therefore, it is possible to assemble a linear system of equations with respect to  $U_{jl}$  and solve it. In [19], the authors have suggested solving it iteratively row-by-row (or record-by-record) using the projection decent method [20, 21], which avoids keeping in memory the entire matrix of the system.

The same discretisation of the functions can be used in the Kolmogorov-Arnold model. Functions of each Urysohn operator are represented in a piecewise-linear form as above. The identification problem for the Kolmogorov-Arnold model (6) is finding parameters of operator  $\mathcal{U}^0$  and of operators  $\mathcal{U}^k$  given set of records  $(X^i, y^i)$ , such that the discrepancy between  $\hat{y}^i$  and  $y^i$  is minimised. This problem has been studied in [11] and the identification algorithm has been proposed. Briefly, it can be seen that if intermediate variable  $\theta^i$  is known, a method for identification of a single Urysohn operator can be applied to find parameters of both  $\mathcal{U}^0$  and  $\mathcal{U}^k$ . Since the exact values of  $\theta^i$  are in fact unknown, the method suggested by the authors is based on the perturbation of  $\theta^i$  by  $\Delta\theta^i$  and finding such  $\Delta\theta^i$  that the residual between the model and the measured outputs is reduced for each data record, fulfilling the condition

$$|y^i - \mathcal{U}^0(\theta^i + \Delta\theta^i)| < |y^i - \mathcal{U}^0(\theta^i)|. \quad (10)$$

Having these new values  $\theta^i + \Delta\theta^i$ , all Urysohn operators are updated. By applying this step sequentially record-by-record, the entire model is identified. The major difference between this method and other methods for this problem [22, 23] is that it identifies the shapes of all involved functions directly, not as a linear combination of a prior chosen set and not by limiting them to being monotonically increasing.

## 4 Binary Urysohn tree

As seen above, the Kolmogorov-Arnold model can be understood as a tree of the Urysohn operators. Although in a general form (i.e. before applying piecewise-linear discretisations of the functions), it

can describe an arbitrary continuous multivariate input-output dependency, in practice, there are a few difficulties. First, after introducing the piecewise-linear discretisations, it is not exact anymore, hence, other equally good (or even better) approximations might exist. Second, since ‘branch’ Urysohn operators  $\mathcal{U}^k$  have identical structure, some randomness is required at the initialisation, otherwise, all ‘branch’ operators end up being equal after the identification is completed. This randomness influences the local minimum to which the identification converges.

In this section, a new model, inspired by the Kolmogorov-Arnold model, but simpler, is introduced. The primary motivation for proposing this model is to have a simpler structure and simpler identification algorithm. The model is a binary tree of the Urysohn operators (or binary Urysohn tree). The tree has  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  levels. At each level  $k$ , there are  $2^{k-1}$  Urysohn operators. At every level except the last one, each Urysohn operator takes two outputs from the next level as the inputs. At the last level, each Urysohn operator takes a combination of components of  $X^i$  as the inputs.

To write this formally, following the notation of the previous section, intermediate variables are introduced as the outputs of the Urysohn operators. These variables are denoted as  $\theta_j^k$ , where  $k$  is the level,  $j$  is the number of the operator within this level and, for clarity, index  $i$  of a record is dropped. At every level except the last one, the Urysohn operators contain only two functions, therefore,

$$\theta_j^k = L_j^k(\theta_{2j-1}^{k+1}) + R_j^k(\theta_{2j}^{k+1}), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{k-1}\}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}, \quad (11)$$

where  $L_j^k$  and  $R_j^k$  are left and right functions of the operator. At the last level, the Urysohn operators contain  $s$  functions:

$$\theta_j^K = \sum_{p=1}^s G_j^p(\theta_{sj-s+p}^{K+1}), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{K-1}\}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\theta_j^{K+1}$  have been introduced and are defined to be the components of the input vector:

$$\theta_j^{K+1} = X_q^i, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{K-1}s\}, \quad q \in \{1, \dots, m\}. \quad (13)$$

It is deliberately not specified which components are specifically taken — the simplest option is selecting integers  $q$  randomly. Finally, the output of the Urysohn operator at the first level is defined as the output of the model:

$$\hat{y}^i = \theta_1^1. \quad (14)$$

Using the commonly-accepted notation related to the tree structures, the operators in  $\theta_j^K$  will be referred to as the ‘leaf’ Urysohn operators and the operator in  $\theta_1^1$  will be referred to as the ‘root’ Urysohn operator.

## 4.1 Discretisation

As previously, the functions must be represented in a discrete form for computational algorithms. Again, a piecewise-linear representation can be used. According to the structure defined above, variables  $\theta_j^k$  are the outputs of the operators at level  $k$  and also serve as the inputs for level  $k-1$  of the tree. Each of these variables can vary within its own range denoted as  $a_j^k \leq \theta_j^k \leq b_j^k$ . Each range can be split into  $n-1$  equal segments, resulting in a set of  $n$  nodes. Since the ranges vary for different variables, it is convenient to introduce slightly different notation for the nodal basis functions than previously:

$$\phi^l(\kappa) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \kappa \in P \text{ and } \kappa \neq \frac{l-1}{n-1}, \\ 1, & \text{if } \kappa = \frac{l-1}{n-1}, \\ \text{linear,} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$P = \left\{0, \frac{1}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{n-2}{n-1}, 1\right\}. \quad (16)$$

Now, functions  $L_j^k$ ,  $R_j^k$  and  $G_j^p$  in equations (11) and (12) can be defined as

$$L_j^k(\theta_{2j-1}^{k+1}) = \sum_{l=1}^n L_{jl}^k \phi^l(\kappa_L), \quad (17)$$

$$R_j^k(\theta_{2j}^{k+1}) = \sum_{l=1}^n R_{jl}^k \phi^l(\kappa_R), \quad (18)$$

$$G_j^p(\theta_{sj-s+p}^{K+1}) = \sum_{l=1}^n G_{jl}^p \phi^l(\kappa_G), \quad (19)$$

$$\kappa_L = \frac{\theta_{2j-1}^{k+1} - a_{2j-1}^{k+1}}{b_{2j-1}^{k+1} - a_{2j-1}^{k+1}}, \quad \kappa_R = \frac{\theta_{2j}^{k+1} - a_{2j}^{k+1}}{b_{2j}^{k+1} - a_{2j}^{k+1}}, \quad \kappa_G = \frac{\theta_{sj-s+p}^{K+1} - a_{sj-s+p}^{K+1}}{b_{sj-s+p}^{K+1} - a_{sj-s+p}^{K+1}}, \quad (20)$$

where  $L_{jl}^k$ ,  $R_{jl}^k$  and  $G_{jl}^p$  are the nodal values of the corresponding functions. For clarity of the presentation,  $n$  is the same for each level of the tree; however, in practice, it is not necessary.

## 4.2 Identification

The general algorithm for identification of an Urysohn tree (record-by-record descent) has been proposed in the previous publication by the authors [11]. In this paper, the algorithm is simplified taking into account the tree structure. Later, the numerical examples will show that such simplifications do not result in any noticeable differences to the previous approach.

The algorithm starts by assigning the initial values of the parameters of the operators. The advantage of the proposed binary Urysohn tree is the absence of the necessity to generate different parameter values for different operators, since the ‘leaf’ operators should converge to different values anyway, due to randomly selected components of the input vector as the inputs of the ‘leaf’ operators. Therefore, it is proposed to take functions  $G_j^p(\theta) = 0$  and functions  $L_j^k(\theta) = R_j^k(\theta) = \theta$  as initial approximations. Since the functions are defined by the set of the equidistant nodes, it is also required to set the initial ranges for all intermediate variables  $\theta_j^k$ , which are taken to be  $a_j^k = y_{\min}$  and  $b_j^k = y_{\max}$ , where  $y_{\min}$  and  $y_{\max}$  are the minimum and the maximum values of actual output  $y^i$ .

The algorithm performs identification record-by-record. For each record, intermediate variables  $\theta_j^k$  and model output  $\hat{y}^i$  are calculated first. The difference between the actual output and the model output is calculated:

$$D^i = y^i - \hat{y}^i. \quad (21)$$

Then, the increments to the intermediate values are calculated in a cascade way as

$$\Delta\theta_1^1 = D^i, \quad (22)$$

$$\Delta\theta_{2j-1}^{k+1} = \frac{\Delta\theta_j^k}{2} \operatorname{sgn} \left. \frac{dL_j^k}{d\theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_{2j-1}^{k+1}}, \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta\theta_{2j}^{k+1} = \frac{\Delta\theta_j^k}{2} \operatorname{sgn} \left. \frac{dR_j^k}{d\theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_{2j}^{k+1}}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{k-1}\}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}. \quad (24)$$

At the above step, the original algorithm of [11] has been simplified to account only for the sign of the derivative of the functions, disregarding the absolute value. In the original algorithm, the values of the derivatives are in the denominators, which requires some sort of regularisation, and it is easier to avoid it completely.

Considering operator  $j$  at level  $k$  of the tree,  $k \neq K$ , this operator results in output  $\theta_j^k$ . This output can now be regarded as the ‘model’ output of the operator, while output  $\theta_j^k + \mu\Delta\theta_j^k$ , where  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  is a regularisation parameter, can now be regarded as the ‘actual’ output for the operator. Thus, the problem is reduced to one step of the identification of a single Urysohn operator. To write this formally, the nodal values of the functions are assembled into a vector:

$$Z^i = [L_{j1}^k \quad R_{j1}^k \quad L_{j2}^k \quad R_{j2}^k \quad \dots \quad L_{jn}^k \quad R_{jn}^k]^T, \quad k \neq K, \quad (25)$$

where superscript  $i$  denotes that the values are taken at step  $i$  and scripts  $k, j$  are omitted for  $Z^i$  for clarity. Next, the values of the nodal basis functions are also assembled into a vector:

$$\Phi^i = [\phi^1(\kappa_L) \quad \phi^1(\kappa_R) \quad \phi^2(\kappa_L) \quad \phi^2(\kappa_R) \quad \dots \quad \phi^n(\kappa_L) \quad \phi^n(\kappa_R)]^T, \quad k \neq K. \quad (26)$$

The model parameters are then updated using one simplified step of the projection descend method [20, 21]:

$$Z^{i+1} = Z^i + \frac{\mu}{2} \Delta \theta_j^k \Phi^i, \quad k \neq K, \quad (27)$$

where the simplification compared to the original algorithm consists in using 2 in the denominator<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, if  $k = K$ , the same steps lead to

$$Z^i = [G_{j1}^k \quad G_{j2}^k \quad \dots \quad G_{jn}^k]^\top, \quad k = K \quad (28)$$

$$\Phi^i = [\phi^1(\kappa_G) \quad \phi^2(\kappa_G) \quad \dots \quad \phi^n(\kappa_G)]^\top, \quad k = K \quad (29)$$

$$Z^{i+1} = Z^i + \frac{\mu}{s} \Delta \theta_j^k \Phi^i, \quad k = K. \quad (30)$$

The iterations are performed until a convergence criteria, e.g. small difference between the model and the real outputs for several consecutive iterations, is fulfilled.

### 4.3 Maintaining input boundaries of internal operators

Since the inputs are known prior to the identification, the domains of the functions of the ‘leaf’ Urysohn operators can be chosen accordingly. However, the inputs of the other operators are drifting during the identification, since they are the outputs of the higher-level operators, which are modified within the identification process. Therefore, some form of renormalisation is required.

During the code development, the authors found that the specific type of renormalisation does not have a significant impact on the results. One efficient method is rescaling according to the collected statistics of inputs of the operators. As introduced in section 4.1, intermediate variables  $\theta_j^k$  vary within their own range denoted as  $a_j^k \leq \theta_j^k \leq b_j^k$ . To collect statistics on the intermediate variables, additional quantities are introduced:  $m_j^{ik}$  is representing the expected value of the intermediate variable at step  $i$  and  $v_j^{ik}$  is representing the variance of the intermediate variable at step  $i$ . These quantities are evolved according to the following equations<sup>2</sup>:

$$m_j^{ik} = \frac{m_j^{(i-1)k} + \theta_j^k c}{1 + c}, \quad v_j^{ik} = \frac{v_j^{(i-1)k} + c(m_j^{ik} - \theta_j^k)^2}{1 + c}, \quad (31)$$

where  $\theta_j^k$  is taken at step  $i$  (as previously) and  $c$  is some update rate constant. It should be noted that  $m_j^{ik}$  and  $v_j^{ik}$  are not exactly the mean and the variance of  $\theta_j^k$ , but should be close to them calculated over a number of steps, provided that the value of  $c$  is small.

Next, assuming a uniform distribution for  $\theta_j^k$ , the expected limits can be calculated at each step as:

$$\bar{a}_j^k = m_j^{ik} - \sqrt{3v_j^{ik}}, \quad \bar{b}_j^k = m_j^{ik} + \sqrt{3v_j^{ik}}, \quad (32)$$

where  $\bar{a}_j^k$  and  $\bar{b}_j^k$  are taken at step  $i$ . Finally, the update is necessary only if the expected limits are significantly different from the current. Formally, this can be written as e.g.

$$\text{if } |a_j^k - \bar{a}_j^k| > \frac{b_j^k - a_j^k}{2(n-1)} \quad \text{then } a_j^k = \bar{a}_j^k, \quad (33)$$

$$\text{if } |b_j^k - \bar{b}_j^k| > \frac{b_j^k - a_j^k}{2(n-1)} \quad \text{then } b_j^k = \bar{b}_j^k. \quad (34)$$

Such procedure allows  $\theta_j^k$  to fall occasionally outside of the boundaries  $a_j^k$  and  $b_j^k$ . In this case, simple extrapolation can be used to compute the function value.

### 4.4 Prevention of overfitting

The common way of detecting whether the model is overfitted is usage of the training and the validation data. The validation data is not used for training and is so-called new or unseen data. The complexity of the binary Urysohn tree is determined by the number of linear blocks  $n$  in each function, the number of inputs  $s$  of the ‘leaf’ Urysohn operators and the number of layers  $K$  in the tree. By modifying these parameters, the optimal complexity can be established.

<sup>1</sup>This simplification does not break the stability of the method. In the original formulation,  $|\Phi^i|^2$  is in the denominator. The proof of the convergence of the projection descend method shows that for convergence, it is necessary that  $\mu \in (0, 2)$ , see e.g. [19]. Here,  $|\Phi^i|^2 \in [1, 2]$  due to the structure of the nodal basis functions. Therefore, if denominator is replaced by 2 and  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  is selected, the convergence condition is not violated.

<sup>2</sup>The idea comes from the discretisation of equation  $\dot{z} = -\alpha(z - X)$ , where  $X$  is some random variable.

## 5 Numerical examples

Since the novelty of this paper consists in two main concepts: the DDR algorithm and the binary Urysohn tree, these concepts should be tested step-by-step. The authors previously tested the Kolmogorov-Arnold model on a variety of datasets [11]. For this paper, the authors tested the binary Urysohn tree on the same datasets and compared to the Kolmogorov-Arnold model. The details are provided in appendix A. Based on the comparison, it can be concluded that both models perform similarly on a range of datasets, while the binary Urysohn tree is a simpler model. The binary Urysohn tree is then used as a deterministic model component of the DDR algorithm, which is tested below. Since within the DDR algorithm, the ensemble of models (trees) are trained, the authors refer them as an Urysohn forest. The evaluation of the performance of the DDR algorithm is made using the synthetic data, since it requires simulating the cumulative distribution functions of the outputs using the Monte-Carlo technique for a given record, which is not possible if data recordings of a real physical system are taken.

### 5.1 Synthetic data example

The generated synthetic data is a set of records with observed input vectors  $X^i$  and corresponding output scalars  $y^i$ . The outputs are computed by some formula  $y^i = \mathcal{F}(X^i + \xi^i)$ , where inputs  $X^i$  are perturbed by a uniformly-distributed noise  $\xi^i$ . When the ensemble of models is obtained and a sample of outputs is computed for particular  $X^i$ , this sample can be compared to the probability distribution or the expected value of  $y^i$ .

A synthetic example must be challenging enough to test the proposed procedure to the limit. This means that the stochastic system must be such that the statistical behaviour of the output changes significantly as a function of the inputs — the probability density function (PDF) changes qualitatively not only from symmetric to non-symmetric, but also by changing the number of minima/maxima as the inputs are changing. Thus, the following system is taken:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y &= \frac{2 + 2X_3^*}{3\pi} \left( \arctan \left( 20 \left( X_1^* - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{X_2^*}{6} \right) \exp(X_5^*) \right) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) + \\
 &+ \frac{2 + 2X_4^*}{3\pi} \left( \arctan \left( 20 \left( X_1^* - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{X_2^*}{6} \right) \exp(X_5^*) \right) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right), \\
 X_j^* &= X_j + 0.4(C_j - 0.5), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 5\},
 \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$


where  $C_j \sim \text{unif}(0, 1)$  are uniformly distributed random variables. The probability density of the output indeed significantly changes depending on inputs. In figure 1, in the insets (blue figures), four examples of probability densities of  $y$  are shown for four different inputs:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X^1 &= [0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5], \\
 X^2 &= [0.65 \quad 0 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5], \\
 X^3 &= [0.68 \quad 1 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5], \\
 X^4 &= [0.74 \quad 1 \quad 0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 1],
 \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to subfigures (a)-(d), respectively. The PDFs are built using the Monte-Carlo sampling of  $10^5$  points.

To test the proposed uncertainty quantification procedure, a total of 40 runs of the programme have been performed. During each run, a dataset of  $N = 10^6$  records has been generated, the Urysohn forest has been constructed and the ECDFs for the given above four points have been calculated using the ‘sliding’ window technique. For data generation, inputs  $X_j \sim \text{unif}(0, 1)$  were taken. The parameters of the Urysohn trees have been selected to be  $K = 5$ ,  $s = 3$  and  $n = 5$  based on a separate parametric study. The identification parameters have been selected to be  $\mu = 0.005$  and  $c = 0.0005$ . During the identification of each tree, 3 passes through the dataset have been performed. To construct the Urysohn forest,  $w \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 17, 23, 29\}$  divisions have been performed. For the ‘sliding’ window technique, parameters have been selected to be  $r = 30000$  and  $d = 5000$ .

In figure 1, for each of the four inputs, the ECDF built using the Monte-Carlo sampling is shown in black colour and the ECDFs obtained from the Urysohn forests are shown in grey colour. Furthermore, an average ECDF across all realisations of the forest (i.e. average of grey curves) is shown in red colour. For the purpose of the discussion, the Monte-Carlo sampling ECDFs will be referred to as the ‘exact’. It can be seen that the Urysohn forest reproduces the major features of the exact CDFs qualitatively and predicts well the range of the output quantitatively. The subfigures show different representative



**Figure 1:** The empirical cumulative distribution functions (ECDFs) for the considered stochastic system obtained using the Monte-Carlo sampling (black) and using the realisations of the Urysohn forest (grey). Averages over the realisations are shown in red. The corresponding probability density functions (PDFs) obtained using the Monte-Carlo sampling are shown in the insets. Subfigures (a)-(d) correspond to inputs  $X^1$ - $X^4$ .

scenarios: for input  $X^1$ , the forest ECDF is very close to the exact CDF; for input  $X^2$ , the forest ECDF is somewhat far from the exact CDF quantitatively, although reproduces qualitatively the change of the slope; for inputs  $X^3$  and  $X^4$ , the forest ECDF is rather close to the exact CDF, although somewhat smoothed.

To estimate quantitatively whether the ECDFs obtained using the Urysohn forests are close to the real CDFs (built using the Monte-Carlo sampling) across a wide range of inputs, the standard Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness test with level  $\alpha = 0.05$  has been used. This test quantifies the distance between the distribution functions and indicates whether they can be regarded to be sampled from the same reference distribution. For each Urysohn forest (as indicated above, a total of 40 forests have been built), a set of 100 input points have been randomly generated. For each input point, the real CDFs have been built using the Monte-Carlo sampling of  $10^3$  points. For these 100 input points, on average,  $26.5 \pm 5.5$  points have failed the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (i.e. for this percentage of points, the CDFs are relatively far). This might seem to be a large percentage, but the underlying system has specifically been chosen to be extremely challenging for the modelling and the failure threshold of the test (level  $\alpha$ ) is relatively low. For simpler systems, the percentage of failed Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests is significantly lower (see appendix B).

Finally, the real CDFs and the ECDFs obtained using the Urysohn forests can also be compared in a different way. For each forest and for each of the 100 input points as above, the mean across the forest and the real mean (from the Monte-Carlo CDFs) have been calculated. On average, the Pearson correlation coefficient between these means was  $0.9947 \pm 0.0011$ . This result indicates that even though a quarter of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests failed, the expected value of the output is modelled very precisely by the Urysohn forest.

## 6 Conclusions

The cases when modelled objects are stochastic, while observed inputs and outputs are exact, are common across wide variety of scientific and technological fields. The introduced in this paper divisive data resorting (DDR) algorithm attempts to address this uncertainty by building an ensemble of models and by using the models' outputs to estimate the probability distribution of the real output. Any regression

model can be used within the DDR algorithm, since it partitions the records over the median residual and no model-specific features are used in the partitioning and the resorting processes. One possible option for a regression model is a hierarchical tree of the discrete Urysohn operators. In this paper, a novel hierarchy has been proposed and studied — the binary Urysohn tree. This tree performs similarly to the Kolmogorov-Arnold model, while being simpler.

In the computational example, the stochastic system has been considered. The system has been chosen such that the probability distribution of the output of the system significantly depends on the input, with different number of maxima points. A set of records has been generated and subsequently used to build an Urysohn forest using the DDR algorithm. The forest qualitatively reproduced the probability distributions of the outputs of the stochastic system, with minor quantitative discrepancies.

It is also useful to note that the Urysohn trees discussed in this paper may be customised for individual cases in a similar way as researchers design neural networks according to specific tasks and data, but algorithms for identification of such trees can be derivatives of the identification algorithm proposed in [11] and its simplified version proposed in this paper.

The problems remaining for the future research are more rigorous numerical analysis of the DDR algorithm and consideration of stochastic systems with correlated outputs. A typical example of the latter is a physical system, where index  $i$  represents moments of time, in which case, the order of the records matters and they cannot be resorted in such straightforward manner.

## Appendix A Testing of the binary Urysohn tree

The aim of this appendix is to compare the binary Urysohn tree (abbreviated as BUT) proposed in this paper and the Kolmogorov-Arnold model (KA) studied in the previous publication [11]. The tests are conducted for synthetic data, mechanical object, biological system and social system. The same testing procedure as in the previous publication has been used; therefore, all details regarding the data and the examples can be found in [11], while here only the most important information is provided.

Two accuracy metrics are used. The first measure is the relative root mean square error (RRMSE) of predicted output  $\hat{y}^i$  compared to actual output  $y^i$ ,

$$\bar{E}_{\text{RRMSE}} = \frac{1}{y_{\max} - y_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y^i - \hat{y}^i)^2}, \quad (36)$$

where  $y_{\min}$  and  $y_{\max}$  are the minimum and the maximum values of the output. The second measure is the Pearson correlation coefficient between the predicted and the actual sequences,  $\hat{y}^i$  and  $y^i$ , respectively.

### A.1 Synthetic data

A specific formula is used to generate the input-output data:

$$y = \frac{|\sin(X_2)^{X_1} - \exp(-X_3)|}{X_4} + X_5 \cos(X_5), \quad (37)$$

which does not have a physical meaning and is used due to its non-linearity. The inputs are uniformly distributed random values. Since new data is generated at each execution of the simulating software, the result slightly varies in each run. One example of obtained results is summarised in table 1.

|                        | KA     | BUT    |
|------------------------|--------|--------|
| training subset size   | 2437   | 2383   |
| selection subset size  | 773    | 804    |
| validation subset size | 780    | 813    |
| RRMSE                  | 0.0151 | 0.0147 |
| Pearson                | 0.9945 | 0.9965 |

**Table 1:** Comparison for the synthetic data.

|                        | KA     | BUT    |
|------------------------|--------|--------|
| training subset size   | 907    | 922    |
| selection subset size  | 290    | 319    |
| validation subset size | 306    | 262    |
| RRMSE                  | 0.0501 | 0.0589 |
| Pearson                | 0.9635 | 0.9559 |

**Table 2:** Comparison for the mechanical object.

|   | KA     | BUT    |
|---|--------|--------|
| training subset size                              | 6120   | 6074   |
| selection subset size                             | 1945   | 1977   |
| validation subset size                            | 1935   | 1949   |
| ratio of errors in selection subset               | 0.1311 | 0.1421 |
| ratio of correct predictions in validation subset | 0.8372 | 0.8579 |

**Table 3:** Comparison for the social system.

## A.2 Mechanical object

The dataset name is “Airfoil self-noise” from UCI Machine Learning Repository<sup>1</sup>. It is used as a benchmark by Artelnics in their software platform Neural Designer<sup>2</sup>. Their reported accuracy is 0.952 for the Pearson correlation coefficient. The results for the binary Urysohn tree and for the Kolmogorov-Arnold model are summarised in table 2.

## A.3 Biological system

The dataset name is “Mushroom classification data” from UCI Machine Learning Repository. The input is 22 quantized properties of the mushrooms, the output is the label — edible or poisonous. Both models, the binary Urysohn tree and the Kolmogorov-Arnold model, resulted in exactly 0 errors in the validation subset.

## A.4 Social system

This dataset name is “Bank churn data”<sup>3</sup>. The inputs are the demographic parameters of the individuals and the output is a human decision. The results for the binary Urysohn tree and for the Kolmogorov-Arnold model are summarised in table 3.

## Appendix B Additional testing of the Urysohn forest

To show that simpler stochastic systems are modelled much accurately with the Urysohn forest, a simpler formula, equation (37), is taken. The same procedure of data generation as in the main example has been used — uniformly distributed random values have been added to the inputs, which then were used in the formula to calculate the outputs. To construct the Urysohn forest,  $w \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$  divisions have been performed. Other details can be directly obtained from the source code.

First, it is useful to note that the average residual error rapidly declines in the process of splitting data into disjoints. This can be seen from table 4, where the Pearson correlation coefficients between the modelled and the actual outputs for each Urysohn tree in the ensemble are shown for one execution of the code. This means that when the data is divided into 8 clusters, a single Urysohn tree can already describe each individual cluster relatively well.

As in the main example, the forest outputs have been compared with the Monte-Carlo sampling of 200 points. The forest ECDFs were compared to the Monte-Carlo CDFs using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Due to randomness of the data, the result varied for each execution of the simulation, but only up to 4 tests out of 100 have been failing across the number of runs. This is due to the simplicity of the

<sup>1</sup><http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.neuraldesigner.com/>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.neuraldesigner.com/learning/examples/bank-churn>

|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 0.80 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 0.91 | 0.92 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.96 |      |      |      |      |
| 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |

**Table 4:** The Pearson correlation coefficients between the modelled and the actual outputs for each individual Urysohn tree in the ensemble during the process of data splitting. Rows correspond to the iterations of the DDR algorithm (at the first iteration there is only 1 tree, at the second — 2 trees, etc.). Although the size of the final ensemble is 16, the last row is not shown, since the correlation coefficients are almost 1 for all trees.

underlying stochastic system — it only has one peak in the probability density function of the output, although the function is non-symmetric. However, even though the system is simple, the use of the DDR algorithm is of course important for building the Urysohn forest. For example, if instead of the DDR algorithm, the records are resorted completely randomly and then subdivided into 16 clusters, on which the forest is built, 25 to 50 Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests out of 100 fail.

## References

- [1] M. Abdar, F. Pourpanah, S. Hussain, D. Rezazadegan, L. Liu, M. Ghavamzadeh, P. Fieguth, X. Cao, A. Khosravi, U. R. Acharya, V. Makarenkov, and S. Nahavandi. A review of uncertainty quantification in deep learning: Techniques, applications and challenges. *Information Fusion*, 76:243–297, 2021.
- [2] B. Efron. Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics*, 7(1):1–26, 1979.
- [3] L. Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning*, 24(2):123–140, 1996.
- [4] R. E. Schapire. The strength of weak learnability. *Machine Learning*, 5(2):197–227, 1990.
- [5] Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139, 1997.
- [6] D. H. Wolpert. Stacked generalization. *Neural Networks*, 5(2):241–259, 1992.
- [7] P. Smyth and D. H. Wolpert. Linearly combining density estimators via stacking. *Machine Learning*, 36(1):59–83, 1999.
- [8] V. Valev. Set partition principles. In J. Kozesnik, editor, *Transactions of the ninth Prague conference on information theory, statistical decision functions, and random processes*, pages 251–256, 1983.
- [9] H. Späth. Anticlustering: Maximizing the variance criterion. *Control and Cybernetics*, 15:213–218, 1986.
- [10] M. Papenberg and G. W. Klau. Using anticlustering to partition data sets into equivalent parts. *Psychological Methods*, 26(2):161–174, 2021.
- [11] A. Polar and M. Poluektov. A deep machine learning algorithm for construction of the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 99:104137, 2021.
- [12] M. A. Krasnoselskii. *Topological methods in the theory of nonlinear integral equations*. Pergamon, 1964.
- [13] V. V. Krylov. Design of models of dynamic system structure from input-output relationships (the theory of abstract realization). II. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 3:5–19, 1984.
- [14] V. I. Arnold. On functions of three variables. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 114(4):679–681, 1957.
- [15] A. N. Kolmogorov. On the representation of continuous functions of many variables by superposition of continuous functions of one variable and addition. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 114(5):953–956, 1957.

- [16] V. E. Ismailov. On the representation by linear superpositions. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 151(2):113–125, 2008.
- [17] V. E. Ismailov. A review of some results on ridge function approximation. *Azerbaijan Journal of Mathematics*, 3(1):3–51, 2013.
- [18] T. J. Hastie and R. J. Tibshirani. *Generalized Additive Models*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1990.
- [19] M. Poluektov and A. Polar. Modelling non-linear control systems using the discrete Urysohn operator. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 357:3865–3892, 2020.
- [20] S. Kaczmarz. Angenäherte auflösung von systemen linearer gleichungen. *Bulletin international de l'Académie polonaise des sciences et des lettres. Classe des sciences mathématiques et naturelles. Série A, Sciences mathématiques*, 35:355–357, 1937.
- [21] R. P. Tewarson. Projection methods for solving sparse linear systems. *The Computer Journal*, 12(1):77–80, 1969.
- [22] D. A. Sprecher. A universal mapping for Kolmogorov's superposition theorem. *Neural Networks*, 6(8):1089–1094, 1993.
- [23] J. Actor. Computation for the Kolmogorov superposition theorem. Master's thesis, Rice University, 2018.