## Inverse Problems

Sommersemester 2023

Vesa Kaarnioja<br>vesa.kaarnioja@fu-berlin.de

FU Berlin, FB Mathematik und Informatik
Fifth lecture, May 15, 2023

Tikhonov regularization

## Tikhonov regularization

The sequence of TSVD solutions $\left\{x_{k}\right\}$ minimizes the norm of the residual

$$
\|A x-y\|
$$

as $k$ tends to $\operatorname{rank}(A)$. Unfortunately, when inverse/ill-posed problems are considered, it may also happen that

$$
\left\|x_{k}\right\| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text { as } k \rightarrow \operatorname{rank}(A)
$$

In consequence, it appears reasonable to try minimizing the residual and the norm of the solution simultaneously.

## Definition

A Tikhonov regularized solution $x_{\delta} \in H_{1}$ is a minimizer of the Tikhonov functional

$$
F_{\delta}(x):=\|A x-y\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2}
$$

where $\delta>0$ is called the regularization parameter.

## Theorem

Let $A$ : $H_{1} \rightarrow H_{2}$ be a compact linear operator with the singular system $\left(\lambda_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n}\right)$. Then the Tikhonov regularized solution exists, is unique, and is given by the formula

$$
x_{\delta}=\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right)^{-1} A^{*} y=\sum_{n=1}^{p} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}
$$

where $p=\operatorname{rank}(A)$.
Remark. The Tikhonov regularized solution can be obtained without knowing the SVD of $A$ by solving $x_{\delta}$ from $\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) x_{\delta}=A^{*} y$.

Proof. We make use of the Lax-Milgram lemma:
Lemma (Lax-Milgram)
Let $H$ be a Hilbert space, and let $B: H \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bilinear quadratic form such that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
|B(x, y)| \leq C\|x\|\|y\| \quad \text { for all } x, y \in H \\
B(x, x) \geq c\|x\|^{2} \quad \text { for all } x \in H
\end{array}
$$

for some constants $0<c \leq C<\infty$. Then there exists a unique linear boundedly invertible operator $T: H \rightarrow H$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B(x, y)=\langle x, T y\rangle \quad \text { for all } y \in H \\
& \|T\| \leq C \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|T^{-1}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

In our case, we define the bilinear operator $B(x, y):=\left\langle x,\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) y\right\rangle$ and observe that $|B(x, y)| \leq\left(\|A\|^{2}+\delta\right)\|x\|\|y\|$ (boundedness) and $B(x, x)=\left\langle x,\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) x\right\rangle=\|A x\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2} \geq \delta\|x\|^{2}$ (coercivity). $\therefore\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right)^{-1}$ exists such that $\left\|\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right)^{-1}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$. In particular, $x_{\delta}=\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right)^{-1} A^{*} y$ is well-defined.

Recall that $A x=\sum_{n} \lambda_{n}\left\langle x, v_{n}\right\rangle u_{n}$ and $A^{*} y=\sum_{n} \lambda_{n}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}$. Especially,

$$
A^{*} A x=\sum_{n} \lambda_{n}^{2}\left\langle x, v_{n}\right\rangle v_{n} .
$$

Since $H_{1}=\operatorname{Ker}(A) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(A)^{\perp}$, we can write

$$
x_{\delta}=P x_{\delta}+Q x_{\delta}=\sum_{n}\left\langle x_{\delta}, v_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}+Q x_{\delta},
$$

where $P: H_{1} \rightarrow \operatorname{Ker}(A)^{\perp}=\overline{\operatorname{span}\left\{v_{n}\right\}}$ and $Q: H_{1} \rightarrow \operatorname{Ker}(A)$ are orthogonal projections. Thus
$\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) x_{\delta}=A^{*} y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{n}\left(\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta\right)\left\langle x_{\delta}, v_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}+Q x_{\delta}=\sum_{n} \lambda_{n}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}$.
Equating terms yields that $Q x_{\delta}=0$ and

$$
\left(\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta\right)\left\langle x_{\delta}, v_{n}\right\rangle=\lambda_{n}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad\left\langle x_{\delta}, v_{n}\right\rangle=\frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle,
$$

as desired.

Finally, to show that $x_{\delta}$ minimizes the quadratic functional $F_{\delta}(x)=\|A x-y\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2}$, consider

$$
x=x_{\delta}+z
$$

where $z \in H_{1}$ is arbitrary. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{\delta}(x) & =F_{\delta}\left(x_{\delta}+z\right)=F_{\delta}\left(x_{\delta}\right)+\left\langle z,\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) x_{\delta}-A^{*} y\right\rangle+\left\langle z,\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) z\right\rangle \\
& =F_{\delta}\left(x_{\delta}\right)+\left\langle z,\left(A^{*} A+\delta I\right) z\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

by definition of $x_{\delta}$. The last term is nonnegative and vanishes only if $z=0$. This proves the claim.

## Morozov discrepancy principle for Tikhonov regularization

Suppose that the measurement $y \in H_{2}$ is a noisy version of some underlying "exact" data $y_{0} \in H_{2}$, and that

$$
\left\|y-y_{0}\right\| \approx \varepsilon>0
$$

In the framework of Tikhonov regularization, the Morozov discrepancy principle tells us to choose the regularization parameter $\delta>0$ so that the residual satisfies

$$
\left\|y-A x_{\delta}\right\|=\varepsilon
$$

It turns out that there is a unique regularization parameter satisfying this condition if

$$
\|y-P y\|<\varepsilon<\|y\|
$$

where $P: H_{2} \rightarrow \overline{\operatorname{Ran}(A)}$ is an orthogonal projection.

## Properties of the Tikhonov regularized solution

Theorem
Let $A$ : $H_{1} \rightarrow H_{2}$ be a compact linear operator with the singular system $\left(\lambda_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n}\right)$. Let $P: H_{2} \rightarrow \overline{\operatorname{Ran}(A)}$ be an orthogonal projection. Then we have the following:
(i) $\delta \mapsto\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|$ is a strictly increasing function of $\delta>0$.
(ii) $\|P y-y\|=\lim _{\delta \rightarrow 0+}\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\| \leq\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\| \leq \lim _{\delta \rightarrow \infty}\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|=\|y\|$.
(iii) If Py $\in \operatorname{Ran}(A)$, then $x_{\delta}$ converges to the solution of the problem

$$
A x=P y \quad \text { and } \quad x \perp \operatorname{Ker}(A)
$$

$$
\text { as } \delta \rightarrow 0+
$$

## Corollary

The equation $\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|=\varepsilon$ has a unique solution $\delta=\delta(\varepsilon)$ iff $\|(I-P) y\|<\varepsilon<\|y\|$.
Interpretation: $\|(I-P) y\|<\varepsilon$ means that any component in the data $y$ orthogonal to the range of $A$ must be due to noise; $\varepsilon<\|y\|$ means that the error level should not exceed the signal level.

Proof. Suppose that the operator $A$ has the SVD

$$
A x=\sum_{n} \lambda_{n}\left\langle x, v_{n}\right\rangle u_{n}
$$

Then $A v_{n}=\lambda_{n} u_{n}$, the orthogonal projection $P: H_{2} \rightarrow \overline{\operatorname{Ran}(A)}$ is

$$
P y=\sum_{n}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle u_{n},
$$

and the Tikhonov regularized solution $x_{\delta}$ and its image under $A$ are

$$
x_{\delta}=\sum_{n} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad A x_{\delta}=\sum_{n} \frac{\lambda_{n}^{2}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle u_{n} .
$$

(i) It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|^{2}=\left\|A x_{\delta}-P y\right\|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2} \\
& =\sum_{n}\left(\frac{\lambda_{n}^{2}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}-1\right)^{2}\left|\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle\right|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2} \\
& =\sum_{n}\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\right)^{2}\left|\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle\right|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## We arrived at

$$
\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|^{2}=\sum_{n}\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\right)^{2}\left|\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle\right|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2}
$$

For each term of the sum,

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} \delta}\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\right)^{2}=\frac{2 \delta \lambda_{n}^{2}}{\left(\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta\right)^{3}}>0
$$

implying that the mapping $\delta \mapsto\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|^{2}$ is strictly increasing.
(ii) It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|^{2} & =\sum_{n}\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\right)^{2}\left|\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle\right|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+}\|(I-P) y\|^{2} \\
\left\|A x_{\delta}-y\right\|^{2} & =\sum_{n}\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\right)^{2}\left|\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle\right|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2} \\
& \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow \infty}\|P y\|^{2}+\|(I-P) y\|^{2}=\|y\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

(iii) Let $P y \in \operatorname{Ran}(A)$. This implies that there exists $x \in \operatorname{Ker}(A)^{\perp}$ such that $A x=P y$; this is the minimum norm solution

$$
x=\sum_{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n}}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n},
$$

for which it can be shown that

$$
x_{\delta}=\sum_{n} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\delta}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+} \sum_{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n}}\left\langle y, u_{n}\right\rangle v_{n}=x
$$

Remark. In parts (ii) and (iii), one should take care when interchanging the order of the limit and the summation, i.e., justifying the steps

$$
\lim _{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} \sum_{n}=\sum_{n} \lim _{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} \text { and } \lim _{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n}=\sum_{n} \lim _{\lambda \rightarrow \infty}
$$

Standard techniques involve the monotone convergence theorem and the dominated convergence theorem (note that these apply to infinite series as well as integrals). In part (iii), it is helpful to observe that $x_{\delta} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+} x$ iff $\left\langle x_{\delta}, \phi\right\rangle \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+}\langle x, \phi\rangle$ for all $\phi \in H_{1}$ and $\left\|x_{\delta}\right\| \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+}\|x\|$.

## Tikhonov regularization with matrices

Consider the special case $H_{1}=\mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $H_{2}=\mathbb{R}^{m}$ corresponding to the matrix equation $y=A x$. The Tikhonov functional takes the special form

$$
F_{\delta}(x)=\left\|\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\sqrt{\delta} l
\end{array}\right] x-\left[\begin{array}{l}
y \\
0
\end{array}\right]\right\|^{2}, \quad I \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n}
$$

The minimizer can be found by solving the least squares problem

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\sqrt{\delta} I
\end{array}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\sqrt{\delta} I
\end{array}\right] x=\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\sqrt{\delta} I
\end{array}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\begin{array}{l}
y \\
0
\end{array}\right]
$$

or, equivalently,

$$
\left(A^{\mathrm{T}} A+\delta I\right) x=A^{\mathrm{T}} y
$$

In MATLAB, this can be implemented simply as follows:
$\mathrm{K}=[\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{sqrt}(\mathrm{delta}) * \operatorname{eye}(\mathrm{n})]$;
z = [y; zeros(n,1)];
xdelta $=K \backslash z$;
In Python, e.g., scipy.linalg.lstsq can be used to obtain the least squares solution. For sparse matrices, e.g.,
xdelta =
scipy.sparse.linalg.lsqr(A,y,damp=numpy.sqrt(delta)) [0].

## Numerical example: backward heat equation

Let us revisit the backward heat equation from earlier:

$$
\begin{cases}\partial_{t} u(x, t)=\partial_{x}^{2} u(x, t) & \text { for }(x, t) \in(0, \pi) \times \mathbb{R}_{+}, \\ u(0, \cdot)=u(\pi, \cdot)=0 & \text { on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \\ u(\cdot, 0)=f & \text { on }(0, \pi)\end{cases}
$$

where $f:(0, \pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the initial heat distribution.
We reconstruct the initial state $f$ based on noisy measurements of $u(\cdot, T)$ at time $T>0$ using Tikhonov regularization.
We assume that the data $U(T) \in \mathbb{R}^{99}$ at time $T=0.1$ is contaminated with mean-zero Gaussian noise with standard deviation 0.01, and that the discrepancy between the measured data and the underlying "exact" data equals the square root of the expected value of the squared norm of the noise vector, i.e.,

$$
\varepsilon=\sqrt{99 \cdot 0.01^{2}} \approx 0.0995
$$

Tikhonov reconstruction with delta $=5.34361 \mathrm{e}-03$
chosen using Morozov



See the files heateq_tikhonov.py / heateq_tikhonov.m on the course webpage!

## Tikhonov regularization for nonlinear problems

Unlike the TSVD, Tikhonov regularization can be generalized to nonlinear problems as well. Consider a nonlinear operator $A$ : $H_{1} \rightarrow H_{2}$ and the problem

$$
y=A(x)
$$

A standard way of solving such a problem is via sequential linearizations, which leads to solving a set of linear problems involving the Fréchet derivative of operator $A$.

## Definition

The function $A$ : $H_{1} \rightarrow H_{2}$ is called Fréchet differentiable at $x_{0} \in H_{1}$ if there exists a continuous linear operator $A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}: H_{1} \rightarrow H_{2}$ such that

$$
A(x+h)=A(x)+A_{x_{0}}^{\prime} h+W_{x_{0}}(z)
$$

where $\left\|W_{x_{0}}(z)\right\| \leq \varepsilon\left(x_{0}, z\right)\|z\|$ and the functional $z \mapsto \varepsilon\left(x_{0}, z\right)$ tends to zero as $z \rightarrow 0$.

The linear operator $A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}$ is called the Fréchet derivative of $A$ at $x_{0}$.

We are interested in minimizing

$$
F_{\delta}(x)=\|A(x)-y\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2}, \quad \delta>0
$$

Since $F_{\delta}$ is no longer quadratic, it is unclear whether a unique minimizer exists and typically the minimizer cannot be given by an explicit formula even it exists.

Let $A$ be Fréchet differentiable. The linearization of $A$ around a given point $x_{0}$ leads to the approximation of the functional $F_{\delta}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{\delta}(x) \approx \widetilde{F}_{\delta}\left(x ; x_{0}\right) & =\left\|A\left(x_{0}\right)+A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}\left(x-x_{0}\right)-y\right\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2} \\
& =\left\|A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}(x)-g\left(y, x_{0}\right)\right\|^{2}+\delta\|x\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $g\left(y, x_{0}\right):=y-A\left(x_{0}\right)+A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)$.
From the previous discussion on the linear case, we know that the minimizer of $\widetilde{F}_{\delta}\left(x ; x_{0}\right)$ is given by

$$
x=\left(\left(A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}\right)^{*} A_{x_{0}}+\delta I\right)^{-1}\left(A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}\right)^{*} g\left(y, x_{0}\right) .
$$

## Minimization strategy with step size control

It may happen that the solution of the linearized problem does not reflect adequately the nonlinearities of the original function. A better strategy is to implement some form of step size control. For example, we might design the following iterative method.

1. Pick an initial guess $x_{0}$ and set $k=0$.

Repeat:
2. Calculate the Fréchet derivative $A_{x_{0}}^{\prime}$.
3. Determine

$$
x=\left(\left(A_{x_{k}}^{\prime}\right)^{*} A_{x_{k}}^{\prime}+\delta I\right)^{-1}\left(A_{x_{k}}^{\prime}\right)^{*} g\left(y, x_{k}\right), \quad g\left(y, x_{k}\right)=y-A\left(x_{k}\right)+A_{x_{k}}^{\prime} x_{k},
$$

and define $\Delta x=x-x_{k}$.
4. Find step size $s>0$ by minimizing the function

$$
f(s)=\left\|A\left(x_{k}+s \Delta x\right)-y\right\|^{2}+\left\|x_{k}+s \Delta x\right\|^{2} .
$$

5. Set $x_{k+1}=x_{k}+s \Delta x$ and increase $k \leftarrow k+1$.
until convergence.

## Remarks on nonlinear Tikhonov regularization

- In practice, evaluating $A_{x_{k}}^{\prime}$ is often the most difficult part.
- For finite-dimensional operators, the Fréchet derivative is simply the Jacobi matrix.
- Depending on the nature of the nonlinearity, one might also consider more "specialized" optimization methods (e.g., Gauss-Newton algorithm, Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm...).


## More general penalty terms

A more general way of defining the Tikhonov functional is

$$
F_{\delta}(x)=\|A x-y\|^{2}+\delta G(x)
$$

where $G: H_{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ takes non-negative values. The existence of a unique minimizer for this kind of functional depends on the properties of $G$, as does the workload needed for finding it.

One typical way of defining $G$ is

$$
G(x)=\left\|L\left(x-x_{0}\right)\right\|^{2}
$$

where $x_{0} \in H_{1}$ is a given reference vector and $L$ is some linear operator. The choice of $x_{0}$ and $L$ reflects our prior knowledge about "feasible" solutions: $L x$ is some property that is known to be relatively close to the reference value $L x_{0}$ for all reasonable solutions. (In the standard case $x_{0}=0$ and $L=I$, the solutions are "known" to lie relatively close to the origin.)

The numerical implementation of Tikhonov regularization with $G(x)=\left\|L\left(x-x_{0}\right)\right\|^{2}$ is approximately as easy as for the standard penalty term.
In the case where $H_{1}=\mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $H_{2}=\mathbb{R}^{m}$, the operator $L$ is some matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{\ell+n}$ and the Tikhonov functional can be given as

$$
F_{\delta}(x)=\left\|\left[\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\sqrt{\delta} L
\end{array}\right] x-\left[\begin{array}{c}
y \\
\sqrt{\delta} L x_{0}
\end{array}\right]\right\|^{2}
$$

Assuming that the singular values of $K$ are bounded suitably far away from zero, the Tikhonov solution can be computed in MATLAB as
$\mathrm{K}=[\mathrm{A} ; \operatorname{sqrt}(\mathrm{delta}) * \mathrm{~L}]$;
z = [y; sqrt(delta) $* \mathrm{~L} * \mathrm{x} 0$ ];
xdelta $=\mathrm{K} \backslash z$;
In Python, e.g., scipy.linalg.lstsq can be used to solve the equivalent least squares problem $\left[\begin{array}{c}A \\ \sqrt{\delta} L\end{array}\right] x=\left[\begin{array}{c}y \\ \sqrt{\delta} L x_{0}\end{array}\right]$. For sparse matrices, e.g.,
K = scipy.sparse.vstack((A,np.sqrt(delta) $* \mathrm{~L})$ )
z = np.hstack((y,np.sqrt(delta)*L@x0))
xdelta = scipy.sparse.linalg.lsqr(K,z)[0]

