A modular approach to simulation with automatic sensitivity calculation

Ken Hanson

Methods of Advanced Scientific Simulation Los Alamos National Laboratory

This presentation available under http://www.lanl.gov/home/kmh/

Overview

- Bayes Inference Engine (BIE)
 - interactive tool for radiographic analysis; data-flow diagram
 - based on "transformation" modules
 - adjoint differentiation incorporated in modules
- Tomographic reconstruction inverse problem
 - approach data fitting as optimization problem
- Optical tomography
 - solve time-dependent diffusion of IR light using adj. diff.
 - amenable to modular approach
- Hamiltonian MCMC requires gradient
 - is very efficient when combined with adjoint differentiation

Design Goals for Bayes Inference Engine

- Develop capability to accurately model radiographs
 - forward simulation model to include previously ignored radiographic effects (cone beam, tilt, spectrum, blur)
 - interactive, flexible, and adaptable model-building tool
 - must handle complex, nonlinear models
- Allow optimization of models to match radiographs
 fast nonlinear optimization wrt many parameters
- Bayesian framework
 - solve ill-posed inverse (reconstruction) problems
 - uncertainty analysis

Advanced features of the BIE

- Advanced image/object models
 - models constructed using interactive graphical interface
 - geometric description of regions via deformable models
 - variable density models for interior of each region
- Quasi-Newton gradient-based optimization
 - maximize posterior to obtain MAP estimate
 - Adjoint Differentiation In Code Technique (ADICT)
- Bayesian uncertainty analysis
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)
 - posterior stiffness

Object-oriented design

- OO design is crucial to BIE success
 - flexibility in developing simulation models
 - easy to construct data-flow diagram; can reverse flow
 - encourages simplified approach to algorithm construction

BIE Canvas

- Analyst interacts with BIE through the canvas
- Desired module is selected from list in GlyphManager
- Module placed on canvas; needed parameters set via pop-up panel



Graphical programming: data-flow diagram

- Analyst connects modules together to create data-flow diagram
- Objective is to create a model that accurately simulates the radiographic process and matches the data
- Data flowing through connections typically consist of large data structures, e.g., images



Create noisy projection data

- Create noisy projections of object whose boundary is defined in terms of geometric model
- Output of each module can be displayed



SAMO 2001

Create noisy projection data

- Outputs from data-flow diagram



Some design aspects of the BIE

- Modules provide functionality
 - each module transforms input data to obtain output data
 - created at run time (real-time instantiation)
 - interactive or "live"; mouse click to
 - view input and output data or set parameters
 - Model-View-Controller paradigm
 - function displayed icon response to mouse/keyboard
 - self contained, autonomous units
 - only responds to queries (messages)
- Connections provide the logic of sequence of transforms
 - link each module to its input and output modules

BIE modules are autonomous agents

- Each BIE module
 - responsible for its own calculation (and its adjoint)
 - responds to requests from modules connected to its output
 - in turn, asks its input modules for their outputs
- No need for supervision to choreograph calculations
- Facilitated by OO design
- Reverse flow of data is easy (needed for adjoint differentiation)



MAP reconstruction of object boundary

- Maximum posterior estimate obtained by optimization
- Gradients calculated by adjoint differentiation



MAP reconstruction of object boundary

- Maximum posterior estimate obtained by optimization



ADICT Adjoint Differentiation In Code Technique



- For sequence of transformations that converts data structure **x** to scalar φ
- Derivatives $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ are efficiently calculated in the reverse (adjoint) direction
- **Code-based approach**: logic of adjoint code is based explicitly on the forward code or on derivatives of the forward algorithm
- Not based on the theoretical eqs., which forward calc. only approximates
- Only assumption is that φ is a **differentiable function** of **x**

All derivatives computed in time comparable to forward calculation

Adjoint differentiation - reverse data flow

- Red arrows show forward flow of data for simulation
- Green arrows show reverse flow required for adjoint calculation
- Optimizer (lower right) requests gradient from GeometricObject



Adjoint differentiation in time-dependent diffusion calculation

- Adjoint differentiation calculation precisely reverses direction of forward calculation
- Each forward data structure has an associated derivative
 - where \mathbf{U}_{n} propagates forward, $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \mathbf{U}_{n}}$ goes backward ($\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\chi^{2}$)



Optical tomographic reconstruction



- Measurements consist of 4 input pulse locations, 4 detector locations (intensity measured vs. time)
- Reconstruction based on
 - conjugate-gradient optimization of 4000 pixel values to obtain best match to light-diffusion data and **adjoint differentiation**

Modular approach to diffusion calculation

- Each box represents a computational module
 - there are just a few different types of modules (reuse!)
 - each module can be decomposed into set of submodules
- Sequence of time steps obtained by connecting modules
- This scenario suggests programming paradigm



Modular approach to diffusion calculation

- Suggests building a toolkit to
 - simulate code
 - collection of modules to create simulation code
 - build in adjoint differentiation into each module
 - programming consists of connecting modules together
 - adjoint differentiation is automatic
 - gradient-based optimization

MCMC - problem statement

- Parameter space of *n* dimensions represented by vector **x**
- Given an "arbitrary" **target** probability density function (pdf), $q(\mathbf{x})$, draw a set of random samples { \mathbf{x}_k } from it
- Only requirement is that, given x, one be able to evaluate Cq(x), where C is an unknown constant;
 thus, q(x) need not be normalized
- Although focus here is on continuous variables, MCMC applies to discrete variables as well

Use of MCMC in Bayesian data analysis



- log(likelihood) value is result of calculation; function of model parameters x
- Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm draws random samples of **x** from posterior probability $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{Y})$
- Produces plausible set of parameters {**x**}, which can be used to characterize posterior distribution, e.g., in terms of mean and covariance matrix

June 18-20, 2001

Hamiltonian MCMC

- MCMC efficiency versus number dimensions
 - Hamiltonian method:
 drops little with n
 - Metropolis method: drops as 0.3/n
- Hamiltonian method much more efficient at high dimensions
- But, **only if** gradients calculated using adjoint differentiation

Multidimensional isotropic Gaussians



Bibliography

- "An object-oriented optimization system," G. S. Cunningham et al., *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Image Processing, Vol. III*, pp. 826-830 (1994)
- "An interactive tool for Bayesian inference," G. S. Cunningham et al., *Rev. Prog. in Quant. Nondestr. Eval.* **14**A, pp. 747-754, (1995)
- "The Bayes Inference Engine," K. M. Hanson et al., *Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods*, pp. 125-134 (Kluwer, 1996)
- "A computational approach to Bayesian inference," K. M. Hanson et al., *Computing Science and Statistics* **27**, pp. 202-211 (Interface,1996)
- "Operation of the Bayes Inference Engine," K. M. Hanson et al., *Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods*, pp. 309-318 (Kluwer, 1999)

Find these under author's home page http://www.lanl.gov/home/kmh/

Acknowledgements

- Developers
 - Ken Hanson, Greg Cunningham, Bob McKee, John Pang, Xavier Battle, Marion Yapuncich, Duane Flamig, Jim Harsh, Connie Franklin, Salem Machaka, Igor Koyfman, George Jennings, David Wolf, Roger Bilisoly, Hanji Zhao
- Testers and critics
 - Barry Warthen, Pete Robins, Steve Calverley, Todd Kauppila, Judith Binstock
- General discussions
 - James Gee, Mark Zander, Kyle Myers, Bob Wagner, Julian Besag, Jim Gubernatis, Richard Silver, Steve Gull, John Skilling