

Handling Uncertainty in Dynamical Systems and Posing New Questions

AHPCRC RMB Meeting - March 7, 2018

Martine Ceberio, Miguel Argaez, Horacio Florez, Leobardo Valera, Jesus Padilla, Phillip Hassoun

Computer Science Department The University of Texas at El Paso mceberio@utep.edu





- Conducted at the University of Texas at El Paso
- From April 2013 to December 2017

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

Being able to make sense of dynamical phenomena

Being able to make sense of dynamical phenomena

This is relevant to many areas:

- from understanding how a vehicle can withstand an underbody blast
- to understanding how a disease spreads depending on the number of affected people and the policies put in place for instance,
- to understanding how efficient a combustion system is, what performance different mixes of fuel yield

• etc.

Being able to make sense of dynamical phenomena

This is relevant to many areas:

- from understanding how a vehicle can withstand an underbody blast
- to understanding how a disease spreads depending on the number of affected people and the policies put in place for instance,
- to understanding how efficient a combustion system is, what performance different mixes of fuel yield

• etc.

In other words: wouldn't it be nice to be able to predict what could happen?

• What types of decisions?

- What types of decisions?
 - Understanding how a dynamic phenomenon unfolds under different input parameters: simulations → e.g., design decisions

- What types of decisions?
 - Understanding how a dynamic phenomenon unfolds under different input parameters: simulations → e.g., design decisions
- What are the challenges? Why is it hard?

- What types of decisions?
 - Understanding how a dynamic phenomenon unfolds under different input parameters: simulations → e.g., design decisions
- What are the challenges? Why is it hard?
 - Size: even if the original problem is not always very large, discretizing it potentially leads to large systems of equations

- What types of decisions?
 - Understanding how a dynamic phenomenon unfolds under different input parameters: simulations → e.g., design decisions
- What are the challenges? Why is it hard?
 - Size: even if the original problem is not always very large, discretizing it potentially leads to large systems of equations
 - **Complexity:** such problems are likely nonlinear, possibly non-smooth, and yet need to be solved

• Size: this can be addressed by Reduced-Order Modeling (ROM) techniques

- Size: this can be addressed by Reduced-Order Modeling (ROM) techniques
 - In this project, we looked at ROM using wavelets (3 conf. + 1 journal articles)

- Size: this can be addressed by Reduced-Order Modeling (ROM) techniques
 - In this project, we looked at ROM using wavelets (3 conf. + 1 journal articles)
- **Complexity:** such problems are likely nonlinear, possibly non-smooth, and yet need to be solved

- Size: this can be addressed by Reduced-Order Modeling (ROM) techniques
 - In this project, we looked at ROM using wavelets (3 conf. + 1 journal articles)
- **Complexity:** such problems are likely nonlinear, possibly non-smooth, and yet need to be solved
 - In this project, we looked at optimization algorithms: regularization in particular (4 conf. + 2 journal articles)

 Handling uncertainty in the dynamical systems we study / observe

- Handling uncertainty in the dynamical systems we study / observe
 - Fuel combustion: e.g., what decision can be made about the best nozzle geometry if the fuel mix is not known with certainty? Under fuel mix uncertainty, what design could limit pollutant emissions during training but maximize performance on the field?

- Handling uncertainty in the dynamical systems we study / observe
 - Fuel combustion: e.g., what decision can be made about the best nozzle geometry if the fuel mix is not known with certainty? Under fuel mix uncertainty, what design could limit pollutant emissions during training but maximize performance on the field?
 - **Trajectories:** e.g., of missiles. What if we could provide an envelope of a missile's trajectory under uncertainty of outside conditions (e.g., weather)?

 Predicting the future behavior of an unfolding event under observation

- Predicting the future behavior of an unfolding event under observation
 - We may **not always have control of unfolding events**. But if we know the type of event we observe, we may be able to deduce its parameters and other conditions so as to predict its future behavior ahead of time.

- Predicting the future behavior of an unfolding event under observation
 - We may **not always have control of unfolding events**. But if we know the type of event we observe, we may be able to deduce its parameters and other conditions so as to predict its future behavior ahead of time.
- Recomputing the behavior of an unfolding event after unexpected changes

- Predicting the future behavior of an unfolding event under observation
 - We may **not always have control of unfolding events**. But if we know the type of event we observe, we may be able to deduce its parameters and other conditions so as to predict its future behavior ahead of time.
- Recomputing the behavior of an unfolding event after unexpected changes
 - How to best **inflect the unfolding of an event** known to lead to an undesired situation?
 - Can we recompute parameters to ensure or avoid a given situation?

And all of these with guarantees.

HOW WE MET THESE NEW OBJECTIVES

- Handling uncertainty
- Making predictions on unfolding events
- Inflecting unfolding events
- While guaranteeing results

• Our approach.

 $\bullet~$ We modeled uncertainty using $intervals \rightarrow$ interval computations

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to reconsider optimization algorithms to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to reconsider optimization algorithms to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to **reconsider optimization algorithms** to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.
- Why?

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to **reconsider optimization algorithms** to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.
- Why? Because interval algorithms are reliable: no solution is lost.

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to **reconsider optimization algorithms** to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.
- Why? Because interval algorithms are reliable: no solution is lost.
- What this allowed us to do:

• Our approach.

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to **reconsider optimization algorithms** to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.
- Why? Because interval algorithms are reliable: no solution is lost.

• What this allowed us to do:

- **Simulations** with intervals: e.g., uncertainty in initial conditions, in input parameters, etc.
- Reduced-Order Modeling using interval computations: to handle both the many snapshots and the possible uncertainty in other parameters / constants → new I-POD technique

• Our approach.

- We modeled uncertainty using intervals \rightarrow interval computations
- We had to reconsider optimization algorithms to handle intervals → algorithms based on numerical constraint solving techniques (see poster session this afternoon)
- We designed a new Finite Element Method technique using intervals for nonlinear functions.
- Why? Because interval algorithms are reliable: no solution is lost.
- What this allowed us to do:
 - **Simulations** with intervals: e.g., uncertainty in initial conditions, in input parameters, etc.
 - Reduced-Order Modeling using interval computations: to handle both the many snapshots and the possible uncertainty in other parameters / constants → new I-POD technique

4 conference articles (2 with ARL collaborator), 1 journal article

UNCERTAINTY: INTERVAL TECHNIQUES



PREDICTIONS

• Important note. Instead of solving: $F_{\lambda}(x) = 0$, we now solve: $F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0$, where our observations are uncertain.

 $\begin{cases} F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0\\ \forall x_k \in Obs, \ x_k = [Obs_k, \overline{Obs_k}] \end{cases}$

• Our challenge.

PREDICTIONS

• **Important note.** Instead of solving: $F_{\lambda}(x) = 0$, we now solve: $F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0$, where our observations are uncertain.

 $\begin{cases} F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0 \\ \forall x_k \in Obs, \ x_k = [Obs_k, \overline{Obs_k}] \end{cases}$

• Our challenge.

 Instead of solving the above problem in the original space, we solved it in the reduced space where the observations do not correspond to a variable of the reduced space.

$$\begin{cases} F(\Phi \tilde{x}, \lambda) = 0 \\ \forall x_k \in Obs, \ x_k = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \Phi_{k,i} \tilde{x_i} \end{cases}$$

PREDICTIONS

• **Important note.** Instead of solving: $F_{\lambda}(x) = 0$, we now solve: $F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0$, where our observations are uncertain.

 $\begin{cases} F_{Obs}(\lambda, x \setminus Obs) = 0 \\ \forall x_k \in Obs, \ x_k = [Obs_k, \overline{Obs_k}] \end{cases}$

• Our challenge.

 Instead of solving the above problem in the original space, we solved it in the reduced space where the observations do not correspond to a variable of the reduced space.

$$\begin{cases} F(\Phi \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \lambda) = \mathbf{0} \\ \forall \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbf{Obs}, \ \mathbf{x}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p \Phi_{k,i} \tilde{\mathbf{x}_i} \end{cases}$$

1 conference article, 1 submitted journal article











• Our approach.

• The problem is similar in essence to predictions.

- The problem is similar in essence to predictions.
- Input parameters are to be recomputed
- Observations are partially replaced: the starting point of the computation is the point where a disruption might have occured (observed) and we have an end point (or multiple constraints) which describes the goal of the recomputation.

• Our approach.

- The problem is similar in essence to predictions.
- Input parameters are to be recomputed
- Observations are partially replaced: the starting point of the computation is the point where a disruption might have occured (observed) and we have an end point (or multiple constraints) which describes the goal of the recomputation.

• Challenge:

- The problem is similar in essence to predictions.
- Input parameters are to be recomputed
- Observations are partially replaced: the starting point of the computation is the point where a disruption might have occured (observed) and we have an end point (or multiple constraints) which describes the goal of the recomputation.
- Challenge: ensuring that the computed parameters satisfy the stated constraints / goals

• Our approach.

- The problem is **similar** in essence to predictions.
- Input parameters are to be recomputed
- Observations are partially replaced: the starting point of the computation is the point where a disruption might have occured (observed) and we have an end point (or multiple constraints) which describes the goal of the recomputation.
- Challenge: ensuring that the computed parameters satisfy the stated constraints / goals

1 conference article

INFLECTING TRAJECTORIES: SOME RESULTS





- Uncertainty:
 - Craig Barker ARL APG and his team, about the modeling of people in vehicle of underbody blast simulations.

 \rightarrow integration of interval computations and the design of the I-POD technique.

• Uncertainty:

• Craig Barker – ARL APG and his team, about the modeling of people in vehicle of underbody blast simulations.

 \rightarrow integration of interval computations and the design of the I-POD technique.

 Luis Bravo – ARL APG, about the model-order reduction of a combustion problem and uncertainty quantification related to fuel mix uncertainty.
→ design of the interval FEM technique.

• Uncertainty:

• Craig Barker – ARL APG and his team, about the modeling of people in vehicle of underbody blast simulations.

 \rightarrow integration of interval computations and the design of the I-POD technique.

 Luis Bravo – ARL APG, about the model-order reduction of a combustion problem and uncertainty quantification related to fuel mix uncertainty.
→ design of the interval FEM technique.

• Predictions:

In the aim to design smart sensors, which predict rather than simply sense.
→ problem modeling and preliminary results in making predictions.

• Uncertainty:

• Craig Barker – ARL APG and his team, about the modeling of people in vehicle of underbody blast simulations.

 \rightarrow integration of interval computations and the design of the I-POD technique.

 Luis Bravo – ARL APG, about the model-order reduction of a combustion problem and uncertainty quantification related to fuel mix uncertainty.
→ design of the interval FEM technique.

• Predictions:

In the aim to design smart sensors, which predict rather than simply sense.
→ problem modeling and preliminary results in making predictions.

Inflections:

- From an APG Open House visit: how to recompute the load of a helicopter after a hit, to ensure landing in a safe zone.
 - \rightarrow preliminary algorithms to show feasibility of recomputations.

COLLABORATIONS (CONT'D)

- Rad Balu ARL ALC (2016-2017): explored collaborations about quantum computing; wrote a joint proposal.
- Simon Su ARL APG (2017): our point of contact for our capstone project, a mobile app for handling dynamic systems with uncertainty



- I-POD package transferred to Craig Barker's team in 2015.
- **UQ App** available for download.

VISITS TO ARL

- Open Campus: Horacio Florez, post-doc of our team, from 02/2015 to 12/2017, at ARL ALC, Adelphi.
- Short visits: to ARL ALC and APG for open houses and other presentations (e.g., poster presentation at June 2017 TAB meeting).

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- edited books
- 5 journal articles
- 15 peer-reviewed conference articles
- 18 conference/workshop presentations
- 5 poster presentations

including: **1** journal article, **2** conference articles, and **1** poster in collaboration with Luis Bravo.

STUDENTS IMPACTED BY THIS PROJECT

- 2 post-doctoral researchers
- 4 students from my lab (even if not sponsored through this project): 2 Ph.D., 2 UG
- 2016-2017: we identified **19** UTEP students to participate in the AHPCRC Summer Institute: **12** selected



Model time uncertainty

• Beyond uncertainty, handle erroneous or missing information

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

Any Questions?

Below are illustrations of different areas of our work:







