

Towards a Fast, Practical Alternative to Joint Inversion of Multiple Datasets: Model Fusion

Omar Ochoa

Department of Computer Science
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968, USA
omar@miners.utep.edu

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 1 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

1. Need to Combine Data from Different Sources

- In many areas of science and engineering, we have different sources of data.
- For example, in geophysics, there are many sources of data for Earth models:
 - first-arrival passive seismic data (from the actual earthquakes);
 - first-arrival active seismic data (from the seismic experiments);
 - gravity data; and
 - surface waves.

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 2 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

2. Need to Combine Data (cont-d)

- Datasets coming from different sources provide complementary information.
- *Example:* different geophysical datasets contain different information on earth structure.
- In general:
 - some of the datasets provide better accuracy and/or spatial resolution in some spatial areas;
 - other datasets provide a better accuracy and/or spatial resolution in other areas or depths.
- *Example:*
 - gravity measurements have (relatively) low resolution;
 - each seismic data point comes from a narrow trajectory of a seismic signal – so resolution is higher.

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 3 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

3. Joint Inversion: An Ideal Future Approach

- *At present:* each of the datasets is often processed separately.
- *It is desirable:* to combine data from different datasets.
- *Ideal approach:* use all the datasets to produce a single model.
- *Problem:* in many areas, there are no efficient algorithms for simultaneously processing all the datasets.
- *Challenge:* designing joint inversion techniques is an important theoretical and practical challenge.

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 4 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

4. Proposed Solution – Model Fusion: Main Idea

- *Reminder*: joint inversion methods are still being developed.
- *Practical solution*: to fuse the *models* coming from different datasets.
- *Simplest case – data fusion, probabilistic uncertainty*:
 - we have several measurements (and/or expert estimates) $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n$ of the same quantity x .
 - each measurement error $\Delta x_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{x}_i - x$ is normally distributed with 0 mean and known st. dev. σ_i ;
 - Least Squares: find x that minimizes $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\tilde{x}_i - x)^2}{2 \cdot \sigma_i^2}$;

– solution:
$$x = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \cdot \sigma_i^{-2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{-2}}.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution – ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 5 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

5. Additional Problem: We Also Have Different Spatial Resolution

- In many situations, different measurements have not only different accuracy, but also different resolution.
- *Example:*
 - seismic data leads to higher-resolution estimates of the density at different locations and depths, while
 - gravity data leads to lower-estimates of the same densities.
- *Towards precise formulation of the problem:*
 - High-resolution measurements mean that we measure the values corresponding to small spatial cells.
 - A low-resolution measurement means that its results are affected by several neighboring spatial cells.

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 6 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

6. Towards Formulation of a Problem

- *What is given:*
 - we have high-resolution estimates $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n$ of the values x_1, \dots, x_n within several small spatial cells;
 - we also have low-resolution estimates \tilde{X}_j for the weighted averages

$$X_j = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{j,i} \cdot x_i.$$

- *Objective:* based on the estimates \tilde{x}_i and \tilde{x} , we must provide more accurate estimates for x_i .
- *Geophysical example:* we are interested in the densities x_i .

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀◀

▶▶

◀

▶

Page 7 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

7. Model Fusion: Case of Probabilistic Uncertainty

We take into account several different types of approximate equalities:

- Each high-resolution value \tilde{x}_i is approximately equal to the actual value x_i , with the known accuracy $\sigma_{h,i}$:

$$\tilde{x}_i \approx x_i.$$

- Each lower-resolution value \tilde{X}_j is approximately equal to the weighted average, with a known accuracy $\sigma_{l,j}$:

$$\tilde{X}_j \approx \sum_i w_{j,i} \cdot x_i.$$

- We usually have a prior knowledge $x_{pr,i}$ of the values x_i , with accuracy $\sigma_{pr,i}$: $x_i \approx x_{pr,i}$.
- Also, each lower-resolution value \tilde{X}_j is approximately equal to the value within each of the smaller cells:

$$\tilde{X}_j \approx x_{i(l,j)}.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀

▶

◀

▶

Page 8 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

8. Case of Probabilistic Uncertainty: Details

- Each lower-resolution value \tilde{X}_j is approximately equal to the value within each of the smaller cells:

$$\tilde{X}_j \approx x_{i(l,j)}.$$

- The accuracy of $\tilde{X}_j \approx x_{i(l,j)}$ corresponds to the (empirical) standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{e,j}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{k_j} \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{k_j} (\tilde{x}_{i(l,j)} - E_j)^2,$$

where

$$E_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{k_j} \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{k_j} \tilde{x}_{i(l,j)}.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀◀

▶▶

◀

▶

Page 9 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

9. Model Fusion: Least Squares Approach

- *Main idea:* use the Least Squares technique to combine the approximate equalities.
- We find the desired combined values x_i by minimizing the corresponding sum of weighted squared differences:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \tilde{x}_i)^2}{\sigma_{h,i}^2} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\sigma_{l,j}^2} \cdot \left(\tilde{X}_j - \sum_{i=1}^n w_{j,i} \cdot x_i \right)^2 +$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - x_{pr,i})^2}{\sigma_{pr,i}^2} + \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^{k_j} \frac{(\tilde{X}_j - x_{i(l,j)})^2}{\sigma_{e,j}^2}.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 10 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

10. Model Fusion: Solution

- To find a minimum of an expression, we:
 - differentiate it with respect to the unknowns, and
 - equate derivatives to 0.
- Differentiation with respect to x_i leads to the following system of linear equations:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{h,i}^2} \cdot (x_i - \tilde{x}_i) + \sum_{j:j \ni i} \frac{1}{\sigma_{l,j}^2} \cdot w_{j,i} \cdot \left(\sum_{i'=1}^n w_{j,i'} \cdot x_{i'} - \tilde{X}_j \right) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{pr,i}^2} \cdot (x_i - x_{pr,i}) + \sum_{j:j \ni i} \frac{1}{\sigma_{e,j}^2} \cdot (x_i - \tilde{X}_j) = 0,$$

where $j \ni i$ means that the j -th low-resolution measurement covers i -th cell.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 11 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

11. Simplification: Fusing High-Resolution Measurement Results and Prior Estimates

- *Idea:* fuse each high-resolution measurement result \tilde{x}_i with a prior estimate $x_{pr,i}$.
- *Detail:* instead of $\frac{1}{\sigma_{h,i}^2} \cdot (x_i - \tilde{x}_i) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{pr,i}^2} \cdot (x_i - x_{pr,i})$, we have a single term $\sigma_{f,i}^{-2} \cdot (x_i - x_{f,i})$, where

$$x_{f,i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\tilde{x}_i \cdot \sigma_{h,i}^{-2} + x_{pr,i} \cdot \sigma_{pr,i}^{-2}}{\sigma_{h,i}^{-2} + \sigma_{pr,i}^{-2}}, \quad \sigma_{f,i}^{-2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{h,i}^{-2} + \sigma_{pr,i}^{-2}.$$

- *Resulting simplified equations:*

$$\sigma_{f,i}^{-2} \cdot (x_i - x_{f,i}) + \sum_{j:j \ni i} \frac{1}{\sigma_{l,j}^2} \cdot w_{j,i} \cdot \left(\sum_{i'=1}^n w_{j,i'} \cdot x_{i'} - \tilde{X}_j \right) + \sum_{j:j \ni i} \frac{1}{\sigma_{e,j}^2} \cdot (x_i - \tilde{X}_j) = 0.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀

▶

◀

▶

Page 12 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

12. Case of a Single Low-Resolution Measurement

- *Simplest case:* we have exactly one low resolution measurement result \tilde{X}_1 .
- *In general:* we only have the results of the high-resolution measurements for *some* of the cells.
- *In geosciences:* such a situation is typical: e.g.,
 - we have a low-resolution gravity measurement which covers a huge area in depth, and
 - we have the results of high-resolution seismic measurements which only cover depths above the Moho.
- *For convenience:* let us number the cells for which we have high-resolution measurement results first.
- Let h denote the total number of such cells.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 13 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

13. Case of a Single Low-Resolution Measurement: Simplified Algorithm

First, we compute the auxiliary value

$$\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sigma_{l,1}^2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i'} w_{1,i'} \cdot x_{i'} - \tilde{X}_1 \right)$$

as $\mu = \frac{N}{D}$, where

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^h \frac{w_{1,i} \cdot (x_{f,i} - \tilde{X}_1)}{1 + \frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}},$$

and

$$D = \sigma_{l,1}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^h \frac{w_{1,i}^2 \cdot \sigma_{f,i}^2}{1 + \frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} + \left(\sum_{i=h+1}^n w_{1,i}^2 \right) \cdot \sigma_{e,1}^2.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀

▶

◀

▶

Page 14 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

14. Case of a Single Low-Resolution Measurement: Simplified Algorithm (cont-d)

- Once we know μ , we compute the desired estimates for x_i , $i = 1, \dots, h$, as

$$x_i = \frac{x_{f,i}}{1 + \frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} - \frac{w_{1,i} \cdot \sigma_{f,i}^2}{1 + \frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} \cdot \mu + \tilde{X}_1 \cdot \frac{\frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}{1 + \frac{\sigma_{f,i}^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}.$$

- We also compute estimates x_i for $i = h + 1, \dots, n$, as

$$x_i = \tilde{X}_1 - w_{1,i} \cdot \sigma_{e,1}^2 \cdot \mu.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀◀

▶▶

◀

▶

Page 15 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

15. Numerical Example: Description

- *Objective:* to illustrate the above formulas.
- *Idea:* consider the simplest possible case, when we have
 - exactly one low resolution measurement result \tilde{X}_1
 - that covers all n cells,

and when:

- all the weights are all equal $w_{1,i} = 1/n$;
- there is a high-resolution measurement corresponding to each cell ($h = n$);
- all high-resolution measurements have the same accuracy $\sigma_{h,i} = \sigma_h$;
- $\sigma_{l,1} \ll \sigma_h$, so $\sigma_{l,1} \approx 0$; and
- there is no prior information, so $\sigma_{pr,i} = \infty$ and thus, $x_{f,i} = \tilde{x}_i$ and $\sigma_{f,i} = \sigma_h$.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀◀

▶▶

◀

▶

Page 16 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

16. Additional Simplification

- *In general*: there are cells for which there are no high-resolution measurement results.
- *How to deal with these cells*: we added a heuristic rule that
 - each lower-resolution value is approximately equal to the value within each of the constituent cells,
 - with the accuracy corresponding to the (empirical) standard deviation $\sigma_{e,j}$.
- *In our simplified example*: we have high-resolution measurements in each cell.
- So, there is no need for this heuristic rule.
- The corresponding heuristic terms in the least squares approach are proportional to $\frac{1}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}$, so we take $\sigma_{e,1}^2 = \infty$.

Need to Combine Data . . .

Joint Inversion: An . . .

Proposed Solution – . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Numerical Example: . . .

Model Fusion: Case of . . .

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 17 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

17. Formulas for the Simplified Case and Numerical Example

- *Resulting formulas:* $x_i = \tilde{x}_i - \lambda$, where

$$\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i - \tilde{X}_1.$$

- *Case study:* $n = 4$ cells,
 - with the high-resolution accuracy $\sigma_h = 0.5$
 - and the measured high-resolution values (in each of these cells)

$$\tilde{x}_1 = 2.0, \quad \tilde{x}_2 = 3.0, \quad \tilde{x}_3 = 5.0, \quad \tilde{x}_4 = 6.0;$$

- the result of the corresponding low-resolution measurement is $\tilde{X}_1 = 3.7$.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀◀

▶▶

◀

▶

Page 18 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

18. High-Resolution and Low-Resolution Measurement Results: Illustration

$\tilde{x}_1 = 2.0$	$\tilde{x}_2 = 3.0$
$\tilde{x}_3 = 5.0$	$\tilde{x}_4 = 6.0$

$$\tilde{X}_1 = 3.7$$

[Need to Combine Data ...](#)

[Joint Inversion: An ...](#)

[Proposed Solution - ...](#)

[Model Fusion: Case of ...](#)

[Numerical Example: ...](#)

[Model Fusion: Case of ...](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[Acknowledgments](#)

[Title Page](#)



Page 19 of 29

[Go Back](#)

[Full Screen](#)

[Close](#)

[Quit](#)

19. Numerical Example: Discussion

- We assume that the low-resolution measurement is accurate ($\sigma_l \approx 0$).
- So, the average of the four cell values is equal to the result $\tilde{X}_1 = 3.7$ of this measurement:

$$\frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4}{4} \approx 3.7.$$

- For the measured high-resolution values \tilde{x}_i , the average is slightly different:

$$\frac{\tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{x}_3 + \tilde{x}_4}{4} = \frac{2.0 + 3.0 + 5.0 + 6.0}{4} = 4.0 \neq 3.7.$$

- *Reason:* high-resolution measurements are much less accurate: $\sigma_h = 0.5$.
- We use the low-resolution measurements to “correct” the values of the high-resolution measurements.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 20 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

20. Numerical Example: Results

- Here, the correcting term takes the form

$$\lambda = \frac{\tilde{x}_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}_n}{n} - \tilde{X}_1 =$$
$$\frac{2.0 + 3.0 + 5.0 + 6.0}{4} - 3.7 = 4.0 - 3.7 = 0.3.$$

- So, the corrected (“fused”) values x_i take the form:

$$x_1 = \tilde{x}_1 - \lambda = 2.0 - 0.3 = 1.7; \quad x_2 = \tilde{x}_2 - \lambda = 3.0 - 0.3 = 2.7;$$

$$x_3 = \tilde{x}_3 - \lambda = 5.0 - 0.3 = 4.7; \quad x_4 = \tilde{x}_4 - \lambda = 6.0 - 0.3 = 5.7.$$

- For these corrected values, the arithmetic average is equal to the measured low-resolution value:

$$\frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4}{4} = \frac{1.7 + 2.7 + 4.7 + 5.7}{4} = 3.7.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 21 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

21. The Result of Model Fusion: Simplified Setting

$\tilde{x}_1 = 1.7$	$\tilde{x}_2 = 2.7$
$\tilde{x}_3 = 4.7$	$\tilde{x}_4 = 5.7$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 22 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

22. Taking $\sigma_{e,j}$ Into Account

- *Idea:* take into account the requirement that
 - the actual values in each cell are approximately equal to \tilde{X}_1 ,
 - with the accuracy $\sigma_{e,1}$ equal to the empirical standard deviation.

- *Resulting formulas:* $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sigma_h^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i - \tilde{X}_1}{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sigma_h^2}$, and

$$x_i = \frac{\tilde{x}_i - \lambda}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} + \tilde{X}_1 \cdot \frac{\frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page

◀

▶

◀

▶

Page 23 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

23. Taking $\sigma_{e,j}$ Into Account: Numerical Example

- *General idea:* the actual values in each cell are approximately equal to \tilde{X}_1 .
- *In our example:* $x_i \approx \tilde{X}_1$, with the accuracy

$$\sigma_{e,1}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^4 (\tilde{x}_i - E_1)^2, \text{ where } E_1 = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^4 \tilde{x}_i.$$

- Here, $E_1 = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^4 \tilde{x}_i = \frac{\tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{x}_3 + \tilde{x}_4}{4} = 4.0$, thus,

$$\sigma_{e,1}^2 = \frac{(2.0 - 4.0)^2 + (3.0 - 4.0)^2 + (5.0 - 4.0)^2 + (6.0 - 4.0)^2}{4} = \frac{4 + 1 + 1 + 4}{4} = \frac{10}{4} = 2.5.$$

- Hence $\sigma_{e,1} \approx 1.58$.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 24 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

24. Taking $\sigma_{e,j}$ Into Account (cont-d)

- *Reminder:* $x_i = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} \cdot (\tilde{x}_i - \lambda) + \frac{\frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} \cdot \tilde{X}_1.$

- Here, $\sigma_h = 0.5$, $\sigma_{e,1} = 2.5$, $\frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2} = \frac{0.25}{2.5} = 0.1$, so

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} = \frac{1}{1.1} \approx 0.91, \text{ and } \frac{\frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}}{1 + \frac{\sigma_h^2}{\sigma_{e,1}^2}} \cdot \tilde{X}_1 = \frac{0.1}{1.1} \cdot 3.7 \approx 0.34;$$

$$x_1 \approx 0.91 \cdot (2.0 - 0.3) + 0.34 \approx 1.89;$$

$$x_2 \approx 0.91 \cdot (3.0 - 0.3) + 0.34 \approx 2.79;$$

$$x_3 \approx 0.91 \cdot (5.0 - 0.3) + 0.34 \approx 4.62;$$

$$x_4 \approx 0.91 \cdot (6.0 - 0.3) + 0.34 \approx 5.53.$$

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 25 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

25. The Result of Model Fusion: General Setting

$\tilde{x}_1 \approx 1.89$	$\tilde{x}_2 \approx 2.79$
$\tilde{x}_3 \approx 4.62$	$\tilde{x}_4 \approx 5.53$

- The arithmetic average of these four values is equal to

$$\frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4}{4} \approx \frac{1.89 + 2.79 + 4.62 + 5.53}{4} \approx 3.71.$$

- So, within our computation accuracy, it coincides with the measured low-resolution value $\tilde{X}_1 = 3.7$.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 26 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

26. Conclusions

- We propose a fast practical alternative to joint inversion of multiple datasets.
- Specifically, we consider measurements that have
 - not only different accuracy and coverage,
 - but also different spatial resolution.
- To fuse such models, we must account for three different types of approximate equalities:
 - each high-resolution value is approximately equal to the actual value in the corresponding cell;
 - each lower-resolution value is \approx to the weighted average of the values in the corresponding cells;
 - each lower-resolution value is approximately equal to the value within each of the constituent cells.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 27 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

27. Conclusions (cont-d)

- *Possible situations*: probabilistic or interval uncertainty.
- *Solution*: use the least squares or interval technique to combine the approximate equalities.
- *Example*: the least squares approach
 - we find the desired combined values
 - by minimizing the resulting sum of weighted squared differences.
- *Case study*: simulated (synthetic) geophysical data.
- *We show*: that model fusion indeed improves the accuracy and resolution of individual models.
- *Future plans*: apply model fusion techniques to more realistic simulated data and to real geophysical data.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution - ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 28 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit

28. Acknowledgments

- This work was supported in part by NSF grants:
 - Cyber-ShARE Center of Excellence (HRD-0734825),
 - Computing Alliance of Hispanic-Serving Institutions CAHSI (CNS-0540592),

and by NIH Grant 1 T36 GM078000-01.

- The author is thankful to all the participants of
 - Int'l Conf. on Scientific Computing SCAN'2008, El Paso, Texas, September 29 – October 3, 2008,
 - AGU'08, San Francisco, California, December 15–19, 2008, and
 - CAHSI'09, Mountain View, California, January 15–18, 2009

for valuable suggestions.

Need to Combine Data ...

Joint Inversion: An ...

Proposed Solution – ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Numerical Example: ...

Model Fusion: Case of ...

Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Title Page



Page 29 of 29

Go Back

Full Screen

Close

Quit