

Artificial Neural Network Uncertainty Quantification for the Sensitivity Analysis of the SIXEP Model

U Oparaji^{1,2}, R.J Sheu², M Bankhead³, E Patelli¹

¹*Institute for Risk and Uncertainty, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZF, United Kingdom*

²*Institute of Nuclear Engineering and Science, National Tsing-Hua University, 101 Sec. 2, Kung Fu Road, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C.*

³*National Nuclear Laboratory LTD, Chadwick House, Warrington Rd, Birchwood Park, Birchwood, Warrington, Cheshire, WA3 6AE, United Kingdom*

Artificial Neural Network (ANNs) are largely used to replace computational expensive models. However, these surrogate models can introduce additional uncertainty and variability on the output of interest. In particular, when it is used to estimate the sensitivity of a model, the result obtained might give a false confidence, when the analyst is not aware of the uncertainty introduced. Hence, it is of fundamental importance to first check the validity of the ANN, and then quantify the uncertainties associated with the point estimates of the model. In this paper, an ANN is constructed based on few data representative of the input/output non-linear relationship of an underlying waste management model (SIXEP). Once constructed, the ANN is used for performing sensitivity analysis in a reasonable computational time. Finally, bootstrapped technique is adopted to quantify the uncertainty introduces by the surrogate model in terms of bias corrected confidence intervals.

I. INTRODUCTION

Various mathematical models use a large number of uncertain parameters as inputs. The impact of input parameter uncertainty leads to variability in the model output quantity of interest. A user of the underlining model of interest might want to identify the contributions of each uncertain input parameter to the variability in the output. This can be achieved by first modelling the uncertain input parameters as random variables, whose probability distribution characterizes the uncertainty in the parameter values. Using Sobol' approach to sensitivity analysis, the variance in the output of interest is decomposed into components, and apportioned to each uncertain input parameter (i.e. sensitivity indices). The sensitivity indices measure the fractional contribution of the input parameters to the variability in the output.

Nevertheless, the computational costs required to compute sensitivity indices are in huge order of magnitude. Specifically, when estimating the Sobol' indices using the variance based method, the number of model runs follows the mathematical relationship $E_M = (p+2) \times N$, where N is the number of samples required. The number of samples N is usually proportional to the dimension of the model being analysed. For instance, Patelli et al., (2012) [1] required $\leq 10^5$ samples to correctly estimate the sensitivity indices of the Gravity Field and Steady-State Ocean Circulation Explorer (GOCE) satellite due to the complexity of the finite element (FE) model used (i.e. $p > 3000$). On the contrary, Baroni et al., (2014) [2] found out that the sensitivity indices convergence was reached using $N = 1024$ samples for a model of $p = 5$ uncertain parameters. Generally speaking, the computational cost required for performing sensitivity analysis can vary amongst different set of models. This is due to the complexity of the model (i.e. large parameters), and the time required for a single deterministic simulation in each model. Hence, in order to tackle these huge computation restrictions, alternative methods that significantly reduces the computational burden must be sourced out.

In the last few decades, the use of meta-modelling tools such as Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) have emerged and proven to be advantageous in terms of reducing the computational effort required for computing sensitivity indices. For example, Patelli et al., (2012) [1] have used ANNs as substitutes to replace an expensive FE models to speed up their analysis. The ANN used in their work was constructed based on a few data representatives of the input-output nonlinear relationships of the FE model. Once constructed, these fast-running meta-models are used for performing the numerous model evaluations required for estimating sensitivity indices. The main advantage of using an ANN for this application, is its ability to capture

and learn functional relationships contained within a set of training data, such that it can generalise the non-linear model relationship, and make predictions about the population from which the training data set originated from. The generalisability of a trained ANN, is measured by the predictive performance on samples not contained within the training data set.

Although ANN have good generalisability ability from a small size of training data, these models can introduce artificial uncertainty and variability in the output quantity of interest. For example, when used in sensitivity indices of a model, the value(s) obtained might not be accurate as a result of these uncertainties present within the ANN. Hence, it is of fundamental importance to first check the validity of the ANN and then quantify the uncertainty associated with the model. Therefore, in this paper, an ANN is adopted to replace a radioactive waste management model (SIXEP model) to reduce the computational burden required to efficiently compute the sensitivity indices of the model. Furthermore, the bootstrap approach [3] for propagating the uncertainties in the point estimate of a model will be applied to the constructed ANN, in order to quantify the uncertainties in the sensitivity indices estimates using confidence intervals. This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 a succinct theory of global sensitivity analysis is introduced. In Section 3, the bootstrap technique used in quantifying uncertainties associated to the sensitivity indices estimates from the ANN will be discussed. This is followed by an application of the bootstrap technique in a real case study concerning the SIXEP in section 4. Section 5 presents the results obtained from this analysis. Finally, section 6 concludes the paper.

II. GLOBAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Global sensitivity analysis methods are based on the analysis of variance (ANOVA), which estimates the fractional contribution of each uncertain input parameter to the variance of the output quantity of interest [4]. The first order and total effect indices [5] are mostly used in this regard, where each index is computed by evaluating a multidimensional integral via Monte Carlo. The variance approach to sensitivity analysis decomposes the variance of the model's output into fractions that can be attributed to the uncertain input parameters of the model [5]. The total variance of the model's output is expressed as:

$$Var(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^p V_i + \sum_{i<j}^p V_{ij} + \dots + V_{12\dots p} \quad (1)$$

where p denotes number of uncertain parameters, V_i the partial variance for single parameters and, V_{ij} represents interactions between parameters. Mathematically, V_i and V_{ij} are expressed as:

$$V_i = Var_{X_i}(E_{X_{\sim i}}(Y | X_i)) \quad (2)$$

$$V_{ij} = Var_{X_{ij}}(E_{X_{\sim ij}}(Y | X_{ij})) \quad (3)$$

The first order sensitivity measure is defined as:

$$S_i = \frac{V_i}{Var(Y)} \quad (4)$$

Eq.4 measures the effect of varying the input parameters of the model, without considering interactions between parameters of the model. Similarly, the second order sensitivity measure that measures the sensitivity due to interactions between parameters of the model is defined as:

$$S_{ij} = \frac{V_{ij}}{Var(Y)} \quad (5)$$

On the other hand, the total effect sensitivity measure T_i that measures the contribution of a single parameter as well as interactions between parameters in the model is mathematically defined as:

$$T_i = 1 - \frac{Var_{X_{\sim i}}[E_{X_i}(Y | X_{\sim i})]}{Var(Y)} \quad (6)$$

As stated previously, when estimating S_i and T_i , the number of model evaluations follows the relationship $E_M = (p+2) \times N$, where N is the number of samples required and p the number of uncertain input parameters. For a robust estimate of the sensitivity measures, N should be greater than 10^5 . However, this is computationally expensive, therefore, fast-running meta-models such as Artificial Neural Networks can be used to reduce the computational burden.

III. BOOTSTRAP ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS

III.A. Artificial Neural Network Modelling

In this paper, we consider an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) with n number of hidden layers to be built for performing a task of nonlinear regression such as estimating a nonlinear relationship between state variables $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_p]$ and a vector of output quantities of interest $y = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_l, \dots, y_p]$ on the basis of a finite training data set D_{train} provided from the original model [6]. It is assumed that the input vector x is related to the target vector y by a nonlinear deterministic function $\mu_y(x)$ corrupted by a white Gaussian noise $\varepsilon(x)$. For simplicity, it is assumed that the noise $\varepsilon(x)$ is represented by a normal distribution with a mean equal to zero [7]. Hence, the aim of constructing the regression model is to estimate $\mu_y(x)$ by the means of a regression function, which depends on set of weight parameters to be determined based on the finite training data set D_{train} . The algorithm used to adjust/train the set of parameters is dependent on the type of surrogate-model being constructed. Specifically, for Artificial Neural Networks, the training algorithm minimizes the error between the output of the expensive model and that of the ANN by adjusting the weight parameters. The error is expressed mathematically as:

$$RMSE = \frac{1}{N_{train} \cdot p} \sum_{z=1}^{N_{train}} \sum_{l=1}^p (y_{z,l} - \hat{y}_{z,l})^2 \quad (7)$$

Once constructed, the ANN is used in place of the expensive model to estimate any quantity of interest U such as the sensitivity measures S_i and T_i .

III.B. The Bootstrap Technique

The procedures of using the bootstrap method for assessing the uncertainty initiated by using an ANN are reported in steps [6]. First, generate a set of training data D_{train} of input/output data by assigning uniform distributions to the uncertain input parameters of the model and sampling each of the input parameter N_{train} number of times using Latin-Hypercube sampling algorithm to obtain the input vectors x_p , $p=1,2,\dots,N_{train}$, then evaluate the model with all the sample realizations obtained. Second, construct an ANN on the basis of the entire data set $D_{train} = \{x, y\}$ obtained in the first step in order to obtain a fast-running meta-model represented by $\mu_y(x)$. Third, use the ANN in constructed in step 2 to estimate quantities of interest \hat{U} of the quantity U . Specifically, draw samples of N_T new input vectors x_r , $r = 1, 2, \dots, N_T$, form the corresponding probability distributions, and feed the ANN with the sampled values to obtain output vectors y_r , $r = 1, 2, \dots, N_T$ for computing the estimate \hat{U} for U . Since ANNs are fast running models, the computational cost is less even with large number of samples N_T . This is followed by constructing a group of B (typically in the order of 500-1000) ANNs models by randomly sampling with replacement from D_{train} , and using each of the bootstrapped ANN model to calculate an estimate \hat{U}_b , $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, for the quantity of interest U . By doing so, a bootstrap-based empirical probability distribution for the quantity U is produced which is the used for calculating the confidence interval. In particular, repeat steps for $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$. Fifth, generate a bootstrap data set $D_{train, b} = \{(x_{p,b}, y_{p,b}), p = 1, 2, \dots, N_{train}\}$, $b=1, 2, \dots, B$ by random sampling with replacement from the original training data set D_{train} . The data set in $D_{train, b}$ will constitute of the same number of data as D_{train} . Although due to sampling with replacement, some patterns in $D_{train, b}$ will appear more than once as in D_{train} and some patterns in D_{train} will not appear at all in $D_{train, b}$. Then, construct B number of ANNs and train each ANN with model with the bootstrap data set $D_{train, b} = \{(x_{p,b}, y_{p,b}), p = 1, 2, \dots, N_{train}\}$, $b=1, 2, \dots, B$. Compute the point estimates such as sensitivity indices \hat{U}_b , $b=1, 2, \dots, B$ from each bootstrapped ANN. Calculate the Bootstrap Bias Corrected (BBC) point estimate U_{BBC} for U as:

$$\hat{U}_{BBC} = 2\hat{U} - \hat{U}_{boot} \quad (8)$$

where \hat{U} is the estimate obtained from ANN trained with training data set D_{train} and \hat{U}_{boot} is the average of the B estimates \hat{U}_b obtained from the B bootstrapped ANNs. Its relationship is given as:

$$\hat{U}_{boot} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{U}_b \quad (9)$$

\hat{U}_{BBC} in Eq. (8) is used as the point estimate of U , this is due to the fact that if a bias exists in the estimate \hat{U}_{boot} compared with \hat{U} , then the same bias exists in the estimate \hat{U} when compared to the true estimate U for the quantity of interest. Finally, calculate the confidence interval for \hat{U}_{BBC} using the following steps:

Firstly, order the point estimates from each bootstrapped ANN \hat{U}_b , $b=1, 2, \dots, B$ in an increasing order of magnitude $\hat{U}_1 < \hat{U}_2 < \dots < \hat{U}_b < \dots < \hat{U}_B$. Second, identify the $100 \cdot \alpha/2$ th and $100 \cdot (1-\alpha/2)$ th quantiles of the bootstrapped empirical probability distribution of U as the $B \cdot \alpha/2$ th and $B \cdot (1-\alpha/2)$ th elements in the ordered list as the $\hat{U}_{([B \cdot \alpha/2])}$ and $\hat{U}_{([B \cdot (1-\alpha/2)])}$ and respectively. Then, calculate the confidence interval of \hat{U}_{BBC} as; $[\hat{U}_{BBC} - (\hat{U}_{boot} - \hat{U}_{([B \cdot \alpha/2])}), \hat{U}_{BBC} + (\hat{U}_{([B \cdot (1-\alpha/2)])} - \hat{U}_{boot})]$.

IV. CASE STUDY

The case study considered in this work studies the Site Ion Exchange Plant (SIXEP) [8]. The SIXEP manages effluent, removing radioactivity from liquid feeds from a number of plants across the nuclear fuel reprocessing and decommissioning site, situated at Sellafield, U.K. A schematic diagram of the SIXEP is shown in Figure 1.




Fig 1. SIXEP Process Diagram [8]

The feeds into the SIXEP frequently contain solid sludge, and a number of other soluble active isotopes which are predominantly, Caesium-137 and Strontium-90. As a result of these predominant radioactive isotopes, the plant is routinely operated on the basis of feeds meeting conditions for acceptance. Currently, the SIXEP model is being used to test different feed compositions to prove to the Environmental Agency (EA) that the plant can perform efficiently for different feed composition (i.e. ensuring the activity levels of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90 are kept within a desired limit).

IV.A. Uncertainties Affecting the SIXEP

Conversely, there is uncertainty of the future feeds composition arising from the Sellafield site, leading to variability in the activity levels of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90. This variability can lead to undesirable event (i.e. the levels of the two afore-mentioned radionuclides exceeds their desired levels). Hence, it is vital to incorporate this uncertainty when using the SIXEP model to visualize the risk involved, and identify the parameters that contributes significantly to this variability. It is to be noted that the uncertainty considered to affect the plant feeds are aleatory (i.e. random) in nature [9]. The consideration of these type of uncertainty in the SIXEP model leads to defining of a state vector \mathbf{x} of 18 uncertain inputs of the SIXEP model $\mathbf{x} = \{x_n: n = 1, 2, \dots, 18\}$, which are assumed to be described by the distributions given in Table.1. This uncertain inputs maps out two output quantities of interest defined by the vector $\mathbf{y} = \{y_k: k=1, 2\}$. The outputs of interest represents the maximum concentration of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90 respectively after approximately 540 days. Fig.2. shows a deterministic simulation from the SIXEP model using the mean values specified in Table.1.




Fig. 2. Deterministic Simulation from the SIXEP Model

The results from the deterministic evaluation of the SIXEP model shown in Fig.2 illustrates the activity levels of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90 with respect to time. From Fig.2 it can be seen that there is a rise and drop in the activity levels of the Caesium-137 and Strontium-90. The reason for the rise in the activity of both radionuclides is as a result of the fact that the long-lived parent radionuclides (Caesium-137 and Strontium-90) decays into a short lived daughter radionuclide [10]. On the other hand, the rapid drop in the activity level of both radionuclides is as a result of the sand bed filter changed after every 77 days of the SIXEP operation.

TABLE 1. Normal Distribution Hyper-Parameters of SIXEP Model Input Parameters

<i>Parameter ID</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>s.t.d.</i>	<i>Lower Bound</i>	<i>Upper Bound</i>
1	0.50E+3	0.66E+3	0.01E+2	6.63E+3
2	39.0E+3	37.0E+3	1.00E+3	210E+3
3	1.05E+3	359E+3	0.11E+3	3.00E+3
4	0.03E+3	0.02E+3	0.01E+4	0.13E+4
5	46.0E-6	36.0E-6	3.00E-6	494E-6
6	6.13E-3	1.83E-3	1.14E-3	1.42E-3
7	1.59E-5	1.28E-5	0.25E-5	14.7E-5
8	9.40E-6	1.05E-5	2.50E-7	1.06E-4
9	15.9E+4	7.10E+4	1.90E+4	4.81E+5
10	0.45E+2	0.49E+2	0.2E+1	0.24E+3
11	2.00E+3	0.62E+3	0.73E+3	4.00E+3
12	0.33E+2	0.39E+2	4.00E-2	5.30E+2
13	0.14E+1	0.30E+1	3.00E-2	0.37E+2
14	3.84E-6	1.22E-5	0.40E-12	1.06E-4
15	3.5E-3	2.82E-4	2.74E-3	4.61E-3
16	3.2E-6	3.28E-6	2.56E-7	3.58E-5
17	2.38E-6	2.93E-6	2.50E-11	2.50E-5
18	2.00E+6	2.79E+5	7.03E+5	3.00E+6

It should be noted that the scalar quantity of interest from the output result shown in Fig.2 is the maximum activity of both radionuclides after the final sand bed filter change. The final sand bed filter change is usually made on the 540th day of the SIXEP operation. On the other hand, propagating the input parameter uncertainties via MC simulation through the SIXEP model give rise to variability in the maximum concentration of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90 after the final sand bed filter

change. Furthermore, the global sensitivity analysis technique discussed in section 2 is used to identify the contributions of the uncertain parameters to the variability in the outputs of interest. However, as further discussed in section 2, computing the sensitivity indices of an expensive model such as the SIXEP requires a numerous amount of model evaluations for robust estimates, which is usually infeasible. In fact, for this present case study, a single evaluation of the SIXEP model requires approximately 20 minutes for a single deterministic evaluation. Thus, an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) is been used as a substitute to replace the SIXEP model for speeding up the global sensitivity analysis. On the other hand, the use of an ANN as a substitute introduces additional uncertainty in the analysis. Hence, the bootstrap technique discussed in section 3 is incorporated into the global sensitivity analysis for the quantification of the uncertainties introduced by the use of an ANN.

V. Results

V.A. CONSTRUCTION OF ANNs

The ANN used in this paper have been constructed with input/output training sets $D_{train} = \{(x_p, y_p), p = 1, 2, \dots, N_{train}\}$ of $N_{train} = 1020$. Specifically, the training data set D_{train} have been obtained by assigning uniform distributions to the uncertain parameters of the model given in Table.1. This was done in order to cover the admissible range of variability in the uncertain parameters. This is followed by the use of Latin Hypercube sampling technique to draw samples out from these distributions, and each sample drawn have been used to evaluate SIXEP model to obtain output training data $y_p = [y_{p1}, y_{p2}]$. The architecture the ANN (i.e. number of hidden layer and, number of nodes) was critical for the network accuracy. In particular, a 3 hidden layer configuration with 18, 7, 2 neurons respectively have been used within each ANN to optimally fit the complicated, nonlinear input/output data. The error back propagation algorithm (see Rumelhart et al., (1986) [11]) have been used to have been used to adjust the weight parameters (i.e. training) in the ANN. Specifically, 80% of training samples in D_{train} have been used to calibrate the ANN, while the remaining 20% have been used to validate it. To monitor the performance of the ANN, the regression error R^2 have been used. The performance results of the ANN constructed are shown in Fig.3 and 4.




Figure 3. Performance of ANN mapping Caesium-137




Figure 4. Performance of ANN mapping Strontium-90

V.B. Sensitivity Indices Estimation

Here, the bootstrapped explained in section 3.2 is used to estimate the sensitivity indices from the ANN constructed ANN. The result of the Bootstrap Bias Corrected (BBC) estimate of the sensitivity indices are shown in Fig. 5 (a), (b) and 6 (a), (b).




Figure 5. Quantified BBC Sensitivity Indices with respect to Caesium-137




Figure 6. Quantified BBC Sensitivity Indices with respect to Strontium-90

This results have been estimated from 2.00E+6 model evaluations of $B = 1000$ ANNs. The red line in the figures shows the BBC estimate of the sensitivity indices, which is assumed to be the true estimate if the real model (SIXEP model) was used. The corresponding confidence intervals of the BBC is also reported in the figures. From the results obtained, the 7th parameter have the largest contribution to the variance in the outputs of interest. Also, the width of the confidence interval of the 7th parameter is the largest. This reflect that there is a high uncertainty associated in estimating the parameter. This huge uncertainty could be as a result of the number of bootstrapped ANNs constructed. Hence, a future research would investigate how the number of bootstrapped ANNs affects the width of the BBC intervals. It is to the noted that although this analysis is computationally expensive, parallelization strategies have been employed. Specifically, 20 CPU cores (1895 MHz) have been used to split the jobs amongst the workers on the computer grid, hence, reducing the computational time by 5%.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented a case study concerning a radioactive waste management plant (SIXEP) used for cleaning up radioactive effluents arising from the Sellafield, UK nuclear fuel reprocessing site. Due to the uncertainties affecting the feed composition used as inputs to the plant, the output performance of the plant can be overestimated/underestimated. Therefore, numerical model of the SIXEP have been developed to understand the response of the plant with respect to different feed compositions. On the other hand, to understand how the model inputs contributes to the variability in the responses of interest, a sensitivity analysis was required. Consequently, due to the high computational

cost involved in computing the sensitivity measures directly from the model, ANNs have been constructed and used as substitutes in order to reduce the computational expenditure. However, the use of ANNs adds extra uncertainties to the estimated quantity of interest. Hence, bootstrapped ANNs have been constructed to quantify the uncertainties originating from the use of an ANN. Although the computational cost required using the bootstrap technique is expensive, parallelization strategies have been employed to cut down the computational cost. On the basis of the results obtained, the 7th parameter which had the greatest contributions to the variance of Caesium-137 and Strontium-90 also have the highest margin of uncertainty investigated by the bootstrap technique. The reason for this huge margin of uncertainty in this parameter could be as a result of the number of bootstrap models constructed. Hence, the effect of the number of bootstrap models constructed on the margin of uncertainties would be investigated in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Authors would like to thank the Cossan working group for providing the software [12] used for performing all the analysis in this work, and the National Nuclear Laboratory for providing the SIXEP model.

REFERENCES

- [1] Patelli, E., Panayirci, H. M., Broggi, M., Goller, B., Beaurepaire, P., Pradlwarter, H. J., & Schuëller, G. I. (2012). General purpose software for efficient uncertainty management of large finite element models. *Finite elements in analysis and design*, 51, 31-48.
- [2] Baroni, G., & Tarantola, S. (2014). A General Probabilistic Framework for uncertainty and global sensitivity analysis of deterministic models: A hydrological case study. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 51, 26-34.
- [3] B. Efron, R.J. Tibshirani. (1993) "An introduction to the bootstrap. Monographs on statistics and applied probability 57", Chapman and Hall, New York.
- [4] Saltelli, A., 2002, Making best use of model valuations to compute sensitivity indices, *Comput.Phys.Commun.* 145, 280–297.
- [5] Sobol', I. M. (2001). Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo estimates. *Mathematics and computers in simulation*, 55(1-3), 271-280.
- [6] Zio, E. (2006). A study of the bootstrap method for estimating the accuracy of artificial neural networks in predicting nuclear transient processes. *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science*, 53(3), 1460-1478.
- [7] Secchi, P., Zio, E., & Di Maio, F. (2008). Quantifying uncertainties in the estimation of safety parameters by using bootstrapped artificial neural networks. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, 35(12), 2338-2350.
- [8] Owens, S., Higgins-Bos, M., Bankhead, M., & Austin, J. (2015). Using chemical and process modelling to design, understand and improve an effluent treatment plant. *Also in this issue*, 4.
- [9] Helton, J. C., & Burmaster, D. E. (1996). Guest editorial: treatment of aleatory and epistemic uncertainty in performance assessments for complex systems. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 54(2), 91-94.
- [10] Forrest, R. A. (2008). Total activity increase as a function of time during radioactive decay. *Fusion Engineering and Design*, 83(1), 96-101.
- [11] Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., Williams, R. J. (1986). Learning internal representations by error back-propagation.
- [12] Patelli, E. (2015). COSSAN: A Multidisciplinary Software Suite for Uncertainty Quantification and Risk Management.