ENSEMBLE KALMAN DIFFUSION GUIDANCE: A DERIVATIVE-FREE METHOD FOR INVERSE PROBLEMS

Hongkai Zheng¹, Wenda Chu^{1*}, Austin Wang^{1*}, Nikola Kovachki², Ricardo Baptista¹, Visong Yue¹

* equal contribution, ¹Caltech, ²NVIDIA

ABSTRACT

When solving inverse problems, it is increasingly popular to use pre-trained diffusion models as plug-and-play priors. This framework can accommodate different forward models without re-training while preserving the generative capability of diffusion models. Despite their success in many imaging inverse problems, most existing methods rely on privileged information such as derivative, pseudoinverse, or full knowledge about the forward model. This reliance poses a substantial limitation that restricts their use in a wide range of problems where such information is unavailable, such as in many scientific applications. To address this issue, we propose Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance (EnKG) for diffusion models, a derivative-free approach that can solve inverse problems by only accessing forward model evaluations and a pre-trained diffusion model prior. We study the empirical effectiveness of our method across various inverse problems, including scientific settings such as inferring fluid flows and astronomical objects, which are highly non-linear inverse problems that often only permit black-box access to the forward model.

1 INTRODUCTION

The idea of using pre-trained diffusion models (Song et al., 2020; Ho et al., 2020) as plug-and-play priors for solving inverse problems has been increasingly popular and successful across various applications including medical imaging (Song et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2023), image restoration (Chung et al., 2022b; Wang et al., 2022), and music generation (Huang et al., 2024). A key advantage of this approach is its flexibility to accommodate different problems without re-training while maintaining the expressive power of diffusion models to capture complex and high-dimensional prior data distributions. However, most existing algorithms rely on privileged information of the forward model, such as its derivative (Chung et al., 2022a; Song et al., 2023b), pseudo-inverse (Song et al., 2023a), or knowledge of its parameterization (Chung et al., 2023a). This reliance poses a substantial limitation that prevents their use in problems where such information is generally unavailable. For instance, in many scientific applications (Oliver et al., 2008; Evensen & Van Leeuwen, 1996; Iglesias, 2015), the forward model consists of a system of partial differential equations whose derivative or pseudo-inverse is generally unavailable or even undefined.

The goal of this work is to develop an efficient method that only requires black-box access to the forward model and pre-trained diffusion model for solving general inverse problems. Such an approach could significantly extend the range of diffusion-based inverse problems studied in the current literature, unlocking a new class of applications – especially many scientific applications. The major challenge here arises from the difficulty of approximating the gradient of a general forward model with only black-box access. The standard zero-order gradient estimation methods are known to scale poorly with the problem dimension (Berahas et al., 2022).

In this paper, we first propose a generic prediction-correction (PC) framework using an optimization perspective that includes existing diffusion guidance-based methods (Chung et al., 2022a; Song et al., 2023b;a; Peng et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024) as special cases. The proposed PC framework consists of two main steps for each iteration: 1) the prediction step, which is a numerical integration step of the unconditional reverse ordinary differential equation (ODE) or stochastic differential equation (SDE); 2) the correction step, which is a proximal operator that maps the current point towards the high likelihood region while remaining close to the original trajectory. This viewpoint not only provides an alternative view and additional insights of the existing methods but also allows us to introduce new designs to develop a fully derivative-free guidance method. Our approach, called Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance (EnKG), uses an ensemble of particles to estimate the guidance term. A key technical step is to use the empirical covariance matrix of this ensemble instead of relying on a usual scalar weight for the L^2 regularization in the correction step. Using this step allows us to derive the update rule for each ensemble member without the need for gradient, following the same approach from classic ensemble Kalman methods (Evensen, 2003; Schillings & Stuart, 2017). Consequently, EnKG is a fully derivative-free diffusion guidance method, and can solve challenging inverse problems that only permit black-box access to the forward model.

Contributions

- We present a generic prediction-correction (PC) framework that provides an alternative interpretation of guided diffusion, as well as additional insights of the existing methods.
- Building upon the PC framework, we propose Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance (EnKG), a fully derivative-free approach that leverages pre-trained model in a plug-andplay manner for solving general inverse problems. EnKG only requires black-box access to the forward model and can accommodate different forward models without any re-training.
- We evaluate on various inverse problems including the standard imaging tasks and scientific problems like the Navier-Stokes equation and black-hole imaging. On the standard imaging tasks, the proposed EnKG outperforms baseline methods on the nonlinear phase retrieval by a large margin. More importantly, EnKG remains effective and efficent on the highly nonlinear inverse problem where the gradient information is genuinely inaccessible such as Navier-Stokes, while the baseline methods fail to generate reasonable predictions.

2 BACKGROUND & PROBLEM SETTING

Problem setting Let $G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ denote the forward model that maps the true unobserved source x to observations y. We consider the following general inverse problem given by:

$$\boldsymbol{y} = G(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$$
 (1)

where we only have black-box access to G, which we generally assume to be non-linear. ξ represents the observation noise which is typically Gaussian, i.e., $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$, and \boldsymbol{y} represents the observation which is usually sparse, i.e., m < n. In this paper, solving the inverse problem amounts to finding the \boldsymbol{x} that has high posterior $p(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y})$, which is often expressed via Bayes's rule as $p(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot p(\boldsymbol{x})$. Here $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the prior distribution over source signals (which we instantiate using a pre-trained diffusion model), and $p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})$ is defined as (1). Because we only have black-box access to G, we can only sample from $p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})$, and do not know its functional form. For simplicity, we focus on finding the max a posteriori estimate: $\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{x}} p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot p(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Diffusion models Diffusion models (Song et al., 2020; Karras et al., 2022) capture the prior p(x) implicitly using a diffusion process, which includes a forward process and backward process. The forward process transforms a data distribution $x_0 \sim p_{data}$ into a Gaussian distribution $x_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(T)I)$ defined by a pre-determined stochastic process. The Gaussian distribution is often referred to as noise, and so the forward process (t going from 0 to T) is typically used to create training data (iteratively noisier versions of $x_0 \sim p_{data}$) for the diffusion model. The backward process (t going from T to 0), which is typically learned in a diffusion model, is the standard generative model and operates by sequentially denoising the noisy data into clean data, which can be done by either a probability flow ODE or a reverse-time stochastic process. In this paper, we consider the following probability flow ODE throughout the whole paper for light notation without loss of generality because every other probability flow ODE is equivalent to it up to a simple reparameterization as shown by Karras et al. (2022):

$$d\boldsymbol{x}_t = -\dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t}\log p_t(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt.$$
(2)

Training a diffusion model amounts to training the so-called score function $\nabla_{x_t} \log p_t(x_t)$, which we assume is already completed. Given a trained diffusion model, we can sample p(x) by integrating (2) starting from a random noise sample. As such, the focus of this paper is not on training diffusion models, but rather on guiding pre-trained diffusion models for solving inverse problems, discussed next.

Diffusion guidance for inverse problems Arguably the most popular approach to solving inverse problems with a pre-trained diffusion model is guidance-based (Chung et al., 2022a; Wang et al., 2022; Kawar et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023a; Zhu et al., 2023; Rout et al., 2023; Chung et al., 2023b; Tang et al., 2024). Guidance-based methods are originally interpreted as the conditional reverse diffusion process targeting the posterior distribution. For ease of notation and clear presentation, we use the probability flow ODE to represent the reverse process and rewrite it with Bayes Theorem.

$$d\boldsymbol{x}_{t} = -\dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_{t}}\log p_{t}(\boldsymbol{x}_{t}|\boldsymbol{y})dt, = -\dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_{t}}\log p_{t}(\boldsymbol{x}_{t})dt - \dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_{t}}\log p_{t}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{t})dt,$$
(3)

where $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log p_t(\boldsymbol{x}_t)$ is the unconditional score and the $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log p_t(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_t)$ is the guidance from likelihood. In practice, the unconditional score is approximated by a pre-trained diffusion model $s_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, t)$ and the weight of the likelihood term is considered as a hyperparameter. The corresponding reverse dynamics is given by

$$d\boldsymbol{x}_t = -\dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)s_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, t)dt - w_t \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log \hat{p}_t(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt,$$
(4)

where w_t is the adaptive time-dependent weight. The design of w_t in Eq. (4) varies across different methods but it is typically not related to $\dot{\sigma}(t)\sigma(t)$ that Eq. (3) suggests, which makes it hard to interpret from a posterior sampling perspective. In this paper, we will take an optimization perspective develop a useful interpretation for designing our proposed algorithm.

One key issue with Eq. (4) is that many algorithms for sampling along Eq. (4) assume the ability to access the gradient $\nabla_{x_t} \log \hat{p}_t(y|x_t)$. When this gradient is unavailable (e.g., when one only has black-box access to $\hat{p}_t(y)$), then one must develop a derivative-free approach, which is the central technical contribution of our work.

Derivative-free optimization Our approach relies on derivative-free optimization in order to solve the inverse problem Derivative-free optimization (DFO) refers to the optimization of a function where access to its derivative is not available, and only black-box access is available. Traditional DFO algorithms are broadly classified as direct search, which includes the coordinate search (Fermi, 1952), stochastic finite-difference approximations of the gradient (Spall, 1998), and Nelder-Mead simplex methods (Nelder & Mead, 1965), and model-based methods which include descent and trust region methods (Conn et al., 2000; Bortz & Kelley, 1998). Recent stochastic zero-order optimization techniques involve approximating the gradient via Gaussian smoothing (Nesterov & Spokoiny, 2017); these gradient estimates can be plugged into algorithms like stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and directly parallel their first-order counterparts (LeCun et al., 1998). Our approach builds on top of Ensemble Kalman Inversion (EKI) which is a popular scientific computing method used primarily for solving physical inverse problems (Iglesias et al., 2013; Calvello et al., 2022). From an optimization to the derivative of the forward operator (Schillings & Stuart, 2017; Kovachki & Stuart, 2019).

3 Method

To develop our Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance (EnKG) method, we first provide an interpretation of diffusion guidance through the lens of the prediction-correction framework. EnKG can be viewed as an instantiation which enables derivative-free approximation of the guidance term.

3.1 PREDICTION-CORRECTION INTERPRETATION OF GUIDANCE-BASED METHODS

Inspired by the idea of the Predictor-Corrector continuation method in numerical analysis (Allgower & Georg, 2012), we show how to express the guidance-based methods within the following prediction-correction framework. Suppose the time discretization scheme is $T = t_0 > t_1 \dots > t_N = 0$. Let $w_i = w_{t_i}$ for light notation. As illustrated in Algorithm 1, guidance-based methods for inverse problems can be summarized into the following steps.

Prior prediction step This step is simply a numerical integration step of the unconditional probability flow ODE, i.e., by moving one step along the unconditional ODE trajectory:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i} - \dot{\sigma}(t_{i})\sigma(t_{i})s_{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}, t_{i}\right)\left(t_{i+1} - t_{i}\right).$$

$$\tag{5}$$

Algorithm 1	Generic	Guidance-based	Method (ODE version)
-------------	---------	----------------	----------	-------------	---

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Require: } G, \boldsymbol{y}, s_{\theta}, \{t_i\}_{i=1}^{N}, \{w_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \\ 1: \text{ sample } \boldsymbol{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(t_0)\boldsymbol{I}) \\ 2: \text{ for } i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\} \text{ do} \\ 3: \quad \boldsymbol{x}'_i \leftarrow \boldsymbol{x}_i - \dot{\sigma}(t_i)\sigma(t_i)s_{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i, t_i\right)\left(t_{i+1} - t_i\right) \\ 4: \quad \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_t) \approx \log p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_t) \\ 5: \quad \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}'_i\|_2^2}{2w_i} - \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}) \\ 6: \text{ end for} \\ 7: \text{ return } \boldsymbol{x}_N \end{array} \right) \qquad \triangleright \text{ Frior prediction step}$



Figure 1: Illustration of the predictioncorrection interpretation for guidancebased methods on a 1D Gaussian mixture example. From left to right, the probability flow ODE gradually transforms $p_t(x_t)$ from a Gaussian into a mixture of two Gaussians. The grey lines indicate the vector field of the probability flow. The prediction step is simply a numerical integration step over the probability flow trajectory. The correction step moves towards the MAP estimator while staying near to the initial prediction point.

Log-likelihood estimation step This step estimates the log-likelihood $\log p(y|x_t)$:

 $\log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_i) \approx \log p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_i).$

Guidance correction step This step solves the following optimization problem that formulates a compromise between maximizing the log-likelihood and being near x_i :

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}'_i\|_2^2}{2w_i} - \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}),$$
(6)

where the larger guidance scale w_i gives the solution point near the MAP estimator and smaller value leads to small movement towards the MAP estimator. Eq. (6) is essentially a proximal operator (Parikh et al., 2014) if w_i is lower bounded by a positive number. Thus it is firmly non-expansive in the convex setting and will converge to MAP estimator when applied recursively.

To solve Eq. (6) efficiently in practice, we may use first-order Taylor approximation of $\log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1})$ at \boldsymbol{x}'_i , which gives:

$$\log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}) = \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i}') + \nabla^{\top} \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_{i}') (\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i}') + O(\Delta \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{2}).$$
(7)

Substituting the approximation Eq. (7) into the correction step (6) gives:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} \approx \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}'_i\|_2^2}{2w_i} - \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}'_i) - \nabla^\top \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}'_i) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}'_i\right)$$
(8)

$$= \boldsymbol{x}_{i}' + w_{i} \nabla \log \hat{p}(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}'), \tag{9}$$

which can recover the gradient step structure of most existing guidance-based methods (Chung et al., 2022a; Song et al., 2023b;a; Mardani et al., 2023).

Putting it together. Figure 1 visually demonstrates the Prediction-Correction interpretation in a 1D Gaussian mixture example. This depiction shows how the guidance-based methods iteratively

Algorithm 2 Our method: Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance (EnKG).

Require:
$$G, \boldsymbol{y}, s_{\theta}$$
, solver $\phi, \{t_i\}_{i=1}^N, \{w_i\}_{i=1}^N, J$
1: sample $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(j)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(t_0)\boldsymbol{I}), j = 1, \dots, J$ \triangleright Initialize particles
2: for $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ do
3: $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)} - \dot{\sigma}(t_i)\sigma(t_i)s_{\theta}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)}, t_i\right)(t_{i+1} - t_i)$ \triangleright Prior prediction step
4: $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{(j)} \leftarrow \phi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)}, t_i\right), j = 1, \dots, J$
5: $g_i^{(j)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^J \left\langle G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{(k)}) - \bar{G}, \boldsymbol{y} - G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{(j)}) \right\rangle_{\Gamma} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\right)$
6: $\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)} + w_i g_i^{(j)}, j = 1, \dots, J$ \triangleright Guidance correction step
7: end for
8: return $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^J$

step towards the MAP estimator while staying close to the initial unconditional generation trajectory defined by the prediction step. More importantly, this PC framework allows more degrees of freedom in design. In the next section, we introduce ensemble covariance matrix to the step size and derive the update rule that does not require gradient information. To stimulate further research, Section 6 discusses other potential design innovations within the PC framework.

3.2 OUR APPROACH: ENSEMBLE KALMAN DIFFUSION GUIDANCE

We now demonstrate how the correction step can be performed in a derivative-free manner using the idea of statistical linearization. Our overall approach is described in Algorithm 2.

Likelihood estimation. The likelihood term can be factorized as follows:

$$p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \int p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_N) p(\boldsymbol{x}_N|\boldsymbol{x}_i) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_N = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N \sim p(\boldsymbol{x}_N|\boldsymbol{x}_i)} p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_N), \quad (10)$$

which is intractable in general. We use the following Monte Carlo approximation:

$$p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N \sim p(\boldsymbol{x}_N|\boldsymbol{x}_i)} p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_N) \approx p(\boldsymbol{y}|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N),$$
(11)

where \hat{x}_N is obtained by running the Probability Flow ODE solver ϕ starting at x_i . One attractive property of this estimate compared to popular ones based on $\mathbb{E}[x_N|x_i]$ and isotropic Gaussian approximations in previous works Chung et al. (2022a); Song et al. (2023a;b) is that our approximation stays on data manifold but the Gaussian approximations include additive noise that do not live on data manifold. This aspect is particularly important for scientific inverse problems based on partial differential equations (PDEs), where staying on the data manifold is important for reliably solving the forward model p(y|x). For instance, we observe that Gaussian approximations frequently violate the stability conditions of numerical PDE solvers, leading to meaningless estimates.

Derivative-free correction step. Consider an ensemble of particles $\{x_i^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^J$. Let \bar{x}_i denote their empirical mean and $C_{xx}^{(i)}$ denote their empirical covariance matrix, at the *i*-th iteration.

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)}, \boldsymbol{C}_{xx}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right)^\top.$$

Instead of the commonly used scalar weight w_i , we use a weighting matrix $w_i C_{xx}^{(i)}$ in Eq. (8):

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)} \approx \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)}} \frac{1}{2} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i}' \right)^{\top} \left(w_i \boldsymbol{C}_{xx}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i}' \right)$$
(12)

$$-\nabla^{\top} \log \hat{p}\left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right)$$
(13)

$$= \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} + w_{i} \boldsymbol{C}_{xx}^{(i)} \nabla \log \hat{p} \left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right), \tag{14}$$

which can be viewed as a gradient step preconditioned by $C_{xx}^{(i)}$. Leveraging the idea of statistical linearization in the ensemble Kalman methods (Bergemann & Reich, 2010; Schillings & Stuart, 2017), we can perform the preconditioned gradient step without explicit derivative.

Assumption 1. $G \circ \phi$ has bounded first and second order derivatives. Let ψ denote $G \circ \phi$. There exist constants M_1, M_2 such that for all $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}', \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{v}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\psi(\boldsymbol{u}) - \psi(\boldsymbol{u}')\| \le M_1 \|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'\|, \boldsymbol{v}^\top H_{\psi}(\boldsymbol{v}')\boldsymbol{v} \le M_2 \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2.$$

where H_{ψ} denotes the Hessian matrix of ψ .

Assumption 2. The distance between ensemble particles is bounded. There exists a constant M_3 such that $\|\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\| < M_3, j = 1, \dots, J$.

Assumption 3. The observation empirical covariance matrix does not degenerate to zero unless the covariance matrix collapses to zero. In other words, $tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right) = 0$ if and only if $C_{xx}^{(i)} = 0$, and

$$C_{xx}^{(i)} \neq 0 \to tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right) > M_4, M_4 > 0,$$

where

$$C_{yy}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}) - \bar{\psi}_{i} \right) \left(\psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}) - \bar{\psi}_{i} \right)^{\top}, \bar{\psi}_{i} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}).$$
(15)

Proposition 1. Under Assumption 1, 2 and 3, suppose the algorithm is implemented with $w_i = 1/(tr(C_{yy}^{(i)}))$, then we have the following approximation:

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{xx}^{(i)} \nabla \log \hat{p}\left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) \approx \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left\langle \psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)}\right) - \bar{G}, \boldsymbol{y} - \psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) \right\rangle_{\Gamma} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}\right), \quad (16)$$

where

$$\bar{G} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} G\left(\hat{x}_{N}^{(j)}\right) = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \psi(x_{i}^{\prime(j)}).$$

The detailed derivation can be found in Appendix A.2. Therefore, we can update each particle with the ensemble difference to move toward the high-likelihood region without evaluating the derivative. A full description of our method is given in Algorithm 2. We name it Ensemble Kalman Diffusion Guidance as it is a guidance for diffusion models based on ensemble Kalman approximation. Implementation details are provided in Appendix A.4.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We empirically study our method on the classic image restoration problems and two scientific inverse problems. We view the scientific inverse problems as the more interesting domains for evaluating our method, particularly the Navier-Stokes equation where it is impractical to accurately compute the gradient of the forward model.

Baselines We focus on comparing against methods that only use black-box access to the forward model. Our first two baselines incorporate numerical estimation methods to substitute automatic differentiation, named Forward-GSG and Central-GSG given in Algorithm 3. Specifically, we use forward Gaussian smoothed gradient (**Forward GSG** in Eq. 28) and central Gaussian smoothed gradient (**Central GSG** in Eq. 29) to approximate the gradient of the log-likelihood, and plug it into the standard gradient-based method, Diffusion Posterior Sampling (DPS)(Chung et al., 2023b). more details can be found in Appendix A.3. The third baseline is Stochastic Control Guidance (SCG) proposed in Huang et al. (2024), which is designed to deal with non-differentiable guidance. The last baseline in Diffusion Policy Gradient (DPG) proposed by Tang et al. (2024). Additionally, for Navier-Stokes equation, we add the traditional method Ensemble Kalman Inversion (EKI) proposed in Iglesias et al. (2013).

	Iı	npaint (bo	x)		SR (×4)		De	blur (Gau	iss)	Pł	ase retrie	val
	PSNR ↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR ↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR ↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
Gradient access												0.407
DPS	21.77	0.767	0.213	24.90	0.710	0.265	25.46	0.708	0.212	14.14	0.401	0.486
Black-box access												
Forward-GSG	17.82	0.562	0.302	18.08	0.469	0.384	24.43	0.704	0.206	7.88	0.070	0.838
Central-GSG	18.76	0.720	0.229	26.55	0.740	0.169	25.39	0.775	0.180	10.10	0.353	0.691
DPG	20.89	0.752	0.184	28.12	0.831	0.126	26.42	0.798	0.143	15.47	0.486	0.495
SCG	4.71	0.302	0.763	4.71	0.302	0.760	4.69	0.300	0.759	4.623	0.294	0.764
EnKG(Ours)	21.70	0.727	0.286	27.17	0.773	0.237	26.13	0.723	0.224	20.06	0.584	0.393

Table 1: Quantitative evaluation on FFHQ 256x256 dataset. We report average metrics for image quality and samples consistency on four tasks. Measurement noise level $\sigma = 0.05$ is used if not otherwise stated.

Table 2: Comparison of different derivative-free algorithms on Navier-Stokes inverse problem. Numbers in parentheses represent the sample standard deviation.

	$\sigma_{\rm noise} = 0$	$\sigma_{\rm noise} = 1.0$	$\sigma_{\rm noise}=2.0$	Computation cost			
	Relative L2	Relative L2	Relative L2	Total # FME	Total # DME	Seq # FME	Seq # DME
EKI	0.577 (0.138)	0.609 (0.119)	0.673 (0.107)	1024k	0	0.50k	0
Forward-GSG	1.687 (0.156)	1.612 (0.173)	1.454 (0.154)	2049k	1k	1k	1k
Central-GSG	2.203* (0.314)	2.117 (0.295)	1.746 (0.191)	2048k	1k	1k	1k
DPG	0.325 (0.188)	0.408* (0.173)	0.466 (0.171)	4000k	1k	1k	1k
SCG	0.908 (0.600)	0.928 (0.557)	0.966 (0.546)	512k	384k	0.75k	1k
EnKG(Ours)	0.120 (0.085)	0.191 (0.057)	0.294 (0.061)	295k	2695k	0.14k	1.3k

4.1 IMAGE INVERSE PROBLEMS

Tackling image inverse problems (e.g., deblurring) is common in the literature and serves as a reasonable reference domain for evaluation. We note that we consider a harder version of the problem where we do not use the gradient of the forward model. Moreover, most imaging problems use a linear forward model (except for phase retrieval), which is significantly simpler than the nonlinear forward models more often used in scientific domains. We do note that, perhaps surprisingly, for the nonlinear phase retrieval task, our approach outperforms the standard strong DPS baseline which actually uses the gradient of the forward model.

Problem setting We evaluate our algorithm on the standard image inpainting, superresolution, deblurring (Gaussian), and phase retrieval problems. For inpainting, the forward model is a box mask with randomized location. For superresolution, we employ bicubic downsampling (either $\times 2$ or $\times 4$) and for Gaussian deblurring, a blurring kernel of size 61×61 with standard deviation 3.0. Finally, phase retrieval takes the magnitude of the Fourier transform of the image as the observation. We use measurement noise $\sigma = 0.05$ in all experiments except for superresolution on 64×64 images, where we set $\sigma = 0.01$. The pre-trained diffusion model for FFHQ 64×64 is taken unmodified from Karras et al. (2022). The model for FFHQ 256×256 is taken from Chung et al. (2022a) and converted to the EDM framework using their Variance-Preserving (VP) preconditioning.

Evaluation metrics We evaluate the sample quality of all methods using peak signal signal-tonoise-ratio (PSNR), structural similarity (SSIM) index (Wang et al., 2004), and learned perceptual image patch similarity (LPIPS) score (Zhang et al., 2018).

Results We demonstrate the qualitative results for image inverse problems in Figure 7, and show the quantitative results in Table 5 and 1. EnKG achieves comparable or even better performance compared to DPS (Chung et al., 2022a), which has gradient access to the forward function and the diffusion model. EnKG consistently outperforms all baseline methods with black-box access on two data settings and four different tasks.



Figure 2: Visualization of results on Navier-Stokes inverse problem with different levels of observation noise. Each observation is subsampled by a factor of 2, representing a sparse measurement. Note that the results of Central-GSG are here for demonstration purpose because neither Central-GSG nor Forward-GSG is able to produce reasonable results.

4.2 NAVIER STOKES

The Navier-Stokes problem is representative of the key class of scientific inverse problems (Iglesias et al., 2013) that our approach aims to tackle. The gradient of the forward model is impractical to reliably compute via auto-differentiation, as it requires differentiating through a PDE solver. Having effective derivative-free methods would be highly desirable here.

Problem setting We consider the 2-d Navier-Stokes equation for a viscous, incompressible fluid in vorticity form on a torus, where $\boldsymbol{u} \in C([0,T]; H^r_{per}((0,2\pi)^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ for any r > 0 is the velocity field, $\boldsymbol{w} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{u}$ is the vorticity, $\boldsymbol{w}_0 \in L^2_{per}((0,2\pi)^2; \mathbb{R})$ is the initial vorticity, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the viscosity coefficient, and $f \in L^2_{per}((0,2\pi)^2; \mathbb{R})$ is the forcing function. The solution operator \mathcal{G} is defined as the operator mapping the vorticity from the initial vorticity to the vorticity at time T. $\mathcal{G}: \boldsymbol{w}_0 \to \boldsymbol{w}_T$. Our experiments implement it as a pseudo-spectral solver (He & Sun, 2007).

$$\partial_{t}\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \nu \Delta \boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{x},t) + f(\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in (0,2\pi)^{2}, t \in (0,T]$$

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = 0, \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in (0,2\pi)^{2}, t \in [0,T] \qquad (17)$$

$$\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{x},0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{0}(\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in (0,2\pi)^{2}$$

The goal is to recover the initial vorticity field from a noisy sparse observation of the vorticity field at time T = 1. The Navier-Stokes equation 17 does not admit a closed form solution and thus there is no closed form derivative available for the solution operator. Moreover, obtaining an accurate numerical derivative via automatic differentiation through the numerical solver is challenging due to the extensive computation graph expanded after thousands of discrete time steps.

We first solve the equation up to time T = 5 using initial conditions from a Gaussian random field, which is highly complicated due to the nonlinearity of Navier-Stokes equation. We sample 20,000 vorticity fields from this empirical measure to train our diffusion model. Then, we independently sample 10 random vorticity fields as the test set.

Evaluation metrics We report the relative L^2 error to evaluate the accuracy of the algorithm, which is given by $\frac{\|\hat{w}_0 - w_0^*\|_{L^2}}{\|w_0^*\|_{L^2}}$ where \hat{w}_0 is the predicted vorticity and w_0^* is the ground truth. To comprehensively capture the computational characteristics of different algorithms, we use the following metrics: 1) Total # Fwd: total number of forward model evaluations; 2) Seq. # Fwd: number of sequential forward model evaluations; 3) Total # DM: total number of diffusion model evaluations; 5) Total # DM grad:



Figure 3: Panel (a): radial power spectrum of the solutions from different algorithms. Panel (b): runtime of single evaluation of the forward model, diffusion model, and diffusion model gradient (tested on a single A100). Panel (c): comparison of computational characteristics of different algorithms on Navier-Stokes problem.

total number of diffusion model gradient evaluations; 6) Seq. # DM grad: number of sequential diffusion model gradient evaluations.

Results In Table 2, we show the average relative L^2 error of the recovered ground truth at different noise levels of the observations. Our approach, by far, outperforms methods which use other forms of approximate derivative information. Indeed, we show in Figure 2 that our method give solutions which qualitatively preserve important features of the flow while other methods completely fail to give a reasonable answer. Additionally, we compare the results in the radial power spectrum as shown in Figure 3(a). The traditional baseline EKI produces an over-smoothed solution, while DPG,SCG, and GSG tend to generate noisy solutions. In Figure 3 (b), we visualize the main source of computation costs, showing that the forward model evaluation of Navier-Stokes equation is significantly slower than other parts as the numerical solver has to take thousands of iterations. Figure 3 (c) compares different algorithms with our proposed efficiency metrics, showing that EnKG requires the least number of forward model evaluations and is highly parallelizable. Therefore, for problems where the forward model evaluation is slow, EnKG stands out to be the most efficient algorithm compared to the baseline methods.

4.3 BLACK-HOLE IMAGING INVERSE PROBLEM

The black-hole imaging problem is interesting due to its highly non-linear and ill-posed forward model (i.e., the sparse observations captured by telescopes on Earth). For evaluation purposes, we assume only black-box access to the forward model.

Problem setting The black hole interferometric imaging system aims to reconstruct image of black holes using a set of telescopes distributed on the Earth. Each pair of telescopes produces a measurement $V_{a,b}^t$ called *visibility*, where (a,b) is a pair of telescopes and t is the measuring time. To mitigate the effect of measurement noise caused by atmosphere turbulence and thermal noise, multiple visibilities can be grouped together to cancel out noise (Chael et al., 2018). This produces noise-invariant measurements, termed closure phases $y_{t,(a,b,c,d)}^{cph}$ and log closure amplitudes $y_{t,(a,b,c,d)}^{camp}$. We specify the likelihood of this measuring function similar as Sun & Bouman (2021), i.e.,

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{t} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_{t}^{\text{cph}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{y}_{t}^{\text{cph}}\|_{2}^{2}}{2\beta_{\text{cph}}^{2}} + \sum_{t} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_{t}^{\text{camp}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{y}_{t}^{\text{camp}}\|_{2}^{2}}{2\beta_{\text{camp}}^{2}} + \rho \frac{\|\sum \boldsymbol{x}_{i} - \boldsymbol{y}^{\text{flux}}\|_{2}^{2}}{2}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_t^{\text{cph}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_t^{\text{camp}}$ measures the closure phase and log closure amplitude of black hole images \boldsymbol{x} . β_{cph} and β_{camp} are some known parameters given by the telescope system. The first two terms are the sum of chi-square values for closure phases and log closure amplitudes, and the last term constrain the total flux of the black-hole image. We trained a diffusion model on GRMHD dataset (Wong et al., 2022) with resolution 64×64 to generate black hole images from telescope measurements.



Figure 4: Visualization of generated samples on the black-hole imaging inverse problem. The first row shows the results on the original resolution, while the second row shows the blurred images in the intrinsic resolution of the imaging system.

Evaluation metrics We report the chi-square errors of closure phases χ^2_{cph} and closure amplitudes χ^2_{camp} to measure how the generated samples fit the given measurement. We calculate the peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) between reconstructed images and the ground truth. Moreover, since the black-hole imaging system provides only information for low spatial frequencies, following conventional evaluation methodology (EHTC, 2019), we blur images with a circular Gaussian filter and compute their PSNR on the intrinsic resolution of the imaging system.

Results Figure 4 shows the reconstructed images of the black-hole using our method and the baseline methods with black box access. EnKG is able to generate black hole images with visual features consistent with the ground truth. Moreover, we report quantitative results of each method in Table 3. EnKG achieves relatively low measurement error and the best (blurred) PSNR compared with baseline methods. SCG achieves slightly better data fitting metrics measured by chi-square value, but produces images that are much noisier than those of EnKG.

	PSNR \uparrow	Blurred PSNR \uparrow	$\chi^2_{\rm cph}\downarrow$	$\chi^2_{\rm camp}\downarrow$
Central-GSG	24.700	30.011	4.616	79.669
SCG	20.201	20.976	1.103	1.134
DPG	13.222	14.281	5.116	15.679
EnKG (Ours)	29.093	32.803	1.426	1.270

Table 3: Quantitative evaluation of the reconstructed black-hole images.

5 LIMITATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The first limitation of the proposed EnKG is that as a optimization-based method, it cannot capture the exact posterior distribution and thus cannot provide reliable uncertainty quantification, which might be important in some applications. A potential future improvement can involve adapting ideas from the sequential Monte Carlo approach to EnKG to enable provable posterior sampling. Secondly, while the per-sample time cost of EnKG is smaller than the standard gradient-based approach, the total runtime is much longer because EnKG maintains a whole ensemble of interacting particles at each iteration. However, as we shown in Figure 6, even a small number of particles can achieve 20-30% relative L^2 error. A potential improvement could be introducing a scheme that adaptively controls the number of particles according to the optimization landscape to improve efficiency.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose EnKG, a fully derivative-free approach to solve general inverse problems that only permit black-box access. EnKG can accommodate different forward models without any re-training while maintaining the expressive ability of diffusion models to capture complex distri-

bution. The experiments on various inverse problems arising from imaging and partial differential equations demonstrate the robustness and effectiveness of our methodology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ben Prather, Abhishek Joshi, Vedant Dhruv, C.K. Chan, and Charles Gammie for the synthetic images used here, generated under NSF grant AST 20-34306. This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. This research used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. This research was done using services provided by the OSG Consortium, which is supported by the National Science Foundation awards #2030508 and #1836650. This research is part of the Delta research computing project, which is supported by the National Science Foundation (award OCI 2005572), and the State of Illinois. Delta is a joint effort of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and its National Center for Supercomputing Applications.

References

- Eugene L Allgower and Kurt Georg. *Numerical continuation methods: an introduction*, volume 13. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Albert S Berahas, Liyuan Cao, Krzysztof Choromanski, and Katya Scheinberg. A theoretical and empirical comparison of gradient approximations in derivative-free optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 22(2):507–560, 2022.
- Kay Bergemann and Sebastian Reich. A mollified ensemble kalman filter. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 136(651):1636–1643, 2010.
- David Matthew Bortz and Carl Tim Kelley. The simplex gradient and noisy optimization problems. In *Computational Methods for Optimal Design and Control: Proceedings of the AFOSR Workshop on Optimal Design and Control Arlington, Virginia 30 September–3 October, 1997*, pp. 77–90. Springer, 1998.
- Edoardo Calvello, Sebastian Reich, and Andrew M Stuart. Ensemble kalman methods: A mean field perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11371*, 2022.
- Andrew A. Chael, Michael D. Johnson, Katherine L. Bouman, Lindy L. Blackburn, Kazunori Akiyama, and Ramesh Narayan. Interferometric imaging directly with closure phases and closure amplitudes. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 857(1):23, apr 2018. doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aab6a8. URL https://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aab6a8.
- Hyungjin Chung, Jeongsol Kim, Michael Thompson Mccann, Marc Louis Klasky, and Jong Chul Ye. Diffusion posterior sampling for general noisy inverse problems. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022a.
- Hyungjin Chung, Byeongsu Sim, Dohoon Ryu, and Jong Chul Ye. Improving diffusion models for inverse problems using manifold constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25683–25696, 2022b.
- Hyungjin Chung, Jeongsol Kim, Sehui Kim, and Jong Chul Ye. Parallel diffusion models of operator and image for blind inverse problems. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 6059–6069, 2023a.
- Hyungjin Chung, Jeongsol Kim, Michael Thompson Mccann, Marc Louis Klasky, and Jong Chul Ye. Diffusion posterior sampling for general noisy inverse problems. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023b. URL https://openreview.net/ forum?id=OnD9zGAGT0k.

Andrew R Conn, Nicholas IM Gould, and Philippe L Toint. Trust region methods. SIAM, 2000.

- The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration EHTC. First m87 event horizon telescope results. iv. imaging the central supermassive black hole. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 875(1): L4, apr 2019. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab0e85. URL https://dx.doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab0e85.
- Geir Evensen. The ensemble kalman filter: Theoretical formulation and practical implementation. *Ocean dynamics*, 53:343–367, 2003.
- Geir Evensen and Peter Jan Van Leeuwen. Assimilation of geosat altimeter data for the agulhas current using the ensemble kalman filter with a quasigeostrophic model. *Monthly Weather Review*, 124(1):85–96, 1996.
- Enrico Fermi. Numerical solution of a minimum problem. Technical report, Los Alamos Scientific Lab., Los Alamos, NM, 1952.
- Yinnian He and Weiwei Sun. Stability and convergence of the crank–nicolson/adams–bashforth scheme for the time-dependent navier–stokes equations. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 45(2):837–869, 2007.
- Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- Yujia Huang, Adishree Ghatare, Yuanzhe Liu, Ziniu Hu, Qinsheng Zhang, Chandramouli S Sastry, Siddharth Gururani, Sageev Oore, and Yisong Yue. Symbolic music generation with nondifferentiable rule guided diffusion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14285, 2024.
- Marco A Iglesias. Iterative regularization for ensemble data assimilation in reservoir models. Computational Geosciences, 19:177–212, 2015.
- Marco A Iglesias, Kody JH Law, and Andrew M Stuart. Ensemble kalman methods for inverse problems. *Inverse Problems*, 29(4):045001, 2013.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Timo Aila, and Samuli Laine. Elucidating the design space of diffusionbased generative models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26565–26577, 2022.
- Bahjat Kawar, Michael Elad, Stefano Ermon, and Jiaming Song. Denoising diffusion restoration models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Nikola B Kovachki and Andrew M Stuart. Ensemble kalman inversion: a derivative-free technique for machine learning tasks. *Inverse Problems*, 35(9):095005, 2019.
- Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- Morteza Mardani, Jiaming Song, Jan Kautz, and Arash Vahdat. A variational perspective on solving inverse problems with diffusion models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- John A Nelder and Roger Mead. A simplex method for function minimization. *The computer journal*, 7(4):308–313, 1965.
- Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 17(2):527–566, 2017.
- Dean S Oliver, Albert C Reynolds, and Ning Liu. Inverse theory for petroleum reservoir characterization and history matching. 2008.
- Neal Parikh, Stephen Boyd, et al. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and trends*® *in Optimization*, 1(3):127–239, 2014.
- Xinyu Peng, Ziyang Zheng, Wenrui Dai, Nuoqian Xiao, Chenglin Li, Junni Zou, and Hongkai Xiong. Improving diffusion models for inverse problems using optimal posterior covariance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02149*, 2024.

- Litu Rout, Negin Raoof, Giannis Daras, Constantine Caramanis, Alex Dimakis, and Sanjay Shakkottai. Solving linear inverse problems provably via posterior sampling with latent diffusion models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=XKBFdYwfRo.
- Claudia Schillings and Andrew M Stuart. Analysis of the ensemble kalman filter for inverse problems. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 55(3):1264–1290, 2017.
- Jiaming Song, Arash Vahdat, Morteza Mardani, and Jan Kautz. Pseudoinverse-guided diffusion models for inverse problems. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023a. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=9_gsMA8MRKQ.
- Jiaming Song, Qinsheng Zhang, Hongxu Yin, Morteza Mardani, Ming-Yu Liu, Jan Kautz, Yongxin Chen, and Arash Vahdat. Loss-guided diffusion models for plug-and-play controllable generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 32483–32498. PMLR, 2023b.
- Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456, 2020.
- Yang Song, Liyue Shen, Lei Xing, and Stefano Ermon. Solving inverse problems in medical imaging with score-based generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.08005*, 2021.
- James C Spall. An overview of the simultaneous perturbation method for efficient optimization. *Johns Hopkins apl technical digest*, 19(4):482–492, 1998.
- He Sun and Katherine L Bouman. Deep probabilistic imaging: Uncertainty quantification and multimodal solution characterization for computational imaging. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 2628–2637, 2021.
- Yu Sun, Zihui Wu, Yifan Chen, Berthy T Feng, and Katherine L Bouman. Provable probabilistic imaging using score-based generative priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10835*, 2023.
- Haoyue Tang, Tian Xie, Aosong Feng, Hanyu Wang, Chenyang Zhang, and Yang Bai. Solving general noisy inverse problem via posterior sampling: A policy gradient viewpoint. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 2116–2124. PMLR, 2024.
- Yinhuai Wang, Jiwen Yu, and Jian Zhang. Zero-shot image restoration using denoising diffusion null-space model. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Zhou Wang, A.C. Bovik, H.R. Sheikh, and E.P. Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TIP.2003.819861.
- George N. Wong, Ben S. Prather, Vedant Dhruv, Benjamin R. Ryan, Monika Mościbrodzka, Chi kwan Chan, Abhishek V. Joshi, Ricardo Yarza, Angelo Ricarte, Hotaka Shiokawa, Joshua C. Dolence, Scott C. Noble, Jonathan C. McKinney, and Charles F. Gammie. Patoka: Simulating electromagnetic observables of black hole accretion. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 259(2):64, apr 2022. doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/ac582e. URL https://dx.doi.org/ 10.3847/1538-4365/ac582e.
- R. Zhang, P. Isola, A. A. Efros, E. Shechtman, and O. Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 586–595, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, jun 2018. IEEE Computer Society. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00068. URL https://doi.ieeecomputersociety. org/10.1109/CVPR.2018.00068.
- Yuanzhi Zhu, Kai Zhang, Jingyun Liang, Jiezhang Cao, Bihan Wen, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Denoising diffusion models for plug-and-play image restoration. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (NTIRE)*, 2023.

Table 4: '	Table	of	notations.
------------	-------	----	------------

Notation	Description
G	the forward model of the inverse problem
ϕ_{μ}	Probability ODE solver
ψ	Composition of G and ϕ
Df	Jacobian matrix of function f
$L^r_{\rm per}$	Lebesgue space of periodic r-integrable functions
$H_{\rm per}^r$	Sobolev space of r-times weakly differentiable periodic functions
$\hat{ abla} f$	approximate gradient of f
μ	Gaussian smoothing factor
Q	number of gradient estimation queries
w_i	log-likelihood gradient scale at step i
N	number of sampling steps
$E_{\mu,Q}(f(\boldsymbol{x}))$	gradient estimator of $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ using smoothing factor μ and Q queries

A APPENDIX / SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

A.1 NOTATION

A.2 PROOFS

Lemma 1. Under Assumption 1, 2 and 3, suppose the algorithm is implemented with $w_i = 1/(tr(C_{yy}^{(i)}))$, then

$$tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i+1)}\right) \le tr\left(\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - \frac{1}{M_3}tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)}^{\top}\right),\tag{19}$$

where

$$C_{xy}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}) - \bar{\psi}_{i} \right)^{\top}.$$

Note that $tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right)$ is zero if and only if all ensemble members collapse to a single point, i.e., $tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) = 0$. Therefore, $tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right)$ monotonically decreases to zero in the limit as i goes to infinity.

Proof. We first rewrite the ensemble update at iteration i as follows

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} + w_i C_{xy}^{(i)} \left(y - \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}) \right),$$
(20)

where $j \in \{1, ..., J\}$. The covariance matrix at the next iteration is given by

$$C_{xx}^{(i+1)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} (\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i+1}) (\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i+1})^{\top}.$$
 (21)

Plugging the update rule in Eq. (20) into Eq. (21), we have

$$C_{xx}^{(i+1)} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j} \left[(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}) + w_{i} C_{xy}^{(i)} \left(\bar{\psi}_{i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)}) \right) \right] \left[(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}) + w_{i} C_{xy}^{(i)} (\bar{\psi}_{i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)})) \right]^{\top} \\ = C_{xx}^{(i)} - 2w_{i} C_{xy}^{(i)} C_{xy}^{(i)\top} + w_{i}^{2} C_{xy}^{(i)} C_{yy}^{(i)\top} C_{xy}^{(i)\top}.$$

By linearity of trace, we have

$$tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i+1)}\right) = tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - 2w_i tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right) + w_i^2 tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{yy}^{(i)\top}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right).$$

By cyclic and submultiplicative properties, we have

$$w_i^2 tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)} C_{yy}^{(i)} C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right) = w_i^2 tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)} C_{xy}^{(i)\top} C_{xy}^{(i)}\right) \le w_i^2 tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right) tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)\top} C_{xy}^{(i)}\right).$$

Since $w_i = 1/\left(tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right)\right)$, we have

$$tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i+1)}\right) \leq tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - \frac{2}{tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right)}tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right) + \frac{1}{tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right)}tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)\top}C_{xy}^{(i)}\right)$$
$$= tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - \frac{1}{tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right)}tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right).$$

By Assumption 1 and 2, we know there exists a constant $M_4 > 0$ such that $tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right) \leq M_4$. Therefore,

$$tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i+1)}\right) \le tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - \frac{1}{tr\left(C_{yy}^{(i)}\right)} tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right) \le tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) - \frac{1}{M_4} tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right).$$

By Assumption 3, $tr\left(C_{xy}^{(i)}C_{xy}^{(i)\top}\right)$ is zero if and only if all the ensemble members collapse to a single point, which is $tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right) = 0$. Therefore, $tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right)$ monotonically decreases to zero. Additionally, we empirically check how quickly the average distance decays as we iterate in our experiments as shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5: Distance of ensemble members quickly decays over update steps. Empirical verification of Lemma 1.

Proposition 1. Under Assumption 1, 2 and 3, suppose the algorithm is implemented with $w_i < 1/(tr(C_{yy}^{(i)}))$, then we have the following approximation:

$$C_{xx}^{(i)} \nabla \log \hat{p}\left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) \approx \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left\langle G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{N}^{\prime(k)}) - \bar{G}, \boldsymbol{y} - G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{N}^{(j)}) \right\rangle_{\Gamma} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}\right),$$
(22)

where

$$\bar{G} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{(j)})$$

Proof. Note that we can always normalize the problem so that Γ is identity. Therefore, without loss of generality and for the ease of notation, we assume $\Gamma = \mathbf{I}$ throughout the whole proof. Given

the inverse problem setting in Eq. 1 where the observation noise is Gaussian, we can rewrite the preconditioned gradient w.r.t $x_i^{\prime(j)}$ as

$$C_{xx}^{(i)} \nabla \log \hat{p}\left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)}\right)$$
(23)

$$= -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right)^{\top} \nabla \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\psi} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right\|^{2}$$
(24)

$$= -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right)^{\top} \boldsymbol{D}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\psi} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{\psi} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right)$$
(25)

$$= -\frac{1}{J}\sum_{k=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{D}\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \boldsymbol{D}\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \left(\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right)$$
(26)

$$= -\frac{1}{J^2} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \sum_{l=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right) \left(\boldsymbol{D}\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(k)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(l)} \right) \right)^{\top} \left(\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right).$$
(27)

By definition, we have

tr

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{xx}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} = tr \left(\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right)^{\top} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} tr \left(\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right)^{\top} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \| \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \|_{2}^{2},$$

which represents the average distance between ensemble members. By Lemma 1, we know that $tr\left(C_{xx}^{(i)}\right)$ monotonically decreases to zero in the limit. Therefore, the ensemble members will get sufficiently close as we iterate. Therefore, we can apply first-order Taylor approximation to h at $x_i'^{(j)}$ under Assumption 1 and obtain

$$\begin{split} \psi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)}\right) &= \psi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} + \mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) \\ &= \psi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) + \mathbf{D}\psi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\right) + o\left(\|\mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} - \mathbf{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)}\|_{2}^{2}\right), \end{split}$$

where $k \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$. Therefore for any $k, l \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$, we have

$$\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime\left(k\right)}\right) - \psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime\left(l\right)}\right) = \boldsymbol{D}\psi\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime\left(j\right)}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime\left(k\right)} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime\left(l\right)}\right)$$

We then plug it into Eq. 27

$$\begin{split} C_{xx}^{(i)} \nabla \log \hat{p} \left(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) \\ &\approx -\frac{1}{J^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \sum_{l=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} \right) - \psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(l)} \right) \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \left(\psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \left(\psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} \right) - \bar{\psi}_{i} \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \left(\psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left\langle \psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(k)} \right) - \bar{\psi}_{i}, \psi \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} \right) - \boldsymbol{y} \right\rangle \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{\prime(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left\langle G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{N}^{\prime(k)}) - \bar{G}, \boldsymbol{y} - G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{N}^{(j)}) \right\rangle \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}^{(j)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} \right), \end{split}$$

concluding the proof.

Algorithm 3 Central/Forward-GSG baseline with $\sigma(t) = t$ and s(t) = 1**Require:** $G, y, D_{\theta}, \{t_i\}_{i=1}^N, \{w_i\}_{i=1}^N, E_{\mu,Q}$ 1: sample $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_0^2 \boldsymbol{I})$ 2: for $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ do $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0 \leftarrow D_{\theta} \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i, t_i \right)$ 3: $\boldsymbol{x}_i' \leftarrow \boldsymbol{x}_i + \frac{\boldsymbol{x}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0}{t_i} (t_{i+1} - t_i)$ 4: ▷ Prior prediction step $\hat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}_i} \log p(\boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x}_i) \leftarrow \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_i} (\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0^\top E_{\mu,Q}(\log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0)))$ 5: ▷ Gradient estimation $\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{x}_i' + w_i \hat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log p(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ 6: ▷ Guidance correction step 7: end for 8: return x_N

A.3 ZERO-ORDER GRADIENT ESTIMATION BASELINE

We use the forward Gaussian smoothing and central Gaussian smoothing gradient estimation methods to establish a baseline to compare against. These methods approximate the gradient of a function using only function evaluations and can be expressed in the following (**forward-GSG**) form :

$$\hat{\nabla}f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i}^{Q} \frac{f(\boldsymbol{x} + \mu \boldsymbol{u}_{i}) - f(\boldsymbol{x})}{\mu} \tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i}$$
(28)

And Central-GSG:

$$\hat{\nabla}f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i}^{Q} \frac{f(\boldsymbol{x} + \mu \boldsymbol{u}_{i}) - f(\boldsymbol{x} - \mu \boldsymbol{u}_{i})}{2\mu} \tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i}$$
(29)

For Gaussian smoothing, u_i follows the standard normal distribution and $\tilde{u}_i = \frac{1}{Q}u_i$. The smoothing factor μ and number of queries Q are both tunable hyperparameters.

Posterior sampling requires computation of the scores $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} p(\boldsymbol{x}_t)$ and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}_t)$; the former is learned by the pre-trained diffusion model, and the latter can be estimated by various approximation methods. In our baseline derivative-free inverse problem solver, we substitute the explicit automatic differentiation used in algorithms such as DPS with (28) and (29). We estimate this gradient by leveraging the fact that a probability flow ODE deterministically maps every \boldsymbol{x}_t to \boldsymbol{x}_0 ; $\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0} p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0)$ is approximated with Gaussian smoothing, and a vector-Jacobian product (VJP) is used to then calculate $\hat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}_t)$. Our gradient estimate is defined as follows:

$$\hat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}_t) = \hat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}_t} \log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0) = \boldsymbol{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}_t}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0 \hat{\nabla}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0} \log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_0)$$
(30)

 $D_{x_t}^{\perp}$ is the transpose of the Jacobian matrix; (30) can be efficiently computed using automatic differentiation. Note that although automatic differentiation is used, differentiation through the forward model does not occur. Thus, this method is still applicable to non-differentiable inverse problems. Furthermore, we choose to perturb \hat{x}_0 and use a VJP rather than directly perturb x_t so that we can avoid repeated forward passes through the pre-trained network, which is very expensive. Pseudocode for these algorithms is provided in Algorithm ??

A.4 ENKG IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

There are mainly two design choices in our algorithm 2 to be made. The first is the step size w_i which controls the extent to which the correction step moves towards the MAP estimator. In the ensemble Kalman literature (Kovachki & Stuart, 2019), the following adaptive step size is widely



Figure 6: Ablation study on the number of particles for Navier-Stokes. The shaded region represents best and worst particle.

Table 5: Qualitative evaluation on FFHQ 64x64 dataset. We report average metrics for image quality and samples consistency on four tasks. Measurement noise level $\sigma = 0.05$ is used if not otherwise stated.

	I	npaint (bo	ox)	SR	$(\times 2, \sigma = 0)$	0.01)	De	eblur (Gau	iss)	Pl	nase retrie	val
	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓	PSNR↑	SSIM↑	LPIPS↓
Gradient access DPS [†]	22.58	0.767	0.087	29.19	0.924	0.032	21.50	0.663	0.157	12.19	0.245	0.592
Black-box access												
Forward-GSG	19.62	0.612	0.189	25.25	0.836	0.093	20.27	0.606	0.170	10.307	0.170	0.493
Central-GSG	21.37	0.764	0.095	27.41	0.916	0.030	20.88	0.729	0.123	11.36	0.283	0.619
DPG	21.92	0.799	0.088	26.86	0.917	0.027	20.00	0.734	0.114	15.56	0.438	0.446
SCG	20.27	0.734	0.098	27.02	0.910	0.036	20.73	0.754	0.100	10.59	0.233	0.617
EnKG(Ours)	23.53	0.822	0.067	29.52	0.930	0.036	22.02	0.698	0.136	26.14	0.840	0.122

used and we adopt it for our experiments as well.

$$w_i^{-1} = \frac{1}{J^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{J} \left\| G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{\prime(k)}) - \bar{G} \right\|^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{y} - G(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_N^{(j)}) \right\|^2}$$
(31)

Secondly, we find it useful to perform two correction steps in Eq. (6) when solving highly nonlinear and high-dimensional problems such as Navier Stokes. Therefore, we perform two correction steps at each iteration when running experiments on Navier Stokes.

A.5 BASELINE DETAILS

A.6 ADDITIONAL RESULTS

We include more qualitative results for inverse problems on FFHQ 256x256 dataset in Figure 7.

A.7 DETAILS OF BLACK HOLE IMAGING

The measurement of black hole imaging is defined as (Sun & Bouman, 2021)

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{t,(a,b,c)}^{\text{cph}} = \angle (V_{a,b}^t V_{b,c}^t V_{a,c}^t) := \mathcal{A}_{t,(a,b,c)}^{\text{cph}}(\mathbf{x})$$
(32)

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{t,(a,b,c,d)}^{\text{camp}} = \log\left(\frac{|V_{a,b}^{t}||V_{c,d}^{t}|}{|V_{a,c}^{t}||V_{b,d}^{t}|}\right) := \mathcal{A}_{t,(a,b,c,d)}^{\text{camp}}(\boldsymbol{x})$$
(33)

where $V_{a,b}$ is the visibility defined by

$$V_{a,b}^t(\boldsymbol{x}) = g_a^t g_b^t \exp(-i(\phi_a^t - \phi_b^t)) \cdot \tilde{\boldsymbol{I}}_{a,b}^t(\boldsymbol{x}) + \eta_{a,b}.$$
(34)



Figure 7: Qualitative results on FFHQ 256.

	Inpaint (box)	SR (×2, $\sigma = 0.01$)	Deblur (Gauss)	Phase retrieval
Forward GSG				
μ	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Q	10000	10000	10000	10000
w_i	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
N	1000	1000	1000	1000
Central GSG				
μ	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Q	10000	10000	10000	10000
$\overline{w_i}$	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
N	1000	1000	1000	1000

Table 6: Hyperparameter choices for DPS with zero-order gradient estimation (64×64).

 g_a, g_b are telescope-based gain errors, ϕ_a^t, ϕ_b^t are phase errors, and $\eta_{a,b}$ is baseline-based Gaussian noise. The measurements consist of (M-1)(M-2)/2 closure phases y^{cph} and $M(M-3)/2 \log$ closure amplitudes y^{camp} for an array of M telescopes. Our experiments use M = 9 telescopes from Event Horizon Telescope.



Figure 8: Vorticity field predicted by EnKG with different number of particles. From left to right, the result gets better as we increase the number of particles.

Inpaint (box) **SR** (×4, $\sigma = 0.05$) Deblur (Gauss) Phase retrieval **Forward-GSG** 0.01 10000 0.01 20000 0.01 0.01 μ Q10000 20000 3.0 1000 1.0 1.0 0.7 w_i N1000 1000 1000 **Central-GSG** 0.01 20000 0.01 0.01 0.01 μ Q10000 10000 20000 1.0 1.0 3.0 0.7 w_i N1000 1000 1000 1000

Table 7: Hyperparameter choices for baselines based on zero-order gradient estimation (256×256).