# The Dynamical Model Representation of Convolution-Generated Spatio-Temporal Gaussian Processes and Its Applications

Yutong Zhang and Xiao Liu

H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology

#### Abstract

Convolution-generated space-time models yield an important class of non-separable stationary Gaussian Processes (GP) through a sequence of convolution operations, in both space and time, on spatially correlated Brownian motion with a Gaussian convolution kernel. Because of its solid connection to stochastic partial differential equations, such a modeling approach offers strong physical interpretations when it is applied to scientific and engineering processes. In this paper, we obtain a new dynamical model representation for convolution-generated spatio-temporal GP. In particular, an infinitedimensional linear state-space representation is firstly obtained where the state transition is governed by a stochastic differential equation (SDE) whose solution has the same space-time covariance as the original convolution-generated process. Then, using the Galerkin's method, a finite-dimension approximation to the infinite-dimensional SDE is obtained, yielding a dynamical model with finite states that facilitates the computation and parameter estimation. The space-time covariance of the approximated dynamical model is obtained, and the error between the approximate and exact covariance matrices is quantified. We investigate the performance of the proposed model through a simulation-based study, and apply the approach to a real case study utilizing the remote-sensing aerosol data during the recent 2025 Los Angeles wildfire. The modeling capability of the proposed approach has been well demonstrated, and the proposed approach is found particularly effective in monitoring the first-order time derivative of the underlying space-time process, making it a good candidate for process modeling, monitoring and anomaly detection problems. Computer code and data have been made publicly available.

**Keywords:** spatio-temporal process, dynamical models, convolution, stochastic differential equations, Galerkin projection.

### 1 Introduction

Statistical spatio-temporal models are widely used in science and engineering to describe dynamic fields such as pollutant dispersion, heat transport, and fluid dynamics (Cressie and Wikle, 2011; Zhu and Xie, 2022; Katzfuss and Schäfer, 2024; Hector and Reich, 2024; Lan et al., 2025). An important class of non-separable and stationary space-time processes can be constructed via convolution operations, in both space and time, with stochastic innovations through an integro-difference equation; see Brown et al. (2000), Gneiting (2002), Sigrist et al. (2015), Richardson et al. (2020) and Liu et al. (2022). To strengthen the process modeling and monitoring capabilities of such an approach, this paper obtains a new dynamical model representation of convolution-generated spatio-temporal Gaussian Processes (GP), and demonstrates its performance in real applications. The advantages of leveraging the hierarchical structure of dynamical (or, state-space) spatio-temporal models have been well elaborated in Wikle and Hooten (2010); Cressie and Wikle (2011).

### 1.1 Some Motivating Examples

We first give some motivating applications that require the modeling and monitoring of spatio-temporal processes and revisit one application in our numerical experiments. In recent years, wildfires have become more frequent, intense, widespread, and destructive globally. During wildfire events, aerosols directly impact public health, cloud radiative forcing, and solar energy production as high aerosol concentrations can drastically reduce photovoltaic efficiency. Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) is a critical atmospheric indicator, reflecting the columnar loading of aerosols such as dust, smoke, or pollution (Remer et al., 2005; Holben et al., 1998; IPCC, 2021). As an illustrative example, Figure 1 shows a snapshot of the spatial distribution of AOD during the Kenneth fire episode near Los Angeles, obtained from the GOES-18 satellite, on Jan 9, 2025. Normally, rapid AOD changes signify the onset and sudden growth of smoke plumes or fire intensity. For instance, the satellite-based retrievals recorded dense AOD plumes around 5:30 PM PST as the Kenneth fire rapidly grew fanned by strong Santa Ana winds. The increasing build-up AOD, or smoke, poses immediate threats to air quality, renewable energy generation, and yields critical information about the hidden fire dynamics which can hardly be directly monitored using optical measurements in the presence of dense smoke. In our numerical investigations provided in Section 3, we show how the proposed model can effectively detect the sudden changes of AOD levels (i.e., the first-order time derivative of AOD processes) and provide early indicators of abrupt events.

Other motivating applications include the early detection of abnormal temperature gradients, in grain warehouses, that can prevent large-scale spoilage by enabling timely ventilation or cooling interventions (Wang et al., 2022), the real-time detection of temperature anomalies, in modern data centers, that help to identify and mitigate thermal hotspots and ensure reliable and energy-efficient operations (Polonelli et al., 2019), and daily PM2.5 concentrations monitoring where the spatiotemporal gradient process reveals the aftermath of a devastating series of wildfires (Quick et al., 2015). These motivating examples illustrate the significance of leveraging novel statistical approaches for the modeling and monitoring of spatio-temporal processes.




Figure 1: GOES-18 ABI Level-2 AOD distribution on January 9, 2025, with the red dot indicating downtown Los Angeles.

### 1.2 Literature Review and Contributions

Statistical modeling of spatio-temporal data and its applications have been extensively investigated in the literature. Among various statistical approaches (we refer the readers to Cressie and Wikle (2011) for a comprehensive survey), this section focuses on the convolution-generated space-time models and its connection to the current paper.

Convolution- or blur-generated space-time models were described in Brown et al. (2000). Taking the form of an integro-difference equation (IDE), a spatial field  $Y(\cdot,t) \equiv \{Y(s,t); s \in \mathbb{R}^d, d \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$  at time t is obtained from  $Y(\cdot,t-\Delta)$  at the previous time step  $t-\Delta$  through a convolution operation with a Gaussian kernel. After each convolution operation, a white-intime and spatially colored Gaussian noise is added to the process. Starting from some initial condition  $Y(\cdot,0)$ , it is shown that a non-separable stationary process can be obtained by a linear operation (i.e., a sequence of convolution operations in space and time) on spatially correlated Brownian motion through an IDE representation (Richardson et al., 2020). One advantage of the IDE model is that it yields a hierarchical spatio-temporal dynamical model after appropriate parameterizations; see Wikle and Hooten (2010).

In fact, for a d-dimensional pure temporal stochastic process  $\mathbf{Y}(t)$  defined by a stochastic differential equation (SDE),  $d\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{AY}dt + \mathbf{B}d\mathbf{W}$  where  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are constant matrices, and  $\mathbf{W}(\cdot)$  is a Wiener process, it is well known that the process evolves in time through a sequence of convolution operations on the Brownian motion (Anderson, 1982). For spatio-temporal processes, such as the stochastic advection-diffusion equation with Gaussian innovations, the solution of such stochastic partial differential equations (SPDE) is also obtained from white-in-time and spatially colored Brownian motion through a convolution operation in both space and time, which is consistent with the results above given in Brown et al. (2000) and Liu et al. (2016).

Such a solid connection to SPDE gives the convolution-generated spatio-temporal GP a strong physical interpretation. As shown in Sigrist et al. (2015) and Liu et al. (2022), the stationary process obtained from the convolution-generated model coincides with the solutions from a linear stochastic advection-diffusion equation with a Gaussian noise. In fact, constructing GP from SPDE is an effective approach for modeling physical and natural processes. From the early work of Whittle (1954) to some more recent investigations by Lindgren et al. (2011); Pförtner et al. (2022); Clarotto et al. (2024); Li et al. (2024); Wei et al. (2024); Hu et al. (2025), GP remains one of the most popular approaches for building surrogate models for physical and natural processes (Morris, 2012; Gramacy, 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Deng et al., 2025).

In this paper, we perform further investigations on the convolution-generated GP and obtain its dynamical model representation. As discussed in the motivating examples, there is a need to quickly detect abrupt process changes in many applications, and the state-space or statistical dynamical models offer a powerful process monitoring framework through the posterior distributions of some key system states. Note that, leveraging the known connection between convolution-generated processes and the solutions of SPDE, it is possible to obtain the dynamical model for convolution-generated processes since the dynamical spatio-temporal models for SPDE-governed processes have already been proposed in the literature (Brown et al., 2000; Sigrist et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2022). Following this existing approach, the state variables include the (truncated) spectrum coefficients of the process.




Figure 2: The proposed approach for obtaining the dynamical model representation of convolution-generated processes and the differences between the proposed and existing approaches.

The proposed approach, as shown in Figure 2, is different. In Hartikainen and Särkkä (2010), the authors presented a procedure for converting spatio-temporal covariance functions into infinite-dimensional SDE. This is a key result that can be leveraged to find an infinite-dimensional SDE whose solution has the same space-time covariance as the original convolution-generated GP (shown in the paper). Then, the infinite-dimensional SDE can be integrated into a state-space model as the state transition equation. This is different from the conventional GP state-space model which has finite-dimensional latent states; see e.g., Lin et al. (2025).

On the other hand, solving such a dynamical model is non-trivial as it involves an infinitedimensional SDE as the state transition equation; e.g., the filtering problem requires an infinite-dimensional Kalman filter. Hence, we resort to a finite-dimensional approximation of the infinite-dimensional SDE. Based on the first-order Euler approximation of the discretized SDE, the Gelerkin's method can be used to obtain a finite-dimensional approximation of the original infinite-dimensional SDE (Amsallem and Farhat, 2014; Benner et al., 2015), which leads to a linear state-space model with a finite number of states. Then, leveraging the Karhunen-Loève (KL) expansion of the Gaussian noise, the space-time covariance of the approximated state-space model is derived, and the approximation error between the space-time covariance of the approximated and the original dynamical models can also be obtained.

It is worth noting that, if the proposed approach above is adopted, half of the state variables in the proposed dynamical model are directly related to the first-order time derivative of the original spatio-temporal process (the other half determines the original spatio-temporal process). This special structure makes the model an ideal choice for monitoring the firstorder time derivative of the process over the spatial domain, directly through the posterior filtering distribution of these state variables. Note that, in Liu et al. (2022), the authors also proposed a linear finite-state state-space model for stochastic advection-diffusion process with a white-in-time Gaussian noise. A key difference, also highlighted in Figure 2, is that their state space model does not involve any state variables directly related to the first-order time derivative of the original spatio-temporal process, and is shown (in our numerical examples) to be much less effective in monitoring the first-order time derivative (of the original spatio-temporal process). We also note that, Quick et al. (2015) developed the distribution theory for spatiotemporal gradients leveraging the limiting properties of GP in the space-time domain. In this paper, on the other hand, the estimate of the process and its temporal gradients are all performed in the frequency domain so that it is possible to leverage the hierarchical structure of a dynamical model and enable efficient detection of subtle changes of the temporal gradients at different frequency levels.

Based on the discussions above, the main contribution of the paper is that it obtains a new dynamical model representation of convolution-generated processes that is different from the existing one, and demonstrates the advantages of the proposed approach through numerical investigations. The main results of the paper include the following:

- For convolution-generated GP, we obtain its infinite-dimensional linear state-space representation where the state transition equation is an SDE whose solution has the same space-time covariance as the original process.
- For the infinite-dimensional dynamical model, we obtain its finite-dimensional approximation to facilitate the computation and parameter estimation. The first half of the state variables determine the spatio-temporal process, while the second half of the state variables are directly related to the first-order time derivative of the process—a structure that makes the proposed model especially effective in monitoring sudden changes of the process in the frequency domain.
- For the approximated dynamical model, we obtain the space-time covariance of the GP generated by the approximated model, and quantify the approximation error between the approximated and the original processes. All results above are given for both the general complex-valued processes and the special real-valued processes often encountered in scientific or engineering applications.

• The advantages of the proposed dynamical model representation are demonstrated through simulation studies as well as an application for monitoring the AOD process during the recent 2025 Los Angeles wildfire.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2.1 provides the preliminaries on convolution-generated spatio-temporal processes. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 respectively present the infinite-dimensional SDE representation and the finite-dimensional approximation, including the space-time covariance of the approximated state-space model as well as the approximation error. Section 2.4 presents the dynamical model representation of convolution-generated processes, including the special results applied to real-valued processes. Finally, numerical investigations are provided in Section 3, and Section 4 concludes the paper.

# 2 The Dynamical Model Representation for Convolution-Generated Spatio-Temporal Processes

### 2.1 Preliminaries: Convolution-Generated Space-Time Processes

A stationary spatio-temporal process Y(s,t), on a spatial domain  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and a temporal domain  $\mathbb{T}$ , can be constructed through convolution operations in both space and time as follows (Brown et al., 2000):

$$Y(s,t) = f(s,t)_{*s*t} dB(s,t), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{T}$$
(1)

where  $\cdot_{*s}$  and  $\cdot_{*t}$  respectively denote the convolution operations in space and time,  $f(\boldsymbol{s},t) = e^{-\eta t} g(\boldsymbol{s}; t\boldsymbol{\mu}, t\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) I_{[0,\infty](t)}$  is the convolution kernel with  $g(\boldsymbol{s},t)$  being a Gaussian density,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \cdots, \mu_d)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \cdots, \sigma_d^2\}$ , and  $B(\boldsymbol{s},t)$  is a spatially-colored white-in-time Brownian motion such that  $dB(\cdot, t) \sim N(0, c_B(\cdot)dt)$  with  $c_B(\boldsymbol{h}) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} |\boldsymbol{\Phi}|^{-1/2} \exp\{-\boldsymbol{h}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{-1} \boldsymbol{h}/2\}$ .

The modeling approach in (1) applies a low-pass filter to remove high-frequency fluctuations and introduces correlation between nearby points in space and time. The model can also be seen as a natural extension of the well-known result that, for temporal stochastic processes defined by stochastic SDE, the process evolution is given by temporal convolution operations on Brownian motion; see e.g., Anderson (1982).

The process defined in (1) has a strong physical interpretation and is in fact the stationary solution of the following stochastic PDE with a Gaussian noise (a stochastic advection-diffusion process):

$$\frac{\partial \xi(t, \mathbf{s})}{\partial t} = -\boldsymbol{\mu}^T \nabla \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \nabla \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) - \eta \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) + \epsilon(t, \mathbf{s})$$
(2)

where  $\nabla$ ,  $\nabla$ , and  $\xi(t, s)$  are respectively the gradient, divergence and a white-in-time Gaussian noise (Sigrist et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2022). It is seen that, the physical parameters  $\mu$  (advection),  $\Sigma$  (diffusion) and  $\eta$  (decay) of (2) are all included in the convolution kernel f(s,t) of (1).

For the space-time process Y(s, t) defined in (1), Brown et al. (2000) gives its stationary space-time covariance

$$c_Y(\boldsymbol{h}, k) \equiv cov(Y(t, \boldsymbol{s}), Y(t + k, \boldsymbol{s} + \boldsymbol{h}) = f(\boldsymbol{h}, k)_{*\boldsymbol{h}*k} f(-\boldsymbol{h}, -k)_{*\boldsymbol{h}} c_B(\boldsymbol{h}). \tag{3}$$

Taking the Fourier transform on both sides yields the power spectrum of Y(s,t):

$$C_Y(\boldsymbol{u}, v) = |F(\boldsymbol{u}, v)|^2 C_B(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{1}{(\eta + \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{u}/2)^2 + (v + \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\mu})^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{\boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{u}}{2}\right\}$$
(4)

where  $F(\boldsymbol{u},v)$  is the Fourier transform of the convolution kernel  $f(\boldsymbol{s},t)$ 

$$F(\boldsymbol{u}, v) = \mathcal{F}(f(\boldsymbol{s}, t)) = \frac{1}{\eta + \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{u} / 2 + i u^T \boldsymbol{\mu} + i v}$$
(5)

and  $C_B(\mathbf{u})$  is the Fourier transform of  $c_B(\mathbf{h})$  given as follows:

$$C_B(\boldsymbol{u}) = \mathcal{F}(c_B(\boldsymbol{h})) = \exp\left\{-\frac{\boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{u}}{2}\right\}.$$
 (6)

### 2.2 An Infinite-Dimensional SDE Representation

Following the preliminaries section, we now show that it is possible to construct an infinite-dimensional SDE whose solution is a space-time field that has the same space-time covariance shown in (3).

Firstly, let  $x(\mathbf{s},t)$  be a continuous space-time process, and let  $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s},t) = (x(\mathbf{s},t),\dot{x}(\mathbf{s},t))^T$  be a vector where  $\dot{x}(\mathbf{s},t)$  denote the time derivative of  $x(\mathbf{s},t)$ . At any t, the spatially-continuous  $x(\mathbf{s},t)$  is an element of an infinite dimensional Hilbert space,  $x(\mathbf{s},t) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Next, we introduce a stochastic SDE that governs the dynamics of  $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s},t)$ :

$$dx(s,t) = Ax(s,t)dt + LdW(s,t)$$
(7)

where W(s,t) is a Wiener process,  $L=(0,1)^T$ , and A is a  $2\times 2$  matrix of linear operators

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\mathcal{A}_0 & -\mathcal{A}_1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{8}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_0: \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mapsto \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1: \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mapsto \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  are two operators to be determined. To obtain  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , we define a function  $G(\boldsymbol{u}, v)$  in the frequency domain as

$$G(\boldsymbol{u}, v) \equiv F(\boldsymbol{u}, v) \exp\left\{-\boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{u}/4\right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\eta + \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{u}/2 + i u^T \boldsymbol{\mu} + i v} \exp\left\{-\boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{u}/4\right\}$$
(9)

and re-write the power spectrum in (4) as  $C_Y(\boldsymbol{u},v) = G(\boldsymbol{u},v)G(-\boldsymbol{u},-v)$ . Note that, the denominator of  $G(\boldsymbol{u},v)$  is a first-order polynomial of iv.

The key results in Sarkka and Hartikainen (2012) state that one may obtain the opera-

tors  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$  by respectively performing the inverse Fourier transform (in space) of the coefficients of the first-order polynomial of iv (in the denominator of  $G(\boldsymbol{u}, v)$ ). Hence, for the convolution-generated spatio-temporal process defined in (1), we obtain from (9) that,

$$\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{F}_s^{-1}(\eta + \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{u}/2 + i \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \eta - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^2 \cdot + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{F}_s^{-1}(1) = 1$$
(10)

where the two operators  $\nabla^2_{\Sigma}$  and  $\nabla_{\mu}$  in (10) are respectively given as

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{2} \cdot = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sigma_{i}^{2} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial s_{i}^{2}} \qquad \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i}}$$
 (11)

The derivations of the two operators in (11) can be immediately verified by performing the Fourier transform (in space) of the two operators:

$$\mathcal{F}_{s}(\nabla_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{2}\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sigma_{i}^{2} \mathcal{F}_{s}(\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial s_{i}^{2}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} u_{i}^{2} \sigma_{i}^{2} = -\mathbf{u}^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{u}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{s}(\nabla_{\mathbf{\mu}}\cdot) = \sum_{i}^{d} \mu_{i} \mathcal{F}_{s}(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i}}) = i \sum_{i}^{d} u_{i} \mu_{i} = i \mathbf{u}^{T} \mathbf{\mu}$$
(12)

where the right-hand-size of (12) recovers the terms in the denominator of  $G(\boldsymbol{u}, v)$ .

Finally, the stationary diffusion operator of the Wiener process W(s,t) is obtained from the inverse Fourier transform of  $C_B(u)$ ,

$$Q(\boldsymbol{h}) = \mathcal{F}_s^{-1}(C_B(\boldsymbol{u})) = \mathcal{F}_s^{-1}(\exp(-\boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{u}/2))$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\boldsymbol{\Phi}|^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{h}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{-1} \boldsymbol{h}\right)$$
(13)

where h = s - s'.

The results above fully determine the infinite-dimensional SDE in (7), which leads to the following dynamical model representation for the convolution-generated spatio-temporal process Y(s,t) defined in (1):

$$dx(s,t) = Ax(s,t)dt + LdW(s,t)$$

$$\tilde{Y}(s,t) = Hx(s,t) + \varepsilon(s,t)$$
(14)

where  $\mathbf{H} = (1,0)$ ,  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s},t) = x(\mathbf{s},t)$  has the same space-time covariance as  $Y(\mathbf{s},t)$  in (1), and  $\varepsilon(t,\mathbf{s})$  is a spatially-colored and white-in-time Gaussian noise added to capture potential observation errors.

### 2.3 A Finite-Dimensional Approximation using the Galerkin's Method

Solving the dynamical model (14) is non-trivial because it involves an infinite-dimensional SDE as the state transition equation; for example, the filtering problem may require an infinite-dimensional Kalman Filter. Hence, we resort to a finite-dimensional approximation obtained as follows.

#### 2.3.1 The Galerkin's Method

We start with the discretized version of the SDE (7) as follows,

$$\boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{\boldsymbol{k}}) = A(\delta)\boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) + \boldsymbol{e}(\boldsymbol{s}), \quad t_{\boldsymbol{k}} - t_{k-1} = \delta, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$
 (15)

where  $A(\delta) = e^{A\delta}$ ,  $e(s) = \int_0^{\delta} A(\delta - \tau) LW(s, \tau) d\tau$  is a spatial GP denoted by  $GP(0, \Sigma_e)$ , and

$$\Sigma_e = Q \int_0^{\delta} A(\delta - \tau) \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^T A^* (\delta - \tau) d\tau.$$
 (16)

Because A is the exponential of an operator, we adopt, for a small  $\delta$ , the first-order Euler approximation of (15) and obtain

$$\boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k}) = \boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) + \mathcal{A}\delta\boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) + \boldsymbol{e}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}). \tag{17}$$

Note that, although (17) is still an infinite-dimensional problem because  $x(s,t), \dot{x}(s,t) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the Galerkin's method can be used to obtain a finite-dimensional approximation of (17). Let  $\phi_j(s) = e^{i\omega_j^T s}$  be the Fourier eigenfunction of  $\mathcal{A}_0$  with the spatial frequencies  $\omega_j = (\omega_{j,1}, \omega_{j,2}, \cdots, \omega_{j,d})^T$ . Performing the eigenfunction decomposition of the operator  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{0}\phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \eta \,\phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{2} \cdot \phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s}) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cdot \phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s})$$

$$= \left( \eta - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sigma_{i}^{2} \,\omega_{j,i}^{2} + i \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu_{i} \,\omega_{j,i} \right) \phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s}) \equiv \lambda_{j} \,\phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s}).$$
(18)

where  $\lambda_j$  is the eigenvalue of the operator  $\mathcal{A}_0$ .

Then, let  $x(\boldsymbol{s},t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \phi_j(\boldsymbol{s}) \alpha_j(t) \equiv \boldsymbol{\phi}^T(\boldsymbol{s}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$  and  $\dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s},t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \phi_j(\boldsymbol{s}) \beta_j(t) \equiv \boldsymbol{\phi}^T(\boldsymbol{s}) \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$ , (17) is re-written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k}) \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k-1}) \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \\ -\mathcal{A}_{0}\boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k-1}) - \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} \delta + \boldsymbol{e}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}). (19)$$

Following the eigenfunction decomposition  $\mathcal{A}_0\phi_j = \lambda_j\phi_j$ , and recall the fact that the Fourier eigenfunctions are orthogonal (i.e.,  $\int \phi_j \phi_j^* ds$  is a constant when j = j, and  $\int \phi_j \phi_j^* ds = 0$  otherwise), multiplying both side by  $\phi_j(s)$  and then integrate both sides over the spatial

domain yields the following for any  $\omega_{i}$ ,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{\jmath}(t_{k}) \\ \beta_{\jmath}(t_{k}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \delta \\ -\lambda_{\jmath}\delta & 1 - \delta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{\jmath}(t_{k-1}) \\ \beta_{\jmath}(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \boldsymbol{v}_{\jmath}(t_{k-1}), \quad \jmath = 1, 2, \cdots, J,$$
 (20)

where  $v_j$  is a random vector and we leave its derivation to Section 2.3.2. Compared with (17), (20) describes the (approximated) finite-state temporal evolution at any frequency  $\omega_j$ .

#### 2.3.2 The Space-Time Covariance

In this section, we obtain the detailed expressions of  $\mathbf{v}_{j}(t)$  in (20). Firstly, recall that  $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{s}) = \int_{0}^{\delta} A(\delta - \tau) \mathbf{L} W(\mathbf{s}, \tau) d\tau$  is a spatial GP, i.e.,  $GP(0, \Sigma_{e})$  with  $\Sigma_{e} = Q \int_{0}^{\delta} A(\delta - \tau) \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^{T} A^{*}(\delta - \tau) d\tau$  in the discretized SDE (15). When the first-order Euler approximation is adopted, we have

$$A(\delta - \tau) = e^{\mathcal{A}(\delta - \tau)} \approx \mathbf{I} + \mathcal{A}(\delta - \tau)$$

$$= \mathbf{I} + (\delta - \tau) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\mathcal{A}_0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \delta - \tau \\ -\mathcal{A}_0(\delta - \tau) & 1 - \delta + \tau \end{bmatrix}$$
(21)

and

$$A(\delta - \tau)\mathbf{L} = A(\delta - \tau)(0, 1)^T \approx (\delta - \tau, 1 - \delta + \tau)^T.$$
(22)

Substituting (22) into  $\Sigma_e = Q \int_0^{\delta} A(\delta - \tau) \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^T A^*(\delta - \tau) d\tau$  yields

$$\Sigma_e \approx Q \int_0^{\delta} (\delta - \tau, 1 - \delta + \tau)^T (\delta - \tau, 1 - \delta + \tau) d\tau = Q \begin{bmatrix} m_1 & m_{12} \\ m_{12} & m_2 \end{bmatrix}$$
 (23)

where  $m_1 = \int_0^{\delta} (\delta - \tau)^2 d\tau = \delta^3/3$ ,  $m_{12} = \int_0^{\delta} (\delta - \tau)(1 + \delta - \tau) d\tau = \delta^2/2 + \delta^3/3$ , and  $m_2 = \int_0^{\delta} (1 + \delta - \tau)^2 d\tau = \delta + \delta^2 + \delta^3/3$ .

The equation above provides a much simpler form of the covariance of e(s) based on the first-order Euler approximation. However, to obtain the finite-dimensional approximation of (20) using the Galerkin's method above, we need a spectrum representation of e(s,t). The following Proposition 1 allows us to well approximate e(s,t) by  $\tilde{e}(s,t)$ , and a spectrum representation is available for the latter.

**Proposition 1** Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}(\boldsymbol{s},t) = (\sqrt{m_1\delta^{-1}}, \sqrt{m_2\delta^{-1}})^T dW(\boldsymbol{s},t)$ , and  $W(\boldsymbol{s},t)$  is a Wiener process with  $\mathbb{E}[dW(\boldsymbol{s},\tau)\,dW(\boldsymbol{s}',\tau')] = Q(\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{s}')\delta_{\tau,\tau'}$  where  $\delta_{\tau,\tau'}$  is the Kronecker delta. Then, we have the following results:

1).  $\tilde{e}(s,t)$  admits a spectrum representation

$$\tilde{e}(\boldsymbol{s},t) \approx (\sqrt{m_1}, \sqrt{m_2})^T \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\kappa_j} \phi_j(\boldsymbol{s}) Z_j$$
 (24)

where  $\phi_j$  is the Fourier eigenfunction,  $\kappa_j = \exp\{-\omega_j^T \Phi \omega_j/2\}$ , and  $Z_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , are independent standard Gaussian random variables.

2).  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}(\boldsymbol{s},t) \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}})$ , and

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{e}} - \Sigma_{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & O(\delta^{2}) \\ O(\delta^{2}) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

The spectrum representation of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}(t)$  in (24) directly comes from the Karhunen–Loève (KL) expansion of a GP,  $dW(\boldsymbol{s},t) = \sqrt{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\kappa_j} \phi_j(\boldsymbol{s}) Z_j \sim GP(0,Q(\boldsymbol{h})\delta)$ , where  $Q(\boldsymbol{h})$  is given in (13). It immediately follows that  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}(t) \approx (\sqrt{m_1},\sqrt{m_2})^T \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\kappa_j} \phi_j(\boldsymbol{s}) Z_j$ . In addition, note that  $\mathbb{E}\{dW(\boldsymbol{s},t)dW(\boldsymbol{s}',t)\} = Q(\boldsymbol{h})\delta$ . From the KL expansion of  $dW(\boldsymbol{s},t)$ , we also have  $\mathbb{E}\{dW(\boldsymbol{s},t)dW(\boldsymbol{s}',t)\} = \delta \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j \phi(\boldsymbol{s}) \phi^T(\boldsymbol{s}') = \delta \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j e^{i\omega_j^T \boldsymbol{h}}$ . Hence,  $Q(\boldsymbol{h}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j e^{i\omega_j^T \boldsymbol{h}}$ , and  $\kappa_j$  is found from the inverse Fourier transform of a Gaussian density function  $Q(\boldsymbol{h})$ , given in (13), as  $\kappa_j = \exp\{-\omega_j^T \Phi \omega_j/2\}$ .

To obtain the approximation error  $\Sigma_{\tilde{e}} - \Sigma_{e}$  shown in (25), it follows from  $\tilde{e}(s,t) = (\sqrt{m_1\delta^{-1}}, \sqrt{m_2\delta^{-1}})^T dW(s,t)$  that

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{e}} = Q \begin{bmatrix} m_1 & \sqrt{m_1 m_2} \\ \sqrt{m_1 m_2} & m_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

Comparing  $\Sigma_e$  in (23) and  $\Sigma_{\tilde{e}}$  in (26), it is seen that the elements on the diagonal line are exactly the same, while the difference of the off-diagonal entries is

$$\sqrt{m_1 m_2} - m_{12} = \delta^2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} + \frac{\delta}{3} + \frac{\delta^2}{9}} - \delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{3}\right) = O(\delta^2). \tag{27}$$

## 2.4 The Model for General Complex-Valued Processes

Based on the results above, this section gives the dynamical model representation of convolution-generated space-time processes. Replacing e(s,t) by  $\tilde{e}(s,t)$  in (19), we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k}) \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k-1}) \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \\ -\mathcal{A}_{0}\boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\alpha(t_{k-1}) - \boldsymbol{\phi}^{T}(\boldsymbol{s})\beta(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} \delta + \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{m_{1}} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sqrt{\kappa_{j}}\phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s})Z_{j} \\ \sqrt{m_{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sqrt{\kappa_{j}}\phi_{j}(\boldsymbol{s})Z_{j} \end{bmatrix},$$
(28)

and equation (20) is also revised accordingly using the Galerkin projection

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{j}(t_{k}) \\ \beta_{j}(t_{k}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \delta \\ -\lambda_{j}\delta & 1 - \delta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{j}(t_{k-1}) \\ \beta_{j}(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{m_{1}\kappa_{j}}Z_{j} \\ \sqrt{m_{2}\kappa_{j}}Z_{j} \end{bmatrix}.$$
(29)

Finally, let  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta_j(t))^T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T(t), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_J^T(t))^T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{G}_j = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \delta \\ -\lambda_j \delta & 1-\delta \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{G} = \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{G}_1, \boldsymbol{G}_2, \dots, \boldsymbol{G}_J)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{v}_j = (\sqrt{m_1 \kappa_j} Z_j, \sqrt{m_2 \kappa_j} Z_j)^T$ , and  $\boldsymbol{v} = (\boldsymbol{v}_1^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{v}_J^T)^T$ , we obtain the finite-dimensional approximation of the infinite-dimensional dynamical model (14) as follows

$$\theta(t_{k}) = G\theta(t_{k-1}) + v(t_{k})$$

$$\tilde{Y}(s, t_{k}) = H\phi^{T}(s)\theta(t_{k}) + \varepsilon(s, t).$$
(30)

Note that, the state vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$  now has a finite dimension of J.

#### 2.4.1 Real-Valued Processes

The discussions above apply to general processes that take complex values. In scientific and engineering applications, one typically deals with real-valued processes. This section presents the special model formulation tailored for real-valued processes.

Consider the spectral representation of a real-valued process and its time derivative as follows (Liu et al., 2022)

$$x(\boldsymbol{s},t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_1} \alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + 2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_2} (\alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + \alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(t) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(\boldsymbol{s}))$$
(31)

$$\dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_n) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_1} \beta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t_n) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + 2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_2} (\beta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t_n) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + \beta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(t_n) f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(\boldsymbol{s}))$$
(32)

where  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t)$ ,  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t)$ ,  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t)$  and  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t)$  are temporally-varying coefficients,  $f_{\mathbf{k}}^{R} = \cos(2\pi \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{s})$ ,  $f_{\mathbf{k}}^{I} = \sin(2\pi \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{s})$ , and

$$\Omega_{1} = \{(0,0), (0, \frac{N_{2}}{2}), (\frac{N_{1}}{2}, 0), (\frac{N_{1}}{2}, \frac{N_{2}}{2})\}, 
\Omega_{2} = \{(k_{1}, k_{2}); k_{1} = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{N_{1}}{2}, k_{2} = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{N_{2}}{2}\} 
\cup \{(k_{1}, k_{2}); k_{1} = 1, \dots, \frac{N_{1}}{2} - 1, k_{2} = -1, \dots, -\frac{N_{2}}{2} + 1\} \setminus \Omega_{1}.$$
(33)

Substituting the spectral representations above into (17) yields:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(\boldsymbol{s}, t_k) \\ \dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_k) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) \\ \dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) \\ -\mathcal{A}_0 x(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) - \dot{x}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} \delta + \boldsymbol{e}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_{k-1})$$
(34)

where

$$\mathcal{A}_0 x(\boldsymbol{s}, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_1} \alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t) \cdot \mathcal{A}_0 f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + 2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_2} (\alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(t) \cdot \mathcal{A}_0 f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) + \alpha_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(t) \cdot \mathcal{A}_0 f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(\boldsymbol{s}))$$
(35)

with  $\mathcal{A}_0 f_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{s}) = a(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{s}) - b(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}}^I(\mathbf{s}), \ \mathcal{A}_0 f_{\mathbf{k}}^I(\mathbf{s}) = b(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{s}) + a(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}}^I(\mathbf{s}), \ a(\mathbf{k}) = \eta + 2\pi^2 \mathbf{k}^T \Sigma \mathbf{k} \text{ and } b(\mathbf{k}) = 2\pi \mathbf{k}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}.$ 

Following the same idea behind Proposition 1, e(s,t) can be approximated by  $\tilde{e}(s,t) = (\sqrt{m_1\delta^{-1}}, \sqrt{m_2\delta^{-1}})^T dW(s,t)$ . Here, the Wiener process W(s,t) with  $\mathbb{E}[dW(s,t) dW(s',t')] = Q(h)\delta_{t,t'}$  can be represented by the real-valued version of the KL expansion:

$$dW(\boldsymbol{s},t) = \sqrt{\delta} \left\{ \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_1} \sqrt{\zeta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{1,R}} f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) Z^{1,R} + 2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \Omega_2} \sqrt{\zeta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{2,R}} f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^R(\boldsymbol{s}) Z^{2,R} + \sqrt{\zeta_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{2,I}} f_{\boldsymbol{k}}^I(\boldsymbol{s}) Z^{2,I} \right\}$$
(36)

where  $Z^{1,R}$ ,  $Z^{2,R}$  and  $Z^{2,I}$  are independent standard Gaussian random variables, and  $\zeta_{k}^{1,R}$ ,

 $\zeta_{m k}^{2,R}$  and  $\zeta_{m k}^{2,I}$  are obtained from the spectral decomposition (Fourier transform) of Q(m h)

$$Q(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega_1} \zeta_{\mathbf{k}}^{1,R} f_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{h}) + 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega_2} \zeta_{\mathbf{k}}^{2,R} f_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{h}) + \zeta_{\mathbf{k}}^{2,I}(t) f_{\mathbf{k}}^I(\mathbf{h}).$$
(37)

Similar to how (29) is obtained, the Galerkin's method yields:

• For any  $k \in \Omega_1$ 

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_n) \\ \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_n) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \delta \\ -a(\mathbf{k})\delta & 1 - \delta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n-1}) \\ \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{m_1 \zeta_k^{1,R}} Z^{1,R} \\ \sqrt{m_2 \zeta_k^{1,R}} Z^{1,R} \end{bmatrix}$$
(38)

• For any  $\mathbf{k} \in \Omega_2$ 

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n}) \\
\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n}) \\
\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t_{n}) \\
\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t_{n})
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & \delta & 0 & 0 \\
-a(\mathbf{k})\delta & 1 - \delta & -b(\mathbf{k})\delta & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & \delta \\
b(\mathbf{k})\delta & 0 & -a(\mathbf{k})\delta & 1 - \delta
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n-1}) \\
\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{R}(t_{n-1}) \\
\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t_{n-1}) \\
\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{I}(t_{n-1})
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{m_{1}\zeta_{k}^{2,R}Z^{2,R}} \\
\sqrt{m_{2}\zeta_{k}^{2,R}Z^{2,R}} \\
\sqrt{m_{1}\zeta_{k}^{2,I}Z^{2,I}} \\
\sqrt{m_{2}\zeta_{k}^{2,I}Z^{2,I}}
\end{bmatrix} (39)$$

Finally, given the state transition equations (38) and (39), one can immediately obtain the finite-dimensional approximation, which takes the same form as (30), to a real-valued dynamical model (14).

# 3 Numerical Investigations

In this section, two numerical examples are presented to demonstrate the performance and application of the proposed model. The first example is based on a simulated dataset, and the second revisits the motivating example involving the satellite remote-sensing AOD data during the 2025 wildfire in the Los Angeles area.

# 3.1 Example-I: A Simulated Dataset

#### 3.1.1 Data and Experiment Setup

In the first numerical example, the proposed model is applied to model and detect a change point during a stochastic advection-diffusion process. The following stochastic PDE with a source term is used to generate the data:

$$\frac{\partial \xi(t, \mathbf{s})}{\partial t} = -\boldsymbol{\mu}^T \nabla \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \nabla \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) - \eta \xi(t, \mathbf{s}) + Q(t, \mathbf{s}) + \epsilon(t, \mathbf{s}), \quad \mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^2, t \in [0, T].$$
(40)

In this example,

 $\bullet$  The SPDE (40) is solved on a discretized spatial and temporal domain. The spatial domain is discretized by a  $40 \times 40$  regular grid, and the temporal domain is discretized into

equal-length intervals with a size of  $\Delta_t = 0.1$ . Here, we let T = 3.3, leading to 33 simulation time steps *excluding* the simulation of the initial condition.

- The initial condition  $\xi(0, \mathbf{s})$  is simulated from a Gaussian Random Field (GRF) with an Exponential covariance, which has a partial sill of 1 and range 0.25; see Figure 3(a).
- The advection, diffusion and decay are respectively set to  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (1,0)^T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(0.02,0.02)$  and  $\eta = 0.1$ . The white-in-time noise  $\epsilon(t,\boldsymbol{s})$  is a zero-mean GRF.
- The source term  $Q(t, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i=1}^{10} Q_i(t, \mathbf{s})$  involves 10 constant sources whose locations are also indicated in Figure 3(a). For each source function  $Q_i(t, \mathbf{s})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 10$ , we let  $Q_i(t, \mathbf{s}) = 10\tilde{f}^{-1} \times f(\mathbf{s}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^Q, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^Q)$  where  $f(\cdot)$  is the density function of a bivariate Gaussian distribution,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^Q$  specifies the location of the center of the source,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^Q = \text{diag}(10^{-3}, 10^{-3})$ , and  $\rho$  is the value of the density function f evaluated at its center  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^Q$ .
- A change point is introduced at t=2 (i.e., the 20th simulation time step). Starting from this change point, two of the ten sources become weaker. In particular, for the two sources terms indicated by " $\oplus$ " in Figure 3(a), the source function becomes  $Q_i(t, \mathbf{s}) = 5\rho^{-1} \times f(\mathbf{s}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^Q, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^Q)$ .

Figure 3(a)-(h) show the simulated process at selected times. Starting from its initial condition, we see that the process gradually reaches a more stationary state. Although a change point is introduced to the source term  $Q(t, \mathbf{s})$  at time t = 2, such a subtle change can hardly be detected by the naked eye.




Figure 3: A simulated advection-diffusion process with a change in the source term at t=2.

#### 3.1.2 Results and Comparison

For comparison purposes, two models are applied to the simulated data to detect the change in the source term introduced at time t = 2. The first model is the one proposed in this paper. Since (40) is a real-valued process, the model is described in Section 2.4.1.

The second model (referred to as the conventional approach) is the state-space model, described in Liu et al. (2022), for advection-diffusion processes governed by the SPDE

(40). A brief description of this competing approach is given as follows. Let  $\mathbf{Y}(t) = (Y(\mathbf{s}_1, t), Y(\mathbf{s}_2, t), \dots, Y(\mathbf{s}_n, t))$  be an *n*-dimensional vector representing the discretized values of (40) at a set of locations  $\{\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n\}$  (in this example, n = 1600). The advection-diffusion process (40), with a source term, can be represented by a dynamical system that is linear in state

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t_k) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}(t_k) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{G} & \boldsymbol{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t_{k-1}) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}(t_{k-1}) \end{bmatrix} + \boldsymbol{e}(t_k) 
\boldsymbol{Y}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_k) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\phi} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t_k) \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}(t_k) \end{bmatrix} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{s}, t_k).$$
(41)

Details of the model (41) are available in Liu et al. (2022). Here,  $\phi$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix with its *i*-th row being  $\phi(s_i) = (\phi_1(s_i), ..., \phi_n(s_i))$  where  $\phi_j(s) = \exp(i\mathbf{k}_j^T s)$  is the Fourier basis function and  $\mathbf{k}_j$  is the spatial wavenumber,  $\mathbf{I}$  is the identity matrix, and  $\mathbf{G}$  is an  $n \times n$  state transition matrix operator depending on the parameters in (40),  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mathbf{e}$  are multivariate Gaussian noise vectors, and  $\alpha(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are the state vectors. For this conventional approach, it is important to note that  $\beta(t)$  captures the growth-decay of the process due to the source term Q(t,s) and is often modeled as an AR(1) process. The inverse Fourier transform of  $\beta(t)$  gives the amount of growth, or decay, of the process over a fixed time interval over the spatial domain. Hence, to detect the change point associated with Q(t,s) at time t=2 in this example, the filtered dynamics of  $\beta(t)$  plays a critical role if the conventional model (41) is adopted.




Figure 4: Filtered processes from the proposed (above) and the conventional (below) models, and both models yield satisfactory performance.

The Kalman Filter is used to estimate the state dynamics for both the proposed and convectional linear state-space models. Note that, in this numerical example based on simulation data, our primary goal is to investigate if the filtered states can detect the change in the source term at time t = 2, and all model parameters are given for both models for a

fair comparison. Figure 4 firstly shows the re-constructed processes using the filtered system states at selected times. The row above shows the filtered process obtained from the proposed model, while the row below shows the process obtained from the convectional model (41). By comparing Figures 3 and 4, it is seen that both models yield seemingly satisfactory performance in terms of obtaining the filtered process.

Next, we investigate which model performs better in detecting the change of the source term at time t = 2 (i.e., at the simulation step 20).

• For the proposed model, Figures 5 and 6 respectively show the filtered  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$  and  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$  for a set of selected wavenumbers from the set,  $\{(0,0),(0,1),(0,2),(0,3),(1,0),(2,0),(3,0),(1,1),(2,2),(3,3)\}$ . These wavenumbers are selected from the low-frequency region of the spectral space and are associated with the most important dominate pattern of the process (of course, it is possible to show the graph for other wavenumbers). Also recall that,  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^R = \dot{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}^R$  and  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^I = \dot{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}^I$  in the proposed model. Hence,  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  and  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  are respectively associated with the process and its first-order derivative.




Figure 5: Filtered  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  for selected spatial frequencies from the proposed approach.

Some important observations are obtained from Figures 5 and 6:

 $\diamond$  It is *ineffective*, if not impossible, to detect the change of the source term by simply looking at the trend of the estimated overall mean (i.e., at the wavenumber  $\mathbf{k} = (0,0)$ ). For  $\mathbf{k} = (0,0)$ , the coefficient  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}=(0,0)}(t)$  is exactly the filtered overall spatial mean of the process following the real-valued Fourier transform (the top left panel of Figure 5). Because the introduced change of the source term is relatively small and the data contain noise, the change of estimated overall spatial mean, before and after time step 20, does not provide a strong indicator of the change of source.

 $\diamond$  It is much more effective to detect the change of the source term, at time step 20, by looking at the estimated trend of  $\alpha_k$  corresponding to other spatial frequencies; for example, (0,1), (0,2) and (0,3). The abrupt, non-smooth and visually noticeable change of the trend




Figure 6: Filtered  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  for selected spatial frequencies from the proposed approach.

 $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  at time step 20 indicates the change; see Figure 5.

 $\diamond$  The change of source at time step 20 is clearly noticeable from the estimated  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  (which is related to the first-order derivative of the process) at multiple spatial frequencies, such as (0,1), (0,2), (0,3), (2,0), (2,2) and (3,3), as shown in Figure 6.

For comparison purposes, Figures 7 and 8 show the filtered  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$  and  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$ , respectively, obtained from the conventional model (41) for the same set of selected wavenumbers. However, neither the filtered dynamics of  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  nor  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$  shows any clear indication of the change of the source term at time t=2.

In summary, this simulation-based comparison provides a strong evidence that the proposed approach yields some advantages over the existing approach in terms of detecting the first-order time derivative of the convolution-generated space-time processes (i.e., the change of the source term at t=2). The main reason is that the proposed state-space model in (30) involves  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_J$  as the second half of the state vector, and these coefficients are directly related to the first-order time derivative of the process as  $\dot{x}(s,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \phi_j(s)\beta_j(t) \equiv \phi^T(s)\beta(t)$ .




Figure 7: Filtered  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  for selected spatial frequencies from the existing approach.




Figure 8: Filtered  $\beta_k(t)$  for selected spatial frequencies from the existing approach.

# 3.2 Example-II: Application to Remote-Sensing AOD Data

In Example-II, we re-visit the motivating example presented in Section 1.1, and apply the proposed approach to model the remote-sensing AOD process and detect spatial areas with rapid AOD changes during the 2025 Los Angeles Kenneth Fire episode. The fire occurred in January 2025 in the West Hills area of Los Angeles County, California.

#### 3.2.1 Data

The 2025 Los Angeles wildfires AOD data are obtained from the GOES-18 ABI Level-2 Aerosol Optical Depth product, which retrieves columnar AOD at 550 nm on a 2 km geostationary grid every 10 minutes. Files are stored as NetCDF-4 in the public Google Cloud bucket gs://gcp-public-data-goes-18/ABI-L2-AODC/2025/009/. Each file contains variables AOD, x, y, and the goes\_imager\_projection metadata are used to map pixel indices to geographic coordinates. An example snapshot of AOD data is provided in Figure 1 of Section 1.1.




Figure 9: Ten evenly spaced (every 20 minutes) snapshots of AOD data streams from the cropped  $40\times40$  window centered on Los Angeles.

We load each NetCDF file with xarray and read the projection parameters from goes\_imager\_projection. Using pyproj, the native GOES grid is reprojected to longitude—latitude. We then locate the grid cell nearest to Los Angeles (34.0522° N, 118.2437° W), and extract a  $40\times40$  pixel window centered on that cell. By processing every third file (20 minute intervals) over a 10 hour span, we assemble a  $40\times40\times30$  array of AOD snapshots for this numerical example. Figure 9 presents ten evenly spaced snapshots from the cropped  $40\times40$  window. The top row illustrates the rapid buildup of AOD as the wildfire plume intensifies, while the bottom row shows the subsequent dispersion and gradual return toward ambient aerosol levels.

#### 3.2.2 Results and Comparison

Similar to Example-I, we apply both the proposed and conventional models (41) to the AOD data stream. Using the Adam optimizer with learning rate of  $10^-3$ , the maximum likelihood estimates of the unknown parameters are firstly obtained before the Kalman Filter is applied. Figures 10 and 11 firstly present the filtered AOD process using both the proposed and the conventional models, respectively. In particular, for the proposed model, Figure 10 shows  $\phi^T(s)\hat{\alpha}(t)$  using the filtered  $\hat{\alpha}(t)$ . For the conventional model (41), Figure 11 shows  $\mathbf{F}^T(s)\hat{\alpha}(t)$  using the filtered  $\hat{\alpha}(t)$ . Both models seem to be capable of estimating the filtered AOD process.




Figure 10: Filtered processes from the proposed model




Figure 11: Filtered processes from the conventional models

Next, we show the estimated first-order time derivative (using the proposed model) and the estimated growth-decay (using the conventional model). In particular, for the proposed model,  $\phi^T(s)\hat{\beta}(t)$  gives the filtered first-order time derivative shown in Figure 12. For the proposed model,  $F^T(s)\hat{\beta}(t)$  gives the estimated process growth-decay using the filtered  $\hat{\beta}(t)$  shown in Figure 13.

A clear difference is observed between the results shown in Figures 12 and 13. In Figure 12, the estimated first-order time derivative largely follows the plume's leading edge (the region with the most rapid change). This shows that the estimated transition matrix  $\hat{G}$  of the proposed model (30) effectively captures the advection–diffusion dynamics of the AOD process. In contrast, the estimated growth-decay, shown in Figure 13, obtained from the conventional model apparently re-produces a similar pattern almost identical to the filtered process shown in Figure 10. This observation is problematic and implies that the estimated transition matrix  $\hat{G}$  in the conventional model (30) cannot fully capture the dynamics of the AOD process, and as a result, the estimated growth-decay  $\mathbf{F}^T(\mathbf{s})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(t)$  serves as a bias




Figure 12: Estimated first-order time derivative of the process from the proposed model




Figure 13: Estimated growth-decay from the conventional model

correction, or compensation, to the filtered process  $\mathbf{F}^T(\mathbf{s})\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t)$  (rather than estimating the actural growth or decay of the process). This is a critical observation suggesting that the proposed model provides a stronger modeling capability over the existing approach.

When examining the filtered modal amplitudes  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$  across some selected wavenumbers, (1,0),(1,1),(1,2),(1,3), from the low-frequency region, both the proposed and conventional models trace highly similar trajectories for broad, slowly varying patterns as shown in Figure 14. The vertical dash line marks 2:07PM when the fire was initially reported. On the other hand, an interesting observation is obtained when examining the filtered  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \sqrt{(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^R(t))^2 + (\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^I(t))^2}$ . In the proposed model,  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  determines the time derivative of the AOD process, while in the conventional model,  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  is used to capture the growth or decay of the AOD process. Figure 15 shows the filtered  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  at the lowest spatial frequency (0,0) for both approaches. Around 2:07PM, the filtered  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  from the proposed model starts to fluctuate and grow, which approximately coincides with




Figure 14: Comparison of  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  across some selected wavenumbers, (1,0),(1,1),(1,2),(1,3). The vertical dashed line marks 2:07PM which indicates the time when the wildfire started.




Figure 15: Comparison of  $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$  at the selected wavenumber, (0,0). The vertical dashed line (2:07PM) indicates the onset of the Kenneth fire which grew rapidly by 5:30PM PST fanned by strong Santa Ana winds

the reported onset of the Kenneth fire near the border of Los Angeles and Ventura counties. More interestingly, the filtered  $\beta_k(t)$  from the proposed model shows a clear late afternoon surge (after  $4:00\,PM$ ) in line with public reports that the Kenneth Fire grew rapidly by  $5:30\,PM$  PST fanned by strong Santa Ana winds. The conventional model, on the other hand, obviously fails to capture the sudden growth of AOD. The reason behind such an observation has already been provided in the discussions of Figures 12 and 13. As discussed above, the estimated transition matrix  $\hat{G}$  in the conventional model (30) does not fully capture the dynamics of the AOD process, and the estimated growth-decay merely serves as a bias correction, or compensation, to the filtered process rather than estimating the actual

growth or decay of the process.

# 4 Conclusions

This paper presented the a new dynamical model representation of convolution-generated spatio-temporal GP. Unlike the existing linear finite-state dynamical model for stochastic advection-diffusion process with a white-in-time Gaussian noise, the proposed dynamical model involves state variables directly related to the process itself as well as its first-order time derivative. The proposed model was obtained by firstly constructing an infinite-dimensional SDE whose solution has the same space-time covariance as the original convolution-generated GP, followed by a finite-dimensional approximation to the infinite-dimensional SDE using the Galerkin's method. The proposed approach has been applied to a simulation-based study and a real case study involving the AOD propagation process of the 2025 Kenneth Fire in the Los Angeles area. The comparison study has successfully demonstrated the superior performance of the proposed dynamical model over the existing approach, making the proposed model a good candidate for process modeling and monitoring of many scientific and engineering spatio-temporal processes.

# References

- Amsallem, D. and Farhat, C. (2014). On the stability of reduced-order linearized computational fluid dynamics models based on pod and galerkin projection: descriptor vs non-descriptor forms. In *Reduced order methods for modeling and computational reduction*, pages 215–233. Springer.
- Anderson, B. D. (1982). Reverse-time diffusion equation models. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 12(3):313–326.
- Benner, P., Gugercin, S., and Willcox, K. (2015). A survey of projection-based model reduction methods for parametric dynamical systems. *SIAM review*, 57(4):483–531.
- Brown, P. E., K., K. F., Gareth, O. R., and Stefano, T. (2000). Blur-generated non-separable space-time models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 62(4):847–860.
- Clarotto, L., Allard, D., Romary, T., and Desassis, N. (2024). The spde approach for spatio-temporal datasets with advection and diffusion. *Spatial Statistics*, 62:100847.
- Cressie, N. and Wikle, C. (2011). Statistics for Spatio-Temporal Data. John Wiley & Sons.
- Deng, X., Kang, L., and Lin, C. D. (2025). Design of experiments for emulations: A selective review from a modeling perspective. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09596.
- Gneiting, T. (2002). Nonseparable, stationary covariance functions for space—time data. Journal of the american statistical association, 97(458):590–600.

- Gramacy, R. B. (2020). Surrogates: Gaussian process modeling, design, and optimization for the applied sciences. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Hartikainen, J. and Särkkä, S. (2010). Kalman filtering and smoothing solutions to temporal Gaussian process regression models. In 2010 IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP), pages 379–384. IEEE.
- Hector, E. C. and Reich, B. J. (2024). Distributed inference for spatial extremes modeling in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(546):1297–1308.
- Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., and et al. (1998). AERONET—a federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 66(1):1–16.
- Hu, Z., Cao, Q., Kawaguchi, K., and Karniadakis, G. E. (2025). Deepomamba: State-space model for spatio-temporal pde neural operator learning. *Available at SSRN 5149007*.
- IPCC (2021). Annex vii: Glossary. In Zhai, P. e. a., editor, Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC, pages A7–1–A7–45. Cambridge University Press.
- Katzfuss, M. and Schäfer, F. (2024). Scalable bayesian transport maps for high-dimensional non-gaussian spatial fields. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(546):1409–1423.
- Lan, S., Pasha, M., Li, S., and Shen, W. (2025). Spatiotemporal besov priors for bayesian inverse problems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, (just-accepted):1–30.
- Li, Z., Yang, S., and Wu, C. J. (2024). Parameter inference based on gaussian processes informed by nonlinear partial differential equations. SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 12(3):964–1004.
- Lin, Z., Li, Y., Yin, F., Maroñas, J., and Thiéry, A. H. (2025). Efficient transformed gaussian process state-space models for non-stationary high-dimensional dynamical systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.18309.
- Lindgren, F., Rue, H., and Lindström, J. (2011). An explicit link between gaussian fields and gaussian markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 73(4):423–498.
- Liu, X., Yeo, K., Hwang, Y., Singh, J., and Kalagnanam, J. (2016). A statistical modeling approach for air quality data based on physical dispersion processes and its application to ozone modeling. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 756–785.
- Liu, X., Yeo, K. M., and Lu, S. Y. (2022). Statistical modeling for spatio-temporal data from stochastic convection-diffusion processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (Theory and Methods), 117:1482–1499.

- Morris, M. D. (2012). Gaussian surrogates for computer models with time-varying inputs and outputs. *Technometrics*, 54(1):42–50.
- Pförtner, M., Steinwart, I., Hennig, P., and Wenger, J. (2022). Physics-informed gaussian process regression generalizes linear pde solvers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12474.
- Polonelli, T., Brunelli, D., Bartolini, A., and Benini, L. (2019). A lorawan wireless sensor network for data center temperature monitoring. arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09400. High-resolution, battery-operated wireless sensors deployed continuously for six months to detect hotspots and optimize cooling.
- Quick, H., Banerjee, S., and Carlin, B. P. (2015). Bayesian modeling and analysis for gradients in spatiotemporal processes. *Biometrics*, 71(3):575–584.
- Remer, L. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Tanré, D., and et al. (2005). The modis aerosol algorithm, products, and validation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 62(4):947–973.
- Richardson, R., Kottas, A., and Sansó, B. (2020). Spatiotemporal modelling using integrodifference equations with bivariate stable kernels. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 82(5):1371–1392.
- Sarkka, S. and Hartikainen, J. (2012). Infite-dimensional kalman filtering approach to spatiotemporal gaussian process regression. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence* and Statistics (AISTATS).
- Sigrist, F., Kunsch, H., and Stahel, W. (2015). Stochastic partial differential equation basedmodelling of large space—time data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *Series B*, 77:3–33.
- Wang, X., Liu, X., Tsung, F., and Yeo, K. (2022). Statistical monitoring of spatio-temporal processes with application to warehouse temperature management. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 54(2):215–235.
- Wei, G., Liu, X., and Barton, R. (2024). An extended pde-based statistical spatio-temporal model that suppresses the gibbs phenomenon. *Environmetrics*, 35(2):e2831.
- Whittle, P. (1954). On stationary processes in the plane. Biometrika, pages 434–449.
- Wikle, C. K. and Hooten, M. B. (2010). A general science-based framework for dynamical spatio-temporal models. *Test*, 19(3):417–451.
- Zhang, Q., Chien, P., Liu, Q., Xu, L., and Hong, Y. (2021). Mixed-input gaussian process emulators for computer experiments with a large number of categorical levels. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 53(4):410–420.
- Zhu, S. X. and Xie, Y. (2022). Spatiotemporal-textual point processes for crime linkage detection. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 1151–1170.