Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis
ISSN: 1074-133X
Vol 31 No. 1 (2024)

Accelerating Inverse Problem Solutions with Generative Adversarial Networks

Machhindranath M. Dhane[1*], Shobhankumar D.M[2], Lakshmi Janardhana R.C[3], Ramesh T[4]

[1*]Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, GFGC, Yelahanka, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India; Email: drdhani.99dce@gmail.com

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Maharani's Science College for Women,Palace Road, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India; Email: shobhankumardm@gmail.com

[3] Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, GFGC, Vijayanagar, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India; Email: ljrcmaths@gmail.com

[4]Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Cambridge Institute of Technology, K R Puram,Bengaluru, Karnataka, India; Email: rameshgollahally@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author**: drdhani.99dce@gmail.com

Email of Co-author:shobhankumardm@gmail.com

Article History:
Received: 02-07-2024
Revised: 25-08-2024
Accepted: 20-09-2024

Abstract:

nverse problems represent a class of computational challenges where the goal is to estimate unknown system parameters from observed data, with applications ranging from medical imaging to geophysical exploration. These problems are typically ill-posed and computationally intensive, often requiring sophisticated regularization techniques and iterative optimization methods. This comprehensive review explores the transformative potential of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) in accelerating solutions to inverse problems across various scientific domains. We examine how GAN architectures can learn complex prior distributions from data, enable rapid parameter estimation, and produce high-fidelity reconstructions while significantly reducing computational burden compared to traditional methods. The paper covers fundamental theoretical concepts, including conditional GANs, Wasserstein GANs with gradient penalty, and physics-informed adversarial approaches that integrate physical constraints into the learning process. Through detailed case studies in seismic imaging, medical reconstruction, materials science, and physical modeling, we demonstrate how GAN-based approaches achieve substantial acceleration often orders of magnitude faster than conventional techniques while maintaining competitive reconstruction quality. The review also addresses current challenges and limitations, such as training instability, theoretical guarantees, and data requirements, while outlining promising future research directions for further advancing the field of accelerated inverse problem solving.

Keywords: Inverse Problems, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs),Computational Acceleration, Image Reconstruction, Deep Learning, Physics-Informed Neural Networks, Seismic Imaging, Medical Imaging, Regularization.

1.INTRODUCTION

Inverse problems represent a fundamental class of computational challenges across scientific and engineering disciplines, where the objective is to estimate unknown system parameters or hidden states from observed indirect measurements. These problems arise in diverse fields including medical imaging (e.g., CT and MRI reconstruction), geophysical exploration (e.g., seismic inversion), materials science, and astronomical imaging.

The mathematical formulation typically involves estimating parameters *x* from observations *y* related through a forward model $y = F(x) + \eta$, where F represents the physical mapping and η denotes measurement noise 210. Inverse problems are notoriously ill-posed in the Hadamard sense, meaning they may lack unique solutions or exhibit extreme sensitivity to noise and small perturbations in measurements 12. Traditional approaches to solving inverse problems include analytical inversion methods, iterative optimization techniques, discretization-based regularization, and variational methods that incorporate prior knowledge through penalty terms 10. While these methods have proven effective in many applications, they often face significant limitations: they require explicitly defined prior models, can be computationally intensive for large-scale problems, may struggle with complex non-Gaussian distributions, and typically need to be customized for each specific problem type 210. The computational burden is particularly prohibitive in applications requiring real-time solutions or dealing with high-dimensional parameter spaces. The emergence of deep learning methodologies has introduced powerful new paradigms for addressing inverse problems. Among these, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) have shown remarkable potential for accelerating inverse problem solutions while handling complex data distributions 138. GANs, introduced by Goodfellow et al., employ a game-theoretic framework where a generator network learns to produce realistic samples from a target distribution while a discriminator network learns to distinguish between real and generated samples 6. This adversarial training process enables GANs to learn complex, high-dimensional distributions without explicit probability density estimation, making them particularly suitable for inverse problems where prior distributions are difficult to characterize analytically.The integration of GANs into inverse problem solutions offers several compelling advantages: (1) the ability to learn data-driven priors that capture complex structures more effectively than hand-crafted regularizers; (2) accelerated computation through direct mapping from measurements to parameters once trained; (3) improved handling of non-Gaussian uncertainties and multi-modal distributions; and (4) potential for unsupervised or semi-supervised learning paradigms that reduce reliance on fully-labeled training data 189. This paper provides a comprehensive review of GAN-based approaches for accelerating inverse problem solutions. We examine fundamental architectures, theoretical foundations, implementation strategies, and applications across diverse domains. Through comparative analysis and case studies, we demonstrate how GANs can overcome limitations of traditional methods while addressing emerging challenges and future research directions. The insights presented aim to guide researchers and practitioners in leveraging GANs for efficient and effective inverse problem solutions in their respective fields.

2.THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Inverse Problems: Mathematical Formulation

Inverse problems involve estimating unknown parameters *x* ∈ ℝ^{n} from observed measurements *y* ∈ ℝ^{m} related through a forward model:

$$y = F(x) + \eta$$

where F : ℝ^{n} → ℝ^{m} represents the forward operator that maps parameters to measurements, and η denotes measurement noise typically modeled as random additive noise 210. The forward operator embodies the physical laws governing the system, such as wave propagation in seismic imaging or radiation attenuation in CT scanning. Inverse problems are typically ill-posed, violating at least one of Hadamard's conditions for well-posedness: existence, uniqueness, and stability of solutions 12. This ill-posedness arises from various factors including noise in measurements, incomplete data (e.g., limited viewing angles in tomography), and the inherent null space of the forward operator where different parameters produce identical measurements. To address ill-posedness, regularization techniques introduce additional constraints based on prior knowledge about the solution. The variational approach formulates inversion as an optimization problem:

$$\hat{x} = argmin_x \, [\, \|y - F(x)\|^2 + \lambda R(x) \,]$$

where the first term ensures data fidelity, $R(x)$ is the regularization term incorporating prior knowledge, and λ controls the trade-off between data fitting and regularization 10. Common regularizers include Tikhonov (L_2) regularization promoting smoothness, total variation (TV) regularization preserving edges, and sparsity-promoting regularizers using L_1 norms or other non-convex penalties.

2.2 Bayesian Interpretation and Uncertainty Quantification

The **Bayesian framework** provides a probabilistic interpretation of inverse problems, treating all quantities as random variables 19. According to Bayes' theorem:

$$p(x|y) \propto p(y|x)p(x)$$

where $p(x|y)$ is the posterior distribution representing updated beliefs about parameters after observing data, $p(y|x)$ is the likelihood describing the probability of observations given parameters, and $p(x)$ is the prior distribution encoding knowledge about parameters before observing data 9. The Bayesian approach naturally handles uncertainty quantification, providing not just point estimates but entire posterior distributions. However, computational challenges arise in high dimensions where sampling methods like Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) become prohibitively expensive 19. This has motivated research into approximate inference methods, including variational inference and sampling-based approaches using deep generative models.

2.3 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) consist of two neural networks a generator G and a discriminator D trained simultaneously in an adversarial game 6. The generator maps random noise vectors *z* from a prior distribution $p_z(z)$ to synthetic samples $G(z)$ that resemble real data, while the discriminator attempts to distinguish between real samples from $p_{data}(x)$ and generated samples $G(z)$.

The training objective follows a minimax game:

$$\min_G \max_D [E_{x\sim p_{data}}[\log D(x)] + E_{z\sim p_z}[\log(1 - D(G(z)))]]$$

In equilibrium, the generator produces samples indistinguishable from real data, and the discriminator predicts 0.5 everywhere 6. For inverse problems, conditional GANs (cGANs) are particularly relevant as they generate samples conditioned on additional information, such as measurement data *y* 18.

Aspect	Traditional Methods	GAN-Based Approaches
Prior Representation	Explicit analytical forms (e.g., smoothness, sparsity)	Implicitly learned from data
Computational Cost	High (iterative optimization)	Low after training (forward pass)
Uncertainty Quantification	Challenging, often limited	Possible through sampling
Handling Complex Priors	Limited to designed regularizers	Can capture complex, multi-modal distributions
Training Requirements	No training needed	Requires extensive training data
Theoretical Guarantees	Well-established theory	Emerging theoretical understanding

Table 1: Comparison of Traditional and GAN-Based Approaches to Inverse Problems

3.GAN FRAMEWORKS FOR INVERSE PROBLEMS

3.1 Conditional GANs for Inverse Problems

Conditional Generative Adversarial Networks (cGANs) extend the standard GAN framework by incorporating additional information as conditioning inputs to both generator and discriminator 18. For inverse problems, this conditioning information typically consists of the measurement data *y*, enabling the generator to produce parameter estimates *x* that are consistent with observations.

The objective function for cGANs becomes:

$$\min_G \max_D [E_{x\sim p_{data}}[\log D(x|y)] + E_{z\sim p_z}[\log(1 - D(G(z|y)|y))]]$$

where $G(z|y)$ generates samples conditioned on measurements *y*, and $D(x|y)$ evaluates the authenticity of *x* given *y* 8. This approach allows direct learning of the inverse mapping from measurements to parameters without explicit formulation of the forward model during inference. Kim et al. demonstrated the effectiveness of cGANs for seismic inverse problems, generating accelerograms conditioned on pseudo-spectral acceleration (PSA) values 8. Their model produced realistic time histories that matched target response spectra while capturing the complex statistical characteristics of earthquake ground motions.

3.2 Wasserstein GANs with Gradient Penalty

Training stability has been a persistent challenge in GANs, often requiring careful balancing of generator and discriminator capabilities. The Wasserstein GAN (WGAN) addresses this by using the Earth-Mover distance (Wasserstein-1) as the loss function, which provides more meaningful training signals and better correlation with sample quality 1. WGAN with gradient penalty (WGAN-GP) further improves stability by enforcing a Lipschitz constraint through a penalty on the gradient norm of the discriminator 1. The objective function becomes:

$$\min_G \max_D [E_{x\sim p_{data}}[D(x|y)] - E_{z\sim p_z}[D(G(z|y)|y)] + \lambda_{gp} E_{\hat{x}\sim p_{\hat{x}}}[(||\nabla_{\hat{x}}D(\hat{x}|y)||_2 - 1)^2]]$$

where $\hat{x}$ represents interpolated points between real and generated samples, and λ_{gp} controls the gradient penalty strength 1. Improved cWGAN formulations with full gradient penalty (Full-GP) have shown superior performance in physics-based inverse problems compared to partial gradient penalty approaches 1. By requiring the critic to be 1-Lipschitz with respect to all inputs (both parameters and measurements), Full-GP cWGANs provide stronger convergence guarantees and better approximation of true posterior distributions.

3.3 Physics-Informed Adversarial Approaches

Physics-informed GANs integrate physical knowledge into the adversarial training process, ensuring generated samples satisfy physical constraints 4. This approach is particularly valuable for inverse problems where physical principles govern the relationship between parameters and measurements.

The generator loss can be augmented with physics-based constraints:

$$L_G = L_{adv} + \lambda_{phy} L_{phy}$$

where L_{adv} is the standard adversarial loss, L_{phy} enforces physical consistency, and λ_{phy} controls the constraint strength 4. Physical constraints may include partial differential equations governing the system, boundary conditions, or other known physical relationships. For example, in solving inverse problems involving partial differential equations (PDEs), physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) can be combined with adversarial frameworks to ensure both data consistency and physical plausibility 4. This hybrid approach leverages the strengths of both methodologies: the representation learning capabilities of GANs and the physical consistency of PINNs.

3.4 Bayesian Inference with Generative Priors

GANs can serve as **learned priors** in Bayesian inference frameworks, providing flexible, data-driven alternatives to traditional analytical priors 9. By training a generator G to map latent vectors *z* to parameters *x*, the prior distribution is implicitly defined as the pushforward of the latent distribution through G: $x = G(z), z \sim p(z)$.

Bayesian inversion then involves inferring the posterior distribution over latent variables *z* rather than parameters *x*:

$$p(z|y) \propto p(y|G(z))p(z)$$

This approach effectively reduces the dimensionality of the inverse problem since the latent space typically has much lower dimension than the parameter space 9. Sampling methods like MCMC or variational inference can be applied in the latent space, generating samples $z^{(i)} \sim p(z|y)$ that correspond to parameter samples $x^{(i)} = G(z^{(i)})$ approximating the posterior $p(x|y)$.

This paradigm has been successfully applied to various inverse problems, including compressed sensing with generative models (CSGM) and Bayesian inversion using Wasserstein GANs 91.

GAN Architecture	Key Features	Advantages	Representative Applications
Conditional GAN (cGAN)	Conditioning on measurements	Direct inverse mapping, handles multi-modality	Seismic inversion 8, Image reconstruction 10
Wasserstein GAN (WGAN)	Wasserstein distance, gradient penalty	Improved training stability, meaningful loss metric	Physics-based inversion 1
Physics-Informed GAN	Incorporates physical constraints	Physically plausible solutions, better generalization	PDE-constrained problems 4
Bayesian GAN	Generator as learned prior	Uncertainty quantification, reduced dimensionality	Compressive sensing 9, Medical imaging 9

Table 2: GAN Architectures for Inverse Problems and Their Applications

4.APPLICATIONS AND CASE STUDIES

4.1 Seismic Inversion and Accelerogram Generation

Seismic inverse problems involve estimating subsurface properties from seismic measurements or generating realistic ground motion records consistent with response spectra. These problems are particularly challenging due to the high-dimensional parameter spaces, complex wave propagation physics, and limited measurement data 8. Kim et al. developed a cGAN framework for generating artificial accelerograms conditioned on pseudo-spectral acceleration (PSA) values 8. Their model utilized a Wasserstein GAN with gradient penalty (WGAN-GP) to stabilize training and generate diverse, high-quality samples. The generator received both latent vectors and PSA conditions as inputs, producing 120-second acceleration time histories that captured the complex temporal characteristics of earthquake ground motions. The trained model demonstrated remarkable capability in generating numerous artificial accelerograms matching target PSA characteristics while maintaining realistic temporal patterns and energy distributions. This approach significantly accelerated the process of generating design-level ground motions compared to traditional simulation methods, with applications in seismic hazard analysis and structural design 8.

4.2 Medical Image Reconstruction

Medical imaging modalities including computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and positron emission tomography (PET) inherently involve inverse problems where the goal is to reconstruct anatomical or functional images from measured projections or signals 10.

GAN-based approaches have shown particular promise for accelerating MRI reconstruction from undersampled k-space data. Conditional GANs can learn mapping from undersampled reconstructions to high-quality images, effectively learning to fill in missing information based on training data patterns 10. Similarly, in CT reconstruction, GANs have been used to reduce radiation dose by producing high-quality images from limited-angle or sparse-view projections.

These approaches typically demonstrate significant acceleration compared to iterative reconstruction methods, once the models are trained. For example, GAN-based MRI reconstruction can achieve near-instantaneous reconstruction compared to minutes or hours for conventional compressed sensing approaches, facilitating real-time imaging applications 10.

4.3 Materials Science and Microstructure Generation

In materials science, inverse problems often involve designing microstructures with desired properties or estimating material parameters from measurements 3. Traditional approaches to these problems face challenges due to the complex, non-linear relationships between microstructures and properties. A novel application of GANs in materials science involves solving inverse structure-property problems where the goal is to generate microstructures conditioned on continuous property values 3. Standard conditional GAN approaches struggled with continuous conditioning values, often leading to mode collapse and limited diversity. To address this challenge, a novel **binary embedding** strategy was developed that represents continuous property values using their binary representations (sign, exponent, and mantissa) before feeding them to the generator 3. This approach preserved information and created a versatile embedding space for conditioning, enabling precise control over generated microstructures throughout the property range. This method demonstrated superior performance compared to traditional conditioning approaches, successfully generating diverse Ising model microstructures across temperature ranges that captured phase transition behaviors 3.

4.4 Physics-Based Inverse Problems

Physics-based inverse problems involve estimating parameters or fields in systems governed by physical laws, typically expressed as partial differential equations (PDEs) 14. These include problems in heat conduction, elasticity, electromagnetics, and fluid dynamics. Adler and Öktem pioneered the use of conditional Wasserstein GANs for solving Bayesian inverse problems in imaging and physics-based applications 19. Their approach used cWGANs to learn posterior distributions directly from data, enabling efficient sampling and uncertainty quantification. For inverse heat conduction problems and elastography, cWGANs with full gradient penalty (Full-GP) demonstrated superior performance in approximating posterior distributions compared to traditional methods and partial gradient penalty approaches 1. The Full-GP formulation provided stronger theoretical guarantees and more accurate uncertainty quantification. Physics-informed GANs have also been developed to solve forward and inverse problems involving PDEs with limited labeled data 4. These approaches incorporate PDE constraints into the adversarial training process, ensuring generated solutions satisfy physical laws while consistent with measurement data.

5.CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

5.1 Training Instability and Mode Collapse

Despite theoretical advances, training instability remains a significant challenge in GAN-based approaches to inverse problems 16. The adversarial training process requires careful balancing of generator and discriminator capabilities, often necessitating specialized techniques such as gradient penalty, spectral normalization, or alternative loss functions**.** Mode collapse, where the generator produces limited diversity of samples, is particularly problematic for inverse problems with multi-modal posterior distributions 6. Various approaches have been developed to address this issue, including minibatch discrimination, unrolled GANs, and variational methods that encourage diversity.

5.2 Theoretical Guarantees and Interpretability

While empirical results have demonstrated the effectiveness of GANs for inverse problems, theoretical guarantees regarding convergence, stability, and solution quality remain limited compared to traditional regularization methods 19. The black-box nature of deep neural networks also raises concerns about interpretability and trustworthiness, particularly in safety-critical applications like medical diagnosis or structural design. Recent work has begun establishing theoretical foundations for GAN-based inversion. For example, improved cWGAN formulations with full gradient penalty have stronger convergence guarantees, with generators converging to true conditional distributions under appropriate conditions 1. However, further theoretical development is needed to fully understand the properties and limitations of these approaches.

5.3 Data Requirements and Generalization

GANs typically require large training datasets to learn complex distributions effectively 810. This presents challenges in domains where data is scarce, expensive to acquire, or difficult to label. For example, in seismic inversion, high-quality ground motion records with corresponding response spectra are limited, particularly for rare extreme events. Generalization beyond the training distribution is another significant concern. GANs may struggle with out-of-distribution inputs, producing unrealistic or inaccurate results when presented with measurement data that differs substantially from training examples 10. This limitation is particularly problematic for inverse problems where the measurement process may vary or where novel scenarios may arise.

5.4 Computational Costs and Resource Requirements

While GANs can accelerate inference once trained, the training process itself is computationally intensive, requiring substantial computational resources and time 8. For example, training the accelerogram GAN model required 22.5 hours, though this upfront cost is amortized over numerous generations 8. The memory requirements of GAN models can also be significant, particularly for high-dimensional problems. As shown in Table 1 of 3, different conditioning approaches have varying parameter counts and memory footprints, with binary embedding approaches offering favorable efficiency compared to class-based conditioning.

Challenge	Impact on Inverse Problems	Potential Solutions
Training Instability	Unpredictable results, need for extensive tuning	WGAN-GP, spectral normalization, progressive growing
Mode Collapse	Limited diversity, incomplete exploration of solution space	Minibatch discrimination, unrolled GANs, variational approaches
Theoretical Limitations	Uncertain reliability for critical applications	Improved formulations with stronger guarantees 1
Data Requirements	Limited applicability in data-scarce domains	Data augmentation, transfer learning, few-shot learning
Generalization Issues	Poor performance on out-of-distribution inputs	Regularization, domain adaptation, uncertainty quantification
Computational Costs	High resource requirements for training	Model compression, efficient architectures, distributed training

Table 3: Challenges and Potential Solutions in GAN-Based Inverse Problem Solving

6.FUTURE DIRECTIONS

6.1 Integration with Physical Models and Domain Knowledge

Future research should further explore the **integration of physical knowledge** with data-driven GAN approaches 45. Physics-informed GANs that incorporate governing equations, boundary conditions, and other physical constraints can improve generalization, reduce data requirements, and enhance the physical plausibility of generated solutions. Hybrid approaches that combine traditional numerical methods with GAN-based components offer promising directions. For example, GANs could learn prior distributions or regularization functions that are then used within traditional optimization frameworks, leveraging the strengths of both approaches 5.

6.2 Theoretical Advances and Uncertainty Quantification

Strengthening the **theoretical foundations** of GAN-based inverse solving should be a priority 19. This includes developing better understanding of convergence properties, generalization error bounds, and conditions for uniqueness and stability of solutions.Improved methods for **uncertainty quantification** are essential for critical applications where understanding the reliability of solutions is as important as the solutions themselves 9. Bayesian approaches with generative priors, conditional normalizing flows, and ensemble methods offer promising directions for probabilistic inversion with GANs.

6.3 Efficiency Improvements and Scalability

Enhancing the **efficiency** of GAN training and inference will broaden applicability to larger-scale problems 8. This includes developing more efficient architectures, training strategies, and optimization techniques that reduce computational requirements while maintaining performance. **Scalability** to higher-dimensional problems is another important direction. Current GAN approaches may struggle with very high-dimensional parameter spaces, such as those arising in 3D imaging or complex physical systems. Techniques from dimension reduction, multi-scale modeling, and distributed computing could address these challenges.

6.4 Specialized Architectures for Inverse Problems

Developing **specialized architectures** tailored to specific inverse problem characteristics represents a promising research direction 38. This includes architectures that respect problem-specific symmetries, handle multi-modal data, or efficiently represent multi-scale features. For problems with structured outputs, such as images or spatial fields, incorporating **geometric priors** and **equivariance constraints** can improve performance and data efficiency. Similarly, for temporal problems like seismic inversion, recurrent architectures or attention mechanisms may capture long-range dependencies more effectively.

7.CONCLUSION

Generative Adversarial Networks have emerged as a powerful framework for accelerating solutions to inverse problems across diverse scientific and engineering domains. By learning complex prior distributions from data and enabling direct mapping from measurements to parameters, GAN-based approaches can significantly reduce computational burden compared to traditional iterative methods while maintaining competitive reconstruction quality. This comprehensive review has examined fundamental concepts, architectures, applications, and challenges in GAN-based inverse problem solving. Conditional GANs enable direct inversion conditioned on measurement data, while Wasserstein GANs with gradient penalty improve training stability and convergence. Physics-informed adversarial approaches integrate physical constraints to ensure plausibility and improve generalization, and Bayesian frameworks with generative priors facilitate uncertainty quantification. Through case studies in seismic inversion, medical imaging, materials science, and physics-based problems, we have demonstrated how GANs achieve substantial acceleration often orders of magnitude faster than conventional methods while handling complex, non-Gaussian distributions that challenge traditional approaches. Despite significant progress, important challenges remain regarding training stability, theoretical guarantees, data requirements, and computational costs. Future research should focus on integrating physical knowledge with data-driven approaches, strengthening theoretical foundations, improving efficiency and scalability, and developing specialized architectures for specific problem classes. As GAN methodologies continue to evolve and integrate with complementary techniques from deep learning and numerical computation, they hold immense potential to transform inverse problem solving across scientific disciplines, enabling new applications that require real-time solutions, handle complex uncertainties, or explore previously intractable problem scales.

REFERENCES

1. Adler, J., & Öktem, O. (2018). Solving ill-posed inverse problems using iterative deep neural networks. *Inverse Problems*, *33*(12), 124007.
2. Arridge, S., Maass, P., Öktem, O., & Schönlieb, C. B. (2019). Solving inverse problems using data-driven models. *Acta Numerica*, *28*, 1-174.
3. Bastek, J. H., & Kochmann, D. M. (2023). Binary-representation-based conditional GANs for inverse design of heterogeneous materials. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 1-15.
4. Yang, Y., Perdikaris, P., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2018). Physics-informed generative adversarial networks for stochastic differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, *40*(4), A292-A322.
5. Pang, G., Lu, L., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2019). fPINNs: Fractional physics-informed neural networks. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, *41*(4), A2603-A2626.
6. Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *27*.
7. Gulrajani, I., Ahmed, F., Arjovsky, M., Dumoulin, V., & Courville, A. C. (2017). Improved training of wasserstein gans. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *30*.
8. Kim, J., Lee, C., & Kim, J. (2023). Conditional Wasserstein GAN-based accelerogram generation for specified pseudo-spectral acceleration. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics*, *52*(5), 1374-1394.
9. Ardizzone, L., Kruse, J., Wirkert, S., Rahner, D., Pellegrini, E. W., Klessen, R. S., Maier-Hein, L., Rother, C., & Köthe, U. (2018). Analyzing inverse problems with invertible neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
10. McCann, M. T., Jin, K. H., & Unser, M. (2017). Convolutional neural networks for inverse problems in imaging: A review. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, *34*(6), 85-95.
11. Bora, A., Jalal, A., Price, E., & Dimakis, A. G. (2017). Compressed sensing using generative models. *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 537-546).
12. Hadamard, J. (1902). Sur les problèmes aux dérivées partielles et leur signification physique. *Princeton University Bulletin*, 49-52.
13. Mirza, M., & Osindero, S. (2014). Conditional generative adversarial nets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1784*.
14. Stuart, A. M. (2010). Inverse problems: a Bayesian perspective. *Acta Numerica*, *19*, 451-559.
15. Radford, A., Metz, L., & Chintala, S. (2015). Unsupervised representation learning with deep convolutional generative adversarial networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
16. Salimans, T., Goodfellow, I., Zaremba, W., Cheung, V., Radford, A., & Chen, X. (2016). Improved techniques for training gans. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *29*.
17. Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., & Brox, T. (2015). U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention* (pp. 234-241).

18. Isola, P., Zhu, J. Y., Zhou, T., & Efros, A. A. (2017). Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 1125-1134).
19. Adler, J., & Öktem, O. (2017). Learned primal-dual reconstruction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *37*(6), 1322-1332.
20. Kingma, D. P., & Welling, M. (2013). Auto-encoding variational bayes. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
21. Lucas, A., Iliadis, M., Molina, R., & Katsaggelos, A. K. (2018). Using deep neural networks for inverse problems in imaging: beyond analytical methods. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, *35*(1), 20-36.
22. Zhu, J. Y., Park, T., Isola, P., & Efros, A. A. (2017). Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision* (pp. 2223-2232).
23. Litjens, G., Kooi, T., Bejnordi, B. E., Setio, A. A. A., Ciompi, F., Ghafoorian, M., ... & Sánchez, C. I. (2017). A survey on deep learning in medical image analysis. *Medical image analysis*, *42*, 60-88.
24. Arjovsky, M., Chintala, S., & Bottou, L. (2017). Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 214-223).
25. Ongie, G., Jalal, A., Metzler, C. A., Baraniuk, R. G., Dimakis, A. G., & Willett, R. (2020). Deep learning techniques for inverse problems in imaging. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, *1*(1), 39-56.
26. Yang, Y., & Perdikaris, P. (2019). Adversarial uncertainty quantification in physics-informed neural networks. *Journal of Computational Physics*, *394*, 136-152.
27. Asim, M., Daniels, M., Leong, O., Ahmed, A., & Hand, P. (2020). Invertible generative models for inverse problems: mitigating representation error. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops* (pp. 102-103).
28. Ulyanov, D., Vedaldi, A., & Lempitsky, V. (2018). Deep image prior. *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 9446-9454).
29. Rick Chang, J. H., Li, C. L., Póczos, B., Vijaya Kumar, B. V., & Sankaranarayanan, A. C. (2017). One network to solve them all--solving linear inverse problems using deep projection models. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision* (pp. 5888-5897).
30. Mardani, M., Gong, E., Cheng, J. Y., Vasanawala, S. S., Zaharchuk, G., Xing, L., & Pauly, J. M. (2018). Deep generative adversarial neural networks for compressive sensing MRI. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, *38*(1), 167-179.
31. Buzug, T. M. (2008). *Computed tomography: from photon statistics to modern cone-beam CT*. Springer Science & Business Media.
32. Tarantola, A. (2005). *Inverse problem theory and methods for model parameter estimation*. SIAM.
33. Kaipio, J., & Somersalo, E. (2006). *Statistical and computational inverse problems*. Springer Science & Business Media.
34. Vogel, C. R. (2002). *Computational methods for inverse problems*. SIAM.
35. Wang, K., Gou, C., Duan, Y., Lin, Y., Zheng, X., & Wang, F. Y. (2017). Generative adversarial networks: introduction and outlook. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatics Sinica*, *4*(4), 588-598.
36. Mao, X., Li, Q., Xie, H., Lau, R. Y., Wang, Z., & Paul Smolley, S. (2017). Least squares generative adversarial networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision* (pp. 2794-2802).

37. Brock, A., Donahue, J., & Simonyan, K. (2019). Large scale GAN training for high fidelity natural image synthesis. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
38. Karras, T., Aila, T., Laine, S., & Lehtinen, J. (2018). Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
39. Reed, S., Akata, Z., Yan, X., Logeswaran, L., Schiele, B., & Lee, H. (2016). Generative adversarial text to image synthesis. *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 1060-1069).
40. Odena, A., Olah, C., & Shlens, J. (2017). Conditional image synthesis with auxiliary classifier gans. *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 2642-2651).
41. Shah, V., He, B., Huang, L., & Shah, S. (2020). Solving inverse problems by joint posterior maximization with autoencoding prior. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, *13*(2), 637-664.
42. Adler, J., Lunz, S., Verdier, O., Schönlieb, C. B., & Öktem, O. (2020). Task-adapted reconstruction for inverse problems. *Inverse Problems*, *36*(12), 125010.
43. Li, C. L., Chang, W. C., Cheng, Y., Yang, Y., & Póczos, B. (2017). Mmd gan: Towards deeper understanding of moment matching network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *30*.
44. Metzler, C. A., Mousavi, A., & Baraniuk, R. G. (2018). Learned D-AMP: Principled neural network based compressive image recovery. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *31*.
45. Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2019). Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, *378*, 686-707.
46. Yang, D., Hong, S., Jang, Y., Zhao, T., & Lee, H. (2019). Diversity-sensitive conditional generative adversarial networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
47. Zhang, H., Goodfellow, I., Metaxas, D., & Odena, A. (2019). Self-attention generative adversarial networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 7354-7363).
48. Zhu, J. Y., Zhang, R., Pathak, D., Darrell, T., Efros, A. A., Wang, O., & Shechtman, E. (2017). Toward multimodal image-to-image translation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.