

Parsimonious neural networks learn classical mechanics, its underlying symmetries, and an accurate time integrator

Saaketh Desai and Alejandro Strachan

*School of Materials Engineering and Birck Nanotechnology Center
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 47907 USA*

Machine learning is playing an increasing role in the physical sciences and significant progress has been made towards embedding physics into domain-agnostic models. Less explored is the potential of machine learning in the discovery of physical laws from observational data through interpretable models. We combine neural networks with evolutionary optimization to find the simplest models that describe the time evolution of a point particle under a highly nonlinear potential. The resulting parsimonious neural networks are easily interpretable as Newton's second law expressed as a non-trivial time integrator that exhibits time-reversibility and conserves energy. By extracting the underlying physics, the model significantly outperforms a generic feed-forward neural network. Furthermore, the models discovered belong to the widely used family of Verlet algorithms which are not only reversible but symplectic.

Machine learning (ML) can provide predictive models in applications where data is plentiful and the underlying governing laws are unknown [1–3]. These approaches are playing an increasing role in the physical sciences where data is generally limited but underlying laws (sometimes approximate) exist [4–9]. For example, ML constitutive models are being used in electronic structure calculations [10] and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations [11–13]. One of the major drawbacks of the use of ML in the physical sciences is that models often do not *learn* the underlying physics of the system at hand, such as constraints or symmetries, limiting their ability to generalize. In addition, most ML models lack interpretability. That is, ML approaches generally neither learn physics nor can they explain their predictions. In many fields, these limitations are compensated by copious amounts of data, but this is often not possible in areas such as materials science where acquiring data is expensive and time consuming. To tackle this challenge, progress has been made towards using knowledge (even partial) of underlying physics to improve the accuracy of models and/or reduce the amount of data required during training [14–16]. Less explored is the use of ML for scientific discovery, i.e. extracting physical laws from observational data, see Refs. [17,18] for notable exceptions. In this letter, we combine neural networks (NNs) with stochastic optimization to find the simplest model capable of describing the dynamics of a particle under a highly non-linear potential, solely from observational data. Our hypothesis is that the requirement of parsimony will result in the discovery of the physical laws underlying the problem. We find that the resulting descriptions are not only interpretable but also satisfy non-trivial underlying symmetries of the physical system. This second feature makes the parsimonious neural networks (PNNs) significantly more accurate than generic NN models. Stochastic optimization has been previously used in conjunction with backpropagation to improve robustness or minimize overfitting in models [19–22], this work extends these ideas to learn physics from data.

The power of physics-based ML is well documented and remains an active area of research. Neural networks have been used to both parametrize and solve differential equations such as Navier Stokes [14,15] and Hamilton’s equations of motion [23]. Recurrent architectures have also shown promise in predicting the time evolution of systems [24,25]. These examples focus on using prior knowledge of the underlying physics to guide the model, often as a numerical constraint added to the models. In contrast, we are interested in learning the physics directly from data, without prior knowledge. Pioneering work along these lines used sparse regression to identify

invariants in dynamical systems by constructing a library of candidate functions and matching partial derivatives of invariants to the numerical derivatives of the training data [17]. A similar approach was used to identify partial differential equations from data [18]. More recently, neural networks have been used to discover underlying equations directly from data [26–28], using conventional neural networks as encoders and connecting the encoders to custom networks aimed at equation discovery. We build on and extend these ideas to propose PNNs designed to find the simplest possible model consistent with the underlying data in a context where the discovered model must be highly accurate and satisfy conservation laws to merit use. We apply PNNs to learn the equations of motion that govern the Hamiltonian dynamics of a particle under a highly non-linear external potential with and without friction. Our hypothesis is that by requiring parsimony (e.g. minimizing adjustable parameters and favoring linear relationships between variables) the resulting model will not only be easily interpretable but also will be forced to tease out the symmetries of the problem. We find that the resulting PNN not only lends itself to interpretation (as Newton’s laws) but also provides a significantly more accurate description of the dynamics of the particle when applied iteratively as compared to a flexible feed forward neural network. The resulting PNNs conserve energy and are time reversible, i.e. they learn non-trivial symmetries hidden in the data but not explicitly provided. By virtue of being based on neural networks, PNNs explore a large function space and obviate the need for estimating numerical derivatives or matching a library of candidate functions, as was done in prior efforts [17,18].

Datasets and baseline, physics-agnostic, neural network. We consider the dynamics of a particle under an external Lennard-Jones potential with and without friction. In both cases the training data consists is obtained from accurate numerical trajectories with various totals energies. The input and output data are positions and velocities at a given time and one timestep ahead respectively (this timestep is ten times what was used to generate the underlying trajectories). The numerical data was divided into training and validation sets and an independent testing set was generated at a different energy, see Methods and section S1 of the SM. The choice of numerical input data was made for convenience, it could have been obtained experimentally. Before describing the PNN model, we establish a baseline by training a standard feed forward neural network (FFNN) on our data for the case without friction. The details of this architecture can be found in section S2 of the SM and can be accessed for interactive, online computing on nanoHUB [29]. We find the FFNN to be capable of matching the training/validation/test data

reasonably well, with root mean squared errors (RMSEs) across all sets on the order of 10^{-5} in LJ units for both positions and velocities (see Figure S1 in SM). However, the network has poor predictive power. Using it iteratively to find the temporal evolution of the particle results in significant drifts in total energy over time, and a lack of time reversibility. Reversibility is judged by applying the NN sequentially 1,000 times, followed by time reversal (changing the sign of the particle's velocity) and applying the NN for a second set of 1,000 steps. We find that deeper architectures do not improve the RMSE, reversibility or energy conservation. Needless to say, these FFNNs are not interpretable. These results highlight the difficulty of the problem at hand. Hamilton's equations for classical mechanics represent a stiff set of differential equations and small errors in each timestep accumulate rapidly resulting in diverging trajectories. While some previous work attempts to address such issues by explicitly training for multiple steps using a recurrent architecture [28], we are interested in solutions stable over timescales far greater than those typically accessed by current recurrent architectures.

Finding such models is non-trivial and the development of algorithms to integrate equations of motion with good energy conservation and time reversibility has a rich history [30–34]. An example of such algorithms is the popular Verlet family of integrators [30,31] that are both reversible and symplectic [35]; their theoretical justification lies in Trotter's theorem [36].

Parsimonious neural networks. Having established the shortcomings of the feed-forward neural network, we now switch to parsimonious neural networks (PNN). We begin with a generic neural network shown in Figure 1 and use genetic algorithms to find the corresponding PNN. The neural network consists of three hidden layers and an output layer with two outputs, the position and velocity of the particle one timestep ahead of the inputs. Each hidden layer has two neurons, with the central hidden layer including an additional force sub-net, a network pre-trained to predict the force on the atom given its position. Our use of a pre-trained force sub-net is motivated by the prior success of neural networks in predicting interatomic forces in a wide variety of materials significantly more complex than our example [37–39]. Our focus is on learning classical dynamics and the use of a force sub-net only incorporates the physical insight that the force is an important quantity. In the context of scientific discovery via neural networks, the force sub-net is analogous to the latent variable learnt by an encoding network [14,15]. As a second baseline, we trained a feed forward NN including a pre-trained force sub-net. This second network's performance is as

poor as the previous baseline feed-forward network, see section S3 in the SM for details. This shows that adding the information about the force is not the key to the development of accurate models for classical mechanics, parsimony is.




Figure 1: Neural network used as the starting point to find the parsimonious neural network as the network that explains the data in the simplest manner possible. The force sub-network is highlighted in orange and is fed into the neural network as a pre-trained model, whose weights are subsequently kept fixed throughout

The starting neural network is a highly flexible mapping from input positions and velocities to output positions and velocities and finding a PNN model reduces to identifying the simplest function capable of describing this relationship. This is an optimization problem in the space of functions spanned by the possible activations and weights of the network. We consider four possible activation functions: linear, rectified linear unit (relu), hyperbolic tangent (tanh), and exponential linear unit (elu). The weights connecting the artificial neurons can be either *fixed* or *trainable*, with the fixed category allowing the following values: 0, $\frac{1}{2}$, 1, 2, $\frac{\Delta t}{2}$, Δt , and $2\Delta t$, with Δt the timestep separating the inputs and outputs. This is motivated by the fact that physical laws often involve integer or simple fractional coefficients and that the timestep represents important

information. Future work will consider other common constants found in physical laws, including additional fractional numbers and irrational numbers such as π and e as well as additional activation functions. Our network has twenty weights (each with eight possible settings) and six activation functions to optimize, see Figure 1 (top panel). A brute force approach to finding a PNN model would require training $\sim 10^{21}$ neural networks, an impossible computational task even for the relatively small networks here. We thus resort to evolutionary optimization, using a genetic algorithm to find the most parsimonious network consistent with our training data.

The genetic algorithm favors: i) linear activation functions over non-linear ones, and ii) non-trainable weights with simple values over optimizable weights. The objective function is defined to capture both the accuracy of a network in reproducing the testing data and its parsimony:

$$F = f_1(E_{test}) + \sum_{i=1}^6 w_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{20} f_2(w_j)$$

where E_{test} represents the mean squared error of the trained PNN on the testing set and f_1 is a logarithmic function that converts the wide range errors into a scale comparable to the other terms, see section S4 of the SM. The second term runs over the six neurons of the network and is designed to favor simple activation functions. The *linear*, *relu*, *tanh* and *elu* activation functions are assigned scores of $w_i = 0, 1, 2$ and 3 , respectively. The third term runs over the network weights and favors fixed, simple weights over trainable ones. A fixed weight value of 0 is assigned a score of 0, while other fixed weights are assigned the score 1, and a trainable weight is assigned a score of 2. We use the DEAP package for the evolutionary optimization [40] and Keras [41] to train individual networks, see Methods.

The resulting PNNs reproduce the training, validation and testing data more accurately than the architecturally complex FFNNs. Figure 2(a) compares the RMSE for positions and velocities from the optimal PNN (denoted PNN1) to the feedforward NN. Remarkably, the PNNs also result in excellent long-term energy conservation and time reversibility, evaluated using the same procedure as before. Figures 2(b) and 2(c) compare the total energy and trajectories generated by PNN1, the FFNN and the velocity Verlet integrator. We see that PNN1 *learns* both time-reversibility and that total energy is a constant of motion. This is in stark contrast to the physics-agnostic FFNN and even naïve physics-based models like a first order Euler integration. A few of the top-ranked PNNs perform similarly to PNN1 and they will be discussed below.




Figure 2: (a) PNN model 1 RMSEs on the training/validation/test sets compared to the feed forward network (b) We see that energy conservation between PNN1 and the verlet integrator is comparable (TE: total energy) (c) Forward and reverse trajectories generated by PNN1 show good reversibility (d) A visualization of PNN model 1 found by the genetic algorithm, attempting to predict positions and velocities one step ahead

Having established that the PNNs *learn* the physics of the system and result in stable and accurate integrators, we now explore their interpretability in the hope of finding out how time-reversibility and energy conservation are achieved. In short: can the PNNs *teach* us what they learned? We find that the PNNs discover simple models, with many weights taking fixed values (including zero) and all activations functions taking the simplest possible alternative (linear functions). As an example, the parameters corresponding to PNN1 are shown in Figure 2(d), other PNNs with comparable (but higher) objective functions are shown in the SM. This simplicity allows us to trivially obtain position and velocity update equations. Equations (1-3) represent the top three PNNs discovered from the data, rewritten in terms of relevant quantities such as timestep and mass.

$$\begin{aligned}
 x(t + \Delta t) &= x(t) + 1.0001 v(t)\Delta t + 0.9997 \frac{1}{2} F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t^2}{m} \\
 v(t + \Delta t) &= v(t) + 0.9997 F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t + \Delta t) &= x(t) + 1.0001 v(t)\Delta t + 0.9994 \frac{1}{2} F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t^2}{m} \\
v(t + \Delta t) &= v(t) + 0.9992 F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t + \Delta t) &= x(t) + 1.0001 v(t)\Delta t + 0.9993 \frac{1}{2} F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t^2}{m} \\
v(t + \Delta t) &= v(t) + 0.9992 F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Inspecting Figure 2(d) and Eq. (1) we find that PNN1 achieves time-reversibility by evaluating the force at the midpoint between inputs and outputs, this central force evaluation is key to many advanced numerical methods. In fact, PNN1 represents the position Verlet algorithm [31] except that the NN training makes an error in the mass of approximately 3 in 10,000. This algorithm is both reversible and symplectic, i.e. it conserves volume in phase space. The small error in mass actually seems to originate from the small inaccuracies of the force sub-net to describe the Lennard-Jones potential, see Section S6 of the SM. PNN2 and 3 are similarly interpretable and, quite remarkably, they also learn to evaluate the force at the half-step. The main difference between these networks and PNN 1 is that a few additional parameters remain adjustable and thus decrease the fitness value, learning a slightly inaccurate version of the position Verlet algorithm with minor energy drifts due to the slight asymmetry in effective mass in the position and velocity update equations.

As a second example, we tested the ability of the PNNs to discover the physics governing a damped dynamical system, see Methods. The equations for the top two PNNs, with γ the damping constant, are:

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t + \Delta t) &= x(t) + 1.0008 v(t) * \left(\Delta t - \frac{\gamma \Delta t^2}{2m} \right) + 0.9991 \frac{1}{2} F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t^2}{m} \\
v(t + \Delta t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma \Delta t}{m} \right) v(t) + 1.0002 F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t + \Delta t) &= x(t) + 1.0008 v(t) * \left(\Delta t - \frac{\gamma \Delta t^2}{2m} \right) + 0.9989 \frac{1}{2} F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t^2}{m} \\
v(t + \Delta t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma \Delta t}{m} \right) v(t) + 0.9978 F \left(x(t) + v(t) \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

As in the first example, the PNNs learn classical mechanics, that the frictional force is proportional to negative the velocity, and discover the same stable integrators based on the position Verlet method, all from the observational data.

We consider the emergence of Verlet style integrators from data remarkable. This family of integrators is the preferred choice for molecular dynamics simulations due to their stability. Unlike other algorithms such as the Runge-Kutta family or the first order Euler method, Verlet integrators are symplectic and time reversible [43]. This class of integrators has been long known and proposed independently by several researchers over decades (see Ref. [43] for a review), but a detailed understanding of their properties and their justification from Trotter's theorem are relatively modern [31]. We stress that the equations of motion and an advanced integrator were obtained with only observational data of the motion of a particle and the force-displacement relationship. We believe that, at the expense of computational cost, the force sub-net could be learned together with the integrators (effectively learning the acceleration) from dynamical data. This assertion is based on the observation that on fixing some of the network parameters that result in a Verlet integrator, the remaining parameters and the force subnet can be learned from the observational data used above, see section S7 of the SM. Finally, we note that evolutionary optimization is not the only way to achieve parsimony. For example, one could include hidden layers containing a library of possible activation functions and use sparsity to prune unnecessary activations. This has recently been used to discover simple kinematics equations [26]. An advantage of this approach over ours is simplicity and computational expedience since such networks can be trained using backpropagation alone. However, unlike the evolutionary approach used here, the solution can be sensitive to initialization and the weights of the network may not automatically evolve to interpretable values, nor optimal, non-adjustable, values can be found.

In summary, we have shown that parsimonious neural networks are capable of learning interpretable physics models from data and extract underlying symmetries in the problem at hand. From data describing the classical evolution of a particle in an external potential, the PNN produces integration schemes that are accurate, conserve energy and satisfy time reversibility. Furthermore, they can be easily interpretable as discrete versions of Newton's equations of motion. Quite interestingly, the PNNs learn the non-trivial need to evaluate the force at the half step for time reversibility. The optimization could have learned the first order Runge-Kutta algorithm, which is

not reversible, but it favored central-difference based integrators. We note that other high-order integrators are not compatible with our initial network, but these can easily be incorporated by starting with a more complex network. As discussed above, the resulting algorithms would not come as a surprise to experts in molecular dynamics simulations as this community has developed, over decades, accurate algorithms to integrate Newton's equations of motion. The fact that such knowledge and algorithms can be extracted automatically from observational data has, however, deep implications if the approach presented is successful in other problems and fields.

Acknowledgements

Partial support from the Network for Computational Nanotechnology, Grant EEC-1227110, is acknowledged.

Methods

The **data** was generated numerically using velocity Verlet scheme with a short timestep (about a tenth of what is required for accurate integration), see section S1 of the SM for additional details. Training and validation data is obtained from trajectories with total energies of -0.999ϵ , -0.895ϵ , -0.797ϵ and -0.733ϵ , 20% of which is used as a validation set. Our test set is a trajectory with total energy -0.884ϵ . For the damped dynamics cases, a frictional force proportional to negative the velocity is added, with frictional coefficient $\gamma = 0.004 \text{ eVps}/\text{\AA}^2$.

Evolutionary optimization. We used populations of 200 and 500 individuals and a two-point crossover scheme and random mutations to evolve the population (weights and activation functions) [42]. For each generation, individual networks in the population are trained using backpropagation using the same protocols as for the feed-forward networks; only adjustable weights are optimized in this operation. The populations were evolved over 50 generations, additional details of the genetic algorithm are included in section S5 of the SM.

References

- [1] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1409.1556 (2014).
- [2] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, edited by F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Q. Weinberger (Curran Associates, Inc., 2012), pp. 1097–1105.

- [3] Y. Bengio, R. Ducharme, P. Vincent, and C. Jauvin, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **3**, 1137 (2003).
- [4] J. Carrasquilla and R. G. Melko, *Nature Physics* **13**, 431 (2017).
- [5] A. W. Senior, R. Evans, J. Jumper, J. Kirkpatrick, L. Sifre, T. Green, C. Qin, A. Židek, A. W. R. Nelson, A. Bridgland, H. Penedones, S. Petersen, K. Simonyan, S. Crossan, P. Kohli, D. T. Jones, D. Silver, K. Kavukcuoglu, and D. Hassabis, *Nature* **577**, 706 (2020).
- [6] B. Meredig, A. Agrawal, S. Kirklin, J. E. Saal, J. W. Doak, A. Thompson, K. Zhang, A. Choudhary, and C. Wolverton, *Physical Review B* **89**, 094104 (2014).
- [7] J. Carrete, W. Li, N. Mingo, S. Wang, and S. Curtarolo, *Physical Review X* **4**, 011019 (2014).
- [8] L. Bassman, P. Rajak, R. K. Kalia, A. Nakano, F. Sha, J. Sun, D. J. Singh, M. Aykol, P. Huck, and K. Persson, *Npj Computational Materials* **4**, 1 (2018).
- [9] K. Kaufmann, D. Maryanovsky, W. M. Mellor, C. Zhu, A. S. Rosengarten, T. J. Harrington, C. Oses, C. Toher, S. Curtarolo, and K. S. Vecchio, *Npj Computational Materials* **6**, 1 (2020).
- [10] J. C. Snyder, M. Rupp, K. Hansen, K.-R. Müller, and K. Burke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 253002 (2012).
- [11] Z. Li, J. R. Kermode, and A. De Vita, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 096405 (2015).
- [12] J. Behler and M. Parrinello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 146401 (2007).
- [13] T. L. Jacobsen, M. S. Jørgensen, and B. Hammer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 026102 (2018).
- [14] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis, *ArXiv:1711.10561 [Cs, Math, Stat]* (2017).
- [15] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis, *ArXiv:1711.10566 [Cs, Math, Stat]* (2017).
- [16] J. Ling, A. Kurzawski, and J. Templeton, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **807**, 155 (2016).
- [17] M. Schmidt and H. Lipson, *Science* **324**, 81 (2009).
- [18] S. H. Rudy, S. L. Brunton, J. L. Proctor, and J. N. Kutz, *Science Advances* **3**, e1602614 (2017).
- [19] S. A. Harp, T. Samad, and A. Guha, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (1990), pp. 447–454.
- [20] G. F. Miller, P. M. Todd, and S. U. Hegde, in *ICGA* (1989), pp. 379–384.
- [21] S. W. Stepniewski and A. J. Keane, *Neural Computing & Applications* **5**, 76 (1997).
- [22] X. Yao and Y. Liu, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **8**, 694 (1997).
- [23] S. Greydanus, M. Dzamba, and J. Yosinski, *ArXiv:1906.01563 [Cs]* (2019).
- [24] Z. Chen, J. Zhang, M. Arjovsky, and L. Bottou, *ArXiv:1909.13334 [Cs, Stat]* (2019).
- [25] M. J. Eslamibidgoli, M. Mokhtari, and M. H. Eikerling, *ArXiv:1909.10124 [Physics]* (2019).
- [26] S. Kim, P. Lu, S. Mukherjee, M. Gilbert, L. Jing, V. Ceperic, and M. Soljagic, *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1912.04825* (2019).
- [27] R. Iten, T. Metger, H. Wilming, L. Del Rio, and R. Renner, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 010508 (2020).
- [28] Z. Long, Y. Lu, and B. Dong, *Journal of Computational Physics* **399**, 108925 (2019).
- [29] S. Desai and A. Strachan, <http://nanohub.org/tools/pnndemo>, (2020).
- [30] L. Verlet, *Phys. Rev.* **159**, 98 (1967).
- [31] M. Tuckerman, B. J. Berne, and G. J. Martyna, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **97**, 1990 (1992).
- [32] H. Yoshida, *Physics Letters A* **150**, 262 (1990).
- [33] G. Rowlands, *Journal of Computational Physics* **97**, 235 (1991).
- [34] J. A. Izaguirre, S. Reich, and R. D. Skeel, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **110**, 9853 (1999).
- [35] R. De Vogelaere, Technical Report (University of Notre Dame. Dept. of Mathematics) (1956).

- [36] H. F. Trotter, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **10**, 545 (1959).
- [37] H. Eshet, R. Z. Khaliullin, T. D. Kühne, J. Behler, and M. Parrinello, Physical Review B **81**, 184107 (2010).
- [38] J. Behler, R. Martoňák, D. Donadio, and M. Parrinello, Physical Review Letters **100**, 185501 (2008).
- [39] S. Chmiela, H. E. Sauceda, K.-R. Müller, and A. Tkatchenko, Nature Communications **9**, 1 (2018).
- [40] F.-A. Fortin, F.-M. De Rainville, M.-A. Gardner, M. Parizeau, and C. Gagné, Journal of Machine Learning Research **13**, 2171 (2012).
- [41] F. Chollet, *Keras* (2015).
- [42] T. Bäck, D. B. Fogel, and Z. Michalewicz, *Evolutionary Computation 1: Basic Algorithms and Operators* (CRC press, 2018).
- [43] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner, Acta Numerica **12**, 399 (2003).