Temporally and spatially dependent uncertain parameters are regularly encountered in engineering applications. Commonly these uncertainties are accounted for using random fields and processes which require knowledge about the appearing probability distributions functions which is not readily available. In these cases non-probabilistic approaches such as interval analysis and fuzzy set theory are helpful uncertainty measures. Partial differential equations involving fuzzy and interval fields are traditionally solved using the finite element method where the input fields are sampled using some basis function expansion methods. This approach however is problematic, as it is reliant on knowledge about the spatial correlation fields.

In this work we utilize physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) to solve interval and fuzzy partial differential equations. The resulting network structures termed interval physics-informed neural networks (iPINNs) and fuzzy physics-informed neural networks (fPINNs) show promising results for obtaining bounded solutions of equations involving spatially uncertain parameter fields. In contrast to finite element approaches, no correlation length specification of the input fields as well as no averaging via Monte-Carlo simulations are necessary. In fact, information about the input interval fields is obtained directly as a byproduct of the presented solution scheme. Furthermore, all major advantages of PINNs are retained, i.e. meshfree nature of the scheme, and ease of inverse problem set-up.
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1 Introduction

Uncertain parameters in engineering applications are commonly found to have temporal and spatial dependencies. These uncertainties include external loading, e.g. in the case of wind loads, as well as material properties e.g. as found in heterogeneous media and biological tissues. Commonly, these types of uncertainties have been modeled as stochastic or random fields (Ostoja-Starzewski [1998][2006]). In stochastic fields the randomness is characterized by correlated random variables at each time increment and spatial location. When random fields appear in partial differential equations
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A fuzzy number $X^F$ is composed of the pair $(X, \mu)$, where the membership function $\mu : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is convex. In contrast to the interval theory where an element is either part of a set or not, in fuzzy set theory the membership function $\mu$ allows us to assign a degree of membership to the elements of a set. This can be achieved by defining

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu(X) &= 0, & X \text{ is no member of the set}, \\
\mu(X) &= 1, & X \text{ is full member of the set}, \\
0 < \mu(X) < 1, & X \text{ is partial member of the set}.
\end{align*}
$$

The elements that are part of the set by at least a value $\alpha$ define the so-called $\alpha$-cut set

$$
X^F_\alpha = \{ x \in X | \mu(x) \geq \alpha \}.
$$

Since the membership function is assumed to be convex, the $\alpha$-cut set is exactly defined by an interval variable

$$
X^I_\alpha = [X_{\alpha L}, X_{\alpha U}],
$$

see Figure [1]. Furthermore a fuzzy number can be thought of as exactly defined by an infinite number of $\alpha$-cuts, whereas a finite number of cuts yields an approximation of $X^F$. This concept allows us to obtain information of fuzzy uncertainties by simply relying on interval theory. In an equivalent way to interval fields we are also able to define time and spatially dependent fuzzy fields as the pair $(F(x, t), \mu)$ where $\mu : F(x, t) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. For more information we refer to [Dubois et al. (2000)].

### 3 Interval and fuzzy partial differential equations

Consider a fuzzy PDE of the form

$$
\tilde{G}(x, t, u, \mathcal{F}) = 0
$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^h$ is the primary vector field of interest, $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the spatial field, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the time coordinate, $\tilde{G}$ is an operator that maps into $\mathbb{R}^{N\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is a set of fuzzy fields $\mathcal{F} = \{ (F_i(x, t), \mu_i), \ldots, (F_s(x, t), \mu_s) \}$ all defined by a certain convex membership function. At a given $\alpha$-cut value we are able to transform this fuzzy PDE into an interval PDE defined as

$$
G(x, t, u, \mathcal{P}_\alpha) = 0
$$

where $G$ still maps into $\mathbb{R}^{N\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ is now the set of $\alpha$-cut interval fields found at $\mu(F_i(x, t)) = \alpha$, $\forall i = 1, \ldots, s$

$$
\mathcal{P}_\alpha = \{ P_1(x, t), \ldots, P_s(x, t) \}
$$

and each $P_i(x, t)$ is defined by $P_i(x, t) \in P_i^I(x, t) = [P_i^L(x, t), P_i^U(x, t)]$. The solution $\tilde{u}(x, t, \mathcal{P}_\alpha)$ to problem [7] is complicated and can typically only be obtained approximately. Consider the time and spatial domain to be discretized into $n$ and $m$ points respectively. In this work we are interested in the two solutions of the problem that are given by

$$
\tilde{u}_{\text{min}}(x, t) = \tilde{u}(x, t, \mathcal{P}_{\text{min}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_{\text{max}}(x, t) = \tilde{u}(x, t, \mathcal{P}_{\text{max}})
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{P}_{\text{min}} &= \min_{P^* \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^h \tilde{u}_k(x_i, t_j, \mathcal{P}^*_\alpha) \\
\mathcal{P}_{\text{max}} &= \max_{P^* \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^h \tilde{u}_k(x_i, t_j, \mathcal{P}^*_\alpha)
\end{align*}
$$
where \( \tilde{u}_k \) is the \( k \)-th component of the vector. Hence, we are interested in the two solutions which correspond to the two cases inside the allowed interval set in which the input parameter values minimize and maximize the sum of the parameter of interest with

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{P}_{\min} &= \{ P^\min_1(x, t), \ldots, P^\min_s(x, t) | P^L_i(x, t) \leq P^\min_i(x, t) \leq P^U_i(x, t), \forall i = 1, \ldots, s \}, \\
\mathcal{P}_{\max} &= \{ P^\max_1(x, t), \ldots, P^\max_s(x, t) | P^L_i(x, t) \leq P^\max_i(x, t) \leq P^U_i(x, t), \forall i = 1, \ldots, s \}.
\end{align*}
\] (10)

In the limit \( \tilde{u}_{\min}(x, t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_{\max}(x, t) \) will yield the output interval bounds.

4 Interval and fuzzy physics-informed neural networks

In this section we provide a brief overview of the neural networks formulation. Neural networks are in general composed of one input, one output and \( n_D - 1 \) hidden layers. Let the weights and biases of the \( k \)-th layer be denoted by \( W^k \) and \( b^k \). Consider that the \( k \)-th hidden layer transfers some output \( x^k \) to the \( (k+1) \)-th layers which applies an affine transformation

\[
\mathcal{L}(x^k) = W^{k+1}x^k + b^{k+1}
\] (11)

and some activation function \( \sigma \) to it. Since, equation (11) is applied in every layer of the network an input \( x \) yields a network output of the form

\[
y(x) = (\mathcal{L}_k \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_{k-1} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_1)(x)
\] (12)

where \( \circ \) is a composition operator. The goal of neural networks is to find the optimal set of trainable parameters \( \Theta = \{ W^k, b^k \}_{k=1}^{n_D+1} \) such that the network \( \mathcal{N}(\Theta) \) provides the best fit for the input-output mapping. This is achieved by following an optimization procedure defined over some loss function \( J(\Theta) \)

\[
\Theta^* = \arg \min_{\Theta} J(\Theta).
\] (13)

This problem is typically solved in an iterative manner by employing a stochastic gradient-descent approach. A review on neural network optimization methods is provided in [Bottou et al., 2018]. For more information on neural networks we refer to [Goodfellow et al., 2016].

The proposed interval physics-informed neural network (iPINN) consists of two separate feedforward neural networks one to approximate the maximum and minimum solution outputs termed \( \mathcal{N}_u(\Lambda) \) and one to find the corresponding input fields \( \mathcal{N}_f(\Psi) \) where \( \Lambda \) and \( \Psi \) are the trainable parameters, see Figure 2. Both networks define a global shape function over the time-space domain \( (x, t) \) of the problem. We define the final activation function of \( \mathcal{N}_f(\Psi) \) is of sigmoidal form. This is done to restrict the outputs \( \hat{z}(x, t, \Lambda) \) of \( \mathcal{N}_f(\Psi) \) to be between 0 and 1 in order to allow for easy scaling of the outputs into the required interval field, i.e.

\[
\hat{P}(x, t) = (P^U(x, t) - P^L(x, t)) \circ \hat{z}(x, t, \Lambda) + P^L(x, t),
\] (14)

where \( P^U(x, t) = [P^U_1, P^U_1, \ldots, P^U_1, P^U_1, \ldots, P^U_s, P^U_s] \) and \( P^L \) is defined equivalently but with the lower limit of the interval. The output of \( \mathcal{N}_u(\Lambda) \) is of the form \( \hat{u}(x, t, \Lambda) = [\hat{u}^\min_1, \hat{u}^\max_1, \ldots, \hat{u}^\min_h, \hat{u}^\max_h] \). As typically found in PINN [Raissi et al., 2019] consider a set of domain training points \( \{ X^k_i \}_{i=1}^{N_R} \), boundary training points \( \{ X^i \}_{i=1}^{N_b} \) and initial state training points \( \{ X^i_0 \}_{i=1}^{N_0} \) and some time discretization \( \{ t^i_j \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \) where \( N_R, N_b, N_0 \) and \( N_t \) denote the number of points, respectively. We can then formulate the optimization problem for iPINN in the following way

\[
(A^*, \Psi^*) = \arg \min_{(A, \Psi)} W_G \text{MSE}_G \left( \{ \{ X^k_i \}_{i=1}^{N_R}, \{ t^i_j \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, (A, \Psi) \right) + W_{mm} \text{U}_{mm} \left( \{ \{ X^i_0 \}_{i=1}^{N_0}, \{ t^i_j \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right) + W_0 \text{MSE}_0 \left( \{ \{ X^i \}_{i=1}^{N_b}, \{ t^i_j \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right) + W_u \text{MSE}_u \left( \{ \{ X^i \}_{i=1}^{N_b}, \{ t^i_j \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right)
\] (15)
where

\[
\text{MSE}_G \left( \{ \{ X_k^i \}_{i=1}^{N_R}, \{ t_j^i \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, (\Lambda, \Psi) \right) = \frac{1}{N_R N_t N_G} \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \sum_{k=1}^{N_G} \left| G_k(X_k^i, t_j^i, \hat{u}(\Lambda), \hat{P}(\Psi)) \right|^2
\]

\[
U_{mm} \left( \{ \{ X_k^i \}_{i=1}^{N_R}, \{ t_j^i \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} h \sum_{k=1}^{N_h} \hat{u}_k^{\text{min}}(X_k^i, t_j^i) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} h \sum_{k=1}^{N_h} \hat{u}_k^{\text{max}}(X_k^i, t_j^i)
\]

\[
\text{MSE}_0 \left( \{ \{ X_k^i \}_{i=1}^{N_R}, \{ t_j^0 \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right) = \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \sum_{k=1}^{N_h} \left| \hat{u}_k^{\text{min}}(X_k^i, t_j^0) - u_k(X_k^i, t_j^0) \right|^2 + \left| \hat{u}_k^{\text{max}}(X_k^i, t_j^0) - u_k(X_k^i, t_j^0) \right|^2
\]

\[
\text{MSE}_u \left( \{ \{ X_k^i \}_{i=1}^{N_R}, \{ t_j^i \}_{j=1}^{N_t} \}, \Lambda \right) = \frac{1}{N_R N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \sum_{k=1}^{N_h} \left| \hat{u}_k^{\text{min}}(X_k^i, t_j^i) - u_k(X_k^i, t_j^i) \right|^2 + \left| \hat{u}_k^{\text{max}}(X_k^i, t_j^i) - u_k(X_k^i, t_j^i) \right|^2
\]

and \(W_G, W_{mm}, W_0\) and \(W_u\) are user-chosen weights. A fuzzy physics-informed neural network (fPINN) can then be understood as a collection of iPINNs, see Figure 3. After minimization of the loss function of eq. (16), the trainable parameters of \(N_u\) and \(N_P\) are obtained. The outputs of these networks yield approximate bounds to iPDE solutions (\(N_u\)) as well as the corresponding input field values that lead to these extreme values (\(N_P\)). It needs to be highlighted that in contrast to FEM no correlation length specification of the input fields needs to be assumed and Monte-Carlo-like simulations are also not required. Additionally, we retain all major advantages of the PINN approach, i.e. the problem is solved meshfree and inverse problems are straightforwardly set up and solvable. For more information on PINNs we refer to Raissi et al. (2019). One slightly negative aspect of this approach is that we employ two network outputs for \(N_u\) and \(N_P\) for each input field which for a larger number of input fields might be restrictive. However this limitation is dependent on the problem complexity and its dimensionality. The presented approach is somewhat related to the stochastic PINN framework proposed in Zhang et al. (2019). However their main concern is probabilistic uncertainty quantification which is not the focus of this paper.
5 Application

In the following, the proposed formulation is tested and studied on a set of problems of increasing complexity. First, a simple problem is considered, involving an interval parameter and fuzzy parameter, and thereafter, we attempt to find the solution to a more complex one-dimensional structural problem involving two simultaneously applied interval fields. The fPINN/iPINN formulation was implemented in Pytorch (Paszke et al., 2019) and the network parameters were optimized using the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014). The FEM results for the second problem were obtained using the FEniCS framework (Alnæs et al., 2015).

5.1 Function of an interval and fuzzy parameter

Consider the following simple functional problem with an interval parameter

\[ u^I(x) = x^I(2 - x^I), \]  

where the interval parameter is constrained by

\[ x^I = [0.5, 2.0]. \]  

The primary output variable \( u^I(x) \) is plotted over the elements of the interval input in Figure 4. It can be seen that \( u \) is non-monotonically dependent on \( x \). As a result the output bounds \( \hat{u}^{\min} \) and \( \hat{u}^{\max} \) are not just resulting from endpoint combinations, i.e. just the evaluation of \( x = x^L = 0.5 \) and \( x = x^U = 2.0 \) is not enough to obtain the output bounds for more information see e.g. (Zadeh, 1965). In fact as seen in Figure 4 the bounds of the primary variable \( \hat{u}^{\min} = 0 \) and \( \hat{u}^{\max} = 1 \) are results of the input interval values \( x^{\min} = 2.0 \) and \( x^{\max} = 1.0 \) respectively.

To highlight how iPINN is able to solve this problem we consider both \( N_u \) and \( N_p \) consisting of 2 hidden layers with 20 neurons. The activation functions are chosen to be the hyperbolic tangent function. These choices are arbitrary and are not the result of any hyperparameter optimization, i.e. they do not represent any special network setup to the best of the author’s knowledge. Both networks have 1 input and 2 outputs. When dealing with interval fields and iPDEs the spatial and temporal values are the inputs. Since in this simple problem the primary variable is independent of space and time, a constant arbitrary value can be chosen as the input which has no effect on the solution (we chose 1.0). The training is conducted with a learning rate of \( 1e^{-3} \) and is stopped after 35,000 iterations. High emphasis is put on the fulfilment of the residual \( u^I(x^I) - x^I(2 - x^I) = 0 \). Hence the loss weights in eq. (15) are chosen to be \( W_G = 100,000 \) and \( W_{\min} = 1 \). Since there are no initial and boundary conditions we do not need to account for those terms in the loss function.

Figure 5a shows the constraining limit values of the input interval as well as the predicted input values that lead to the output interval bounds, see Figure 5b over the training process. It can be seen that both the input values, as well as the output bounds are accurately predicted after around 25,000 epochs.

---

1 Codes will be made public after acceptance of this paper.
Instead of an interval number, consider the function to be dependent on a fuzzy number

$$u^F(x^F) = x^F(2 - x^F).$$

Let $x^F$ be a triangular fuzzy number of the form given in Figure 6 where $\mu(x = 1) = 1.0$. We can see that the previously investigated problem coincides with the $\alpha$-cut at $\mu = 0$. In order to obtain an approximate description of the output fuzzy bounds we consider 4 more $\alpha$-cuts at $0.25, 0.5, 0.75$ and $1.0$. The interval bounds for these cuts are also shown in Figure 6.
Following the fPINN concept, we build an iPINN for each new $\alpha$-cut value, i.e. resulting in 4 new iPINNs. Only changing the considered bounding interval in comparison to the previous problem and leaving the rest of the networks unchanged (hyperparameter, learning rate, etc.) the predicted output bounding intervals of the subproblems over the training process are shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: fPINN predicted bounding outputs for different $\alpha$-cuts over training process

Hence, using these results for the considered $\alpha$-cuts we can make an approximation of the output fuzzy number by knowing the intervals at each $\alpha$-cut. Therefore, using fPINN we are able to obtain the fuzzy number estimations as shown in Figure 8 which exactly correspond to the analytical solutions, which can be obtained trivially. An interesting side not is that the output fuzzy number seen in Figure 8 appears to be no longer triangular.

Figure 8: Fuzzy (interval) output values for considered $\alpha$-cuts obtained using fPINN framework
5.2 One-dimensional bar with two interval fields

In order to test the capability of the proposed approach when dealing with a more realistic structural problem with interval fields, we study the iPNN on a 1D bar problem, see Figure 9. The relevant interval ordinary differential equation is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( E^I(x) A^I(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + n(x) = 0 \quad (20)$$

where $n(x) = \cos(3x)x$ in $N/m^2$, $E^I$ in $N/m^2$ and $A^I$ in $m^2$ are the spatially dependent interval fields of the Young’s modulus and the area which are defined as

$$E^I(x) \begin{cases} \geq & E^L(x) = 0.5 \sin(x) + 0.55 \\ \leq & E^U(x) = 0.4 \sin(2x) + 1.4 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

and

$$A^I(x) \begin{cases} \geq & A^L(x) = \cos(3x) + 2.0 \\ \leq & A^U(x) = \cos(3.8x) + 3.0. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

The boundary conditions are given as

$$u(x=0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=L} = \frac{P}{E(x=L)A(x=L)} \quad (23)$$

where $P = 0.1N$ and where the length of the bar is $L = 2m$. The training is conducted with a learning rate of $1e-4$. The network of the primary solution network $N_u$ consists of 4 hidden layers with 40 neurons each while the input interval network $N_P$ has 5 hidden layers a 50 neurons. The authors can not find anything special about these hyperparameter values. They are employed without any immediate considerations. We use 200 equidistant points inside the one-dimensional training domain. The FEM mesh consists of 200 elements. During the studies of this work it was found that high-emphasis needs to be placed on the fulfillment of the residual, i.e. $W_G = 100,000$ in eq. (15) whereas the other weights are less influential for this study $W_{mm} = W_0 = W_u = 1$. The network is trained for 500,000 epochs. Due to the unique formulation of iPNN we are able to obtain the input fields leading to the bounds of the interval displacement field as a simple byproduct of the training approach, see Figure 10. It can be seen that the predicted input fields are effectively equal to the constraining interval values for a majority of the computational domain. However both input field predictions “switch” from being closely aligned to the lower bound to being closely aligned to the upper bound value and vice versa. This is an interesting observation which is not trivially predictable beforehand. The bounds of the interval displacement field as well as the bounds of the FEM solutions using the four possible combinations of input interval limits $(E^L - A^L, E^U - A^L, E^L - A^U, E^U - A^U)$ are shown in Figure 11a. The absolute error between the FEM solution and the iPNN output for the input fields obtained through $N_P$ are shown in Figure 11b which proves that the approach is able to effectively solve the problem in a similar accuracy to FEM. It can be seen that the “switch” of the input fields happens around the global minimum of the primary variable. The total loss and all individual losses over the training process are shown in Figure 12. It can be seen that the losses decline in a satisfactory manner and that especially the residual losses ($MSE_G$ and the boundary loss) are fulfilled quite accurately due to the choice of the loss weights as described above. In contrast to FEM approaches we do not need to sample from the input fields, i.e. we do not need to assume any spatial correlations of the interval fields. Furthermore, we also do not need to conduct Monte-Carlo sampling as a means to obtain approximations for the output bounds.

6 Discussion and outlook

The presented paper proposes a physics-informed neural network formulation for solving interval PDEs which can be used to obtain approximate solutions to (some) fuzzy PDEs as well. The proposed network infrastructure, termed
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(a) Predicted and constraining Young’s modulus field

(b) Predicted and constraining area field

Figure 10: Predicted and constraining input fields

(a) $\mathcal{N}_u$ output and maximum and minimum FEM outputs using 4 combination of interval limits

(b) Error between FEM and the $\mathcal{N}_u$ output for $\mathcal{N}_{fp}$ input field

Figure 11: Comparisons and output of primary output

(a) Non-residual losses over training epochs

(b) Residual losses over training epochs

Figure 12: Losses over the training process
interval physics-informed neural networks (iPINNs), consists of a two separate feedforward neural networks with one aiming to approximate minimum and maximum possible primary outputs whereas the other one tries to obtain the accompanying input fields that lead to these specific solutions of the PDE. The presented approach is studied in an introductory example as well as in a one-dimensional structural problem showing promising results. In particular the input fields that correspond to the bounds of the interval displacement field are obtained as a byproduct of the iPINN formulation without any necessary prior knowledge of the spatial correlation of the input field. We believe this framework has a lot of potential by being able to avoid the major problems of the finite element method when dealing with interval and fuzzy fields.

In the future we aim to extend this framework to higher dimensions and try to tackle inverse problems related to finding possible input intervals from observed output ranges. Furthermore we could potentially study more theoretical problems that are hard to study with interval finite element methods, i.e. physical law discovery.
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