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Abstract

The Neural network-based approach to solving partial differential equations has attracted considerable attention due to its simplicity and flexibility to represent the solution of the partial differential equation. In training a neural network, the network tends to learn global features corresponding to low-frequency components while high-frequency components are approximated at a much slower rate (F-principle). For a class of equations in which the solution contains a wide range of scales, the network training process can suffer from slow convergence and low accuracy due to its inability to capture the high-frequency components. In this work, we propose a hierarchical approach to improve the convergence rate and accuracy of the neural network solution to partial differential equations. The proposed method comprises multi-training levels in which a newly introduced neural network is guided to learn the residual of the previous level approximation. By the nature of neural networks’ training process, the high-level correction is inclined to capture the high-frequency components. We validate the efficiency and robustness of the proposed hierarchical approach through a suite of linear and nonlinear partial differential equations.

1 Introduction

By the representation power and trainability of neural networks, data-driven methods with neural networks have achieved remarkable success in solving a wide range of partial differential equations arising in various fields [1, 2, 3, 4]. In general, neural network-based methods take advantage of computing derivatives of a neural network to represent the given law of physics written in a differential operator. The methods also do not require mesh or grid designs, which is computationally beneficial for high-dimensional problems.

Many research efforts have focused on well-designed objective or loss functions to guide a neural network to approximate the solution of PDE. An objective function measures how well a neural network satisfies the PDE, typically defined as the empirical mean of the residual by a neural network. Physics-informed neural networks (PINN) [5], and DGM [1] consider the direct PDE residual as the loss function so that the neural network satisfies the PDE in the domain. The approaches in [6, 7] reformulate an elliptic PDE using an equivalent energy minimization problem to train a neural network. For time-dependent problems, the approach proposed in [2] estimates the
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solution of parabolic PDEs at a single point by a neural network catered to the time discretization of equivalent backward stochastic differential equations (BSDE). For elliptic PDEs, the method in \[8\] utilizes a stochastic representation in solving the elliptic PDE and trains a neural network in the form of reinforcement learning.

In particular, PINN has flexibility in informing physical laws described in differential equations, and thus it has been employed in solving a wide range of PDEs. Despite its successful results in many applications, PINN suffers from a slow convergence rate and accuracy degradation for a certain class of PDEs. Recent works have enlightened the limitations of a multi-objective optimization problem comprising different loss components corresponding to the governing differential equation and initial/boundary conditions. The work in \[9\] inspected the gradients of individual loss components during the training process. The result demonstrated the undesirable pathology of stiff gradient flows caused by the imbalance among the different loss components during back-propagation, which can degrade the overall training process of the neural network.

The training dynamics of the standard PINN model have been analyzed in \[10\] using the neural tangent kernel (NTK) theory \[11\]. The analysis shows that the eigenvalues of NTK can estimate the convergence rate of different loss components. The authors address the discrepancy in convergence rates as a fundamental reason for degrading the convergence rate of the overall test error. Adaptive weighting on loss components was proposed in the sense of convergence rate normalization \[12\] to mitigate the discrepancy. The study approached the balance on loss components in the perspective of the relative error. Motivated by the fact that approximation of derivatives tends to be highly correlated to the magnitude of true derivatives, an optimal choice of the weighted loss function is derived under the full knowledge of the true solution followed by a heuristic method called magnitude normalization.

Such computational challenges are often inherent from the characteristics of the solution of a PDE, in particular when the solution involves a wide range of scales. The multiscale PDE problems arise in the modeling across many scientific domains, such as fluid dynamics, quantum mechanics, or molecular dynamics. Standard methods, such as finite difference methods (FDM) or finite element methods (FEM), encounter an intractable computational complexity in resolving all relevant scales, numerical instabilities, or slow convergence in general. There have been significant efforts in developing efficient discretization methods for multiscale problems. As a representative example, the multigrid (MG) method \[13\] addresses the disparate convergence rates of different scale components through a hierarchical design of discretizations. The MG method captures the diverse target scale components of the solution from the collaboration of scale-corresponding grid approximations. The MG method achieves fast convergence as the method approximates all scale components corresponding to the grids. A hierarchical approach for multiscale problems has also been discussed in \[14\] for turbulent diffusion. Instead of using a fine resolution grid for the whole domain at each level, the approach in \[14\] uses a local spatiotemporal domain. By designing a hierarchy that captures all possible scale ranges of the solution, the approach can capture the effective macroscopic behavior by a significant computational gain.

Neural network-based methods also face hurdles in approximating the multiscale solution of a PDE in that a neural network prefers low frequencies (F-Principle) \[15\]. Therefore, a standard network design can be ineffective in learning the high-frequency components. There are several recent research efforts to address the limitation in training high-frequencies by modifying the architecture or the ingredients of neural networks \[16\] \[17\] \[18\]. In particular, \[18\] proposed the neural network structure with Fourier feature embeddings to learn the multiscaled PDE solutions more efficiently.
The embedding allows one to specify target characteristic frequencies of the neural network. The authors consider the multiple embeddings of inputs to learn the diverse range of frequencies in the solution simultaneously.

This work proposes hierarchical learning for solving PDEs to expedite the convergence through a hierarchical design of neural networks. We aim to decompose the learning by multiple target segments of the frequency spectrum and combine all pieces of learning consequences to the overall approximation of the PDE solutions, in which each reduced target could be efficiently resolved. We impose a hierarchy in neural networks, each of which corresponds to the different target characteristic frequencies. The neural networks are trained in sequence to correct the residual of the approximation up to previous levels. By F-Principle, the targets of neural networks are naturally aligned from low to high-frequency components in the solution. We employ appropriate neural networks to learn each target frequencies efficiently. In particular, the hierarchical composition of Fourier feature embeddings is considered. With the support of techniques to improve the convergence, such as the aforementioned adaptive weighting algorithms, the proposed method accelerate the convergence further. This study investigates the effect of hierarchical learning in the framework of the Physics-informed neural network. We believe that the idea could be applied to the other neural network-based methods, which we leave as future work.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 overview the PINN method and discuss the previous efforts to overcome the spectral barriers in training neural networks to solve PDEs. In section 3, we propose the hierarchical learning methodology to solve PDEs using standard MLPs, and Fourier feature embedded neural networks. Section 4 provides numerical experiments of linear and nonlinear PDEs validating the performance of proposed methods. Finally, we conclude this paper with discussions about the limitation and future directions of the current study in section 5.

2 Physics-informed neural networks

In this section, we summarize physics-informed neural networks (PINN) and discuss the variant methods to overcome the limitations of standard PINN methods.

We consider partial differential equation of unknown real-valued function $u$ on the bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\mathcal{N}[u](x) = f(x), \; x \in \Omega, \quad \mathcal{B}[u](x) = g(x), \; x \in \partial \Omega,$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a differential operator and $\mathcal{B}$ represents a boundary condition operator, including Dirichlet, Neumann or periodic boundary conditions.

General deep learning based methods to solve Eq. (1) employ a neural network, $u(x; \theta)$, to approximate the solution, and train the parameters $\theta$ under the guidance of loss functions leading the neural network to satisfy Eq. (1). The PINN measures the direct PDE residuals in the loss function, which consists of the interior and boundary loss terms,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \lambda_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega}(\theta) + \lambda_{\partial \Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\partial \Omega}(\theta),$$

(2)
where

\[ \mathcal{L}_\Omega(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |N[u(\cdot; \theta)](x^i_r) - f(x^i_r)|^2, \tag{3} \]

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\partial \Omega}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} |B[u(\cdot; \theta)](x^i_b) - g(x^i_b)|^2. \tag{4} \]

Here \( \{x^i_r\}_{i=1}^{N_r} \) and \( \{x^i_b\}_{i=1}^{N_b} \) are sampling points in the interior and the boundary of the domain, respectively. Both loss terms can be understood as Monte-Carlo approximation of continuous integrals of PDE residuals. We note that the derivatives of the neural network with respect to the input \( x \) as well as the parameters \( \theta \) can be efficiently computed by automatic differentiation (AD) \[19\], which is the strength in using neural networks in general. The parameters \( \lambda_\Omega \) and \( \lambda_{\partial \Omega} \) determine the balance between two loss terms, and they can be specified as hyperparameters or effectively applied \[9\] \[10\]. The neural network is trained by minimizing the loss function with a gradient descent method as

\[ \theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - \alpha \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta). \tag{5} \]

The learning rate \( \alpha \) could be attuned on each step, and the gradient step can also be modified by reflecting the previous steps such as Adam optimization \[20\]. Moreover, the sample points in both interior and boundary can be chosen in random at every iteration when considering the stochastic gradient descent method (SGD).

Despite remarkable achievement in many applications, the PINN often struggles to learn the solutions of PDEs with either unstable convergence or degraded accuracy. Recent works have endeavored to understand unfavorable training scenarios of neural networks and proposed alternative methodologies to overcome the limitations. One line of approach involves the balance of different loss terms in the context of multi-objective optimization discussed in section \[1\]. The other direction addresses the intrinsic behavior of training neural networks, which is specifically disadvantageous to learn functions involving diverse frequency spectrum. The general learning process of neural networks has been studied from the perspective of the frequency domain \[21\] \[22\] \[15\] \[23\]. It is understood in common that gradient-based training process has spectral bias as the neural networks tend to learn low frequency first and it requires longer iterations to fit high frequency, which is referred to F-Principle in \[15\]. This phenomenon arises as an challenge in neural network based methods to solve multi-scale PDE problems suffering slow convergence or accuracy degradation missing the high frequency components. To tackle the challenges, \[16\] proposed a neural network architecture with an input scaling treatment for conversion of the high-frequency components to low-frequency ones preferable to learn. Installed with a compact supported activation function, the network is effectively applied to multiscale applications \[21\] \[25\]. \[26\] introduced adaptive activation functions with trainable scaling factors in considering the dynamical topology of the loss function in an optimization process. The authors empirically demonstrate the effect of adaptive activation function in the frequency domain to accelerate the convergence and improve the accuracy. \[17\] showed that a simple random Fourier features embeddings of inputs enables a standard MLP to learn high-frequency components more efficiently in applications of computer vision and graphics. Namely, the embedding corresponds to a map from the input \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) to the \( 2m \)-dimensional frequency domain as

\[ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} a \odot \cos(B_\sigma x) \\ a \odot \sin(B_\sigma x) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}, \tag{6} \]
where $B_σ ∈ \mathbb{R}^{n×m}$ is a random wave number matrix sampled from the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,σ^2)$ and $a ∈ \mathbb{R}^m$ is a scaling vector. The authors analyzed the effect of the embedding on the neural tangent kernel (NTK) of standard MLP to attenuate the spectral bias by appropriate choice of $σ$ and $a$. The Fourier feature embedding is extended to solve multi-scale PDE problems with PINN models in [18]. The authors proposed the multiple Fourier feature embeddings of inputs rather than a single embedding to learn diverse frequency components simultaneously. Moreover, it was also demonstrated that separation in spatial and temporal embeddings is effective in handling the problems with different multiscale behavior in spatial and temporal directions.

3 Hierarchical PINN

The methods discussed in the previous section focus on various strategies to improve the capability of a single neural network in learning a wide range of scales in the solution of a PDE. In the current study, we propose a hierarchical design of the neural network to represent the multiscale solution. The proposed method, which we call ‘hierarchical Physics-informed neural network’ (HiPINN), uses a sequence of neural networks to represent different scale components of the PDE solution. Our approach is motivated by the multigrid method that uses a hierarchy of different grid sizes to expedite the convergence of an iterative method to solve PDEs [13]. The rationale of the multigrid method is that a grid size has its own characteristic scale with its corresponding convergence rate. The multigrid method achieves an overall fast convergence rate by uniformly capturing different scale components through variable grid sizes. The idea of the proposed hierarchical approach for PINN is to impose a hierarchy in networks so that each network can capture its corresponding scales, and we uniformly capture all possible ranges of scales.

3.1 Hierarchical design of networks

HiPINN employs a set of $M$ neural networks $\{v_m(x;θ_m)\}_{m=1}^M$ with a hierarchy to represent the PDE solution where $M$ represents the number of levels for different characteristic scales. To mimic the hierarchy of the multigrid method, we consider two approaches in the current study. The first approach is the standard multiplayer perceptron (MLP) with various network sizes. For low variability components of the unknown solution, we expect that a simple network will be enough to approximate while high variability components require a more complicated network. Following this intuitive argument, we increase the complexity of networks by increasing the depth and width of each network. One issue of this approach is that it is not clear to cover a specific range of scales. If there are two networks that are significantly different in terms of complexity, we expect that the two networks will represent different scale components, but it is not clear whether there is a gap between them. In the study of the spectral bias of neural networks [22], it is shown that higher frequencies are significantly less robust than lower ones in the perturbation of the neural network parameters. This observation shows that a limited volume in the parameter space is involved in expressing the high-frequency components. With the support of this observation, we consider the complexity of networks in composing the hierarchy. The schematic diagram of the hierarchical employment of the MLPs is displayed in Fig. 1.

Another approach to impose a hierarchy in the network is the Fourier feature embedding [17]. The structure of each network is identical through levels with the input embedding as Eq. (6). However, we vary them by increasing $σ$ as the level ($m$) increases so that a high-level network
Figure 1: Hierarchical composition of standard MLPs; small-sized MLP for capturing low variability components and large-sized MLP for high variability components.

Figure 2: Hierarchical composition of Fourier feature embedded neural networks; With the same network architecture, the target characteristic frequency is controlled by the Fourier feature embedding of inputs as Eq. (6).

represents high frequency or wavenumber behaviors compared to the ones captured by the low-level networks. As the network size does not change through the hierarchy, the Fourier embedding-based approach does not provide any computational efficiency in solving a low level network compared to the hierarchy using the network complexity of MLP. However, the Fourier embedded hierarchy can specify the target characteristic scales through $\sigma$. In the multiscale approach using the Fourier embedding for PINN [18], a various range of $\sigma$ values is incorporated to design a single network to target all possible ranges of scales in the solution. In terms of the network complexity, HiPINN does not necessarily use a network more complicated than the one used in [18]. The goal of HiPINN is to expedite the training process by dividing the training into specific scales instead of training all possible scales simultaneously. The schematic of a hierarchical neural network design using the Fourier feature embedding is shown in Fig. 2.
3.2 HiPINN algorithm

Using the neural networks with a hierarchy, the $M$-level HiPINN representation of the PDE solution is the sum of all neural networks, which is given as

$$u_M(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} v_m(x; \theta_m). \quad (7)$$

Under this structure, the training of each level network is on the correction of the residual of the previous level solution representation. To add the $(M+1)$-th level to $u_M$ using $v_{M+1}$, the loss function $\mathcal{L}^{(M+1)}$ is

$$\mathcal{L}^{(M+1)}(\theta_M) = \lambda_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega}^{(M+1)}(\theta_{M+1}) + \lambda_{\partial\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\partial\Omega}^{(M+1)}(\theta_{M+1}), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}^{(M+1)}(\theta_{M+1}) = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |\mathcal{N}[u_M + v_{M+1}(\cdot; \theta_{M+1})](x^r_i) - f(x^r_i)|^2,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial\Omega}^{(M+1)}(\theta_{M+1}) = \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} |\mathcal{B}[u_M + v_{M+1}(\cdot; \theta_{M+1})](x^b_i) - g(x^b_i)|^2. \quad (9)$$

We note that $u_M$ is already approximated, and thus the training variable related to $\mathcal{L}^{(M+1)}$ is $\theta_{M+1}$.

If the differential operator and the boundary operator are linear, the $(M+1)$-th level training is equivalent to solving the original PDE operator using $v_{M+1}$ for modified $f^{(M+1)}(x)$ and $g^{(M+1)}(x)$, which are given by

$$f^{(M+1)}(x) = f(x) - \mathcal{N}[u_M](x) \quad (10)$$

and

$$g^{(M+1)}(x) = g(x) - \mathcal{B}[u_M](x), \quad (11)$$

respectively. Therefore, the implementation for the linear case involves only marginal modification of the standard PINN method. When the differential operator $\mathcal{N}$ is nonlinear, the differential operator on $v_{M+1}$ at the $(M+1)$-th level will be different from the original operator $\mathcal{N}$. However, the structure of the operator does not change over the level; it remains at minimizing the loss related to $\mathcal{N}['approximation up to the previous level'+ 'current level network']$ over the current level network. Thus HiPINN for a nonlinear problem requires only one implementation of a solver and uses it repeatedly for all levels.

We also note that HiPINN does not require any projection or interpolation operations between different level solutions, which are crucial in the algebraic multigrid method. In HiPINN, each level solution approximation uses the same sampling points $\{x^r_i\}_{i=1}^{N_r}$ and $\{x^b_i\}_{i=1}^{N_b}$. From the homogeneity of the problem to be solved at each level, it is straightforward to implement various types of cycles to iterate over different levels, such as V and W cycles. V cycle starts from a low resolution to a high resolution and iterates back to a low resolution. W cycle repeats the V cycle to approximate scale components not sufficiently captured at the corresponding level.
4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we validate the performance of the proposed hierarchical learning methodology to solve PDEs through a suite of test problems. Throughout the numerical experiments, we use standard multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) and Fourier feature embedded neural networks [18] with tanh activation functions. The architecture of the later neural network is designed as the following in sequence; 1) multiple Fourier feature embeddings of input, each of embedding corresponding to the map in Eq. (6) with scaling vector $\mathbf{a} = 1$, 2) a multi-scale feature extractor MLP common for each embedded feature, 3) a final linear layer passed by concatenated features extracted. In our numerical experiments, we consider the dimension of a Fourier feature embedding as the same as that of the first hidden layer of the multi-scale feature extractor. Moreover, we include a dense layer to pass the concatenated features, which performs better than direct linear mapping to the output in our experiments. We train a neural network by means of the stochastic gradient descent method (SGD) using the Adam optimizer [20] with the learning parameters $\beta_1 = 0.95$ and $\beta_2 = 0.95$, and all the trainable parameters are initialized from Glorot normal distribution [27]. Moreover, we employ the adaptive weights algorithm [10] in all experiments, in particular, updating the weights in every 100 gradient descent steps for computational efficiency. We measure the accuracy of a numerical approximation $\tilde{u}$ of $u$ by the relative $L^2$-error, $\|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} / \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, and all benchmark losses are referred to the test losses computed on the corresponding grid points.

4.1 Poisson equation

As a preliminary example, we consider the Poisson equation on $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$ with a Dirichlet boundary condition,

$$
\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\quad u = g \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega.
$$

Here, we choose the force term $f$ and the boundary values $g$ such that Eq. (12) has the exact solution, $u(x) = \sin(8\pi x_2^2 + 4\pi x_2)\sin(8\pi x_1^2 + 4\pi x_1)$. The exact solution involves the linearly-varying frequencies through the domain.

We consider 2-level hierarchical learning with neural networks, $v(x; \theta_1)$ and $v(x; \theta_2)$, which are sequentially trained under the corresponding loss functions,

\begin{align}
\text{(level 1)} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(1)}(\theta_1) &= \frac{\lambda_{\Omega}}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |\Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_1) - f(x^i_r)|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\partial\Omega}}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} |v(x^i_b; \theta_1) - g(x^i_b)|^2, \\
\text{(level 2)} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(2)}(\theta_2) &= \frac{\lambda_{\Omega}}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \left| (\Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_1^*) + \Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_2)) - f(x^i_r) \right|^2
\quad + \frac{\lambda_{\partial\Omega}}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} \left| (v(x^i_b; \theta_1^*) + v(x^i_b; \theta_2)) - g(x^i_b) \right|^2.
\end{align}

Here, $\theta_1^*$ in Eq. (14) is the updated $\theta_1$ at level 1 and is fixed at level 2. We note that as the differential (i.e., Laplacian) and boundary operators are linear, the residual PDE for the neural network $v(x; \theta_2)$ is also a Poisson equation with Dirichlet boundary values, only differed in the
force term and the boundary values from given Eq. (12) inducing the shift of the target frequencies at level 2. We test our method using both standard MLPs and Fourier feature embedded neural networks with training sample size $N_r = 400$ and $N_b = 400$.

First, we use the MLP with 3 hidden layers of each dimension 200 at the first level and with 5 hidden layers of each dimension 200 at the second level. The hierarchical learning is compared with the standard learning (i.e., single-level hierarchy) with different size of MLPs, $H$ numbers of hidden layers of each dimension 200, $H = 2, 3, \ldots, 8$, among which the MLP with $H = 3$ achieves the best performance in approximation accuracy. Fig. 3 summarizes the training procedures during $2 \times 10^5$ iterations. We observe that the correction at the 2nd level properly works to accelerate the convergence in two losses and achieve better approximation accuracy than standard learning correspondence.

For the case of Fourier feature embedded neural networks, we use the same size of neural networks at both levels except the different embeddings are considered. We use single Fourier feature embedding at each level with $\sigma = 1$ and $\sigma = 5$, respectively, in considering the low frequency target at the 1st level and relatively high frequency at the 2nd level. The rest of the network consists of the feature extractor with 3 hidden layers of each dimension 200 followed by the last 200-dense layer. To demonstrate the effectiveness of learning the diverse frequencies in sequence from low to high, we compare our method with the standard learning with not only the single embedding ($\sigma = 1$, $\sigma = 5$) but also multiple embeddings ($\sigma = 1, 5$) aiming to learn various frequencies simultaneously, under the structure of a neural network is controlled. As shown in Fig. 4, our method strongly accelerates the convergence at the 2nd level and achieves more accurate approximation (relative $L^2$-error $1.33 \times 10^{-3}$) in comparison to the other experiments (best relative $L^2$-error $1.65 \times 10^{-2}$) by standard learning (see also Fig. 5). Moreover, our method combined with Fourier feature embedding outperforms using the standard MLP, as we can employ a neural network suitable for learning the target bands of frequency at each level.

We address a question when it is appropriate to switch the level from the 1st to the 2nd indirectly by solving Eq. (12) with a different choice of the 2nd level initiation. Fig. 6 presents the 6 training procedures of the Fourier feature embedded neural networks ($\sigma = 1$, $\sigma = 5$ in level sequence), in which we can observe the strong acceleration in loss convergence followed by a more accurate approximation less sensitive to the choice of the 2nd level initiation.
Figure 3: Training procedures of MLPs in solving 2D Poisson equation, Eq. (12), by standard learning (3 hidden layers, 200 units) and proposed hierarchical learning (1st level: 3 hidden layers, 200 units, 2nd level: 5 hidden layers, 200 units). (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors. The test data for each benchmark are obtained from $201 \times 201$ uniform grid on $\Omega = [0,1]^2$. The hierarchical learning corresponds to 2nd level initiation at $4 \times 10^4$ iterations.

Figure 4: Training procedures of Fourier feature embedded neural networks in solving 2D Poisson equation, Eq. (12), by standard learning and proposed hierarchical learning. (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors. The test data for each benchmark are obtained from $201 \times 201$ uniform grid on $\Omega = [0,1]^2$. The standard learning corresponds to single Fourier feature embedding with $\sigma = 1$, $\sigma = 5$, separately, and multiple embeddings $\sigma = 1, 5$. The hierarchical learning runs with single embedding $\sigma = 1$ at the 1st level, and $\sigma = 5$ at the 2nd level, in sequence. The 2nd level training is initiated at $6 \times 10^4$ iterations. The detail approximations are also presented in Fig. 5.
Figure 5: 1st row: The Numerical solutions (Fourier Feature embedded neural networks) of the 2D Poisson equation, Eq. (12) by standard learning (multiple embeddings $\sigma = 1, 5$) and proposed hierarchical learning (single embedding $\sigma_1 = 1, \sigma_2 = 5$ in sequence). (left) the exact solution, (middle) the pointwise error of the approximation from standard learning, (right) the pointwise error of the approximation from proposed hierarchical learning. 2nd row: the approximations at each level in the hierarchical learning. (left) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta^*_1)$ at the 1st level, (middle) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta^*_2)$ at the 2nd level, (right) the target function for $v(\cdot; \theta^*_2)$ at the 2nd level, which is equal to $(u_{\text{exact}} - v(\cdot; \theta^*_1))$.

Figure 6: Training procedures of Fourier feature embedded neural network (single embedding $\sigma_1 = 1, \sigma_2 = 5$ in sequence) in solving 2D Poisson equation, Eq. (12) with different 2nd level initiations, $2n \times 10^4, n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$. (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors.
4.2 Nonlinear Poisson Equation

When our method is applied to solve a linear PDE as a previous example, the hierarchical learning is consequently equivalent to solving multiple PDEs induced from the given equation simply by spectral separation of force term. For the nonlinear PDEs, on the other hand, the separation could be much more multiplex by the inclusion of nonlinear effect on uncertain approximation from the previous levels. To validate the flexibility of our method in this line, we consider the nonlinear Poisson equation on \( \Omega = [0, 1]^2 \) with Dirichlet boundary condition,

\[
-\nabla \cdot ((1 + u^2)\nabla u) = f \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\
\]

\[
u = g \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega. \\
\]

(15)

We choose the force term \( f = \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(2 + 2 \sin(10\pi x_1^2 + 10\pi x_2)\right) \) with high-frequency behavior and the boundary values \( g = 1 \). We obtain a reference solution by FEM method to measure the accuracy of a neural network based approximation.

We train neural networks \( v(x; \theta_1) \) and \( v(x; \theta_2) \) in 2-level hierarchy under the corresponding losses

\[
\text{(level 1)} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(1)}(\theta_1) = \frac{\lambda_\Omega}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |\mathcal{R}(\theta_1; x_i^1)|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\partial\Omega}}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} |v(x_b^1; \theta_1) - g(x_b^1)|^2, \\
\]

\[
\text{(level 2)} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(2)}(\theta_2) = \frac{\lambda_\Omega}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |\mathcal{R}(\theta_2; x_i^1)|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\partial\Omega}}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} |(v(x_b^1; \theta_1^*) + v(x_b^1; \theta_2)) - g(x_b^1)|^2, \\
\]

(16)

(17)

where the residuals of PDEs at two levels are

\[
\mathcal{R}(\theta_1; x_i^1) = -\nabla \cdot ((1 + v(x_i^1; \theta_1)^2)\nabla v(x_i^1; \theta_1)) - f(x_i^1), \\
\]

(18)

\[
\mathcal{R}(\theta_2; x_i^1) = -\nabla \cdot ((1 + (v(x_i^1; \theta_1^*) + v(x_i^1; \theta_2))^2)\nabla (v(x_i^1; \theta_1^*) + v(x_i^1; \theta_2))) - f(x_i^1). \\
\]

(19)

Here, \( \theta_1^* \) in Eq. (17) and Eq. (19) is the updated \( \theta_1 \) at level 1 and is fixed at level 2. In comparison to the linear case, the residual PDE for the neural network \( v(x; \theta_2) \) at the level 2 differs from given Eq. (15) in not only the force term and the boundary values but also in differential operator as \( u \mapsto \nabla \cdot ((1 + 2v(\cdot; \theta_1^*)u + u^2)\nabla u) \). We test the effectiveness of our method, in particular, the correction from solving the residual PDE, using standard MLPs and Fourier features embedded neural networks with training sample size \( N_r = 900 \) and \( N_b = 300 \).

First, we apply the hierarchical learning with MLPs, which comprise 3 hidden layers of each dimension 200 at the 1st level and 5 hidden layers of each dimension 200 at the 2nd level. We train MLPs over \( 8 \times 10^4 \) iterations, in which the 2nd level is initiated at the end of \( 3 \times 10^4 \) iterations of the 1st level. As in the previous example, we compare our method with standard learning using different size of MLPs, \( H \) numbers of hidden layers of each dimension 200, \( H = 2, 3, \cdots, 8 \), among which MLP with \( H = 4 \) achieves the best performance in approximation accuracy. Fig. 7 summarizes the learning procedure in two losses and relative \( \mathcal{L}^2 \)-errors. During the \( 3 \times 10^4 \) iterations of 1st level, the 4-layered MLP in standard learning performs better in all benchmarks than the 3-layered MLP in hierarchical learning. Once the 5-layered MLP is introduced at the 2nd level, the correction treatment accelerates convergences leading to more accurate approximation than standard learning of 4-layered MLP.
Next, we employ the neural networks with Fourier feature embeddings to test our hierarchical learning in the perspective of frequency more explicitly. With the same size of the neural networks in both levels, we consider different single embedding in each level with $\sigma = 1$ and $\sigma = 5$ respectively, aiming to capture the low-frequency components at the 1\textsuperscript{st} level and the high-frequency residuals at the 2\textsuperscript{nd} level. The rest of the network is set to the feature extractor with 3 hidden layers of each dimension 200 followed by last 200-dense layer. We compare the result to standard learning with different Fourier embeddings; single embedding with $\sigma = 1$ and $\sigma = 5$, and multiple embeddings with $\sigma = 1, 5$ and $\sigma = 1, 10$. We present the training procedures of numerical experiments in Fig. 8. Among the results from standard learning, multiple embeddings with $\sigma = 1, 5$ achieve the best approximation accuracy, $9.72 \times 10^{-4}$ relative $L^2$-error. It is compared with our hierarchical learning using the same Fourier feature embeddings, which approximates the solution more accurately with $6.25 \times 10^{-5}$ relative $L^2$-error (See also Fig. 9). Moreover, as in the previous example, we can see the better performance of our method with Fourier feature embedded networks than standard MLPs by specifying the target band of frequency at each level more explicitly.

We also conduct the numerical experiments to see the sensitivity of our method to the choice of iteration step to initiate the next level using the Fourier feature embedded neural networks ($\sigma = 1$, $\sigma = 5$ in level sequence). As shown in Fig. 10, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} level correction works properly to accelerate the convergence and improve the approximation accuracy for all trials with different level iteration settings.
Figure 7: Training procedures of MLPs in solving 2D nonlinear Poisson equation, Eq. (15), by standard learning (4 hidden layers, 200 units) and proposed hierarchical learning (1st level: 3 hidden layers, 200 units, 2nd level: 5 hidden layers, 200 units). (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors. The test data for each benchmark are obtained from $201 \times 201$ uniform grid on $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$. The hierarchical learning corresponds to 2nd level initiation at $3 \times 10^4$ iterations.

Figure 8: Training procedures of Fourier feature embedded neural networks in solving 2D nonlinear Poisson equation, Eq. (15), by standard learning and proposed hierarchical learning. (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors. The test data for each benchmark are obtained from $201 \times 201$ uniform grid on $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$. The standard learning corresponds to single Fourier feature embedding with $\sigma = 1$, $\sigma = 5$, separately, and multiple embeddings $\sigma = 1, 5$ and $\sigma = 1, 10$. The hierarchical learning runs with single embedding $\sigma = 1$ at the 1st level, and $\sigma = 5$ at the 2nd level, in sequence. The 2nd level training is initiated at $2 \times 10^4$ iterations. The detail approximations are also presented in Fig. 9.
Figure 9: 1st row: The Numerical solutions (Fourier Feature embedded neural networks) of the 2D nonlinear Poisson equation, Eq. (15) by standard learning (multiple embeddings $\sigma = 1, 5$) and proposed hierarchical learning (single embedding $\sigma_1 = 1, \sigma_2 = 5$ in sequence). (left) the exact solution, (middle) the pointwise error of the approximation from standard learning, (right) the pointwise error of the approximation from proposed hierarchical learning. 2nd row: the approximations at each level in the hierarchical learning. (left) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta_1^*)$ at 1st level, (middle) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta_2^*)$ at 2nd level, (right) the target function for $v(\cdot; \theta_2^*)$ at 2nd level, which is equal to $(u_{\text{exact}} - v(\cdot; \theta_1^*))$.

Figure 10: Training procedures of Fourier feature embedded neural network (single embedding $\sigma_1 = 1, \sigma_2 = 5$ in sequence) in solving 2D nonlinear Poisson equation, Eq. (15) with different 2nd level initiations, $n \times 10^4$, $n = 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4$. (left) interior losses, (middle) boundary losses, (right) relative $L^2$-errors.
### 4.3 Steady-state advection-diffusion equation

In this example, we aim to demonstrate the capability of the proposed method in handling the multiscale behavior of residual in a correction level, which could arise from the intertwined consequences of both differential operator and force term. We consider the steady-state advection-diffusion equation with mixed Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions,

\[ w \cdot \nabla u - \nu \Delta u = f \quad \text{in} \quad x \in [0, 1]^2, \]
\[ u(0, x_2) = g_1 \quad \text{for} \quad x_2 \in [0, 1], \]
\[ u(1, x_2) = g_2 \quad \text{for} \quad x_2 \in [0, 1], \]
\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x_1, 0) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x_1, 1) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x_1 \in [0, 1]. \]

We choose the diffusion coefficient \( \nu = 0.01 \), the force term \( f = \sin(4\pi x_2) \), Dirichlet boundary values, \( g_1 = 0 \) and \( g_2 = 1 \), and the advection velocity \( w \), an incompressible field (i.e. \( \nabla \cdot w = 0 \)),

\[ w(x) = \begin{bmatrix} -5 \sin(6\pi x_1) \cos(6\pi x_2) \\ 5 \cos(6\pi x_1) \sin(6\pi x_2) \end{bmatrix}. \]

We solve Eq. \((20)\) using 2-level hierarchy, in which neural networks \( v(x; \theta_1) \) and \( v(x; \theta_2) \) are trained under the corresponding losses

\[
\text{(level 1)} \quad L^{(1)}(\theta_1) = \frac{\lambda_0}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |R(\theta_1; x^i_r)|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{0,1}}{N_{b,1}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{b,1}} \left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial n}(x^i_{b,1}; \theta_1) \right|^2 \\
+ \frac{\lambda_{0,2}}{N_{b,2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{b,2}} \left| v(x^i_{b,2}; \theta_1) - g(x^i_{b,2}) \right|^2,
\]

\[
\text{(level 2)} \quad L^{(2)}(\theta_2) = \frac{\lambda_0}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} |R(\theta_2; x^i_r)|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{0,1}}{N_{b,1}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{b,1}} \left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial n}(x^i_{b,1}; \theta_1) + \frac{\partial v}{\partial n}(x^i_{b,1}; \theta_2) \right|^2 \\
+ \frac{\lambda_{0,2}}{N_{b,2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{b,2}} \left| v(x^i_{b,2}; \theta_1^*) + v(x^i_{b,2}; \theta_2) - g(x^i_{b,2}) \right|^2,
\]

where the residuals of PDE at two levels are

\[
R(\theta_1; x^i_r) = w \cdot \nabla v(x^i_r; \theta_1) - \nu \Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_1) - f(x^i_r)
\]
\[
R(\theta_2; x^i_r) = (w \cdot \nabla v(x^i_r; \theta_1^*) - \nu \Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_1^*)) + (w \cdot \nabla v(x^i_r; \theta_2) - \nu \Delta v(x^i_r; \theta_2)) - f(x^i_r).
\]

Here, \( x_{b,1} \) and \( x_{b,2} \) are sample points on the Neumann and the Dirichlet boundary respectively, \( g \) is read as \( g_1 \) or \( g_2 \) depending on the location of \( x_{b,2} \), and \( \theta_1^* \) in Eq. \((23)\) and Eq. \((25)\) is the updated \( \theta_1 \) at level 1 and is fixed at level 2. Moreover, we consider the weight \( \lambda_0 \) on boundary loss separately as \( \lambda_{0,1} \) on the Neumann boundary loss, and \( \lambda_{0,2} \) on the Dirichlet boundary loss when applying adaptive weights algorithm \cite{10}. We note that the 2nd level correction is required to train \( v(x; \theta_2) \) to approximate the solution of residual PDE involving the oscillatory advection operator with modified force term.

We apply the hierarchical learning with the Fourier feature embedded neural networks, in which the same size of neural networks are considered at both levels with different single embedding, \( \sigma = 2 \)
at the 1st level, and $\sigma = 5$ at the 2nd level in consideration of low-to-high frequency targets. The rest of the network is made up of the feature extractor with 3 hidden layers of each dimension 200 followed by the last 200-dense layer. We train the neural networks over $1 \times 10^5$ iterations, in which we choose 3 different 2nd level initiations, at $n \times 10^4$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, iteration step. We compare the hierarchical learning with the standard learning using the same size of neural network with different Fourier feature embeddings; single embedding $\sigma = 2$, $\sigma = 5$ separately, and multiple embeddings $\sigma = 2, 5$. Fig. 11 summarizes the training procedures in terms of 3 losses and relative $L^2$-errors. Among the standard learning experiments, $\sigma = 2$ embedding is suitable for this example as it converges to the relative $L^2$ errors $4.76 \times 10^{-3}$, the most accurate approximation, at the end of the iterations. It is compared with our hierarchical learning with the 2nd level initiation at $1 \times 10^4$ iterations, which performs better in approximation accuracy (relative $L^2$-error $2.41 \times 10^{-3}$) with 2.5 times faster convergence (near $4 \times 10^4$ iterations). We can also observe the strong acceleration in convergence by the 2nd level correction in all the hierarchical learning experiments. We present the numerical solutions from both standard learning and hierarchical learning with comparison in Fig. 12.
Figure 11: Training procedures of Fourier feature embedded neural networks in solving steady-state advection-diffusion equation, Eq. (20), by standard learning and proposed hierarchical learning. (1st row, left) interior losses, (1st row, right) Dirichlet boundary losses, (2nd row, left) Neumann boundary losses, (2nd row, right) relative $L^2$-errors. The test data for each benchmark are obtained from $201 \times 201$ uniform grid on $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$. The standard learning corresponds to single Fourier feature embedding with $\sigma = 2, \sigma = 5$, separately, and multiple embeddings $\sigma = 2, 5$. The hierarchical learning runs with single embedding $\sigma = 2$ at the 1st level, and $\sigma = 5$ at the 2nd level, in sequence. The 2nd level training is initiated at $n \times 10^4$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, iterations. The detail approximations are also presented in Fig. 12.
Figure 12: 1st row: The numerical solutions (Fourier Feature embedded neural networks) of the steady-state advection-diffusion equation, Eq. (20) by standard learning (single embedding $\sigma = 2$) and proposed hierarchical learning (single embedding $\sigma_1 = 2$, $\sigma_2 = 5$ in sequence). (left) the exact solution, (middle) the pointwise error of the approximation from standard learning, (right) the pointwise error of the approximation from proposed hierarchical learning. 2nd row: the approximations at each level in the hierarchical learning. (left) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta_1^*)$ at 1st level, (middle) the approximation $v(\cdot; \theta_2^*)$ at 2nd level, (right) the target function for $v(\cdot; \theta_2)$ at 2nd level, which is equal to $(u_{\text{exact}} - v(\cdot; \theta_1^*))$. 
5 Discussions and conclusions

This study proposed a hierarchical learning method to solve PDEs using neural networks. We showed that a hierarchical design of a neural network is efficient and robust in representing a PDE solution that contains a wide range of scales. Various numerical tests have shown that a neural network has its characteristic scales, which have a fast convergence rate for training. The hierarchical approach we proposed in this study enables us to cover all possible scales in the solution. To impose a hierarchy, we tested two methods; 1) multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs) with various network complexities, and 2) Fourier feature embedded network. The first approach has a computational efficiency in solving a low complexity network while capturing the low-frequency components of the solution. The second approach does not provide any computational gain as each network at different levels has the same complexity. Still, we can explicitly impose the range of scales of the solution through the Fourier feature embedded layer. The proposed hierarchical learning method has been tested through a suite of numerical tests, including linear and nonlinear PDEs, including the advection-diffusion problem with a multiscale velocity field.

There are several issues to be addressed, which we leave as future work. It is unclear to see the connection between the network complexity and its characteristic scales to represent a function. We have checked in our numerical experiments that changing the complexity of a network will change its corresponding scales. Still, we lack explicit and rigorous criteria to determine the characteristic scales. Also, we used the same network complexity for each level for the Fourier feature embedding approach, assuming that the Fourier embedded layer will determine its characteristic scales. We plan to investigate the effect of a network complexity that guarantees the imposed characteristic scales through the Fourier feature embedding. Another issue of our interest is the transition between different level networks. In the current study, we have tested only a one-directional transition from large-scale to small-scale representation. In multigrid methods, several transition methods such as V or W cycles have shown successful results in improving the accuracy. We believe that various transition cycles will also improve the hierarchical learning method for solving PDEs, which we will report in another place.

The numerical tests we considered here are elliptic PDEs, and we believe that the proposed method can apply to time-dependent problems. In solving a time-dependent problem, there are two approaches. One uses a network to learn the spatiotemporal scales at the same time. The other approach is to march the problem where the spatial variations are learned through a network [5]. We are interested in designing hierarchical networks to resolve multiscale behaviors in the temporal domain, particularly to capture the long-time behavior of a dynamical system, such as the climatology of geophysical fluid systems. Lastly, in the current study, we have tested the hierarchical learning method in the PINN framework. As the overarching idea of the proposed method is in the efficient representation of a multiscale function using hierarchical networks, we expect that the proposed method can apply to other network-based methods for solving PDEs, which we leave as future work.
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