
CONVECTION-DIFFUSION EQUATION: A THEORETICALLY CERTIFIED FRAMEWORK FOR NEURAL NETWORKS

Tangjun Wang

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Tsinghua University
wangtj20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Chenglong Bao*

Yau mathematical sciences center
Tsinghua University
clbao@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

Zuoqiang Shi*

Yau mathematical sciences center
Tsinghua University
zqshi@tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we study the partial differential equation models of neural networks. Neural network can be viewed as a map from a simple base model to a complicate function. Based on solid analysis, we show that this map can be formulated by a convection-diffusion equation. This theoretically certified framework gives mathematical foundation and more understanding of neural networks. Moreover, based on the convection-diffusion equation model, we design a novel network structure, which incorporates diffusion mechanism into network architecture. Extensive experiments on both benchmark datasets and real-world applications validate the performance of the proposed model.

Keywords partial differential equations | neural networks | convection-diffusion equation | scale-space theory

1 Introduction

Neural networks (NNs) have achieved great success in many tasks, such as image classification Simonyan and Zisserman [2015], speech recognition Dahl et al. [2011], video analysis Bo et al. [2011], and action recognition Wang et al. [2016]. Among the existing networks, residual networks (ResNets) are important architectures that enable the training of ultra-deep NNs and have the ability to avoid gradient vanishing He et al. [2016a,b]. Moreover, the idea of ResNets has motivated the development of many other NNs, including WideResNet Zagoruyko and Komodakis [2016], ResNeXt Xie et al. [2017], and DenseNet Huang et al. [2017].

In recent years, understanding ResNets from a dynamical perspective has become a promising approach E [2017], Haber et al. [2018], Chen et al. [2018]. Specifically, assuming $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as the input of a ResNet and defining $\mathcal{F}$ as the mapping, the l -th residual block can be realized by

$$\mathbf{x}_{l+1} = \mathbf{x}_l + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_l$ and $\mathbf{x}_{l+1}$ are the input and output of the residual mapping, and $\mathbf{w}_l$ is the parameter of the l -th block that will be learned by minimizing the training loss. Let $\mathbf{x}_L$ be the output of a ResNet with L blocks, then the classification score is determined by $\mathbf{y} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_L)$, where $\mathbf{w}$ is a learnable weight of the final linear classifier.

For any $T > 0$, by introducing a temporal partition $\Delta t = T/L$, the residual block represented by (1) can be viewed as the explicit Euler discretization with time step Δt for the following ordinary differential equation (ODE):

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = v(\mathbf{x}(t), t), \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2)$$

where $v(\mathbf{x}(t), t)$ is a velocity field such that $v(\mathbf{x}(t), t) = F(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{w}(t))/\Delta t$. This interpretation of ResNets provides a new perspective for viewing NNs and has inspired the development of many networks. Some approaches involve applying different numerical methods to construct diverse discrete layers Larsson et al. [2017], Zhang et al. [2017], Lu et al. [2018], while others explore the continuous-depth model Chen et al. [2018], Jia and Benson [2019].

Furthermore, the connection between ODEs and partial differential equations (PDEs) through the well-known characteristics method has motivated the analysis of ResNets from a PDE perspective. This includes theoretical analysis Sonoda

*Corresponding authors.




Figure 1: $\mathcal{T}_t$ represents the mapping from $u(\cdot, 0)$ to $u(\cdot, t)$. Top block describes the evolution from a coarse image to a fine image in scale-space theory. Bottom block describes the evolution from a base classifier to a neural network.

and Murata [2019], novel training algorithms Sun Qi and Qiang [2020], and improvements in adversarial robustness Wang et al. [2020a] for NNs. Specifically, from the PDE theory, (2) is the characteristic curve of the convection equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, t) = -v(\mathbf{x}, t) \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]. \quad (3)$$

The method of characteristics tells us that, along the curve defined by (2), the function value $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ remains unchanged. Denote the flow map from $\mathbf{x}(0)$ to $\mathbf{x}(T)$ along (2) as Φ , which is the continuous form of feature extraction in ResNets. If we enforce $u(\mathbf{x}, T) = f(\mathbf{x}) := \text{softmax}(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x})$ as a linear classifier at $t = T$, then

$$u(\mathbf{x}(0), 0) = u(\mathbf{x}(T), T) = f(\mathbf{x}(T)) = f \circ \Phi(\mathbf{x}(0))$$

Thus at $t = 0$, $u(\cdot, 0)$ is the composition of a feature extractor and a linear classifier, which corresponds to a ResNet.

In one word, NN can be viewed as the image $u(\cdot, t)$ of a mapping driven by a certain PDE. In the case of ResNets, this mapping is formulated as a convection equation. A natural question is: *How to bridge NN and PDE in a unified framework?*

In this paper, we try to address the questions from a mathematical perspective. To begin, we formally define the mapping $\mathcal{T}_t$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_t : f = u(\cdot, 0) \mapsto u(\cdot, t), \quad t \in [0, T]$$

This operator converts a base model into a neural network. Here we choose $u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x})$ because it is more intuitive to conceptualize NNs as progressing from shallow to deep in the forward direction. The connection between convection equation and ResNets remains consistent, since (3) is reversible in time.

Defining such an evolution operator is inspired by the scale-space theory Koenderink [1984], Witkin [1987], which is a framework widely used in image processing, computer vision and many fields. It provides formalized theory for manipulating the image at different scales. Scale, in this context, measures the degree of smoothing, or more specifically, the size of neighborhoods of the smoothing kernel. Scale space is the family of smoothed images parameterized by the scale, from the finest image (original image) to the most coarse image. Previous works Canny [1986], Perona and Malik

[1990], Alvarez et al. [1993], Duits et al. [2004] relate scale-space theory to PDEs, where the smoothing kernels are governed by a set of axioms and satisfy a certain form of PDEs. In this paper, we aim to identify a set of criteria that the operator $\mathcal{T}_t$ should satisfy. By meeting these assumptions, we can derive the form of PDEs, and thus answer the aforementioned questions. An illustration of our approach is provided in Figure 1.

Our framework shares certain similarities with that in scale-space theory while also possessing distinct features. Both frameworks rely on several PDE-type assumptions, such as locality and regularity, because both are built upon PDEs. However, there are notable differences between the two: (1) Scale-space theory typically operates in low-dimensional spaces, such as 2D for images and 3D for movies, whereas NNs can be potentially high-dimensional. (2) NNs possess unique assumptions that are not universal in scale-space theory. On the other hand, certain assumptions from image processing, such as rotation invariance and scale invariance, cannot be directly applied to NNs. (3) The intuition behind similar assumptions may differ between the two frameworks, such as the comparison principle. We argue that our explanation of several assumptions is more natural from a NN viewpoint.

In what follows, we theoretically prove that under reasonable assumptions on $\mathcal{T}_t$, $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{T}_t f(\mathbf{x})$ is the solution of a second order convection-diffusion PDE,

$$\frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

We believe that an axiomatic formulation can improve the interpretability of NNs. The theoretical result provides a unified framework which covers various existing network structures such as diffusive graph neural network, and training algorithm designed to improve robustness such as randomized smoothing. The framework also illuminates new thinking for designing networks. Specifically, we propose a new network structure called **CON**vection **d**iffusion **N**etworks (COIN), which achieves state-of-the-art or competitive performance on several benchmarks as well as novel tasks.

2 Theoretical Results

In this section, we show that under several reasonable assumptions, the sequence of operator images $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{T}_t f(\mathbf{x})$ is the solution of the convection-diffusion equation. Throughout this section, we assume $\mathcal{T}_t$ is well defined on C_b^∞ , where C_b^∞ is the space of bounded functions which have bounded derivatives at any order, and $\mathcal{T}_t f$ is a bounded continuous function. These assumptions are reasonable, as typical base classifiers f are indeed bounded (between 0 and 1) and have bounded derivatives. The operator image $\mathcal{T}_t f$, which we hope to be a NN, is evidently bounded and continuous.

To get the expression of the operator $\mathcal{T}_t$, we assume it has some fundamental properties, which fall into two categories: NN-type and PDE-type. We will present the assumptions individually and provide a concise explanation of their underlying intuition. A more comprehensive discussion regarding these assumptions can be found in the Discussion section.

2.1 NN-type assumptions

[Comparison Principle] For all $t \geq 0$ and $f, g \in C_b^\infty$, if $f \leq g$, then $\mathcal{T}_t(f) \leq \mathcal{T}_t(g)$.

Suppose we are given two classifiers f and g such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq g(\mathbf{x})$ for all data point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $f \circ \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \leq g \circ \Phi(\mathbf{x})$ if we replace the data points $\mathbf{x}$ with the extracted features $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$. Recall that for ResNet, $f \circ \Phi = \mathcal{T}_T(f)$, which implies $\mathcal{T}_T(f) \leq \mathcal{T}_T(g)$. Since the order-preserving property holds both at initial time step $t = 0$ and final time step $t = T$, it is reasonable to make the assumption.

[Markov Property] For all $s, t \geq 0$ and $t + s \leq T$, $\mathcal{T}_{t+s} = \mathcal{T}_t \circ \mathcal{T}_{t+s,t}$, where $\mathcal{T}_{t+s,t}$ denotes the flow from time t to time $t + s$.

The prediction of a deep neural network is computed using forward propagation, i.e. the network uses output of former layer as input of current layer. Thus, for a NN model, it's natural that the output of a NN can be deduced from the output of intermediate l -th layer without any information depending upon the original data point $\mathbf{x}$ and output of m -th layer ($m < l$). Regarding the evolution of operator $\mathcal{T}_t$ as stacking layers in the neural network, we should require that $\mathcal{T}_{t+s}$ can be computed from $\mathcal{T}_t$ for any $s \geq 0$, and T_0 is of course the identity.

[Linearity] For any $f, g \in C_b^\infty$, and real constants β_1, β_2 , we have

$$\mathcal{T}_t(\beta_1 f + \beta_2 g) = \beta_1 \mathcal{T}_t(f) + \beta_2 \mathcal{T}_t(g)$$

if C is a constant function, then $\mathcal{T}_t(C) = C$.

Linearity is also an intrinsic property of deep neural networks. Notice that we are not referring to a single NN's output v.s. input linearity, which is obviously wrong because of the activation function. Rather, we are stating that two different NN with the same feature extractor can be merged in to a new NN with a new classifier composed with the shared extractor, i.e.

$$(\beta_1 f + \beta_2 g) \circ \Phi = \beta_1 f \circ \Phi + \beta_2 g \circ \Phi$$

This is linearity at $t = T$, and for $t = 0$ it is trivial. For the latter part, we can hope that a constant base model always produces constant values with evolution.

2.2 PDE-type assumptions

[Locality] For all fixed $\mathbf{x}$, if $f, g \in C_b^\infty$ satisfy $D^\alpha f(\mathbf{x}) = D^\alpha g(\mathbf{x})$ for all $|\alpha| \geq 0$, where $D^\alpha f$ denotes the α -order derivative of f , then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(\mathcal{T}_t(f) - \mathcal{T}_t(g))(\mathbf{x})}{t} = 0$$

First of all, we need an assumption to ensure the existence of a differential equation. If two classifiers f and g have the same derivatives of any order at some point, then we should assume same evolution at this point when t is small. If we unrigorously define $\partial \mathcal{T}_t(f)/\partial t = (\mathcal{T}_t(f) - f)/t$ when $t \rightarrow 0^+$ (or infinitesimal generator in our proof), then $\partial \mathcal{T}_t(f)/\partial t$ should equal to $\partial \mathcal{T}_t(g)/\partial t$. Thus, we give the locality assumption concerning the local character of the operator $\mathcal{T}_t$ for t small.

[Spatial Regularity] There exists a positive constant C depending on f such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f) - \tau_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathcal{T}_t f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cht$$

for all $f \in C_b^\infty$, $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \geq 0$, where $(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f)(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{h})$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\|_2 = h$.

Regularity is an essential component in PDE theory. Thus, when considering PDE-type assumptions on $\mathcal{T}_t$, it is necessary to study its regularity. We separate the regularity requirements into spatial and temporal. Spatial regularity implies that the addition of a perturbation $\mathbf{h}$, whether applied to the base model f or the evolved model $\mathcal{T}_t f$, should result in minimal differences. One can relate it to the well-known translation invariance in image processing, but our assumption is weaker, as we allow small difference rather than require strict equivalence.

[Temporal Regularity] For all $t, s, t+s \in [0, T]$ and all $f \in C_b^\infty$, there exist a constant $C \geq 0$ depending on f such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{t+s}(f) - f\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Ct \\ \|\mathcal{T}_{t+s}(f) - \mathcal{T}_t(f)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Cst \end{aligned}$$

Temporal regularity requires that in any small time interval, the evolution process will not be rapid, because we want a smooth operator $\mathcal{T}_t$ in time.


Finally, combine all the assumptions on $\mathcal{T}_t$, we can derive the following theorem, emphasizing that the output value of neural network $\mathcal{T}_t(f)$ with time evolution satisfies a convection-diffusion equation,

Theorem 1. *Under the above assumptions, there exists Lipschitz continuous function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and Lipschitz continuous positive function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that for any bounded and uniformly continuous base classifier $f(\mathbf{x})$, $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{T}_t(f)(\mathbf{x})$ is the unique solution of the following convection-diffusion equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x}), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in [0, T]$. Here $\sigma_{i,j}$ is the i, j -th element of matrix function $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

We will provide the proof of Theorem 1 in the Supplementary Information.



3 Experimental Results

3.1 Convection Diffusion Network

To validate the effectiveness of our axiomatized PDE model, we have designed a novel network structure called **CO**nvection **d**iffusion **N**etworks (COIN), which incorporates diffusion layers after the ResNet architecture.

The proposed algorithm is a straightforward split scheme of (4). We divide the convection-diffusion equation into two parts, namely, the convection part and the diffusion part,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t), & t \in [0, T - 1] \\ \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \sigma^2 \Delta u(\mathbf{x}, t), & t \in [T - 1, T] \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x}) \end{cases}$$

Here we focus on the isotropic models, i.e., the diffusion term is $\sigma^2 \Delta u$. The time step $T - 1$ serves as a pseudo time step for understanding and does not have a practical impact. As mentioned in the introduction, the forward propagation of ResNets can be viewed as the convection equation. Therefore, we can use a ResNet to simulate the convection part from 0 to $T - 1$. In our implementation, we use a shallow two-layer fully connected network with a residual connection to represent the ResNet.

To handle the diffusion part, we model the data samples as nodes on a graph, allowing us to discretize the Laplacian term using the graph Laplacian. In this context, a graph represents a discretization of the domain $\mathbb{R}^n$ into a finite space, where a continuous function vector u is defined. Given a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denotes the set of N vertices and $\mathcal{E} = \{w_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^N$ describes the relationship between nodes $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$, we can compute the graph Laplacian as follows:

$$\Delta u(\mathbf{x}, t) = -L u(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} (u(\mathbf{x}_i, t) - u(\mathbf{x}_j, t))$$

The weight w_{ij} can be either given or pre-computed, depending on the specific task. $L = D - W$ is the graph Laplacian matrix, where $D = \text{diag}(d_i)$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij}$. Then, by applying the forward Euler scheme to discretize the derivative with respect to time t , we obtain the following expression:

$$u_i^{k+1} = u_i^k - \sigma^2 \sum_j w_{ij} (u_i^k - u_j^k), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1 \quad (5)$$

where u_i^k represents the value of u on node $\mathbf{x}_i$ at time step t_k . The initial time step t_0 is set to $T - 1$, which corresponds to the output of the ResNet, and the final time step $t_K = T$ corresponds to the final output of COIN. (5) is referred to as a diffusion layer. In our implementation, we often stack multiple diffusion layers ($K > 1$) because the value of σ^2

cannot be too large due to stability concerns Wang et al. [2024]. Consequently, we use the forward Euler scheme to discretize the diffusion term, allowing us to reach the desired diffusion strength.

To demonstrate that our implementation is derived from the PDE, rather than ODE, perspective, we should point out that diffusion is imposed on the network output value u , rather than intermediate value $\mathbf{x}$. We achieve such idea by incorporating the activation function (such as softmax for multi-class classification or sigmoid for binary classification) in the output layer of ResNet represented by $u(\mathbf{x}, T - 1)$. Consequently, when computing the final loss function, it is unnecessary to add an additional activation function after $u(\mathbf{x}, T)$.

Last but not least, we want to emphasize that our COIN model is only one of the many possible approaches of modeling the convection-diffusion PDE. Other methods may include introducing a regularization term that enforces NNs to obey the PDE, similar to PINN Raissi et al. [2019]. We are looking forward to exploring other paths in the future work.

3.2 Graph Node Classification

We have performed tests on our COIN model for semi-supervised node classification problems in graph. We present the results for the well-established citation network benchmarks, namely Cora, Citeseer, and Pubmed. These datasets consist of citation networks where nodes represent publications, edges represent citation links, and features are represented by sparse bag-of-words vectors. The dataset statistics are provided in Materials and Methods. Each node (publication) is categorized into a class. The objective of the graph node classification task is to predict the class of test nodes, given only a limited number of labeled training nodes.

To ensure a reliable comparison, we follow the methodology of Shchur et al. Shchur et al. [2019] instead of using the fixed Planetoid split Yang et al. [2016]. We conduct 100 random train-val-test splits, with each split involving 20 random neural network initialization. We report the average accuracy and standard variation across these splits. For each dataset, we adopt the approach of Shchur et al. Shchur et al. [2019] and select 20 data points per class for the training set, 30 data points per class for the validation set, and the remaining points for the test set.

Table 1: Performance comparison on graph node classification tasks. Reported results are average accuracy $\pm$ standard variation from 100*20 experiments. Methods marked with * indicate that their results are averaged across 40 random splits with 10 random initialization each, due to excessive time consumption per task.

	Method	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed
Classic	MLP	57.4 $\pm$ 2.1	59.9 $\pm$ 2.2	70.0 $\pm$ 2.0
	GCN Kipf and Welling [2017]	81.6 $\pm$ 1.1	72.1 $\pm$ 1.6	79.0 $\pm$ 2.1
	GraphSAGE Hamilton et al. [2017]	79.3 $\pm$ 1.4	71.7 $\pm$ 1.6	76.1 $\pm$ 2.0
	GAT Veličković et al. [2018]	80.8 $\pm$ 1.3	71.6 $\pm$ 1.7	78.7 $\pm$ 2.1
	SGC Wu et al. [2019]	80.5 $\pm$ 1.3	73.9 $\pm$ 1.4	77.2 $\pm$ 2.6
	APPNP Gasteiger et al. [2019a]	82.7 $\pm$ 1.1	73.3 $\pm$ 1.5	80.6 $\pm$ 1.8
ODE	CGNN* Xhonneux et al. [2020]	82.5 $\pm$ 1.0	73.0 $\pm$ 1.6	80.5 $\pm$ 2.2
	GCDE Poli et al. [2021]	80.0 $\pm$ 1.5	72.1 $\pm$ 1.6	76.0 $\pm$ 3.9
Diffusion	GDC Gasteiger et al. [2019b]	81.6 $\pm$ 1.3	72.2 $\pm$ 2.6	79.0 $\pm$ 2.0
	GraphHeat* Xu et al. [2019]	81.4 $\pm$ 1.2	73.5 $\pm$ 1.5	78.4 $\pm$ 2.1
	DGC Wang et al. [2021]	81.4 $\pm$ 1.2	75.0 $\pm$ 1.9	78.2 $\pm$ 2.1
	Diffformer Wu et al. [2023]	82.0 $\pm$ 2.3	71.9 $\pm$ 1.7	74.8 $\pm$ 4.5
	GRAND Chamberlain et al. [2021]	82.5 $\pm$ 1.4	73.7 $\pm$ 1.7	78.8 $\pm$ 1.8
	Diff-ResNet Wang et al. [2024]	82.1 $\pm$ 1.1	74.6 $\pm$ 1.8	80.1 $\pm$ 2.0
	COIN	82.2 $\pm$ 1.2	75.8 $\pm$ 1.3	81.1 $\pm$ 1.9

We compare our method with graph learning methods from three categories that are closely related to ours: classic methods, ODE-based methods, and methods that also include diffusion. Some methods may belong to more than one category, e.g. GRAND. In this case, we pick its main contribution as the category. We have re-implemented all the aforementioned methods using their official code available online and compared their performance with ours under the same experimental settings. During the testing of these methods, we have used the recommended parameters provided in the paper or the Github repository. A comparison between our re-implemented results and reported results is provided in the Supplementary Information. For detailed training settings, please refer to Materials and Methods.

The experimental results are presented in Table 1. Our COIN outperforms state-of-the-art approaches in terms of accuracy on Citeseer and Pubmed, while achieving comparable results on Cora.




Figure 2: Accuracy boxplots of COIN with different diffusion strength. x-axis represents σ^2 , y-axis represents accuracy(%). The orange solid line represents median. The green dashed line represents mean. The lower and upper hinges correspond to the 1st and 3rd quartiles, the whisker corresponds to the minimum or maximum values no further than $1.5 \times$ inter-quartile range from the hinge. Data beyond the end of the whiskers are outlying points that are plotted individually.

Furthermore, we study the effect of diffusion strength on the network performance. We fix the number of diffusion layers at either $K = 20$ or $K = 40$ and vary the diffusion strength of each layer σ^2 . The accuracy is averaged over 10 random train-validation-test splits, with each split involving 10 random neural network initializations, thus potentially yielding slightly different results compared to Table 1. We plot the boxplot of 100 experimental results in Figure 2.

From the results, two findings emerge. First, the performance gradually increases and then decreases with the total diffusion strength $K\sigma^2$, which indicates the existence of an optimal strength. Notably, the network achieves comparable performance within a fairly broad range of diffusion strength. Second, for a given total strength $k\sigma^2$, the layer number K does not have a significant effect. For example, the performance with $K = 20$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.3$ is comparable to that with $K = 40$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.15$.

3.3 Few-shot learning

The effectiveness of deep learning methods is strongly influenced by the availability of a substantial number of training examples. However, collecting such data requires significant labor and is often unfeasible in many domains due to the privacy or safety issues. To alleviate the reliance on training data, there has been a growing interest in few-shot learning methods Fei-Fei et al. [2006], Vinyals et al. [2016] in recent years. See Wang et al. [2020b] for a comprehensive review. Formally, the few-shot learning tasks are defined as follows. Given a novel dataset $\mathbb{X}_{\text{novel}} = \mathbb{X}_s \cup \mathbb{X}_q$, where $\mathbb{X}_s = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_1}$ is the support set with label information and $\mathbb{X}_q = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{N_2}$ is the query set without labels, the goal of few-shot learning is to find the labels of points in the query set when the size of support set $|N_1|$ is very small. Along with the novel dataset $\mathbb{X}_{\text{novel}}$, there exists a base dataset $\mathbb{X}_{\text{base}}$, where all samples are provided with label information. To prevent information leak, $\mathbb{X}_{\text{base}}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{\text{novel}}$ contain data points from distinct classes. The base dataset can be utilized for various purposes, such as data augmentation in transfer learning, episodic training in meta-learning, or backbone training in embedding learning. Among the different few-shot learning method, we employ embedding learning, which aims to map each sample into a latent space such that similar samples are close while dissimilar samples are far away.

The embedding function is parameterized by a deep neural network (backbone) pretrained on $\mathbb{X}_{\text{base}}$. During the few-shot learning tasks on $\mathbb{X}_{\text{novel}}$, the pretrained embedding function remains fixed without any further fine-tuning.

Table 2: 1-shot average accuracy (in %) and 95% confidence interval in *miniImageNet*, *tieredImageNet* and CUB with backbone WRN. Re-implemented results using public official code with our pretrained backbone are marked with †.

Methods	<i>miniImageNet</i>	<i>tieredImageNet</i>	CUB
Qiao Qiao et al. [2018]	59.60 ± 0.41	-	-
LEO Rusu et al. [2018]	61.76 ± 0.08	66.33 ± 0.05	-
ProtoNet Snell et al. [2017]	62.60 ± 0.20	-	-
CC+rot Gidaris et al. [2019]	62.93 ± 0.45	70.53 ± 0.51	-
MatchingNet Vinyals et al. [2016]	64.03 ± 0.20	-	-
FEAT Ye et al. [2020]	65.10 ± 0.20	70.41 ± 0.23	-
Transductive Dhillon et al. [2019]	65.73 ± 0.68	73.34 ± 0.71	-
BD-CSPN Liu et al. [2020a]	70.31 ± 0.93	78.74 ± 0.95	-
PT+NCM Hu et al. [2021]	65.35 ± 0.20	69.96 ± 0.22	80.57 ± 0.20
SimpleShot Wang et al. [2019]†	65.20 ± 0.20	71.49 ± 0.23	78.62 ± 0.19
LaplacianShot Ziko et al. [2020]†	72.90 ± 0.23	78.79 ± 0.25	87.70 ± 0.18
EPNet Rodríguez et al. [2020]†	67.09 ± 0.21	73.20 ± 0.23	80.88 ± 0.20
Diff-ResNet Wang et al. [2024]†	73.47 ± 0.23	79.74 ± 0.25	87.74 ± 0.19
COIN	74.85 ± 0.24	80.66 ± 0.25	89.20 ± 0.18

We conduct experiments on three benchmarks for few-shot image classification: *miniImageNet*, *tieredImageNet* and CUB. The *miniImageNet* and *tieredImageNet* are both subsets of the larger ILSVRC-12 dataset Russakovsky et al. [2015], with 100 classes and 608 classes respectively. The *miniImageNet* contains 100 classes and is split into 64 base classes, 16 validation classes, and 20 novel classes. The *tieredImageNet* contains 608 classes and is split into 351 base classes, 97 validation classes, and 160 novel classes. CUB-200-2011 Wah et al. [2011] is a fine-grained image classification dataset with 200 classes. It is split into 100 base classes, 50 validation classes, and 50 novel classes. The dataset split is standard as in previous papers Wang et al. [2019], Ziko et al. [2020]. All images are resized to 84×84 , following Vinyals et al. [2016].

The most common way to build a task is called an N -way- K -shot task Vinyals et al. [2016], where N classes are sampled from $\mathbb{X}_{\text{novel}}$ and only K (e.g., 1 or 5) labeled samples are provided for each class. Following standard evaluation protocol Wang et al. [2019], Ziko et al. [2020], we randomly sample 10000 5-way-1-shot and 5-way-5-shot classification tasks, and report the average accuracy and corresponding 95% confidence interval.

We choose two widely used networks, ResNet-18 He et al. [2016a] and WRN-28-10 Zagoruyko and Komodakis [2016] as our backbone. The backbone training process is in general similar to that in SimpleShot Wang et al. [2019] and LaplacianShot Ziko et al. [2020], but details are slightly different. See the Materials and Methods for details. The training process follows a standard pipeline in supervised learning and does not involve any meta-learning or episodic-training strategy. As a result, we obtain an embedding function that maps the original data points to $\mathbb{R}^M$, where $M = 512$ for ResNet-18 and $M = 640$ for WRN-28-10. For fair comparison, we also employ techniques used in Wang et al. [2019], Ziko et al. [2020], including centering and normalization and cross-domain shift, to transform the embedded features. The details of these techniques are explained in the Materials and Methods.

During each few-shot task, we train a COIN using M -dimensional features extracted from both the support set and the query set. To apply diffusion, we require a weight matrix that captures the similarity between data points. The weight w_{ij} is computed using a Gaussian kernel based on the Euclidean distance between x_i and x_j .

The results of 1-shot tasks with WRN-28-10 as backbone are reported in Table 2. Results for 5-shot tasks and ResNet-18 as backbone are available in the Supplementary Information. In Table 2, the results for comparison are collected from Wang et al. [2019], Ziko et al. [2020]. Across all datasets with different backbone architectures, our COIN consistently achieves the highest classification accuracy. Our method outperforms the state-of-the-art by an average margin of more than 1%, showcasing its effectiveness in scenarios with extremely limited training data.

3.4 COVID-19 case prediction with missing data

Our axiomatic framework can also be applied to predict the reported case for COVID-19 in scenarios with missing data. During a pandemic, accurate prediction of the infection spread is of utmost importance to enable governments to take timely and proactive measures. Timely and accurate predictions enable governments to make informed decisions, optimize healthcare resource allocation, and implement effective measures to suppress the spread of the virus. Recent

studies have addressed the challenge of predicting pandemics using deep learning methods Zeroual et al. [2020], Chimmula and Zhang [2020], Pal et al. [2020], Hu et al. [2020]. One promising approach is to use graph neural network Kapoor et al. [2020], Panagopoulos et al. [2021], Gao et al. [2021], Fritz et al. [2022], where regions are considered as nodes, and the interaction between nodes is captured through human mobility data (i.e., the number of people moving from one place to another within a given period).

We conduct our experiment using the England COVID-19 dataset sourced from the PyTorch Geometric Temporal open-source library Rozemberczki et al. [2021]. This dataset comprises daily reported COVID-19 cases in 129 regions of England known as NUTS3 regions, spanning from 3rd March to 12th May (61 days). The dataset is structured as a collection of graph snapshots, where each snapshot represents a specific day. Within each graph, the nodes correspond to the 129 regions in England. The node features capture the number of COVID-19 cases reported in each region over the past 8 days, while the objective is to predict the number of cases in each node for the following day. The graphs are directed and weighted, with edge weights indicating the daily volume of people moving from one region to another. These weights are derived from the Facebook Data For Good disease prevention maps and the official UK government website. Importantly, the graph snapshots are dynamic, meaning that different snapshots exhibit variations in terms of node features, edge weights, and prediction targets. To ensure consistent analysis, we normalize the reported cases for both node features and targets, setting their mean to zero and their variance to one. We divide the snapshots into training, validation, and test sets using a 2:2:6 ratio chronologically.

To address the challenge of missing data, we apply a masking strategy when constructing the dataset, which randomly hides a portion of the reported cases with a probability of 0.9. Notice that a reported case can be used both as part of node feature and as target. When missing data occurs in the node features, we substitute it with a value of zero. As for the missing data in the target, we treat it as NaN (Not a Number). This means that on the specific day (graph snapshot), the region with missing target data does not contribute to the neural network training. We achieve this by masking out the loss when the target is NaN during training. This setting effectively simulates the scenario of missing data that occurs in real-world situations, closely resembling the challenges encountered in practical applications. However, during testing, we make an exception and use the true target values for more accurate evaluation. Nevertheless, any missing data in the node feature is still treated as zero.

Table 3: Average Mean Squared Error on England COVID-19 dataset with missing data.

Method	MSE
All-Zero	0.8197
LR	0.8344 ± 0.0769
MLP	0.7777 ± 0.0203
GCN	0.7607 ± 0.0185
DCRNN Li et al. [2018]	0.8213 ± 0.0663
MPNN-LSTM Panagopoulos et al. [2021]	0.9384 ± 0.0633
GConvGRU Seo et al. [2018]	0.8153 ± 0.0435
A3TGCN Bai et al. [2021]	0.7797 ± 0.0362
EvolveGCN Pareja et al. [2020]	0.8237 ± 0.0856
COIN	0.7168 ± 0.0187

We compared our COIN model with several methods using Mean Squared Error (MSE) on the test set as the evaluation metric. To provide a fair benchmark, we establish a baseline where we simply predict all-zero values. Since the dataset has been normalized to zero mean, this baseline serves as a reference point. Additionally, we implemented Logistic Regression (LR), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), and Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) to compare against our COIN model. These models represent traditional and widely-used approaches in the field. Furthermore, we explore various methods that leverage techniques from recurrent neural networks (RNN) to incorporate temporal information. These methods not only consider spatial information but also incorporate temporal information.

We randomly mask out the reported cases using 10 random seeds, each with 10 random neural network initialization. The results are presented in Table 3. In our experimental setup, where a significant portion of the data is missing, methods that incorporate temporal information struggle to generalize and some perform even worse than the all-zero baseline. We speculate that the misleading effect of missing data on network predictions is amplified when employing temporal information within an RNN structure.

Conversely, non-RNN methods such as MLP and GCN outperform the aforementioned approaches. The superiority of GCN over MLP can be attributed to the inclusion of graph information, specifically the daily movement of people, which plays a crucial role in pandemic prediction, especially when only a limited amount of valid data from the past

several days is available in our setting. By leveraging information from neighboring nodes, the neural network can make more accurate predictions.

Nevertheless, our COIN model surpasses all other methods by a significant margin, with a notable 74.4% improvement over GCN when compared to the all-zero baseline.

3.5 Prostrate cancer classification

Over the past decade, significant advancements in molecular profiling technologies have enabled the collection of genomic, transcriptional and additional features from cancer patients. This wealth of molecular profiling data, combined with clinical annotations, has greatly contributed to the identification of numerous genes, pathways, and complexes associated with lethal cancers. However, in the case of prostate cancer, uncovering the relationship between these molecular features and disease prediction remains a major biological and clinical challenge Robinson et al. [2015], Abida et al. [2019], Elmarakeby et al. [2021]. Developing a highly accurate predictive model is essential for the early detection of preclinical prostate cancer and holds significant potential for wider application in various cancer types.

The dataset utilized in this study is derived from the work of Armenia et al. [2018], where they collected and analyzed genomic profiles from 1,013 patients diagnosed with prostate cancer (680 primary and 333 metastatic). These profiles are generated using a unified computational pipeline to ensure consistent derivation of somatic alterations. Following Elmarakeby et al. [2021], patient features are aggregated at the gene level, resulting in a total of 9,229 genes. Each gene is encoded with binary values (0 or 1) to represent somatic mutation, copy number amplification, and copy number deletion. Consequently, each patient is characterized by a feature vector of dimension 27,687. The dataset is split into a training set of size 20, a validation set of size 100 and the rest as the test set. The objective is to predict the cancer state of patients in the test set as either primary or metastatic.

We compare our COIN model with several machine learning methods and a deep neural network approach. Machine learning methods include logistic regression (LR), support vector machine (SVM), random forest and adaptive boosting (AdaBoost). The deep neural network approach, P-NET Elmarakeby et al. [2021], incorporates curated biological pathways to build a pathway-aware multi-layered hierarchical network. In this network, each neuron represents a gene, and the connections between neurons correspond to biological pathways. As a result, P-NET is a sparse network with 6 layers and a total of 71,009 parameters.

Following Elmarakeby et al. [2021], we adopt the same first layer structure from Elmarakeby et al. [2021] in Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), ResNet and COIN in Table 4. Specifically, each neuron is connected to exactly three nodes in the input feature representing somatic mutation, copy number amplification, and copy number deletion of one gene. To ensure that the performance improvement of our COIN over P-NET does not result from an increase in parameters, the hidden dimension of MLP, ResNet and COIN is set to 3. Consequently, the total number of parameters is 64610 for MLP, and 73840 for ResNet and COIN, which is comparable to that of the P-NET model. Similar to few-shot learning, the weight is computed using a Gaussian kernel based on the Euclidean distance between patient features. However, instead of using the raw 27,687 dimension feature, we pretrain a ResNet and select the 9,229 dimension output after the first layer as the feature for computing distance.

Table 4: Average accuracy, ROC-AUC and AUPRC on prostate classification task.

Method	Accuracy(%)	ROC-AUC	AUPRC
LR	67.90	0.5884	0.4498
SVM	67.01	0.6484	0.4370
Random forest	67.14	0.7307	0.5150
AdaBoost	76.75	0.7094	0.5967
MLP	73.39	0.6540	0.5498
P-NET Elmarakeby et al. [2021]	74.77	0.7720	0.6548
ResNet	78.23	0.7635	0.7100
COIN	80.35	0.8001	0.7598

We conduct a comparison of the accuracy, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC-AUC), and area under the precision-recall curve (AUPRC) for these methods. ROC and PRC shows the true positive rate v.s. false positive rate, and precision v.s. recall, respectively, at different classification thresholds. The results, presented in Table 4, are averaged over 10 random train-validation-test splits and 10 random initializations for each split. Notably, our COIN consistently achieves the highest performance across all evaluation metrics. Compared with ResNet, our COIN

adds several diffusion layers motivated by PDE framework and further improves the classification performance. These results underscore the effectiveness of our axiomatic framework in accurately classifying prostate cancer state.

4 Discussion

4.1 Examples under framework

Under the convection-diffusion framework, we can give interpretation to several regularization mechanisms that are designed to improve robustness, including Gaussian noise injection Wang et al. [2020a], Liu et al. [2020b], ResNet with stochastic dropping out the hidden state of residual block Srivastava et al. [2014], Sun Qi and Qiang [2020] and randomized smoothing Cohen et al. [2019], Li et al. [2019], Salman et al. [2019]. We can also interpret several graph neural networks, including diffusive ones Eliasof et al. [2021], Chamberlain et al. [2021], Wang et al. [2021, 2024] and convective ones Xhonneux et al. [2020], Poli et al. [2021], as a specific example under our unified framework.

Gaussian noise injection Gaussian noise injection is an effective regularization mechanism for a NN model. For a vanilla ResNet with L residual mapping, the l -th residual mapping with Gaussian noise injected can be written as

$$\mathbf{x}_{l+1} = \mathbf{x}_l + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) + a\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$$

where the parameter a is a noise coefficient. Using the same temporal partition as in the introduction, and let $a = \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}$, this noise injection can be viewed as the approximation of the following continuous dynamic using the Euler-Maruyama method,

$$d\mathbf{x}(t) = v(\mathbf{x}(t), t)dt + \sigma d\mathbf{B}(t) \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a Brownian motion. The output of L -th residual mapping is the state of $\hat{I}t\hat{o}$ process (6) at terminal time T . So, an ensemble prediction over multiple networks with shared parameters and random Gaussian noise can be written as a conditional expectation,

$$\hat{y} = \mathbb{E}(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}(T)) | \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0). \quad (7)$$

According to Feynman-Kac formula Mao [2007], (7) is known to solve the following convection-diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \Delta u(\mathbf{x}, t), & t \in [0, T] \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}). \end{cases}$$

Dropout of Hidden Units Consider the case that we disable every hidden units independently from a Bernoulli distribution $\mathcal{B}(1, p)$ with $p \in (0, 1)$ in each residual mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{l+1} &= \mathbf{x}_l + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) \odot \frac{\mathbf{z}_l}{p} \\ &= \mathbf{x}_l + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) \odot \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}_l}{p} - \mathbf{I}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{z}_l \sim \mathcal{B}(1, p)$ namely $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{z}_n = 0) = 1 - p$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{z}_n = 1) = p$ and $\odot$ indicates the Hadamard product. If the number of the ensemble is large enough, according to Central Limit Theorem, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) \odot \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}_l}{p} - \mathbf{I}\right) \approx \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{w}_l) \odot \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1-p}{p})$$

The similar way with Gaussian noise injection, the ensemble prediction $\hat{y}$ can be viewed as the solution $u(\mathbf{x}, T)$ of an convection-diffusion equation with diffusion term

$$\frac{1-p}{2p} \sum_i (v^T v)_{i,i} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i^2}(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

Compared with adding Gaussian noise, which is an isotropic model, dropout of hidden units is an anisotropic model, because the noise introduced by dropout is related to the output of previous layer. In fact, similar to dropout, shake-shake regularization Gastaldi [2017], Huang and Narayanan [2018] and ResNet with stochastic depth Huang et al. [2016] can also be interpreted by our convection-diffusion equation model.

Randomized Smoothing Consider transforming a trained classifier into a new smoothed classifier by adding Gaussian noise to the input during inference. If we denote the trained classifier by $h(\mathbf{x})$ and denote the new smoothed classifier by $g(\mathbf{x})$. Then $h(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$ have the following relation:

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon_i) \approx \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)} [h(\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon)]$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$. According to Feynman-Kac formula, $g(\mathbf{x})$ can be viewed as the solution of the following PDE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \Delta u, & t \in [0, 1] \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = h(\mathbf{x}). \end{cases}$$

Especially, when $h(\mathbf{x})$ is a ResNet, the smoothed classifier $g(\mathbf{x}) = u(\mathbf{x}, T + 1)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t), & t \in [0, T] \\ \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \Delta u, & t \in [T, T + 1] \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}). \end{cases}$$

We extend the terminal time T to $T + 1$ to emphasize that randomized smoothing is a post-processing step.

Diffusive Graph Neural Network Some models, e.g. PDE-GCN Eliasof et al. [2021], GRAND Chamberlain et al. [2021], DGC Wang et al. [2021], introduce diffusion in graph neural network, which corresponds to the diffusion part in our convection-diffusion framework. Diff-ResNet Wang et al. [2024] contains both convection and diffusion, but its formulation is derived from ODE perspective. Thus the diffusion is applied on the features $\mathbf{x}$, rather than on the value $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

Convective Graph Neural Network There are some methods, including CGNN Xhonneux et al. [2020] and GCDE Poli et al. [2021], which models the forward propagation from the perspective of ODE,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = v(\mathbf{x}(t), t)$$

As stated in the introduction, it can be viewed as the characteristics of the convective PDE,

$$\frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = -v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad t \in [0, T]$$

Nonetheless, these methods belong to the ODE category, ignoring the diffusion term during forward propagation.

4.2 More explanation on assumptions

We compare our assumptions with the corresponding assumptions in the scale space theory, providing their common ground and difference below.

[Comparison Principle] In scale-space theory, especially for the transformation on grey-scale images, the comparison principle means that if one grey-scale image is everywhere brighter than another image, this ordering should be preserved along with the smoothing of the original picture. However, when the goal is to find the edges or depth map in the image, the comparison principle is no longer valid. However, from our NN perspective, comparison principle is natural and always valid, since the ordering between classifiers should be the same, no matter the input is raw data point or extracted feature.

[Markov Property] Markov Property corresponds to *Recursivity*, or slightly weaker *Causality*, in scale space theory. It is natural that a coarser analysis of the original picture can be inferred from a finer one without any reliance on the original picture itself. It is also natural in NN due to the feed-forward structure of network design.

[Linearity] Linearity is not a common assumption in the field of scale space theory, as there exists both linear processes Koenderink [1984], Canny [1986] and nonlinear processes Perona and Malik [1990], depending on the filters. However, it is an inherent property of NN, as discussed in the theoretical results. Such linear combination is widely used in practice known as ensemble methods Zhou [2012]. It is a popular method in machine learning which combines many weak classifiers and add them to obtain a strong classifier.

[Locality] Locality describes the local characterization of the operator, and is crucial for both scale space theory and ours, as they both use PDE to describe the evolution of the operator. Using the assumptions other than Locality, we may prove the existence of an infinitesimal generator, $(\mathcal{T}_t(f) - f)/t$. Then, the meaning of locality is that if two functions have the same derivatives at some point, then they have the same infinitesimal generator at this point.

[Spatial Regularity] The most relevant axiom in scale-space theory is translation invariance, which means

$$\mathcal{T}_t(\tau_h f) = \tau_h(\mathcal{T}_t f)$$

It is stronger than our assumption as it requires absolute equivalence. The concept of translation invariance stems from the idea that there should be no prior knowledge about the specific location of a feature in an image. In convolutional neural networks Lecun et al. [1998], translation invariance is achieved by a combination of convolutional layers and pooling layers. For example, a cat is recognized as a cat regardless of whether it appears in the top or bottom half of an image. However, we do not intend to manually design the neural network structure to strictly enforce this level of invariance. Instead, we relax the constraint to allow for some variations.

Spatial regularity may also be beneficial for adversarial robustness. NNs have been shown to be vulnerable to some well-designed input samples, which are called adversarial samples Goodfellow et al. [2015], Kurakin et al. [2017]. These adversarial samples are produced by adding carefully hand-crafted perturbations to the inputs of the targeted model. Although these perturbations are imperceptible to human eyes, they can fool NNs to make wrong prediction. In some sense, the existence of these adversarial examples is due to spatial unstability of NNs. We hope the new model $\mathcal{T}_t(f)$ to be spatially stable by adding spatial regularity.

[Temporal Regularity] Temporal regularity is used in both scale-space theory and in our NN framework, which ensures the existence of PDE. The first inequality states a natural assumption about continuity. When $s = 0$, it reduces to

$$\|\mathcal{T}_t(f) - f\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ct$$

which means that the change should be small when the evolution time is short. It is related to stiffness in the field of numerical solution of differential equations. A stiff equation generally means that there is rapid variation in the solution, and thus we need extremely small steps when numerically solving the equation. Stiffness is not a desirable property of differential equations, and thus we require temporal regularity in the framework. The second inequality is a natural extension for time origin from $t = 0$ to $t \geq 0$.

4.3 Extra Comments

Why do we want to use an axiomatic framework? Why do we say it can improve the interpretability of NNs? Some may question this, arguing that since the analytic expression of solutions to convection-diffusion equations is intractable, the framework has nothing to do with interpretability. However, it is important to clarify that we are referring to the interpretability of the model itself, rather than the interpretability of the model results.

An instructive would be Maxwell’s equations, which serve as the foundation of classical electromagnetism. These equations are derived from several fundamental laws in physics, such as Gauss’s law and Faraday’s law. They help scientists understand the underlying principles governing electricity, magnetism, and light. Although it is generally not possible to solve Maxwell’s equations analytically, this does not diminish the interpretability provided by the equations. Similarly, in our framework, the solution to the convection-diffusion model is not the primary concern; rather, it is the assumptions made and the intuition behind those assumptions that truly matter.

Regarding the time and space complexity of our algorithm, we provide the average time per training epoch, average convergence time per task, and allocated GPU memory of our COIN, compared to other methods, on graph node classification tasks. The experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090. It is worth noting that we have used the same early-stopping criterion for all methods, ensuring a fair comparison in terms of average convergence time. Our method incorporates diffusion on the output $u = f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^c$, where c represents the number of classes. As the class number is significantly smaller than the feature dimension (e.g., 7 vs. 1433 for Cora dataset), our method exhibits low time and space complexity, even with multiple diffusion layers. As shown in Figure 3, our method demonstrates significantly reduced per-epoch time and convergence time compared to certain methods in the ODE and Diffusion categories, such as CGNN and GRAND, while achieving superior results. The time complexity results for Cora and Citeseer are provided in the Supplementary Information. In Figure 4, even with multiple diffusion layers ($K = 20$ in graph node classification tasks), COIN does not occupy much memory.

Currently, the weight in the adjacency matrix is either given or pre-computed, which fix the correlation between data samples. Nonetheless, it is possible to introduce attention mechanism to dynamically adjust the pairwise weight. By learning the attention parameter, we may model more complex relationship, and we leave as future work.




Figure 3: Time complexity on Citeseer dataset. The x-axis represents average time (seconds) per training epoch, and the y-axis represents average convergence time (seconds) per task, both in log-scale. The color bar measures the average accuracy of each method.




Figure 4: Space complexity shown in bar plot. The y-axis represents the allocated GPU memory (MB) in log-scale.

5 Materials and Methods

5.1 Graph Node Classification

For all datasets, we treat the graph as undirected and only consider the largest connected component.

Table 5: Graph Node Classification Dataset Statistics.

Dataset	Node	Edge	Class	Feature Dim	Label Rate
Cora	2485	5069	7	1433	0.057
Citeseer	2120	3679	6	3703	0.056
Pubmed	19717	44324	3	500	0.003

We follow the normalization technique in GCN Kipf and Welling [2017]: the adjacent matrix is first added with a self-loop, and then symmetrically normalized. The feature vectors are row normalized.

We use the Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.01. Weight decay is $5e-4$ for Cora and Pubmed, 0.01 for Citeseer. Dropout is not used in this experiment. The early stopping criteria is the validation loss does not decrease and the

validation accuracy does not increase for 50 epochs. Parameters are chosen based on the accuracy on the validation set. The number of diffusion layers K is fixed to be 20 for all datasets. The strength for each layer σ^2 is 0.35 for Cora, 0.4 for Citeseer, and 0.3 for Pubmed.

5.2 Few-shot learning

We train the backbone on the base classes using cross-entropy loss with label smoothing factor of 0.1, SGD optimizer, standard data augmentation and a mini-batch size of 256 to train all models. The model is trained for $T = 100$ epochs for *miniImageNet* and *tieredImageNet*, and $T = 400$ epochs for CUB due to its small size. We use a multi-step scheduler, which decays the learning rate by 0.1 at $0.5T$ and $0.75T$. We evaluate the nearest-prototype classification accuracy on the validation set and obtain the best model.

Following previous works Wang et al. [2019], Ziko et al. [2020], two additional feature transformation skills are used to enhance the performance. (1) Centering and Normalization: $x = x - \bar{x}$ then $x = x/\|x\|_2$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{X}_s \cup \mathbb{X}_q$, where $\bar{x}$ is the base class average. (2) Cross-Domain Shift: $x = x + \Delta$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{X}_q$, where $\Delta = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{X}_s|} \sum_{\mathbb{X}_s} x - \frac{1}{|\mathbb{X}_q|} \sum_{\mathbb{X}_q} x$ is the difference between the mean of features within the support set and the mean of features within the query set.

Weight is calculated by $w_{ij} = \exp(-\|x_i - x_j\|_2^2 / \sigma(x_i)^2)$, where $\sigma(x_i) = k$ means σ is chosen to be the k -th closest distance from a specific point x_i , so it varies with points. We choose $n_{\text{top}} = 8$, which truncates weight matrix to the 8-th nearest neighbor, and $\sigma = 4$. Weight is symmetrically normalized. The diffusion step size σ^2 is fixed to be 0.5 for all tasks. The number of diffusion layers number K varies with tasks: for 1-shot learning, $K = 10$ for all datasets; for 5-shot learning, $K = 4$ for *miniImageNet* and CUB, $K = 2$ for *tieredImageNet*. The optimizer is SGD with initial learning rate 0.1, momentum = 0.9 and weight_decay = $1e-4$. We train $T = 100$ epochs. We use a multi-step scheduler, which decays the learning rate by 0.1 at $0.5T$ and $0.75T$.

5.3 COVID-19 case prediction with missing data

For all methods, we select ELU Clevert et al. [2016] as the activation function due to its slightly better performance. When normalizing the adjacency matrix for PDE-ResNet, we exclude the self-loop by setting the diagonal elements to zero. We also experiment with removing the self-loop for other methods, but find that doing so negatively affects their performance. Hence, we only employ this technique for our PDE-ResNet.

We use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.01 and weight decay of $5e-4$ to train our network for 100 epochs. We choose a hidden dimension of 16 for MLP, ResNet and our PDE-ResNet. The dropout rate is set to 0.5 for all other methods, while for PDE-ResNet, it is set to 0.25, because we apply dropout after each diffusion layer. The selection of the dropout rate is based on testing the MSE on the validation set using a grid search. In our model architecture, we used $K = 10$ layers with $\sigma^2 = 0.5$, which aligns with the settings in few-shot learning.

5.4 Prostrate cancer classification

We use the SGD optimizer with a initial learning rate of 1.0 and weight decay of $5e-4$ to train our PDE-ResNet for $T = 300$ epochs. We use a multi-step scheduler, which decays the learning rate by 0.1 at $0.5T$ and $0.75T$. When calculating the weight, we first pretrain a ResNet for 300 epochs with the same optimizer as above. Output after the first layer is used as the feature to calculate weight for each patient. Weight is calculated in the same way as in few-shot learning, and the parameters are $n_{\text{top}} = 40$, $\sigma = 20$. Diffusion parameters are $K = 40$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.2$.

5.5 Data, Materials, and Software Availability

Code and data for reproducing results in the paper has been deposited in <https://github.com/shwangtangjun/COIN>.

6 Conclusion

Motivated by the scale-space theory, we theoretically prove that the evolution from a base classifier to neural networks can be modeled by a convection-diffusion equation. Based on the theoretical results, we develop a novel network structure and verify its effectiveness through extensive experiments. We are aware that modeling the convection-diffusion equation through introducing diffusion mechanism is one of the many possible approaches, and we are looking forward to explore other paths in the future work.

References

- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- George E. Dahl, Dong Yu, Li Deng, and Alex Acero. Context-dependent pre-trained deep neural networks for large-vocabulary speech recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 20(1):30–42, 2011. doi:10.1109/TASL.2011.2134090.
- Liefeng Bo, Kevin Lai, Xiaofeng Ren, and Dieter Fox. Object recognition with hierarchical kernel descriptors. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 1729–1736, 2011. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2011.5995719.
- Limin Wang, Yuanjun Xiong, Zhe Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Xiaoou Tang, and Luc Van Gool. Temporal segment networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 20–36. Springer, 2016.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016a.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 630–645. Springer, 2016b.
- Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. Wide residual networks. In *British Machine Vision Conference 2016*. British Machine Vision Association, 2016.
- Saining Xie, Ross Girshick, Piotr Dollár, Zhuowen Tu, and Kaiming He. Aggregated residual transformations for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1492–1500, 2017.
- Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- Weinan E. A proposal on machine learning via dynamical systems. *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics*, 5(1):1–11, 2017.
- Eldad Haber, Lars Ruthotto, Elliot Holtham, and Seong-Hwan Jun. Learning across scales—multiscale methods for convolution neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Ricky TQ Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Gustav Larsson, Michael Maire, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. Fractalnet: Ultra-deep neural networks without residuals. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1VaB4cex>.
- Xingcheng Zhang, Zhizhong Li, Chen Change Loy, and Dahua Lin. Polynet: A pursuit of structural diversity in very deep networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 718–726, 2017.
- Yiping Lu, Aoxiao Zhong, Quanzheng Li, and Bin Dong. Beyond finite layer neural networks: Bridging deep architectures and numerical differential equations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3276–3285. PMLR, 2018.
- Junteng Jia and Austin R Benson. Neural jump stochastic differential equations. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/59b1deff341edb0b76ace57820cef237-Paper.pdf.
- Sho Sonoda and Noboru Murata. Transport analysis of infinitely deep neural network. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):31–82, 2019.
- Tao Yunzhe Sun Qi and Du Qiang. Stochastic training of residual networks in deep learning. *Mathematica Numerica Sinica*, 42(3):349, 2020.
- Bao Wang, Binjie Yuan, Zuoqiang Shi, and Stanley J Osher. Enresnet: Resnets ensemble via the feynman–kac formalism for adversarial defense and beyond. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 2(3):559–582, 2020a.
- Jan J Koenderink. The structure of images. *Biological cybernetics*, 50(5):363–370, 1984.
- Andrew P Witkin. Scale-space filtering. In *Readings in computer vision*, pages 329–332. Elsevier, 1987.
- John Canny. A computational approach to edge detection. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 8(6):679–698, 1986.

-
- P. Perona and J. Malik. Scale-space and edge detection using anisotropic diffusion. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 12(7):629–639, 1990. doi:10.1109/34.56205.
- Luis Alvarez, Frédéric Guichard, Pierre-Louis Lions, and Jean-Michel Morel. Axioms and fundamental equations of image processing. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 123(3):199–257, 1993.
- Remco Duits, Luc Florack, Jan De Graaf, and Bart ter Haar Romeny. On the axioms of scale space theory. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 20:267–298, 2004.
- Tangjun Wang, Zehao Dou, Chenglong Bao, and Zuoqiang Shi. Diffusion mechanism in residual neural network: Theory and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(2):667–680, 2024. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2023.3272341.
- Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mumme, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation, 2019.
- Zhilin Yang, William Cohen, and Ruslan Salakhudinov. Revisiting semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 40–48. PMLR, 2016.
- Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- Will Hamilton, Zitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJXmpikCZ>.
- Felix Wu, Amauri Souza, Tianyi Zhang, Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Weinberger. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6861–6871. PMLR, 2019.
- Johannes Gasteiger, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019a.
- Louis-Pascal Xhonneux, Meng Qu, and Jian Tang. Continuous graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10432–10441. PMLR, 2020.
- Michael Poli, Stefano Massaroli, Junyoung Park, Atsushi Yamashita, Hajime Asama, and Jinkyoo Park. Graph neural ordinary differential equations, 2021.
- Johannes Gasteiger, Stefan Weißenberger, and Stephan Günnemann. Diffusion improves graph learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019b.
- Bingbing Xu, Huawei Shen, Qi Cao, Keting Cen, and Xueqi Cheng. Graph convolutional networks using heat kernel for semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1928–1934. AAAI Press, 2019.
- Yifei Wang, Yisen Wang, Jiansheng Yang, and Zhouchen Lin. Dissecting the diffusion process in linear graph convolutional networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:5758–5769, 2021.
- Qitian Wu, Chenxiao Yang, Wentao Zhao, Yixuan He, David Wipf, and Junchi Yan. Difformer: Scalable (graph) transformers induced by energy constrained diffusion. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- Ben Chamberlain, James Rowbottom, Maria I Gorinova, Michael Bronstein, Stefan Webb, and Emanuele Rossi. Grand: Graph neural diffusion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1407–1418. PMLR, 2021.
- Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro Perona. One-shot learning of object categories. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 28(4):594–611, 2006.
- Oriol Vinyals, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Daan Wierstra, et al. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29:3630–3638, 2016.
- Yaqing Wang, Quanming Yao, James T Kwok, and Lionel M Ni. Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 53(3):1–34, 2020b.
- Siyuan Qiao, Chenxi Liu, Wei Shen, and Alan L Yuille. Few-shot image recognition by predicting parameters from activations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7229–7238, 2018.

-
- Andrei A Rusu, Dushyant Rao, Jakub Sygnowski, Oriol Vinyals, Razvan Pascanu, Simon Osindero, and Raia Hadsell. Meta-learning with latent embedding optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard Zemel. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Spyros Gidaris, Andrei Bursuc, Nikos Komodakis, Patrick Pérez, and Matthieu Cord. Boosting few-shot visual learning with self-supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8059–8068, 2019.
- Han-Jia Ye, Hexiang Hu, De-Chuan Zhan, and Fei Sha. Few-shot learning via embedding adaptation with set-to-set functions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8808–8817, 2020.
- Guneet Singh Dhillon, Pratik Chaudhari, Avinash Ravichandran, and Stefano Soatto. A baseline for few-shot image classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Jinlu Liu, Liang Song, and Yongqiang Qin. Prototype rectification for few-shot learning. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020*, pages 741–756. Springer, 2020a.
- Yuqing Hu, Vincent Gripon, and Stéphane Pateux. Leveraging the feature distribution in transfer-based few-shot learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 487–499. Springer, 2021.
- Yan Wang, Wei-Lun Chao, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Laurens van der Maaten. Simpleshot: Revisiting nearest-neighbor classification for few-shot learning, 2019.
- Imtiaz Ziko, Jose Dolz, Eric Granger, and Ismail Ben Ayed. Laplacian regularized few-shot learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 11660–11670. PMLR, 2020.
- Pau Rodríguez, Issam Laradji, Alexandre Drouin, and Alexandre Lacoste. Embedding propagation: Smoother manifold for few-shot classification. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020*, pages 121–138. Springer, 2020.
- Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International journal of computer vision*, 115(3):211–252, 2015.
- C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie. The Caltech-UCSD Birds-200-2011 Dataset. Technical Report CNS-TR-2011-001, California Institute of Technology, 2011.
- Abdelhafid Zeroual, Fouzi Harrou, Abdelkader Dairi, and Ying Sun. Deep learning methods for forecasting covid-19 time-series data: A comparative study. *Chaos, solitons & fractals*, 140:110121, 2020.
- Vinay Kumar Reddy Chimmula and Lei Zhang. Time series forecasting of covid-19 transmission in canada using lstm networks. *Chaos, solitons & fractals*, 135:109864, 2020.
- Ratnabali Pal, Arif Ahmed Sekh, Samarjit Kar, and Dilip K Prasad. Neural network based country wise risk prediction of covid-19. *Applied Sciences*, 10(18):6448, 2020.
- Zixin Hu, Qiyang Ge, Shudi Li, Li Jin, and Momiao Xiong. Artificial intelligence forecasting of covid-19 in china, 2020.
- Amol Kapoor, Xue Ben, Luyang Liu, Bryan Perozzi, Matt Barnes, Martin Blais, and Shawn O’Banion. Examining covid-19 forecasting using spatio-temporal graph neural networks, 2020.
- George Panagopoulos, Giannis Nikolentzos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. Transfer graph neural networks for pandemic forecasting. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(6):4838–4845, May 2021. doi:10.1609/aaai.v35i6.16616.
- Junyi Gao, Rakshith Sharma, Cheng Qian, Lucas M Glass, Jeffrey Spaeder, Justin Romberg, Jimeng Sun, and Cao Xiao. Stan: spatio-temporal attention network for pandemic prediction using real-world evidence. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(4):733–743, 2021.
- Cornelius Fritz, Emilio Dorigatti, and David Rügamer. Combining graph neural networks and spatio-temporal disease models to improve the prediction of weekly covid-19 cases in germany. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):3930, 2022.
- Benedek Rozemberczki, Paul Scherer, Yixuan He, George Panagopoulos, Alexander Riedel, Maria Astefanoaei, Oliver Kiss, Ferenc Beres, Guzmán López, Nicolas Collignon, et al. Pytorch geometric temporal: Spatiotemporal signal processing with neural machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 4564–4573, 2021.
- Yaguang Li, Rose Yu, Cyrus Shahabi, and Yan Liu. Diffusion convolutional recurrent neural network: Data-driven traffic forecasting. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR ’18)*, 2018.

-
- Youngjoo Seo, Michaël Defferrard, Pierre Vandergheynst, and Xavier Bresson. Structured sequence modeling with graph convolutional recurrent networks. In *Neural Information Processing: 25th International Conference, ICONIP 2018, Siem Reap, Cambodia, December 13-16, 2018, Proceedings, Part I* 25, pages 362–373. Springer, 2018.
- Jiandong Bai, Jiawei Zhu, Yujiao Song, Ling Zhao, Zhixiang Hou, Ronghua Du, and Haifeng Li. A3t-gcn: Attention temporal graph convolutional network for traffic forecasting. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10(7): 485, 2021.
- Aldo Pareja, Giacomo Domeniconi, Jie Chen, Tengfei Ma, Toyotaro Suzumura, Hiroki Kanezashi, Tim Kaler, Tao Schardl, and Charles Leiserson. Evolvegcn: Evolving graph convolutional networks for dynamic graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 5363–5370, 2020.
- Dan Robinson, Eliezer M Van Allen, Yi-Mi Wu, Nikolaus Schultz, Robert J Lonigro, Juan-Miguel Mosquera, Bruce Montgomery, Mary-Ellen Taplin, Colin C Pritchard, Gerhardt Attard, et al. Integrative clinical genomics of advanced prostate cancer. *Cell*, 161(5):1215–1228, 2015.
- Wassim Abida, Joanna Cyrta, Glenn Heller, Davide Prandi, Joshua Armenia, Ilsa Coleman, Marcin Cieslik, Matteo Benelli, Dan Robinson, Eliezer M Van Allen, et al. Genomic correlates of clinical outcome in advanced prostate cancer. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(23):11428–11436, 2019.
- Haitham A Elmarakeby, Justin Hwang, Rand Arafeh, Jett Crowdis, Sydney Gang, David Liu, Saud H AlDubayan, Keyan Salari, Steven Kregel, Camden Richter, et al. Biologically informed deep neural network for prostate cancer discovery. *Nature*, 598(7880):348–352, 2021.
- Joshua Armenia, Stephanie AM Wankowicz, David Liu, Jianjiong Gao, Ritika Kundra, Ed Reznik, Walid K Chatila, Debyani Chakravarty, G Celine Han, Ilsa Coleman, et al. The long tail of oncogenic drivers in prostate cancer. *Nature genetics*, 50(5):645–651, 2018.
- Xuanqing Liu, Si Si, Qin Cao, Sanjiv Kumar, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. How does noise help robustness? explanation and exploration under the neural sde framework. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 282–290, 2020b.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research*, 15(1):1929–1958, 2014.
- Jeremy Cohen, Elan Rosenfeld, and Zico Kolter. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1310–1320. PMLR, 2019.
- Bai Li, Changyou Chen, Wenlin Wang, and Lawrence Carin. Certified adversarial robustness with additive noise. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Hadi Salman, Greg Yang, Jerry Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Huan Zhang, Ilya Razenshteyn, and Sébastien Bubeck. Provably robust deep learning via adversarially trained smoothed classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 11292–11303, 2019.
- Moshe Eliasof, Eldad Haber, and Eran Treister. PDE-GCN: Novel architectures for graph neural networks motivated by partial differential equations. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wWtk6GxJB2x>.
- Xuerong Mao. *Stochastic differential equations and applications*. Elsevier, 2007.
- Xavier Gastaldi. Shake-shake regularization, 2017.
- Che-Wei Huang and Shrikanth S Narayanan. Stochastic shake-shake regularization for affective learning from speech. In *INTERSPEECH*, pages 3658–3662, 2018.
- Gao Huang, Yu Sun, Zhuang Liu, Daniel Sedra, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Deep networks with stochastic depth. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 646–661. Springer, 2016.
- Zhi-Hua Zhou. *Ensemble methods: foundations and algorithms*. CRC press, 2012.
- Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998. doi:10.1109/5.726791.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, 2015.
- Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial examples in the physical world, 2017.
- Djork-Arné Clevert, Thomas Unterthiner, and Sepp Hochreiter. Fast and accurate deep network learning by exponential linear units (elus), 2016.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.

-
- Wei-Yu Chen, Yen-Cheng Liu, Zsolt Kira, Yu-Chiang Wang, and Jia-Bin Huang. A closer look at few-shot classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Flood Sung, Yongxin Yang, Li Zhang, Tao Xiang, Philip HS Torr, and Timothy M Hospedales. Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1199–1208, 2018.
- Spyros Gidaris and Nikos Komodakis. Dynamic few-shot visual learning without forgetting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4367–4375, 2018.
- Nikhil Mishra, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Xi Chen, and Pieter Abbeel. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Boris Oreshkin, Pau Rodríguez López, and Alexandre Lacoste. Tadam: Task dependent adaptive metric for improved few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Kwonjoon Lee, Subhransu Maji, Avinash Ravichandran, and Stefano Soatto. Meta-learning with differentiable convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10657–10665, 2019.
- Yanbin Liu, Juho Lee, Minseop Park, Saehoon Kim, Eunho Yang, Sungju Hwang, and Yi Yang. Learning to propagate labels: Transductive propagation network for few-shot learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SyVuRiC5K7>.
- Limeng Qiao, Yemin Shi, Jia Li, Yaowei Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Yonghong Tian. Transductive episodic-wise adaptive metric for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3603–3612, 2019.
- Ruibing Hou, H. Chang, Bingpeng Ma, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Cross attention network for few-shot classification. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- Andrei A. Rusu, Dushyant Rao, Jakub Sygnowski, Oriol Vinyals, Razvan Pascanu, Simon Osindero, and Raia Hadsell. Meta-learning with latent embedding optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BJgklhAcK7>.

Supplementary Information

A Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Following the techniques in Alvarez et al. [1993], we set

$$\delta_{t,s}(f) = \frac{\mathcal{T}_t(f) - \mathcal{T}_s(f)}{t-s}, \quad \delta_t(f) = \delta_{t,0}(f)$$

The proof of theorem mainly consists of two steps. First we will prove that $\delta_t(f)$ converges to a limit as $t \rightarrow 0$, which we call an infinitesimal generator. Then, we verify that the generator satisfies a second-order convection-diffusion equation.

First of all, we describe some basic properties of $\delta_t(f)$. From **[Temporal Regularity]**, we know $\delta_t(f)$ is uniformly bounded,

$$\|\delta_t(f)\|_{L^\infty} = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{T}_t(f) - f}{t} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$$

Also, it is obvious that **[Linearity]** is preserved for $\delta_t(f)$,

$$\delta_t(\beta_1 f + \beta_2 g) = \beta_1 \delta_t(f) + \beta_2 \delta_t(g)$$

Additionally, $\delta_t(f)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{R}^d$, uniformly for $t \in (0, 1]$ and $f \in C_b^\infty$. Indeed, let $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\mathbf{h}\|_2 = h$,

$$\|\tau_{\mathbf{h}}(\delta_t(f)) - \delta_t(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\tau_{\mathbf{h}}(\delta_t(f)) - \delta_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\delta_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f) - \delta_t(f)\|_{L^\infty}$$

The first term can be bounded using **[Spatial Regularity]**,

$$\|\tau_{\mathbf{h}}(\delta_t(f)) - \delta_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f)\|_{L^\infty} = \left\| \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathcal{T}_t f) - \mathcal{T}_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f)}{t} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ch$$

The second term can be bounded using the fact that $f \in C_b^\infty$. We may write $\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f = f + hg$ for some $g \in C_b^\infty$ depending on $\mathbf{h}$, then using linearity and uniform boundedness,

$$\|\delta_t(\tau_{\mathbf{h}}f) - \delta_t(f)\|_{L^\infty} = \|\delta_t(f + hg) - \delta_t(f)\|_{L^\infty} = h\|\delta_t(g)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ch$$

Lastly, since $f \leq g + \|f - g\|_{L^\infty}$, we can use **[Comparison Principle]** and **[Linearity]** to get

$$\mathcal{T}_t(f) \leq \mathcal{T}_t(g + \|f - g\|_{L^\infty}) = \mathcal{T}_t(g) + \|f - g\|_{L^\infty}$$

Thus for any $f, g \in C_b^{\infty 2}$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{T}_t(f) - \mathcal{T}_t(g)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|f - g\|_{L^\infty} \quad (8)$$

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem.

A.1 Existence of infinitesimal generator

First we want to prove:

$$\|\delta_{t+s,t}(f) - \delta_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq m(t) \quad (9)$$

where $m(t)$ is some continuous, nonnegative, nondecreasing function such that $m(0) = 0$, and $m(t)$ depends only on the bounds of derivatives of f .

Since $\delta_s(f)$ not necessarily belongs to C_b^∞ , we mollify $\delta_s(f)$ by introducing a standard mollifier $K \geq 0$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K d\mathbf{y} = 1$, $K \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $K_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d} K(\cdot/\varepsilon)$. Using the Lipschitz continuity of $\delta_s(f)$, we can obtain that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a positive constant C_1 depending only on the derivatives of f , such that

$$\|\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon - \delta_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 \varepsilon. \quad (10)$$

where $*$ denote the convolution. Because of **[Markov Property]**, **[Temporal Regularity]** and (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{t+s}(f) - \mathcal{T}_t \circ \mathcal{T}_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\mathcal{T}_t \circ \mathcal{T}_{t+s,t}(f) - \mathcal{T}_t \circ \mathcal{T}_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{t+s,t}(f) - \mathcal{T}_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cst \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

²By continuity, $\mathcal{T}_t$ can be extended as a mapping from $BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of bounded, uniformly continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ into itself. By density, (8) still hold for f, g in $BUC(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The extension will be used in (11).

By (8) and (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{T}_t \circ \mathcal{T}_s(f) - \mathcal{T}_t(f + s\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\mathcal{T}_s(f) - (f + s\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon)\|_{L^\infty} \\ & = s\|\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon - \delta_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 \varepsilon s \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By **[Linearity]** and **[Temporal Regularity]**, since $\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon \in C_b^\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{T}_t(f + s\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon) - (\mathcal{T}_t(f) + s\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon)\|_{L^\infty} \\ & = s\|\mathcal{T}_t(\delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon) - \delta_s(f) * K_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon s t \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

for some positive constant C_ε depending only on ε . Combining (10), (11), (12) and (13), we finally deduce that

$$\|\delta_{s+t,t}(f) - \delta_s(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2C_1 \varepsilon + C_\varepsilon t + Ct$$

By setting $m(t) = \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} (2C_1 \varepsilon + C_\varepsilon t) + Ct$ we can get desired estimate (9).

Now we give a Cauchy estimate for $\delta_s(f)$. We will prove that

$$\|\delta_t(f) - \delta_h(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\frac{C_0 r}{t} + m(t) \quad \text{where } r = t - Nh, N = \left\lceil \frac{t}{h} \right\rceil$$

Notice that

$$\delta_t(f) = \frac{Nh}{t} \delta_{Nh}(f) + \frac{r}{t} \delta_{Nh+r,Nh}(f)$$

Using (9) with $s = r, t = Nh$ we have

$$\|\delta_{Nh+r}(f) - \frac{Nh}{Nh+r} \delta_{Nh}(f) - \frac{r}{Nh+r} \delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{r}{Nh+r} m(Nh) \quad (14)$$

Again, notice that

$$\delta_{Nh}(f) = \frac{(N-1)h}{Nh} \delta_{(N-1)h}(f) + \frac{h}{Nh} \delta_{Nh,(N-1)h}(f)$$

Using (9) with $s = h, t = (N-1)h$, we have

$$\|\delta_{Nh}(f) - \frac{N-1}{N} \delta_{(N-1)h}(f) - \frac{1}{N} \delta_h(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{N} m((N-1)h) \quad (15)$$

Combining (14) and (15), we obtain

$$\|\delta_t(f) - (N-1)\frac{h}{t} \delta_{(N-1)h}(f) - \frac{h}{t} \delta_h(f) - \frac{r}{t} \delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{r}{t} m(Nh) + \frac{h}{t} m((N-1)h)$$

Reiterating the procedure, we obtain that after $(N-1)$ steps,

$$\|\delta_t(f) - \frac{Nh}{t} \delta_h(f) - \frac{r}{t} \delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{r}{t} m(Nh) + \frac{h}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} m(jh)$$

Since $m(t)$ is nondecreasing and $\delta_t(f)$ is uniformly bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_t(f) - \delta_h(f)\|_{L^\infty} & \leq \|\delta_t(f) - \frac{Nh}{t} \delta_h(f) - \frac{r}{t} \delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{r}{t} \|\delta_h(f) - \delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \leq \frac{r}{t} m(Nh) + \frac{(N-1)h}{t} m(t) + \frac{r}{t} (\|\delta_h(f)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\delta_r(f)\|_{L^\infty}) \\ & \leq m(t) + 2\frac{C_0 r}{t} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_t(f)$ is uniformly bounded and Lipschitz continuous, We can pick h_n going to 0 and $\delta_{h_n}(f)$ converges uniformly on compact sets to a bounded Lipschitz function on $\mathbb{R}^d$, which we denote by $A[f]$ (the infinitesimal generator). Then using the Cauchy estimate we have derived, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\delta_t(f) - \delta_{h_n}(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(t) + 2\frac{C_0 r}{t}$$

which implies

$$\|\delta_t(f) - A[f]\|_{L^\infty} \leq m(t)$$

So $\delta_t(f)$ converges uniformly to $A[f]$ when t goes to 0. Similarly, there exist an operator A_t such that $\delta_{s,t}(f)$ converges uniformly to $A_t[f]$ when s goes to t .

A.2 Second-order convection-diffusion equation

Let $f, g \in C_b^\infty$ and satisfy $f(\mathbf{0}) = g(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ (if not equal to 0, we replace $f(\mathbf{x}), g(\mathbf{x})$ by $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{0}), g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{0})$), $Df(\mathbf{0}) = Dg(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $D^2f(\mathbf{0}) = D^2g(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. We are first going to show that $A[f](\mathbf{0}) = A[g](\mathbf{0})$.

Introduce $f^\varepsilon = f + \varepsilon \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \in C_b^\infty$. Using Taylor formula, there exist a positive constant c such that for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq c\varepsilon$ we have $f^\varepsilon \geq g$. Let $w \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a bump function satisfying

$$\begin{cases} w(\mathbf{x}) = 1 & \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq c/2 \\ 0 \leq w(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1 & c/2 < \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 < c \\ w(\mathbf{x}) = 0 & \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \end{cases}$$

and $w_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = w(\mathbf{x}/\varepsilon)$. Finally we introduce $\bar{f}^\varepsilon = w_\varepsilon f^\varepsilon + (1 - w_\varepsilon)g$ so that $\bar{f}_0^\varepsilon \geq g$ on the whole domain $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then because of **[Comparison Principle]**, $\mathcal{T}_t(\bar{f}^\varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{T}_t(g)$. Since $\bar{f}^\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) = f^\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) = f(\mathbf{0}) = g(\mathbf{0})$, we can get $A[\bar{f}](\mathbf{0}) \geq A[g](\mathbf{0})$. Because there exists a neighborhood of $\mathbf{0}$ that $\bar{f}^\varepsilon = f^\varepsilon$, we have $D^\alpha \bar{f}^\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) = D^\alpha f^\varepsilon(\mathbf{0})$ for $\forall |\alpha| \geq 0$. In view of **[Locality]** we have $A[\bar{f}^\varepsilon](\mathbf{0}) = A[f^\varepsilon](\mathbf{0})$. And considering the continuity of A , we can deduce $A[\bar{f}^\varepsilon](\mathbf{0})$ converges to $A[f](\mathbf{0})$ in L^∞ when ε goes to 0. This means $A[f](\mathbf{0}) \geq A[g](\mathbf{0})$. By symmetry, we can get $A[f](\mathbf{0}) \leq A[g](\mathbf{0})$, which means $A[f](\mathbf{0}) = A[g](\mathbf{0})$.

Also, in our proof, $\mathbf{0}$ can be replaced by any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. So the value of $A[f](\mathbf{x})$ only depends on $\mathbf{x}, f, Df, D^2f$. Observe that from **[Linearity]**, $A[f + C] = A[f]$ for any constant C , so $A[f](\mathbf{x})$ only depends on $\mathbf{x}, Df, D^2f$. At last, we prove that there exists a continuous function F such that

$$A[f] = F(Df, D^2f, \mathbf{x})$$

From **[Comparison Principle]** of $\mathcal{T}_t$, we can derive a similar argument for F . Let $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$ and set

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \left[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \right] w(\mathbf{x}), \quad g(\mathbf{x}) = \left[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \right] w(\mathbf{x})$$

Indeed, $f \geq g$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ while $f(\mathbf{0}) = g(\mathbf{0})$. Using **[Comparison Principle]**,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{0}) &= A[f](\mathbf{0}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{T}_t(f)(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{0})}{t} \\ &\geq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{T}_t(g)(\mathbf{0}) - g(\mathbf{0})}{t} = A[g](\mathbf{0}) = F(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{0}) \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{0}$ can be replaced by any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus

$$F(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B} \quad (16)$$

In the same way, we can get

$$A_t[f] = F(D(\mathcal{T}_t(f)), D^2(\mathcal{T}_t(f)), \mathbf{x}, t)$$

which implies $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{T}_t(f)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = F(Du, D^2u, \mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in [0, T] \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x}). \end{cases}$$

According to **[Linearity]**, F therefore satisfies

$$F(rDf + sDg, rD^2f + sD^2g, \mathbf{x}, t) = rF(Df, D^2f, \mathbf{x}, t) + sF(Dg, D^2g, \mathbf{x}, t)$$

for any real numbers r and s and any functions f and g and at any point $(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Since the values of Df, Dg, D^2f, D^2g are arbitrary and can be independently taken to be 0, we obtain for any vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2$ and symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2$ and any fixed point $(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} F(r\mathbf{v}_1 + s\mathbf{v}_2, r\mathbf{A}_1 + s\mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) &= rF(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) + sF(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \\ F(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) &= F(\mathbf{v}_1, 0, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) + F(0, \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$F(\mathbf{v}, 0, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) = F_1(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0), F(0, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) = F_2(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0)$$

Then F_1 and F_2 are both linear, i.e., there exists a function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) &= v(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \cdot \mathbf{v}, \\ F_2(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) &= \sum_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, t) A_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{i,j}$ is the i, j -th element of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and $\sigma_{i,j}$ is the i, j -th element of matrix function σ .

If we choose $\mathbf{A} = \boldsymbol{\xi} \boldsymbol{\xi}^T \succeq \mathbf{0}$, where $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d)^T$ is a d -dimension vector, then according to (16),

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^T \sigma(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \boldsymbol{\xi} = \sum_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \xi_i \xi_j = F_2(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \geq F_2(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0) = 0$$

which implies matrix function σ is a positive semi-definite function.

Thus we can finally get there exist a Lipschitz continuous function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a Lipschitz continuous positive semi-definite function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{T}_t(f)$ is the solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = v(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x}), \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the i, j -th element of matrix function $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$. □

B Additional Experiment results

First we provide a detailed results for graph node classification tasks.

Table 6: Performance comparison on graph node classification tasks. In each cell, the first row represents average accuracy $\pm$ standard variation, the second row represents training time per epoch / average convergence time per task (seconds), and the third row represents allocated GPU memory. Results marked with * indicate that they are averaged across 40 random splits with 10 random initialization each, due to excessive time consumption per task.

Category	Method	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed
Classic	MLP	57.4 $\pm$ 2.1 1.896 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 0.420 1141 MB	59.9 $\pm$ 2.2 2.085 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 0.521 1195 MB	70.0 $\pm$ 2.0 2.591 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 0.504 4107 MB
	GCN Kipf and Welling [2017]	81.6 $\pm$ 1.1 3.072 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.240 1147 MB	72.1 $\pm$ 1.6 3.271 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.152 1201 MB	79.0 $\pm$ 2.1 3.614 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.617 4113 MB
	GraphSAGE Hamilton et al. [2017]	79.3 $\pm$ 1.4 3.380 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.161 1263 MB	71.7 $\pm$ 1.6 3.646 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.172 1339 MB	76.1 $\pm$ 2.0 4.746 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.660 4109 MB
	GAT Veličković et al. [2018]	80.8 $\pm$ 1.3 7.296 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.397 1291 MB	71.6 $\pm$ 1.7 7.641 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.324 1381 MB	78.7 $\pm$ 2.1 0.0157 / 3.374 4123 MB
	SGC Wu et al. [2019]	80.5 $\pm$ 1.3 1.671 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 2.797 413 MB	73.9 $\pm$ 1.4 1.531 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 2.126 495 MB	77.2 $\pm$ 2.6 2.090 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 1.545 527 MB
	APPNP Gasteiger et al. [2019a]	82.7 $\pm$ 1.1 0.0143 / 12.41 373 MB	73.3 $\pm$ 1.5 0.0150 / 8.824 433 MB	80.6 $\pm$ 1.8 0.0195 / 8.974 475 MB
ODE	CGNN Xhonneux et al. [2020]	82.5* $\pm$ 1.0 0.3369 / 293.6 451 MB	73.0* $\pm$ 1.6 0.2744 / 110.7 459 MB	80.5* $\pm$ 2.2 0.2678 / 133.2 951 MB
	GCDE Poli et al. [2021]	80.0 $\pm$ 1.5 0.0205 / 12.24 387 MB	72.1 $\pm$ 1.6 0.0207 / 15.53 429 MB	76.0 $\pm$ 3.9 0.0216 / 6.309 3353 MB
Diffusion	GDC Gasteiger et al. [2019b]	81.6 $\pm$ 1.3 8.374 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 2.641 1815 MB	72.2 $\pm$ 2.6 5.716 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 2.421 1241 MB	79.0 $\pm$ 2.0 0.0489 / 7.112 4909 MB
	GraphHeat Xu et al. [2019]	81.4 $\pm$ 1.2 7.803 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 3.930 431 MB	73.5 $\pm$ 1.5 8.397 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 3.256 467 MB	78.4* $\pm$ 2.1 0.2488 / 84.01 3095 MB
	DGC Wang et al. [2021]	81.4 $\pm$ 1.2 1.678 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 4.164 413 MB	75.0 $\pm$ 1.9 1.797 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 0.5149 495 MB	78.2 $\pm$ 2.1 4.324 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 3.545 567 MB
	Difformer Wu et al. [2023]	82.0 $\pm$ 2.3 0.0431 / 18.61 1205 MB	71.9 $\pm$ 1.7 0.0265 / 31.27 1187 MB	74.8 $\pm$ 4.5 0.0469 / 48.31 4153 MB
	GRAND Chamberlain et al. [2021]	82.5 $\pm$ 1.4 0.0879 / 11.20 2879 MB	73.7 $\pm$ 1.7 0.1257 / 19.39 2617 MB	78.8 $\pm$ 1.8 0.3631 / 59.41 14247 MB
	Diff-ResNet Wang et al. [2024]	82.1 $\pm$ 1.1 0.0413 / 12.60 552 MB	74.6 $\pm$ 1.8 0.0758 / 16.38 1163 MB	80.1 $\pm$ 2.0 0.0509 / 17.35 829 MB
	COIN	82.2 $\pm$ 1.2 6.256 $\times 10^{-3}$ / 0.798 484 MB	75.8 $\pm$ 1.3 0.0134 / 2.081 906 MB	81.1 $\pm$ 1.9 0.0229 / 3.769 558 MB

Then we provide a comparison between the reported results (if available) and our re-implemented results of several methods. There are several reasons for the performance discrepancies. Firstly, some methods use a fixed train-val-test split, such as GCDE, GraphHeat, DGC, etc. These methods are likely to overfit on a specific split. Secondly, while some other methods, such as GDC, APPNP, GRAND, also use 100 random train-val-test splits with 20 random neural network initializations each, their validation set has 1500 data points, which is much larger than ours ($30 \times$ class number). Lastly, these methods may set a fixed training epoch or utilize various early-stopping criteria, while we use the same early-stopping criterion across all methods in the re-implementation, which is the validation loss does not decrease or validation accuracy does not increase for 50 epochs.

Table 7: Performance difference between reported results (first row) and our re-implementation results (second row).

Category	Method	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed
Classic	GCN	80.1 ± 0.5	67.9 ± 0.5	78.9 ± 0.7
		81.6 ± 1.1	72.1 ± 1.6	79.0 ± 2.1
	GAT	83.0 ± 0.7	72.5 ± 0.7	79.0 ± 0.3
		80.8 ± 1.3	71.6 ± 1.7	78.7 ± 2.1
ODE	SGC	80.6 ± 1.2	71.4 ± 4.0	77.0 ± 1.6
		80.5 ± 1.3	73.9 ± 1.4	77.2 ± 2.6
	APPNP	83.8 ± 0.2	75.8 ± 0.3	79.7 ± 0.3
		82.7 ± 1.1	73.3 ± 1.5	80.6 ± 1.8
	CGNN	82.7 ± 1.2	72.7 ± 0.9	83.2 ± 1.4
		82.5 ± 1.0	73.0 ± 1.6	80.5 ± 2.2
Diffusion	GCDE	83.8 ± 0.5	72.5 ± 0.5	79.5 ± 0.4
		80.0 ± 1.5	72.1 ± 1.6	76.0 ± 3.9
	GDC	83.5 ± 0.2	73.2 ± 0.3	79.6 ± 0.4
		81.6 ± 1.3	72.2 ± 2.6	79.0 ± 2.0
	GraphHeat	83.7	72.5	80.5
		81.4 ± 1.2	73.5 ± 1.5	78.4 ± 2.1
	DGC	83.3 ± 0.0	73.3 ± 0.1	80.3 ± 0.1
		81.4 ± 1.2	75.0 ± 1.9	78.2 ± 2.1
	Difformer	85.9 ± 0.4	73.5 ± 0.3	81.8 ± 0.3
		82.0 ± 2.3	71.9 ± 1.7	74.8 ± 4.5
	GRAND	83.6 ± 1.0	73.4 ± 0.5	78.8 ± 1.7
		82.5 ± 1.4	73.7 ± 1.7	78.8 ± 1.8

Table below provides the 1-shot and 5-shot results of few-shot learning with either ResNet-18 (and its variants) or WRN as backbone.

Table 8: Average accuracy (in %) and 95% confidence interval in *miniImageNet*, *tieredImageNet* and CUB. Re-implemented results using public official code with our pretrained backbone are marked with †.

Methods	Backbone	<i>miniImageNet</i>		<i>tieredImageNet</i>		CUB	
		1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
MAML Finn et al. [2017]	ResNet-18	49.61 ± 0.92	65.72 ± 0.77	-	-	69.96 ± 1.01	82.70 ± 0.65
Baseline Chen et al. [2019]	ResNet-18	51.87 ± 0.77	75.68 ± 0.63	-	-	67.02 ± 0.90	83.58 ± 0.54
RelationNet Sung et al. [2018]	ResNet-18	52.48 ± 0.86	69.83 ± 0.68	54.48 ± 0.93	71.32 ± 0.78	67.59 ± 1.02	82.75 ± 0.58
MatchingNet Vinyals et al. [2016]	ResNet-18	52.91 ± 0.88	68.88 ± 0.69	-	-	72.36 ± 0.90	83.64 ± 0.60
ProtoNet Snell et al. [2017]	ResNet-18	54.16 ± 0.82	73.68 ± 0.65	53.31 ± 0.89	72.69 ± 0.74	71.88 ± 0.91	87.42 ± 0.48
Gidaris Gidaris and Komodakis [2018]	ResNet-15	55.45 ± 0.89	70.13 ± 0.68	-	-	-	-
SNAIL Mishra et al. [2018]	ResNet-15	55.71 ± 0.99	68.88 ± 0.92	-	-	-	-
TADAM Oreshkin et al. [2018]	ResNet-15	58.50 ± 0.30	76.70 ± 0.30	-	-	-	-
Transductive Dhillon et al. [2019]	ResNet-12	62.35 ± 0.66	74.53 ± 0.54	-	-	-	-
MetaoptNet Lee et al. [2019]	ResNet-18	62.64 ± 0.61	78.63 ± 0.46	65.99 ± 0.72	81.56 ± 0.53	-	-
TPN Liu et al. [2019]	ResNet-12	53.75 ± 0.86	69.43 ± 0.67	57.53 ± 0.96	72.85 ± 0.74	-	-
TEAM Qiao et al. [2019]	ResNet-18	60.07 ± 0.59	75.90 ± 0.38	-	-	80.16 ± 0.52	87.17 ± 0.39
CAN+T Hou et al. [2019]	ResNet-12	67.19 ± 0.55	80.64 ± 0.35	73.21 ± 0.58	84.93 ± 0.38	-	-
SimpleShot Wang et al. [2019]†	ResNet-18	62.86 ± 0.20	79.22 ± 0.14	69.71 ± 0.23	84.13 ± 0.17	72.86 ± 0.20	88.57 ± 0.11
LaplacianShot Ziko et al. [2020]†	ResNet-18	70.46 ± 0.23	81.76 ± 0.14	76.90 ± 0.25	85.10 ± 0.17	82.92 ± 0.21	90.77 ± 0.11
EPNet Rodríguez et al. [2020]†	ResNet-18	63.83 ± 0.20	77.98 ± 0.15	70.08 ± 0.23	82.11 ± 0.18	73.32 ± 0.21	87.55 ± 0.13
Diff-ResNet Wang et al. [2024]†	ResNet-18	71.11 ± 0.24	82.07 ± 0.14	77.98 ± 0.25	85.75 ± 0.17	84.20 ± 0.21	91.12 ± 0.10
COIN	ResNet-18	72.50 ± 0.24	82.07 ± 0.14	78.83 ± 0.25	86.05 ± 0.16	85.63 ± 0.20	91.31 ± 0.10
Qiao Qiao et al. [2018]	WRN	59.60 ± 0.41	73.74 ± 0.19	-	-	-	-
LEO Rusu et al. [2019]	WRN	61.76 ± 0.08	77.59 ± 0.12	66.33 ± 0.05	81.44 ± 0.09	-	-
ProtoNet Snell et al. [2017]	WRN	62.60 ± 0.20	79.97 ± 0.14	-	-	-	-
CC+rot Gidaris et al. [2019]	WRN	62.93 ± 0.45	79.87 ± 0.33	70.53 ± 0.51	84.98 ± 0.36	-	-
MatchingNet Vinyals et al. [2016]	WRN	64.03 ± 0.20	76.32 ± 0.16	-	-	-	-
FEAT Ye et al. [2020]	WRN	65.10 ± 0.20	81.11 ± 0.14	70.41 ± 0.23	84.38 ± 0.16	-	-
Transductive Dhillon et al. [2019]	WRN	65.73 ± 0.68	78.40 ± 0.52	73.34 ± 0.71	85.50 ± 0.50	-	-
BD-CSPN Liu et al. [2020a]	WRN	70.31 ± 0.93	81.89 ± 0.60	78.74 ± 0.95	86.92 ± 0.63	-	-
PT+NCM Hu et al. [2021]	WRN	65.35 ± 0.20	83.87 ± 0.13	69.96 ± 0.22	86.45 ± 0.15	80.57 ± 0.20	91.15 ± 0.10
SimpleShot Wang et al. [2019]†	WRN	65.20 ± 0.20	81.28 ± 0.14	71.49 ± 0.23	85.51 ± 0.16	78.62 ± 0.19	91.21 ± 0.10
LaplacianShotZiko et al. [2020]†	WRN	72.90 ± 0.23	83.47 ± 0.14	78.79 ± 0.25	86.46 ± 0.17	87.70 ± 0.18	92.73 ± 0.10
EPNetRodríguez et al. [2020]†	WRN	67.09 ± 0.21	80.71 ± 0.14	73.20 ± 0.23	84.20 ± 0.17	80.88 ± 0.20	91.40 ± 0.11
Diff-ResNetWang et al. [2024]†	WRN	73.47 ± 0.23	83.86 ± 0.14	79.74 ± 0.25	87.10 ± 0.16	87.74 ± 0.19	92.96 ± 0.09
COIN	WRN	74.85 ± 0.24	83.82 ± 0.14	80.66 ± 0.25	87.48 ± 0.15	89.20 ± 0.18	93.24 ± 0.09

Finally, we provide the time complexity results on Cora and Citeseer.




Figure 5: Time complexity on Cora dataset. The x-axis represents average time (seconds) per training epoch, and the y-axis represents average convergence time (seconds) per task, both in log-scale. The color bar measures the average accuracy of each method.




Figure 6: Time complexity on Pubmed dataset. The x-axis represents average time (seconds) per training epoch, and the y-axis represents average convergence time (seconds) per task, both in log-scale. The color bar measures the average accuracy of each method.