
Graph Neural Ordinary Differential Equations

Michael Poli^{*1}, Stefano Massaroli^{*2}, Junyoung Park^{*1}

Atsushi Yamashita², Hajime Asama², Jinkyoo Park¹

¹Department of Industrial & Systems Engineering, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea

²Department of Precision Engineering, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

{poli.m, junyoung, jinkyoo.park}@kaist.ac.kr,

{massaroli, yamashita, asama}@robot.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

We extend the framework of *graph neural networks* (GNN) to continuous time. *Graph neural ordinary differential equations* (GDEs) are introduced as the counterpart to GNNs where the input–output relationship is determined by a *continuum* of GNN layers. The GDE framework is shown to be compatible with the majority of commonly used GNN models with minimal modification to the original formulations. We evaluate the effectiveness of GDEs on both static as well as dynamic datasets: results prove their general effectiveness even in cases where the data is not generated by continuous time processes.

1 Introduction

Introducing appropriate inductive biases on deep learning models is a well known approach to improving sample efficiency and generalization performance [2]. Graph neural networks (GNNs) represent a general computational framework for imposing such inductive biases when the target problem structure can be encoded as a graph or in settings where prior knowledge about relationships among input entities can itself be described as a graph [17, 7, 25]. GNNs have shown remarkable results in various application areas such as node classification [1], graph classification [30] and forecasting [16, 20] as well as generative tasks [15].

A different but equally important class of inductive biases is concerned with the class of systems from which the data is collected. Although deep learning has traditionally been a field dominated by discrete models, recent advances propose a treatment of neural networks as models equipped with a continuum of layers [4]. This view allows a reformulation of the forward pass as the solution of the initial value problem of an ordinary differential equation (ODE). This assumption allows direct modeling of ODEs and enhances the performance of neural networks on tasks involving continuous time processes. Our work is aimed at bridging the gap between geometric deep learning and continuous models. Graph neural ordinary differential equations (GDEs) cast common tasks on graph–structured data into a system–theoretic framework, as shown in Figure (1). GDEs provide flexibility due to their structure defined by a *continuum* of GNN layers and can therefore accommodate irregularly sampled

Preprint. Work in progress.




Figure 1: A *graph neural ordinary differential equation* (GDE) is designed to model vector fields defined on graphs, both in cases when the structure is fixed or changes in time. This is achieved by equipping the model with a continuum of *graph neural network* (GNN) layers.

sequential data. We show that GDEs offer improved performance in a traffic forecasting application due to their ability to track the underlying dynamics and adjust the prediction horizon according to timestamp information.

In general, no assumptions on the data generating process are necessary in order for GDEs to be effective. Indeed, following recent work connecting different discretization schemes of ODEs [18] to previously known architectures such as FractalNets [14], we show that GDEs can equivalently be utilized as high-performance general purpose models. In the standard transductive semi-supervised node classification tasks on datasets Cora, Pubmed and Citeseer, GDEs are shown to be competitive with state-of-the-art models such as graph convolutional networks (GCNs) [12] and graph attention networks (GATs) [28]. Finally, we show that training GDEs with adaptive ODE solvers leads to performing deep GNN models without the need to specify the number of layers a-priori, sidestepping known depth-limitations of GNNs [32].

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We introduce *graph ordinary differential equation networks* (GDEs), continuous counterparts to graphical models. We show that the proposed framework includes most common GNN models and naturally extends to spatio-temporal and autoregressive models on graphs.
- We validate GDEs experimentally on a static semi-supervised node classification task on standard datasets Cora, Citeseer and Pubmed. GDEs are shown to be competitive with well known state-of-the-art models.
- We conduct an experiment on a forecasting task with severely undersampled data. We compare GDEs and an equivalent discrete GNN model, showing that GDEs offers improved performance in tasks involving dynamical systems thanks to their continuous nature.

2 Background

Notation Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers and \mathbb{R} is the the one of reals. Scalars are indicated as lowercase letters, vectors as bold lowercase, matrices and tensors as bold uppercase and sets with calligraphic letters. Let \mathcal{V} be a finite set with $|\mathcal{V}| = n$ whose element are called *nodes* and let \mathcal{E} be a finite set of tuples of \mathcal{V} elements. Its elements are called *edges* and are such that $\forall e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$, $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j)$ and $v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{V}$. A graph \mathcal{G} is defined as the collection of nodes and edges, i.e. $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. The *adjacency* matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of a graph is defined as

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E} \\ 0 & e_{ij} \notin \mathcal{E} \end{cases}$$

If \mathcal{G} is an *attributed graph*, the *feature vector* of each $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is $\mathbf{x}_v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. All the feature vectors are collected in a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Note that often, the features of graphs exhibits temporal dependency, i.e. $\mathbf{X} := \mathbf{X}_t$.

Graph neural networks Current work on GNNs and ODEs [24] is limited in scope and constrains the GNN architecture to the specific case of dynamical systems. Our focus is developing general, continuous counterparts of the main variants of static GNNs: *graph convolutional networks* (GCNs) [12], diffusion graph convolution (DGC) [1], *graph attention networks* (GATs) [28] as well as recurrent models: *graph convolutional recurrent networks* (GCRNNs) [5] and *gated unit graph convolutional networks* (GCGRU) [33].

Neural ordinary differential equations Continuous neural network architectures are built upon the observation that, for particular classes of discrete models such as ResNets [10], their inter-layer dynamics:

$$\mathbf{h}_{s+1} = \mathbf{h}_s + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{h}_s, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad s \in \mathbb{N} \quad (1)$$

resemble Euler discretizations of an ordinary differential equation (ODE). The continuous counterpart of neural network layers with equal input and output dimensions can therefore be described by a first order ODE of the type:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{h}_s}{ds} = \mathbf{f}(s, \mathbf{h}_s, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad s \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R} \quad (2)$$

It has been noted that the choice of discretization scheme of (2) can describe previously known discrete multi-step architectures [18]. As a result, the *neural ordinary differential equation* (NODE) [4] framework is not limited to the modeling of differential equations and can guide discovery of novel general purpose models.

A motivating example Multi-agent systems permeate science in a variety of fields: from physics to robotics, game-theory, finance and molecular biology, among others. Often, closed-form analytic formulations are not available and forecasting or decision making tasks have to rely on noisy, irregularly sampled observations. The primary purpose of GDEs is to offer a data-driven approach to the modeling of such systems, particularly when the dynamics are nonlinear and therefore challenging to approach with classical or analytical methods.

3 Graph Neural Ordinary Differential Equations

Without any loss of generality, the inter-layer dynamics of a GNN node feature matrix can be represented in the form:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{H}_{s+1} = \mathbf{H}_s + \mathbf{F}(s, \mathbf{H}_s, \Theta_s) \\ \mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{X} \end{cases}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}$$

where \mathbf{F} is a matrix-valued nonlinear function conditioned on graph \mathcal{G} and Θ is the tensor of trainable parameters of the s -th layer. Note that the explicit dependence on s of the dynamics is justified in some graph architectures, such as diffusion graph convolutions [1].

A *graph neural differential ordinary equation* (GDE) is defined as the following Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{H}}_s = \mathbf{F}(s, \mathbf{H}_s, \Theta) \\ \mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{X} \end{cases}, \quad s \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is a depth-varying vector field defined on graph \mathcal{G} .

Well-posedness Let $\mathcal{S} := [0, 1]$. Under mild conditions on \mathbf{F} , namely Lipschitz continuity with respect to \mathbf{H} and uniform continuity with respect to s , for each initial condition (GDE input) \mathbf{X} , the ODE in (3) admits a unique solution \mathbf{H}_s defined in the whole \mathcal{S} . Thus there is a mapping Ψ from $\mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ to the space of absolutely continuous functions $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ such that $\mathbf{H} := \Psi(\mathbf{X})$ satisfies the ODE in (3). This implies the the output \mathbf{Y} of the GDE satisfies

$$\mathbf{Y} = \Psi(\mathbf{X})(1)$$

Symbolically, the output of the GDE is obtained by the following

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{F}(\tau, \mathbf{H}_\tau, \Theta) d\tau$$

Integration domain We restrict the integration interval to $\mathcal{S} := [0, 1]$, given that any other integration time can be considered a rescaled version of \mathcal{S} . In application where \mathcal{S} acquires a specific meaning (i.e forecasting with irregular timestamps) the integration domain can be appropriately tuned to evolve GDE dynamics between arrival times [22] without assumptions on underlying vector field [3].

GDE training GDEs can be trained with a variety of methods. Standard backpropagation through the computational graph, adjoint method for $\mathcal{O}(1)$ memory efficiency [4], or backpropagation through a relaxed spectral elements discretization [21]. Numerical instability in the form of accumulating errors on the adjoint ODE during the backward pass of NODEs has been observed in [8]. A proposed solution is a hybrid checkpointing-adjoint scheme, where the adjoint trajectory is reset at predetermined points in order control the error dynamics.

4 GDE Architectures

We include a derivation of GDE counterparts of common GNN models, starting from static GNNs and continuing with dynamic GNNs i.e. models designed to handle sequences graphs.

4.1 Static Models

Graph convolution networks Based on graph spectral theory, *graph convolution network* (GCN) [12] layers are in the form

$$\mathbf{H}_{s+1} = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}_s \mathbf{W}_s)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} := \mathbf{A} + \mathbb{1}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ is a diagonal matrix defined as $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} := \sum_j \tilde{A}_{ij}$

A residual connection can naturally be added as suggested in [12]. From this formulation:

$$\mathbf{H}_{s+1} = \mathbf{H}_s + \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}_s \mathbf{W}_s)$$

its counterpart in the continuous depth domain can be obtained as:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{H}_s}{ds} = \mathbf{F}_{\text{GCN}}(\mathbf{H}, \Theta) := \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}_s \Theta)$$

Diffusion graph convolution Consider a *diffusion graph convolution* (DGC) network [1]

$$\mathbf{H}_{s+1} = \mathbf{H}_s + \sigma(\mathbf{P}^s \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}_s) \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an activation function assumed to act component-wise, $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a probability transition matrix, $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A}$. The continuous counterpart of (4), DGC-NODE, can be therefore derived as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{H}}{ds} = \mathbf{F}_{\text{DGC}}(s, \mathbf{X}, \Theta) := \sigma(\mathbf{P}^s \mathbf{X} \Theta),$$

which consists in a depth-varying vector field constant with respect to the hidden node feature matrix.

Additional models and considerations We include additional derivations of continuous counterparts of common static GNN models such as *graph attention networks* (GAT) [28] in Appendix A.

While the definition of GDE models is given with \mathbf{F} made up by a single layer, in practice multi-layer architectures can also be used without any loss of generality.

4.2 Spatio-Temporal Continuous Graph Architectures

For settings involving a temporal component, the depth domain of GDEs coincides with the time domain $s \equiv t$ and can be adapted depending on the requirements. For example, given a time window Δt , the prediction performed by a GDE assumes the form:

$$\mathbf{H}_{t+\Delta t} = \mathbf{H}_t + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{F}(\tau, \mathbf{H}_\tau, \Theta) d\tau$$

regardless of the specific GDE architecture employed. Here, GDEs represent a natural model class for autoregressive modeling of sequences of graphs $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}$. This line of reasoning naturally leads to an extension of classical spatio-temporal architectures in the form of *hybrid dynamical systems* [27, 9], i.e., systems characterized by interacting continuous and discrete-time dynamics. Let $(\mathcal{K}, >)$, $(\mathcal{T}, >)$ be linearly ordered sets; namely, $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{T} is a set of time instants, $\mathcal{T} := \{t_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$. We suppose to be given a *state-graph data stream* which is a sequence in the form

$$\{(\mathbf{X}_t, \mathcal{G}_t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$$

Our aim is to build a continuous model predicting, at each $t_k \in \mathcal{T}$, the value of $\mathbf{X}_{t_{k+1}}$, given $(\mathbf{X}_t, \mathcal{G}_t)$. Let us also define a *hybrid time domain* as the set $\mathcal{I} := \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} ([t_k, t_{k+1}], k)$ and a *hybrid arc* on \mathcal{I} as a function Φ such that for each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $t \mapsto \Phi(t, k)$ is absolutely continuous in $\{t : (t, j) \in \text{dom } \Phi\}$.

The core idea is to have a GDE smoothly steering the latent node features between two time instants and then apply some discrete operator, resulting in a “jump” of \mathbf{H} which is then processed by an output layer. Therefore, solutions of the proposed continuous spatio-temporal model are hybrid arcs.




Figure 2: Schematic of autoregressive GDEs as hybrid automata.

Autoregressive GDEs The solution of a general autoregressive GDE model for a one timestamp period can be symbolically represented by:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{H}}_s &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{H}_s, \Theta) & s \in [t_k, t_{k+1}] \\ \mathbf{H}_s^+ &= \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{H}_s, \mathbf{X}_{t_k}) & s = t_{k+1} \\ \mathbf{Y}_{t_{k+1}} &= \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{H}_s) \end{cases}, \quad k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{K} are GNN-like operators or general neural network layers¹ and \mathbf{H}^+ represents the value of \mathbf{H} after the discrete transition. The evolution of system (5) can be visualized by means of hybrid automata as shown in Figure 2. Compared to standard recurrent models which are only equipped with discrete jumps, system (5) incorporates a continuous flow of latent node features \mathbf{H} between jumps. This feature of autoregressive GDEs allows them to track dynamical systems from irregular observations.

Different combinations of \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{K} can yield continuous variants of most common spatio-temporal GNN models.

Graph Differential Convolutional GRU We illustrate the generality of (5) by deriving the continuous version of GCGRU [33], GCDE-GRU:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{H}}_s &= \mathbf{F}_{\text{GCN}}(\mathbf{H}_t) & s \in [t_k, t_{k+1}] \\ \mathbf{H}_s^+ &= \text{GCGRU}(\mathbf{H}_s, \mathbf{X}_{t_k}) & s = t_{k+1} \\ \mathbf{Y}_{t_{k+1}} &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{H}_s + \mathbf{b}) \end{cases}, \quad k \in \mathcal{K}$$

where \mathbf{W} is a learnable weight matrix and σ a general activation function or identity function, depending on the application. The complete description of a GCGRU layer of computation is included in Appendix B.

5 Experiments

We evaluate GDEs on a transductive node classification task as well as a forecasting task. Code will be available at <https://github.com/Zymrael/gde>.

5.1 Transductive Node Classification

Experimental setup The first task involves performing semi-supervised node classification on static graphs collected from baseline datasets Cora, Pubmed and Citeseer [26]. Main goal of these experiments is to show the usefulness of GDEs as general GNNs variants even when the data is not generated by continuous dynamical systems. We follow the standard experimental setup of [12] for a fair comparison. The models are optimized using Adam [11] with constant learning rate 0.01. L_2 weight penalty is set to 0.001 as a strong regularizer due to the small size of the training sets [19]. All convolution-based models are equipped with a latent dimension of 64.

The performance of *graph convolutional ODE* (GCDE) is assessed with both a fixed-step solver Runge-Kutta [23, 13] as well as an adaptive-step solver, Dormand-Prince [6]. The resulting models are denoted as GCDE-rk4 and GCDE-dpr5 respectively. We utilize the `torchdiffeq` [4] PyTorch package to solve and backpropagate through ODEs via the adjoint method.

¹More formal definitions of the hybrid model in the form of *hybrid inclusions* can indeed be easily given. However, the technicalities involved are beyond the scope of this paper.

Model (depth)	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed	Parameters
GCN(2)	81.4 \pm 0.5%	70.9 \pm 0.5%	79.0 \pm 0.3%	184k/474k/64k
GAT (2)	83.0 \pm 0.7%	72.5 \pm 0.7%	79.0 \pm 0.3%	93k/238k/39k
GCDE-rk4 (4)	85.0 \pm 0.4%	71.4 \pm 0.8%	79.5 \pm 0.3%	188k/478k/68k
GCDE-dpr5 (108)	82.9 \pm 0.7%	69.0 \pm 0.8%	79.1 \pm 0.4%	188k/478k/68k

Table 1: Test accuracy results in percentages across 100 runs (mean and standard deviation). All GCN models have hidden dimension set to 64. For GAT and GCN64 results we refer to [28].




Figure 3: Test loss and accuracy of GCN variants on Cora (500 epochs). Shaded area is the 95% confidence interval.

Discussion Following [28], we report mean and standard deviation across 100 training runs. The best performing GCN in terms of layer depth is selected as a baseline. GCDE-rk4 outperforms GCNs across all datasets as shown in Table 1; its structure offers a computationally efficient FractalNet-like [14] structure for GCNs that improves accuracy and training stability as shown in Figure (3). GCDEs do not require more parameters than their discrete counterparts. Additionally, training GCDEs with adaptive step solvers naturally leads to deeper models than possible with vanilla GCNs, whose layer depth greatly reduces performance. We report the number of *function evaluations* (NFE) of the ODE function contained in the GCDE as a measure of its depth. It can be noted that the performance of GCDE-dpr5 is slightly worse compared to GCDE-rk4, since deeper models are penalized on these datasets by a lack of sufficient regularization [12].

5.2 Forecasting

Experimental setup To evaluate the effectiveness of autoregressive GDE models on forecasting tasks we perform a series of experiments on the established PeMS traffic dataset. We follow the setup of [31] in which a subsampled version of PeMS, PeMS7(M), is obtained via selection of 228 sensor stations and aggregation of their historical speed data into regular 5 minute frequency time series. To simulate a challenging environment with missing data and irregular timestamps, we undersample the time series by performing independent Bernoulli trials on each data point with probability 0.7 of removal. In order to measure performance gains obtained by GDEs in settings with data generated by continuous time systems, we employ a GCDE-GRU as well as its discrete counterpart GCGRU [33]. To contextualize the results GRU performance on the task is included. For each model under

consideration we collect *normalized RMSE* (NRMSE) and *mean absolute percentage error* (MAPE). More details about the chosen metrics and data are included in Appendix C.

Model (depth)	MAPE	NRMSE	Parameters
GRU	27.52 ± 0.00	1.47 ± 0.00	9658
GCGRU	24.80 ± 0.12	1.44 ± 0.00	9985
GCDE-GRU	23.08 ± 0.11	1.40 ± 0.01	9955

Table 2: Forecasting test results across 5 runs (mean and standard deviation).

Discussion The distribution of timestamp deltas (in 5 minute units) used to adjust the ODE integration domain of GCDE-GRU is shown in Figure 4. Non-constant differences between timestamps result in a challenging forecasting task for a single model since the average prediction horizon changes drastically over the course of training and testing. For a fair comparison between models we include delta timestamps information as an additional node feature for GCGNs and GRUs. The main objective of these experiments is to measure the performance gain of GDEs when exploiting a correct assumption about the underlying data generating process. Traffic systems are intrinsically dynamic and continuous and therefore a model able to track continuous underlying dynamics is expected to offer improved performance. Since GCDE-GRUs and GCGRUs are designed to match in structure and number of parameters we can measure this performance increase from the results shown in Table 2. GDEs offer an average improvement of 3% in NRSME and 7% in MAPE. A variety of other application areas with continuous dynamics and irregular datasets could similarly benefit from adopting GDEs as modeling tools: medicine, finance or distributed control systems, to name a few.




Figure 4: Distribution of deltas between timestamps $t_{k+1} - t_k$ in the undersampled dataset. Time scale of predictions varies greatly during the task.

6 Conclusion

In this work we introduce the *graph neural ordinary differential equations* (GDE), the continuous counterpart to *graph neural networks* (GNN) where the inputs are propagated through a continuum of GNN layers. The GDE formulation is general, as it can be adapted to include any GNN architecture with minimal or no modifications. Additionally, GDEs represents a natural approach to sequential forecasting problems with irregularly sampled data since they are able to accommodate arbitrary timestamps. Finally, when GDEs are coupled with adaptive step solvers, as is the case for NODEs [4], they do not require apriori tuning of the number of layers and can naturally lead to deeper models, ultimately reducing the effort required on hyperparameter search for an effective deployment across application areas.

References

- [1] J. Atwood and D. Towsley. Diffusion-convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1993–2001, 2016.
- [2] P. W. Battaglia, J. B. Hamrick, V. Bapst, A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, V. Zambaldi, M. Malinowski, A. Tacchetti, D. Raposo, A. Santoro, R. Faulkner, et al. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01261*, 2018.
- [3] Z. Che, S. Purushotham, K. Cho, D. Sontag, and Y. Liu. Recurrent neural networks for multivariate time series with missing values. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):6085, 2018.

- [4] T. Q. Chen, Y. Rubanova, J. Bettencourt, and D. K. Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 6571–6583, 2018.
- [5] Z. Cui, K. Henrickson, R. Ke, and Y. Wang. Traffic graph convolutional recurrent neural network: A deep learning framework for network-scale traffic learning and forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07007*, 2018.
- [6] J. R. Dormand and P. J. Prince. A family of embedded runge-kutta formulae. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 6(1):19–26, 1980.
- [7] M. Gasse, D. Chételat, N. Ferroni, L. Charlin, and A. Lodi. Exact combinatorial optimization with graph convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01629*, 2019.
- [8] A. Gholami, K. Keutzer, and G. Biros. Anode: Unconditionally accurate memory-efficient gradients for neural odes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10298*, 2019.
- [9] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel. Hybrid dynamical systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 29(2):28–93, 2009.
- [10] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [11] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [12] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016.
- [13] W. Kutta. Beitrag zur näherungsweise integration totaler differentialgleichungen. *Z. Math. Phys.*, 46:435–453, 1901.
- [14] G. Larsson, M. Maire, and G. Shakhnarovich. Fractalnet: Ultra-deep neural networks without residuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07648*, 2016.
- [15] Y. Li, O. Vinyals, C. Dyer, R. Pascanu, and P. Battaglia. Learning deep generative models of graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03324*, 2018.
- [16] Y. Li, R. Yu, C. Shahabi, and Y. Liu. Diffusion convolutional recurrent neural network: Data-driven traffic forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01926*, 2017.
- [17] Z. Li, Q. Chen, and V. Koltun. Combinatorial optimization with graph convolutional networks and guided tree search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 539–548, 2018.
- [18] Y. Lu, A. Zhong, Q. Li, and B. Dong. Beyond finite layer neural networks: Bridging deep architectures and numerical differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10121*, 2017.
- [19] F. Monti, D. Boscaini, J. Masci, E. Rodola, J. Svoboda, and M. M. Bronstein. Geometric deep learning on graphs and manifolds using mixture model cnns. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5115–5124, 2017.
- [20] J. Park and J. Park. Physics-induced graph neural network: An application to wind-farm power estimation. *Energy*, 187:115883, 2019.
- [21] A. Quaglino, M. Gallieri, J. Masci, and J. Koutník. Accelerating neural odes with spectral elements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07038*, 2019.
- [22] Y. Rubanova, R. T. Chen, and D. Duvenaud. Latent odes for irregularly-sampled time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03907*, 2019.
- [23] C. Runge. Über die numerische auflösung von differentialgleichungen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 46(2):167–178, 1895.
- [24] A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, V. Bapst, K. Cranmer, and P. Battaglia. Hamiltonian graph networks with ode integrators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12790*, 2019.
- [25] A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, N. Heess, J. T. Springenberg, J. Merel, M. Riedmiller, R. Hadsell, and P. Battaglia. Graph networks as learnable physics engines for inference and control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01242*, 2018.
- [26] P. Sen, G. Namata, M. Bilgic, L. Getoor, B. Galligher, and T. Eliassi-Rad. Collective classification in network data. *AI magazine*, 29(3):93–93, 2008.

- [27] A. J. Van Der Schaft and J. M. Schumacher. *An introduction to hybrid dynamical systems*, volume 251. Springer London, 2000.
- [28] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Lio, and Y. Bengio. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- [29] Z. Wu, S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and P. S. Yu. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00596*, 2019.
- [30] S. Yan, Y. Xiong, and D. Lin. Spatial temporal graph convolutional networks for skeleton-based action recognition. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [31] B. Yu, H. Yin, and Z. Zhu. Spatio-temporal graph convolutional networks: A deep learning framework for traffic forecasting. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2018.
- [32] J. Zhang. Gresnet: Graph residuals for reviving deep graph neural nets from suspended animation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05729*, 2019.
- [33] X. Zhao, F. Chen, and J.-H. Cho. Deep learning for predicting dynamic uncertain opinions in network data. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 1150–1155. IEEE, 2018.

A Additional Static GDEs

Message passing neural networks Let us consider a single node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and define the set of neighbors of v as $\mathcal{N} := \{u \in \mathcal{V} : (v, u) \in \mathcal{E} \vee (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Message passing neural networks (MPNNs) perform a spatial-based convolution on the node v as

$$\mathbf{h}_{s+1}^{(v)} = \mathbf{u}_s \left(\mathbf{h}^{(v)}, \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{m}_s \left(\mathbf{h}_s^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_s^{(u)} \right) \right) \quad (6)$$

where, in general, $\mathbf{h}_0^v = \mathbf{x}_v$ while \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{m} are functions with trainable parameters. For clarity of exposition, let $\mathbf{u}_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{g}_s(\mathbf{y})$ where \mathbf{g}_s is the actual parametrized function. The (6) becomes

$$\mathbf{h}_{s+1}^{(v)} = \mathbf{h}_s^{(v)} + \mathbf{g}_s \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{m}_s \left(\mathbf{h}_s^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_s^{(u)} \right) \right) \quad (7)$$

and its continuous counterpart is

$$\dot{\mathbf{h}}_s^{(v)} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{MPNN}}^{(v)}(\mathbf{H}, \Theta) := \mathbf{g}_s \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{m}_s \left(\mathbf{h}_s^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_s^{(u)} \right) \right)$$

Graph Attention Networks Graph attention networks (GATs) [28] perform convolution on the node v as

$$\mathbf{h}_{s+1}^{(v)} = \sigma \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v) \cup v} \alpha_{vu} \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{h}_s^{(u)} \right) \quad (8)$$

Similarly, to GCNs, a *virtual skip connection* can be introduced allowing us to defined the GDE:

$$\dot{\mathbf{h}}_s^{(v)} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{GAT}}^{(v)}(\mathbf{H}, \Theta) := \sigma \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v) \cup v} \alpha_{vu} \Theta \mathbf{h}_s^{(u)} \right)$$

where α_{vu} are attention coefficient which can be computed following [29, eq. (23)]

B Spatio Temporal GNNs

We include a complete description of GCGRUs to fully specify GCDE-GRUs:

B.1 GCGRU

GCGRUs [33] perform the following computation on latents \mathbf{H} and input features \mathbf{X} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{xz} *_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{X}_t + \mathbf{W}_{hz} *_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{H}_{t-1}) \\ \mathbf{R} &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{xr} *_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{X}_t + \mathbf{W}_{hr} *_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{H}_{t-1}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}} &= \tanh(\mathbf{W}_{xh} *_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{X}_t + \mathbf{W}_{hh} *_{\mathcal{G}} (\mathbf{R} \odot \mathbf{H}_{t-1})) \\ \mathbf{H}_t &= \mathbf{Z} \odot \mathbf{H}_{t-1} + (1 - \mathbf{Z}) \odot \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the operator $*_{\mathcal{G}}$ denotes the standard graph convolution.

C Additional experimental details

Node classification The *hyperbolic tangent* (\tanh) is used as activation for GDNs. Smooth activations have been observed to reduce stiffness [4] of the ODE and therefore the number of function evaluations (NFE) required for a solution that is within acceptable tolerances. All the other activation functions are *rectified linear units* (ReLU).

Forecasting PeMS7(M) contains a weighted adjacency matrix function of distances between stations. We threshold \mathbf{A} using the 80th. Ratio of train/test data is set to 0.5 post-undersampling step. All models receive input sequences of 5 graphs and are trained for 50 epochs with a batch size of 16. We use Adam [11] with a learning rate of 0.01. We measured MAPE (mean absolute percentage error) and NRMSE (IQR normalized RMSE). These metrics are defined as follows:

$$\text{MAPE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \frac{100\%}{pT} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t) \oslash \mathbf{y}_t \right\|_1 \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{y} , and $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the set of vectorized target and prediction of models respectively. \oslash and $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes Hadamard division and the 1-norm of vector.

$$\mathbf{y}^{\text{IQR}} = \mathbf{y}^{0.75} - \mathbf{y}^{0.25}$$

$$\text{NRMSE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \frac{1}{p} \left\| \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{y}_t - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t)^2} \oslash \mathbf{y}^{\text{IQR}} \right\|_1$$

where $\mathbf{y}^{0.75}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{0.25}$ denotes 75th and 25th percentiles of each station's measurement. \mathbf{y}^{IQR} vector denotes the interquartile range of sensor measurements of the stations. $(\cdot)^2$ and $\sqrt{\cdot}$ denotes the element-wise squares and square root of the input vector. \mathbf{y}_t and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t$ denote the target and prediction vector respectively.