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Abstract

Equivariances provide useful inductive biases in neural network modeling, with the translation equivariance of convolutional neural networks being a canonical example. Equivariances can be embedded in architectures through weight-sharing and place symmetry constraints on the functions a neural network can represent. The type of symmetry is typically fixed and has to be chosen in advance. Although some tasks are inherently equivariant, many tasks do not strictly follow such symmetries. In such cases, equivariance constraints can be overly restrictive. In this work, we propose a parameter-efficient relaxation of equivariance that can effectively interpolate between (i) non-equivariant linear product, (ii) a strict-equivariant convolution, and (iii) a strictly-invariant mapping. The proposed parameterization can be thought of as a building block to allow adjustable symmetry structure in neural networks. Compared to non-equivariant or strict-equivariant baselines, we experimentally verify that soft equivariance leads to improved performance in terms of test accuracy on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 image classification tasks.

1 Introduction

Symmetric properties, such as equivariances and invariances, can be embedded into neural network architectures to provide inductive biases that leads to better data-efficiency and improved generalization. Convolutional layers are known to provide translation equivariance in simple euclidean spaces, and recent works have allowed various extensions to more complex groups and domains. However, symmetries are typically fixed, must be specified in advance, and can not be adjusted.

Symmetries embedded in network architectures enforce a hard constraint on the functions a neural network can represent. This can be an effective way to encode prior knowledge for problems that are inherently symmetric. However, hard symmetry constraints can become prohibitive if a problem does not strictly follows symmetries. For example, convolutional layers cannot encode potentially relevant absolute positional information, and ‘6’s and a ‘9’s become difficult to distinguish under rotation invariance. Relaxed symmetry constraints can mitigate such symmetry misspecifications without completely losing the useful inductive biases that symmetries provide.

In this work, we propose to relax equivariance constraints by generalizing the convolution operator with non-stationary filters that can depend on absolute input or output group elements. Compared to previous approaches, this results in a parameter-efficient layer that can interpolate between (i) non-invariant linear products akin to a fully-connected layer, (ii) strict group equivariant convolutions, and (iii) strict group invariant mappings (Fig. 1).

The importance of this work is twofold. First of all, relaxable symmetry constraints can directly improve the performance in cases where strict symmetries are misspecified and result in an overly restrictive model class. Secondly, automatically learning symmetry structure from data is an interesting problem. Work in this field which often focuses on invariances [27, 4, 26, 22, 10], which are easier to parameterize than equivariances. Parameterizations that allow smooth and adjustable symmetry constraints could extends such methods to layer-by-layer learnable equivariances.
2 Related Work

**Group equivariance.** Equivariance constraints applied to layers provide a strong inductive bias that enforces transformations in the input to result in equivalent transformations in the output. For compact groups it can be shown that this constraint naturally leads to (group) convolutions [11]. Many works have allowed for equivariances to groups other than translation, including continuous roto-translations [31, 29, 12], discrete roto-translations [5, 3], scale [30], and permutations [32] and non-euclidean domains, e.g., spheres [6], points clouds [9] and graphs [21].

**Symmetry misspecification and approximate equivariance.** Equivariance constraints are extensively used in machine learning. But, if data does not inherently follow a particular symmetry, such constraints can become prohibitive. For instance, Liu et al. [13] raised an ‘intriguing failing’ in convolutional neural networks and showed that activations of convolutional layers can not encode absolute coordinate information. The same work also proposed an ad-hoc solution, effectively breaking equivariance constraints by explicitly adding coordinate information. To achieve the same result, Finzi et al. [8] proposed to break equivariance of a convolutional layer by summing it with a non-equivariant fully-connected layer. The fully-connected layer does introduce many additional parameters compared to the convolutional layer. Romero and Lohit [18] consider a sparse local support around the group identity element to break equivariance. This is effective for sparsely sampled subgroups, such as rotation, but becomes less practical for more densely sampled groups such as translation where the local support could lead to very sparse feature maps. Lastly, Wang et al. [28] propose a relaxed convolutional operator similar to our non-stationary approach, but require a low-rank factorization which potentially limits the expressivity of the feature maps. The same work briefly discusses a mathematical description without such factorization similar to our proposal which is deemed “too large a trainable weight space to be practical”. This is true for discrete convolutional kernels. Instead we define our kernels as continuous kernels [20] parameterized with a finite number of parameters. Consequently, our weight space becomes tractable and does not pose a problem at all.

**Physics and filtering.** Symmetries play a central role in physics. In [28] approximate equivariances are used to allow more robust models for dynamical systems. In Noether networks [1] conservation laws are inferred by learning symmetries from data. Our work could offer new ways to parameterize adjustable symmetries in such applications. In geophysics and seismology, there are some interesting parallels between non-stationary filtering methods and approximate equivariances in machine learning. In particular, [15] discusses generalizations of the convolution in the context of non-stationary filtering very similar to how we propose to relax equivariances in neural networks.

**Automatic symmetry discovery.** An interesting problem is to automatically learn symmetry structure in neural networks architectures based on data. For instance, Lorraine et al. [14] learn data augmentations by differentiating the validation loss using the implicit function theorem and Zhou et al. [33] showed how symmetry structure could be learned through a meta-learning outer loop. In [4] and [8] symmetries are selected using a regularized training loss directly. Many symmetry discovery methods focus on learning invariances [27, 4, 22, 26, 10], which are easier to parameterize. This works offers a way to parameterize continuous equivariance constraints, which could allow extensions of symmetry discovery approaches to learnable equivariances.
Equivariance and invariance. Equivariance is the property of a mapping such that transformations to the input result in equivalent transformations to the output. If changes are invertible, they can be described as the action of a group $G$ on some space $X$. Formally, we say that a function $h : X \to X$ is equivariant to the group $G$ if $h(g \cdot x) = g \cdot h(x)$ for all $g \in G, x \in X$.

If the output of the function is completely independent to the action of the group $G$ on the input, we say that the function is invariant to the group $G$. Formally, a function $h : X \to X$ is invariant to the group $G$ if $h(g \cdot x) = h(x)$ for all $g \in G, x \in X$.

The group convolution. Let $f : G \to \mathbb{R}$ be an input signal and $k_\theta : G \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convolutional kernel parameterized by $\theta$. The group convolution is defined as:

$$h(u) = (k_\theta \ast f)(u) = \int_G k_\theta(v^{-1}u)f(v)d\mu(v),$$

where we integrate with respect to the Haar measure of the group $\mu$. The group convolution was found to be both a sufficient and necessary condition for equivariance to a compact group [11]. The regular convolution for translation equivariance is the special case where the group is the translation group $G = T(n) \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, and the group action is given by addition, i.e., $v^{-1}u = u - v$.

The convolutional kernel $k_\theta(v^{-1}u)$, which we will sometimes refer to as ‘filter’ for stylistic purposes, is called stationary because it can only depend on $u$ and $v$ through $v^{-1}u$. This invariance of the kernel is an important constraint and in fact a requirement for $h$ to be equivariant. Breaking the stationarity of the kernel allows us to relax the equivariant symmetry constraints, and it is one of the central ideas of this paper.

Group lifting. The input and output signals of a neural network are typically not defined on the group $G$, but rather on an input and output space $X$ and $Y$. Using a group lifting and projection procedure [11, 7], we can define our model on the group and still apply it on the input and output space. We define a lifting operator $\uparrow^G$ to map input signals $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ to functions on the group $f \uparrow^G : G \to \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we define a projection operator that maps function on the group $f' : G \to \mathbb{R}$ to functions on the output space $f' \downarrow_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$.

3 Background

Groups. A Lie group provides a natural way to describe continuous symmetry. It forms a continuous manifold of which the underlying elements are equipped with a group structure. Lie groups do not necessarily form a vector space. However, to every Lie group $G$ we can associate an underlying vector space called the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The Lie algebra corresponds to the tangent space of the group at the identity, has the same dimensionality as the group, and captures the local structure of the group. Because the Lie algebra is a vector space, elements $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ can be expanded in a basis $a = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{g})} a_i A_i$ with coefficients $a \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\mathfrak{g})}$. The exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \to G$ maps elements from the Lie algebra to the Lie group. We can also define a logarithm map $\log : G \to \mathfrak{g}$ that maps elements in the Lie group to the Lie algebra. Such a choice always exists, but is not necessarily smooth or unique.

Groups. A Lie group provides a natural way to describe continuous symmetry. It forms a continuous manifold of which the underlying elements are equipped with a group structure. Lie groups do not necessarily form a vector space. However, to every Lie group $G$ we can associate an underlying vector space called the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The Lie algebra corresponds to the tangent space of the group at the identity, has the same dimensionality as the group, and captures the local structure of the group. Because the Lie algebra is a vector space, elements $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ can be expanded in a basis $a = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{g})} a_i A_i$ with coefficients $a \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\mathfrak{g})}$. The exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \to G$ maps elements from the Lie algebra to the Lie group. We can also define a logarithm map $\log : G \to \mathfrak{g}$ that maps elements in the Lie group to the Lie algebra. Such a choice always exists, but is not necessarily smooth or unique.

Equivariance and invariance. Equivariance is the property of a mapping such that transformations to the input result in equivalent transformations to the output. If changes are invertible, they can be described as the action of a group $G$ on some space $X$. Formally, we say that a function $h : X \to X$ is equivariant to the group $G$ if $h(g \cdot x) = g \cdot h(x)$ for all $g \in G, x \in X$.

If the output of the function is completely independent to the action of the group $G$ on the input, we say that the function is invariant to the group $G$. Formally, a function $h : X \to X$ is invariant to the group $G$ if $h(g \cdot x) = h(x)$ for all $g \in G, x \in X$.

The group convolution. Let $f : G \to \mathbb{R}$ be an input signal and $k_\theta : G \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convolutional kernel parameterized by $\theta$. The group convolution is defined as:

$$h(u) = (k_\theta \ast f)(u) = \int_G k_\theta(v^{-1}u)f(v)d\mu(v),$$

where we integrate with respect to the Haar measure of the group $\mu$. The group convolution was found to be both a sufficient and necessary condition for equivariance to a compact group [11]. The regular convolution for translation equivariance is the special case where the group is the translation group $G = T(n) \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, and the group action is given by addition, i.e., $v^{-1}u = u - v$.

The convolutional kernel $k_\theta(v^{-1}u)$, which we will sometimes refer to as ‘filter’ for stylistic purposes, is called stationary because it can only depend on $u$ and $v$ through $v^{-1}u$. This invariance of the kernel is an important constraint and in fact a requirement for $h$ to be equivariant. Breaking the stationarity of the kernel allows us to relax the equivariant symmetry constraints, and it is one of the central ideas of this paper.

Group lifting. The input and output signals of a neural network are typically not defined on the group $G$, but rather on an input and output space $X$ and $Y$. Using a group lifting and projection procedure [11, 7], we can define our model on the group and still apply it on the input and output space. We define a lifting operator $\uparrow^G$ to map input signals $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ to functions on the group $f \uparrow^G : G \to \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we define a projection operator that maps function on the group $f' : G \to \mathbb{R}$ to functions on the output space $f' \downarrow_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$.
4 Method

4.1 Non-stationary Integral Operator

The group convolution operation of Eq. (1) is strictly equivariant due to the stationarity of the kernel. That is, the kernel $k$ only depends on relative group element $v^{-1}u$. For translation $G=\mathbb{T}(2)$, the kernel only depends on relative coordinates $(u−v)$ and not on the absolute position in the image. To relax equivariance constraints, we let the kernel also depend on the absolute group element:

$$h(u) = (k\theta \cdot f)(u) = \int_G k\theta(v^{-1}u, v)f(v)d\mu(v).$$

(2)

The main difference with the group convolution of Eq. (1) is that the kernel $k\theta : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ now has two input group elements. We will refer to the first input argument $v^{-1}u \in G$ as the stationary component and the second input argument $v \in G$ as the non-stationary component. In case of translation, this change lets the kernels depend also on the absolute coordinate of the input image on which it is applied. Consequently, $h(u)$ does no longer describe the regular convolution, but rather a non-stationary integral operator, for which the convolution remains a limiting case.

For the purpose of this work, there is no meaningful difference between expressing the non-stationary component in the input domain $k\theta(v^{-1}u, v)$ or the output domain $k\theta(v^{-1}u, u)$. We will stick with the input domain and some discussion on the difference can be found in [15]. One could also think of writing the kernel in an even more general form: $k\theta(u, v)$. This, as such, does not lead to a more expressive kernel (they are isomorphic, see App. A.2). This more general description will make it harder to parameterize kernels with controllable symmetry constraints, so we do not consider it.

The non-stationary integral operator of Section 4.1 can represents interesting special cases through an independence of $k\theta$ with respect to the first and second input arguments.

**Remark 1** (Linear product / Fully-connected). If the kernel equals an impulse response in the stationary component multiplied by some function $k'\theta$ in the non-stationary component $k\theta(v^{-1}u, v) = \delta(v^{-1}u)k'\theta(v)$, then the operator $h(u) = (k\theta \cdot f)(u)$ corresponds to a linear product with $k'\theta$.

If we have a kernel $k\theta(v^{-1}u, v) = \delta(v^{-1}u)k'\theta(v)$, then we have that:

$$h\theta(u) = \int_G k\theta(v^{-1}u, v)f(v)d\mu(v) = \int_G \delta(v^{-1}u)k'\theta(v)f(v)d\mu(v) = k'\theta(u)f(u),$$

(3)

which is the linear product between $k'\theta(u)$ and input $f(u)$. This is akin to an element-wise product continuously defined on $G$. Optionally, the layer could be followed by an invariant layer to average pool activations. In the discrete case $G=\mathbb{Z}^n$, this corresponds to a fully-connected layer where the weights are given by $k'\theta$.

**Remark 2** (Group equivariance / Convolution). If the kernel does not depend on the non-stationary component, then the operator $h(u) = (k\theta \cdot f)(u)$ is equivalent to a strict $G$-equivariant convolution.

If the kernel only depends on the first stationary component, then $k\theta(v^{-1}u, v) = k'\theta(v^{-1}u)$, and:

$$h\theta(u) = \int_G k\theta(v^{-1}u, v)f(v)d\mu(v) = \int_G k'\theta(v^{-1}u)f(v)d\mu(v) = (k'\theta \ast f)(u),$$

(4)

which equals the group convolution which is known to be strictly group equivariant.

**Remark 3** (Group Invariance / Pooling). If the kernel is independent of both stationary and non-stationary components, the operator $h(u) = (k\theta \cdot f)(u)$ is strictly $G$-invariant.

If the kernel does not depend on both inputs, it must be constant $k\theta(v^{-1}u, u) = C$, and we obtain:

$$h\theta(u) = \int_G k\theta(v^{-1}u, u)f(v)d\mu(v) = C\int_G f(v)d\mu(v),$$

(5)

which is a scaled average ‘global-pooling” over group actions and leads to strict group invariance. We obtain partial invariance or ‘local-pooling” if the kernel is only non-zero constant in some local support of the stationary domain.
4.2 Parameterizing the kernel

Lie algebra basis. In Eq. (2), we have proposed a non-stationary integral operator with a kernel $k_{\theta} : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that takes two input arguments: the stationary group element $v^{-1}u$ and a non-stationary group element $v$. We can parameterize the kernel $k_{\theta}$ in terms of real vector spaces, which are more practical to work with, by defining elements in an explicit Lie algebra basis. To do so, we first define a logarithm function $\log$ and express the kernel $k = \hat{k}(\log g, \log h)$ in terms of a kernel $k$ in the Lie algebra $\hat{k} : g \times g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which always form vector spaces. For rotation $G=SO(2)$, the exponential map $exp$ sending Lie algebra elements (on a line) to Lie group elements (on a circle) is not left invertible, but is right invertible, as a function. As the right inverse is not unique, we choose to use the principal $log$ sending Lie group elements to Lie algebra elements closest to the identity. In general, such a choice for the logarithm always exists but is not necessarily unique or continuous. We choose a vector space basis $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim(G)}$ to express Lie algebra elements $a \in g$ in terms of coefficients $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)}$ that relate to Lie group elements $g \in G$ by:

$$
\begin{align*}
g &= \exp(a) = \exp \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(G)} \alpha_i A_i \in G, \\
\alpha &\in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)} 
\end{align*}
$$

Through this construction, each group element $g$ corresponds through a choice of $log$ to a unique Lie algebra element $\alpha$ which can be implemented as a real vector $\alpha$.

Functions in the Lie algebra. For practicality, we parameterize the kernel $k_{\theta} : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the Lie algebra that allows us to define the kernel $\hat{k} : g \times g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the cross-product of two vector spaces. We refer to the first vector space related to the stationary component as the filter-space, as it corresponds to space in which filters of conventional convolutions are defined. And refer to the second vector space of the non-stationary component as the domain-space, because elements directly relate to absolute group elements in the input domain.

In Section 4.1 we showed that an independence of the kernel with respect to the first and second input argument correspond to strict equivariant and invariant symmetry constraints. We would, therefore, like to choose $\hat{k}$ such that we can control the dependence on the stationary and non-stationary components, as this will allow for explicit control over symmetry constraints. One option would be to let $\hat{k}$ be a Gaussian Processes (GP) with an RBF-kernel with a frequency parameter $\gamma$ for each dimension — set to be the inverse of the conventional lengthscale parameter $\omega = \gamma^{-1}$. The frequency parameter gives us control over the spectral properties of the function in filter-space and domain-space. But crucially, a frequency of $\omega=0$ results in a constant infinite lengthscale and therefore a function $\hat{k}$ that is independent to the associated input dimension. This mechanic allows us to select the special cases discussed in Section 4.1 and interpolate between them! Together, we have a frequency parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)}$ that controls spectral properties in filter-space and a frequency parameter $\omega' \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)}$ to control spectral properties in domain-space. Instead of a GP, we will consider a weight-space variation in this work that equivalently has frequency parameters $\omega$, $\omega'$ with the same discussed properties.

Weight-space implementation. The infinite number of basis functions in a GP feature space can be approximated with a finite number of $D$ random fourier features (RFF) [17, 24] $\gamma_{\omega} : g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2D}$:

$$
\gamma_{\omega}(\alpha) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{D}} \left[ \cos \left( 2\pi \left( W(\alpha \odot \omega) \right) \right) \sin \left( 2\pi \left( W(\alpha \odot \omega) \right) \right) \right]. 
$$

embedding Lie algebra elements $\alpha \in g$ as real vectors using their coefficients $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)}$ in a way that is controlled by frequency parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G)}$. Values of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times \dim(G)}$ are randomly initialized and can be kept fixed. We parameterize the Lie algebra kernel $\hat{k} : g \times g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a neural network $NN_{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{4D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ taking concatenated Fourier features as input:

$$
\hat{k}_{\theta}(a_{v^{-1}u}, a_v) = NN_{\theta} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{\omega}(a_{v^{-1}u}) \\ \gamma_{\omega'}(a_v) \end{bmatrix} \right)
$$

where $\gamma_{\omega}(a_{v^{-1}u})$ are the Fourier features of the stationary component on the filter-space and $\gamma_{\omega'}(a_v)$ are the Fourier features of the non-stationary component on the domain-space.
Although frequency parameters $\omega$ and $\omega'$ represent the stationary and non-stationary input components $v^{-1}u \in G$ and $v \in G$. Frequency parameters $\omega$ and $\omega'$ respectively control the spectra of the filter-space and domain-space, generalizing the convolution to an operator with continuously adjustable symmetry constraints.

Directly representing the kernel with an MLP on $\alpha$ without Fourier features will likely hamper performance as MLPs are known to suffer from ‘spectral bias’ [2, 16], making it difficult to encode high-frequency functions. Sinusoidal activations in random fourier features [17, 24] and SIRENs [23] alleviate this issue and have been found suitable encodings of positional information in neural networks [25], including (place-coded) continuous kernels in neural networks [20, 19]. Moreover, it can be shown that if we initialize $W$ with independent Gaussian noise from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and let $\text{NN}_\theta$ be a single linear layer, $k$ corresponds to a GP with RBF-kernel in the infinite width limit $D \to \infty$ [17].

**Intuition behind frequency parameters.** The frequency parameters $\omega$ and $\omega'$ control the frequencies in the respective ‘filter-space’ and ‘domain-space’. Specific values of $\omega$ and $\omega'$ correspond to a layer $\theta$ that exactly is or interpolates between special cases discussed in Section 4.1. Most notably, for $\omega'=0$ the layer becomes a strictly equivariant convolution and for both $\omega=\omega'=0$ the layer performs invariant pooling. To understand why this is the case, it can be helpful to consider how different frequencies affect the kernel. A Fourier feature of which the frequency parameter is zero is constant $\gamma_0$. For $\omega'=0$ we therefore have a constant Fourier feature for the non-stationary component $\gamma_\omega'(a_v) = \gamma_0$ and a kernel that is solely defined in the filter-space. If both $\omega=\omega'=0$, we also have a constant Fourier feature for the non-stationary component $\gamma_\omega(a_v-x_v) = \gamma_0$ and a kernel that is constant everywhere, which results in invariant pooling. Positive values for $\omega'$ introduce non-stationarity that effectively relaxes the strict equivariance constraints of the convolution at $\omega'=0$. Note that individual scalars in $\omega'$ correspond to particular subgroups and we can relax equivariance constraints of specific subgroups by letting $\omega'$ be greater than zero in the associated dimension.

As an example, let us consider the translation group $G=T(2)$ with two filter-space frequencies $\omega = [\omega_x, \omega_y]^T$ and two domain-space frequencies $\omega' = [\omega_x', \omega_y']^T$. If $\omega'=0$, the layer becomes a strict equivariant convolution where higher values of $\omega_x, \omega_y > 0$ relate to more rapid changes in filter-space. No matter the value of $\omega$ or weights $\theta$, the kernel will remain completely stationary due to $\omega'=0$ meaning the same filter is applied to all locations in the input, as is always the case in a convolution. If, instead, we let the components of $\omega'$ become non-zero, $\omega_x', \omega_y' > 0$, then the kernel values can also depend on the absolute coordinate in the input image. Higher $\omega'$ result in a more rapidly changing kernel relative to different locations in the input image. This non-stationarity breaks equivariance constraints in a continuous way. For sufficiently high $\omega'$, the function can become akin to a linear product that has enough variance to have an independent weight for each input location. Illustrations of the different symmetry modes for translation $G=T(2)$ are shown in Fig. 1.

Although frequency parameters $\omega, \omega'$ are continuous and can be differentiated, they can not be learned naively together with $\theta$ using the common maximum likelihood objective. Lower values for $\omega$ and $\omega'$ constrain the function and prohibit a better data fit according to the traditional training loss. To find values for $\omega$ and $\omega'$ that lead to good generalization, we resort to cross-validation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$T(2)$</th>
<th>$SO(2)$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
<th>$\omega'$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T(2)-CNN (regular continuous CNN)</td>
<td>strict</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$\omega_x, \omega_y$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE(2)-CNN</td>
<td>strict</td>
<td>strict</td>
<td>$\omega_x, \omega_y$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft T(2)-CNN (ours)</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$\omega_x', \omega_y'$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft SE(2)-CNN (ours)</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>$\omega_x', \omega_y'$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft SE(2)-CNN (ours)</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>$\omega_x', \omega_y'$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft SE(2)-CNN (ours)</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>$\omega_x', \omega_y'$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we compare a rotation invariant G-CNN model that consists of multiple strictly equivariant layers.

we repeat the MNIST-180 problem of [18] and include our model. This toy problem is designed

we empirically validate the approach by relaxing symmetries in $T(2)$.

To verify that relaxed equivariance allows for less restrictive functions compared to strict equivariance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. samples in SO(2)</th>
<th>T(2) \times SO(2)</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Test accuracy CIFAR-10</th>
<th>Test accuracy CIFAR-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strict - CNN</td>
<td>81.80 ± 0.18</td>
<td>46.20 ± 0.09</td>
<td>81.82 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE(2) ⋊ T(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strict Partial</td>
<td>81.39 ± 0.26</td>
<td>44.00 ± 0.18</td>
<td>82.16 ± 0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Romero and Lohit [18]</td>
<td>84.82 ± 0.20</td>
<td>50.41 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strict Partial</td>
<td>82.16 ± 0.26</td>
<td>46.43 ± 0.14</td>
<td>86.39 ± 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Romero and Lohit [18]</td>
<td>84.82 ± 0.20</td>
<td>50.41 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strict Partial</td>
<td>85.33 ± 0.13</td>
<td>47.08 ± 0.15</td>
<td>86.29 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Romero and Lohit [18]</td>
<td>85.92 ± 0.32</td>
<td>50.58 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soft</td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>85.92 ± 0.32</td>
<td>50.58 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Implementation

Parameterization in $T(2)$, SO(2) and SE(2) Although we define the Eq. (2) for general groups, we empirically validate the approach by relaxing symmetries in $T(2)$, SO(2) and SE(2) groups. We define frequencies in $x$-direction $\omega_x$, $\omega'_x$, $y$-direction $\omega_y$, $\omega'_y$ and rotation $\omega_r$, $\omega'_r$. To ensure the kernel is smooth in SO(2), we let $\omega_r$, $\omega'_r$ and associated entries in $W$ be integer valued, similar to circular harmonics. In Table 1 we give an overview of $\omega$ and $\omega'$ for different models.

Sampling. The integral in Eq. (2) is not tractable in closed form and we therefore choose to approximate it by using samples, similar to Finzi et al. [7]. We deterministically evaluate group elements in $T(2)$ that correspond to (lifted) pixel locations and randomly sample 4, 8 or 16 group elements uniformly over SO(2). For [18], the uniform distribution over SO(2) covers the entire group at the start of training but has an adjustable range that is learned by early-stopping on the validation loss. Both approaches have continuous convolutional kernels that can be evaluated anywhere and thus do not require any interpolation of filter values.

Locally-supported in filter-space. Similar to conventional convolutional networks, we only define the kernel in a local subset $S$ of the filter-space, forcing the kernel to be zero $\forall \theta=0$ outside this local support. Doing so, makes the approximation of the integral in Eq. (2) much cheaper as we only need to sample the group elements within the support. Another consequence is that we no longer obtain strictly invariant global-pooling of Eq. (5). Instead, a kernel that is only a constant non-zero value in a local support represents a local-pooling layer, where the pool size equals the support size. In the experiments we let $S$ be a disk in $T(2)$ with a diameter equal to 7 pixels in the input domain $\Lambda'.

Choosing frequency parameters. As we compare with Romero and Lohit [18], which is the only method known to us that relaxes equivariance constraints for continuous kernels, we follow the same ResNet architecture and initialization of $\omega$ and NN $\theta$. We select $\omega'$ with cross-validation and limit the search space by considering equal filter-space frequencies $\omega_x = \omega_y = \omega_r$, translation axes $\omega'_x = \omega'_y = \omega'_r$, and share frequencies across layers. Equal frequencies in $x$ and $y$ only scale the Fourier basis and do not constrain the kernel to be isotropic. Independent frequencies per layer is interesting future work.

6 Experiments

6.1 Verifying soft-equivariance using symmetry misspecification toy example

To verify that relaxed equivariance allows for less restrictive functions compared to strict equivariance, we repeat the MNIST-180 problem of [18] and include our model. This toy problem is designed such that it can not be solved under strict symmetry constraints. It consists of the 6's in the MNIST dataset of which one half is randomly rotated by 180 degrees. The task is to determine whether a sample has been rotated, i.e., a binary classification problem between ’6’s and ’9’s. In Table 3, we compare a rotation invariant G-CNN model that consists of multiple strictly equivariant layers followed by group pooling and compare with [18] and our model. In line with our expectations, we find that in this artificial set-up the relaxed ResNet model quickly converges to 100% test accuracy. The model with strict rotation symmetry are unable to distinguish between ’6’s and ’9’s and can thus not improve over a simple coin-flip with 50% accuracy on average.
Table 3: Toy problem. Models that obey strict rotation symmetry cannot distinguish between 6’s and 9’s whereas the task can be solved under relaxed symmetry constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SO(2)</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Test accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>G-CNN</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparse [18]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft (ours)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Image classification experiments

We assess the effectivity of relaxing equivariance constraints for translation and rotation groups T(2), SO(2) and SE(2) on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 image classification tasks. As strict symmetries can lead to misspecification, we hypothesize that relaxed equivariance can improve the model performance on these tasks. As baselines, we use a strictly equivariant G-CNNs and a Partial G-CNNs [18]. The difference in model sizes arising from different kernel input dimensions are negligible compared to the total number of model parameters for the used architecture. In Fig. 4, we plot performance on the validation set for different values of frequency parameter $\omega'$ and list final test accuracies in Table 2. In our experiments, we find that relaxing equivariance always lead to better results, indicating that strict equivariance could be misspecified in these problems. We find that relaxing equivariance always leads to improved test accuracy, albeit almost negligibly small for T(2). The optimal frequency parameters should not directly be interpret as its scale also depends on the chosen basis, parameterization and initialization of NN$\theta$. It would be interesting to see whether this gap becomes larger with increased number of basis functions or other choices of NN$\theta$. With soft-SO(2) we observe up to 7 percentage points of improved test accuracy on CIFAR-100 compared to strict equivariance.

![Figure 4: Relaxing equivariance constraints. Classification accuracies for SE(2)-equivariant model with soft-SO(2) equivariances for different values of $\omega'$ and soft-T(2) equivariance varying $\omega'_{x}=\omega'_{y}$.](image)

7 Conclusion

In this work, we have proposed a generalization of the group convolution to allow for a smooth parameter-efficient relaxation of otherwise strict symmetry constraints. The main idea is to use a non-stationary kernel that also depends on the absolute input group element, breaking strict equivariance constraints. By representing group elements in a Fourier feature space, we obtain explicit control over the symmetry constraints through tunable frequency parameters.

A limitation of the approach is that frequency parameters that determine the amount of symmetry are set using cross-validation. More sophisticated methods could allow frequencies to be learned based on training data and possibly even independently for each layer. We expect this to further improve the effectivity of the proposed method. This as an interesting avenue of research, which could enable automatic layer-by-layer symmetry discovery as part of the training procedure.

We have demonstrated that neural network layers with adjustable symmetry constraints can improve test accuracy in image classification tasks and hope that the work can be generally useful in machine learning applications that require smooth relaxations of symmetry constraints.
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A Mathematical details

A.1 Proofs of limiting cases

Remark 4. \( h_\theta(u) = (k_\theta \cdot f)(u) \) is strictly \( G \)-equivariant if \( \omega' = 0 \).

Proof. For \( \omega' = 0 \), we can write \( \gamma_\omega(a) = D^2 \left[ \cos(0) \sin(0) \right]^T = \gamma_0 \) as a (constant) vector that does not depend on \( a \). Subsequently, the Lie algebra kernel \( \hat{k}_\theta(a_{v^{-1}}, a_v) = \text{NN}_\theta \left( \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{\omega'}(a_{v^{-1}}) \\ \gamma_0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \hat{k}_\theta(a_{v^{-1}}, 0) \) is invariant to its second input and so is the Lie group kernel \( k_\theta(v^{-1}u, v) = k_\theta(v^{-1}u, 0) := k'_\theta(v^{-1}u) \). From here we can see that \( h_\theta(u) = (k_\theta \cdot f)(u) = \int_G k'_\theta(v^{-1}u) f(v) d\mu(v) = (k'_\theta \ast f)(u) \) is a convolution, which is \( G \)-equivariant. \( \square \)

Remark 5. \( h_\theta(u) = (k_\theta \cdot f)(u) \) is strictly \( G \)-invariant if \( \omega = \omega' = 0 \) (or if the kernel is constant).

Proof. For \( \omega = \omega' = 0 \), we can write both Fourier features \( \gamma_\omega(a) = \gamma_{\omega'}(a) = \gamma_0 \) as a (constant) vector that does not depend on \( a \). Subsequently, the kernel in our Lie algebra do not depend on \( a_v \) and \( a_{v^{-1}} \). Assuming \( \text{NN}_\theta \) is a deterministic function, we then have that our Lie algebra kernel is invariant to both inputs and must therefore be constant \( \hat{k}_\theta(a_{v^{-1}u}, a_v) = \text{NN}_\theta \left( \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0 \\ \gamma_0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \hat{k}_\theta(0, 0) = C \)

and similarly for the Lie group kernel \( k_\theta(v^{-1}u, v) = k_\theta(0, 0) = C \). From here we have that \( h_\theta(u) = (k_\theta \cdot f)(u) = \int_G C f(v) d\mu(v) = C \int_G f(v) d\mu(v) \) is a scaled integral over the entire group, which is \( G \)-invariant. \( \square \)

A.2 Change of variables

To show \((u, v), (v^{-1}u, v)\) and \((v^{-1}u, u)\) are isomorphic, it suffices to show we have bijective mappings between each pair.

Remark 6. \( \phi_1 : G \times G \rightarrow G \times G : (u, v) \rightarrow (v^{-1}u, v) \) forms a bijection.

Proof. We let \( \phi_1(a, b) = (b^{-1}a, b) \), so we have \( \phi_1(u, v) = (v^{-1}u, v) \). Now for the inverse we can choose \( \phi_1^{-1}(a, b) = (ba, b) \), so that

\[
\phi_1^{-1}(v^{-1}u, v) = (v(v^{-1}u), v) = ((vv^{-1})u, v) = (u, v)
\]

which proofs that \( \phi_1 \) is a bijection. \( \square \)

Remark 7. \( \phi_2 : G \times G \rightarrow G \times G : (u, v) \rightarrow (v^{-1}u, u) \) forms a bijection.

Proof. We let \( \phi_2(a, b) = (b^{-1}a, a) \), so we have \( \phi_2(u, v) = (v^{-1}u, u) \). Now for the inverse we can choose \( \phi_2^{-1}(a, b) = (b, ba^{-1}) \), so that

\[
\phi_2^{-1}(v^{-1}u, u) = (u, u(v^{-1}u)^{-1}) = (u, u(u^{-1}v)) = (u, (uu^{-1})v) = (u, v)
\]

which proofs that \( \phi_2 \) is a bijection. \( \square \)

Remark 8. \( \phi_3 : G \times G \rightarrow G \times G : (v^{-1}u, v) \rightarrow (v^{-1}u, u) \) forms a bijection.

Proof. We let \( \phi_3 = \phi_2^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \) be a composition of two bijections, which must therefore be bijective. \( \square \)
B Examples of continuous filter banks

The kernel $k_\theta$ is continuously defined over group elements in $G$. The figure below shows continuous filter bank and samples at initialization for different choices for lengthscales $\omega_x = \omega_y$. Higher values for $\omega$ result in higher frequency filters.

![Figure 5: Visualization of continuous filterbank $k_\theta$ and samples for different lengthscales $\omega$.](image)

Non-stationary filter bank

In the image below, we plot the filter bank of an SE(2)-equivariant model.

If we let $\omega'$ (here specifically $\omega'_r$) be a positive value, we instead obtain a non-stationary kernel $k_\theta(v^{-1}u, v)$ that also depends on the non-stationary second argument $v$:

Local filter support

For the experiments, we use a disk-shaped local-support in filter-space with a diameter that corresponds to 7 pixels in the original input space.
Soft filter mask

Instead of a strict local support, we could also consider a soft mask using a zero-mean Gaussian where the radius is defined by its standard deviation $\sigma_{\text{mask}}$: 

- Mask = 0.05
- Mask = 0.2
- Mask = 0.5
- Mask = 1.0