## Physics-informed kernel learning

CRM Spring school, Montreal 2025

### Work team



Nathan Doumèche



Francis Bach



Gérard Biau



Claire Boyer

### Summary

- 1. Hybrid modeling
- 2. Survival kit on kernel learning
- 3. PIML as a kernel method
- 4. The PIKL algorithm

### Summary

#### 1. Hybrid modeling

- 2. Survival kit on kernel learning
- 3. PIML as a kernel method
- 4. The PIKL algorithm

### Hybrid modeling

Statistical model:  $Y = f^*(X) + \varepsilon$ 

- Goal: estimate  $f^*$  using
  - Supervised learning: an i.i.d. training sample  $(X_i, Y_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$

Physical modeling: a prior knowledge

 $\mathcal{D}(f^\star,\cdot)\simeq 0$ 

with a known differential operator  ${\mathscr D}$ 

### Why combining learning with physics?



### Example: Blood flow in an aneurysm





### Modeling the blood flow



Goal: estimate the blood flow  $f = (f_x, f_y, P)$ 

Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\mathcal{D}_1(f,\cdot) = f_x \partial_x f_x + f_y \partial_y f_x - \partial_{x,x}^2 f_x - \partial_{y,y}^2 f_x + \partial_x P$$

$$\mathcal{D}_2(f,\cdot) = f_x \partial_x f_y + f_y \partial_y f_y - \partial_{x,x}^2 f_y - \partial_{y,y}^2 f_y + \partial_y P$$

$$\mathcal{D}_3(f,\cdot) = \partial_x f_x + \partial_y f_y$$

[Arzani et al., 2021]

### Geometry of the problem



▶  $\Omega \subseteq [-L, L]^d$ : the bounded set on which the problem is posed

- $f^*: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ : the unknown target function
- ► Differential operator  $\mathscr{D}(f^{\star}, \cdot) \simeq 0$  on  $\Omega$

### Three samplings



- Training sample (X,Y)
- + Condition points X<sup>(e)</sup>
- × Collocation points X<sup>(r)</sup>

### Physics-informed empirical risk

- ► Training sample  $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  (unknown distribution)
- ► Boundary/initial sample  $X_1^{(e)}, ..., X_{n_e}^{(e)} \in E \subseteq \partial \Omega$  (chosen distribution)
- Collocation points  $m{X}_1^{(r)},\ldots,m{X}_{n_r}^{(r)}\in\Omega$

(uniform distribution)

#### Empirical risk function

$$R_{n,n_e,n_r}(f_{\theta}) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f_{\theta}(X_i) - Y_i\|_2^2}_{\text{data-fidelity}} + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda_{(\text{pde})}}{n_r} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_r} \|\mathscr{D}(f_{\theta}, \mathbf{X}_{\ell}^{(r)})\|_2^2}_{\text{PDEs}}}_{\text{PDEs}} + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda_e}{n_e} \sum_{j=1}^{n_e} \|f_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_{j}^{(e)}) - h(\mathbf{X}_{j}^{(e)})\|_2^2}_{\text{boundary conditions}}}$$

Physics-Informed Neural Networks: NN obtained after training

### (Previously) Statistical convergence of PINNs

[Doumèche, Biau, Boyer, 2024]

Training of a NN with large width and a few hidden layers

$$\begin{split} \widehat{NN}_{\theta} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{NN} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f_{\theta}(X_{i}) - Y_{i}\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{(\text{pde})}}{n_{r}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{r}} \|\mathscr{D}(f_{\theta}, \boldsymbol{X}_{\ell}^{(r)})\|_{2}^{2} \\ + \frac{\lambda_{(\text{sob})}}{n_{r}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{r}} \Big( \sum_{|\alpha| \leqslant s} \|\partial^{\alpha} f_{\theta}(X_{i}^{(r)})\|_{2}^{2} \Big) + \lambda_{(\text{ridge})} \|\theta\|_{2}^{2} \end{split}$$

Ridge regularization to prevent overfitting

- Sobolev and ridge regularizations for strong convergence
  - + statistical accuracy on the support of the training data
  - + physical consistency anywhere else

### Towards a kernel approach

- Assumption:  $f^* \in H^s(\Omega)$
- Extension:  $H^{s}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s}_{per}([-2L, 2L]^{d})$
- ►  $H^s_{per}([-2L, 2L]^d)$  = subspace of  $H^s([-2L, 2L]^d)$  of functions whose 4*L*-periodic extension is still *s*-times weakly differentiable
- Important:  $f^* \in H^s(\Omega) \iff f^* \in H^s([-2L, 2L]^d)$



Empirical risk $R_n(f) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(X_i) - Y_i|^2}_{\text{data-fidelity term}} + \underbrace{\lambda_{(\text{sob})} \|f\|_{H^s_{\text{per}}([-2L,2L]^d)}^2}_{\text{target regularity}} + \underbrace{\lambda_{(\text{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}_{\text{PDE}}$ 

### Objective

### Framing PIML as a kernel method

$$\hat{f}_n = \operatorname*{argmin}_{f \in H^s_{ ext{per}}([-2L, 2L]^d)} \ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(X_i) - Y_i|^2 + \|f\|^2_{ ext{RKHS}},$$

with 
$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{RKHS}}^2 = \lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \|f\|_{H^s_{\mathrm{per}}([-2L,2L]^d)}^2 + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

- How does the PDE penalty impact learning?
- How to leverage the kernel toolbox?
- How to define a tractable estimator?

#### Assumption

 $\mathcal{D}$  is a linear operator of the derivatives of f.

### Summary

- 1. Hybrid modeling
- 2. Survival kit on kernel learning
- 3. PIML as a kernel method
- 4. The PIKL algorithm

### Kernel ridge regression

- ► Kernel: a symmetric positive definite function  $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{i,i'=1}^{n} \alpha_i \alpha_{i'} K(x_i, x_{i'}) \ge 0$
- ▶ There exists a Hilbert space RKHS of functions  $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$  such that

(i) 
$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, K(\cdot, x) \in \text{RKHS}$$
  
(ii)  $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}, \langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_{\text{RKHS}} = f(x)$ 

- Reproducing kernel Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K
- Example: polynomial kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{\mathcal{T}} = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}' \\ (\mathbf{x}')^2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{T}}$$

### The kernel trick

#### Regularized empirical risk minimization

$$\hat{f}_n = \operatorname*{argmin}_{f \in \mathrm{RKHS}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - f(X_i))^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathrm{RKHS}}^2$$

Representer theorem

$$\hat{f}_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\alpha}_i K(x, X_i)$$

▶ The solution lives in a finite-dimensional subspace!

### Kernel methods

We solve a finite-dimensional problem

$$\begin{split} \hat{\alpha} &= \operatorname*{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( Y_{i} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{j} \mathcal{K}(X_{i}, X_{j}) \right)^{2} + \lambda \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{j} \mathcal{K}(\cdot, X_{j}) \right\|_{\mathrm{RKHS}}^{2} \\ &= \operatorname*{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n}} \frac{1}{n} \left\| \mathbb{Y} - \mathbb{K} \alpha \right\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \alpha^{\top} \mathbb{K} \alpha \\ &= \left( \mathbb{K} + n \lambda I_{n} \right)^{-1} \mathbb{Y} \end{split}$$

#### ► Final predictor

$$\hat{f}_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\alpha}_i K(x, X_i)$$

 $\bigcirc$  No need to explicitly use/know  $\varphi$  to train a kernel ridge regressor!

### Effective dimension & convergence

▶ Integral/covariance operator  $L_K : L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P}_X) \to L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P}_X)$ , defined by

$$\forall f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P}_X), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad L_K f(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} K(x, y) f(y) d\mathbb{P}_X(y)$$

• Effective dimension:  $tr(L_{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda Id + L_{\mathcal{K}})^{-1})$ 

Convergence rate of the kernel method

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathcal{X}}|\hat{f}_n - f^{\star}|^2 d\mathbb{P}_X = \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{\text{Effective dimension}}{n}\Big)$$

### Summary

- 1. Hybrid modeling
- 2. Survival kit on kernel learning
- 3. PIML as a kernel method
- 4. The PIKL algorithm

### Underlying RKHS for linear PDEs

#### Lemma

There exists a positive operator  $\mathcal{O}_n$  on  $L^2([-2L, 2L]^d)$  such that, for any  $f \in H^s_{per}([-2L, 2L]^d)$ ,

$$\|\mathscr{O}_n^{-1/2}(f)\|_{L^2([-2L,2L]^d)}^2 = \lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \|f\|_{H^s_{\mathrm{per}}([-2L,2L]^d)}^2 + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

This suggests the inner product

$$\langle f,g \rangle_{\mathrm{RKHS}} = \langle \mathcal{O}_n^{-1/2}(f), \mathcal{O}_n^{-1/2}(g) \rangle_{L^2([-2L,2L]^d)}$$

### Underlying RKHS for linear PDEs II

For any 
$$f \in L^2([-2L, 2L]^d)$$
 and  $x \in [-2L, 2L]^d$ ,  
 $\mathscr{O}_n(f)(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} a_m \langle f, v_m \rangle_{L^2([-2L, 2L]^d)} v_m(x)$ 

Orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions v<sub>m</sub> ∈ H<sup>s</sup><sub>per</sub>([-2L, 2L]<sup>d</sup>)
 Eigenvalues a<sub>m</sub> > 0

#### Theorem

The space  $H_{per}^{s}([-2L, 2L]^{d})$ , equipped with the inner product

$$\langle f,g\rangle_{\mathrm{RKHS}} = \langle \mathcal{O}_n^{-1/2}f, \mathcal{O}_n^{-1/2}g\rangle_{L^2([-2L,2L]^d)},$$

is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. For  $f \in H^s_{per}([-2L, 2L]^d)$ ,

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{RKHS}}^2 = \lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \|f\|_{H^s_{\mathrm{per}}([-2L,2L]^d)}^2 + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

and the associated kernel is  $K(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} a_m v_m(x) v_m(y)$ .

### PIML as a kernel method

$$\begin{split} \hat{f}_n &= \underset{f \in H_{\text{per}}^s([-2L,2L]^d)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(X_i) - Y_i|^2 + \lambda_{(\text{sob})} \|f\|_{H_{\text{per}}^s([-2L,2L]^d)}^2 + \lambda_{(\text{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \underset{f \in H_{\text{per}}^s([-2L,2L]^d)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(X_i) - Y_i|^2 + \|f\|_{\text{RKHS}}^2 \end{split}$$

 $\checkmark$   $\hat{f}_n$  is a kernel method

X Computing the kernel is not straightforward

#### Proposition (Characterization of the kernel)

The kernel K is the unique solution to the following weak formulation, valid for all test functions  $\varphi \in H^s_{per}([-2L, 2L]^d)$ : for all  $x \in \Omega$ ,

$$\lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \sum_{|\alpha| \leqslant s} \int_{[-2L, 2L]^d} \partial^{\alpha} K(x, \cdot) \ \partial^{\alpha} \varphi + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \int_{\Omega} \mathscr{D}(K(x, \cdot)) \ \mathscr{D}(\varphi) = \varphi(x).$$

### Convergence rate of the PIML kernel method

▶ Integral operator  $L_{\mathcal{K}} : L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{P}_X) \to L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{P}_X)$ , defined by

$$\forall f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{P}_X), \forall x \in \Omega, \quad L_{\mathcal{K}}f(x) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{K}(x, y)f(y)d\mathbb{P}_X(y)$$

• Effective dimension  $\mathscr{N}(\lambda_{(\text{sob})}, \lambda_{(\text{pde})}) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}(\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}})^{-1})$ 

#### Theorem (Convergence rate)

Assume that  $f^* \in H^s(\Omega)$ , s > d/2,  $\frac{d\mathbb{P}_X}{dx} \leq \kappa$ , and the noise  $\varepsilon$  is  $(M, \sigma)$ -sub-Gamma. Then, for all n large enough,

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E} & \int_{\Omega} |\hat{f}_n - f^{\star}|^2 d\mathbb{P}_X \\ & \lesssim \log^2(n) \Big( \lambda_{(\text{sob})} \|f^{\star}\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 + \lambda_{(\text{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f^{\star})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \\ & \frac{M^2}{n^2 \lambda_{(\text{sob})}} + \frac{\sigma^2 \mathscr{N}(\lambda_{(\text{sob})}, \lambda_{(\text{pde})})}{n} \Big). \end{split}$$

- × Not easy to characterize the eigenvalues of  $L_K$  for the PIML estimator
- ▶ A simple bound on  $\mathscr{N}(\lambda_{(sob)}, \lambda_{(pde)})$  shows that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{\Omega}|\hat{f}_n-f^{\star}|^2d\mathbb{P}_X=\mathcal{O}_n(n^{-2s/(2s+d)}\log^3(n))$$

Can we do better?

### A toy example

► 
$$d = 1, \ \Omega = [-L, L], \ \Omega^{\text{aug}} = [-2L, 2L]$$
  
►  $f^* \in H^1(\Omega)$   
►  $\mathscr{D} = \frac{d}{dx}$  ( $f^*$  is approximately constant)  
 $\hat{f}_n = \underset{f \in H^1_{\text{per}}(\Omega^{\text{aug}})}{\operatorname{min}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(X_i) - Y_i|^2 + \lambda_{(\text{sob})} ||f||^2_{H^1_{\text{per}}(\Omega^{\text{aug}})} + \lambda_{(\text{pde})} ||\mathscr{D}(f)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ 



### Speed-up of the physical penalty

### Theorem (Kernel speed-up)

Let  $\lambda_{(sob)} = n^{-1} \log(n)$  and

$$\lambda_{(\text{pde})} = \begin{cases} n^{-2/3} / \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \text{ if } \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \neq 0\\ 1 / \log(n) & \text{ if } \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0. \end{cases}$$

#### Then

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{[-L,L]} |\hat{f}_n - f^*|^2 d\mathbb{P}_X = \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \mathcal{O}_n(n^{-2/3}\log^3(n)) \\ + (\|f^*\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 + \underbrace{\sigma^2 + M^2}_{noise \ param}) \mathcal{O}_n(n^{-1}\log^3(n)).$$

### Speed-up of the physical penalty

Theorem (Kernel speed-up) Let  $\lambda_{(sob)} = n^{-1} \log(n)$  and  $\lambda_{(\text{pde})} = \begin{cases} n^{-2/3} / \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \text{if } \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \neq 0\\ 1 / \log(n) & \text{if } \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0. \end{cases}$ Then  $\mathbb{E}\int_{[1,L]} |\hat{f}_n - f^*|^2 d\mathbb{P}_X = \|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \mathcal{O}_n(n^{-2/3}\log^3(n))$  $+ \left( \|f^*\|^2_{H^s(\Omega)} + \underbrace{\sigma^2 + M^2}_{} \right) \mathcal{O}_n \left( \frac{n^{-1} \log^3(n)}{} \right).$ noise param

✓ When  $\|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \rightarrow \text{parametric rate of } n^{-1}$ 

✓ When  $\|\mathscr{D}(f^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} > 0$  → Sobolev minimax rate in  $H^1(\Omega)$  of  $n^{-2/3}$ 

### Summary

- 1. Hybrid modeling
- 2. Survival kit on kernel learning
- 3. PIML as a kernel method
- 4. The PIKL algorithm

### In practice

- ► Kernel estimator:  $\hat{f}_n(x) = (K(x, X_1), \dots, K(x, X_n))(\mathbb{K} + nI_n)^{-1}\mathbb{Y}$
- Problem: what to do when K is not explicit?
- Solution 1: finite element methods to solve a weak PDE

$$\lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \int_{\Omega} \left[ \mathcal{K}(x,\cdot) \ \varphi + \sum_{|lpha|=s} \partial^{lpha} \mathcal{K}(x,\cdot) \ \partial^{lpha} arphi 
ight] + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \int_{\Omega} \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{K}(x,\cdot)) \ \mathscr{D}(arphi) = arphi(x)$$



### In practice

• Kernel estimator  $\hat{f}_n(x) = (K(x, X_1), \dots, K(x, X_n))(\mathbb{K} + nI_n)^{-1}\mathbb{Y}$ 

- Problem: what to do when K is not explicit?
- Solution 2: exploit Fourier series
  - 1. Periodize

$$\bar{R}_{n}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f(X_{i}) - Y_{i}|^{2} + \lambda_{(\text{sob})} \|f\|_{H^{s}_{\text{per}}([-2L, 2L]^{d})}^{2} + \lambda_{(\text{pde})} \|\mathscr{D}(f)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}$$

2. Restrict the minimization to

$$H_m = \operatorname{Span}((\varphi_k)_{\|k\|_{\infty} \leqslant m}), \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi_k(x) = (4L)^{-d/2} e^{\frac{i\pi}{2L} \langle k, x \rangle}$$

3. PIKL estimator:

$$\hat{f}^{\mathrm{PIKL}} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{f \in H_m} \ \bar{R}_n(f)$$

### Properties of the PIKL estimator

• Assumption: linear operator  $\mathscr{D}(f) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} a_{\alpha} \partial^{\alpha} f$ 

Both the Sobolev norm  $||f||_{H^s_{per}([-2L,2L]^d)}$  and the PDE penalty  $||\mathscr{D}(f)||_{L^2(\Omega)}$ are bilinear functions of the Fourier coefficients z of f

$$\begin{split} \|f\|_{\mathrm{RKHS}}^2 &= \langle z, M_m z \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^{(2m+1)^d}} \text{ on } H_m \\ & \to M_m \in \mathbb{C}^{(2m+1)^d \times (2m+1)^d} \\ & (M_m)_{j,k} = \lambda_{(\mathrm{sob})} \underbrace{\left(1 + \left(\frac{\|k\|_2^2}{(2L)^d}\right)^s\right) \delta_{j,k}}_{\text{Sobolev norm}} + \lambda_{(\mathrm{pde})} \underbrace{\frac{P(j)\bar{P}(k)}{(4L)^d} \int_{\Omega} e^{\frac{i\pi}{2L} \langle k-j, x \rangle} dx}_{\text{PDE norm}}, \\ & \text{where } P(k) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leqslant s} a_\alpha (\frac{-i\pi}{2L})^{|\alpha|} \prod_{\ell=1}^d (k_\ell)^{\alpha_\ell} \end{split}$$

Computation of the integrals possible by numerical integration but also by closed-form formulas:

✓ When 
$$\Omega = [-L, L]^d$$
, integral  $\propto \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\sin(\pi k_j/2)}{\pi k_j}$   
✓ When  $\Omega = B_2^2$ , integral  $\propto \frac{\text{Bessel function}_1(\pi ||k||_2/2)}{4||k||_2}$ 

### Computing the PIKL estimator

For  $f \in H_m$ :

#### **PIKL** estimator

$$\hat{f}^{\text{PIKL}}(x) = (K_m(x, X_1), \dots, K_m(x, X_n))(\mathbb{K}_m + nI_n)^{-1}\mathbb{Y}$$
$$= \Phi_m(x)^* (\Phi^* \Phi + nM_m)^{-1} \Phi^* \mathbb{Y}$$

with 
$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_m(X_1)^{\star} \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_m(X_n)^{\star} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times (2m+1)^d}$$

### Computing the PIKL estimator

#### **PIKL** estimator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{PIKL}}(x) = (\mathcal{K}_m(x, X_1), \dots, \mathcal{K}_m(x, X_n)) \underbrace{(\mathbb{K}_m + nI_n)^{-1}}_{n \times n} \mathbb{Y}$$
$$= \Phi_m(x)^* \underbrace{(\Phi^* \Phi + nM_m)^{-1}}_{(2m+1)^d} \Phi^* \mathbb{Y}$$

- Complexity/storage:  $n \times n$  vs.  $(2m+1)^d \times (2m+1)^d$
- ▶ Possible computation of  $\Phi^*\Phi$  and  $\Phi^*\mathbb{Y}$  online and in parallel
- Training longer than evaluation
- Interpretability of Fourier modes

### XP: Perfect modeling with closed-form PDE solutions<sup>5 / 40</sup>

Harmonic oscillator differential prior

• 
$$d = 1$$
,  $\Omega = [-\pi, \pi]$   
•  $\mathscr{D}(f) = \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} + \frac{df}{dx} + f$ 

▶ PDE solutions  $f = a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2$ , where  $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $f_1(x) = \exp(-x/2)\cos(\sqrt{3}x/2)$ , and  $f_2(x) = \exp(-x/2)\sin(\sqrt{3}x/2)$ 

• Comparison with OLS via  $(\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2)$ 



Fig.:  $L^2$ -error (mean  $\pm$  std over 5 runs) w.r.t. *n* in  $\log_{10} - \log_{10}$  scale.

 Expected parametric rate of n<sup>-1</sup>

The PIKL estimator (m = 300) performs as well as the OLS estimator specifically designed to explore the space of PDE solutions

### XP: Imperfect modeling

Heat equation

• 
$$d = 2, \ \Omega = [-\pi, \pi]^2$$

$$\blacktriangleright \mathscr{D}(f) = \partial_1 f - \partial_{2,2}^2 f$$

• 
$$f^*(t,x) = \exp(-t)\cos(x) + 0.5\sin(2x)$$

► Imperfect modeling:  $\|\mathscr{D}(f^{\star})\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} = \pi > 0$  and  $\frac{\|\mathscr{D}(f^{\star})\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}}{\|f^{\star}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}} \simeq 4 \times 10^{-3}$ 



- Sobolev minimax rate of  $n^{-2/3}$
- The PIKL estimator successfully combines the strengths of hybrid modeling
  - using the PDE when data is scarce
  - relying more on data when it becomes abundant

### PDE solving: PINNs vs. PIKL

- Using PIKL as PDE solvers means
  - no noise (i.e.,  $\varepsilon = 0$ )
  - no modeling error (i.e.,  $\mathscr{D}(f^*) = 0$ )
  - data = uniform samples of  $\partial \Omega$  (boundary & init. conditions) n = 100
- Convection equation: on  $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$

$$\mathscr{D}(f) = \partial_t f + \beta \partial_x f \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \forall x \in [0, 2\pi], \quad f(0, x) = \sin(x), \\ \forall t \in [0, 1], \quad f(t, 0) = f(t, 2\pi) = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

Solution:  $f^*(t,x) = \sin(x - \beta t) \notin H_m$ 

<sup>◊</sup> Krishnapriyan et al. (2021)

	Vanilla PINNs <sup>◊</sup>	Curriculum-trained PINNs $^{\diamond}$	PIKL estimator
$egin{aligned} & eta &= 20 \ & eta &= 30 \ & eta &= 40 \end{aligned}$	$\begin{array}{c} 7.50 \times 10^{-1} \\ 8.97 \times 10^{-1} \\ 9.61 \times 10^{-1} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.84 \times 10^{-3} \\ 2.02 \times 10^{-2} \\ 5.33 \times 10^{-2} \end{array}$	$egin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$

■ PIKL (m = 20) improves the solution accuracy without being sensitive to  $\beta$ 

### PDE solving: PINNs vs. PIKL

Id-wave equation: on Ω = [0, 1]<sup>2</sup>

$$\mathscr{D}(f) = \partial_{t,t}^{2} f - 4 \partial_{x,x}^{2} f \text{ with } \begin{cases} \forall x \in [0,1], & f(0,x) = \sin(\pi x) + \sin(4\pi x)/2, \\ \forall x \in [0,1], & \partial_{t} f(0,x) = 0, \\ \forall t \in [0,1], & f(t,0) = f(t,1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Solution:  $f^*(t,x) = \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi t) + \sin(4\pi x)\cos(8\pi t)/2$ 

• Significant variation  $\|\partial_t f^\star\|_2^2 / \|f^\star\|_2^2 = 16\pi^2$ 

◊ Wang et al. (2022)

	Vanilla PINNs <sup>◊</sup>	NTK-optimized PINNs $^{\diamond}$	PIKL estimator
L <sup>2</sup> relative error Training data (n) # parameters	$\begin{array}{c} 4.52 \times 10^{-1} \\ 2.4 \times 10^{6} \\ 5.03 \times 10^{5} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.73 \times 10^{-3} \\ 2.4 \times 10^{6} \\ 5.03 \times 10^{5} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}(8.70{\scriptstyle \pm 0.08})\times10^{-4}\\10^{5}\\1.68\times10^{3}\end{array}$



PIKL more accurate, requiring fewer data points and parameters

### Opening: PIKL vs. PDE solvers

Performance of traditional PDE solvers for the wave equation on  $\Omega = [0,1]^2$ 

	Euler explicit	RK4	CN	PIKL
L <sup>2</sup> relative error Training data (n)	$\frac{3.8\times 10^{-6}}{10^4}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.8 \times 10^{-6} \\ 10^{4} \end{array}$	${5.6\times 10^{-3}\atop 10^{4}}$	$\begin{array}{c} 8.70 \times 10^{-4} \\ 10^{3} \end{array}$

Traditional PDE solvers outperform PIKL (even with fewer data)

Performance for the wave equation with noisy boundary conditions

	PINNs	Euler explicit	RK4	CN	PIKL estimator
L <sup>2</sup> relative error Training data (n)	$\begin{array}{c} 4.61\times10^{-1}\\ 2.4\times10^{6} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.25\times10^{-1}\\ 4\times10^4\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.05\times 10^{-2} \\ 4\times 10^4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.01\times10^{-2} \\ 4\times10^4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.87 \times 10^{-2} \\ 4 \times 10^{4} \end{array}$

PIKL outperforms PDE solvers under noisy conditions

### Conclusion

- Minimizing the empirical risk regularized by a PDE can be viewed as a kernel method
- Physical information can be beneficial to the statistical performance of the estimators
- PIKL: kernel toolbox for physics-informed learning

# Thank you!

- [Doumèche, Bach, Biau, Boyer] PIKL paper on arXiv 2409.13786
- [Doumèche, Bach, Biau, Boyer COLT 2024] Kernel paper on arXiv 2402.07514
- [Doumèche, Biau, Boyer Bernoulli 2024] PINN paper on arXiv 2305.01240