

Physics of Data. Part XIV

[Physics of Data. Part XIV](#) | [Alfonso R. Reyes](#)

Do Physics-Informed Neural Networks ([PINNs](#)) mean more accurate calculations and faster solvers than FEM, FVM, FDM, and mesh approaches?

Does it mean it's time to say goodbye to traditional [PDE](#) and [ODE](#) solvers?

[PINNs](#) are not necessarily more accurate, or faster, than traditional [PDE](#) or [ODE](#) solvers. That is not the main purpose or aim of PINNs.

What I gather from the literature - papers by Prof. Raissi, Karniadakis, Jagtap, Brunton, Cuomo, et al - is that PINNs allows you find out faster what is the best approach before you embark on a more time consuming and expensive effort with the traditional methods: FEM, FVM, FDM with meshed based [simulation](#). Traditional solving methods are decades proven to work, and the scientific community should continue working and investing in them.

PINNs are also ideal to supplement [Data Science](#) and [Machine Learning](#) projects in [real time](#) dynamical systems - very similar to those found in the field -, to include your own [hidden Physics](#) in the [algorithms](#). In the form of differential equations, [Dynamical Systems](#) behavior can be understood and predicted much, much better than typical pure [data Driven](#) methods if you are able to identify parameters and state variables. Just by itself, discovering and finding the right [equations](#) it's a great challenge.

In some way, we could say that PINNs and relatives enable [computational Physics](#) and scientific machine learning to advance at a pace similar to that Silicon Valley phrase of "fail fast, fail often, learn fast"

FVM: Finite Volume Method

FEM: Finite Element Method

FDM: Finite Differences Method



Alfonso R. Reyes ✓ • You

VP Artificial Intelligence Engineering - Energy Division

4mo • Edited •

...

Physics of Data. Part XIV

Do Physics-Informed Neural Networks (**#PINNs**) mean more accurate calculations and faster solvers than FEM, FVM, FDM, and mesh approaches?

Does it mean it's time to say goodbye to traditional **#PDE** and **#ODE** solvers?

#PINNs are not necessarily more accurate, or faster, than traditional **#PDE** or **#ODE** solvers. That is not the main purpose or aim of PINNs.

What I gather from the literature - papers by Prof. Raissi, Karniadakis, Jagtap, Brunton, Cuomo, et al - is that PINNs allows you find out faster what is the best approach before you embark on a more time consuming and expensive effort with the traditional methods: FEM, FVM, FDM with meshed based **#simulation**. Traditional solving methods are decades proven to work, and the scientific community should continue working and investing in them.

PINNs are also ideal to supplement **#dataScience** and **#machinelearning** projects in **#realtime** dynamical systems - very similar to those found in the field -, to include your own **#hiddenPhysics** in the **#algorithms**. In the form of differential equations, **#dynamicalSystems** behavior can be understood and predicted much, much better than typical pure **#dataDriven** methods if you are able to identify parameters and state variables. Just by itself, discovering and finding the right **#equations** it's a great challenge.

In some way, we could say that PINNs and relatives enable **#computationalPhysics** and scientific machine learning to advance at a pace similar to that Silicon Valley phrase of "fail fast, fail often, learn fast"

FVM: Finite Volume Method

FEM: Finite Element Method

FDM: Finite Differences Method

#PhysicsOfData **#SciML** **#petroleumEngineering** **#spe** **#seg** **#DigitalTr**