# A GENERAL APPROACH FOR LEARNING CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONSHIPS (PHYSICAL LAWS) FROM NEURAL NETWORKS

ANDREW TEMPLE, MATTHEW MILLER, AARON STEBNER, PETER COLLINS, AND BRANDEN KAPPES

## 1. Methods

Fully dense neural network (NN) architectures, such as the one shown in Figure 1, perform a sequence of affine transformations, $\mathbf{z}_i \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \mathbf{x}^{(i)}$, followed by element-wise functional operations, $\sigma(\mathbf{z}_i)$ to introduce non-linearity at each layer; that is, each layer stretches and distorts the underlying space.




Figure 1. Schematic view of a fully dense neural network. Each sequence of affine and non-linear transformations are captured in the function, $f_i(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x}^{(i+1)} \leftarrow \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i \mathbf{x}^{(i)})$

The resulting network,

$$f(x) = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1} \sigma(\ldots \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \mathbf{x})))) \tag{1}$$

is an arbitrary function generator, but at present, the network weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ can not map back to analytic forms that capture and describe the underlying physics. There are, however, many such mappings through polynomial series expansions,

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n \tag{2}$$

We hypothesize that the physics of a process can be extracted by fitting the polynomial expansions of known physical relationships to the polynomial coefficients of a polynomial series expansion of Equation (1).

Although ReLU (rectified linear units) have become a more common activation function, its discontinuity at $x = 0$ requires an infinite series to fully capture the behavior at this transition. However, the sigmoid function,

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} \tag{3}$$

is a special case of the generating function for the Euler polynomial coefficients,

$$\frac{2e^{xt}}{1 + e^t} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n(x) \frac{t^n}{n!} \tag{4}$$

where, for $x = 0$,

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n(0) \frac{(-1)^n}{n!}. \tag{5}$$

The Euler polynomials at $x = 0$,

$$E_n(0) = -2(n+1)^{-1} \left(2^{n+1} - 1\right) B_{n+1} \tag{6}$$

where $B_n$ is the $n^{\text{th}}$ Bernoulli number. Since Bernoulli numbers of odd index, with the exception of $B_1$, are zero, $E_i(0) = 0$ for $i = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, 2n$. Therefore, the summand and limits of Equation (5) change to

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{E_{2n-1(0)}}{(2n-1)!} \right) x^{2n-1}. \tag{7}$$

The series representation of $E_{2n-1}(x)$

$$E_{2n-1}(x) = \frac{(-1)^n 4(2n-1)!}{\pi^{2n+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\cos[(2k+1)\pi x]}{(2k+1)^{2n}} \tag{8}$$

such that,

$$E_{2n-1}(0) = \frac{(-1)^n 4(2n-1)!}{\pi^{2n+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)^{2n}} \tag{9}$$

and therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma(x) &= \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2\frac{(-1)^n}{\pi^{2n}} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)^{2n}} \right) x^{2n-1} \qquad (10)\\
&= \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2\frac{(-1)^n}{\pi^{2n}} \left(4^{-n}\left(4^n - 1\right)\zeta(2n)\right) x^{2n-1}\\
&= \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{2\left(\frac{-1}{4\pi^2}\right)^n \left(4^n - 1\right)\zeta(2n)}_{a_n} x^{2n-1}\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n,\ a_n = \begin{cases} 1/2 & n = 0 \\ -2\left(\frac{-1}{4\pi^2}\right)^{(n+1)/2}\left(4^{(n+1)/2} - 1\right)\zeta(n+1) & n \text{ odd} \\ 0 & n \text{ even} \end{cases} \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 2. Discussion

Many non-trivial problems in materials science, and in science more broadly, are explained not through a single constitutive relationship, but through a superposition of contributing physics.

Figure **??** shows an artificial dataset constructed to replicate the impact of yield stress in a two-phase, solid-solution strengthened alloy system. Using a combination of composite theory for the contribution of flow stress, NAME solid solution [**?**], and Hall-Petch [**?**] strengthening, the expected yield stress is

$$
\sigma_y = F_v^A \sigma_f^A + F_v^B \sigma_f^B + \sum_i C_i [x_i]^{2/3} + \sum_j k_j d_j^{-1/2} + \dots \qquad (12)
$$

with free parameters

| | |
|---|---|
| $F_v^i$ | Volume fraction of phase $i$ |
| $[x_i]$ | Concentration of solute $i$ |
| $d_j$ | Average grain diameter of phase $j$ |

and fixed parameters

| | |
|---|---|
| $\sigma_f^i$ | Flow stress of phase $i$ |
| $C_i$ | Solid solution strengthening coefficient for solute species $i$ |
| $k_j$ | Hall-Petch strengthening coefficient for phase $j$ |

The goal is to iteratively improve on this constitutive model one term at a time, and monitor the effect on the residuals between the predicted yield, $\hat{\sigma_y}$ and the actual yield $\sigma_y$.

The analytical form, combining Equations (1) and (11), the estimated output of a two-layer NN can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}_1 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T \mathbf{x})^k \\
\mathbf{y}_2 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^T \mathbf{y}_1)^k \\
&= b_0 \mathbf{1} + \\
&\quad + b_1(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_2 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \\
&\quad + b_2(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_2 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^2 \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad + b_k(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_2 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^k \\
&\quad \vdots
\end{aligned} \tag{13}
$$

where $\tilde{a}_i = \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^T a_i$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T \mathbf{x}$. However from Equation (11), $a_i = 0$ for $i = 2, 4, 6, \ldots$, and therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}_1 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T \mathbf{x})^k \\
\mathbf{y}_2 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^T \mathbf{y}_1)^k \\
&= b_0 \mathbf{1} + \\
&\quad + b_1(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\tilde{a}_5 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \\
&\quad + b_2(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\tilde{a}_5 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^2 \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad + b_k(\tilde{a}_0 + (\tilde{a}_1 + (\tilde{a}_3 + (\tilde{a}_5 + (\ldots)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^k \\
&\quad \vdots
\end{aligned} \tag{14}
$$

where the $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2 = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \odot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, the Hadamard product of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ with itself.

$$
\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \sum_{l=0}^{k} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \ldots b_N \binom{N}{k, l, m, \ldots} \tilde{a}_0^k \tilde{a}_1^l \tilde{a}_3^m \ldots \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{N-k\ldots} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{N-k-l\ldots} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{N-k-l-m\ldots}
$$

where $N = k + l + m + n + \ldots$

$$
\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{N} \sum_{l=0}^{k} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \ldots b_N \binom{N}{k, l, m, \ldots} \tilde{a}_0^k \tilde{a}_1^l \tilde{a}_3^m \ldots \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{l+m+n+\ldots} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{m+n+\ldots} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{n+\ldots}
$$

Collecting coefficients and terms of power, $k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{y}_2 &= \sum_{N=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{N}\sum_{l=0}^{k}\sum_{m=0}^{l}\ldots b_N\binom{N}{k,l,m,\ldots}\tilde{a}_0^k\tilde{a}_1^l\tilde{a}_3^m\ldots\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{l+m+n+\cdots}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{m+n+\cdots}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2)^{n+\cdots}\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}c_k\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k\end{aligned}$$

that, having the same form as Equation (11) creates a sequential process for determining the coefficients of the power series expansion of each layer in an ANN.

If $a_i = 0\ \forall\ i$ even, then are Equations (13-14) everywhere 0?

How does dropout affect this?