

# iPINNs: Incremental learning for Physics-informed neural networks

Aleksandr Dekhovich<sup>1</sup>, Marcel H.F. Sluiter<sup>1</sup>, David M.J. Tax<sup>2</sup>, and Miguel A. Bessa<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, Delft, 2628 CD, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> Pattern Recognition and Bioinformatics Laboratory, Delft University of Technology, Van Mourik Broekmanweg 6, Delft, 2628 XE, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> School of Engineering, Brown University, 184 Hope St., Providence, RI 02912, USA  
miguel\_bessa@brown.edu

**Abstract.** Physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) have recently become a powerful tool for solving partial differential equations (PDEs). However, finding a set of neural network parameters that lead to fulfilling a PDE can be challenging and non-unique due to the complexity of the loss landscape that needs to be traversed. Although a variety of multi-task learning and transfer learning approaches have been proposed to overcome these issues, there is no incremental training procedure for PINNs that can effectively mitigate such training challenges. We propose incremental PINNs (iPINNs) that can learn multiple tasks (equations) sequentially without additional parameters for new tasks and improve performance for every equation in the sequence. Our approach learns multiple PDEs starting from the simplest one by creating its own subnetwork for each PDE and allowing each subnetwork to overlap with previously learned subnetworks. We demonstrate that previous subnetworks are a good initialization for a new equation if PDEs share similarities. We also show that iPINNs achieve lower prediction error than regular PINNs for two different scenarios: (1) learning a family of equations (e.g., 1-D convection PDE); and (2) learning PDEs resulting from a combination of processes (e.g., 1-D reaction-diffusion PDE). The ability to learn all problems with a single network together with learning more complex PDEs with better generalization than regular PINNs will open new avenues in this field.

**Keywords:** Physic-informed neural networks (PINNs) · Scientific machine learning (SciML) · Incremental learning · Sparsity

## 1 Introduction

Deep neural networks (DNNs) play a central role in scientific machine learning (SciML). Recent advances in neural networks find applications in real-life problems in physics [38,6,50,28], medicine [41,51,49], finance [22,66,17,58], and engineering [5,55,11,26]. In particular, they are also applied to solve Ordinary Differential

Equations and Partial Differential Equations (ODEs/PDEs) [34,42,65,46]. Consider the following PDE,

$$\mathcal{F}[u(\mathbf{x}, t)] = f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad t \in [t_0, T], \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{B}[u(\mathbf{x}, t)] = b(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, \quad (2)$$

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t_0) = h(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a differential operator,  $\mathcal{B}$  is a boundary condition operator,  $h(\mathbf{x})$  is an initial condition, and  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain.

The first neural network-based approaches incorporated a form of the equation into the loss function with initial and boundary conditions included as hard constraints [31,32]. However, these works used relatively small neural networks with one or two hidden layers. On the contrary, PINNs [46] encode initial and boundary conditions as soft constraints into the loss function of a DNN. Subsequently, PINNs and their extensions found applications in fluid mechanics [40,60,7], inverse problems [13,37,61] and finance [46,2]. Later, the generalized version of PINNs, called XPINNs [24], was proposed by decomposing the domain into multiple subdomains. However, this method uses as many networks as the number of subdomains, increasing the algorithm’s complexity. Multi-head PINNs (MH-PINNs) [67] is a multi-task learning approach for PINNs that is employed to learn stochastic processes, synergistic learning of PDEs and uncertainty quantification. MH-PINNs have a shared part of the network and task-specific output heads for prediction. Therefore, it uses additional parameters for every head, increasing the model’s size with respect to the number of tasks.

Despite the popularity of DNNs, and PINNs in particular, there are few *incremental* learning algorithms available in SciML literature. Yet, incremental learning and continual learning algorithms [8,9,27] are capable of handling tasks sequentially, instead of altogether as in multi-task learning and other strategies. Moreover, they are still capable of not forgetting how to solve all of the previously learned tasks. If tasks have some similarities with each other, new tasks have the potential of being learned better (i.e., faster or with lower testing error) with the help of previously learned ones. The goal of this work is to propose an incremental learning algorithm for PINNs such that similar symbiotic effects can be obtained.

**Background and main challenges.** PINNs formulate the PDE solution problem by including initial and boundary conditions into the loss function of a neural network as soft constraints. Let us denote the output of the network  $\mathcal{N}$  with learnable parameters  $\theta$  as  $\hat{u}(\theta; \mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{N}(\theta; \mathbf{x}, t)$ . Then sampling the set of collocation points, i.e. a set of points in the domain,  $\mathcal{CP} = \{(x^i, t^i) : x^i \in \text{int } \Omega, t^i \in (t_0, T], i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\mathcal{F}}\}$ , the set of initial points  $\mathcal{IP} = \{(x^j, t_0) : x^j \in \partial\Omega, j = 1, 2, \dots, N_{u_0}\}$  and the set of boundary points  $\mathcal{BP} = \{(x^k, t^k) : x^k \in \partial\Omega, t^k \in (t_0, T], k = 1, 2, \dots, N_b\}$  one can write the optimization problem and loss function arising from PINNs as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\theta) + \mathcal{L}_{u_0}(\theta) + \mathcal{L}_b(\theta) \rightarrow \min_{\theta}, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_{\mathcal{F}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathcal{F}}} \|\mathcal{F}[\hat{u}(\theta, x^i, t^i)] - f(x^i)\|^2, \quad (x^i, t^i) \in \mathcal{CP}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{u_0}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_{u_0}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{u_0}} \|\hat{u}(\theta, x^j, t_0) - h(x^j)\|^2, \quad (x^j, t_0) \in \mathcal{IP}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_b(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{k=1}^{N_b} \|\mathcal{B}[\hat{u}(\theta, x^k, t^k)] - b(x^k)\|^2, \quad (x^k, t^k) \in \mathcal{BP}. \quad (7)$$

However, sometimes PINNs struggle to learn the ODE/PDE dynamics [59,30,47,43] (see Figure 1). Wight & Zhao [62] proposed several techniques to improve the optimization process compared to the original formulation: mini-batch optimization and adaptive sampling of collocation points. Adaptive sampling in time, splits the time interval  $[t_0, T] = \cup_{k=0}^K [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ ,  $t_K = T$ , and solves an equation on the first interval  $[t_0, t_1]$ , then on  $[t_0, t_2]$ , and so on up to  $[t_0, T]$ . Thus, if a solution can be found on a domain  $\Omega \times [t_0, t_{k-1}]$ , then the network is pretrained well for the extended domain  $\Omega \times [t_0, t_k]$ . Krishnapriyan et al. [30] proposed the *seq2seq* approach that splits the domain into smaller subdomains in time and learns the solution on each of the subdomains with a separate network. Thus, both adaptive sampling in time and *seq2seq* are based on the idea of splitting the domain into multiple subdomains, on which solutions can be learned easier.

As explained in [47], improving PINN's solutions by considering small subdomains is possible because the loss residuals ( $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$  term) can be trivially minimized in the vicinity of fixed points, despite corresponding to nonphysical system dynamics that do not satisfy the initial conditions. Therefore, the reduction of the domain improves the convergence of the optimization problem (4) and helps to escape nonphysical solutions.




Fig. 1: 1-D reaction equation with parameter  $\rho = 5$  (see P1.2).

Another strategy is to consider transfer learning. Transfer learning is commonly used in computer vision and natural language processing [3,57,48,23]. It tries to improve the optimization process by starting with better weight initialization. In PINNs, transfer learning is also successfully used to accelerate the loss convergence [18,45,10,63]. For instance, Chen et al. [12] apply transfer learning to learn faster different PDEs creating tasks by changing coefficients or source terms in equations. Analogously, curriculum regularization (similar to curriculum learning [4]) is proposed in [30] to find good initial weights.

**Our contribution.** We propose *incremental PINNs* (iPINNs) and implement this strategy by creating one subnetwork per task such that a complete neural network can learn multiple tasks. Each subnetwork  $\mathcal{N}_i$  has its own set of parameters  $\theta_i \subset \theta$ , and the model is trained sequentially on different tasks. A subnetwork for a new task can overlap with all previous subnetworks, which helps to assimilate the new task. As a result, the network consists of overlapping subnetworks, while the free parameters can be used for future tasks. To illustrate the benefits of the algorithm we consider two problem formulations (Section 3). Firstly, we learn a family of equations (e.g., convection) starting from a simple one and incrementally learning new equations from that family. Secondly, we learn a dynamical system that consists of two processes (e.g., reaction-diffusion) by first learning the individual components of the process. Both scenarios demonstrate that the incremental approach enables an iPINN network to learn for cases where regular PINNs fail. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first example where one network can sequentially learn multiple equations without extending its architecture, with the added benefit that performance is significantly improved.

## 2 Related work

Our methodology is based on creating sparse network representations and, similarly to other PINN research, is sensitive to the choice of activation functions. We briefly highlight key related work herein.

**Sparse network representation.** Sparse architectures are often advantageous compared to dense ones [19,1,64,35]. According to the lottery ticket hypothesis (LTH) [16], every randomly initialized network contains a subnetwork that can be trained in isolation to achieve comparable performance as the original network. Based on this observation, the idea of using subnetworks has been adopted in continual learning [39,53,54]. In this paradigm, every subnetwork created is associated with a particular task and used only for this task to make a prediction. One of the approaches to find these tasks-related subnetworks is connections’ pruning [33,21,20,15,14] that removes unimportant parameters while exhibiting similar performance.

**Choice of the activation function.** There are several studies that investigate how different activation functions affect the performance of neural networks in

classification and regression tasks [56,25]. It was shown that `ReLU` [44] activation function which can be powerful in classification tasks, in the case of physics-informed machine learning (PIML) regression, may not be the optimal choice. Meanwhile, hyperbolic tangent (`tanh`) or sine (`sin`) perform well for PIML. Sinusoidal representation networks (SIRENs) [52] tackle the problem of modeling the signal with fine details. Special weights initialization scheme combined with `sin` activation function allows SIREN to learn complex natural signals. Hence, we use `sin` activation function in our experiments. In Section 6.1, we provide the comparison in results between the discussed activation functions.

### 3 Problem formulation

We focus on two scenarios: (1) incremental PINNs learning, where the network sequentially learns several equations from the same family; and (2) learning a combination of multiple equations that create another physical process. To illustrate these cases, we consider one-dimensional convection, reaction and reaction-diffusion problems with periodic boundary conditions.

#### 3.1 Scenario 1: Equation incremental learning

We consider the problem of learning the sequence of equations that belong to one family:

$$\mathcal{F}_k(u(x, t)) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad t \in [t_0, T], \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (\text{P1})$$

where  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1}^K$  are differential operators from the same family of equations.

1-D convection equation	1-D reaction equation
$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \beta_k \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (\text{P1.1})$ $u(x, 0) = h_1(x),$ $u(0, t) = u(2\pi, t),$ <p style="text-align: center;">where</p> $t \in [0, 1], \quad x \in [0, 2\pi], \quad \beta_k \in \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}.$	$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \rho_k u(1 - u) = 0, \quad (\text{P1.2})$ $u(x, 0) = h_2(x),$ $u(0, t) = u(2\pi, t),$ <p style="text-align: center;">where</p> $t \in [0, 1], \quad x \in [0, 2\pi], \quad \rho_k \in \mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{N}.$

In this case, every task  $k$  is associated with  $\mathcal{D}_k = \{(x, t, k) : x \in [0, 2\pi], t \in [t_0, T], k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Following [30], we take  $h_1(x) = \sin x$  and  $h_2(x) = e^{-\frac{(x-\pi)^2}{2(\pi/4)^2}}$ .

#### 3.2 Scenario 2: Combination of multiple equations


We also consider the case when a dynamic process consists of multiple components. Let us consider the reaction-diffusion equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} - \rho u(1 - u) &= 0, \\ u(x, 0) &= h_2(x), \\ u(0, t) &= u(2\pi, t), \end{aligned} \tag{P2}$$

where  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ ,  $\nu, \rho > 0$ . This process consists of two parts: reaction term ( $\nu = 0$ ):  $-\rho u(1 - u)$  and diffusion term ( $\rho = 0$ ):  $-\nu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}$ . Therefore, we construct one task as the reaction, another one as the diffusion, and the final one as the reaction-diffusion. We can change the order of the reaction tasks and diffusion tasks to show the robustness of incremental learning. The reaction-diffusion task should be the last one since our goal is first to learn the components of the system and only then the full system.

Considering these two problems, we want to show that better generalization can be achieved by pretraining the network with simpler related problems rather than by dividing the domain into smaller subdomains. In the following section, we show how one network can incrementally learn different equations without catastrophic forgetting.

## 4 Methodology



$$\mathcal{L}(\theta; \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2) = \mathcal{L}_1(\theta_1; \mathcal{D}_1) + \mathcal{L}_2(\theta_2; \mathcal{D}_2)$$

Fig. 2: An example of iPINNs with two PDEs: every subnetwork corresponds to only one task (PDE).

The proposed method needs to be applicable to both types of problems P1 and P2. However, these problems cannot be solved by one network with the same output head for all  $K$  tasks, since  $\mathcal{F}_i(u(x, t)) \neq \mathcal{F}_j(u(x, t))$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . Therefore, we propose iPINNs – an incremental learning algorithm that focuses on learning task-specific subnetworks  $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_K$  for each task  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . To create these subnetworks, we use an iterative pruning algorithm NNrelief [14]. This pruning approach uses input data to estimate the contribution of every connection to the neuron in the pretrained network and

delete the least important ones. However, in principle, any connections pruning algorithm or any other approach that is able to find and train sparse network representations is suitable.

iPINN trains task-related subnetworks with pruning, allowing the subnetworks to overlap on some connections. This way the method provides knowledge sharing between the subnetworks. These overlaps are updated with respect to all tasks that are assigned to a particular connection. Let us denote the loss of each task  $\mathcal{D}_j$  as  $\mathcal{L}_j = \mathcal{L}(\theta_j; \mathcal{D}_j)$ , where  $\theta_j$  is the parameter vector for task  $\mathcal{D}_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Then the total loss and its gradient with respect to a parameter  $w$  can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{L}_j, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w} = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_j}{\partial w} = \sum_{j: w \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_j}{\partial w}, \quad (9)$$

because if  $w \notin \mathcal{N}_j$ , then  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_j}{\partial w} = 0$ . The pseudocode of the algorithm is shown as follows:

---

**Algorithm** PINN incremental learning

---

**Require:** neural network  $\mathcal{N}$ , training datasets  $\mathcal{D}_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ), training hyperparameters, pruning hyperparameters (*num\_iters*).

- 1: **for**  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$  **do**
  - 2:      $\mathcal{N}_k \leftarrow \mathcal{N}$  ▷ set full network as a subnetwork
  - 3:     Train  $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$  on tasks  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k$  using Eq. 9.
  - 4:     **for**  $it = 1, 2, \dots, num\_iters$  **do** ▷ repeat pruning
  - 5:          $\mathcal{N}_k \leftarrow Pruning(\mathcal{N}_k, \mathcal{D}_k)$  ▷ reduce unimportant connections
  - 6:         Retrain subnetworks  $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$  on tasks  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k$  using Eq. 9.
  - 7:     **end for**
  - 8: **end for**
- 

The main advantage of the proposed approach is that a neural network learns *all* tasks (subdomains or equations) that were given during training and not only the last one. This is achieved by constantly replaying old data. In the next section, we experimentally show that pretrained parts of the network help to improve the convergence process.

## 5 Numerical experiments

Our findings illustrate the advantage of the Algorithm over regular PINNs [46]. The Algorithm allows the network to learn multiple equations (P1) from the same family. Furthermore, by starting with simpler tasks, the network can learn more complex ones that cannot be learned separately.

**Experiments setup.** Let us start by examining the proposed algorithms on the convection and reaction equations with periodic boundary conditions (P1). Following the setup in [30], we use a four-layer neural network with 50 neurons per layer. We use 1000 randomly selected collocation points on every time interval between 0 and 1 for  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . The Adam optimizer [29] is used to train the model.

To evaluate the performance of the algorithms we compare the final error after the last task. In addition, following continual learning literature [36], we compare backward and forward transfer metrics. Let us denote the test set as  $\mathcal{D}^{test} = \{(x^i, t^i, l) : x^i \in [0, 2\pi], t^i \in [0, 1], l \text{ is the task-ID}\}$ , the solution of the equation at the point  $(x^i, t^i, l)$  as  $\mathbf{u}_{l,k}^i = u_{l,k}^i(x^i, t^i)$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{l,k}^i$  is a prediction of the model at point  $(x^i, t^i, l)$  after task  $\mathcal{D}_k$  is learned. Relative and absolute errors are denoted as  $r_{l,k}$  and  $\varepsilon_{l,k}$ , respectively, as they are calculated for task  $l$  after task  $k$  is learned ( $l \leq k$ ).

$$\text{Relative error: } r_{l,k} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_l - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{l,k}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{u}_l\|_2} \times 100\%, \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Absolute error: } \varepsilon_{l,k} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\mathbf{u}_l^i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{l,k}^i|, \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Backward Transfer: } \text{BWT} = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \varepsilon_{l,k} - \varepsilon_{l,l} \quad \text{or} \quad (12)$$

$$\text{BWT} = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} r_{l,k} - r_{l,l} \quad (13)$$

## 5.1 Results

Table 1 presents the results after all reaction equations are learned varying  $\rho$  from 1 to 5. Figure 3 shows the error history for every equation after incremental steps. The Table summarizes the performance improvement of iPINNs compared to regular PINNs, exhibiting negligible error for all values of  $\rho$ , which is especially relevant for cases when  $\rho$  is larger. Moreover, iPINNs provide negative BWT which means that previous subnetworks help to learn the following ones.

Similarly, we observe for the convection equation the same learning behaviour. By learning incrementally the sequence of convection equations, we achieve much lower absolute and relative errors for the equations that are more difficult to learn ( $\beta = 30, 40$ ). In Table 2 we show final errors at the end of training, and Figure 4 shows the absolute error history for each equation.

In Figures 5 and 6, we illustrate the error of iPINNs on convection and reaction equations and the exact solutions for every value of parameter  $\beta$  or  $\rho$  that were considered. Overall, we see that the neural network learns more complicated tasks more accurately if parts of the network are pretrained with easier tasks. At the same time, iPINNs replay the training data for previous PDEs during training for the new one. There are no additional costs to store or



Table 1: Final error and forgetting after all reaction equations are learned.



		regular PINN	iPINN
$\rho = 1$	abs. err	$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	0.263%	<b>0.039%</b>
$\rho = 2$	abs. err	$1.97 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	0.479%	<b>0.070%</b>
$\rho = 3$	abs. err	$6.72 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.1 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	2.05%	<b>0.210%</b>
$\rho = 4$	abs. err	$1.13 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.18 \times 10^{-3}$
	rel. err	3.68%	<b>0.458%</b>
$\rho = 5$	abs. err	$5.04 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.91 \times 10^{-3}$
	rel. err	12.19%	<b>0.763%</b>
BWT	abs. err	N/A	$-3.8 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	N/A	-0.112%


Table 2: Final error and forgetting after all convection equations are learned.

		regular PINN	iPINN
$\beta = 1$	abs. err	$2.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	<b>0.042%</b>	0.074%
$\beta = 10$	abs. err	$1.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	0.222%	<b>0.087%</b>
$\beta = 20$	abs. err	$1.9 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.66 \times 10^{-3}$
	rel. err	0.339%	<b>0.288%</b>
$\beta = 30$	abs. err	$2.2 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.44 \times 10^{-3}$
	rel. err	3.957%	<b>0.246%</b>
$\beta = 40$	abs. err	$2.3 \times 10^{-1}$	$6.02 \times 10^{-3}$
	rel. err	37.4%	<b>1.139%</b>
BWT	abs. err	N/A	$1.8 \times 10^{-4}$
	rel. err	N/A	0.0280%


generate input points  $(x, t)$  for previous tasks since they can be easily sampled when necessary.

Another illustration of the method is learning the problem P2. We consider the values of  $\rho$  and  $\nu$  for which PINN does not have difficulties with learning each component separately. Results obtained when first learning the reaction


 Fig. 3: Relative error history for reaction equations ( $\alpha = 0.99$ ). Every row shows the error after a new task is learned.

 Fig. 4: Relative error history for convection equations ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ). Every row shows the error after a new task is learned.




(a) 1-D reaction equation (absolute error).




(b) 1-D reaction equation (exact solution).

Fig. 5: iPINNs on 1-D reaction equation.



(a) Absolute error.



(b) Exact solution.

Fig. 6: iPINNs on 1-D convection equation.

part (diffusion part) are shown in Table 3 (Table 4). The main finding is that the network can learn almost every equation at least as well as when it is learned independently. In fact, for the reaction equation, the neural network improves significantly the prediction error. Another interesting observation is that the model learns the reaction-diffusion equation with almost the same error, regardless of the order of the tasks.

Table 3: Final error and forgetting for reaction  $\rightarrow$  diffusion  $\rightarrow$  reaction-diffusion.

parameters	equation		regular PINN	iPINN
$\rho = 3, \nu = 5$	reaction	abs. err	$6.72 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>9.41 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>
		rel. err	2.05%	<b>0.31%</b>
	diffusion	abs. err	<b><math>1.38 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	$1.85 \times 10^{-4}$
		rel. err	<b>0.05%</b>	0.06%
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.89 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.10 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.80%	<b>0.68%</b>
$\rho = 4, \nu = 4$	reaction	abs. err	$1.13 \times 10^{-2}$	<b><math>7.88 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	3.68%	<b>2.99%</b>
	diffusion	abs. err	<b><math>4.35 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	$5.84 \times 10^{-4}$
		rel. err	<b>0.16%</b>	0.19%
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.58 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.42 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.70%	<b>0.67%</b>
$\rho = 4, \nu = 5$	reaction	abs. err	$5.04 \times 10^{-2}$	<b><math>4.20 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	12.19%	<b>1.71%</b>
	diffusion	abs. err	$5.18 \times 10^{-4}$	<b><math>2.30 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.18%	<b>0.08%</b>
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.61 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.58 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.69%	<b>0.68%</b>

 Table 4: Final error and forgetting for diffusion  $\rightarrow$  reaction  $\rightarrow$  reaction-diffusion.

parameters	equation		regular PINN	iPINN
$\rho = 3, \nu = 5$	diffusion	abs. err	<b><math>1.38 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	$8.64 \times 10^{-4}$
		rel. err	<b>0.05%</b>	0.28%
	reaction	abs. err	$6.72 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>2.11 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	2.05%	<b>0.68%</b>
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.89 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.07 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.80%	<b>0.67%</b>
$\rho = 4, \nu = 4$	diffusion	abs. err	$4.35 \times 10^{-4}$	<b><math>3.45 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.16%	<b>0.12%</b>
	reaction	abs. err	$1.13 \times 10^{-2}$	<b><math>4.91 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	3.68%	<b>1.97%</b>
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.58 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.42 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.70%	<b>0.67%</b>
$\rho = 4, \nu = 5$	diffusion	abs. err	<b><math>5.18 \times 10^{-4}</math></b>	$1.05 \times 10^{-3}$
		rel. err	<b>0.18%</b>	0.33%
	reaction	abs. err	$5.04 \times 10^{-2}$	<b><math>9.15 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	12.19%	<b>3.39%</b>
	reaction-diffusion	abs. err	$4.61 \times 10^{-3}$	<b><math>4.30 \times 10^{-3}</math></b>
		rel. err	0.69%	<b>0.65%</b>

## 6 Additional study

In this section, we provide additional information about the learning procedure of iPINNs. We highlight some important training details such as the presence of regularization and the choice of activation functions. Also, we explore the subnetworks that our approach produces showing the proportion of parameters allocated to each task.

### 6.1 Sensitivity to hyperparameters

Here we illustrate the influence of different training hyperparameters on the performance of iPINNs. First, we compare the results with and without regularization parameter (weight decay). In Figure 7, it can be observed that the presence of weight decay worsens the prediction error. However, looking at the result it is clear that iPINNs still work if weight decay is present. We can explain the lack of need for weight decay with the fact that many parameters are assigned to multiple tasks and cannot overfit to a particular one. Each subnetwork is also less parameterized than the original network and therefore does not tend to overfit. Thus, weight decay is not necessary and its presence only worsens the result due to the complication of the optimization procedure.




Fig. 7: Influence of weight decay on the results for reaction (left) and convection (right) equations after all tasks are learned.

Furthermore, we compare the performance when using `sin` and `tanh` activation functions for two task orderings in Figure 8. We observe that `sin` works significantly better in both cases. Also, we test `ReLU` activation but it demonstrates poor performance in both PDEs orderings. If the reaction is learned first, the absolute errors are 0.4959, 0.2369 and 0.1493. If we start with the diffusion equation and then learn reaction and reaction-diffusion PDEs, the errors are 0.2399, 0.2977 and 0.3003.

In addition, we present how different values of pruning parameter  $\alpha$  affect the results. The higher the value of  $\alpha$  is, the less the network is pruned. Therefore, if




Fig. 8: Influence of activation function on the results when the reaction learned first (left) and diffusion learned first (right).

$\alpha = 0.95$  the task-specific subnetworks are sparser than with  $\alpha = 0.99$  but less sparse if  $\alpha = 0.9$ . In Figure 9, we observe that for the reaction equation, we can prune less and achieve better performance which can be explained by the fact that PDEs in the reaction family are quite similar. Therefore, we can allow the network to have more overlaps to share knowledge between subnetworks. For the case of learning within the same family of convection PDEs, the value of  $\alpha = 0.95$  was revealed to be a better option for constructing a sufficiently expressive task-specific subnetwork and frees space for future tasks. Notwithstanding, the performance is good with any reasonable choice of pruning parameter.




Fig. 9: iPINNs with different values of pruning parameter  $\alpha$ .

### 6.2 Subnetworks analysis

In Figure 10, we present the portions of the subnetworks that are occupied by each task. We will illustrate this by considering both orders – when the model learns the reaction equation first (Figure 10a), and when diffusion comes first

(Figure 10b). These results are averaged over 3 different runs for each of the orderings. It is noteworthy that the percentage of parameters occupied by all tasks is very similar for both orderings (31.8% and 31.5% respectively of all network parameters). On the other hand, the percentages of used parameters for both cases are 79.5% and 79.3%. This means that the total number of trained parameters for the two incremental procedures is the same for both cases, which shows the robustness of the method. Moreover, the network has about 20% of free connections to learn new tasks.




Fig. 10: Percentage of parameters used for every equation with  $\rho = 4$ ,  $\nu = 4$ .

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we propose an incremental learning approach for PINNs where every task is presented as a new PDE. Our algorithm is based on task-related subnetworks for every task obtained by iterative pruning. To illustrate our idea, we consider two cases when incremental learning is applicable to a sequence of PDEs. In the first case, we consider the family of convection/reaction PDEs, learning them sequentially. In the second example, we consider the reaction-diffusion equation and learn firstly the components of the process, namely reaction and diffusion, and only then the reaction-diffusion equation. Our main goal is to show the possibility of incremental learning for PINNs without significantly forgetting previous tasks. From our numerical experiments, the proposed algorithm can learn all the given tasks, which is not possible with standard PINNs. Importantly, we also show that future tasks are learned better because they can share connections trained from previous tasks, leading to significantly better performance than if these tasks were learned independently. We demonstrate that this stems from the transfer of knowledge occurring between subnetworks that are associated with each task. Interestingly, the model's performance on previous tasks is also improved by learning the following tasks. In essence, iPINNs demonstrate symbiotic training effects between past and future tasks by learning them with a single network composed of dedicated subnetworks for each task that share relevant neuronal connections.

## References

1. Ahmad, S., Scheinkman, L.: How can we be so dense? the benefits of using highly sparse representations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11257 (2019)
2. Bai, Y., Chaolu, T., Bilige, S.: The application of improved physics-informed neural network (ipinn) method in finance. *Nonlinear Dynamics* **107**(4), 3655–3667 (2022)
3. Bengio, Y.: Deep learning of representations for unsupervised and transfer learning. In: Proceedings of ICML workshop on unsupervised and transfer learning. pp. 17–36. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings (2012)
4. Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., Weston, J.: Curriculum learning. In: Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning. pp. 41–48 (2009)
5. Bessa, M.A., Bostanabad, R., Liu, Z., Hu, A., Apley, D.W., Brinson, C., Chen, W., Liu, W.K.: A framework for data-driven analysis of materials under uncertainty: Countering the curse of dimensionality. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **320**, 633–667 (2017)
6. Bogatskiy, A., Anderson, B., Offermann, J., Roussi, M., Miller, D., Kondor, R.: Lorentz group equivariant neural network for particle physics. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 992–1002. PMLR (2020)
7. Cai, S., Mao, Z., Wang, Z., Yin, M., Karniadakis, G.E.: Physics-informed neural networks (pinns) for fluid mechanics: A review. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* pp. 1–12 (2022)
8. Castro, F.M., Marín-Jiménez, M.J., Guil, N., Schmid, C., Alahari, K.: End-to-end incremental learning. In: Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV). pp. 233–248 (2018)
9. Cermelli, F., Geraci, A., Fontanel, D., Caputo, B.: Modeling missing annotations for incremental learning in object detection. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 3700–3710 (2022)
10. Chakraborty, S.: Transfer learning based multi-fidelity physics informed deep neural network. *Journal of Computational Physics* **426**, 109942 (2021)
11. Chandrasekhar, A., Suresh, K.: Tounn: topology optimization using neural networks. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **63**(3), 1135–1149 (2021)
12. Chen, X., Gong, C., Wan, Q., Deng, L., Wan, Y., Liu, Y., Chen, B., Liu, J.: Transfer learning for deep neural network-based partial differential equations solving. *Advances in Aerodynamics* **3**(1), 1–14 (2021)
13. Chen, Y., Lu, L., Karniadakis, G.E., Dal Negro, L.: Physics-informed neural networks for inverse problems in nano-optics and metamaterials. *Optics express* **28**(8), 11618–11633 (2020)
14. Dekhovich, A., Tax, D.M., Sluiter, M.H., Bessa, M.A.: Neural network relief: a pruning algorithm based on neural activity. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10795 (2021)
15. Dong, X., Chen, S., Pan, S.: Learning to prune deep neural networks via layer-wise optimal brain surgeon. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **30** (2017)
16. Frankle, J., Carbin, M.: The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03635 (2018)
17. Gogas, P., Papadimitriou, T.: Machine learning in economics and finance. *Computational Economics* **57**(1), 1–4 (2021)
18. Goswami, S., Anitescu, C., Chakraborty, S., Rabczuk, T.: Transfer learning enhanced physics informed neural network for phase-field modeling of fracture. *Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics* **106**, 102447 (2020)

19. Guo, Y., Zhang, C., Zhang, C., Chen, Y.: Sparse dnns with improved adversarial robustness. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018)
20. Han, S., Pool, J., Tran, J., Dally, W.: Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **28** (2015)
21. Hassibi, B., Stork, D.: Second order derivatives for network pruning: Optimal brain surgeon. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **5** (1992)
22. Hosaka, T.: Bankruptcy prediction using imaged financial ratios and convolutional neural networks. *Expert systems with applications* **117**, 287–299 (2019)
23. Hounsby, N., Giurgiu, A., Jastrzebski, S., Morrone, B., De Laroussilhe, Q., Gesmundo, A., Attariyan, M., Gelly, S.: Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. pp. 2790–2799. PMLR (2019)
24. Jagtap, A.D., Karniadakis, G.E.: Extended physics-informed neural networks (xpinns): A generalized space-time domain decomposition based deep learning framework for nonlinear partial differential equations. In: *AAAI Spring Symposium: MLPS* (2021)
25. Jagtap, A.D., Karniadakis, G.E.: How important are activation functions in regression and classification? a survey, performance comparison, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02681* (2022)
26. Juan, N.P., Valdecantos, V.N.: Review of the application of artificial neural networks in ocean engineering. *Ocean Engineering* **259**, 111947 (2022)
27. Kang, M., Park, J., Han, B.: Class-incremental learning by knowledge distillation with adaptive feature consolidation. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 16071–16080 (2022)
28. Khatib, O., Ren, S., Malof, J., Padilla, W.J.: Learning the physics of all-dielectric metamaterials with deep lorentz neural networks. *Advanced Optical Materials* p. 2200097 (2022)
29. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014)
30. Krishnapriyan, A., Gholami, A., Zhe, S., Kirby, R., Mahoney, M.W.: Characterizing possible failure modes in physics-informed neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34**, 26548–26560 (2021)
31. Lagaris, I.E., Likas, A., Fotiadis, D.I.: Artificial neural network methods in quantum mechanics. *Computer Physics Communications* **104**(1-3), 1–14 (1997)
32. Lagaris, I.E., Likas, A., Fotiadis, D.I.: Artificial neural networks for solving ordinary and partial differential equations. *IEEE transactions on neural networks* **9**(5), 987–1000 (1998)
33. LeCun, Y., Denker, J., Solla, S.: Optimal brain damage. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **2** (1989)
34. Lee, H., Kang, I.S.: Neural algorithm for solving differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics* **91**(1), 110–131 (1990)
35. Liao, N., Wang, S., Xiang, L., Ye, N., Shao, S., Chu, P.: Achieving adversarial robustness via sparsity. *Machine Learning* **111**(2), 685–711 (2022)
36. Lopez-Paz, D., Ranzato, M.: Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
37. Lu, L., Pestourie, R., Yao, W., Wang, Z., Verdugo, F., Johnson, S.G.: Physics-informed neural networks with hard constraints for inverse design. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **43**(6), B1105–B1132 (2021)
38. Madrazo, C.F., Heredia, I., Lloret, L., de Lucas, J.M.: Application of a convolutional neural network for image classification for the analysis of collisions in high energy physics. In: *EPJ Web of Conferences*. vol. 214, p. 06017. EDP Sciences (2019)



39. Mallya, A., Lazebnik, S.: Packnet: Adding multiple tasks to a single network by iterative pruning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 7765–7773 (2018)
40. Mao, Z., Jagtap, A.D., Karniadakis, G.E.: Physics-informed neural networks for high-speed flows. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **360**, 112789 (2020)
41. Marques, G., Agarwal, D., de la Torre Díez, I.: Automated medical diagnosis of covid-19 through efficientnet convolutional neural network. *Applied soft computing* **96**, 106691 (2020)
42. Meade Jr, A.J., Fernandez, A.A.: Solution of nonlinear ordinary differential equations by feedforward neural networks. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* **20**(9), 19–44 (1994)
43. Mojgani, R., Balajewicz, M., Hassanzadeh, P.: Lagrangian pinns: A causality-conforming solution to failure modes of physics-informed neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02902 (2022)
44. Nair, V., Hinton, G.E.: Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In: International Conference on Machine Learning (2010)
45. Niaki, S.A., Haghighat, E., Campbell, T., Poursartip, A., Vaziri, R.: Physics-informed neural network for modelling the thermochemical curing process of composite-tool systems during manufacture. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **384**, 113959 (2021)
46. Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., Karniadakis, G.E.: Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational physics* **378**, 686–707 (2019)
47. Rohrhofer, F.M., Posch, S., Gößnitzer, C., Geiger, B.C.: Understanding the difficulty of training physics-informed neural networks on dynamical systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13648 (2022)
48. Ruder, S., Peters, M.E., Swayamdipta, S., Wolf, T.: Transfer learning in natural language processing. In: Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Tutorials. pp. 15–18 (2019)
49. Sarvamangala, D., Kulkarni, R.V.: Convolutional neural networks in medical image understanding: a survey. *Evolutionary intelligence* **15**(1), 1–22 (2022)
50. Shlomi, J., Battaglia, P., Vlimant, J.R.: Graph neural networks in particle physics. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **2**(2), 021001 (2020)
51. Si, T., Bagchi, J., Miranda, P.B.: Artificial neural network training using meta-heuristics for medical data classification: an experimental study. *Expert Systems with Applications* **193**, 116423 (2022)
52. Sitzmann, V., Martel, J., Bergman, A., Lindell, D., Wetzstein, G.: Implicit neural representations with periodic activation functions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 7462–7473 (2020)
53. Sokar, G., Mocanu, D.C., Pechenizkiy, M.: Spacenet: Make free space for continual learning. *Neurocomputing* **439**, 1–11 (2021)
54. Sokar, G., Mocanu, D.C., Pechenizkiy, M.: Avoiding forgetting and allowing forward transfer in continual learning via sparse networks. In: Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases. Springer (2022)
55. Sosnovik, I., Oseledets, I.: Neural networks for topology optimization. *Russian Journal of Numerical Analysis and Mathematical Modelling* **34**(4), 215–223 (2019)
56. Szadała, T.: Review and comparison of commonly used activation functions for deep neural networks. In: Bio-inspired neurocomputing, pp. 203–224. Springer (2021)

57. Tan, C., Sun, F., Kong, T., Zhang, W., Yang, C., Liu, C.: A survey on deep transfer learning. In: International conference on artificial neural networks. pp. 270–279. Springer (2018)
58. Wang, J., Gan, X.: Neurodynamics-driven portfolio optimization with targeted performance criteria. *Neural Networks* **157**, 404–421 (2023)
59. Wang, S., Teng, Y., Perdikaris, P.: Understanding and mitigating gradient flow pathologies in physics-informed neural networks. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **43**(5), A3055–A3081 (2021)
60. Wessels, H., Weißenfels, C., Wriggers, P.: The neural particle method—an updated lagrangian physics informed neural network for computational fluid dynamics. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **368**, 113127 (2020)
61. Wiecha, P.R., Arbouet, A., Girard, C., Muskens, O.L.: Deep learning in nanophotonics: inverse design and beyond. *Photonics Research* **9**(5), B182–B200 (2021)
62. Wight, C.L., Zhao, J.: Solving allen-cahn and cahn-hilliard equations using the adaptive physics informed neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.04542 (2020)
63. Xu, C., Cao, B.T., Yuan, Y., Meschke, G.: Transfer learning based physics-informed neural networks for solving inverse problems in engineering structures under different loading scenarios. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **405**, 115852 (2023)
64. Ye, S., Xu, K., Liu, S., Cheng, H., Lambrechts, J.H., Zhang, H., Zhou, A., Ma, K., Wang, Y., Lin, X.: Adversarial robustness vs. model compression, or both? In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 111–120 (2019)
65. Yentis, R., Zaghoul, M.: Vlsi implementation of locally connected neural network for solving partial differential equations. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications* **43**(8), 687–690 (1996)
66. Yu, P., Yan, X.: Stock price prediction based on deep neural networks. *Neural Computing and Applications* **32**(6), 1609–1628 (2020)
67. Zou, Z., Karniadakis, G.E.: L-hydra: Multi-head physics-informed neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02152 (2023)