

# Grounding Continuous Representations in Geometry: Equivariant Neural Fields

David R. Wessels<sup>\*,1</sup>, David M. Knigge<sup>\*,1</sup>, Riccardo Valperga<sup>1</sup>, Samuele Papa<sup>1</sup>,  
Sharvaree Vadgama<sup>1</sup>, Efstratios Gavves<sup>1</sup>, Erik J. Bekkers<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>University of Amsterdam <sup>2</sup>Netherlands Cancer Institute  
d.r.wessels@uva.nl, d.m.knigge@uva.nl

## Abstract

Neural Fields (NeFs) are increasingly being leveraged as continuous signal representations. In a *conditional neural field*, a signal is represented by a latent variable that conditions the NeF, whose parametrisation is otherwise shared over an entire dataset. We propose Equivariant Neural Fields (ENFs) based on cross attention transformers, in which NeFs are conditioned on a geometric variable—a latent point cloud—that enables an *equivariant* decoding from latent to field. Our equivariant approach induces a *steerability* property by which both field and latent are grounded in geometry and amenable to transformation laws: if the field transforms, the latent representation transforms accordingly—and vice versa. Crucially, this equivariance relation ensures that the latent is capable of (1) *representing geometric patterns faithfully*, allowing for geometric reasoning in latent space, (2) *weight-sharing over similar local patterns*, allowing for efficient learning of datasets of fields. These main properties are validated using classification experiments and a verification of the capability of fitting entire datasets, in comparison to other non-equivariant NeF approaches. We further validate the potential of ENFs by demonstrating unique (local) field editing properties.





Figure 1: **(a)** The proposed equivariant neural fields (ENFs) approximate continuous functions  $f(x) \approx f_\theta(x; z)$  by conditioning on latent point clouds  $z$  composed of tuples  $(p_i, c_i)$  with a poses  $p_i$  in a group  $G$  and context vectors  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^c$ . **(b)** Latent representations  $z$  are grounded in geometry; if the field transforms, the latents transform accordingly.

# 1 Introduction

Neural fields (NeFs) [32] have recently gained significant traction in the machine learning community as an innovative type of representation that models data as continuous functions or signals. These fields, denoted as  $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^c$ , are functions that map spatial coordinates, e.g., pixels  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , to corresponding feature representations, e.g., RGB values  $f_\theta(x) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , with the parameters  $\theta$  defining the model. The field parameters  $\theta$  are typically optimised to approximate a specific target signal  $f$ , i.e., such that  $\forall x : f(x) \approx f_\theta(x)$ . This makes NeFs particularly well-suited for handling continuous spatial, spatio-temporal, and geometric data, where traditional grid-based representations are inadequate [10].

Expanding upon this concept, *conditional neural fields* (CNFs) introduce a conditioning variable  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  to the model. Consider, for example, a dataset of  $N$  fields  $\mathcal{D} = \{f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^c\}_{i=1}^N$ . Using a CNF, each specific field can now be represented by a specific conditioning variable  $z_i$  via  $\forall x : f_i(x) \approx f_\theta(x; z_i)$ , whereas the model weights  $\theta$  are otherwise shared over the entire dataset. With conditional neural fields, datasets of fields can be efficiently modelled by a dataset of latent variables that condition a *shared-backbone* NeF. This allows for representing and analysing fields by means of their latent representation, enabling unique approaches for solving tasks surrounding fields through a principle referred to as *learning with functors* [10]. This includes classification, segmentation, and generation of continuous fields [10, 20], or performing continuous PDE forecasting by solving dynamics on latent representations [34, 16].

Figure 2: In contrast to other set-based neural fields (NFs), the proposed *equivariant* NFs have the following properties: (1) Equivariance - transformations in the field correspond to transformations in the latent space, (2) Spatial Locality - localized cross-attention mechanisms around latent poses, and (3) Weight Sharing - efficient learning through shared weights over similar local patterns.



A notable limitation of conventional NeFs, however, is a lack of geometric interpretability. CNFs provide representations for continuous fields—be it the network weights or the latent conditioning variable; however, these representations may not necessarily be useful for downstream tasks. This has motivated works like Field2Vec [9] and others [36, 17, 19] to factorize out redundant (permutation) symmetries. However, these approaches still yield abstract representations that are not necessarily meaningful. For instance, in classification tasks, spatial organisation of an image’s content is crucial for understanding shape and enabling geometric reasoning [31]; current neural fields lack geometric inductive biases. To this end, we propose *equivariant neural fields* (ENFs), a new class of NeFs that allows for the identification of continuous fields with concrete geometric representations (Fig. 1 & 2).

**Geometry-grounded neural fields** When the goal is to utilise field representations  $z_i$  in downstream tasks, it is crucial that these representations encapsulate both textural/appearance information and explicit geometric information. Our approach is inspired by the idea of *neural ideograms*—learnable geometric representations [29, 30], as well as the observation that human perception prioritises shape over texture, and addresses the pervasive issue of *texture bias*, which causes typical deep learning systems to overfit to textural patterns and ignore important geometric cues [13, 14]. To address this challenge, we propose defining representations that separate shape/geometry from appearance. This necessitates that the geometric components of the representations have a meaningful structure, adhering to the same group transformation laws applicable to the fields. Geometrically, this means that distortions in the field translate to corresponding distortions in the latent space, ensuring that geometric (shape) variations are preserved and representable in latent space.

To establish an explicit grounding in geometry, we propose modelling the conditioning variables as geometric point sets  $z = \{(p_i, \mathbf{a}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , comprising  $N$  pose-appearance tuples, with  $p_i \in G$  being a pose (element) in a group  $G$ , and  $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^c$  an appearance vector. This representation space has

\* shared first author

a well-defined group action, namely  $gz = \{(gp_i, \mathbf{a}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , allowing us to formalise the notion of grounding a neural field through the following

$$\boxed{\text{Steerability property: } \forall g \in G : f_\theta(g^{-1}x; z) = f_\theta(x; gz)}. \quad (1)$$

This property ensures that if the field as a whole transforms, the latent will transform accordingly. See Fig. 1 for an intuition.

**Contributions** With this work we present the following contributions:

- A new class of geometry-grounded equivariant neural fields, that posses
  - the *steerability* property and thus proveable generalization over group actions
  - *weight sharing* which enables more efficient learning
  - *localized representations* in a latent point set which enables unique editing properties
- We illustrate the application of these symmetry-preserving conditioning variables in an equivariant manner for downstream tasks:
  - Empirical support for the claim that latents are *geometrically meaningful* through classification experiments.
  - Show competitive reconstruction and representation capacity
  - Show that the framework is compatible with a *meta-learning based encoding scheme*




Figure 3: Illustration of attention-based equivariant neural fields (ENFs) sharing weights over equivalence classes of  $(z, x)$ -pairs (left), by representing local neighbourhoods of the input domain with conditioning variables  $z = (p, c)$  and calculating geometric invariants  $\mathbf{a}$ . (center), which are used to parameterise a cross-attention operator with Gaussian windowing to localise the attention-weights (right).

## 2 Background

**Autodecoding and metalearning** When fitting samples with Conditional Neural Fields (CNFs), two key challenges emerge: (1) efficiently encoding the shared characteristics of each data point within the neural network’s shared parametrisation, and (2) the slow process of fitting neural fields, particularly when applied to an entire dataset. Both issues can be addressed through meta-learning. Meta-learning enables a network or latent initialisation to be learned such that each sample can be fitted with just a few gradient steps. By applying Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) [11] to fitting Neural Fields (NeFs), [27] and [25] demonstrated that this allows new samples of NeRF scenes or signed distance functions (SDFs) to be fitted in a few gradient steps.

The success of [21], and its adoption by [10] in CNFs, highlights the utility of the auto-decoder approach for learning latent conditioning variables for images, shapes, and manifolds. This approach involves randomly initialising a latent-vector per sample, alongside a set of shared backbone parameters jointly optimized by minimising reconstruction error on each batch during training. Auto-decoding for learning latent-representations is appealing as it avoids the memory-intensive double loop optimizations required by meta-learning. However, [20] observes that MSE-based reconstruction

does not necessarily leads to good representations, i.e. using MSE-based auto-decoding may complicate the latent space, impeding optimization of downstream models. Since, reconstruction MSE does not force any structure upon the latent space. Moreover, [10] notes that training was unstable and the Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) was significantly lower compared to meta-learning for images.

To address this, [10] incorporates both auto-decoding and meta-learning. In meta-learning latent representations, only the modulations are updated in the inner loop, while the base network weights are updated in the outer loop. This method corresponds to an instance of learning a subset of weights with MAML, also known as Contextual Variable Interaction Analysis (CAVIA) [38].

---

**Algorithm 1** Meta-learning ENF

---

```

Randomly initialize shared base network  $f_\theta$ 
while not done do
  Sample batch  $\mathcal{B}$  of signals  $f$ 
  Sample random coordinates  $\mathbf{x}$ 
  Initialize latents  $z^f \leftarrow \{(p_i, \mathbf{c}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ .
  for all  $\text{step} \in 1, \dots, N_{\text{inner}}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{B}$  do
     $z^f \leftarrow z^f - \epsilon \nabla_{z^f} \mathcal{L}_{\text{mse}}(f_\theta(x, z^f), f(x))$ 
  end for
  Update ENF:  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}'_{\text{mse}}$ 
end while

```

---

**Mathematical preliminaries** A group is an algebraic construction defined by a set  $G$  and a binary operator which is called the group product  $G \times G \rightarrow G$ . To be a proper group, this construction should satisfy the following axioms:

1. *closure*:  $\forall h, g \in G : h \cdot g \in G$
2. *identity*:  $\exists e \in G$
3. *inverse*:  $\forall g \exists g^{-1} \in G : g \cdot g^{-1} = e$
4. *associativity*:  $\forall g, h, i \in G : (g \cdot h) \cdot i = g \cdot (h \cdot i)$

Given such a group  $G$  with identity element  $e \in G$ , and a set  $X$ , the *group action* is a map  $\mathcal{L}_g : G \times X \rightarrow X$  such that  $\mathcal{L}_e(x) = x$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{gh}(x) = \mathcal{L}_g(\mathcal{L}_h(x))$ .

In particular, we are interested in the Special Euclidean group  $SE(n) = T_n \times SO(n)$ .  $SE(n)$  is the roto-translation group consisting of elements  $g = (\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{R})$  with group operation  $gg' = (\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{R})(\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{R}') = (\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}')$ ; the left-regular action on function spaces is defined by  $\mathcal{L}_g f(\mathbf{x}) = f(g^{-1}\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{t}))$ .

**Equivariant graph neural networks for downstream tasks.** A key property of our framework is its ability to *associate geometric representations with fields*. This capability unlocks a rich toolset for field analysis through the lens of geometric deep learning (GDL) [5]. The GDL field has made significant advancements in the analysis and processing of geometric data, including the study of molecular properties [2, 1, 12, 4] and the generation of molecules [15, 3] and protein backbones [8, 33]. In essence, these approaches *characterise shape*. Our encoding scheme makes these tools now applicable to analysing the geometric components of neural fields. This capability is demonstrated through classification experiments in Sec. 4.1.

Equivariant Graph Neural Networks (EGNNs) are a class of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) that imposes roto-translational equivariance constraints on their message passing operators to ensure that the learned representations adhere to specific transformation symmetries of the data. For instance, [24] introduced the EGNN model, which achieves equivariance to translations and rotations. They propose to condition the messages passed between nodes on the invariant relative distances, and it incorporates a tailored position update mechanism. These design choices collectively create an architecture equivariant to  $E(n)$ -transformations.

Among the various forms of equivariant graph NNs [28, 4, 24, 12, 3] we will utilise PONITA [3] as an equivariant operator to analyse and process our latent point-set representations of fields. For the neural field, we leverage the same optimal bi-invariant attributes as introduced in [3]—which are

based on the theory of homogeneous spaces—to parameterise our neural fields, allowing for seamless integration. They formalise the notion of *weight sharing* in convolutional networks as the sharing of message functions over point-pairs that should be treated equally. By defining equivalence classes of point-pairs that are identical up to a transformation in the group, we too derive attributes that uniquely identify these classes and enable weight sharing in our proposed ENFs.

### 3 Method

In this section we show how we impose the proposed steerability property in eq 1 in CNFs. Inspired by [35] we propose a cross-attention based neural field with a geometry grounded *latent-set*  $z^f$  as conditioning variable for a signal  $f$ . By grounding the latent set in some geometry with a pose for every element in the set, we get a latent point-set or point-cloud. These poses enable the use of geometric-invariants proposed by [3] as parametrisation of the query function within the cross-attention operation. We first cover the grounding of the conditioning variables than we discuss the equivariant parametrisation of the cross-attention operation. Afterwards, we discuss how to incorporate locality in the latents, making sure that they represent a local neighbourhood in the input-space. Finally, we will discuss the consequences of grounding the latent point-sets in geometry.

#### 3.1 The constraint of bi-invariance

Before presenting our equivariant neural field design, we need to understand the constraints imposed by the steerability property (1). The key result is that for steerability, the field  $f_\theta$  must be bi-invariant with respect to both coordinates and latents.

**Lemma 1.** *A conditional neural field satisfies the steerability property iff it is bi-invariant, i.e.,  $\forall g \in G : f_\theta(gx; gz) = f_\theta(x; z)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f_\theta$  satisfies the steerability property, then  $f_\theta(gx; gz) = f_\theta(g^{-1}gx; z) = f_\theta(x; z)$ , so it is bi-invariant. Conversely, if  $f_\theta$  is bi-invariant, then  $f_\theta(g^{-1}x; z) = f_\theta(gg^{-1}x; gz) = f_\theta(x; gz)$ , satisfying the steerability property (1).  $\square$

#### 3.2 Cross-attention neural fields with geometric attributes

We next explain how cross-attention networks could be used to parametrise neural fields, taking [35] as reference, which considers cross-attention between embeddings of coordinates  $x$  and a latent set of context vectors  $z = \{\mathbf{c}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ . Such cross-attention fields assign to each  $x$  a corresponding value  $f_\theta(x; z)$ , by matching a coordinate (query) embedding  $\mathbf{q}(x)$  against latent (key) vectors  $\mathbf{k}(z_i)$ , and aggregating associated values  $\mathbf{v}(z_i)$  via

$$f_\theta(x; z) = \sum_{i=1}^N att(x, z) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{c}_i) \quad \text{with} \quad att(x, z) = \text{softmax}_i \left( \frac{\mathbf{q}(x)^T \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{c}_i)}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right).$$

Our desired latent representation, however, contains a geometric component, namely the poses  $p_i$  associated with the context vectors  $\mathbf{c}_i$ . In order to see how geometric information could be maximally utilised, we highlight how each of the three components (query, key, and value) could depend on the [geometric attributes](#):

$$f_\theta(x; z) = \sum_{i=1}^N att(x, z) \mathbf{v}(x, p_i, \mathbf{c}_i) \quad \text{with} \quad att(x, z) = \text{softmax}_i \left( \frac{\mathbf{q}(x, p_i)^T \mathbf{k}(x, p_i, \mathbf{c}_i)}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right).$$

The steerability condition demands that the field has to be bi-invariant with respect to transformations on both  $x$  and  $p_i$ , and the easiest way to achieve this is to replace any instance of  $x, p_i$  by a invariant pair-wise attribute  $\mathbf{a}(x, p_i)$  that is both invariant and maximally informative. With maximally informative we mean that coordinate-pose pairs that are not the same up to a group action receive a different vector descriptor, i.e.,  $\mathbf{a}(x, p_i) = \mathbf{a}(x', p'_i)$  if and only if there exists a  $g \in G$  such that  $x' = gx$  and  $p'_i = gp_i$ .

### 3.3 Equivariant neural fields

Based on recent results in the context of equivariant graph neural networks [3], we let  $\mathbf{a}(x, p_i) := p_i^{-1}x$  be the the unique and complete *bijective* identifier for the equivalence class of all coordinate-pose pairs that are the same up to a group action. Bijectivity here implies that the descriptor  $p_i^{-1}x$  contains all information possible to identify the equivalence classes, and thus the use of those attributes leads to maximal expressivity. The attributes used in this work are shown in table 4. We finally remark that in the pair-wise attention there is no need to implement a dependency on  $\mathbf{a}(x, p_i)$  more than once, and choose to only condition on it using the query term to come to our ENF definition:

$$f_{\theta}(x; z) = \sum_{i=1}^N att(x, z) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}(x, p_i), \mathbf{c}_i) \quad \text{with} \quad att(x, z) = \text{softmax}_i \left( \frac{\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{a}(x, p_i))^T \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{c}_i)}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right).$$

We make the following specific choice for each of the functions

$$\mathbf{a}(x, p_i) := \phi(p_i^{-1}x) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}(x, p_i), \mathbf{c}_i) := (\mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{c}_i) \odot (\mathbf{W}_{a_\alpha} \mathbf{a}(x, p_i)) + (\mathbf{W}_{a_\beta} \mathbf{a}(x, p_i)) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{a}(p_i^{-1}x)) := \mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{a}(x, p_i) \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{c}_i) := \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{c}_i, \quad (5)$$

with  $\odot$  denoting element-wise multiplication and  $\phi$  a relative coordinate embedding function which we set to be a Gaussian RFF embedding [26]. In neural field literature it is known that neural networks suffer from high spectral biases [23]. Due to smooth input-output mappings it becomes difficult to learn high-frequency information in low-dimensions such as the coordinate inputs for a NeF. Gaussian RFF embeddings introduce high-frequency signals in the embedding to alleviate the spectral bias.

Since the value transform has as goal to fill in the appearances during reconstruction in a geometrically informed manner, the value-function is also conditioned on the geometric attributes  $p_i^{-1}x$ . To add extra expressivity we chose to apply the conditioning via FiLM modulation [22] which applies a feature-wise linear modulation with a learnable shift and scale modulation.

A crucial difference with standard transformer-type methods on point clouds is that cross-attention is between *relative position embeddings*—relative to the latent pose  $p_i$ —and that the value transform is of depth-wise separable convolutional form [3], which is a stronger form of conditioning [18] than additive modulation as is typically done in biased self-attention networks such as Point Transformer [37].

### 3.4 Enforcing and learning locality in the point-sets

With the current proposed setup, cross-attention is universally applied across the entire set of latents and coordinates. Given the Softmax distribution, each coordinate indiscriminately receives a nonzero attention value from every latent  $z_i^f$  in the set  $z^f$ . Consequently, although latents possess inherent positional attributes within their latent space, they do not strictly represent localised regions, precluding their interpretation as such.

To address this issue, we modify the attention mechanism by incorporating a Gaussian window, potentially adjustable, into the computation of attention coefficients. This approach follows the strategy proposed by [7]. Specifically, the attention scores derived from the dot product between the query and key values are modulated by a Gaussian window  $\mathbf{G}$ , which is dependent on the Euclidean distance between latent positions and the input coordinates, expressed as  $\mathbf{G}_i = \sigma_{att} \|p_i - \mathbf{x}\|^2$ . Here,  $\sigma_{att}$  is a hyperparameter that regulates the size for each latent.

$$att(x, z) = \text{softmax}_i \left( \frac{\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{a}(x, p_i))^T \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{c}_i)}{\sqrt{d_k}} + \mathbf{G}(x, p_i) \right)$$

where  $\mathbf{G}(x, p_i)$  represents the Gaussian window computed for each latent position. To enhance the expressiveness of the model even further,  $\sigma_{att}$  could be made learnable through autodecoding as well, akin to the adjustments of positional and appearance vectors. This extension allows the latents to

be expressed as sets of tuples or so-called point-sets:  $z^f = \{(p_i, \mathbf{c}_i, \sigma_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , effectively coupling position, appearance, and locality attributes within the latent space. However, we keep this for further research.

### 3.5 Resulting properties of equivariant neural fields

**Weight sharing** The fact that all operations are conditioned on attributes  $\mathbf{a}$  that are unique identifiers for equivalence classes of (latent-coordinate)-pairs, ensure that the cross-attention operators—be it the attention logits or the value transform—respond similarly regardless of the pose under which an signal pattern presents itself. This leads to a generalised notion of weight sharing [3] due to which we can expect improved data and representation efficiency from our ENFs, compared to other types of NeFs. We confirm this property in figure 4, which shows that ENFs share weights over group actions  $g \in G$  for the geometry in which the point-sets are grounded. By observing the reconstructions of translated or rotated point-sets of different invariants.

**Locality and interpretability** Our choice to work with latent point sets allows us to localise cross-attention mechanisms around the latent pose, akin to how a convolution operator works with localised kernels. We in fact localise the attention coefficients as explained in 3.4 to make latents locally responsible for reconstructing the field. Not only does this improve interpretability (field patterns can be attributed to specific latent points), it also enables unique field editing possibilities. Since our method is based on sets of latents and each element is responsible for a local neighbourhood of the input domain, we can take arbitrary unions(e.g. stitching) or intersections(e.g. latent-merging) of point-sets of different samples.

**Geometric reasoning** Since ENFs acquire geometry-grounded representations, they enable the use of the rich tool set from geometric deep learning in the representation of fields. Equivariant operators, common in computational chemistry and physics domains [28, 2, 1, 3, 4, 12, 24], applied in latent space, facilitate the application of geometric deep learning techniques to the representation of fields, allowing for more precise analysis of their geometric components. This includes dynamics forecasting [4], where equivariant methods are commonly used. These methods can now too be applied to modelling neural field dynamics in latent space [34, 16].

## 4 Experiments

We evaluate ENFs for different data modalities, e.g. images, shapes, with different invariant parameterisations. The ENF framework is tested on four different datasets (Cifar10, CelebA, STL10 and




Figure 4: Reconstructions for different ENF parameterizations: (a) abs-pos, (b) rel-pos, (c) norm-rel-pos, and (d) ponita. Each row shows the effect of an invariant type on preserving translational and rotational symmetries. Invariant (a) produces distorted reconstructions for both rotations and translations due to lacking bi-invariance. Invariant (b) distorts after rotation but only shows border artifacts after translation. Invariants (c) and (d) achieve perfect reconstructions for both transformations.




Figure 5: In subfigures (a) and (b), we present two reconstructed images of a car and a duck from the CIFAR-10 dataset. Each point cloud consists of 25 latents. We created a new point cloud by combining the left half of the car and the right half of the duck. After reconstructing the combined point cloud, we observed that the local geometry is preserved within the local latents.

ShapeNet) for reconstruction, classification. Moreover, we showcase the consequences of our choice for geometry grounded conditioning-variables by showing linear local interpolation of latents and some examples of latent-manipulation.

To enhance our understanding of the practical utility of ENFs, we conduct a comparative analysis of our proposed bi-invariants. The invariants are compared with absolute positions  $x$  as 'invariant', with which used in ENF boils down to a non-equivariant attention-based NeF. As extra baseline, we compare against functa[10], which is the framework which inspired to ground latents within certain geometries.

When testing our point-sets as downstream representations we chose to use Ponita as equivariant operator. For every experiment we apply 4-layer Ponita MPNN for point-set classification for both shapes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and images in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . The ponita model is always parameterised with an  $SO(2)$  or  $SO(3)$  invariant, since although the ENF used a translational bi-invariant parametrisation, the task of point-cloud/point-set classification is still rotationally invariant.

#### 4.1 Images

**Reconstruction** For image reconstruction, we evaluated on Cifar10, CelebA and STL-10. All models are trained on 5000 training and 5000 validation samples. We swept over different parameters for every dataset and ended up with 16 latents of dimension 32 for Cifar10 and 25 latents of dimension 128 for CelebA and STL-10. All metrics for the different datasets are measured in terms of Peak signal-to-noise ratio measured in decibel (Db).

Table 1 shows that in terms of reconstruction ENF beats functa for all datasets, often even with the non-invariant parametrisation. This latter observation tells us that, geometry grounded conditioning variables, even without equivariance, already help in reconstructing images. We argue that, having localised latents already helps without weight-sharing over these local neighbourhoods. However, table 1 also shows, that when the parametrisation becomes invariant to certain groups of interests, and weight-sharing between latent-coordinate pairs is allowed, the reconstruction capabilities are even higher.

MODEL	SYMMETRY	CIFAR10	CELEBA	STL-10
Functa [10]	x	31.9	28.0	20.7
ENF - abs pos	x	31.5	16.8	22.8
ENF - rel pos	$\mathbb{R}^2$	<b>34.8</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>26.8</b>
ENF - abs rel pos	SE(2)	32.8	32.4	23.9
ENF - ponita	SE(2)	33.9	32.9	25.4

Table 1: Reconstruction PSNR (db $\uparrow$ ) on Cifar10, CelebA and STL-10.

**Classification** Besides testing the reconstruction capabilities, we also want to show that the grounding of latents in geometry also leads to better representation since [20] shows that reconstruction does not necessarily leads to better downstream performance. We test these representation capabilities ENF based on classification of latent-pointsets extracted from the trained ENF model on the cifar10 dataset.

Based on findings of [10] we augment the cifar10 images with 50 random crops and flips, resulting in a dataset of 2500000 (50000 \* 50) images. This dataset is used to fit a point-set for every image. Afterwards we use Ponita as point-set classifier. Table 2 shows the results for the different tested invariants and functa.

MODEL	SYMMETRY	CIFAR10
Functa [10]	x	68.3
ENF - abs pos	x	68.7
ENF - rel pos	$\mathbb{R}^2$	<b>82.1</b>
ENF - abs rel pos	SE(2)	70.9
ENF - ponita	SE(2)	81.5

Table 2: Classification accuracy (% $\uparrow$ ) on Cifar10.

**Latent editing and manipulation** To further test our geometry grounded latents, we tried play around with fitted point-sets. One such, example could already be seen in figure 5 where we stitched halves of two different point-sets on two Cifar10 images. Figure 7 4 different sampled versions for all latents. Moreover, to show that our latent point-sets are really capturing local information we replace a single latent of a reconstructed CelebA pointset by a latent of another pointset. Since CelebA is aligned, it should capture the local

As an additional experiment we are clustering the latents fit to CelebA with kmeans applied to the context vectors and visualize samples for some of the resultin clusters. In Fig. 8 we show how latents from the same cluster correspond to similar visual patterns.

## 4.2 Shapes

To further investigate ENF, we evaluate the model on Signed Distance Functions (SDFs) created from ShapeNet [6] meshes. First, the mesh is made watertight, after which we sample a pointcloud of 200000 points on the surface. These points are perturbed with Gaussian noise along the normals of the mesh. These noise-values correspond to the distance-values in the SDF. To compare with [10] we took 10 classes of shapenet and created a training and validation set with respectively 34980 and 10000 SDFs. We need to stress that functa did not train their model on SDFs but on voxel reconstruction

Table 3 shows the results on shape reconstruction and classification via SDFs. The metric on shape reconstruction is the Intersection-over-Union (IOU) and for classification accuracy (ACC). For actual visual reconstructions we refer to appendix.

MODEL	Reconstruction (voxel)	Reconstruction (SDF)	Classification
Functa [10]	99.44	-	93.6
ENF	-	55	89

Table 3: Reconstruction IOU ( $\uparrow$ ) on ShapeNet




Figure 6: Subfigures (a) and (b) show reconstructed point clouds fitted to two different shapes. Subfigure (c) shows the result of translating the point cloud from (b) and reconstructing the union of both point clouds. This demonstrates the translation equivariance of the fitted representation and illustrates that combining latent point-clouds of two different objects does not result in information loss during reconstruction.

## 5 Conclusion

In conclusion, our work introduces Equivariant Neural Fields (ENFs) as a novel approach to enhancing Neural Fields (NeFs) by incorporating geometric conditioning through cross-attention transformers. This method leverages latent point sets to achieve an equivariant decoding process, ensuring that transformations in the field are faithfully mirrored in the latent space and vice versa. This steerability property allows for the accurate representation of geometric patterns and efficient weight-sharing over spatially similar patterns, significantly improving learning efficiency. Our experiments validate the superiority of ENFs over traditional NeFs in classification tasks and in fitting entire datasets.

## References

- [1] Ilyes Batatia, David P Kovacs, Gregor Simm, Christoph Ortner, and Gábor Csányi. Mace: Higher order equivariant message passing neural networks for fast and accurate force fields. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:11423–11436, 2022.
- [2] Simon Batzner, Albert Musaelian, Lixin Sun, Mario Geiger, Jonathan P Mailoa, Mordechai Kornbluth, Nicola Molinari, Tess E Smidt, and Boris Kozinsky. E (3)-equivariant graph neural networks for data-efficient and accurate interatomic potentials. *Nature communications*, 13(1): 2453, 2022.
- [3] Erik J Bekkers, Sharvaree Vadgama, Rob D Hesselink, Putri A van der Linden, and David W Romero. Fast, expressive se ( $n$ ) equivariant networks through weight-sharing in position-orientation space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02970*, 2023.
- [4] Johannes Brandstetter, Rob Hesselink, Elise van der Pol, Erik J Bekkers, and Max Welling. Geometric and physical quantities improve e (3) equivariant message passing. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [5] Michael M Bronstein, Joan Bruna, Taco Cohen, and Petar Veličković. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13478*, 2021.
- [6] Angel X Chang, Thomas Funkhouser, Leonidas Guibas, Pat Hanrahan, Qixing Huang, Zimo Li, Silvio Savarese, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Hao Su, et al. Shapenet: An information-rich 3d model repository. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03012*, 2015.
- [7] Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, Andreas Loukas, and Martin Jaggi. On the relationship between self-attention and convolutional layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03584*, 2019.
- [8] Gabriele Corso, Hannes Stärk, Bowen Jing, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi S Jaakkola. Diff-dock: Diffusion steps, twists, and turns for molecular docking. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [9] Luca De Luigi, Adriano Cardace, Riccardo Spezialetti, Pierluigi Zama Ramirez, Samuele Salti, and Luigi Di Stefano. Deep learning on implicit neural representations of shapes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05438*, 2023.
- [10] Emilien Dupont, Hyunjik Kim, SM Eslami, Danilo Rezende, and Dan Rosenbaum. From data to functa: Your data point is a function and you can treat it like one. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12204*, 2022.
- [11] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.
- [12] Johannes Gasteiger, Florian Becker, and Stephan Günnemann. Gemnet: Universal directional graph neural networks for molecules. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 6790–6802, 2021.
- [13] Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, Claudio Michaelis, Matthias Bethge, Felix A Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. Imagenet-trained cnns are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12231*, 2018.
- [14] Katherine Hermann, Ting Chen, and Simon Kornblith. The origins and prevalence of texture bias in convolutional neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 19000–19015, 2020.
- [15] Emiel Hoogeboom, Victor Garcia Satorras, Clément Vignac, and Max Welling. Equivariant diffusion for molecule generation in 3d. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8867–8887. PMLR, 2022.
- [16] David M Knigge, David R Wessels, Riccardo Valperga, Samuele Papa, Jan-Jakob Sonke, Efstratios Gavves, and Erik J Bekkers. Space-time continuous pde forecasting using equivariant neural fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06660*, 2024.

- [17] Miltiadis Kofinas, Boris Knyazev, Yan Zhang, Yunlu Chen, Gertjan J. Burghouts, Efstratios Gavves, Cees G. M. Snoek, and David W. Zhang. Graph neural networks for learning equivariant representations of neural networks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=o06FsMyDBt>.
- [18] Yeskendir Koishekenov and Erik J Bekkers. An exploration of conditioning methods in graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01933*, 2023.
- [19] Derek Lim, Haggai Maron, Marc T Law, Jonathan Lorraine, and James Lucas. Graph metanetworks for processing diverse neural architectures. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [20] Samuele Papa, Riccardo Valperga, David Knigge, Miltiadis Kofinas, Phillip Lippe, Jan-Jakob Sonke, and Efstratios Gavves. How to train neural field representations: A comprehensive study and benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10531*, 2023.
- [21] Jeong Joon Park, Peter Florence, Julian Straub, Richard Newcombe, and Steven Lovegrove. Deep sdf: Learning continuous signed distance functions for shape representation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 165–174, 2019.
- [22] Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm De Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron Courville. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [23] Nasim Rahaman, Aristide Baratin, Devansh Arpit, Felix Draxler, Min Lin, Fred Hamprecht, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. On the spectral bias of neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5301–5310. PMLR, 2019.
- [24] Victor Garcia Satorras, Emiel Hoogeboom, and Max Welling. E (n) equivariant graph neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 9323–9332. PMLR, 2021.
- [25] Vincent Sitzmann, Eric Chan, Richard Tucker, Noah Snavely, and Gordon Wetzstein. Metasdf: Meta-learning signed distance functions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:10136–10147, 2020.
- [26] Matthew Tancik, Pratul Srinivasan, Ben Mildenhall, Sara Fridovich-Keil, Nithin Raghavan, Utkarsh Singhal, Ravi Ramamoorthi, Jonathan Barron, and Ren Ng. Fourier features let networks learn high frequency functions in low dimensional domains. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7537–7547, 2020.
- [27] Matthew Tancik, Ben Mildenhall, Terrance Wang, Divi Schmidt, Pratul P Srinivasan, Jonathan T Barron, and Ren Ng. Learned initializations for optimizing coordinate-based neural representations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2846–2855, 2021.
- [28] Nathaniel Thomas, Tess Smidt, Steven Kearnes, Lusann Yang, Li Li, Kai Kohlhoff, and Patrick Riley. Tensor field networks: Rotation-and translation-equivariant neural networks for 3d point clouds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08219*, 2018.
- [29] Sharvaree Vadgama, Jakub Mikolaj Tomczak, and Erik J Bekkers. Kendall shape-vae: Learning shapes in a generative framework. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Symmetry and Geometry in Neural Representations*, 2022.
- [30] Sharvaree Vadgama, Jakub M Tomczak, and Erik Bekkers. Continuous kendall shape variational autoencoders. In *International Conference on Geometric Science of Information*, pages 73–81. Springer, 2023.
- [31] Nguyen Van Quang, Jinhee Chun, and Takeshi Tokuyama. Capsulenet for micro-expression recognition. In *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2019.

- [32] Yiheng Xie, Towaki Takikawa, Shunsuke Saito, Or Litany, Shiqin Yan, Numair Khan, Federico Tombari, James Tompkin, Vincent Sitzmann, and Srinath Sridhar. Neural fields in visual computing and beyond. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 41, pages 641–676. Wiley Online Library, 2022.
- [33] Jason Yim, Andrew Campbell, Andrew YK Foong, Michael Gastegger, José Jiménez-Luna, Sarah Lewis, Victor Garcia Satorras, Bastiaan S Veeling, Regina Barzilay, Tommi Jaakkola, et al. Fast protein backbone generation with se (3) flow matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05297*, 2023.
- [34] Yuan Yin, Matthieu Kirchmeyer, Jean-Yves Franceschi, Alain Rakotomamonjy, and Patrick Gallinari. Continuous pde dynamics forecasting with implicit neural representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14855*, 2022.
- [35] Biao Zhang, Jiapeng Tang, Matthias Niessner, and Peter Wonka. 3dshape2vecset: A 3d shape representation for neural fields and generative diffusion models. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 42(4):1–16, 2023.
- [36] David W Zhang, Miltiadis Kofinas, Yan Zhang, Yunlu Chen, Gertjan J Burghouts, and Cees GM Snoek. Neural networks are graphs! graph neural networks for equivariant processing of neural networks. 2023.
- [37] Hengshuang Zhao, Li Jiang, Jiaya Jia, Philip HS Torr, and Vladlen Koltun. Point transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 16259–16268, 2021.
- [38] Luisa Zintgraf, Kyriacos Shiarli, Vitaly Kurin, Katja Hofmann, and Shimon Whiteson. Fast context adaptation via meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7693–7702. PMLR, 2019.

## A Weight-sharing via equivalence-classes between (latent-coordinate)-pairs

Equivariant neural fields (ENFs) ground their conditioning variables in some geometry, by imposing an equivariance constraints w.r.t. actions of a group  $G$  acting on the cross-attention operation between the latent set and the sampled coordinates. We propose a novel model class of Equivariant Conditional Neural Fields that using these constraints impose a steerability property which preserves geometric transformations in the representation of  $z^f$ .

**Generalised weight sharing** [3] discusses that the general viewpoint of weight sharing in convolutions does not transfer to the continuous case and more general processing frameworks such as message passing. Therefore, they formalised weight-sharing through the notion of equivalence relations between point-pairs  $x, x' \in X \times X$ . This work takes this insight to create an attention-operation over equivalence classes of (latent,coordinate)-pairs that adhere to an equivalence relation for a certain group  $G$ . Such that, points corresponding to the same equivalence class can be mapped to each other by a group-action  $g \in G$ .

Since, equivalence relations defined for groups of interest requires evaluating geometric quantities it is necessary to ground the latent set in a certain geometry corresponding to the group  $G$  as well. Therefore, we extend the latent set of [35] with poses  $p_i$  corresponding to the following conditioning variable  $z^f = \{(p_i, \mathbf{a}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ . Elements  $i$  of the latent set  $z^f$  are disentangled into tuples of *pose*  $p_i \in G$  and *appearance*  $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Where  $d$  is the dimensionality of the latent vectors. These poses ground the set of latent vectors in a certain geometry, where e.g. for  $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  the set is grounded in a 2D Euclidean base-space, where for  $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1$  the set is grounded in position-orientation base-space. So instead of utilising latents sets as conditioning variables, we now parameterise our neural field with latent point-clouds.

Since, the equivalence relation are not defined between point pairs in this case we change the definition the following for two pairs  $((p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k), ((p_j, \mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{x}_l) \in Z \times X$

$$((p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k) \sim ((p_j, \mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{x}_l) \iff \exists_{g \in G} : (p_i, \mathbf{x}_k) = (gp_j, g\mathbf{x}_l) \quad (6)$$

Other than the grounding of our latents in some geometry, we also need an appropriate definition of a group action which can act on this latent space in which the point cloud lives. We define the following group action  $gz = \{(gp_i, \mathbf{a}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , in which elements of the group act only on the geometric elements of the latent point-cloud, leaving the appearances invariant to geometric transformations. This gives rise to the following equivalence class for signals defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$\left[ z_i^f, \mathbf{x}_k \right] = [(p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k] = \{((p_j, \mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{x}_l) \in Z \times X \mid ((p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k) \sim ((p_j, \mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{x}_l)\}, \quad (7)$$

Where,  $[(p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k]$  represents the set of pairs of latents and sampled input coordinates that should be treated equivalently. Definition 3.3 of [3] shows that these equivalence classes correspond to  $H$ -orbits in the base-space  $X$ .

For  $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , the equivalence class for  $(z^f, x)$ -pairs could be defined by the translational *relative pose*  $p_i^{-1}x = (\mathbf{R}_i^T(x - x_i))^T$ :

$$[(p_i, \mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{x}_k] = \{((p_j, \mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{x}_l) \in Z \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid p_j^{-1}\mathbf{x}_l = p_i^{-1}\mathbf{x}_k\}, \quad (8)$$

or those pairs of latents elements and coordinates under an identical *relative pose*  $p^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ . This quantity is bi-invariant to the group action per:

$$\forall g \in SE(2) : (p_i, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto (gp_i, g\mathbf{x}) \Leftrightarrow p_i^{-1}\mathbf{x} \mapsto (gp_i)^{-1}g\mathbf{x} = p_i^{-1}g^{-1}g\mathbf{x} = p_i^{-1}\mathbf{x}. \quad (9)$$

## B Invariant attributes

INVARIANT	SYMMETRY	ATTRIBUTE
Absolute Position (abs pos)	$\mathbf{x}$	$a(x, p) = x$
Relative Position (rel pos)	$\mathbb{R}^2$	$a(x, p) = x - p$
Absolute Relative Position (abs rel pos)	$SE(2)$	$a(x, p) = \ x - p\ $
Ponita [3]	$SE(2)$	$a(x, p) = R_p^{-1}(x - p)$

Table 4: Invariant attributes  $a(x, p)$  defined for different symmetry groups.

## C Experiments



Figure 7: Stitching randomly sampled latents of a dataset point-sets extracted from the CelebA dataset.



Figure 8: We cluster the latent context vectors  $\mathbf{c}_i$  and visualize latents from the same cluster (rows). Latents from the same cluster correspond to visually similar patterns.




Figure 9: We applied linear interpolation between a single latent for CelebA