
Lie-Equivariant Quantum Graph Neural Networks

Jogi Suda Neto^{1,2} Roy T. Forestano³ Sergei Gleyzer⁴
 Kyoungchul Kong⁵ Konstantin T. Matchev^{3,4} Katia Matcheva^{3,4}

¹QuaTI, 13560-161 São Carlos, SP, Brazil

²Department of Computer Science, UNESP, SJRP 15054-000, Brazil

³IFT, Physics Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

⁴Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA

⁵Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA

jogi.suda@unesp.br

{roy.forestano,matchev,matcheva}@ufl.edu

{sgleyzer,kmatchev,kmatcheva}@ua.edu

kckong@ku.edu

Abstract

Discovering new phenomena at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) involves the identification of rare signals over conventional backgrounds. Thus binary classification tasks are ubiquitous in analyses of the vast amounts of LHC data. We develop a Lie-Equivariant Quantum Graph Neural Network (Lie-EQGNN), a quantum model that is not only data efficient, but also has symmetry-preserving properties. Since Lorentz group equivariance has been shown to be beneficial for jet tagging, we build a Lorentz-equivariant quantum GNN for quark-gluon jet discrimination and show that its performance is on par with its classical state-of-the-art counterpart LorentzNet, making it a viable alternative to the conventional computing paradigm.

1 Introduction

The onset of the high luminosity stage of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [1] by the end of this decade presents a formidable computational challenge to effectively manage and analyze the resulting datasets [2]. A promising new computing paradigm for tackling this problem is the application of quantum machine learning (QML), which offers the possibility of reducing the time complexity of classical algorithms by running on quantum computers, which can have access to the exponentially large Hilbert space [3–9].

In particle physics, symmetries underpin the fundamental laws governing the interactions and behaviors of subatomic particles: the Standard Model (SM), for example, is built upon symmetry principles such as gauge and Lorentz invariance, which dictate the interactions between particles and fields [10]. At the same time, symmetries play a crucial role in machine learning as well — if a neural network is invariant under some group, then its output could be expressed as functions of the orbits of the group [11]. In recent years, the field of *Geometric Deep Learning* [12] was born, and it posits that despite the curse of dimensionality, the success of deep learning can be explained by two main inductive biases: symmetry and scale separation. By leveraging inherent symmetries in the data, the hypothesis space is effectively reduced, models can become more compact, and require less data for training - attributes that are particularly critical for quantum computing, given the current hardware limitations.

Recognizing the intertwined nature of symmetries and deep learning, a plethora of models have been developed that are invariant to different groups. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs), for example, which have revolutionized computer vision, are naturally invariant to image translations. Transformer-based language models, on the other hand, exhibit permutation invariance. These architectures, when

provided with appropriate data, are capable of learning stable latent representations under the action of their respective groups. An interesting question to be explored in quantum machine learning is the use of symmetries [13–17], especially in the context of particle physics [18–22].

Since the data generated by collision events is usually represented in a graph format, graph neural networks (GNNs) [23] are a natural choice in particle physics [24]. Furthermore, Lorentz symmetry is a fundamental spacetime symmetry for any relativistic model of elementary particles. The state of the art implementation of Lorentz symmetry in a GNN is LorentzNet [25], which has been used for jet tagging, i.e., identifying the progenitor elementary particle which initiates the jet. In this paper we focus on a specific version of the jet tagging problem, namely, discriminating between light quark and gluon jets [26–28]. We build a Lorentz-equivariant quantum GNN for quark-gluon jet discrimination and show that its performance is on par with its classical state-of-the-art counterpart, LorentzNet. This is an encouraging result, given that quantum computation is still in its infancy stage. In the NISQ era, our focus is on quantum utility, i.e., effectiveness and practicality of quantum computers in terms of speed, accuracy or energy consumption, over a classical machine of similar size, weight, and cost [29].

2 Lie-Equivariance

Given the abstract definition of Lie groups as used in particle physics [30, 31], our primary goal is to understand how these symmetries can be embedded in hybrid quantum-classical ML architectures. Mathematically, we consider our data as a set of vectors x sampled from an input space $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$. We then describe how a group element $g \in G$ acts linearly on x through $T_{\mathcal{X}}(g)$, where $T_{\mathcal{X}} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{GL}(n)$ is known as the group representation. Essentially, $T_{\mathcal{X}}$ maps each element of the group G to a nonsingular matrix $T_{\mathcal{X}}(g) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. It is important to note that each representation of a Lie group induces a corresponding representation in its Lie algebra.

The idea of symmetry-preserving behavior in machine learning is essential. By reducing the hypothesis space, the learning process becomes more efficient. Additionally, models that integrate geometric information as an inductive bias tend to be naturally data-efficient, eliminating the need for data augmentation during training [13–17, 25, 32–35]. This is particularly important in Quantum Machine Learning (QML), where the limited number of qubits makes data efficiency crucial [18, 19].

For a given function $f : x \in \mathcal{X} \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{Y}$ (for example, f could be a neural network, \mathcal{X} the input space, and \mathcal{Y} a latent space) and some group G that acts on both \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , the f holds the desirable property of equivariance if $\forall g \in G, (x, y) \in \mathcal{D}, T_{\mathcal{Y}}(g)y = f(T_{\mathcal{X}}(g)x)$. For brevity of notation, we write it as: $g \cdot y = f(g \cdot x)$.

It becomes clear that the invariance is a special case of equivariance where $f(g \cdot x) = f(x)$, that is, $T_{\mathcal{Y}}(g) = \mathbb{I}$, so every group element acting in the space of \mathcal{Y} gets mapped to the identity. To incorporate invariance into the architectures, it is essential to first identify the group G that accounts for the underlying transformations of the data. In our context, these groups are Lie groups. In particular we will consider the Lorentz group, which is a fundamental symmetry of the standard model of particle physics. Our objective is to build a Quantum Algorithm for Lorentz-Equivariant Graph Neural Network for gluon/quark discrimination.

3 Dataset

In this work, we consider the task of determining whether a given jet originated from a quark or a gluon (this is known as jet-tagging). For illustration we use the high energy physics dataset *Pythia8 Quark and Gluon Jets for Energy Flow* [36], which contains two million jets split equally into one million quark jets and one million gluon jets. These jets resulted from simulated LHC collisions with total center of mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV and were selected to have transverse momenta p_T^{jet} between 500 to 550 GeV and rapidities $|y^{jet}| < 1.7$. For our analysis, we randomly picked $N = 12500$ jets and used the first 10000 for training, the next 1250 for validation, and the last 1250 for testing. These sets happened to contain 4982, 658, and 583 quark jets, respectively.

For our purposes, we consider the jet dataset to be constituted of point-clouds, where each jet is represented as a graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, i.e., a set of nodes and edges, respectively. (This is the natural data structure used by Graph Neural Networks.) In our case, each node has the transverse momentum




Figure 1: The coordinate system (left) used to represent components of the particle momentum \vec{p} (see also Fig. 1 in [21]). Schematic representation of a gluon jet (middle) and a quark jet (right). The jet constituents (solid lines) are collimated around the jet axis. (Figure adapted from Fig. 1 in [37].)

p_T , pseudorapidity η , azimuthal angle ϕ (and other scalar-like quantities like particle ID, particle mass, etc.) of the respective constituent particle in the jet (see Figure 1). Generally, the number of features is always constant, but the number of nodes in each jet may vary. For our analysis we used jets with at least 10 particles.

4 Models

4.1 Graph Neural Networks

Graph Neural Networks are a class of neural networks designed to operate on graph-structured data. Unlike traditional neural networks that work on Euclidean data such as images or sequences, GNNs are capable of capturing the dependencies and relationships between nodes in a graph. The fundamental idea behind GNNs is to iteratively update the representation of each node by aggregating information from its neighbors, thereby enabling the network to learn both local and global graph structures.

Mathematically, a GNN can be described as follows: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of edges. Each node $v \in V$ has an initial feature vector $\mathbf{h}_v^{(0)}$. The node features are updated through multiple layers of the GNN. At each layer l , the feature vector of node v is updated by aggregating the feature vectors of its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(v)$ and combining them with its own feature vector. This can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{h}_v^{(l)} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{W}_e^{(l)} \mathbf{h}_u^{(l)} \right)$$

where $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{W}_e^{(l)}$ are learnable weight matrices, σ is a non-linear activation function, and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors of node v . This process is repeated for a fixed number of layers, allowing the network to capture higher-order neighborhood information. The final node representations can be used for various downstream tasks such as node classification, link prediction, or graph classification.

4.2 Equivariant Graph Neural Networks

As a simple example of equivariance in the context of classical GNNs, consider a dataset of graphs in which the nodes have cartesian coordinates as input features, and let $SO(2)$ be their underlying group. Since the Euclidean norm - induced by the euclidean metric - is invariant to rotations, any node-updating function of the form:

$$x_i^{l+1} = x_i^l + C \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} (x_i^l - x_j^l) \phi_x(m_{ij}^l) \quad (1)$$

is naturally equivariant (for the proof, see Appendix A in [19]). Here ϕ_x is some classical neural network and m_{ij}^l is the *edge message* between nodes i and j in layer l . See Ref. [25] for different classical neural networks, ϕ_e , ϕ_m and ϕ_h .

Equivariant GNNs (EGNNs) can be applied to other groups of interests, like the Lorentz group, a central piece in high energy physics [25].

Particles observed at the LHC are moving at velocities comparable to the speed of light, and are therefore described by special relativity. Mathematically, the transformations between two inertial frames of reference are described by the Lorentz group $O(1, 3)$.

4.3 Quantum Graph Neural Networks

Having established that classical GNNs aim to learn a lower-dimensional, topologically preserving representation of graphs, we now explore quantum graph neural networks (QGNNs). One approach for QGNNs involves encoding the graph’s nodes and edges into any Hamiltonian whose topology of interactions is that of the problem graph [38]. Previous works [19, 38] have utilized the transverse-field Ising model, initially introduced to study phase transitions in magnetic systems. Once the graph is encoded in the Hamiltonian, it is transformed into a quantum circuit using a Trotter-Suzuki approximation [39].

This method naturally yields a permutation-equivariant QGNN via the Ising Hamiltonian. As discussed, the symmetries from quantum fields, describing the invariance of physical laws under different inertial frames, are represented by the Lorentz group. Prior research outlines efficient strategies for achieving equivariance. For instance, [40] demonstrates that an invariant model can be constructed using an equivariant set of quantum gates. However, this framework fundamentally assumes the presence of either discrete or compact Lie groups.

Given that the Lorentz group is noncompact, here we adopt an alternative method based on Invariant Theory [41, 42], which is different from the strategy to achieve equivariance explained before [40]. In addition, our approach for QGNNs is different from the one used in [19, 38]. It has previously been applied in the classical setting for High-Energy Physics [25], and is the main motivation for our work.

4.4 Lie-Equivariant Quantum Graph Neural Network

Similarly to LorentzNet, for standard jet tagging approach, our input is made of 4-momentum vectors and any associated particle scalar one may wish to include, like color and charge. We start with the traditional LorentzNet architecture (Fig. 1 in Ref. [25]), with the following modifications: ϕ_e , ϕ_x , ϕ_h , and ϕ_m , i.e., the classical multilayer perceptrons in LorentzNet, are substituted by quantum counterparts, that is, variational circuits, whose architecture is illustrated below in Fig. 2:




Figure 2: The ansatz used in our work, which consists of a unitary angle encoding followed by $L = 2$ trainable variational layers, which in turn consist each of entangling and parameterized RY rotations for each qubit.




Figure 3: Lorentz-Equivariant Quantum Block (LEQB). This block ensures equivariance in the coordinate update function x_i^{l+1} and invariance in the scalar update function h_i^{l+1} .

4.4.1 Lie Equivariant Quantum Block

Lorentz Equivariant Quantum Block (LEQB) is the main piece of our model (see Fig. 3). We aim to fundamentally learn deeper quantum representations of x^l and h^l ,

$$x_i^{l+1} = x_i^l + c \sum_{j=1}^n \phi_x(m_{ij}^l) x_j^l, \quad (2)$$

$$h_i^{l+1} = h_i^l + \phi_h(h_i^l, c \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} h_j^l), \quad (3)$$

where x^l are the 4-momentum observables and h^l are the particle scalars in the input layer $l = 0$, and m_{ij} is the message between particles i and j , defined by

$$m_{ij}^l = \phi_e(h_i^l, h_j^l, \psi(\|x_i - x_j\|^2), \psi(\langle x_i^l, x_j^l \rangle)), \quad (4)$$

where $\|x_i - x_j\|^2 = \eta(x_i - x_j, x_i - x_j)$ is the squared Minkowski norm, and $\langle x_i^l, x_j^l \rangle$ is the Minkowski inner product, defined by the bilinear form $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle = x_i^T \eta x_j$, where $\eta = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ is the Minkowski metric. Finally, ψ is just a normalization constant for large distributions to improve training stability, as defined in [25].

5 Experiments & results

After substituting ϕ_e , ϕ_x , ϕ_h , and ϕ_m for parameterized circuits one at a time, we find the results (accuracy and losses over training epochs) shown in the first four panels in Figures 4 and 5. When all four modules ϕ_e , ϕ_x , ϕ_h and ϕ_m are represented with quantum circuits, we find the results shown in the lower left panels in Figures 4 and 5. Finally, the results in the lower right panels correspond to the fully classical panels model LorentzNet [25]. In all experiments, we used *AdamW* [43] as our optimizer with a learning rate $\gamma = 10^{-3}$ and weight decay of $\lambda = 10^{-2}$. Our simulations are idealized in the sense that we ignore any noise and assume an infinite number of shots. For warming up, we used a combination of cosine annealing [44] and gradual warm-up [45]. The total number of trainable parameters in all models can be seen in Table 1.

Model	ϕ_e	ϕ_h	ϕ_m	ϕ_x	full_quantum	LorentzNet
Trainable Parameters	668	1100	1090	998	592	1088

Table 1: The number of trainable parameters for the different models.




Figure 4: Classification accuracies for LieEQGNN with quantum architectures in place of ϕ_e (top left), ϕ_x (top right), ϕ_h (middle left), ϕ_m (middle right). The lower left panel shows the result from the model where all four ϕ_e , ϕ_x , ϕ_h and ϕ_m are represented with quantum circuits. The lower right panel is the result from the classical model LorentzNet [25].

6 Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that the performance of Lie-EQNNs is comparable to or slightly better than that of their classical counterparts, LorentzNet. This highlights the potential of quantum-inspired architectures in resource-constrained settings. The code used for this study is publicly available at https://github.com/ML4SCI/QMLHEP/tree/main/Lie_EQGNN_for_HEP_Jogi_Suda_Neto.

Acknowledgments

This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 using NERSC award NERSC DDR-ERCAP0025759. SG is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Award No. DE-SC0012447. KM is supported in part by the U.S. DOE award number DE-SC0022148. KK is supported in part by US DOE DE-SC0024407.

References

- [1] CERN. The HL-LHC Project, 2022. Available online: <https://hilumilhc.web.cern.ch/content/hl-lhc-project> (accessed 24 Sep 2023).
- [2] Simone Amoroso et al. Challenges in Monte Carlo Event Generator Software for High-Luminosity LHC. *Comput. Softw. Big Sci.*, 5(1):12, 2021. doi: 10.1007/s41781-021-00055-1.
- [3] Srinivasan Arunachalam and Ronald de Wolf. A survey of quantum learning theory, Jul 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1701.06806>.




Figure 5: The same as Fig. 4, but showing the training loss (blue dashed line) and the validation loss (orange solid line).

- [4] Jacob Biamonte, Peter Wittek, Nicola Pancotti, Patrick Rebentrost, Nathan Wiebe, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum machine learning. *Nature*, 549(7671):195–202, Sep 2017. doi: 10.1038/nature23474. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23474>.
- [5] Maria Schuld and Nathan Killoran. Quantum machine learning in feature hilbert spaces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 122:040504, Feb 2019. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.040504. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.040504>.
- [6] S. Mangini, F. Tacchino, D. Gerace, D. Bajoni, and C. Macchiavello. Quantum computing models for artificial neural networks. *Europhysics Letters*, 134(1):10002, Apr 2021. doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/134/10002. URL <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/134/10002>.
- [7] Yunchao Liu, Srinivasan Arunachalam, and Kristan Temme. A rigorous and robust quantum speed-up in supervised machine learning. *Nature Physics*, 17(9):1013–1017, Sep 2021. ISSN 1745-2481. doi: 10.1038/s41567-021-01287-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-021-01287-z>.
- [8] Hsin-Yuan Huang, Michael Broughton, Jordan Cotler, Sitan Chen, Jerry Li, Masoud Mohseni, Hartmut Neven, Ryan Babbush, Richard Kueng, John Preskill, and Jarrod R. McClean. Quantum advantage in learning from experiments. *Science*, 376(6598):1182–1186, Jun 2022. doi: 10.1126/science.abn7293. URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn7293>.
- [9] Matthias C. Caro, Hsin-Yuan Huang, M. Cerezo, Kunal Sharma, Andrew Sornborger, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. Generalization in quantum machine learning from few training data. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):4919, Aug 2022. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-022-32550-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32550-3>.

- [10] David J. Gross. The role of symmetry in fundamental physics. *PNAS*, 93(25):14256–14259, December 1996. doi: 10.1073/pnas.93.25.14256. URL <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.25.14256>.
- [11] Marvin Minsky and Seymour Papert. Perceptron: an introduction to computational geometry. *The MIT Press, Cambridge, expanded edition*, 19(88):2, 1969.
- [12] Michael M. Bronstein, Joan Bruna, Taco Cohen, and Petar Veličković. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13478>.
- [13] Roy T. Forestano, Konstantin T. Matchev, Katia Matcheva, Alexander Roman, Eyup B. Unlu, and Sarunas Verner. Deep learning symmetries and their Lie groups, algebras, and subalgebras from first principles. *Mach. Learn. Sci. Tech.*, 4(2):025027, 2023. doi: 10.1088/2632-2153/acd989.
- [14] Alexander Roman, Roy T. Forestano, Konstantin T. Matchev, Katia Matcheva, and Eyup B. Unlu. Oracle-preserving latent flows. *Symmetry*, 15(7):1352, July 2023. doi: 10.3390/sym15071352.
- [15] Roy T. Forestano, Konstantin T. Matchev, Katia Matcheva, Alexander Roman, Eyup B. Unlu, and Sarunas Verner. Discovering sparse representations of Lie groups with machine learning. *Phys. Lett. B*, 844:138086, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138086.
- [16] Roy T. Forestano, Konstantin T. Matchev, Katia Matcheva, Alexander Roman, Eyup B. Unlu, and Sarunas Verner. Accelerated discovery of machine-learned symmetries: Deriving the exceptional Lie groups G₂, F₄ and E₆. *Phys. Lett. B*, 847:138266, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138266.
- [17] Roy T. Forestano, Konstantin T. Matchev, Katia Matcheva, Alexander Roman, Eyup B. Unlu, and Sarunas Verner. Identifying the group-theoretic structure of machine-learned symmetries. *Phys. Lett. B*, 847:138306, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138306.
- [18] Zhongtian Dong et al. $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ Equivariant Quantum Neural Networks: Benchmarking against Classical Neural Networks. *Axioms*, 13(3):188, 2024. doi: 10.3390/axioms13030188.
- [19] Roy T. Forestano et al. A Comparison between Invariant and Equivariant Classical and Quantum Graph Neural Networks. *Axioms*, 13(3):160, 2024. doi: 10.3390/axioms13030160.
- [20] Eyup B. Unlu et al. Hybrid Quantum Vision Transformers for Event Classification in High Energy Physics. *Axioms*, 13(3):187, 2024. doi: 10.3390/axioms13030187.
- [21] Marçal Comajoan Cara et al. Quantum Vision Transformers for Quark–Gluon Classification. *Axioms*, 13(5):323, 2024. doi: 10.3390/axioms13050323.
- [22] Alessandro Tesi, Gopal Ramesh Dahale, Sergei Gleyzer, Kyoungchul Kong, Tom Magorsch, Konstantin T. Matchev, and Katia Matcheva. Quantum Attention for Vision Transformers in High Energy Physics, 11 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.13520>.
- [23] Petar Veličković. Everything is connected: Graph neural networks. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 79:102538, April 2023. ISSN 0959-440X. doi: 10.1016/j.sbi.2023.102538. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2023.102538>.
- [24] Jonathan Shlomi, Peter Battaglia, and Jean-Roch Vlimant. Graph neural networks in particle physics. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 2(2):021001, January 2021. ISSN 2632-2153. doi: 10.1088/2632-2153/abbf9a. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2632-2153/abbf9a>.
- [25] Shiqi Gong, Qi Meng, Jue Zhang, Huilin Qu, Congqiao Li, Sitian Qian, Weitao Du, Zhi-Ming Ma, and Tie-Yan Liu. An efficient lorentz equivariant graph neural network for jet tagging. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2022(7), July 2022. ISSN 1029-8479. doi: 10.1007/jhep07(2022)030. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2022\)030](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2022)030).
- [26] Andrew J. Larkoski, Ian Mould, and Benjamin Nachman. Jet Substructure at the Large Hadron Collider: A Review of Recent Advances in Theory and Machine Learning. *Phys. Rept.*, 841:1–63, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.2019.11.001.

- [27] Roman Kogler et al. Jet Substructure at the Large Hadron Collider: Experimental Review. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 91(4):045003, 2019. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.91.045003.
- [28] Simone Marzani, Gregory Soyez, and Michael Spannowsky. *Looking inside jets: an introduction to jet substructure and boosted-object phenomenology*, volume 958. Springer, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-15709-8.
- [29] Nils Herrmann, Daanish Arya, Marcus W. Doherty, Angus Mingare, Jason C. Pillay, Florian Preis, and Stefan Prestel. Quantum utility – definition and assessment of a practical quantum advantage. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Software*, pages 162–174. IEEE, July 2023. doi: 10.1109/qsw59989.2023.00028.
- [30] Pierre Ramond. *Group theory: A physicist’s survey*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [31] Howard Georgi. *Lie Algebras In Particle Physics : from Isospin To Unified Theories*. Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, 2000. ISBN 978-0-429-96776-4, 978-0-367-09172-9, 978-0-429-49921-0, 978-0-7382-0233-4. doi: 10.1201/9780429499210.
- [32] Lek-Heng Lim and Bradley J. Nelson. What is an equivariant neural network? *CoRR*, abs/2205.07362, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2205.07362. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.07362>.
- [33] Alexander S. Ecker, Fabian H. Sinz, Emmanouil Froudarakis, Paul G. Fahey, Santiago A. Cadena, Edgar Y. Walker, Erick Cobos, Jacob Reimer, Andreas S. Tolia, and Matthias Bethge. A rotation-equivariant convolutional neural network model of primary visual cortex. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=H1fU8iAqKX>.
- [34] Haggai Maron, Heli Ben-Hamu, Nadav Shamir, and Yaron Lipman. Invariant and equivariant graph networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Syx72jc9tm>.
- [35] Victor Garcia Satorras, Emiel Hooeboom, and Max Welling. E(n) equivariant graph neural networks. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.09844, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:231979049>.
- [36] Patrick T. Komiske, Eric M. Metodiev, and Jesse Thaler. Energy flow networks: deep sets for particle jets. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2019(1), jan 2019. doi: 10.1007/jhep01(2019)121. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fjhep01%282019%29121>.
- [37] Raghav Kansal, Javier Duarte, Hao Su, Breno Orzari, Thiago Tomei, Maurizio Pierini, Mary Touranakou, Jean-Roch Vlimant, and Dimitrios Gunopulos. Particle Cloud Generation with Message Passing Generative Adversarial Networks. In *35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 6 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11535>.
- [38] Guillaume Verdon, Trevor McCourt, Enxhell Luzhnica, Vikash Singh, Stefan Leichenauer, and Jack Hidary. Quantum graph neural networks, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.12264>.
- [39] Naomichi Hatano and Masuo Suzuki. *Finding Exponential Product Formulas of Higher Orders*, page 37–68. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, November 2005. ISBN 9783540315155. doi: 10.1007/11526216_2. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/11526216_2.
- [40] Quynh T. Nguyen, Louis Schatzki, Paolo Braccia, Michael Ragone, Patrick J. Coles, Frédéric Sauvage, Martín Larocca, and M. Cerezo. Theory for equivariant quantum neural networks. *PRX Quantum*, 5(2), May 2024. ISSN 2691-3399. doi: 10.1103/prxquantum.5.020328. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.5.020328>.
- [41] Soledad Villar, David W. Hogg, Kate Storey-Fisher, Weichi Yao, and Ben Blum-Smith. Scalars are universal: Equivariant machine learning, structured like classical physics, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.06610>.
- [42] Ben Blum-Smith and Soledad Villar. Machine learning and invariant theory, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.14991>.

- [43] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1711.05101>.
- [44] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.03983>.
- [45] P Goyal. Accurate, large minibatch sgd: training imagenet in 1 hour, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.02677>.