
ENHANCING SYMBOLIC REGRESSION AND UNIVERSAL PHYSICS-INFORMED NEURAL NETWORKS WITH DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS

Lena Podina

Cheriton School of Computer Science
University of Waterloo

Diba Darooneh

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Waterloo

Joshveer Grewal

Northville High School
Public school in Northville, Michigan

Mohammad Kohandel

Department of Applied Mathematics
University of Waterloo

ABSTRACT

We present a new method for enhancing symbolic regression for differential equations via dimensional analysis, specifically Ipsen’s and Buckingham π methods. Since symbolic regression often suffers from high computational costs and overfitting, non-dimensionalizing datasets reduces the number of input variables, simplifies the search space, and ensures that derived equations are physically meaningful. As our main contribution, we integrate Ipsen’s Method of dimensional analysis with Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks. We also combine dimensional analysis with the AI Feynman symbolic regression algorithm to show that dimensional analysis significantly improves the accuracy of the recovered equation. The results demonstrate that transforming data into a dimensionless form significantly decreases computation time and improves accuracy of the recovered hidden term. For algebraic equations, using the Buckingham π Theorem reduced complexity, allowing the AI-Feynman model to converge faster with fewer data points and lower error rates. For differential equations, Ipsen’s Method was combined with Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs) to identify hidden terms more effectively. These findings suggest that integrating dimensional analysis with symbolic regression can significantly lower computational costs, enhance model interpretability, and increase accuracy, providing a robust framework for automated discovery of governing equations in complex systems when data is limited.

1 Introduction

Symbolic regression has gained popularity as a method for discovering mathematical models directly from data [7, 11, 12, 13]. Unlike traditional regression, which assumes a specific model form, symbolic regression searches for the best-fitting equation for the dataset without predefined assumptions. The flexibility of symbolic regression algorithms makes them powerful for uncovering hidden relationships in complex datasets. However, the method’s exhaustive search over possible equations can be computationally expensive, leading to slow performance and the risk of overfitting. Symbolic regression is generally an NP-hard problem [14].

Dimensional analysis, a widely used technique in mathematics and physics, simplifies algebraic or differential equations by reducing the number of variables involved. This allows the true underlying equations and hidden parameters to be recovered with higher accuracy and with less computational expense. It also ensures that the recovered equation adheres to the physical laws. Dimensional analysis can be performed using different methods e.g. manual non-dimensionalization, Buckingham π method [3], and Ipsen’s method [4]. Manual non-dimensionalization involves scaling each dimensional variable by a hand-chosen value to remove its units, then substituting the non-dimensional variables for the dimensional ones. This removes the units but may not reduce the number of free parameters. The Buckingham π method is an automated procedure to minimize the possible number of dimensionless constants (π

terms) that the equation can be expressed with. Although there are many choices of sets of π terms, it is difficult to directly control the final equation, although it will have the minimal number of free variables. Ipsen’s method is very similar to the Buckingham π method, but enables straightforward user selection of the dimensionless constants. This method is useful when one is interested in reducing (or maximizing) the number of free variables that appear in a specific term in the equation.

Several symbolic regression algorithms [7, 11, 12] have previously integrated dimensional analysis into their workflow. This has been done to ensure that the output of the symbolic regression is physically consistent, and to reduce the number of independent variables in the problem. However, this integration in past works has been limited and is not always tailored to the problem at hand. AI Feynman [12] does incorporate symbolic regression, but the dimensions for variables are fixed and analyzed automatically. Φ -SO [11] incorporates dimensional analysis but does not non-dimensionalize datasets before fitting them. SciMED [7] integrates dimensional analysis with symbolic regression and applies it to both algebraic and differential equations, but its application is restricted to differential equations that are written as one-side differential equations.

We propose a novel method for increasing efficiency and accuracy in symbolic regression by first non-dimensionalizing the data using Ipsen’s method. As a proof of concept, we also test that dimensional analysis in fact improves the performance of symbolic regression. We stay in a regime where some terms in a differential equation are known, and some need to be learned, which is common in many mathematical modelling applications. Ipsen’s method of nondimensionalization allows for the fine control of the variables that appear in different components of the differential equation. Then, learning individual unknown terms using UPINNs can be easily done. This approach allows for reducing the number of input variables while ensuring the consistency of expressions by examining the units. Due to nondimensionalization, our strategy also avoids calculations involving high-order or low-order numbers. The true underlying expression can be found by undoing the nondimensionalization.

Our main contribution is the development of a novel pipeline that integrates Ipsen’s method of dimensional analysis with Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs) [9] and symbolic regression. This approach achieves a minimal number of variables in the hidden terms upon non-dimensionalization, thereby enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of both UPINNs and symbolic regression. Additionally, we demonstrate how the Buckingham π method can be combined with any symbolic regression algorithm. Specifically, when paired with AI Feynman symbolic regression, this combination yields the correct expressions more efficiently and with greater accuracy.

2 Background

2.1 Symbolic regression

Symbolic regression is a powerful technique for discovering mathematical equations directly from data, integrating various methods to optimize search efficiency and ensure physical coherence of the derived models. Main frameworks in this field include AI-Feynman, PySR (Python Symbolic Regression), EPDE (Evolutionary Partial Differential Equations), and SINDy (Sparse Identification of Nonlinear Dynamics) [5, 6, 8, 12].

AI Feynman leverages dimensional analysis to refine the search space, facilitating the discovery of dimensionally consistent equations such as Newton’s law of gravitation. PySR, an open-source tool for symbolic regression, utilizes evolutionary algorithms and, while not explicitly designed for dimensional analysis, can be modified to include dimensional constraints. The EPDE framework operates without a predefined library of functions, utilizing basic terms to discover both differential and algebraic equations. It employs a multi-objective optimization approach to select the most effective equations and includes a custom solver that handles noisy data and supports the visualization of the discovery process. SINDy identifies dynamical systems by finding sparse representations of governing equations from data. When integrated with dimensional analysis, SINDy ensures that the equations are dimensionally consistent, which is crucial for maintaining physical accuracy in complex systems.

2.2 Buckingham π Theorem

The Buckingham π Theorem is a fundamental tool in dimensional analysis, used to derive dimensionless quantities when the governing equation is not explicitly known [2]. This Theorem reduces the number of parameters in the original equation from n to $n - k$, where n is the number of variables and k is the number of fundamental dimensions (such as length, mass, time, etc.).

As an example, consider the equation for the potential energy difference due to gravity:

$$U = Gm_1m_2 \left(\frac{1}{r_2} - \frac{1}{r_1} \right),$$

where U is the potential energy difference between two points, $[ML^2T^{-2}]$, G is the gravitational constant, $[M^{-1}L^3T^{-2}]$, m_1 and m_2 are the masses involved, $[M]$, and r_1 and r_2 are the distances from each mass to a point of interest, $[L]$. Using the Buckingham π Theorem, the number of variables in the equation can be reduced from six to three. The dimensional matrix \mathcal{D} representing the physical dimensions of each variable in the gravitational potential energy equation is structured as follows:

$$\mathcal{D} = \begin{matrix} & U & G & m_1 & m_2 & r_1 & r_2 \\ \begin{matrix} \mathcal{M} \\ \mathcal{L} \\ \mathcal{T} \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -2 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Three dimensionless variables (π groups) are formed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &= \frac{U r_2}{G m_1^2} = \frac{[ML^2T^{-2}] \times [L]}{[M^{-1}L^3T^{-2}] \times [M]^2} = 1, \\ \pi_2 &= \frac{m_2}{m_1} = \frac{[M]}{[M]} = 1, \\ \pi_3 &= \frac{r_1}{r_2} = \frac{[L]}{[L]} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This choice of π groups is just one possibility, and other combinations could be considered.

To derive a functional relationship $\pi_1 = f(\pi_2, \pi_3)$, we substitute for m_2 and r_1 in terms of π_2 and π_3 respectively, into the equation for U :

$$U = G m_1 m_2 \frac{r_1 - r_2}{r_1 r_2} = G m_1 m_2 \frac{(r_2 \pi_3) - r_2}{(r_2 \pi_3) r_2} = G m_1 m_2 \frac{r_2 (\pi_3 - 1)}{r_2^2 \pi_3}$$

Simplifying further with $m_2 = m_1 \pi_2$:

$$U = G m_1 (m_1 \pi_2) \frac{r_2 (\pi_3 - 1)}{r_2^2 \pi_3} = G m_1^2 \pi_2 \frac{\pi_3 - 1}{r_2 \pi_3}$$

Substituting this expression for U into π_1 :

$$\pi_1 = \frac{U r_2}{G m_1^2} = \frac{G m_1^2 \pi_2 \frac{\pi_3 - 1}{r_2 \pi_3} r_2}{G m_1^2} = \frac{\pi_2 (\pi_3 - 1)}{\pi_3}$$

Thus, the relationship $\pi_1 = f(\pi_2, \pi_3)$ is established as:

$$\pi_1 = \frac{\pi_2 (\pi_3 - 1)}{\pi_3}$$

2.3 Ipsen's Method of Dimensional Analysis

Ipsen's Method for non-dimensionalizing equations involves identifying characteristic scales for variables and parameters, which are then used to create dimensionless variables [15]. This substitution of dimensionless variables into the original equations simplifies their form. In contrast to the Buckingham π Theorem, Ipsen's method provides flexibility to adjust the number of non-dimensional parameters, thus optimizing the input variables required for unknown expressions. This approach not only minimizes the number of required data points but also improves accuracy and reduces computation time. The original form of the equation can subsequently be easily recovered by reapplying dimensional analysis to the regressed expression.

Given its dependency on specific equations, we detail the application of Ipsen's method to two separate differential equations in the Methods section.

2.4 Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks

Given data $\{x_i, t_i, u_i\}$ from a (partial or ordinary) differential equation, Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs) can be used to find a representation of a hidden term in a PINN-style fashion. Suppose that we have an ordinary differential equation of the following form with m variables, where $u : t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $F, G : u, t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\frac{du}{dt} = F(u, t) + G(u, t) \quad (1)$$

where $F(u, t)$ is a known term and G is an unknown term. Then, the following loss can be used to train the UPINN and find $G(u, t)$:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{MSE} + \mathcal{L}_{ODE}$$

The MSE loss ensures that the output of the surrogate solution U_{NN} adheres to the data $\{t_i, u_i\}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{MSE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n (U_{NN}(t) - u_i)$$

As for the ODE loss, this loss minimizes the difference between the derivative of $U_{NN}(t)$ (autodifferentiated) and the right hand side of eq. 1.

$$\mathcal{L}_{ODE} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \left(\left. \frac{dU_{NN}(t)}{dt} \right|_{t_j} - (F(U_{NN}(t_j), t_j) + G_{NN}(U_{NN}(t_j), t_j)) \right)$$

This method has demonstrated strong performance in regimes characterized by low and noisy data [9], compared to Universal Differential Equations (UDEs) [10], despite both approaches aiming to learn representations of hidden terms.

3 Methods

We first illustrate how we integrated symbolic regression with the Buckingham π Theorem to derive algebraic equations (Section 3.1). Subsequently, to learn hidden components of differential equations, we employed a combination of AI Feynman, Ipsen’s method of dimensional analysis, and Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs) (Section 3.2).

3.1 Full Discovery of Algebraic Equations

We utilized the open-source model AI Feynman [12] for symbolic regression to predict symbolic expressions of six different equations, each varying in complexity and variable count. This model identifies expressions for one variable in terms of others by executing polynomial fits, performing brute force mathematical operations, and training neural networks (NNs) to detect translational symmetry and separability within the dataset.

We assessed AI Feynman’s performance by evaluating its runtime, average error, and overall accuracy across datasets of different sizes, ranging from 10,000 to 10 data points. The model began with an initial dataset of 10,000 entries per equation, systematically reducing the dataset size by a factor of ten, down to the minimum number required to derive the expressions effectively. We selected multiples of ten for our data sizes to maintain a consistent scaling approach for data reduction.

Following this, we conducted dimensional analysis using the Buckingham π Theorem on each equation and applied symbolic regression to the resulting dimensionless quantities, employing the same evaluation protocols. The objective of this comparative analysis was to determine the extent to which dimensional analysis enhances the performance of symbolic regression, specifically in terms of the number of data points required, the time taken to identify correct expressions, and the accuracy of the equation fits. We note that while AI Feynman was our chosen tool for symbolic regression, alternative algorithms could also be applied in this framework.

3.2 Discovery of Differential Equation Hidden Terms

For two distinct types of differential equations, first-order and second-order, we explored the effectiveness of Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs) combined with Ipsen’s method and AI Feynman in recovering the true equation [9, 12]. Initially, we applied UPINNs to learn a representation of the hidden (unknown) term in the differential equations. Subsequently, we employed Ipsen’s method to nondimensionalize the equations, aiming to minimize the number of parameters in the unknown term. This reduction is designed to simplify the symbolic regression process, enabling AI Feynman to more effectively identify the true hidden term from its approximation.

3.2.1 Extended Logistic Growth Model

To show the effectiveness of our method on a differential equation, we start with a variant of the logistic growth model, commonly used in computational biology:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = rN \left(1 - \frac{N}{k} \right) + \frac{AN^2}{B^2 + N^2} \quad (2)$$

where $N(t)$ are the number of cells over time, t is time, r, k, A, B being constant values. The dimensional matrix is:

$$D = \begin{matrix} & & N & r & k & A & B & t \\ \begin{matrix} M \\ T \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

where M is the dimension mass, and T is the dimension time. For this problem, we are interested in recovering the true form of the hidden term $G(A, N, B) = AN^2/(B^2 + N^2)$. The rest of the differential equation is known. The inputs to the function G are also assumed to be known.

Using the Buckingham π Theorem to nondimensionalize this equation provides us with seven unique sets of π values. However, it is initially unclear which set would allow the subsequent symbolic regression step to proceed with the highest accuracy in recovering the true unknown term. Furthermore, it may not be possible to find this set at all because some of the differential equation (G) is unknown. A π set for this equation which minimizes the number of parameters and variables in the unknown term is the following:

$$\beta = \frac{Br}{A} \quad \epsilon = \frac{K}{B} \quad \tau = \frac{At}{B} \quad \alpha = \frac{N}{B}$$

By algebraic manipulation, we can rewrite the original equation in terms of the non-dimensional parameters.

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d\tau} = \beta\alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\epsilon} \right) + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\alpha^2} + 1} \quad (3)$$

When G is unknown, this equation takes the form of:

$$\frac{d\alpha}{d\tau} = \beta\alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\epsilon} \right) + G_2(\alpha) \quad (4)$$

where G_2 is the transformed hidden term.

By contrast, Ipsen’s method significantly reduces the calculations by offering a preliminary insight into the number of parameters each non-dimensional function will have, without the need to know what the hidden terms are. We express the ordinary differential equation as the sum of F and G , with the parameters shown in Equation (3):

$$0 = F(r, N, k, t) + G(A, N, B) \quad (5)$$

where $F = rN(1 - N/k)$ and G is the unknown component $AN^2/(B^2 + N^2)$. The goal is to minimize the number of parameters in the unknown function G . Ipsen’s Method facilitates this by manipulating the number of parameters in each function without altering the overall behavior of the system, using dimensions as a scaling factor.

To illustrate, we show how to apply Ipsen’s method in this example.

First, we eliminate B (with dimension $[M]$):

$$0 = F\left(r, \frac{N}{B}, \frac{K}{B}, t\right) + G\left(\frac{A}{B}, \frac{N}{B}\right) \quad (6)$$

Next, we eliminate A/B (with dimension $[T]$):

$$0 = F\left(\frac{rB}{A}, \frac{N}{B}, \frac{K}{B}, \frac{tA}{B}\right) + G\left(\frac{N}{B}\right) \quad (7)$$

The method allows us to eliminate terms or variables (B or A/B) from the unknown component by dividing all other variables by each term appearing in G . This decreases the number of terms in G at each step. These steps are repeated until the remaining inputs to the functions F and G are dimensionless.

To test the effectiveness of this method, we generate a set of solution points for the differential equation. The dimensional analysis performed earlier reduces the number of required input variables for the hidden function to just $\alpha = \frac{N}{B}$. Assuming the function F is known, we use UPINNs and AI-Feynman to discover the function $G(N)$.

3.2.2 Rotating Bead Model

Now, we introduce a second-order differential equation which governs the displacement of a bead on a rotating hoop.

$$mr \frac{d^2\theta}{dt^2} = -b \frac{d\theta}{dt} - mg \sin \theta + mr\omega^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta \quad (8)$$

A similar approach is used for this equation. However, θ is initially excluded as a parameter in functions P and Q since this variable is already dimensionless. We define $P = -mr \frac{d^2\theta}{dt^2} - b \frac{d\theta}{dt} - mg \sin \theta$ and the unknown term $Q = mr\omega^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta$.

$$0 = P(m, r, b, t) + Q(m, g, r, \omega) \quad (9)$$

Eliminating m (dimension $[M]$):

$$0 = P\left(\frac{m}{m}, r, \frac{b}{m}, t\right) + Q(g, r, \omega) \quad (10)$$

Eliminating ω (dimension $[T]$):

$$0 = P\left(\frac{m}{m}, r, \frac{b}{m\omega}, t\omega\right) + Q\left(\frac{g}{\omega^2}, r\right) \quad (11)$$

Eliminating r (dimension $[L]$):

$$0 = P\left(\frac{m}{m}, \frac{r}{r}, \frac{b}{m\omega r}, t\omega\right) + Q\left(\frac{g}{\omega^2 r}\right) \quad (12)$$

We have concluded that the set of dimensionless parameters that reduces the number of parameters in Q is:

$$\varepsilon = \frac{g}{\omega^2 r}; \quad \tau = t\omega; \quad \gamma = \frac{b}{m\omega r}$$

We can use this set of dimensionless parameters and nondimensionalize the equation using this set. For the demonstration of our method, we use an equivalent set where Q similarly has only one input γ , yielding the following dimensionless form:

$$\varepsilon \frac{d^2\theta}{d\tau^2} = -\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} - \sin \theta + \gamma \sin \theta \cos \theta \quad (13)$$

With the non-dimensional parameters:

$$\gamma = \frac{R\omega^2}{g} \quad \epsilon = \frac{m^2 g R}{b^2} \quad \tau = \frac{mg}{b} t$$

Our goal is to learn $Q(\theta, \gamma)$ from data, translating to learning $Q(m, g, r, \omega)$ in the original equation.

To generate data, the original equation is solved numerically for ten different values of ω . The data from each solution is nondimensionalized according to the second set of dimensionless constants corresponding to eq. 13. Then, UPINNs are used to learn the hidden term for each dataset. This yields a function $Q(\theta)$ for each dataset which has a unique γ . When symbolic regression is run, the data from all points is combined in order to solve for the hidden term $Q(\theta, \gamma)$. The results of the hidden term predicted by UPINNs and AI-Feynman, compared to the true expression, are demonstrated through graphs corresponding to each solution set.


4 Results

We detail the results of combining symbolic regression with the Buckingham π method to discover algebraic equations (Section 4.1). We also show the results of learning hidden terms in two separate differential equations using UPINNs combined with Ipsen’s method of nondimensionalization (Section 4.2).

4.1 AI Feynman with Buckingham π Theorem

In our experiment, we utilized six distinct algebraic equations to compare the solution time and error for finding both the original and dimensionally reduced equations. Each data entry contains the values of the known parameters, which are generated randomly, and the corresponding value of the target expression. The charts demonstrate the performance of the AI-Feynman model for each equation before and after dimensional analysis in terms of mean absolute error and overall runtime.

The overall conclusion is that nondimensionalizing the data before running AI Feynman improves the runtime, accuracy and the required minimal number of data points.



(a) Runtime of each equation for the minimum number of data points required

(b) The least number of data points required for accurate symbolic regression for each equation

Figure 1: Comparison of runtime and data points required for each equation

4.2 Symbolic Regression with Ipsen’s Method and UPINNs

We tested our method on first order and second order differential equations, comparing the results of discovered expression through UPINNs and AI-Feynman. Each graph represents the true hidden function, compared with the function regressed using the models evaluated at the corresponding dataset.


4.2.1 Extended Logistic Growth Model Identification of Hidden Term

We set parameters $r = 1.0$, $A = 5.0$, $B = 2.0$ and $k = 1.5$ to generate data for one solution to the ODE. Using UPINNs and then AI Feynman, we obtain correctly the unknown function $G(\frac{N}{B})$ (eq. 5) to be $\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha^2+1}$ where α is $\frac{N}{B}$. The

Equation Name	Original Equation	AI-Feynman Equation	Mean Absolute Error	Data Points	Runtime (s)
Free Fall _{Traditional}	$S = s + vt - \frac{1}{2}gt^2$	$(x_0 + (((x_2 \cdot (x_1 + (x_1 - (x_3 \cdot x_2)))))))/((0 + 1) + 1))$	3.41E-17	10	1839
Free Fall _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_1 = -\frac{1}{2}\pi_3\pi_2 - \pi_3 - 1$	$0.5 \cdot (((x_1 \cdot ((x_1 \cdot (-x_0)) + 1) + 1)) + 1) + 1)$	6.66E-17	10	486
Terminal Velocity _{Traditional}	$V_t = \sqrt{\frac{2mg}{\rho CA}}$	$1.414213562373 \cdot \text{sqrt}((x_4 \cdot ((x_0/x_2)/(x_3 \cdot x_1))))$	3.09E-13	10	3813
Terminal Velocity _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_3 = \frac{2}{\pi_2\pi_1^2}$	$((x_1 + x_1)/(x_0 \cdot x_0))$	1.08E-16	10	495
Darcy-Weisbach _{Traditional}	$P_f = f \cdot \frac{l}{d} \cdot \frac{\rho v^2}{2}$	$0.5 \cdot (x_3 \cdot (x_3 \cdot (x_2 \cdot ((x_0/x_4) \cdot x_1))))$	1.05E-17	100	3600
Darcy-Weisbach _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_1 = \frac{\pi_3\pi_2}{2}$	$0.5 \cdot (x_1 \cdot x_0)$	4.62E-17	10	603
Exponential Growth/Decay _{Traditional}	$n = n_0 \cdot e^{-\frac{mgx}{k_B T}}$	$1.0 \cdot (x_0/\text{exp}((x_3 \cdot ((x_1 \cdot x_2)/(x_4 \cdot x_5))))))$	1.10E-08	1000	4877
Exponential Growth/Decay _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_2 = \pi_3 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{\pi_1}}$	$(x_1/\text{exp}(((2 \cdot (0) + 1)/x_0)))$	2.28E-09	10	489
Gravitational PE _{Traditional}	$U = Gm_1m_2 \left(\frac{1}{r_2} - \frac{1}{r_1} \right)$	$-1.0 \cdot (((x_0 \cdot (x_1 \cdot x_4))/(-x_3)) + ((x_0 \cdot (x_1 \cdot x_4))/x_2))$	3.86E-16	100	2837
Gravitational PE _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_1 = \frac{\pi_3\pi_2 - 1}{\pi_3}$	$(x_0 + (x_0/(-x_1)))$	9.92E-17	10	342
Gravitational Force _{Traditional}	$F_g = -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{r^2}$	$-1.0 \cdot (x_3 \cdot (x_1 \cdot (x_0/(x_2 \cdot x_2))))$	9.35E-13	10	2618
Gravitational Force _{Dimensionless}	$\pi_1 = -\pi_2$	$(-x_0)$	2.16E-16	10	128

Table 1: Algebraic Equation Analysis Table with Dimensionless Forms

expressions found by AI Feynman and UPINNs are plotted in comparison with the true hidden term function in Fig. 2. We can see that AI Feynman and UPINNs recover the hidden term with high accuracy.


 Figure 2: Hidden term as a function of α (dimensionless N) for a single dataset.

Complexity	Error	Symbolic Expression
37.702120	27.541141	$\tan(-4.139356671834 + (\pi + 1))$
37.702120	27.541141	$\tan(-3.139356671834 + \pi)$
39.913656	27.540064	$\tan(0.000647273350\pi)$
40.371662	26.556440	$0.000526886815 + \sin(\sin(x_0))$
43.525937	26.382369	$\arcsin(0.000494734883 + \sin(\sin(\sin(x_0))))$
45.522610	23.982034	$\sin(x_0 - (x_1 \sin(\sin(x_0))))$
55.905251	22.413663	$((x_1 \cos(x_0) - 1) \sin(x_0)) \left(\sqrt{-\sin(\pi)} - 1 \right)$
56.163748	22.409392	$\frac{(x_1 \cos(x_0) - 1) \sin(x_0)}{\sin(\pi + \pi) - 1}$
56.163818	22.409309	$((x_1 \cos(x_0) - 1) \sin(x_0)) (\sin(\pi) - 1)$
56.163888	22.408866	$-((x_1 \cos(x_0) - 1) \sin(x_0))$
66.281814	22.401252	$((x_1 \cos(x_0) - 1) \sin(x_0)) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\cos(\sqrt{\pi})}\right)$

Table 2: Symbolic expressions returned by AI Feynman for the rotating bead problem. Additive constants smaller than 10^{-3} are omitted from the symbolic expressions for clarity. The true (correct) expressions are bolded.

4.2.2 Rotating Bead Model

For this model, we are interested in learning the hidden term $-\sin \theta + \gamma \sin \theta \cos \theta$ in equation (11). Hence, we assume that we have the equation

$$mr \frac{d^2 \theta}{dt^2} = -b \frac{d\theta}{dt} - F(\theta, m, r, b) \quad (14)$$

where F is the hidden term. First we nondimensionalize the equation according to Ipsen’s method to yield

$$\epsilon \frac{d^2 \theta}{d\tau^2} = -\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} + F(\theta, \gamma) \quad (15)$$

as per the technique in the methods, since this ensures the fewest possible parameters and variables in the hidden term. To demonstrate our method, we solve equation (11) for different values of γ (by choosing different values of ω), thereby generating a single large dataset which consists of tuples (t, θ, γ) . Using UPINNs, we then estimate the hidden term F as a function of θ, γ , yielding an estimate $\hat{F}(\theta, \gamma)$. Creating a dataset with tuples $(\theta, \gamma, \hat{F}(\theta, \gamma))$, we are able to feed it to AI-Feynman and obtain the true hidden term, $\sin \theta + \gamma \sin \theta \cos \theta$. We report the AI Feynman results in Table 2.

5 Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, we proposed an integrated framework that combines symbolic regression with dimensional analysis, utilizing both the Buckingham π Theorem and Ipsen’s Method. This approach effectively reduces the complexity of the search space and ensures physical consistency in the discovered equations. Our findings indicate that non-dimensionalizing datasets prior to symbolic regression significantly enhances both accuracy and computational efficiency.

For algebraic equations, the application of the Buckingham π Theorem notably decreased the number of independent variables, thus streamlining the symbolic regression process. This dimensionality reduction facilitated faster convergence, reduced the risk of overfitting, and improved accuracy, even in scenarios involving sparse datasets. We successfully recovered the symbolic expressions for several physics-based equations, demonstrating that this combined methodology can efficiently discover physically meaningful equations in complex systems with minimal computational resources.

In the context of differential equations, we expanded this framework by integrating Ipsen’s Method and Universal Physics-Informed Neural Networks (UPINNs). Ipsen’s Method systematically reduced the number of unknown parameters by transforming the equations into their dimensionless forms. The synergy between dimensional analysis and symbolic regression enhanced the capability of UPINNs to efficiently uncover hidden terms in differential equations, leading to faster convergence and a diminished reliance on extensive datasets. This is particularly beneficial in situations where data acquisition is limited or expensive.




Figure 3: Equation produced by AI Feynman (surface) using the data from UPINNs (lines).

Our results confirm that the combination of symbolic regression and dimensional analysis offers a robust methodology for automatically discovering governing equations in various domains, including physics. By leveraging the inherent scaling properties of physical laws, we can significantly simplify symbolic regression tasks, resulting in more interpretable and accurate models.

Additionally, while other works, such as those by Bakarji et al. [1], apply symbolic regression and the Buckingham π Theorem to scenarios like the rotating bead problem, our method introduces key distinctions. Bakarji et al. focus on identifying the most *physically meaningful* dimensionless terms that best match the data given an optimal relationship between the terms. In contrast, our approach utilizes the Buckingham π Theorem to uncover a hidden term in a partially known model, treating all nondimensionalizations as equivalent and favoring those that minimize the number of π groups involved in the hidden term. This simplification aids UPINNs in learning fewer variable interactions, especially under conditions of sparse data availability. Initially applying UPINNs allows for the learning of potentially complex hidden terms with minimal inputs, followed by a powerful and versatile symbolic regression technique, such as AI Feynman, to precisely identify the true hidden term without optimizing for the "most physically meaningful" dimensionless π groups. Moreover, AI Feynman could be substituted with other equally versatile symbolic regression algorithms like PySR [5] or Symbolic GPT [13].

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), under the Discovery Grants Program, Grant No. RGPIN-2021-03472.

References

- [1] Joseph Bakarji, Jared Callahan, Steven L Brunton, and J Nathan Kutz. Dimensionally consistent learning with buckingham pi. *Nature Computational Science*, 2(12):834–844, 2022.
- [2] Genick Bar-Meir. Buckingham- π -theorem, 2021. Accessed: 2024-09-02.

- [3] Edgar Buckingham. On physically similar systems; illustrations of the use of dimensional equations. *Physical review*, 4(4):345, 1914.
- [4] John P Clark. An alternate means to form non-dimensional products in dimensional analysis. In *Turbo Expo: Power for Land, Sea, and Air*, volume 86021, page V005T08A003. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2022.
- [5] Miles Cranmer. Interpretable Machine Learning for Science with PySR and SymbolicRegression.jl, May 2023. arXiv:2305.01582 [astro-ph, physics:physics].
- [6] Alan A. Kaptanoglu, Brian M. de Silva, Urban Fasel, Kadierdan Kaheman, Andy J. Goldschmidt, Jared Callahan, Charles B. Delahunt, Zachary G. Nicolaou, Kathleen Champion, Jean-Christophe Loiseau, J. Nathan Kutz, and Steven L. Brunton. Pysindy: A comprehensive python package for robust sparse system identification. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7(69):3994, 2022.
- [7] Liron Simon Keren, Alex Liberzon, and Teddy Lazebnik. A computational framework for physics-informed symbolic regression with straightforward integration of domain knowledge. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):1249, 2023.
- [8] Mikhail Maslyaev, Alexander Hvatov, and Anna V Kalyuzhnaya. Partial differential equations discovery with epde framework: application for real and synthetic data. *Journal of Computational Science*, page 101345, 2021.
- [9] Lena Podina, Brydon Eastman, and Mohammad Kohandel. Universal physics-informed neural networks: Symbolic differential operator discovery with sparse data. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 27948–27956. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- [10] Christopher Rackauckas, Yingbo Ma, Julius Martensen, Collin Warner, Kirill Zubov, Rohit Supekar, Dominic Skinner, Ali Ramadhan, and Alan Edelman. Universal differential equations for scientific machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04385*, 2020.
- [11] Wassim Tenachi, Rodrigo Ibata, and Foivos I Diakogiannis. Deep symbolic regression for physics guided by units constraints: toward the automated discovery of physical laws. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 959(2):99, 2023.
- [12] Silviu-Marian Udrescu and Max Tegmark. Ai feynman: A physics-inspired method for symbolic regression. *Science Advances*, 6(16):eaay2631, 2020.
- [13] Mojtaba Valipour, Bowen You, Maysum Panju, and Ali Ghodsi. Symbolicgpt: A generative transformer model for symbolic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14131*, 2021.
- [14] Marco Virgolin and Solon P Pissis. Symbolic regression is np-hard. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01018*, 2022.
- [15] F.M. White and H. Xue. *Fluid Mechanics, 9th Edition*. McGraw-Hill, 2021.