

ODEFORMER: SYMBOLIC REGRESSION OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS WITH TRANSFORMERS

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Ordinary differential equations (ODEs) are fundamental in the natural sciences. We introduce ODEFormer, the first transformer able to infer multivariate ODE systems in symbolic form from the observation of a single solution trajectory. We perform extensive evaluations on two datasets: (i) the existing ‘Strogatz’ dataset featuring two-dimensional systems; (ii) ODEBench, a collection of one- to four-dimensional systems that we carefully curated from the literature to provide a more holistic benchmark. ODEFormer consistently outperforms existing methods while displaying much higher robustness to noisy and irregularly sampled datasets than existing methods. We release our code, model and benchmark publicly.

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent triumphs of machine learning (ML) induce growing enthusiasm for accelerating scientific discovery (???). In particular, inferring dynamical laws governing an observed system from observational data is an extremely challenging and still mostly manual task that is anticipated to benefit substantially from modern ML methods. Modeling and forecasting dynamics from essentially all scientific domains has a long history in machine learning. However, the inherent black-box character of most prominent approaches from recent years, such as neural ordinary differential equation (NODE) based methods (see ? and the large body of follow-up work) limit the interpretability and scientific insights to be gained from these models. While improved interpretability of highly overparameterized models has been brought into the focus of the community recently, there is still a substantial gap in fully analytical, directly human-readable representations of dynamical laws.

This is the main goal of symbolic regression (SR) techniques, which make predictions in the form of explicit symbolic mathematical expressions directly from observations. Recent advances in symbolic regression make it a promising alternative to infer natural laws from data and have catalyzed initial successes in accelerating scientific discoveries (???). So far, SR has most commonly been used to infer a function $g(x)$ from paired observations $(x, g(x))$ – we call this ‘functional SR’. However, in many fields of science, understanding a system involves deciphering its dynamics, i.e., inferring a function $f(x)$ governing its evolution via an ODE $\dot{x} = f(x)$ – we call this setting ‘dynamical SR’. The task is then to recover f from observed solution trajectories $(t, x(t))$ for potentially different initial conditions $x(t_0) = x_0$ and potentially noisy observations of $x(t)$.

In principle, dynamical SR, inferring f from $(t, x(t))$, can be framed as functional SR for $(x(t), \dot{x}(t))$ pairs. However, as we will show in this paper, this approach does not work well, for at least two reasons: (i) it requires numerical estimates of $\dot{x}(t)$ from observed trajectories (typically via finite differencing), a severe challenge for noisy and irregularly sampled observations (?), in particular for higher-dimensional systems; (ii) it assumes the observations are independent, losing their sequential nature. Hence, scalable and efficient methods specifically tailored to dynamical SR are an important and difficult problem to address.

Contributions ODEFormer is the new state of the art in inferring dynamical laws in the form of multi-variate ODE systems from observational (noisy, irregularly sampled) data in symbolic form. It relies on large-scale training of a sequence-to-sequence transformer on diverse synthetic data, leading to efficient and scalable inference for unseen trajectories – unlike most existing approaches, it does not require separate training for each new observed system. ODEFormer infers unseen dynamical systems with high accuracy even for challenging systems with up to 6 variables.

We take particular care in our empirical evaluation. To the best of our knowledge, there is only one existing benchmark dataset, containing a small collection of 16 two-dimensional systems (?). In




Figure 1: **ODEFormer achieves excellent symbolic recovery for noisy and irregularly sampled data.** Ground truth trajectories (thick dim lines) are corrupted (5% noise) and unevenly sampled (50% of the equally spaced points are dropped), yielding the observed trajectories (dots) from which ODEFormer symbolically infers an ODE. We then integrate this ODE from the original initial condition for the prediction (thin solid line). Noiseless, densely sampled versions of these two-dimensional systems were studied by ?.

addition, the numerical trajectories in this “Strogatz dataset” have not been integrated with sufficient precision, making symbolic recovery almost impossible for existing methods(?). While we evaluate our model on this “Strogatz” dataset, we also curate ODEBench, a new, more extensive dataset with [56] ODE systems that have been used in the literature to model real-world processes varying in dimension from one to four. We provide carefully integrated solution trajectories for different initial conditions for each system. Finally, proper evaluation of symbolic regression – in particular dynamical SR – is notoriously elusive(??) and we provide detailed guidance for how to fairly evaluate various nuances of what can be considered in- and out-of-distribution generalization.

Problem setting and overview We assume potentially noisy and irregularly sampled observations $\{(t_i, x(t_i))\}_{i \in [N]}$, where $x(t)$ solves the ODE

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \quad \text{for some } f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D.$$

Our task is then to infer f in symbolic form from the data $\{(t_i, x(t_i))\}_{i \in [N]}$.¹ We note that this includes higher-order as well as non-autonomous ODE systems, because every d -dimensional, k -th order ODE can be written equivalently as a $(k \cdot d)$ -dimensional first order ODE and every non-autonomous d -dimensional first order ODE can be written equivalently as a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional autonomous first order ODE (?). ODEFormer is based on large-scale pre-training of a transformer model on synthetic ‘labelled’ examples that consist of randomly generated symbolic mathematical expressions as the prediction target f and a discrete solution trajectory $\{(t_i, x(t_i))\}_{i \in [N]}$ as input, which we get from integrating $\dot{x} = f(x)$ for a random initial condition.

We describe our data generation procedure in ??, our model choices and innovations in ??, our benchmarks, baselines and evaluation methods in ??, and finally our results in ??.

2 RELATED WORK

Modelling dynamical systems. Modelling and discovering dynamical systems from data has a long history in machine learning. We briefly discuss selected relevant cornerstones, each of which has inspired a large body of follow-up work and extensions. SINDy (?) is a widely used algorithm that performs sparse linear regression on a manually pre-defined set of basis functions. Thus it is limited to ground truth functions that are a linear combination of these basis functions and only the

¹We use the notation $[N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$ and \dot{x} for the temporal derivative.




Figure 2: **Sketch of our method to train ODEFormer.** We generate random ODE systems, integrate a solution trajectory on a grid of N points $x \in \mathbb{R}^D$, and train ODEFormer to directly output the ODE system in symbolic form, supervising the predicted expression via cross-entropy loss.

coefficients have to be inferred. Assuming a different kind of prior knowledge, physics-informed neural networks (?) aim to model dynamical systems using neural networks regularized to satisfy a set of physical constraints. Recently, this approach has been extended to uncover unknown terms in differential equations (?). Finally, Neural ODEs (NODE) (?) parameterize the ODEs f by a neural network and train it by backpropagating through ODE solvers (either directly or via the adjoint sensitivity method). NODEs require no domain knowledge, but only represent the dynamics as a generally overparameterized black-box model void of interpretability.

Approaches to symbolic regression. Symbolic regression aims to provide a mathematical function in symbolic form that fits the observations while remaining interpretable and parsimonious – an analytical expression may still be useless when it spans multiple pages. The latter aspect is typically encapsulated in some complexity measure for symbolic expressions. Because the symbolic output of SR methods has made it difficult to formulate differentiable losses, SR has traditionally benefitted comparably little from advances in autodifferentiation and gradient-based optimization frameworks. The dominant approach was thus based on evolutionary algorithms such as genetic programming (GP) (????????), see (??) for recent reviews. Neural networks have still been leveraged to aid GP (???), e.g. by proposing good starting distributions over expressions (?). Conversely, evolutionary algorithms have been used to interpret the latent space of neural networks (?). A divide-and-conquer strategy powered by hand-tuned heuristics inspired by ? has recently also been extended to inferring dynamical systems (?). Most of these approaches require a separate (model) optimization for each new observed system, severely limiting scalability.

Transformers for symbolic regression. With the advent of transformer models (?), efficient learning of sequence-to-sequence tasks for essentially arbitrary objects became feasible. Paired with large-scale pre-training on synthetic data, transformers have been used for symbolic tasks such as integration (?), formal logic (?), and theorem proving (?). Few recent works applied them to SR (????) obtaining comparable results to GP methods, with a key advantage: after one-time pre-training, inference is often orders of magnitude faster since no training is needed for previously unseen systems. ? have recently proposed a hybrid system combining and leveraging the advantages of most previous approaches for state of the art performance on functional SR tasks.

Symbolic regression for dynamical systems. All existing methods mentioned so far focus on functional SR. ? introduces ProGED, which performs dynamical SR via random search of candidate equations, constrained by probabilistic context-free grammars (PCFGs) – however, the parameters of the PCFGs need to be carefully tailored to each problem, which assumes prior knowledge on the ground truth. In the realm of transformers, ? infer one-dimensional recurrence relations in sequences of numbers, which may be interpreted as discrete versions of differential equations. Most related to our work, ?? explored a transformer-based approach to dynamical SR for ODEs. However, their method is limited to scalar, non-autonomous ODEs. Such systems exhibit extremely limited behavior, where solution trajectories can only either monotonically diverge or monotonically approach a fixed value – not even inflections let alone oscillations are possible. In this study, we tackle the important yet unsolved task of efficiently discovering arbitrary non-linear ODE systems in a symbolic form directly from data in multiple dimensions, without assuming any prior knowledge on the ground truth.

3 DATA GENERATION

Generating functions. For a D -dimensional ODE, we independently sample the D component functions f_1, \dots, f_D of the function f as random unary-binary trees following the method of (?), where internal nodes represent mathematical operators and leaves represent constants or variables. In our specific procedure, we first sample the **system dimension** D uniformly from $[D_{\max}]$ for a fixed $D_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ and then perform the following steps for each component function:

1. Sample the number of **binary operators** b uniformly from $[b_{\max}]$ for a fixed $b_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$.
2. Sample b times from the binary operators $\{+, \times\}$ with probabilities $P(+) = \frac{3}{4}$ and $P(\times) = \frac{1}{4}$.²
3. Construct a **binary tree** with those b nodes using the procedure of ?.
4. For each **leaf** in the tree, sample one of the **variables** x_i for $i \in [D]$.
5. Sample the number of **unary operators** u uniformly from $[u_{\max}]$ for a fixed $u_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$.
6. Sample u times from the unary operators $\{x \mapsto \sin(x), x \mapsto x^{-1}, x \mapsto x^2\}$, and insert them above any node whose subtree has a depth smaller than 6.³
7. Sample the **constants** in the equation from a log-uniform distribution on $[c_{\min}, c_{\max}]$. To achieve full generality, we ensure that each term is multiplied by a prefactor, and that the argument x of each unary function is rescaled by an affine transformation $x \rightarrow a \cdot x + b$, with a, b sampled from the same log-uniform distribution.

In our experiments, we use $D_{\max} = 6$, $b_{\max} = 5$, $u_{\max} = 3$, $(c_{\min}, c_{\max}) = (0.05, 20)$. Due to random continuous constants (as well as initial conditions), we almost surely never generate the same function twice during training.

Integrating the ODEs. Once the function f is generated, we sample an initial condition $x_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma \mathbb{I}_D)$ for a fixed $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and integrate the ODE from $t = 1$ to $t = T$ using the numerical solver `scipy.integrate.solve_ivp` provided by the SciPy (?) on a fixed homogeneous grid of N points, where N is sampled uniformly in $\{50, 200\}$.

The `solve_ivp` function defaults to an adaptive 5th order explicit Runge Kutta method with 4th order error control (?) as well as relative and absolute tolerances of 10^{-3} and 10^{-6} respectively. When integration fails, i.e., when the solver throws an error, returns unsuccessfully, or takes longer than one second, we simply discard the current example. ?? explains in detail that we can fix T and γ during training without loss of generality, as we can rescale observations at inference time. Hence, we fix $\gamma = 1$ and $T = 10$ during training.

Data filtering. Under the distribution over functions f defined implicitly by our generator, a substantial fraction of sampled ODEs (and initial conditions) lead to solutions where at least one component diverges over time. This is typically deemed “unphysical”. Among the trajectories that remain finite, we observe that again a substantial fraction swiftly converges towards a single constant fixed point. Although these ODEs and their solutions may be realistic, their dominance hamper diversity in our dataset. Hence, we deploy the following two heuristics to guide our generator towards a rich class of ODEs.

- If any variable of the solution trajectory exceeds a fixed threshold (10^2 in our experiments), we discard the example. This amounts to filtering out divergent systems.
- If the oscillation of all component functions over the last quarter of the integration range is below a certain threshold (10^{-3} in our experiments), we discard the example with a probability of 90%.⁴ This filters out a majority of rapidly converging systems.

Data corruption. We apply two forms of corruption to the clean, homogeneously integrated solution trajectories during training:

- **Noise:** We sample a noise level σ uniformly in $[0, 0.1]$ and corrupt each observation of each component of the trajectory independently multiplicatively with Gaussian noise: $x_j(t_i) \rightarrow (1 + \xi)x_j(t_i)$ for $j \in [D], i \in [N]$ and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$. This noise model has been used and argued for in previous works (??).

²Subtractions and divisions are included via multiplication with negative numbers and the unary operator $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ respectively. It has been argued that divisions appear less frequently than additions and multiplications in ‘typical expressions’ (?).

³This condition aims to avoid deeply nested – and thus uninterpretable – expressions, which often occur in genetic programming-based SR.

⁴The oscillation of a function $h : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $\sup_{x \in [a, b]} h(x) - \inf_{x \in [a, b]} h(x)$.

- **Subsampling:** For each trajectory, we sample a subsampling ratio ρ uniformly in $[0, 0.5]$ and drop a fraction ρ of the points along the trajectory uniformly at random. Since the equally spaced original trajectories contained between 50 and 200 points, after subsampling inputs can vary in length between 25 and 200.

Tokenizing numbers. Following ?, we represent numbers in base 10 floating-point notation, round them to four significant digits, and encode them as sequences of 3 tokens: their sign, mantissa (between 0 and 9999), and exponent (from E-100 to E100).

We also experimented with three alternative representations: (i) two-token encoding, where the sign and mantissa are merged together, (ii) one-token encoding where sign, mantissa and exponent are all merged together, (iii) a two-hot encoding inspired by ? and used in ?, which interpolates linearly between fixed, pre-set values to represent continuous values. These representations have the advantage of decreasing sequence length, and (iii) has the added benefit of increased numerical precision for the inputs. Since all three alternatives led to worse overall performance, we used the 3 token representation (sign, mantissa, exponent) for ODEFormer.

Encoding functions. To represent mathematical functions as sequences, we enumerate the trees in prefix order, i.e., direct Polish notation (?). Operators, variables, and integers are represented via dedicated tokens. Constants are encoded as described in the previous paragraph. For example, the ODE $f(x) = \cos(2.4242x)$ is encoded as the six token sequence `[cos mul + 2424 E-3 x]`. Note that the vocabulary of the decoder contains a mix of symbolic tokens (operators and variables) and numeric tokens, whereas that of the encoder contains only numeric tokens. For full generality, the embeddings of numeric tokens are *not* shared between the encoder and decoder.

For D -dimensional systems, we simply concatenate the encodings of the D component functions, separated by a special token “|”. With this simple method, the sequence length scales linearly with the dimensionality of the system, i.e., the number of variables. While this is unproblematic for small dimensions such as $D \leq D_{\max} = 6$, it may impair the scalability of our approach⁵.

4 MODEL TRAINING AND INFERENCE

ODEFormer is a transformer for end-to-end dynamical SR, which we illustrate in ??.

Embedder. ODEFormer is provided N input points $(t_i, x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}$, each of which is represented by $3(D+1)$ tokens of dimension d_{emb} . As D and N become large, this results in long input sequences, which challenge the quadratic complexity of full attention in transformers. To reduce the computational complexity, we introduce an embedder to map each input point to a single embedding. The embedder pads the empty input dimensions to D_{\max} , then feeds the $3(D_{\max}+1)d_{\text{emb}}$ -dimensional vector into a 2-layer fully-connected feedforward network (FFN) with Sigmoid-weighted linear unit (SiLU) activations (?), which projects down to dimension d_{emb} . The resulting N embeddings of dimension d_{emb} are then fed to the transformer.

Transformer. We use a sequence-to-sequence transformer architecture (?) with 16 attention heads and an embedding dimension of 512, resulting in a total parameter count of 86M. Like ?, we observe that an asymmetric architecture performs best for this problem: we use 4 layers in the encoder and 16 in the decoder. A notable property of our task is the permutation invariance of the N input points. To account for this invariance, we remove positional embeddings from the encoder.

Training. We optimize a cross-entropy loss with the Adam optimizer (with default parameters) (?), warming up the learning rate from 10^{-7} to 2×10^{-4} over the first 10,000 steps, then decaying it using a cosine annealing schedule for the next 300,000 steps, then restarting the annealing cycle with a damping factor of 3/2 (?), amounting to a total of around 800,000 optimization steps. We do not use any regularization in the form of weight decay or dropout. To avoid wasteful padding for the significantly varying input sequence lengths, we batch together examples of similar lengths, ensuring that a full batch contains a minimum of 10,000 tokens. We train our model on around 50M examples which we pre-generate using 80 CPU cores. On a single NVIDIA A100 GPU with 80GB memory and 8 CPU cores, training ODEFormer takes about 3 days.

Rescaling. During training, the model only observes initial conditions from a standard normal, and the integration range is fixed to $[1, 10]$. To accommodate for different scales of initial conditions and

⁵One possibility to alleviate this would be to treat the decoding of each component function as a separate problem, adding a specifier to the BOS (beginning of sequence) token to identify which component is to be decoded.

time ranges, we apply the affine transformations $t \rightarrow \tilde{t} = at + b$ to rescale the time range to $[1, 10]$ and $x_i(t) \rightarrow \tilde{x}_i(t) = \frac{x_i(t)}{x_i(0)}$ to rescale initial values to unity. The prediction \hat{f} that ODEFormer provides on inputs (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) are then transformed as $f_i = \frac{dx_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{ax_i(0)} \frac{d\tilde{x}_i}{d\tilde{t}} = \frac{1}{ax_i(0)} \tilde{f}_i$ to recover original units.

Decoding strategy. At inference time, we use beam sampling (?) to decode candidate equations⁶. The beam temperature is an important parameter to control this diversity – as the beam size increases, it typically becomes useful to also increase the temperature to maintain diversity. Unless stated otherwise, we perform our experiments with a beam size of 50 and a temperature of 0.1.

(Optional) parameter optimization. Most SR methods break the task into two subroutines (possibly alternating between the two): predicting the optimal “skeleton”, i.e., equation structure, and fitting the numerical values of the constants. Just like ?, our model is end-to-end, in the sense that it handles both subroutines simultaneously. However, we also experimented with adding an extra parameter optimization step, as performed in methods such as ProGED (?). We describe the details of the parameter optimization procedure in ??. While we observe marginal gains in fitting power, this method does not improve generalization, and can lead to overfitting when the data is noisy – see the results in ??, where the model with additional constant optimization is denoted as “ODEFormer (opt)”.

5 EVALUATION, BENCHMARKS AND BASELINES

Symbolic vs numerical evaluation. When evaluating SR methods, the desired metric is whether the inferred ODE \hat{f} perfectly agrees symbolically with the ground truth expression f . However, such an evaluation is problematic in multiple ways: (i) The ambiguity in representing mathematical expressions and non-determinism of ‘simplify’ operations in modern computer algebra systems render comparisons on the symbolic level difficult; (ii) Expressions may differ symbolically, while evaluating to essentially the same outputs on all possible inputs (e.g. in presence of a very small extra term); Moreover, ? have shown that for generic non-linear systems it is impossible to fully identify an ODEs f from a single solution trajectory, especially outside the domain covered by the observations. Hence, comparing expressions numerically within a relevant input range, i.e., measuring the distance between $f(x)$ and $\hat{f}(x)$ for representative inputs x , is more reliable and meaningful⁷.

Evaluation types. For dynamical SR there is a spectrum of reasonable comparisons. We could simply be interested in finding *some* ODE \hat{f} whose solution approximates the single observed trajectory $x(t)$ on the observed time interval, even if \hat{f} and f still differ on certain parts of the input domain. A more ambitious goals, which is closer to full identification of f , include finding a \hat{f} that even approximates the correct trajectories for unobserved initial conditions. We highlight that these evaluations, which in our view are most meaningful to assess dynamical SR, are often absent in the literature, e.g., from ? who instead use manual symbolic heuristics. If an inferred \hat{f} yields correct solutions for all initial values and all time spans, it is equal to f and we would have achieved perfect identification.

Accordingly, we evaluate the following aspects of performance in our experiments:

- **Reconstruction:** we compare the (noiseless, dense) ground truth trajectory with the one we get from integrating the predicted ODE from the same initial condition.
- **Generalization:** we integrate both the ground truth and the inferred ODE for a new, different initial condition over the same interval $[0, T]$ and compare the obtained trajectories.

Metrics. Even having fixed the types of evaluation, the exact quantitative comparison metrics pose a non-trivial problem in SR. In this paper, we consider the following four regression metrics.

- **R^2 score:** this is the coefficient of determination classically used for regression tasks, defined as $R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \in (-\infty, 1]$. Since R^2 is unbounded from below, aggregating R^2 -scores over multiple examples via averaging may suffer from a few unusually bad outliers. Therefore, we mostly report median R^2 -scores over the different datasets.

⁶Beam search tends to produce candidates which all have the same skeleton, and only differ by small variations of the constants, leading to a lack of diversity. Beam sampling ensures that randomness is added at each step of decoding leading to a more diverse set of candidate expressions.

⁷Even modern computer algebra systems include numerical evaluations in their equality checks for symbolic expression and note that such checks are generally error-prone (?).

- **Accuracy:** following ?, we define our accuracy metric as 1 if the R^2 score is larger than a threshold, and 0 otherwise. Given the difficulty of this dynamical SR task, we set the threshold to 0.9.
- **Complexity:** we define the complexity of a symbolic expression as the number of operators. We acknowledge that this is a crude measure, for example, it would assign equal complexity to the functions $\exp(\tan(x))$ and $1 + 2x$. Yet, there is no agreed-upon meaning of the ‘complexity’ of a symbolic expression in this context, let alone a quantitative measure.
- **Inference time:** the average time to produce a prediction.

Corruptions. For all datasets, we also compare models on their robustness to two types of corruption: (i) we add noise to the observations via $x_j(t_i) \rightarrow (1 + \xi)x_j(t_i)$ for $j \in [D], i \in [N]$ and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$; (ii) we drop a fraction ρ of the observations along the trajectory uniformly at random. For all datasets, we report results for various noise levels σ and subsampling fractions ρ .

Strogatz benchmark We first consider the “Strogatz dataset”, included in the Penn Machine Learning Benchmark (PMLB) database (?). This dataset consists in 7 ODE systems, all of dimension 2, and has been used as a benchmark by various SR methods, in particular those specialized on dynamical SR (?). However, it has several limitations: (i) it is small, (ii) it only contains 2-dimensional systems, (iii) it is not integrated with sufficient precision (?), and, (iv) all existing methods typically fail to recover the ground truth equations, hinting to a potential unidentifiability problem (?).

ODEBench Faced with these limitations, we curated a new extended benchmark dataset, which we name ODEBench. We followed the original approach of Strogatz and manually went through the book by ? copying out all ODE systems that are used in the book or by previously published work cited in the book to model real-world phenomena. We omit the many more ODEs mentioned in the book without a physical description or interpretation. We then chose fixed values for the parameters of the ODE systems manually, aiming to observe the behavior in the solution trajectories the models were developed for. Finally, we fix two different initial conditions for each equation, which we will use to evaluate generalization. ODEBench consists of [23 one-dimensional, 28 two-dimensional, 4 three-dimensional, and 1 four-dimensional (making for a total of 56)] systems and contains all equations in Strogatz (while using different parameter values and initial conditions). We publicly release ODEBench with descriptions, the source of all equations, and carefully integrated solutions trajectories, see ?? for details.

Baselines In our experiments, we extensively compare ODEFormer with (strong representatives of) existing methods summarized in??. For each run of each baseline model, we perform a separate hyperparameter optimization for maximal fairness. Apart from ProGED, all baselines were developed for functional SR. We use them for dynamical SR as described in ??, by computing temporal derivatives $\dot{x}_i(t)$ via finite differences with hyperparameter search on the approximation order and optional use of a Savgol filter for smoothing.

In symbolic regression, one typically faces a trade-off between accuracy (how well the function/trajectory is recovered) and complexity of the proposed expression. There are different strategies in the literature to select a single, final equation from the accuracy-complexity Pareto front, which may bias comparisons across methods along one or the other dimension. For a fair comparison, we evaluate all equations of a model’s Pareto front and pick the final equation solely based on accuracy.

6 RESULTS

Results on synthetic data We first assess how the performance of ODEFormer is affected by the dimensionality of the ODE system, the number of unary and binary operators, and the number of points in the trajectory. The ablation results on 10,000 synthetic examples with a beam size of one are shown in ??. While performance degrades with the first three parameters as expected, ODEFormer is robust to the number of points in the trajectory.

While generalization accuracy is generally lower than reconstruction accuracy as expected, for low-dimensional systems the difference is relatively small (e.g. from 85% reconstruction accuracy to 60% generalization accuracy for 1D). This shows that our model is indeed capable of generalizing to new initial conditions, suggesting that it actually correctly recovers the ground truth ODE.

We also investigate the robustness to irregularly sampled and noisy data by adding 5% noise ($\sigma = 0.05$) and subsampling 10% of the data points ($\rho = 0.1$). While ODEFormer copes well with subsampling, it suffers more from noisy inputs. However, the effect on generalization is much smaller than that on fitting.




Figure 3: **Ablation detailing the performance of our model on synthetic data.** We vary four parameters governing the difficulty of an example (from left to right): the dimension of the system, the total number of unary and binary operators, and the number of points in the trajectory. In each panel, we average the results over a dataset of 10,000 examples. In all cases, we use a beam size of 50.

Results on benchmarks We display the results of ODEFormer on Strogatz and ODEBench in Fig. ?? . From top to bottom, we ranked methods according to their average accuracy across all noise and subsampling levels. We see that in both cases, ODEFormer achieves the state of the art. The gap compared to existing methods is particularly exacerbated in presence of noise and subsampling.

In the two rightmost panels, we observe that our model achieves this performance in a much smaller inference time (a few seconds, versus a few minutes for all other methods except Sindy), while maintaining low equation complexity even at high noise levels.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We presented ODEFormer the first transformer capable of inferring multidimensional ODE systems from observed solution trajectories. In extensive experiments, including on a new benchmark which we introduce and release for easy future comparison, we show that our model consistently outperforms existing methods while being more scalable and faster during inference time. We foresee real-world applications of ODEFormer across the sciences, for hypothesis generation of dynamical laws underlying noisy, irregularly sampled experimental observations. However, we also highlight several limitations of the current method, opening up interesting directions for future work.

First, there is an inherent ambiguity and difficulty in crafting a prior over “relevant” or “expected” ODEs without focusing on a specific domain and specific prior knowledge. That said, ODEFormer performs well on rather simple systems that are representative for ODEs found in textbooks without any specific tuning of the generator.

Second, from the limited representatives in ODEBench (only the Lorenz system), ODEFormer appears to struggle with chaotic systems, which have been argued to provide good benchmarks for data driven modeling and forecasting (?). We note that for chaotic systems, understanding properties of the attractor (or invariant measure) is often more desirable than precise forecasting. In particular, long horizon forecasting is typically impossible, since exponential divergence of trajectories from different initial conditions is part of the characterization of chaotic behavior. Hence, unlike our setting here, chaotic systems are typically studied over long time spans, where observed trajectories trace out the attractor (invariant measure) relatively densely. Exploring dynamical law learning from short (transient) solution trajectories of chaotic systems remains an interesting question for future work.

Third, we only considered first order ODEs. As described in ??, any higher-order ODE can be equivalently written as a system of first order ODEs. However, this does not immediately allow ODEFormer to make predictions based only on a trajectory of a higher-order ODE. For instance, let $x(t)$ be the observed solution of a third-order scalar ODE, we would then still need to approximate $\dot{x}(t)$ and $\ddot{x}(t)$ from $x(t)$ to use ODEFormer. While possible in principle via finite differencing schemes, we would suffer similar robustness drawbacks as other methods that rely on finite differences from noisy, irregularly sampled data.

Forth, our model can only infer ODEs for which all variables are observed. In real-world settings, some relevant variables may be unknown or unobservable to the experimenter. For example, inferring chemical kinematics may be challenged by the difficulty in measuring the concentration of reaction




Figure 4: **Our model achieves state-of-the-art performance on both benchmarks considered, while achieving much higher robustness to noise and irregular sampling.** We compare ODEFormer with and without additional parameter optimization with existing methods following the protocol described in Sec. ??.

intermediates throughout the reactions ?. A potential technique to circumvent this issue is to randomly mask variables during training (replacing their observations by a dedicated token), to emulate unobserved variables. While this opens many questions around identifiability and robustness, we plan to explore such directions in future work. In addition, this technique could handle higher-order ODEs by considering the derivatives to be unobserved.

Lastly, all existing methods for dynamical SR, including ours, perform inference based on a single observed trajectory. In our opinion, the most promising and pressing direction for future work is to enable inference from multiple different solution trajectories of the same ODE. Key benefits may include averaging out possible noise sources as well as improving identifiability as we “explore a wider range of f ”. Initial experiments with various forms of logit aggregation in the decoder during inference did not yield convincing results yet. In future work, we plan to exploit a cross-attention encoder to combine the embeddings of the different trajectories to leverage the combined information.

REFERENCES

- Nikos Aréchiga, Francine Chen, Yan-Ying Chen, Yanxia Zhang, Rumen Iliev, Heishiro Toyoda, and Kent Lyons. Accelerating understanding of scientific experiments with end to end symbolic regression. *ArXiv*, abs/2112.04023, 2021.
- Steven Atkinson, Waad Subber, Liping Wang, Genghis Khan, Philippe Hawi, and Roger Ghanem. Data-driven discovery of free-form governing differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05117*, 2019.
- Sören Becker, Michal Klein, Alexander Neitz, Giambattista Parascandolo, and Niki Kilbertus. Discovering ordinary differential equations that govern time-series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02830*, 2022.
- Sören Becker, Michal Klein, Alexander Neitz, Giambattista Parascandolo, and Niki Kilbertus. Predicting ordinary differential equations with transformers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- Luca Biggio, Tommaso Bendinelli, Alexander Neitz, Aurelien Lucchi, and Giambattista Parascandolo. Neural symbolic regression that scales, 2021.
- Steven L. Brunton, Joshua L. Proctor, and J. Nathan Kutz. Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(15):3932–3937, 2016. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1517384113. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/113/15/3932>.
- Jordi Burés and Igor Larrosa. Organic reaction mechanism classification using machine learning. *Nature*, 613(7945):689–695, 2023.
- Anja Butter, Tilman Plehn, Nathalie Soybelman, and Johann Brehmer. Back to the formula – 1hc edition. 2021.
- François Charton. Linear algebra with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01898*, 2021.
- Ricky TQ Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Allan Costa, Rumen Dangovski, Owen Dugan, Samuel Kim, Pawan Goyal, Marin Soljačić, and Joseph Jacobson. Fast neural models for symbolic regression at scale, 2021.
- M. Cranmer, Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Peter W. Battaglia, Rui Xu, Kyle Cranmer, David N. Spergel, and Shirley Ho. Discovering symbolic models from deep learning with inductive biases. *ArXiv*, abs/2006.11287, 2020.
- Miles Cranmer. Interpretable machine learning for science with pysr and symbolicregression. *jl. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01582*, 2023.
- Stéphane d’Ascoli, Pierre-Alexandre Kamienny, Guillaume Lample, and François Charton. Deep symbolic regression for recurrent sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.04600*, 2022.
- A Davies, P Velickovic, L Buesing, S Blackwell, D Zheng, N Tomasev, R Tanburn, P Battaglia, C Blundell, A Juhasz, et al. Advancing mathematics by guiding human intuition with ai. *Nature*, 2021.
- Brian de Silva, Kathleen Champion, Markus Quade, Jean-Christophe Loiseau, J Nathan Kutz, and Steven Brunton. PySINDy: A Python package for the sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems from data. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(49):1–4, 2020.
- Jonas Degraeve, Federico Felici, Jonas Buchli, Michael Neunert, Brendan Tracey, Francesco Carpanese, Timo Ewalds, Roland Hafner, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Diego de Las Casas, et al. Magnetic control of tokamak plasmas through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 602(7897):414–419, 2022.
- John R Dormand and Peter J Prince. A family of embedded runge-kutta formulae. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 6(1):19–26, 1980.

- Stefan Elfving, Eiji Uchibe, and Kenji Doya. Sigmoid-weighted linear units for neural network function approximation in reinforcement learning. *Neural networks*, 107:3–11, 2018.
- William Gilpin. Chaos as an interpretable benchmark for forecasting and data-driven modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05266*, 2021.
- Roger Guimerà, Ignasi Reichardt, Antoni Aguilar-Mogas, Francesco A Massucci, Manuel Miranda, Jordi Pallarès, and Marta Sales-Pardo. A bayesian machine scientist to aid in the solution of challenging scientific problems. *Science advances*, 6(5):eaav6971, 2020.
- Christopher Hahn, Frederik Schmitt, Jens U Kreber, Markus N Rabe, and Bernd Finkbeiner. Teaching temporal logics to neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04218*, 2020.
- Morris W Hirsch and Stephen Smale. *Differential equations, dynamical systems, and linear algebra*. Academic press, 1974.
- John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Žídek, Anna Potapenko, et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- Pierre-Alexandre Kamienny, Stéphane d’Ascoli, Guillaume Lample, and Francois Charton. End-to-end symbolic regression with transformers. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=GoOuIrDHG_Y.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Michael Kommenda, Bogdan Burlacu, Gabriel Kronberger, and Michael Affenzeller. Parameter identification for symbolic regression using nonlinear least squares. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines*, 21(3):471–501, 2020. doi: 10.1007/s10710-019-09371-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10710-019-09371-3>.
- William La Cava, Lee Spector, and Kourosh Danai. Epsilon-lexicase selection for regression. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016*, pp. 741–748, 2016.
- William La Cava, Tilak Raj Singh, James Taggart, Srinivas Suri, and Jason H Moore. Learning concise representations for regression by evolving networks of trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.00981*, 2018.
- William La Cava, Patryk Orzechowski, Bogdan Burlacu, Fabricio Olivetti de Franca, Marco Virgolin, Ying Jin, Michael Kommenda, and Jason H Moore. Contemporary symbolic regression methods and their relative performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14351*, 2021.
- William G La Cava. *Automatic Development and Adaptation of Concise Nonlinear Models for System Identification*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2016.
- Guillaume Lample and François Charton. Deep learning for symbolic mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01412*, 2019.
- Mikel Landajuela, Chak Shing Lee, Jiachen Yang, Ruben Glatt, Claudio P Santiago, Ignacio Aravena, Terrell Mundhenk, Garrett Mulcahy, and Brenden K Petersen. A unified framework for deep symbolic regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:33985–33998, 2022.
- Kookjin Lee, Nathaniel Trask, and Panos Stinis. Structure-preserving sparse identification of nonlinear dynamics for data-driven modeling. In *Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning*, pp. 65–80. PMLR, 2022.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*, 2016.
- Nour Makke and Sanjay Chawla. Interpretable scientific discovery with symbolic regression: a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10873*, 2022.

- Yoshitomo Matsubara, Naoya Chiba, Ryo Igarashi, and Yoshitaka Ushiku. Rethinking symbolic regression datasets and benchmarks for scientific discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10540*, 2022.
- Trent McConaghy. Ffx: Fast, scalable, deterministic symbolic regression technology. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice IX*, pp. 235–260. Springer, 2011.
- Aaron Meurer, Christopher P Smith, Mateusz Paprocki, Ondřej Čertík, Sergey B Kirpichev, Matthew Rocklin, AMiT Kumar, Sergiu Ivanov, Jason K Moore, Sartaj Singh, et al. Sympy: symbolic computing in python. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 3:e103, 2017.
- T. Nathan Mundhenk, Mikel Landajuela, Ruben Glatt, Claudio P. Santiago, Daniel M. Faissol, and Brenden K. Petersen. Symbolic regression via neural-guided genetic programming population seeding, 2021.
- Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2e edition, 2006.
- Nina Omejc, Boštjan Gec, Jure Brence, Ljupčo Todorovski, and Sašo Džeroski. Probabilistic grammars for modeling dynamical systems from coarse, noisy, and partial data. 2023.
- Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, Jak Vanderplas, Alexandre Passos, David Cournapeau, Matthieu Brucher, Matthieu Perrot, and Édouard Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *JMLR*, 2011.
- Brenden K Petersen, Mikel Landajuela Larma, T Nathan Mundhenk, Claudio P Santiago, Soo K Kim, and Joanne T Kim. Deep symbolic regression: Recovering mathematical expressions from data via risk-seeking policy gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04871*, 2019.
- Lena Podina, Brydon Eastman, and Mohammad Kohandel. Universal physics-informed neural networks: Symbolic differential operator discovery with sparse data. 2023.
- Stanislas Polu and Ilya Sutskever. Generative language modeling for automated theorem proving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03393*, 2020.
- Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- Michael Schmidt and Hod Lipson. Age-fitness pareto optimization. In *Genetic programming theory and practice VIII*, pp. 129–146. Springer, 2011.
- Michael D Schmidt and Hod Lipson. Age-fitness pareto optimization. In *Proceedings of the 12th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, pp. 543–544, 2010.
- Philipp Scholl, Aras Bacho, Holger Boche, and Gitta Kutyniok. The uniqueness problem of physical law learning. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Thomas Hubert, Karen Simonyan, Laurent Sifre, Simon Schmitt, Arthur Guez, Edward Lockhart, Demis Hassabis, Thore Graepel, et al. Mastering atari, go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature*, 588(7839):604–609, 2020.
- Steven H. Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry and Engineering*. Westview Press, 2000.
- Tony Tohme, Dehong Liu, and Kamal Youcef-Toumi. Gsr: A generalized symbolic regression approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15569*, 2022.
- Silviu-Marian Udrescu and Max Tegmark. Ai feynman: a physics-inspired method for symbolic regression, 2020.

- Silviu-Marian Udrescu and Max Tegmark. Symbolic pregression: Discovering physical laws from raw distorted video. *Physical review. E*, 103 4-1:043307, 2021.
- Mojtaba Valipour, Bowen You, Maysum Panju, and Ali Ghodsi. Symbolicpt: A generative transformer model for symbolic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14131*, 2021.
- Jurgen Van Gael, Yunus Saatci, Yee Whye Teh, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Beam sampling for the infinite hidden markov model. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 1088–1095, 2008.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017.
- Marco Virgolin, Tanja Alderliesten, Cees Witteveen, and Peter AN Bosman. Improving model-based genetic programming for symbolic regression of small expressions. *Evolutionary computation*, 29 (2):211–237, 2021.
- Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, et al. Scipy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in python. *Nature methods*, 17(3):261–272, 2020.
- Juliane Weilbach, Sebastian Gerwinn, Christian Weilbach, and Melih Kandemir. Inferring the structure of ordinary differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07345*, 2021.

Table 1: Overview of the baselines (f.d.: finite differences required, ode: method developed for dynamical SR, MC: Monte Carlo, reg.: regression).

name	type	ode	f.d.	description	reference
AFP	GP	no	yes	age-fitness Pareto optimization	(?)
FE-AFP	GP	no	yes	AFP with co-evolved fitness estimates	(?)
EHC	GP	no	yes	AFP with epigenetic hillclimbing	(?)
EPLEX	GP	no	yes	epsilon-lexicase selection	(?)
FEAT	GP	no	yes	learned differentiable features	(?)
PySR	GP	no	yes	AutoML-Zero + simulated annealing	(?)
SINDy	reg	yes	yes	sparse linear regression	(?)
FFX	reg	no	yes	pathwise regularized ElasticNet regression	(?)
ProGED	MC	yes	no	MC on probabilistic context free grammars	(?)

A EVALUATION OF BASELINE MODELS

Hyperparameter optimization All baseline models are fitted to each trajectory separately and each fit involves a separate hyperparameter optimization. Hyperparameters that are searched over are listed in Table ??, all other hyperparameters are set to their respective default values. For each combination of hyperparameters, the model is fitted on the first 70% and scored on the remaining 30% of a trajectory. To reduce runtime, we parallelize optimization according to `GridSearchCV` from `scikit-learn` (?) and set the number of parallel jobs to $\min(\# \text{ combinations}, \# \text{ cpu cores}) (= 48)$. After selecting the combination with highest R^2 score, the final model is fitted on the full trajectory.

Finite difference approximations Except for ProGED, all baseline models require approximations of temporal derivatives of all state variables of an ODE system as regression targets. To estimate temporal derivatives we use the central finite difference algorithm as implemented by `FiniteDifference` in the `pysindy` software package (?) and include the approximation order in the hyperparameter search. For a fair comparison on noisy trajectories we extend the hyperparameter search to also include optional smoothing of trajectories with a Savgol filter with a window length of 15 as implemented by `SmoothedFiniteDifference` (?).

Vector-valued functions Some of the baseline implementations (AFP, FE-AFP, EPLEX, EHC, FFX) do not readily support vector-valued functions ($f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$) but only scalar-valued functions ($f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$). To evaluate these baselines on systems of ODEs, we run them separately for each component $f_i : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the system and combine the predictions for all components $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ via the Cartesian product $\{f_1^1, \dots, f_1^{K_1}\} \times \dots \times \{f_D^1, \dots, f_D^{K_D}\}$ where K_i represents the number of predictions, e.g., the length of the Pareto front, obtained for component i .

B (OPTIONAL) PARAMETER OPTIMIZATION

In contrast to all baseline models, ODEFormer is a pretrained model and predicted ODEs are not explicitly fit to the data observed at inference time. However, similar to ? we can post-hoc optimize the parameters of a predicted ODE to improve the data fit. Although parameter estimation for dynamical system is known to be a challenging inference problem, we use the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno algorithm (BFGS) (?) as implemented in `scipy.optimize.minimize` (?) and thus opt for a comparatively simple method in the hope that the parameter values predicted by ODEFormer only need slight refinement. The optimizer solves the following problem

$$\arg \min_{\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}} \text{loss}((x(t_0), \dots, x(t_n)), \text{solve_ivp}(\hat{f}(x; \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}), x_0 = x(t_0), t = (t_0, \dots, t_n))) \quad (1)$$

where $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ denotes the set of parameters of the ODE \hat{f} that was predicted by ODEFormer, and where $(x(t_0), \dots, x(t_n))$ represents the (potentially noisy) observations. We use the negative variance-weighted R^2 score as optimization loss.

Table 2: Hyperparameter names and values for optimization of baseline models. For FFX and PySR, we optimize over finite difference order and smoother window length but no additional hyperparameters.

Model	Hyperparameter	Values	# of Combinations	Comment
all models	finite difference order	2,3,4		
	smoother window length	None, 15		
AFP	population size	100, 500, 1000		
	generations	2500, 500, 250		
	operators	[n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt], [n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt,sin,cos]		
EHC	population size	100, 500, 1000		
	generations	1000, 200, 100		
	operators	[n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt], [n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt,sin,cos]		
EPLEX	population size	100, 500, 1000		
	generations	2500, 500, 250		
	operators	[n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt], [n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt,sin,cos]		
FE-AFP	population size	100, 500, 1000		
	generations	2500, 500, 250		
	operators	[n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt], [n,v,+,-,*,./,exp,log,2,3,sqrt,sin,cos]		
ProGED	grammar	universal, rational simplerational, trigonometric polynomial		
sindy (full)	polynomial degree	1,2,3		
	basis functions	[polynomials], [polynomials,sin,cos,exp], [polynomials,sin,cos,exp,log,sqrt,1/x]		
	optimizer threshold	0.05, 0.1, 0.15		
	optimizer alpha	0.025, 0.05, 0.075		
	optimizer max iterations	20, 100		
sindy (poly)	polynomial degree	{1, ..., 10}		
	basis functions	polynomials		
	optimizer threshold	0.05, 0.1, 0.15		
	optimizer alpha	0.025, 0.05, 0.075		
	optimizer max iterations	20, 100		

C VISUALIZATION

In Fig. ??, we plot the predictions of the ODEformer on the Strogatz datasets. As can be seen, the model achieves excellent fitting capabilities, hence the high fitting R^2 score.

D ODEBENCH

[Niki: describe more details?]

E EFFECT OF BEAM SIZE

In ??, we study the impact of the beam size on reconstruction and generalization performance. While reconstruction improves with the beam size, generalization hardly changes. This highlights the importance of using both metrics: the two are not necessarily correlated, and the latter is a much better proxy of symbolic recovery than the former.




Figure 5: Predictions of the ODEFormer on the Strogatz dataset.




Figure 6: Histogram of per equation R^2 scores for the interpolation task on Strogatz. Subfigures correspond to different noise levels. The y-axis represents counts and is scaled per model for better visibility of the distribution of scores. The x-axis annotations “invalid” and “<0” respectively denote the number of invalid predictions as well as the number of predictions that yielded an R^2 score below 0. The red dashed line corresponds to the mean R^2 score across equations, the black dashed line corresponds to the median R^2 score; mean and median are based on scores of valid predictions only. Models are ranked per subfigure according to the median R^2 score.




Figure 7: Histogram of per equation R^2 scores for the interpolation task on Strogatz where 50% of the trajectory are dropped uniformly at random. Subfigures correspond to different noise levels. The y-axis represents counts and is scaled per model for better visibility of the distribution of scores. The x-axis annotations “invalid” and “<0” respectively denote the number of invalid predictions as well as the number of predictions that yielded an R^2 score below 0. The red dashed line corresponds to the mean R^2 score across equations, the black dashed line corresponds to the median R^2 score; mean and median are based on scores of valid predictions only. Models are ranked per subfigure according to the median R^2 score.





Figure 8: Solution trajectories of all equations in ODEBench for one of the initial conditions.

Figure 9: **Increasing the beam size improves reconstruction, but not generalization.** We plot the average reconstruction and generalization R^2 -score on 10,000 noise-free, densely samples synthetic examples for various beam sizes and a temperature of 0.1.