FAST CRYSTAL TENSOR PROPERTY PREDICTION: A GENERAL O(3)-EQUIVARIANT FRAMEWORK BASED ON POLAR DECOMPOSITION

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Predicting the tensor properties of crystalline materials is a fundamental task in materials science. Unlike single-value property prediction, which is inherently invariant, tensor property prediction requires maintaining O(3) group tensor equivariance. This equivariance constraint often introduces tremendous computational costs, necessitating specialized designs for effective and efficient predictions. To address this limitation, we propose a general O(3)-equivariant framework for fast crystal tensor property prediction, called *GoeCTP*. Our framework is efficient as it does not need to impose equivalence constraints onto the network architecture. Instead, GoeCTP captures the tensor equivariance with a simple external rotation and reflection (R&R) module based on polar decomposition. The crafted external R&R module can rotate and reflect the crystal into an invariant standardized crystal position in space without introducing extra computational cost. We show that GoeCTP is general as it is a plug-and-play module that can be smoothly integrated with any existing single-value property prediction framework for predicting tensor properties. Experimental results indicate that *GoeCTP* achieves higher prediction performance and runs $13 \times$ faster compared to existing state-of-the-art methods in elastic benchmarking datasets, underscoring its effectiveness and efficiency. Our code is publicly available at https://anonymous.4open.science/r/GoeCTP-FC98/.

029 030 031

032

005 006

007

008 009 010

011

013

014

015

016

017

018

019

021

023

025

026

027

028

1 INTRODUCTION

034 The tensor properties of crystalline materials can capture intricate material responses through highorder tensors, with wide-ranging applications in fields such as physics, electronics, and engineer-035 ing (Yan et al., 2024b). Compared to single-value property prediction, predicting tensor properties 036 of crystalline materials is substantially more complex. This complexity arises from the fact that 037 tensor properties describe how crystals respond to external physical fields, such as electric fields or mechanical stress (Nye, 1985; Resta, 1994; Yan et al., 2024b). Consequently, tensor property prediction modeling necessitates preserving consistency with the crystal's spatial position, exhibiting 040 "special" O(3) equivariance (Yan et al., 2024b). Furthermore, high-order tensor property predic-041 tion is computationally intensive due to its high dimensionality and large data volume. Therefore, 042 providing fast and accurate predictions of tensor properties across various materials is challenging. 043

Thus far, several works have been dedicated to crystal tensor property prediction. One prominent 044 category of approaches involves *ab initio* physical simulation techniques, such as density functional 045 theory (DFT) (Petousis et al., 2016). These classical simulation techniques can accurately calculate 046 various material properties, including electronic structures, phonon spectra, and tensor properties. 047 However, they necessitate extensive computational resources due to the complexity of handling a 048 vast number of atoms and electrons in crystal systems (Yan et al., 2024b), hindering their applicability in practice. Alternatively, machine learning (ML) models have been proposed to facilitate the process of crystalline material property prediction. These methods typically leverage high-precision 051 datasets deriving from *ab initio* simulations and utilize crystal graph construction techniques along with graph neural networks (GNNs) (Chen et al., 2019; Louis et al., 2020; Choudhary & DeCost, 052 2021; Xie & Grossman, 2018) or transformers (Yan et al., 2024a; Taniai et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a).

054 Existing ML methods have primarily focused on predicting single-value properties of crystals. They exhibit promising prediction performance by enforcing the periodic invariance constraint into the 056 model design. However, these methods cannot be directly applied to tensor property prediction as 057 they overlook the inherent anisotropy of the crystal systems, failing to achieve "special" O(3) equiv-058 ariance (Yan et al., 2024a; Taniai et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024a). Some recent works attempt to ensure equivariance through specialized designs of network architectures (Mao et al., 2024; Lou & Ganose, 2024; Heilman et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2024; Pakornchote et al., 2023; 060 Yan et al., 2024b; Zhong et al., 2023). These methods generally employ harmonic decomposition 061 to achieve equivariance, where the tensor space is decomposed into the direct sum of irreducible 062 representations of the rotation group. In this regard, numerous computationally intensive opera-063 tions, such as tensor products and the merging of irreducible representations, are required. These 064 operations incur large amounts of computation overhead, particularly when processing high-order 065 data. 066

To address the above challenges, we propose a novel O(3)-equivariant framework for fast crystal 067 tensor property prediction dubbed GoeCTP. In particular, instead of enforcing the equivariance into 068 the model design, we craft a simple yet effective "rotation and reflection" (R&R) module based on 069 polar decomposition. Our designed R&R module rotates and reflects the input crystal with different positions into a standardized invariant position in space. This standardized crystal position is 071 subsequently passed into the property prediction network to obtain an invariant tensor value. Mean-072 while, the orthogonal matrix obtained from the R&R module is used to achieve equivariant tensor 073 properties prediction. Our approach is plug-and-play as it can be readily integrated with any ex-074 isting single-value property prediction network for predicting tensor properties without incurring 075 additional computational costs. Compared to the previous state-of-the-art work Yan et al. (2024b), 076 the *GoeCTP* method achieves higher quality prediction results and runs more than $13 \times$ faster in the elastic benchmarking dataset. 077

078 079

2 PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

080 081 082

2.1 PRELIMINARIES

The structure of crystalline materials consists of a periodic arrangement of atoms in 3D space, with a repeating unit called a unit cell. An entire crystal typically can be characterized by describing the parameters of a single unit cell, such as the types and coordinates of the atoms within it, as well as the lattice parameters (Yan et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024b; Jiao et al., 2024). General methods for describing crystals can be divided into the Cartesian coordinate system and the fractional coordinate system, as described below.

Cartesian Coordinate System. A crystal can be mathematically represented as $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L})$, where $\mathbf{A} = [a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_a}$ denotes atom features for *n* atoms within a unit cell. Each $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_a}$ is a d_a -dimensional feature vector characterizing an individual atom. The matrix $\mathbf{X} = [x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 3}$ contains the 3D Cartesian coordinates of *n* atoms in the unit cell. The lattice maxtrix $\mathbf{L} = [l_1, l_2, l_3] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ consists of the lattice vectors l_1, l_2 , and l_3 , which form the basis of the 3D Euclidean space. A complete crystal is therefore represented as $(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \{(\hat{a}_i, \hat{x}_i) | \hat{x}_i = x_i + k_1 l_1 + k_2 l_2 + k_3 l_3, \hat{a}_i = a_i, k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \le i \le n\}$. In this representation, the integers k_i and l_i denote all possible atomic positions in the periodic lattice.

Fractional Coordinate System. Instead of using the standard orthogonal basis, fractional coordinate system utilizes the lattice matrix $\mathbf{L} = [l_1, l_2, l_3] \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ as the basis vectors for atomic positions. With this representation, the position of an atom is given by a fractional coordinate vector denoted as $f_i = [f_1, f_2, f_3]^T \in [0, 1)^3$. The corresponding Cartesian coordinate vector can then be expressed as $\mathbf{x}_i = f_i \mathbf{l}_i$. Therefore, for a crystal **M**, it can be represented as $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$, where $\mathbf{F} = [f_1, \dots, f_n]^T \in [0, 1)^{n\times3}$ represents the fractional coordinates of all atoms in the unit cell.

103

104 2.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

105

106 **Crystal Tensor Prediction.** The crystal tensor properties prediction is a classic regression task. 107 Its goal is to estimate the high-order tensor property denoted as \mathcal{Y}_{label} from the raw crystal data represented as $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$ while minimizing the expected error between the actual property



Figure 1: The illustration of O(3)-equivariance for crystal tensor prediction. Some of the visualizations in the figure are generated using the VESTA (Momma & Izumi, 2011), Yan et al. (2024b), and VELAS (Ran et al., 2023).

 \mathcal{Y}_{label} and the estimated property value \mathcal{Y}_{pred} . This problem can be formally formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{n=1}^{N} ||\mathcal{Y}_{pred}^{(n)} - \mathcal{Y}_{label}^{(n)}||^2, \quad \mathcal{Y}_{pred}^{(n)} = f_{\theta}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}),$$
(1)

where $f_{\theta}(\cdot)$ represents a tensor prediction model with learnable parameters θ , and the superscript ndenotes individual samples in the dataset. In what follows, we will omit superscript n for simplicity. As did in the literature (Mao et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2024b), our objective is to estimate high-order tensor properties, including dielectric tensor (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_{label} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$), piezoelectric tensor (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_{label} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3}$), and elastic tensor (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_{label} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} C \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3\times3\times3}$), respectively.

O(3)-Equivariance. The O(3) group, also known as the orthogonal group in 3D, consists of all rotations and reflections in 3D space, i.e., 3×3 orthogonal matrices. In predicting the crystal tensor properties, the requirements for O(3) equivariance typically differ from the O(3)-equivariance defined in the general molecular studies (Hoogeboom et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024; Song et al., 2024). Specifically, taking the dielectric tensor as an example where $\mathcal{Y}_{label} \triangleq \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$, for a tensor prediction model $f_{\theta}(\cdot)$ in Eq. 1, if it is O(3) equivariant, it must satisfy the following equality formulated as:

$$f_{\theta}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{QL}) = \mathbf{Q} f_{\theta}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}) \mathbf{Q}^{T},$$
(2)

where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an arbitrary orthogonal matrix (Yan et al., 2024b). For clarity, an illustration of O(3)-equivariance for crystal tensor prediction is shown in Fig. 1; for more equivariance details, see Appendix A.2.

Our Objective. Our objective is to devise a new framework that can capture the O(3)-equivariance for accurately predicting the high-order crystal tensor properties.

149 150 151

152

154

148

121

122

123

124 125

126 127 128

129

3 Methodology

153 3.1 THE RATIONALE OF OUR FRAMEWORK

To enforce O(3) equivariance, as described in Eq. 2, existing crystal tensor prediction methods typically employ specialized network architectures based on harmonic decomposition, resulting in substantial computational overhead. For example, existing work (Yan et al., 2024b;a) gather the rotational information from neighboring nodes to the central node *i* through the following computation formulated:

159

160

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{i,\lambda}^{l} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_{i}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j}^{l'}, \mathbf{Y}_{\lambda}(\hat{\mathbf{e_{ji}}})),$$
(3)

(2) Crystal

graph

construction

(1) R&R

module

position

Crystal graph preprocessing

c)

orthogonal matrix Q

企

R&R

module

(3) Node &

edge feature

embeddings

162 163



166

167

Crystal with arbitrary

Input

- 168 169 170
- 171
- 172 173

174

175

176

177

178

179

Figure 2: The Illustration of GoeCTP. To begin with, (1) the R&R module rotates and reflects the input crystal structure, which may have an arbitrary direction, to the standardized crystal position. Next, (2) Crystal Graph Construction module organizes the adjusted input into a crystal graph, followed by (3) the Node & Edge Feature Embedding module, which encodes the features of the crystal graph. Subsequently, (4) the Prediction module leverages these embedded features to predict the invariant tensor properties corresponding to the standardized crystal position. Finally, (5) the Reverse R&R module applies the orthogonal matrix Q, obtained from the R&R module, to ensure the output of the equivariant tensor properties.

Node-wise

transformer

orthogonal matrix Q

Standardized

crystal position

(4) Prediction module (eComFormer here)

Node-wise

equivariant

update

Invariant crystal

tensor property

(5) Reverse

R&R

module

Equivalent crystal

tenser property

Output

Node-wise

transformer

orthogonal matrix Q

J

Reverse

R&R

module

Ľ

ſ

180 181

> where f_i^l is node *i*'s features, $|\mathcal{N}_i|$ is the number of neighbors of node *i*, \mathbf{TP}_{λ} refers to tensor prod-183 uct layers with rotation order λ (Geiger & Smidt, 2022), and $\mathbf{Y}_{\lambda}(\hat{\mathbf{e}_{ii}})$ represents the equivariant edge feature embedding, which is embedded by the corresponding spherical harmonics. When transmit-185 ting rotational information for higher-order tensors like the elastic tensor, the rotation order λ is set 186 to 3 (Yan et al., 2024b). In comparison, for transmitting lower-order tensor rotational information 187 (where λ is set to 1 (Yan et al., 2024a)), the dimension of $\mathbf{Y}_{\lambda}(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ii})$ increases about double, thus, the corresponding computational cost increases. If we can transmit the rotational information and 188 maintain the model performance for higher-order tensors with a lower value of λ , e.g., $\lambda = 1$, this 189 would significantly reduce the computational costs. 190

> 191 To this end, we propose the *GoeCTP* method, which achieves O(3) equivariance without requiring 192 specialized network architecture design. For instance, it enables the transmission of rotational infor-193 mation for higher-order tensors using $\lambda = 1$ rather than $\lambda = 3$, thereby simplifying the model complexity while maintaining equivariance. GoeCTP leverages polar decomposition, a mathematical 194 technique with significant geometric properties. Polar decomposition decomposes a matrix into two 195 components: an orthogonal matrix, representing a rotation or reflection, and a positive semi-definite 196 matrix (Higham, 1986). The orthogonal matrix captures an O(3)-group transformation, while the 197 positive semi-definite matrix represents a stretching or scaling. When applied to crystal structures, polar decomposition effectively separates the spatial directional information of the crystal via the 199 orthogonal matrix, allowing us to directly transfer equivariance without the need for intricate model 200 design. Furthermore, polar decomposition is only performed during the data preprocessing stage and 201 does not occur during network training, thereby introducing virtually no additional computational 202 burden.

- 203
- 204 **OUR PROPOSED FRAMEWORK:** GoeCTP 3.2 205
- 206 In what follows, we will first introduce the core rotation and reflection (R&R) module of the pro-207 posed *GoeCTP*, focusing on how to obtain a standardized crystal position for a crystal with arbitrary spatial direction using polar decomposition. Then, we will describe how the input crystal data is 208 processed and introduce the property prediction network of GoeCTP. Finally, we will explain how 209 proposed GoeCTP achieves equivariant property predictions. An overview of the GoeCTP frame-210 work is illustrated in Fig. 2. 211

212 **R&R Module.** The primary function of the R&R Module is to rotate and reflect the crystal to a 213 standardized crystal position in space. In the fractional coordinate system, the O(3) group transformations applied to a crystal affect only the lattice matrix L, while fractional coordinates remain 214 invariant, making it convenient for the R&R module to perform rotation and reflection operations 215 on the crystal data. Therefore, R&R module adopts the fractional coordinate system to represent the

225

226

227

228 229

230

231 232 233

234

235

236

241

253

crystal $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$. This choice simplifies the implementation of the R&R module. Specifically, the application of O(3)-group transformations is achieved by applying polar decomposition as follows.

Proposition 3.1 (*Polar Decomposition (Hall & Hall, 2013; Higham, 1986; Jiao et al., 2024).)* An invertible matrix $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ can be uniquely decomposed into $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{Q} \exp(\mathbf{S})$, where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ is an orthogonal matrix, $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ is a symmetric matrix and $\exp(\mathbf{S}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{S}^n}{n!}$ defines the exponential mapping of \mathbf{S} .

Building on the above proposition, it is evident that for a crystal $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$, the invertible lattice matrix \mathbf{L} can be uniquely represented by a symmetric matrix \mathbf{S} . By defining $\mathbf{H} = \exp(\mathbf{S})$, the lattice matrix \mathbf{L} can also be uniquely represented by a symmetric matrix denoted as \mathbf{H} , i.e. $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{QH}$. Furthermore, \mathbf{H} remains invariant with the O(3) group transformation.

Proof 3.1.1 Given the lattice matrices \mathbf{L} and $\mathbf{Q'L}$, where $\mathbf{Q'}$ is an arbitrary O(3) group transformation, applying polar decomposition on both \mathbf{L} and $\mathbf{Q'L}$ yields the following expressions:

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H} \tag{4}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{Q}_1\mathbf{H}_1. \tag{5}$$

By combining Eq. 4 and 5, we can have the following equation:

$$\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}.$$
 (6)

Because $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q})^T = \mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^T\mathbf{Q}'^T = \mathbf{I}$, it follows that $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}$ is an orthogonal matrix. According to the uniqueness of polar decomposition, we can have $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_1$, which implies $\mathbf{Q}_1\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}_1\mathbf{H}_1$. If $\mathbf{H}_1 \neq \mathbf{H}$, this would violate the uniqueness property of polar decomposition. Therefore, we conclude that $\mathbf{H}_1 = \mathbf{H}$, indicating that \mathbf{H} remains unaffected by the O(3) group transformation.

In essence, regardless of the O(3) group transformation applied to the crystal in space, the corresponding **H** associated with **L** remains invariant. Consequently, **H** serves as a fixed standardized crystal position for the crystal $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$, allowing the crystal with different position to be consistently rotated to a same position through polar decomposition. The concept of the standardized crystal position can be formally stated as the following proposition :

Proposition 3.2 (Standardized Crystal Position.) By performing polar decomposition on the lattice matrix $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{QH}$, the standardized crystal position \mathbf{H} is obtained. When an arbitrary O(3) group transformation \mathbf{Q}' is applied to a crystal structure, \mathbf{H} remains unchanged.

Therefore, the R&R Module directly applies polar decomposition to the lattice matrix L formulated as:

$$f_p(\mathbf{M}) = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H}),\tag{7}$$

where $f_p(\mathbf{M})$ represents the application of polar decomposition to the lattice matrix L of M.

As shown in Fig. 2, the crystal $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H})$ is passed to the subsequent crystal graph construction module for further processing. The orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} obtained during this decomposition is passed to the reverse R&R module, ensuring the equivariant transformation of the output tensor properties. Our proposed R&R module based on polar decomposition allows the input crystal data to be transformed into a standardized spatial position that is invariant under O(3) space group transformations. With this particular module, the equivariance can be captured, meaning that the subsequent components of *GeoCTP* are no longer required to account for equivariance.

262 Crystal Graph Construction. To enable networks to handle such infinite crystal structures 263 $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H})$, it is typically necessary to employ graph construction methods that represent the in-264 teractions between infinite crystal structures and atoms using finite graph data. Here, we use the 265 crystal graph construction from Yan et al. (2024a;b) to describe the structure and relationships 266 within crystals. Specifically, we first convert the fractional coordinate system $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H})$ into the 267 Cartesian coordinate system $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{H})$ as introduced in Sec. 2. We assume that the output crystal graph is represented as $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, \mathcal{V} denotes the set of nodes v_i in the crystal graph, where 268 each node v_i contains atomic features $\mathbf{v}_i = (\mathbf{a}_i, \hat{p}_i)$. \mathcal{E} represents the set of edges denoted as 269 e_{ij} , which are typically constructed based on the Euclidean distance d_{ij} between nodes v_i and 270 v_j . When the Euclidean distance d_{ij} between nodes v_i and v_j is less than a given radius R, 271 i.e. $d_{ij} = ||\mathbf{p}_j + k_1\mathbf{l}_1 + k_2\mathbf{l}_2 + k_3\mathbf{l}_3 - \mathbf{p}_i||_2 \leq R$, an edge e_{ij} will be built with edge feature 272 $\mathbf{e}_{ij} = \mathbf{p}_j + k_1\mathbf{l}_1 + k_2\mathbf{l}_2 + k_3\mathbf{l}_3 - \mathbf{p}_i$. Here, R is established based on the distance to the k-th 273 nearest neighbor, and different values of $\mathbf{k} = [k_1, k_2, k_3] \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ represent different edges between 274 nodes v_i and v_j . Since there are no equivariance requirements for subsequent models, any other 275 graph construction methods can be used to replace this part, such as Wang et al. (2024a); Yan et al. 276 (2024a).

Node and Edge Feature Embedding. Building on previous work (Xie & Grossman, 2018; Yan et al., 2024b;a), node features a_i are embedded into a 92-dimensional CGCNN feature vector f_i . Edge features \mathbf{e}_{ij} are decomposed into their magnitude $||\mathbf{e}_{ij}||_2$ and a normalized direction vector $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}$. The magnitude is further mapped to a term similar to potential energy, $-c/||\mathbf{e}_{ij}||_2$, through the application of a radial basis function (RBF) kernel for encoding (Lin et al., 2023). Subsequently, \mathbf{e}_{ij} are embedded into feature vector f_{ij}^e .

Prediction Module. Since the R&R module is responsible for preserving equivariance, any predictive network can serve as the Prediction module, such as those proposed by Yan et al. (2024a); Taniai et al. (2024); Yan et al. (2022); Lee et al. (2024); Wang et al. (2024a), among others. For better performance, we select eComformer (Yan et al., 2024a), which has demonstrated excellent performance in single-value property prediction tasks, as our Prediction module. A detailed explanation of eComFormer can be found in Appendix A.1. Once processed through the stacked layers of eComFormer, the node features are aggregated to generate the crystal's global features as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{G}^{\text{final}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \le i \le n} \boldsymbol{f}_i^{\text{final}}.$$
(8)

Reverse R&R Module. The primary function of the Reverse R&R module is to generate the equivariant tensor property predictions based on the crystal global features from the Prediction module. First, the Reverse R&R module transforms G^{final} into a tensor output, as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = f_{MLP}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\text{final}}), \tag{9}$$

297 298 299

295

296

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\text{final}} = f_{rp}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{Q}), \tag{10}$$

where $f_{MLP}(\cdot)$ represents a multilayer perceptron (MLP) and the operation reshaping dimension. Next, $f_{rp}(\cdot)$ utilizes the orthogonal matrix **Q** obtained from the R&R Module to convert the tensor output ε into its final equivariant form denoted as $\varepsilon^{\text{final}}$.

This conversion $f_{rp}(\cdot)$ for predicting the dielectric tensor can be expressed by:

304 305 306

307

308

303

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\text{final}} = \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\mathbf{Q}^T.$$
 (11)

For predicting the higher-order piezoelectric and elastic tensor, the conversion process becomes more complex, seeing Appendix A.2 for more details.

309 310 311

4 RELATED WORK

GNN-Based Methods. CGCNN is a pioneering GNN model specifically designed for handling 312 crystal structures (Xie & Grossman, 2018). This model proposed to represent crystal structures as 313 multi-edge crystal graphs. It was applied to predict various single-value properties such as forma-314 tion energy and band gap. Since then, several GNN methods have been developed to improve upon 315 CGCNN through exploring various network designs or leveraging prior knowledge (Chen et al., 316 2019; Louis et al., 2020; Choudhary & DeCost, 2021; Das et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023). These 317 GNN methods are primarily designed for single-value property prediction and do not address the 318 prediction of high-order tensor properties, such as dielectric or elastic tensors. Furthermore, they 319 lack the ability to preserve the equivariance required for accurate high-order tensor property predic-320 tion. In contrast, recent studies attempted to ensure equivariance through specialized network archi-321 tectures (Mao et al., 2024; Lou & Ganose, 2024; Heilman et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2024; Pakornchote et al., 2023; Yan et al., 2024b; Zhong et al., 2023). These approaches generally employ harmonic 322 decomposition to achieve equivariance for tensor properties. Within these network architectures, 323 many operations are required, such as tensor products and combining irreducible representations. These processes significantly increase computational costs, especially when handling higher-order data.

Transformer-Based Methods. Transformers, with their self-attention mechanism and parallel pro-327 cessing capabilities, are particularly well-suited for predicting crystal material properties. Mat-328 former (Yan et al., 2022), one of the earliest Transformer-based networks used for crystal material 329 property prediction, encoded crystal periodic patterns by using the geometric distances between 330 the same atoms in neighboring unit cells. This addressed the issue in earlier GNN-based meth-331 ods, including CGCNN, MEGNet, GATGNN, and others, which neglected the periodic patterns of 332 infinite crystal structures. Subsequently, more advanced Transformer-based approaches were pro-333 posed. Some methods, such as ComFormer (Yan et al., 2024a), CrystalFormer (Wang et al., 2024a), and CrystalFormer (Taniai et al., 2024), typically incorporate either enhanced graph construction 334 techniques or physical priors, exhibiting impressive results in the prediction of single-value proper-335 ties. Furthermore, DOSTransformer (Lee et al., 2024) is tailored for the density of states prediction, 336 utilizing prompt-guided multi-modal transformer architecture to achieve super performance. Never-337 theless, these models are not directly applicable for accurate high-order tensor property prediction 338 due to their inability to capture the necessary equivariance. 339

340 341

342

344

364

365

366

367

368

5 EXPERIMENTS

343 5.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Datasets. In this work, we evaluate the performance of *GoeCTP* on three key tensor property pre-345 diction tasks: the second-order dielectric tensor, the third-order piezoelectric tensor, and the fourth-346 order elastic tensor, respectively. The dataset for dielectric tensor and piezoelectric tensor is derived 347 from the data processed by Yan et al. (2024b), sourced from the JARVIS-DFT database. Similarly, 348 the dataset for elastic tensor is obtained from the dft_3d data within the JARVIS-DFT database¹. 349 The statistical details of the datasets are presented in Table 1. Additionally, in the dielectric tensor 350 dataset, the dielectric tensor is a 3×3 symmetric matrix. Therefore, during prediction, we predict 351 6 elements of the matrix (see Appendix A.3 for details) and then reconstruct the entire 3×3 sym-352 metric matrix. In the piezoelectric tensor dataset, the piezoelectric tensor is represented using Voigt 353 notation as a 3×6 matrix, rather than a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ third-order tensor (see Appendix A.3 for details). we only predict the 3×6 matrix. In the elastic tensor dataset, the elastic tensor is represented using 354 Voigt notation as a 6×6 symmetric matrix, rather than a $3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3$ fourth-order tensor (Itin & 355 Hehl, 2013; Wen et al., 2024). Therefore, we predict the 6×6 matrix during usage (see Appendix 356 A.3 for details). 357

Dataset	Sample size	Fnorm Mean	Fnorm STD	Unit
Dielectric	4713	14.7	18.2	Unitless
Piezoelectric	4998	0.43	3.09	C/m^2
Elastic	25110	306.4	238.4	GPa

Table	1:	Dataset	statistics.

Baseline Methods. we selected several state-of-the-art methods in the field of crystal tensor property prediction, i.e. MEGNET (Chen et al., 2019; Morita et al., 2020), EGTNN (Zhong et al., 2023), and GMTNet (Yan et al., 2024b), as baseline methods.

Evaluation Metrics. We followed the evaluation metrics defined by Yan et al. (2024b) to assess the 369 performance of the methods. The following metrics were employed: (1) Frobenius norm (Fnorm) 370 is used to measure the difference between the predicted tensor and the label tensor, which is the 371 square root of the sum of the squares of all elements in a tensor. Fnorm is widely used in various 372 regression tasks. (2) Error within threshold (EwT) is determined by the ratio of the Fnorm between 373 the predicted tensor and the ground truth tensor to the Fnorm of the ground truth tensor. This ratio 374 can be expressed as $||y_{pred} - y_{label}||_F / ||y_{label}||_F$, where $|| \cdot ||_F$ is Fnorm, and y_{label} and y_{pred} 375 represent the ground truth and predicted values, respectively. For instance, EwT 25% indicates that 376 the proportion of predicted samples with this ratio is below 25%. Higher values of EwT signify 377

¹https://pages.nist.gov/jarvis/databases/

378 better prediction quality. In our experiments, we utilized several thresholds for EwT: EwT 25%, 379 EwT 10%, and EwT 5%. 380

Experimental Settings. The experiments were performed using an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 381 GPU. For benchmarking, we directly utilized the codebases for MEGNET, ETGNN, and GMTNet 382 as provided by Yan et al. (2024b). For each property, the dataset is split into training, validation, and test sets in an 8:1:1 ratio. During model training, Huber loss, AdamW (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2018), 384 a weight decay of 10^{-5} , and polynomial learning rate decay were employed. 385

Since we observed some randomness in the results during the training process of the repeated di-386 electric dataset experiments, we conducted 5 repeated experiments for each method and used the 387 average of the 5 experiment metrics as the final experimental results. The results of the 5 repeated 388 experiments can be found in the Appendix A.4. 389

390 391

407

408 409

410

411

412

5.2 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

392 **Predicting Dielectric Tensors.** The performance of various models in predicting the dielectric tensor is summarized in Table 2. While GoeCTP and GMTNet show close results in terms of Fnorm 394 and EwT 25%, GoeCTP demonstrates higher values for EwT 10% and EwT 5%, with an improve-395 ment of 5% in EwT 5% compared to GMTNet. This indicates that GoeCTP delivers higher-quality 396 predictions compared to GMTNet. Furthermore, as GoeCTP is designed to be a flexible framework, 397 we also evaluated its combination with other models, such as iComFormer (Yan et al., 2024a) and CrystalFormer (Taniai et al., 2024). Detailed results of these combinations are provided in Appendix 398 A.4. 399

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Fnorm ↓	3.71	3.40	3.28	3.23
EwT 25% ↑	75.8%	82.6%	83.3%	83.2%
EwT 10% ↑	38.9%	49.1%	56.0%	56.8%
EwT 5% ↑	18.0%	25.3%	30.5%	35.5%

Table 2: Comparison of performance metrics between MEGNET, ETGNN, GMTNet, and GoeCTP on the dielectric dataset.

Predicting Piezoelectric tensors. The experimental results for the elastic tensor dataset are shown in Table 3. Similar to the experimental results on the dielectric tensors dataset, although the EwT 25% value of GoeCTP is not as good as GMTNet, it achieves optimal results on all other evaluation metrics.

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Fnorm ↓	0.465	0.535	0.462	0.448
EwT 25% ↑	43.9%	37.5%	45.7%	44.9%
EwT 10% ↑	37.9%	22.8%	39.3%	43.1%
EwT 5% ↑	27.1%	13.8%	35.7%	40.1%

420 Table 3: Comparison of performance metrics between MEGNET, ETGNN, GMTNet, and GoeCTP on the piezoelectric dataset.

422 423

421

Predicting Elastic Tensors. Experimental results on the elastic tensor dataset are presented in Ta-424 ble 4. GoeCTP demonstrated outstanding performance in predicting higher-order, complex tensors, 425 outperforming all baseline methods across every evaluation metric. Notably, it achieved the lowest 426 Fnorm of 107.11 and improved all EwT metrics by an average of 6% compared to GMTNet, empha-427 sizing its general applicability in predicting diverse tensor properties in materials science. Further 428 details on the results of *GoeCTP*'s combination with other models can be found in Appendix A.4. 429

Verifying the O(3) Equivariance. To evaluate the effectiveness of *GoeCTP*, we conducted exper-430 iments to verify the O(3) equivariance of tensor properties. Specifically, after training GoeCTP, 431 we extracted its Prediction module (i.e., eComFormer) for comparative testing on two different test

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Fnorm ↓	143.86	123.64	117.62	107.11
EwT 25% ↑	23.6%	32.0%	36.0%	42.5%
EwT 10% ↑	3.0%	3.8%	7.6%	15.3%
EwT 5% ↑	0.5%	0.5%	2.0%	7.2%

Table 4: Comparison of performance metrics between MEGNET, ETGNN, GMTNet, and GoeCTP on the elastic dataset.

478

439

sets (original test set and augmented test set). All crystals in the original test set were adjusted to the standardized crystal position, while the augmented test set was generated by applying arbitrary O(3) group transformations to all crystals in the original test set. The method for generating the corresponding orthogonal matrices is from Heiberger (1978). We then evaluated both the Prediction module (eComFormer) and *GoeCTP* on these two datasets and compared the performance metrics.

447 The results on the dielectric tensor dataset are shown in Table 5. *GoeCTP* performed equally well on 448 the augmented test set as on the original test set, indicating that it maintains strong O(3) equivariance 449 for tensor properties. In contrast, the performance of the eComFormer method significantly declined on the augmented test set, with Fnorm decreasing by nearly 45%, demonstrating that it does not 450 meet the O(3) equivariance requirements for tensor properties. The results on the piezoelectric 451 tensor dataset are presented in Table 6. Similar to the dielectric tensor dataset, GoeCTP maintained 452 consistent performance between the augmented and original test sets. In contrast, the eComFormer 453 method exhibited a decline in performance on the augmented test set, indicating its inability to 454 fully satisfy the O(3) equivariance requirements for tensor properties. The results on the elastic 455 tensor dataset are shown in Table 7. Similar to the dielectric tensor dataset, the performance of 456 the eComFormer method significantly declined on the augmented test set, with Fnorm dropping by 457 nearly 29%. In contrast, GoeCTP's performance remained unchanged, further demonstrating the 458 effectiveness of the GoeCTP method. Additionally, runtime comparisons between GoeCTP and 459 eComFormer on the test set showed that GoeCTP introduced no significant increase in runtime. 460 This indicates that when integrated into single-value property prediction networks, *GoeCTP* incurs almost no additional computational cost, enhancing its practicality without compromising efficiency. 461

	eCom. (ori. data)	eCom. (aug. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (ori. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (aug. data)
Fnorm ↓	3.23	4.71	3.23	3.23
EwT 25% ↑	83.2%	69.7%	83.2%	83.2%
EwT 10% †	56.8%	42.7%	56.8%	56.8%
EwT 5% ↑	35.5%	22.5%	35.5%	35.5%
Total Time (s) \downarrow	26.03	26.01	26.23	26.18

Table 5: Ablation study for verifying the O(3) equivariance with dielectric dataset.

	eCom. (ori. data)	eCom. (aug. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (ori. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (aug. data)
Fnorm ↓	0.448	0.496	0.448	0.448
EwT 25% ↑	44.9%	44.3%	44.9%	44.9%
EwT 10% ↑	43.1%	42.1%	43.1%	43.1%
EwT 5% ↑	40.1%	38.3%	40.1%	40.1%
Total Time (s) \downarrow	12.83	12.23	13.01	12.71

Table 6: Ablation study for verifying the O(3) equivariance with piezoelectric dataset.

Efficiency. The results presented in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10 illustrate the running times for *GoeCTP* and baseline methods. On the dielectric dataset, *GoeCTP* completed the entire training process with only 38.2% of the time spent compared to GMTNet. On the piezoelectric dataset, *GoeCTP* completed the entire training process with only 16.3% of the time spent compared to GMTNet. On the elastic dataset, *GoeCTP* required less than 7.0% of the time spent by GMTNet to complete the entire training process. To achieve O(3) equivariance for tensor properties, GMTNet's network architecture relies on irreducible representations and tensor operations, which considerably reduce computational efficiency, especially for higher-order tensor property (elastic tensor) prediction tasks

6		eCom. (ori. data)	eCom. (aug. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (ori. data)	GoeCTP (Ours) (aug. data)
7	Fnorm ↓	107.11	138.45	107.11	107.11
8	EwT 25% ↑	42.5%	25.9%	42.5%	42.5%
9	EwT 10% ↑	15.3%	2.2%	15.3%	15.3%
-	EwT 5% ↑	7.2%	0.2%	7.2%	7.2%
0	Total Time (s) \downarrow	83.26	83.02	90.10	89.60
11		•			

Table 7: Ablation study for verifying the O(3) equivariance with elastic dataset.

where the time cost of GMTNet increases sharply. In contrast, GoeCTP requires no special architectural design for tensor property prediction tasks; it predicts tensor properties of varying orders using only a MLP at the network's output, ensuring both efficiency and scalability across different tensor orders.

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Total Time (s) \downarrow	663	1325	1611	616
Time/batch (s) \downarrow	0.052	0.104	0.126	0.048

Table 8: Efficiency comparison on the dielectric dataset.

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Total Time (s) \downarrow	843	1220	5771	938
Time/batch (s) \downarrow	0.065	0.095	0.45	0.073

Table 9: Efficiency comparison on the piezoelectric dataset.

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (Ours)
Total Time (s) \downarrow	2899	4448	> 36000	2422
Time/batch (s) \downarrow	0.226	0.348	> 2.813	0.189

Table 10: Efficiency comparison on the elastic dataset.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE WORKS

In this work, we propose a novel O(3)-equivariant framework *GoeCTP* for fast crystal tensor pre-diction, which is a plug-and-play framework that can be integrated with any existing single-value property prediction network, enabling them to predict tensor properties with almost no additional computational cost. Based on predicting invariant tensor properties from standardized crystal posi-tions and using an external module to ensure tensor equivariance, this approach has achieved state-of-the-art performance and the highest efficiency in different widely used crystal tensor property benchmark tests. The limitations of our current GoeCTP include (1) The performance of GoeCTP is inherently dependent on the performance of the Prediction module. (2) Currently, GoeCTP is specifically tailored for the prediction of tensor properties in crystalline materials and has not yet been adapted for other material types. In future work, we intend to explore the following directions: for (1), we aim to improve performance by integrating prior knowledge related to the independent components of tensor properties across different crystal systems in Appendix A.3 (Further discussion on the utilization of space group constraints on tensor properties can be found in Appendix A.6); for (2), we plan to extend the framework to other domains, such as 3D point cloud research, broadening its applicability. Seeing Appendix A.5 for more extensibility and limitations details.

540 REFERENCES

552

553

554

562

563

565

566 567

573

574

575

576

586

592

- Chi Chen, Weike Ye, Yunxing Zuo, Chen Zheng, and Shyue Ping Ong. Graph networks as a universal
 machine learning framework for molecules and crystals. *Chemistry of Materials*, 31(9):3564–3572, 2019.
- Kamal Choudhary and Brian DeCost. Atomistic line graph neural network for improved materials
 property predictions. *npj Computational Materials*, 7(1):185, 2021.
- Kishalay Das, Bidisha Samanta, Pawan Goyal, Seung-Cheol Lee, Satadeep Bhattacharjee, and Niloy
 Ganguly. Crysgnn: Distilling pre-trained knowledge to enhance property prediction for crystalline
 materials. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 7323– 7331, 2023.
 - Maarten De Jong, Wei Chen, Henry Geerlings, Mark Asta, and Kristin Aslaug Persson. A database to enable discovery and design of piezoelectric materials. *Scientific data*, 2(1):1–13, 2015.
- Mario Geiger and Tess Smidt. e3nn: Euclidean neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.09453*, 2022.

Semën Gorfman and Nan Zhang. Piezoelectric coefficients and crystallographic symmetry. *Piezoelectric Materials: From Fundamentals to Emerging Applications*, 1:1–15, 2024.

- Brian C Hall and Brian C Hall. *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations*. Springer, 2013.
 - Richard M Heiberger. Algorithm as 127: Generation of random orthogonal matrices. *Applied Statistics*, pp. 199–206, 1978.
 - Alex Heilman, Claire Schlesinger, and Qimin Yan. Equivariant graph neural networks for prediction of tensor material properties of crystals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03563*, 2024.
- Nicholas J Higham. Computing the polar decomposition—with applications. SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing, 7(4):1160–1174, 1986.
- Emiel Hoogeboom, Victor Garcia Satorras, Clément Vignac, and Max Welling. Equivariant diffusion for molecule generation in 3d. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 8867–8887. PMLR, 2022.
 - Yakov Itin and Friedrich W Hehl. The constitutive tensor of linear elasticity: its decompositions, cauchy relations, null lagrangians, and wave propagation. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54 (4), 2013.
- Rui Jiao, Wenbing Huang, Yu Liu, Deli Zhao, and Yang Liu. Space group constrained crystal
 generation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- 579
 580
 580
 581
 581
 582
 582
 583
 584
 584
 584
 585
 585
 586
 586
 586
 587
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
 588
- Yuchao Lin, Keqiang Yan, Youzhi Luo, Yi Liu, Xiaoning Qian, and Shuiwang Ji. Efficient approximations of complete interatomic potentials for crystal property prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 21260–21287. PMLR, 2023.
- Yuchao Lin, Jacob Helwig, Shurui Gui, and Shuiwang Ji. Equivariance via minimal frame averaging for more symmetries and efficiency. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Confer- ence on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- 593 Yuchen Lou and Alex M Ganose. Discovery of highly anisotropic dielectric crystals with equivariant graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07915*, 2024.

594 Steph-Yves Louis, Yong Zhao, Alireza Nasiri, Xiran Wang, Yuqi Song, Fei Liu, and Jianjun Hu. 595 Graph convolutional neural networks with global attention for improved materials property pre-596 diction. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 22(32):18141–18148, 2020. 597 Zetian Mao, Wenwen Li, and Jethro Tan. Dielectric tensor prediction for inorganic materials using 598 latent information from preferred potential. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09052, 2024. 600 Koichi Momma and Fujio Izumi. Vesta 3 for three-dimensional visualization of crystal, volumetric 601 and morphology data. Journal of applied crystallography, 44(6):1272–1276, 2011. 602 Kazuki Morita, Daniel W Davies, Keith T Butler, and Aron Walsh. Modeling the dielectric constants 603 of crystals using machine learning. The Journal of Chemical Physics, 153(2), 2020. 604 605 Kostya S Novoselov, Da Jiang, F Schedin, TJ Booth, VV Khotkevich, SV Morozov, and Andre K 606 Geim. Two-dimensional atomic crystals. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102 (30):10451-10453, 2005.607 608 John Frederick Nye. *Physical properties of crystals: their representation by tensors and matrices.* 609 Oxford university press, 1985. 610 Teerachote Pakornchote, Annop Ektarawong, and Thiparat Chotibut. Straintensornet: Predicting 611 crystal structure elastic properties using se (3)-equivariant graph neural networks. Physical Re-612 view Research, 5(4):043198, 2023. 613 614 Ioannis Petousis, Wei Chen, Geoffroy Hautier, Tanja Graf, Thomas D Schladt, Kristin A Persson, 615 and Fritz B Prinz. Benchmarking density functional perturbation theory to enable high-throughput 616 screening of materials for dielectric constant and refractive index. *Physical Review B*, 93(11): 617 115151, 2016. 618 Omri Puny, Matan Atzmon, Edward J Smith, Ishan Misra, Aditya Grover, Heli Ben-Hamu, and 619 Yaron Lipman. Frame averaging for invariant and equivariant network design. In *International* 620 Conference on Learning Representations, 2022. 621 Zheng Ran, Chunming Zou, Zunjie Wei, and Hongwei Wang. Velas: An open-source toolbox for 622 visualization and analysis of elastic anisotropy. Computer Physics Communications, 283:108540, 623 2023. 624 625 Raffaele Resta. Macroscopic polarization in crystalline dielectrics: the geometric phase approach. 626 Reviews of modern physics, 66(3):899, 1994. 627 Victor Garcia Satorras, Emiel Hoogeboom, and Max Welling. E (n) equivariant graph neural net-628 works. In International conference on machine learning, pp. 9323–9332. PMLR, 2021. 629 630 Peter C Sherrell, Marco Fronzi, Nick A Shepelin, Alexander Corletto, David A Winkler, Mike Ford, Joseph G Shapter, and Amanda V Ellis. A bright future for engineering piezoelectric 2d crystals. 631 Chemical Society Reviews, 51(2):650-671, 2022. 632 633 Yuxuan Song, Jingjing Gong, Minkai Xu, Ziyao Cao, Yanyan Lan, Stefano Ermon, Hao Zhou, 634 and Wei-Ying Ma. Equivariant flow matching with hybrid probability transport for 3d molecule 635 generation. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024. 636 Tatsunori Taniai, Ryo Igarashi, Yuta Suzuki, Naoya Chiba, Kotaro Saito, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and 637 Kanta Ono. Crystalformer: Infinitely connected attention for periodic structure encoding. In The 638 Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, 2024. 639 640 Yingheng Wang, Shufeng Kong, John M Gregoire, and Carla P Gomes. Conformal crystal graph 641 transformer with robust encoding of periodic invariance. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference 642 on Artificial Intelligence, volume 38, pp. 283–291, 2024a. 643 Zhenzhong Wang, Haowei Hua, Wanyu Lin, Ming Yang, and Kay Chen Tan. Crystalline material 644 discovery in the era of artificial intelligence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08044, 2024b. 645 Mingjian Wen, Matthew K Horton, Jason M Munro, Patrick Huck, and Kristin A Persson. An 646 equivariant graph neural network for the elasticity tensors of all seven crystal systems. Digital 647 Discovery, 3(5):869-882, 2024.

- Tian Xie and Jeffrey C Grossman. Crystal graph convolutional neural networks for an accurate and interpretable prediction of material properties. *Physical review letters*, 120(14):145301, 2018.
- Minkai Xu, Jiaqi Han, Aaron Lou, Jean Kossaifi, Arvind Ramanathan, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli,
 Jure Leskovec, Stefano Ermon, and Anima Anandkumar. Equivariant graph neural operator for
 modeling 3d dynamics. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Keqiang Yan, Yi Liu, Yuchao Lin, and Shuiwang Ji. Periodic graph transformers for crystal material property prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15066–15080, 2022.
 - Keqiang Yan, Cong Fu, Xiaofeng Qian, Xiaoning Qian, and Shuiwang Ji. Complete and efficient graph transformers for crystal material property prediction. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a.
 - Keqiang Yan, Alexandra Saxton, Xiaofeng Qian, Xiaoning Qian, and Shuiwang Ji. A space group symmetry informed network for 0 (3) equivariant crystal tensor prediction. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024b.
 - Zinan Zheng, Yang Liu, Jia Li, Jianhua Yao, and Yu Rong. Relaxing continuous constraints of equivariant graph neural networks for broad physical dynamics learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 4548–4558, 2024.
 - Yang Zhong, Hongyu Yu, Xingao Gong, and Hongjun Xiang. A general tensor prediction framework based on graph neural networks. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 14(28):6339–6348, 2023.

A APPENDIX

657

658

659

660

661

662

663 664

665

666

667

668

669

670 671 672

673 674

675 676

677

678

679

680

681

694

695

696

A.1 DETAILS OF ECOMFORMER

The eComFormer has demonstrated strong performance across a range of single-value property prediction tasks (Yan et al., 2024a). It is built on an SO(3)-equivariant crystal graph representation, where the interatomic distance vectors are employed to represent the edge features of the graph. The model converts this crystal graph into embeddings and utilizes a transformer architecture, incorporating both a node-wise transformer layer and a node-wise equivariant updating layer, to extract rich geometric information during the message-passing process.



Figure 3: The detailed architectures of the node-wise transformer layer and node-wise equivariant updating layer, adapted from Yan et al. (2024a).

697 Specifically, the node-wise transformer layer is responsible for updating the node-invariant fea-698 tures f_i . This process utilizes the node features f_i , neighboring node features f_j , and edge fea-699 tures f_{ij} to facilitate message passing from neighboring node j to the central node i, followed 699 by aggregation of all neighboring messages to update f_i . The update mechanism is structured 691 similarly to a transformer. Fristly, the message from node j to node i is transformed into cor-692 responding query $q_{ij} = \text{LN}_Q(f_i)$, key $k_{ij} = (\text{LN}_K(f_i)|\text{LN}_K(f_j))$, and value feature $v_{ij} =$

702 $(LN_V(f_i)|LN_V(f_j)|LN_E(f_{ij}))$, where $LN_Q(\cdot)$, $LN_K(\cdot)$, $LN_V(\cdot)$, $LN_E(\cdot)$ denote the linear trans-703 formations, and | denote the concatenation. Then, the self-attention output is then computed as: 704

708

709

711 712 713

726

727

733

734 735 736

737

738

739 740

741

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{\boldsymbol{q}_{ij} \circ \boldsymbol{\xi}_K(\boldsymbol{k}_{ij})}{\sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{q}_{ij}}}}, \boldsymbol{msg}_{ij} = \text{sigmoid}(\text{BN}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij})) \circ \boldsymbol{\xi}_V(\boldsymbol{v}_{ij}),$$
(12)

where ξ_K , ξ_V represent nonlinear transformations applied to key and value features, respectively, and the operators \circ denote the Hadamard product, $\xi_{msq}(\cdot)$ refers to the batch normalization layer, and $\sqrt{d_{q_{ij}}}$ indicates the dimensionality of q_{ij} . Then, node feature f_i is updated as follows, 710

$$msg_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} msg_{ij}, f_i^{new} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{msg}(\boldsymbol{f}_i + BN(\boldsymbol{m}sg_i)),$$
 (13)

714 where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{msg}(\cdot)$ denoting the softplus activation function. 715

The node-wise equivariant updating layer is designed to effectively capture geometric features by 716 incorporating node feature \mathbf{a}_i and edge feature $||\mathbf{e}_{ji}||_2$ as inputs and stacking two tensor product (TP) 717 layers (Geiger & Smidt, 2022). It uses node feature f_i^l and equivalent vector feature e_{ji} embedded 718 by corresponding spherical harmonics $\mathbf{Y}_0(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ji}) = c_0, \mathbf{Y}_1(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ji}) = c_1 * \frac{\mathbf{e}_{ji}}{||\mathbf{e}_{ij}||_2} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{Y}_2(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ji}) \in \mathbb{R}^5$ 719 to represent the input features. Gathering rotational information from neighboring nodes to the 720 central node *i*, the first TP layer is shown as 721

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{i,0}^{l} = \boldsymbol{f}_{i}^{l'} + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_{i}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{0}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j}^{l'}, \mathbf{Y}_{0}(\hat{\mathbf{e}_{ji}})), \boldsymbol{f}_{i,\lambda}^{l} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_{i}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j}^{l'}, \mathbf{Y}_{\lambda}(\hat{\mathbf{e}_{ji}})), \lambda \in \{1, 2\},$$

$$(14)$$

where $f_i^{j'}$ is linearly transformed from f_i^{j} , $|\mathcal{N}_i|$ and \mathbf{TP}_{λ} represent the number of neighbors of node i and TP layers with rotation order λ respectively. Then, to represent the invariant node features, the second TP layer is written as

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{i}^{l*} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_{i}|} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{0}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j,0}^{l}, \mathbf{Y}_{0}(\hat{\mathbf{e_{ji}}})) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{0}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j,1}^{l}, \mathbf{Y}_{1}(\hat{\mathbf{e_{ji}}})) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \mathbf{TP}_{0}(\boldsymbol{f}_{j,2}^{l}, \mathbf{Y}_{2}(\hat{\mathbf{e_{ji}}}))), \right)$$
(15)

stacking the two tensor product layers together using both linear and nonlinear transformations, the output $f_{i.updated}^{l}$ is combined as

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{i,updated}^{l} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\text{equi}}(\text{BN}(\boldsymbol{f}_{i}^{l*})) + \text{LN}_{\text{equi}}(\boldsymbol{f}_{i}^{l}),$$
(16)

with $\sigma_{\rm equi}$ denoting a nonlinear transformation made up of two softplus layers with a linear layer positioned between them. The detailed architectures of the node-wise transformer layer and nodewise equivariant updating layer are shown in Fig. 3.

A.2 O(3) EQUIVARIANCE FOR CRYSTAL TENSOR PROPERTIES

742 The O(3) equivariance required for crystal tensor property prediction tasks differs from the O(3)743 equivariance typically encountered in general molecular studies (Hoogeboom et al., 2022; Xu et al., 744 2024; Song et al., 2024). In molecular studies, for a function $f : (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}) \to \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if it is 745 O(3) equivariant, then it satisfies $f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{QL}) = \mathbf{Q}f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$, where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an arbitrary 746 orthogonal matrix. Here, the function f can be seen as the model.

747 Dielectric tensor. However, in the prediction of crystal tensor properties, such as the dielectric 748 tensor $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, the requirements for O(3) equivariance differ. For a function $f: (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}) \to \varepsilon$, 749 if it is O(3) equivariant, it must satisfy $f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{QL}) = \mathbf{Q}f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})\mathbf{Q}^T$. The specific reason for 750 this difference can be referenced in the previous work (Yan et al., 2024b), and is rooted in the fact 751 that the dielectric tensor characterizes a material's polarization response to an external electric field, 752 describing the relationship between the electric displacement $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and the applied electric field 753 $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ by $\mathbf{D} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}$. When an O(3) group transformation \mathbf{Q} is applied to the crystal structure, we have $\mathbf{D}' = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' \mathbf{E}'$, where $\mathbf{D}' = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{E}' = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{E}$. This results in the transformation of the 754 dielectric tensor under O(3) group transformation as $\varepsilon' = \mathbf{Q}\varepsilon\mathbf{Q}^T$. This transformation principle 755 extends similarly to other crystal tensors, as follows.

 $\mathbf{D}_i' = \sum_\ell \mathbf{Q}_{i\ell} \mathbf{D}_\ell$

 $=\sum_{\ell}\mathbf{Q}_{i\ell}\sum_{jk}\mathbf{e}_{\ell jk}oldsymbol{\epsilon}_{jk}$

Piezoelectric tensor. The piezoelectric tensor $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}$, describes the relationship between the applied strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ to the electric displacement field $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ within the material. Mathematically, this relationship is expressed as $\mathbf{D}_i = \sum_{jk} \mathbf{e}_{ijk} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{jk}$, with $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. When an O(3) group transformation \mathbf{Q} is applied to the crystal, the strain tensor and electric displacement field is transformed to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{jk} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{mn}$ and $\mathbf{D}'_i = \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{Q}_{i\ell} \mathbf{D}_{\ell}$. The relation is then reformulated as $\mathbf{D}'_i = \sum_{jk} \mathbf{e}'_{ijk} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{jk}$.

Since **Q** is orthogonal matrix ($\mathbf{Q}^{-1} = \mathbf{Q}^T$), we have $\epsilon_{jk} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{mj} \mathbf{Q}_{nk} \epsilon'_{mn}$. Consequently, \mathbf{D}'_i can be represented as

 $= \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{Q}_{i\ell} \sum_{jk} \mathbf{e}_{\ell jk} (\sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{mj} \mathbf{Q}_{nk} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{mn})$ $= \sum_{\ell} \mathbf{Q}_{i\ell} \sum_{mn} \mathbf{e}_{\ell mn} (\sum_{jk} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{jk}) \quad (exchange sign, m \leftrightarrow j, n \leftrightarrow k)$ $= \sum_{jk} \sum_{lmn} \mathbf{Q}_{il} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \mathbf{e}_{lmn} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{jk}$

Therefore, under the O(3) group transformation **Q**, the transformed piezoelectric tensor \mathbf{e}'_{ijk} is given by:

$$\mathbf{e}_{ijk}' = \sum_{lmn} \mathbf{Q}_{il} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \mathbf{e}_{lmn}.$$
 (18)

(17)

783 When employing GoeCTP to predict the piezoelectric tensor, Equation 11 becomes $\mathbf{e}_{ijk}^{\text{final}} = \sum_{lmn} \mathbf{Q}_{il} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \mathbf{e}_{lmn}$.

Elastic tensor. The elastic tensor $C \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3}$ relates the applied strain $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ to the stress tensor $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ within the material, expressed as: $\sigma_{ij} = \sum_{k\ell} C_{ijk\ell} \epsilon_{k\ell}$, with $i, j, k, \ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. When an O(3) group transformation \mathbf{Q} is applied to the crystal, the strain tensor and stress tensor is transformed to $\epsilon'_{jk} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \epsilon_{mn}$ and $\sigma'_{jk} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{jm} \mathbf{Q}_{kn} \sigma_{mn}$. The relation becomes $\sigma'_{ij} = \sum_{k\ell} C'_{ijk\ell} \epsilon'_{k\ell}$.

Because Q is orthogonal matrix ($\mathbf{Q}^{-1} = \mathbf{Q}^T$), we have $\epsilon_{jk} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{mj} \mathbf{Q}_{nk} \epsilon'_{mn}$, then σ'_{ij} can be represented as

$$\sigma'_{ij} = \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \sigma_{mn}$$

$$= \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \sum_{pq} C_{mnpq} \epsilon_{pq}$$

$$= \sum_{mn} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \sum_{pq} C_{mnpq} \sum_{k\ell} \mathbf{Q}_{kp} \mathbf{Q}_{\ell q} \epsilon'_{k\ell}$$

$$= \sum_{k\ell} \sum_{mnpq} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \mathbf{Q}_{kp} \mathbf{Q}_{lq} C_{mnpq} \epsilon'_{k\ell}$$
(19)

Therefore, under the O(3) group transformation **Q**, C'_{ijkl} is represented as:

$$C'_{ijkl} = \sum_{mnpq} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \mathbf{Q}_{kp} \mathbf{Q}_{lq} C_{mnpq}.$$
(20)

When GoeCTP is used to predict elastic tensor, Equation 11 becomes $C_{ijkl}^{\text{final}} = \sum_{mnpq} \mathbf{Q}_{im} \mathbf{Q}_{jn} \mathbf{Q}_{kp} \mathbf{Q}_{lq} C_{mnpq}$.

810A.3TENSOR PROPERTIES SYMMETRY811

812 Tensor properties, such as dielectric tensors and elastic tensors, describe the material's response 813 to external physical fields (such as electric fields or mechanical stress). In materials with symmetry, this response must adhere to the symmetry requirements of the material. As demonstrated by 814 Yan et al. (2024b), when the space group transformation \mathbf{R} is applied to the corresponding crystal 815 structure $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L})$, the crystal remains unchanged, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}) = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{RL})$. Therefore, 816 the corresponding tensor properties also remain unchanged, i.e., $\varepsilon = \mathbf{R} \varepsilon \mathbf{R}^T$. Thus, crystal sym-817 metry imposes strict constraints on the components of the tensor, leading to the simplification or 818 elimination of many components, reducing the number of independent components. 819

Crystal system	Number of independent elements	Dielectric tensor		
Cubic	1	$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} \end{pmatrix}$)	
Tetragonal & Hexagonal & Trigonal	2	$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{33} \end{pmatrix}$)	
Orthorhombic	3	$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{33} \end{pmatrix}$)	
Monoclinic	4	$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} & 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{13} \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{22} & 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{13} & 0 & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{33} \end{pmatrix}$)	
Triclinic	6	$oldsymbol{arepsilon} oldsymbol{arepsilon} oldsymbol{arepsilon} = egin{pmatrix} oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{11} & oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{12} & oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{12} & oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{22} & oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{23} & oldsymb$)	

835 836 837

854

855

859

861

820 821

823 824 825

Table 11: Number of independent components in the dielectric tensor for different crystal systems.

Independent components in the dielectric tensor. The 3 × 3 dielectric tensor has a minimum of 1
and a maximum of 6 independent elements for various types of systems due to the crystal symmetry.
The number of independent components in the dielectric tensor for different crystal systems is shown
in Tabel 11 (Mao et al., 2024).

Voigt notation for elastic tensor. Similar to the dielectric tensor, the elastic tensor also has independent elements for various types of systems due to the crystal symmetry. The elastic tensor has a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 21 independent elements for various types of systems. Voigt notation is a compact way to represent these independent components of tensor properties (Itin & Hehl, 2013). According to the rules $11 \rightarrow 1$; $22 \rightarrow 2$; $33 \rightarrow 3$; 23, $32 \rightarrow 4$; 31, $13 \rightarrow 5$; 12, $21 \rightarrow 6$, the elastic tensor in Voigt notation is a 6×6 symmetric matrix (Wen et al., 2024; Ran et al., 2023):

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} C_{1111} & C_{1122} & C_{1133} & C_{1123} & C_{1131} & C_{1112} \\ C_{1122} & C_{2222} & C_{2233} & C_{2223} & C_{2231} & C_{2212} \\ C_{1133} & C_{2233} & C_{3333} & C_{3323} & C_{3331} & C_{3312} \\ C_{1123} & C_{2223} & C_{3323} & C_{2331} & C_{2312} \\ C_{1131} & C_{2231} & C_{3311} & C_{2331} & C_{3131} & C_{3112} \\ C_{1112} & C_{2212} & C_{3312} & C_{2312} & C_{3112} & C_{1212} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} & C_{14} & C_{15} & C_{16} \\ C_{12} & C_{22} & C_{23} & C_{24} & C_{25} & C_{26} \\ C_{13} & C_{23} & C_{33} & C_{33} & C_{35} \\ C_{14} & C_{24} & C_{34} & C_{44} & C_{45} & C_{46} \\ C_{15} & C_{25} & C_{35} & C_{45} & C_{55} & C_{56} \\ C_{16} & C_{26} & C_{36} & C_{46} & C_{56} & C_{66} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(21)$$

The number of independent components in the elastic tensor for different crystal systems is shown in Tabel 12 (partial data shown; for more details, refer to Wen et al. (2024); Ran et al. (2023)).

Voigt notation for piezoelectric tensor. The number of independent components in the piezoelectric tensor for different crystal systems is shown in Tabel 13 (partial data shown; for more details, refer to De Jong et al. (2015); Gorfman & Zhang (2024)).

A.4 EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS AND ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Hyperparameter settings of GoeCTP. When constructing the crystal graph, we used the 16th nearest atom to determine the cutoff radius. For edge embeddings, we used an RBF kernel with c = 0.75and values ranging from -4 to 0, which maps $-c/||\mathbf{e}_{ij}||_2$ to a 512-dimensional vector. In the

864	Crystal system	Number of independent elements			Ela	stic te	nsor		
865				$/C_{11}$	C_{12}	C_{12}	0	0	0 \
866				C_{12}^{11}	C_{11}^{12}	C_{12}^{12}	Ő	Õ	0
867	Cubic	3	C =	C_{12}	C_{12}	C_{11}	0	0	0
868	Cubic	5	0 -	0	0	0	C_{44}	0	0
869					0	0	0	0	Cul
870				$\rangle_{C_{11}}$	C_{12}	C_{13}	0	0	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \end{pmatrix}$
070				C_{12}^{11}	C_{11}^{12}	C_{13}^{10}	0	0	0
871	Tetragonal	6	C =	C_{13}	C_{13}	C_{33}	0	0	0
872	retragonar	0	0 -	0	0	0	C_{44}	0	0
873				0	0	0	0	C_{44}	0
874				\sum_{α}^{0}	0	0	0	0	C_{66}
075				$\begin{bmatrix} C_{11} \\ C_{12} \end{bmatrix}$	C_{12}	C_{13}	0	0	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$
C10				C_{12}	C_{22}	C_{23}	0	0	
876	Orthorhombic	9	C =	0	0	033	C	0	0 I
877				0	0	0	0	C_{55}	0
878				0	0	0	0	0	C_{66}
970				C_{11}	C_{12}	C_{13}	C_{14}	C_{15}	C_{16}
019				C_{12}	C_{22}	C_{23}	C_{24}	C_{25}	C_{26}
880	Triclinic	21	C =	C_{13}	C_{23}	C_{33}	C_{34}	C_{35}	C_{36}
881			~	C_{14}	C_{24}	C_{34}	C_{44}	C_{45}	C_{46}
882				C_{15}	C_{25}	C_{35}	C_{45}	C_{55}	C_{56}
883				1016	€26	036	U46	$_{56}$	066/

Table 12: Number of independent components in the elastic tensor for different crystal systems.

Crystal system	point groups Number of independent elements		Piezoelectric tensor					
Trigonal	32	2	$\mathbf{e} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{11} & -\mathbf{e}_{11} & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{14} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{e}_{14} & -\mathbf{e}_{11}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$					
Monoclinic	2	8	$\mathbf{e} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{14} & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{16} \\ \mathbf{e}_{21} & \mathbf{e}_{22} & \mathbf{e}_{23} & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{25} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{34} & 0 & \mathbf{e}_{36} \end{pmatrix}$					
Triclinic	1	18	$\mathbf{e} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{11} & \mathbf{e}_{12} & \mathbf{e}_{13} & \mathbf{e}_{14} & \mathbf{e}_{15} & \mathbf{e}_{16} \\ \mathbf{e}_{21} & \mathbf{e}_{22} & \mathbf{e}_{23} & \mathbf{e}_{24} & \mathbf{e}_{25} & \mathbf{e}_{26} \\ \mathbf{e}_{31} & \mathbf{e}_{32} & \mathbf{e}_{33} & \mathbf{e}_{34} & \mathbf{e}_{35} & \mathbf{e}_{36} \end{pmatrix}$					

Table 13: Number of independent components in the piezoelectric tensor for different crystal systems.

dielectric and piezoelectric tensor prediction task, the 512-dimensional vector is mapped to a 128-dimensional vector through a non-linear layer, while in the elastic tensor prediction, it is mapped to a 256-dimensional vector. For the prediction module, eComFormer, in the dielectric tensor prediction task, we used 4 node-wise transformer layers and 1 node-wise equivariant updating layer, whereas in the piezoelectric and elastic tensor prediction, we used 2 node-wise transformer layers and 1 node-wise equivariant updating layer. For both dielectric, piezoelectric, and elastic tensor tasks, the learning rate was set to 0.001, with 200 epochs and a batch size of 64. In the Reverse R&R module, for the dielectric tensor prediction task, the 128-dimensional vector features output by the predic-tion module are mapped to a 6-dimensional vector through two non-linear layers, then reconstructed into a 3×3 matrix and combined with the orthogonal matrix **Q** obtained from the R&R module to achieve O(3) equivariant output. For the piezoelectric prediction task, the 18-dimensional vector features output by the prediction module are reconstructed into a 3×6 matrix and combined with the orthogonal matrix Q from the R&R module to achieve O(3) equivariant output. For the elastic ten-sor prediction task, the 256-dimensional vector features output by the prediction module are mapped to a 36-dimensional vector through two non-linear layers, then reconstructed into a 6×6 matrix and combined with the orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} from the R&R module to achieve O(3) equivariant output.

Hyperparameter settings of GMTNet, ETGNN, and MEGNET. Following Yan et al. (2024b), we trained GMTNet, ETGNN, and MEGNET for 200 epochs using Huber loss with a learning rate of 0.001 and Adam optimizer with 10^{-5} weight decay across all tasks. The same polynomial learning rate decay scheduler is used in all experiments.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	mean
MEGNET						
Fnorm ↓	3.62	3.70	3.66	3.74	3.81	3.71
EwT 25% ↑	76.0%	77.1%	75.6%	73.7%	76.4%	75.8 %
EwT 10% ↑	41.2%	39.3%	38.2%	39.7%	36.3%	38.9%
EwT 5% ↑	17.6%	16.8%	18.5%	19.1%	17.8%	18.0%
ETGNN						
Fnorm ↓	3.42	3.48	3.33	3.35	3.41	3.40
EwT 25% ↑	82.1%	81.7%	83.4%	82.6%	83.2%	82.6 %
EwT 10% ↑	46.9%	47.8%	50.7%	49.4%	50.5%	49.1%
EwT 5% ↑	22.3%	26.5%	27.1%	25.9%	24.6%	25.3%
GMTNet						
Fnorm ↓	2.98	3.64	3.23	3.16	3.39	3.28
EwT 25% ↑	83.4%	81.3%	83.8%	84.5%	83.7%	83.3 %
EwT 10% ↑	54.9%	56.2%	55.8%	56.2%	57.1%	56.0%
EwT 5% ↑	31.2%	30.5%	28.8%	29.3%	32.7%	30.5%
GoeCTP (Ours)						
Fnorm ↓	3.33	3.29	3.36	3.25	2.92	3.23
EwT 25% ↑	82.5%	83.4%	82.1%	83.9%	84.2%	83.2 %
EwT 10% ↑	57.5%	53.9%	56.4%	56.7%	59.7%	56.8%
EwT 5% ↑	36.9%	31.6%	37.1%	34.2%	37.8%	35.5%

Table 14: Comparison of 5 repeated experiments on dielectric dataset.

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (eCom.)	GoeCTP (iCom.)	GoeCTP (Crys.)
Fnorm ↓	3.71	3.40	3.28	3.23	3.40	3.53
EwT 25% ↑	75.8%	82.6%	83.3%	83.2%	81.7%	80.1%
EwT 10% †	38.9%	49.1%	56.0%	56.8%	53.8%	52.9%
EwT 5% †	18.0%	25.3%	30.5%	35.5%	32.3%	30.6%
Total Time (s) \downarrow	663	1325	1611	616	535	645
Time/batch (s) \downarrow	0.052	0.104	0.126	0.048	0.042	0.202

Table 15: Additional comparison of performance metrics on dielectric dataset.

Additional results. Given the relatively small size of the dielectric tensor dataset, along with other influencing factors, we observed some randomness in the results during repeated training runs, introducing noise into the outcome comparisons. To mitigate this effect and ensure the reliability of the results, we conducted five independent trials for each method, using the average of the performance metrics across these five trials as the final reported value. The detailed results from these repeated experiments are presented in Table 14.

We assessed the performance of GoeCTP when combined with iComFormer (Yan et al., 2024a) and CrystalFormer (Taniai et al., 2024) (denoted as GoeCTP (iCom.) for the combination) on both the dielectric tensor and elastic tensor datasets. As presented in Table 15, on the dielectric tensor dataset, although the prediction accuracy of GoeCTP (iCom.) and GoeCTP (Crys.) did not exceed that of GoeCTP (eCom.), GoeCTP (iCom.) demonstrated slightly higher computational efficiency compared to GoeCTP (eCom.). In contrast, as shown in Table 16, on the elastic tensor dataset, GoeCTP (iCom.) and GoeCTP (Crys.) achieved superior prediction quality relative to GoeCTP (eCom.), albeit with lower efficiency.

968 A.5 THE EXTENSIBILITY AND LIMITATIONS OF OUR METHOD

limitations. (1)As discussed in the main text, GoeCTP is a plug-and-play O(3)-equivariant framework designed to enhance the backbone network's ability to achieve equivariant predictions. Consequently, the performance of our method is inherently dependent on the capabilities of the backbone

	MEGNET	ETGNN	GMTNet	GoeCTP (eCom.)	GoeCTP (iCom.)	GoeCTP (Crys.)
Fnorm ↓	143.86	123.64	117.62	107.11	102.80	107.44
EwT 25% ↑	23.6%	32.0%	36.0%	42.5%	46.7%	43.5%
EwT 10% ↑	3.0%	3.8%	7.6%	15.3%	18.6%	15.8%
EwT 5% ↑	0.5%	0.5%	2.0%	7.2%	8.2%	7.9%
Total Time (s) \downarrow	2899	4448	> 36000	2422	4035	7891
Time/batch (s) \downarrow	0.226	0.348	> 2.813	0.189	0.315	0.616

Table 16: Additional comparison of performance metrics on elastic dataset.

network. If the backbone lacks sufficient predictive power, the combined framework may not fully
surpass the state-of-the-art tensor prediction networks in all evaluation metrics. For instance, as
shown in Table 15, when our framework is integrated with CrystalFormer (Taniai et al., 2024), although the computational speed significantly exceeds that of GMTNet, the Fnorm, EwT 25%, and
EwT 10% values are lower than those achieved by GMTNet.

(2)As demonstrated in Higham (1986) and Proposition 3.1, polar decomposition applied to a 3×3 988 invertible matrix L produces a unique 3×3 orthogonal matrix Q. For 3D crystal structures, the 989 lattice matrix L is always full-rank (i.e. invertible), therefore, ensuring the applicability of our 990 method to 3D crystal systems. However, for certain special cases, such as 2D crystals with single-991 layer structures (Novoselov et al., 2005; Sherrell et al., 2022), the rank of the lattice matrix L may be 992 less than 3. In these scenarios, directly applying polar decomposition may not yield an unique 3×3 993 orthogonal matrix Q and an unique standardized crystal position. H. This limitation could cause 994 our method to fail, as crystals with different spatial orientations cannot be consistently adjusted to 995 a unique standardized position, thereby preventing the method from achieving the desired O(3)-996 equivariance.

997 Extensibility. For the extensibility of our proposed method, a natural extension would be to adapt 998 it for use with 3D point cloud systems, such as 3D molecular systems. The ability of our method 999 to directly transmit rotational information renders it particularly effective for specialized equivariant 1000 tasks. For instance, in equivariant 3D molecular generation tasks, our approach can directly transfer 1001 equivariant information from time step 0 to time step T, bypassing multiple denoising networks 1002 (Hoogeboom et al., 2022). This is previous equivariant techniques such as equivariant network 1003 (Satorras et al., 2021) and frame averaging (Puny et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2024) cannot achieve. 1004 Specifically, a molecule in 3D space can be represented as $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X})$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_a \times n}$ denotes d_a -dimensional atom features for n atoms in the molecular, and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n}$ contains the 3D 1005 coordinates of these n atoms. To extend our method, polar decomposition would be applied to the 1006 coordinate matrix, such that $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Q} \exp(\mathbf{S})$. Then, the rotational information \mathbf{Q} can be transferred 1007 to the output of the network to complete the equivariant task. As demonstrated in Higham (1986), if 1008 the coordinate matrix is full-rank, the polar decomposition is unique, enabling a seamless extension 1009 of our method to 3D molecular systems. However, there are special cases where this approach may 1010 fail. For example, in a molecule composed of three atoms all lying within the same plane, the 1011 coordinate matrix \mathbf{X} may not be full-rank (e.g., when all atomic coordinates lie on a plane passing 1012 through the origin). This is similar to the scenario where our method is applied to 2D crystals, 1013 where directly applying polar decomposition may not yield a unique 3×3 orthogonal matrix Q 1014 and a unique standardized position **H**. Additionally, since proposed framework operates externally 1015 to the network and does not participate in actual training, it may potentially assist large language 1016 models in achieving equivariant prediction tasks.

1017

979

980 981 982

1018

1019 1020

A.6 How to further utilize the tensor properties symmetry

1020

In this section, we will use the dielectric tensor as an example to briefly discuss how to further utilize the symmetry of tensor properties.

1024 Utilizing symmetry constraints for zero elements. We first present an example of GoeCTP pre 1025 diction results, as shown in Fig. 17. It can be observed that, within a certain margin of error, our results are relatively consistent with the constraints.

	Label		F	Predictio	n	Cub	ic diel	ectric	tensor
$\begin{array}{c} 2.258 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2.258\\ 0\end{array}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ 0\\ 2.258 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2.252 \\ 0.016 \\ 0.008 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.016 \\ 2.230 \\ 0.007 \end{array}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.008 \\ 0.007 \\ 2.262 \end{pmatrix}$	$\epsilon =$	$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$egin{array}{c} 0 \ oldsymbol{arepsilon}_{11} \ 0 \ \end{array}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ 0\\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} \end{pmatrix}$

Table 17: An example of GoeCTP prediction results

For a dielectric tensor, using 1% of the average value of non-zero elements in the labels as a threshold, we judge whether the prediction for a zero element was successful. The results are as shown in Fig. 18.

-	Crystal system	Cubic	Tetragonal	Hexagonal-Trigonal	Orthorhombic	Monoclinic
	Success rate	88.3%	86.6%	84.5%	84.5%	75.7%

Table 18: The GoeCTP results of predicting symmetry-constrained zero-valued dielectric tensor elements.

1044 It can be observed that our method successfully predicts most zero elements, but it is not perfect. 1045 Since our advantage lies in transferring equivariance through an external framework, there are no 1046 restrictions on the model itself. Therefore, to achieve a higher success rate for zero elements, we 1047 added a ReLU activation function to the output layer of the network to improve the success rate (this 1048 applies only to cases where tensor elements are greater than or equal to zero; for other cases, specific 1049 activation functions need to be designed, such as ReLU(x - 0.01) - ReLU(-x)). The results after 1050 retraining GeoCTP are as follows:

	Label		1	Predictio	n	Cubi	ic diel	ectric	tensor
$\begin{pmatrix} 2.25\\ 0\\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$		$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\ 0\\ 2.258 \end{pmatrix}$	$\left \begin{array}{c} 2.237\\ 0.000\\ 0.000\end{array}\right $	$\begin{array}{c} 0.000\\ 2.283\\ 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.000 \\ 0.000 \\ 2.228 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \epsilon =$	$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{11} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$egin{array}{c} 0 \ m{arepsilon}_{11} \ 0 \end{array}$	$egin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ m{arepsilon}_{11} \end{pmatrix}$

Table 19: An example of GoeCTP (ReLU) prediction results

Crystal system	Cubic	Tetragonal	Hexagonal-Trigonal	Orthorhombic	Monoclinic
Success rate	100%	100%	87.2%	100%	100%

Table 20: The GoeCTP (ReLU) results of predicting symmetry-constrained zero-valued dielectric tensor elements.

	GoeCTP	GoeCTP(relu)
Fnorm \downarrow	3.23	3.26
EwT 25% ↑	83.2%	82.6%
EwT 10% ↑	56.8%	58.4%
EwT 5% ↑	35.5%	36.3%

Table 21: Predictive performance comparisons between GoeCTP and GoeCTP (ReLU) on the dielectric dataset.

This simple modification allows our method to more accurately predict the zero elements in dielectric tensors caused by the space group.

1077 Utilizing symmetry constraints for non-zero elements. The example of utilizing symmetry constraints for zero elements is a simple illustration; when the space group of the input crystal is known, the prior knowledge in Appendix A.3 can be used to ensure that the network output fully obeys the constraints of tensor properties. For instance, the mask from Table 11 can be applied to weight

1080	the network output ensuring 100% compliance with the constraints. This was not experimentally
1081	demonstrated in our current work, but we plan to explore related studies in future work.
1082	
1083	
1084	
1085	
1086	
1087	
1088	
1089	
1090	
1091	
1092	
1093	
1094	
1095	
1096	
1097	
1098	
1099	
1100	
1101	
1102	
1103	
1104	
1105	
1106	
1107	
1108	
1109	
1110	
1111	
1112	
1113	
1114	
1115	
1116	
1117	
1110	
1120	
1120	
1121	
1122	
1123	
1125	
1126	
1127	
1128	
1129	
1130	
1131	
1132	
1133	