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Abstract—Diffusion is the movement of molecules from a region of higher concentration to a region of lower concentration. It can be used to describe the interactions among data points. In many machine learning problems including transductive semi-supervised learning and few-shot learning, the relationship between labeled and unlabeled data points is a critical component for high classification accuracy. In this paper, inspired by the convection-diffusion ODE, we propose a novel diffusion residual network (Diff-ResNet) to introduce diffusion mechanism into neural networks internally. Under the structured data assumption, it is proved that the diffusion mechanism can increase the distance-diameter ratio that improves the separability of inter-class points and reduces the distance among local intra-class points. This property can be easily adopted by the residual networks for constructing the separable hyperplanes. Extensive experiments of synthetic binary classification, semi-supervised graph node classification and few-shot image classification in various datasets validate the effectiveness of the proposed diffusion mechanism.
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1 INTRODUCTION

To better understand and improve the performance of deep neural networks, a recent line of works has mentioned the connection between ordinary differential equations (ODEs) and deep neural networks [1], [2], [3]. The analysis focuses on a specific network architecture called ResNet [4], which is a typical network architecture that introduces identity skip connections among different layers. Compared to non-residual networks, ResNet significantly improves the training stability and test performance. To demystify the success of ResNet, recent works interpret ResNet and its variants from the perspective of dynamical systems. The iterative updates can be seen as the Euler discretization of a continuous convection ODE. Based on the connection between neural network and ODE system, many network architectures have been developed with improved performance. The attempts are two-fold. One approach for designing networks is to unroll the ODE system via different discretization schemes, which build up an end-to-end mapping. Typical networks include PolyNet [5] which uses backward Euler scheme, FractalNet [6] v.s. Runge-Kutta scheme, linear multi-step network [7] v.s. multi-step scheme. The other approach is to add some new blocks into the current network architecture which is based on the modification of the ODE model, e.g. noise injection [8], stochastic dynamic system [9], adding a damping term [10].
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Despite these interesting connections, a question arises: the ODE counterpart of ResNet is a convection equation, which ignore any relationship between data points. Formally, the corresponding ODE is

\[
\frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = f(x_i(t), \theta(t)), \quad x_i(0) = x_i. \tag{1}
\]

where \(x_i(0)\) is the input data point, \(f\) represents each residual block. In the equation, each point \(x_i\) evolves independently. Although such evolution is acceptable when abundant training data is provided [4], [11], [12], the performance is significantly deteriorated as the number of supervised samples decreases. This is indeed an important problem since collecting labeled points requires intensive labor works, and is sometimes impossible due to privacy and safety in many application fields. To address the above issue, semi-supervised learning [13], [14] is proposed as a new type of learning method between traditional supervised and unsupervised learning, using large amount of unlabeled data, together with the labeled data, to build better classifiers. More recently, a new learning paradigm called few-shot learning [15], [16], has been proposed and become an important topic in machine learning. The goal of few-shot learning is to find the labels of points in the query set (unlabeled points) when the size of support set (labeled points) is very small. Few-shot learning is closely related to semi-supervised learning, and the difference lies in that the former has fewer labeled samples in each task, and has access to prior knowledge such as pretrained models. A crucial point in semi-supervised learning and few-shot learning is making use of the unlabeled samples to address the limited labeled set issue. To deal with the problem, we propose to introduce diffusion mechanism into the residual neural network.

The reason is that, diffusion can introduce the interactions among particles, which is a key component ignored in the convection equation. The convection equation is widely used
in describing physical phenomenon such as heat transfer, air or fluid movement. It describes a large movement, in roughly the same direction, of a large mass of particles. However, for instance in equation (1), the interaction among particles will be ignored with merely convection equation. In real world, as all objects are driven by a large combined effect such as gravity field, every object will also interact with each other. That is why diffusion and convection often appear simultaneously: to more faithfully describe the real world scenario. The convection-diffusion equation is a more precise interpretation of physical phenomena where particles or energy are transferred inside a collective physical system, including fluid dynamics [17], building physics [18], semiconductors [19] and so on. The broad application of convection-diffusion equation in physics motivates us to apply it to neural networks. As mentioned in equation (1), ResNet is closely related to convection ODE. On the other hand, many existing semi-supervised learning approaches only consider diffusion [20], [21], [22]. We intend to combine diffusion and convection by manipulating the convection corresponding ResNet.

There are two possible approaches: adding a Laplacian regularizer in the loss function, or adding a counterpart of diffusion term in the network structure. This paper chooses the latter for following reasons. The idea of introducing diffusion through adding a Laplacian regularizer is widely used in graph-based semi-supervised learning [23], [24]. The first variation of Laplacian regularizer coincides with the diffusion term in this paper. However, this approach only changes the objective function of the neural network, while the network structure remains the same. Intuitively, such method intends to achieve the desired diffusion effect through convection ResNet, which is not effective. In contrast, adding diffusion layers in the network structure, which is the method proposed in this paper, links convection and diffusion more closely. Moreover, it is verified experimentally in Section 5.3 that the second approach can obtain much better results compared to the first one. The above discussion motivates us to tighten the relationship between network architectures and convection-diffusion equation. Besides, we theoretically analyze the diffusive ODE and show its advantage in terms of distance-diameter ratio among data samples.

To sum up, the main contributions of this paper are listed as follows.

- We are the first in literature to incorporate diffusion into neural networks. The added diffusion layer is crucial for solving semi-supervised and few-shot problems as it strengthen the relationships among labeled and unlabeled data points. Moreover, our way of introducing diffusion mechanism is far more efficient than adding diffusion through objective function. It is also easy to implement with matrix multiplication. Thus, it is simple and effective.
- Under the structured data assumption [25], it is proved that diffusion mechanism is able to accelerate the classification process in the sense that samples from different subclasses can be driven apart, while samples from the same subclass will be brought together. Using such property, we can theoretically construct a residual network that ensures that output features are linear separable. This analysis provides the mathematical foundation of our method.
- Extensive experiments on various tasks and datasets validate our theoretical results and the advantages of the proposed Diff-ResNet.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The related work is given in Section 2. Section 3 presents the formulation and details of our diffusion residual network, and Section 4 provides theoretical the analysis of diffusion mechanism. Experimental results on various tasks are reported in Section 5. We conclude the paper in Section 6.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 Diffusion Mechanism

The idea of diffusion is widely used in various fields. In graph neural networks, [26] concludes a unified framework for graph diffusion, and proposes a preprocessing method that create a new graph based on diffusion. With spectral analysis of the new graph, they show that local clusters can be amplified while noise can be suppressed. Diffusion-Convolutional neural networks [27] learn diffusion-based representations from graph and use them as an effective basis for node classification. Diffusion is also used in diffusion map or eigenmap [28], [29], which uses linear diffusion PDEs with closed form solutions for dimension reduction. Different from linear dimensional reduction methods like principal component analysis (PCA), diffusion maps belongs to nonlinear methods that focus on the underlying manifold of data. It constructs a Markov chain based on diffusion process, which can capture the geometric structure of manifold at larger scales as the diffusion goes on. Diffusion is used by previous work to deal with data insufficiency. [30] diffuses the label information to propose an efficient criterion for switching between exploration and refinement in active learning. Recently, diffusion has been proposed to design new network architectures. DiffNet [31] constructs a diffusion process on a single image for semantic segmentation, and approximates the process by a cascade of random walks. [32] also adds a diffusion term into ODE induced by ResNet, but its diffusion is in the Euclidean space while ours is in the embedded manifold. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that applies the diffusion mechanism to ResNet with rigorous mathematical analysis.

2.2 Neural ODEs

The deep learning models and dynamical systems have closed relationship, which is firstly introduced in a proposal of E. et al. [1]. Using this connection, many works have been proposed for improving deep learning models. [33], [34] propose several training algorithms based on Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle condition and successive approximation method. Neural ODE [2] treats ResNet as the forward Euler discretization of an ordinary differential equation and adopt adjoint method to train the ODE model, which inspires a long list of work considering the relationship between ordinary differential equations and deep residual networks. These papers interpret ResNets as a discretization of dynamical
systems, where the dynamics at each step is a linear transformation followed by a non-linear activation function.\cite{3} treats deep networks as a parameter estimation problem of nonlinear dynamical systems, and propose new forward propagation techniques that relieve exploding or vanishing gradients problem.\cite{35} provides a unified framework for interpreting ResNets and its derivatives, such as PolyNet\cite{5} and FractalNet\cite{6}. Based on the framework, the author proposes a linear multi-step architecture. However, most ODE inspired residual networks cannot be directly applied to the semi-supervised problems as they need many supervised samples.

2.3 Graph-based semi-supervised learning

Graph-based SSL algorithms have received much attention\cite{13},\cite{20} because graph structure can effectively encode the relationship among data points. Graph-based semi-supervised learning is based on the assumption that nearby nodes tend to have the same labels. In graph, each sample is denoted by a vertex, and the weighted edge measures the similarity between samples.\cite{20} initially proposes the Gaussian Fields and Harmonic Functions (GFHF) algorithm, which aims to minimize the graph Laplacian objective function with the constraint on labeled points. After that,\cite{36} introduces Local and Global Consistency (LGC) algorithm, which differs from GFHF model in that the label for each sample is penalized to ensure regularity, and the hard label constraint is turned into a soft constraint using Laplacian multiplier. Belkin et al.\cite{37},\cite{38} proposes the manifold regularization framework, which employs a kernel-based regularization term. Such kernels are often derived from the graph Laplacian, which becomes a general extension of graph Laplacian regularization\cite{39},\cite{40}. Semi-supervised embedding\cite{23} extends the Laplacian regularizer from labels to network outputs, which imposes constraints on the parameters of a neural network. Nonetheless, our paper embeds the Laplacian regularization intrinsically in the neural network structure through diffusion layers, which is different from methods that use iterative approach to minimize the loss function, or those that adds a regularization term based on graph Laplacian to the objective function and uses vanilla networks to optimize.

2.4 Few-shot learning

To address the limited training samples problem, few-shot learning, a new learning paradigm\cite{15},\cite{41}, has been proposed and become an important topic in machine learning. The few-shot learning has been extensively explored in recent years, and there are many different kinds of methods. Among existing few-shot learning methods, embedding learning is a typical approach, which maps each sample to a low dimensional spaces such that similar samples are close while dissimilar samples are far away. The embedding method maps data samples to a feature space by training an embedding function from a large-scale dataset. In the feature space, another classifier is applied for classifying query data. Typical methods include Matching Network\cite{42}, which uses LSTM with attention mechanism and external memory to construct the embedding mappings for the query set and the support set. It firstly introduce the episode-based training method to match the training and testing condition. Prototypical Network\cite{43} compares the embedding of the query point with the prototype of each class and assign the query point to the same class of the nearest prototype. The work in\cite{44} introduces Relation Network that concatenates features of training and test samples as the embedding, and feeds it to another CNN to output a similarity score. It also introduces a deep distance metric instead of hand-crafted metrics like cosine distance. TADAM\cite{45} changes the metric for different tasks in order to use the specific information of each task. It introduces new parameters to scale the gradient and fine-tune the output of each convolutional blocks. Recently, Wang et al.\cite{46} shows that merely pretraining an embedding function on base classes along with nearest neighbor clustering in l2 distance can achieve competitive results. This line of work avoid complicated training strategies and get back on simple yet effective manipulations on embedded features. Following that, Laplacian regularized clustering\cite{47} adopts a regularizer based on graph Laplacian.\cite{48} rectifies the features to reduce the cross-class and intra-class bias, and use the rectified prototype to help clustering. Compared to the existing works, our method adopts similar embedding training procedure with different attached classifier that has good performance in various few-shot learning tasks. More importantly, under the suitable assumption, we establish a thorough theoretical analysis of the propose method.

3 DIFFUSION RESIDUAL NETWORKS

In this section, we introduce the diffusion mechanism from the ODE perspective and present the Diff-ResNet based on the numerical scheme for the diffusive ODE.

3.1 The ODE formulation

In ResNet\cite{4}, the feature map of a specific data point $x_i$ after the $k$-th residual block is defined as $x_i^k$. Residual connection means $x_i^k$ is added to $x_i^{k+1}$ via a skip identity link. If we gather convolutional layers, batch normalization layers and other layers together, and denote them as function $f$, each residual block can be written as

$$x_i^{k+1} = x_i^k + f(x_i^k, \theta^k),$$

(2)

where $\theta^k$ is the parameters of $k$-th block. From ODE perspective, $f$ can be seen as the velocity, while $x_i^k$ and $x_i^{k+1}$ can be treated as the start position and end position of $x_i$. Introducing a time step $\Delta t$ which can be absorbed in $f$, the ResNet can be seen as the forward Euler discretization of the following ODE model, which depicts the evolution of $x_i$:

$$\frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = f(x_i(t), \theta(t)), \quad x_i(0) = x_i.$$  

(3)

Time forms a continuous analogy to the layer index, where each layer corresponds to an iteration of the evolution. This ODE contains only the convection term, and each point moves independently without collision. To enhance the interactions among data points especially for unlabeled samples, we introduce an additional diffusion term in $\frac{d}{dt}$.
which leads to the following convection-diffusion ODE system:

\[
\frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = f(x_i(t), \theta(t)) - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} (x_i(t) - x_j(t))
\]

for all \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, N\), where \(N\) is the number of points, \(\gamma > 0\) is a parameter that controls the strength of diffusion and \(w_{ij} \geq 0\) is the weight between \(x_i\) and \(x_j\). By designing a weight matrix that can depict the similarity between points, we can expect similar points are brought together, while dissimilar points are driven apart. In this paper, the convection term \(f\) is set to be a simple 2-layer network with width \(w\), i.e.

\[
f(x_i(t), \theta(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{w} a_i^{(i)} \sigma(w_i^{(i)} \cdot x(t) + b_i^{(i)})
\]

Here \(x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d\), \(b_i^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}\), \(a_i^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d\), \(w_i^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d\) and \(f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d\). The activation function \(\sigma(\cdot)\) is chosen to be ReLU. \(\theta(t) = [w_i^{(i)}, b_i^{(i)}, a_i^{(i)}]_{i=1}^{w}\) is the collection of network weights at time \(t\). In the next section, we will derive a practical algorithm based on the new ODE equation (4).

### 3.2 Algorithm

We discretize the convection-diffusion equation (4) using the classic Lie-Trotter splitting scheme [49]. After absorbing the time step \(\Delta t\) into \(f\) and \(\gamma\), it leads to

\[
x_i^{k+1/2} = x_i^k + f(x_i^k, \theta^k),
\]

\[
x_i^{k+1} = x_i^{k+1/2} - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} (x_i^{k+1/2} - x_j^{k+1/2}).
\]

The convection step (6) is nearly identical to the residual block (2), only differs in the time step, which is not essential as the implementation is the same. The added diffusion step (7) can be seen as the stabilization of the convection step (6). If the weight matrix is pre-computed, the diffusion step is parameter free, thus the proposed diffusion term can be easily combined with any existing networks or algorithms in a plug-and-play manner. To construct the weight matrix, we use the Gaussian kernel \(k(x, y) = \exp(-\|x - y\|^2/\sigma^2)\) to measure the similarity between data points. \(\sigma\) is a parameter to adjust the distribution of weight. Next, we introduce two operators, Sparse and Normalize, and one hyperparameter, \(n_{top}\), to obtain a sparse and balanced weight matrix. Sparse is a truncation operator to make the weight matrix sparse. In each row, it keeps the largest \(n_{top}\) entries and truncate other entries to 0. Normalize symmetrically normalize the weight matrix. Once constructed, the weight matrix remains unchanged during the training process.

With Lie-Trotter scheme, we get one diffusion step (7) after convection step (6). However, in our implementation, there are often several diffusion steps followed by each convection step. The reason is that the diffusion term has strong numerical stiffness as proved in Appendix A. The step size \(\gamma\) should be small enough to keep numerical stability when the simple explicit Euler discretization method is used. Consequently, in order to maintain certain diffusion strength, we will use simple forward Euler scheme to discretize the diffusion term. Moreover, even if the total strength is small, multiple diffusion layers also give slightly better results in experiments. Thus, in the networks, we add \(r\) diffusion layers after each residual block, each with a fixed step size \(\gamma\). The illustration of our Diff-ResNet can be found in Figure 1. We summarize our method in Algorithm [4].
To address this problem, we can adopt the mini-batch training method. We can set the learning rate to be the maximum across all classes, and let the diameter of a set be the maximum distance between any two points in the set. In the binary classification problem and our analysis framework, the Structured Data Assumption may be more practical for tasks when the total number of data points is too large.

Remark 1. Our algorithm can also extend to large scale datasets. In diffusion step 7, the feature map of the i-th data point depends on the feature map of all data points at previous layer, which is not realistic in tasks when the total number of data points is too large. To address this problem, we can adopt the mini-batch training strategy, i.e. each time only a small portion of data is fed into the network to update the parameters. In each batch, the weights are sparsified and normalized correspondingly.

4 Analysis of Diffusion Mechanism

In this section, the effectiveness of diffusion mechanism will be analyzed in theory. For the sake of simplicity, we only consider the binary classification problem and our analysis can be naturally extended to multi-class case.

4.1 Structured Data Assumption

Our dataset is generated as follows. Suppose all the data points come from $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i$. Symbol $\bigcup$ means that $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i$ and $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset, \forall i \neq j$. Each set $S_i$ contains the points from the i-th class. We further assume that each set $S_i$ can be divided into several non-overlap and bounded subsets $S_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{l_i} S_{i,j}$, each $S_{i,j}$ corresponding to a subclass. In the binary classification, $k = 2$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. $l$ is the number of subclasses, which may vary with class. However, we can set $l$ to be the maximum across all classes, and let $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for those nonexistent subclasses. Denote $M = kl$ as the total number of subsets. The distance between two disjoint sets $A, B$ is defined as

$$\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} \|x - y\|^2.$$

The diameter of a set $A$ is defined as

$$\text{diam}(A) = \sup_{x, y \in A} \|x - y\|^2.$$

Remark 2. The reason we introduce subclass instead of directly using class is that it can relieve our separability assumption. We do not need two classes to be well apart, which is not realistic in real-world scenario. Rather, we only need local subclasses to form clusters.

We are now ready to state the structured data assumption. (A) (Upper Bound of Diameters) There exists $D > 0$ such that for each $(i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$, we have: $S_{i,j} \subset B(x_0, D/2)^2$ for some $x_0$, then:

$$\text{diam}(S_{i,j}) \leq D$$

(B) (Lower Bound of Distances) There exists $L > 0$ such that for each $(i_1, j_1) \neq (i_2, j_2) \in [k] \times [l]$, we have:

$$\text{dist}(S_{i_1,j_1}, S_{i_2,j_2}) \geq L$$

Here, $L$ and $D$ are similar to inter-class distance and intra-class distance, which are terminologies widely used in the field of clustering. The difference lies in that the diameter used in our analysis is the upper bound for the points in the subclass, corresponding the local intra-class distance. In this sense, the Structured Data Assumption may be more practical for dealing with complex datasets. For example, in MNIST dataset, every digit may have different handwriting styles, which corresponds to different subclasses and fits to our analysis framework. The intuition behind the Structured Data Assumption is simple: similar samples should be close while dissimilar samples should be far away.

4.2 Theoretical Analysis

We present the theoretical results of this paper so as to explain the role of diffusion mechanism in the few-shot setting.

1. $B(x_0, D/2)$ is defined as a ball centered at $x_0$ with radius $D/2$
Then we can construct the time-dependent parameters we give a sufficient condition that is related to the Distance-Diameter Ratio. 

**Theorem 1.** (Approximation Property of ResNet Flow) If all the $S_{i,j}$, $(i,j) \in [k] \times [l]$ can be separated by a set of $M-1$ parallel hyperplanes, i.e., there exists a unique $S_{i,j}$ that lies in the region between each pair of adjacent parallel hyperplanes. Then we can construct the time-dependent parameters $\theta(t) = \{w_i^{(i)}, b_i^{(i)}, a_i^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^w$ in the ResNet flow:

$$f(x(t), \theta(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^w a_i^{(i)} \sigma(w_i^{(i)} \cdot x(t) + b_i^{(i)})$$

such that all the regions $F_i = \{x(1) : x(0) \in S_{i,j}, j \in [l], i \in [k]\}$ are linear separable. We need $2M + O(d)$ different variables and $M/w$ layers.

We give a sketch of proof. Consider the simplest case in which each $S_{i,j}$ only contains one point and the width $w$ is also 1. Our main idea is to construct a ResNet flow such that each subclass is moved to a proper position with better separability. We split the total time into $N$ intervals and deal with points one by one. After solving the simplest case, we extend to case $w > 1$, i.e., the network width is larger. Lastly, we prove the case when there are multiple points in each subclass $S_{i,j}$.

In the classical XOR dataset, the original data points $x_i(0) = x_i$ are not linear separable. However, Theorem 1 tells us that: through the ODE flow, we can make the output features $x_i(1)$ become linear separable, so that a proper fully-connected layer can achieve accurate classification.

Our next step is to show that the condition in Theorem 1 can be satisfied by introducing diffusion mechanism. First, we give a sufficient condition that is related to the Distance-Diameter ratio.

**Theorem 2.** If the Distance-Diameter Ratio is large enough:

$$\frac{L}{D} \geq \frac{M(M-1)\sqrt{\pi}}{4}d,$$

then all the $S_{i,j}$, $(i,j) \in [k] \times [l]$ can be separated by a set of $M-1$ parallel hyperplanes.

This proof relies on comparing the surface area of a specific set with the unit sphere. It is noted that $M$ is the number of subclasses that has $M \ll N$ in most cases. Thus the constant in the inequality is achievable. The next proposition shows that the diffusion step can increase this ratio with exponential rate.

The diffusion of each data point $x_i$ is modeled as

$$\frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = -\gamma \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij}(x_i(t) - x_j(t)), x_i(0) = x_i$$

for $i \in [N]$. Thus, all points change their positions subject to mutual interactions, and the distances between subsets and diameters of subsets are changed accordingly. Let $S_{i,j}(t)$ be the subset at time $t$, we define lower bound of distances $L(t)$ and upper bound of diameters $D(t)$ at time $t$ as

$$\text{diam}(S_{i,j}(t)) \leq D(t), \forall (i,j) \in [k] \times [l],$$

$$\text{dist}(S_{i,j1}(t), S_{i,j2}(t)) \geq L(t), \forall (i1, j1) \neq (i2, j2) \in [k] \times [l].$$

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, where $V$ is the set of data points, and $E$ is the set of edges corresponding to non-zero weights $w_{ij}$. Then we have the following proposition describing the diffusion effects.

**Proposition 1.** Suppose the data points in each subset $S_{i,j}$, $(i,j) \in [k] \times [l]$ form a connected component in the graph $G$, and each $S_{i,j}$ is convex. Then, the Distance-Diameter Ratio grows to infinity, i.e.

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{L(t)}{D(t)} = \infty.$$ Moreover, the growth rate is exponential.

The basic idea for proving Proposition 1 is to show that $L(t)$ is nonincreasing while $D(t)$ converges to zero at exponential rate. Using the spectral clustering theory, it is proved that each subclass converges to its center along with the diffusion process.

To meet the assumption that points in each subset form a connected component in the graph, we should ensure (1) there is no edge that connect points among different subsets (2) any two vertices in the same subset $S_{i,j}$ are connected to each other. By the construction of weight matrix, each vertex in graph $G$ is only connected to its $n_{top}$ nearest neighbors. Thus the first argument is satisfied when the nearest neighbors only contain points from the same subclass, which requires that $n_{top}$ should not be too large. On the other hand, the threshold for the connectivity of a k-nearest neighbor graph is $O(\log n)$ [50], where $n$ in our setting should be the number of points in each subset.

The above analysis reveals that the diffusion mechanism is helpful for organizing data points by making data points from the same subclass region closer to each other while others relatively further away. As the Distance-Diameter ratio increases, it is easy for distinguishing data points using ResNet flow. This property is important for semi-supervised problems as it deeply explores the relationship among data points.

5 Experiments

In this section, we show the efficacy of diffusion mechanism on synthetic data, and report the performance of the Diff-ResNet on semi-supervised graph learning and few-shot learning tasks.

5.1 Synthetic Data

We conduct experiments on four classical synthetic datasets: XOR, moon, circle and spiral. In XOR dataset, we directly apply diffusion without any convection. Then we can clearly see the evolution process of points that verifies the Proposition 1. The other three datasets are used to show the effectiveness

3. Code at [https://github.com/shwangtangjun/Diff-ResNet](https://github.com/shwangtangjun/Diff-ResNet)
of diffusion in classification tasks. In this section, we only show results of XOR and circle datasets. Due to the space limitation, please refer to Appendix E.1.4 for more results.

We randomly collect 100 points each in four circles centered at (0,0), (0,2), (2,0), (2,2), respectively, with radius 0.75. These four circles are treated as the subsets corresponding to four subclasses. The circles centered at (0,0) and (2,2) belong to the same class, and points from them are colored red. The blue ones are generated similarly. Here, we show the evolution of points as diffusion strength goes to infinity. As stated in the Section 3.2, we stack diffusion steps with small step size $\gamma$ to ensure stability. In Figure 3, points distribution after 1, 10, 20 and 200 diffusion steps are given. In the above example, the initial diameter is $D = 1.5$ while the distance is $L = 0.5$, which does not meet the sufficient condition $L > D$ in Proposition 1. However, as shown in Figure 3, this diffusion still works well. Data points in same subclass converge to a single point. We also observe from Figure 3 (b) that the Distance-Diameter Ratio indeed grows exponentially to infinity.

Remark 3. Some may doubt the use of terminology, diffusion, as it actually draws similar points together and create high density regions. In fact, the phenomenon shown in Figure 3 is not contradictory to the definition of diffusion. The position of a point on the figure is decided by its coordinate. The diffusion ODE spreads coordinates with high concentration to those with low concentration, resulting in that points have similar coordinates. Visually, diffusion leads to gathering points together. In words, the diffusion ODE acts on the coordinates, or features, rather than on the points.

Next, we show the effectiveness of diffusion in residual networks on binary classification tasks containing 1000 planar data points forming two circles. Two classes are marked with different colors. We use residual networks with hidden dimensions 2 (so that it will be convenient for us to visualize the features). The details of experiment settings can be found in Appendix E.1. During training residual networks with or without diffusion mechanism, we plot the features before the final classification layer in Figure 4. Note that what we plot are not the input data points. Thus, even without diffusion, the points have to pass through a randomly initialized residual block. So in subfigure (c) of Figure 4, features are different from raw input points in (a). The results of circle dataset is shown in Figure 4.

As shown in Figure 4, diffusion can reduce the noise. In Figure 4 (f),(g),(h), the features are very clean while in Figure 4 (f),(g),(h), features are still noisy. Moreover, diffusion step makes the final feature much easier to separate. In Figure 4 (h), features can be easily separated by a straight line while the features are not linear separable without diffusion as shown in Figure 4 (e). It is not surprise that in this example ResNet fails to give correct classification considering it only has 18 parameters in total. With the help of diffusion step, even this small network with only 18 parameters can give correct classification which demonstrates that diffusion is very useful in classification problem.

5.2 Graph Learning

We investigate the effect of diffusion on semi-supervised learning problems in graph. In diffusion step, a key point is how to determine the weights that can properly depict the relationship between data points. Nonetheless, in graph this is not a problem since the weights have already been given in the form of adjacent matrix. We report results for the most widely used citation network benchmarks including Cora, Citeseer and Pubmed. These datasets are citation networks in which nodes are documents, edges are citation links.
and features are sparse bag-of-words vectors. The concrete dataset statistics is given in Appendix E.2.1. Moreover, rather than using the fixed Planetoid split, we follow [51] and report results for all datasets using 100 random splits with 20 random initializations each.

The mainstream approach in graph learning, such as GCN [52], GraphSAGE [53] and GAT [54], contains aggregation steps, which aggregate feature information from neighbors using the adjacent matrix, and then predict labels with aggregated information. Different from these conventional paradigm, our method is composed of convection-and-then-diffusion. Moreover, despite the large discrepancy between our diffusion network and mainstream networks, our method still achieves competitive results with respect to classical methods in graph learning. Thus, we propose an alternative path for semi-supervised graph learning problems.

We compare our method with three graph learning methods: GCN, GraphSAGE (its two variants) and GAT. The detailed network structure and parameter settings can be found in Appendix E.2. The classification results are reported in Table 1. Diff-ResNet is significantly better than ResNet without diffusion. It achieves more than 15% accuracy boost on average, which is a strong evidence for the benefit of diffusion. Moreover, despite the large discrepancy between our diffusion network and mainstream networks, our method still achieves competitive results with respect to classical methods in graph learning. Thus, we propose an alternative path for semi-supervised graph learning problems.

|                | Cora | Citeseer | Pubmed |
|----------------|------|----------|--------|
| GCN            | 81.5±1.3 | 71.9±1.9 | 77.8±2.9 |
| GraphSAGE-mean | 79.2±7.7 | 71.6±1.9 | 77.4±2.2 |
| GraphSAGE-maxpool | 76.6±1.9 | 67.5±2.3 | 76.1±2.3 |
| GAT            | 81.8±1.3 | 71.4±1.9 | 78.7±2.3 |
| No-Diff-ResNet | 58.9±1.9 | 61.9±2.1 | 70.1±2.1 |
| Diff-ResNet(ours) | 82.1±1.1 | 74.6±1.8 | 80.1±2.0 |

Additionally, it is reported that methods based on aggregation of neighboring information suffers over-smoothing problems with increasing depth [55, 56]. As is observed in Figure 5, the performance of GCN drops more than 50% on average when the network depth increases to 32. Different from GCN, our Diff-ResNet does not use aggregation, thus the representations of the nodes will not converge to a certain value and become indistinguishable. When the number of layers increases to 32, performance of Diff-ResNet only drops less than 10%, which is partly due to the deep network training burden. This serves as an evidence that our network structure is far different from mainstream architectures.

### 5.3 Few-shot Learning

Given a dataset \( X = X_s \cup X_q \), where \( X_s = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_1} \) is the support set with label information and \( X_q = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{N_2} \) is the query set without labels, the goal of few-shot learning is to find the labels of points in the query set when the size of support set \( |N_1| \) is very small. Among existing few-shot learning methods, embedding learning is a typical approach, which maps each sample to a low dimensional spaces such that similar samples are close while dissimilar samples are far away. The embedding function can be learned by a deep neural network (a.k.a. backbone), which is pretrained using a large number of labeled examples over base classes. In the few-shot learning problems, the pretrained embedding function is fixed and maps all data samples into the embedded space.

We conduct experiments on three benchmarks for few-shot image classification: miniImageNet, tieredImageNet and CUB. The miniImageNet and tieredImageNet are both subsets of the larger ILSVRC-12 dataset [57], with 100 classes and 608 classes respectively. CUB-200-2011 [58] is another fine-grained image classification dataset with 200 classes. We follow the standard dataset split as in previous papers [46, 59, 60]. All images are resized to \( 84 \times 84 \), following [16].

We choose two widely used networks, ResNet-18 [4] and WRN-28-10 [61] as our backbone: the latter widens the residual blocks by adding more convolutional layers (28 layers) and feature planes (10 times). First, we train the backbone on the base classes using cross-entropy loss, SGD optimizer, standard data augmentation and a mini-batch size of 256 to train all models. Note that our training procedure does not involve any meta-learning or episodic-training strategy. The model is trained for \( T = 100 \) epochs for miniImageNet and tieredImageNet, and \( T = 200 \) epochs for CUB. We use a multi-step scheduler, which decays the learning rate by 0.1 at \( 0.5T \) and \( 0.75T \). We evaluate the nearest-prototype classification accuracy on the validation set and obtain the best model. The embedding training process is in general similar to that in SimpleShot [46] and LaplacianShot [47], but details are slightly different. Eventually we get an embedding function which maps the original data point to \( \mathbb{R}^M \) where \( M = 512 \) for ResNet-18 and \( M = 640 \) for WRN-28-10.

After we obtain a feature vector for every data point, we compare the performance of 5 typical classification methods to emphasize the effectiveness of diffusion mechanism.

1. **Nearest Prototype.** The prototype \( m_c \) of each class \( c \)
which assigns label to each query point. Then the query sample is classified as class $c$ in the $1$-shot case. It is the most natural classification method, and serves as a baseline. (2) Diffusion. We try to minimize an objective function with Laplacian regularizer in an iterative way. In Laplacian-Shot [47], the author optimizes the loss function below

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_2} \sum_{c=1}^{C} y_{i,c} d(x_i - m_c) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_2} w(x_i, x_j) \| y_i - y_j \|^2$$

$N_2 = |X_q|$ is the number of query samples. $y_i = [y_{i,1}, \ldots, y_{i,C}] \in \{0, 1\}^C$ is in the $C$-dimensional simplex, which assigns label to each query point. $d$ is Euclidean distance. $w(x_i, x_j)$ is the weight between $x_i$ and $x_j$.

The first loss term functions similar to nearest prototype classification. The second loss term is the well-known Laplacian regularizer. We use the iterative algorithm provided by LaplacianShot [47] to minimize the objective function $\min_x \mathcal{L}$. Since there is no neural network, or manipulations on features, rather just label propagation, we name this method as Diffusion.

(3) Convection. We minimize cross entropy loss

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{c=1}^{C} y_{i,c} \log(f(x_i,c))$$

on the support set using gradient descent and simple $2$-layer residual network. $N_1 = |X_s|$ is the number of support samples. The detailed network structure can be found in Appendix E.3.2. There is no relationship between data points during training, and the residual network is the counterpart of a convection ODE, so we refer to this method as Convection.

(4) External Convection-Diffusion. We minimize cross entropy loss on the support set plus Laplacian regularizer using gradient descent and simple $2$-layer residual network. The difference from (3) is that we add a Laplacian regularizer

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{c=1}^{C} y_{i,c} \log(f(x_i,c)) + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} w(x_i, x_j) \| f(x_i) - f(x_j) \|^2$$

to the loss function. $N = N_1 + N_2 = |X_s \cup X_q|$ is the total number of support samples and query samples. The first variation of the Laplacian term coincides with the diffusion term of our convection-diffusion ODE. The residual network structure corresponds to convection, while the Laplacian regularizer corresponds to diffusion. As diffusion appears in the loss function externally, we refer to this method as External Convection-Diffusion.

(5) Internal Convection-Diffusion. We minimize cross entropy loss

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{c=1}^{C} y_{i,c} \log(f(x_i,c))$$

on the support set using gradient descent and simple $2$-layer diffusion residual network (Diff-ResNet). The loss term is the same as (3), while the difference is that we add diffusion layers internally in the network structure. By comparing (4) and (5), we want to verify the necessity of incorporating diffusion as part of network structure, rather than as part of loss function.

Following the standard evaluation protocol [46], we randomly sample $1000$ $5$-way-$1$-shot and $5$-way-$5$-shot classification tasks from the test classes, with $15$ query samples in each class, and report the average accuracy of $5$ methods above in Table 5.3. Internal Convection-Diffusion, which uses our proposed Diff-ResNet, achieves best results in all tasks. In $1$-shot tasks, it has a performance boost of nearly $20\%$ compared to Convection, which clearly states the effectiveness of diffusion. Additionally, compared to External Convection-Diffusion, it also has approximately $10\%$ increase, indicating that embedding diffusion in the network structure is far more efficient than adding diffusion in the loss term. In $5$-shot tasks, as the nearest prototype method

| Backbone | Method | miniImageNet | tieredImageNet | CUB |
|----------|--------|--------------|----------------|-----|
|          |        | $1$-shot | $5$-shot | $1$-shot | $5$-shot | $1$-shot | $5$-shot |
| ResNet-18 | Nearest Prototype | 57.09 | 79.30 | 63.46 | 83.53 | 66.53 | 86.03 |
|          | Diffusion | 57.81 | 79.54 | 64.38 | 83.83 | 67.96 | 86.49 |
|          | Convection | 53.04 | 79.58 | 56.17 | 82.79 | 58.68 | 86.10 |
|          | External Convection-Diffusion | 55.30 | 79.55 | 65.15 | 83.74 | 70.00 | 86.92 |
|          | Internal Convection-Diffusion | 68.47 | 80.02 | 75.31 | 84.19 | 79.12 | 87.18 |
| WRN     | Nearest Prototype | 59.54 | 79.81 | 65.60 | 84.76 | 68.56 | 86.13 |
|          | Diffusion | 60.30 | 80.31 | 66.59 | 85.17 | 69.70 | 86.58 |
|          | Convection | 57.07 | 80.92 | 58.79 | 84.69 | 62.84 | 87.51 |
|          | External Convection-Diffusion | 59.46 | 80.70 | 68.10 | 85.31 | 73.08 | 87.08 |
|          | Internal Convection-Diffusion | 69.77 | 81.17 | 77.44 | 85.50 | 80.31 | 87.76 |
has already provided competitive baseline, the increase is not remarkable, but still has about 1% improvement against Convection.

We use T-SNE [62] to visualize the features before and after diffusion in 1-shot and 5-shot task in Figure 6. Labeled data are marked as stars, and unlabeled data are marked as circles. In 1-shot scenario, we can observe that points are hard to separate at first. However, with the help of diffusion mechanism, points in the same subclass are driven closer, making it easier to classify. In 5-shot tasks, since the sample points already have nice separability, the improvement with diffusion mechanism is not so remarked as that in 1-shot tasks. Nonetheless, we could verify the necessity of introducing subclass in Structured Data Assumption, as the blue points are indeed divided into two subsets.

![T-SNE visualization](image)

(a) 1-shot, before  
(b) 1-shot, after  
(c) 5-shot, before  
(d) 5-shot, after

Fig. 6. T-SNE visualization of features before and after diffusion steps. Stars represent labeled points (support data). Circles represent unlabeled points (query data).

Furthermore, we study the effect of several important parameters in diffusion mechanism: weight truncation parameter $n_{\text{top}}$, diffusion step number $r$ and step size $\gamma$. We conduct experiments on 1000 5-way-1-shot tasks on miniImageNet with ResNet-18 and WRN as backbone, and report the average accuracy with different parameters.

First, we tune $n_{\text{top}}$ in the Sparse operator. We choose $\sigma = [n_{\text{top}}/2]$. The results are depicted in Figure 7. From the figure, we notice that $n_{\text{top}}$ should be neither too small nor too large. Small $n_{\text{top}}$ may break up large local clusters, while large $n_{\text{top}}$ will include points from different classes into neighborhood. However, the classification accuracy is not very sensitive to $n_{\text{top}}$, compared to diffusion strength.

![Effect of n_top on accuracy](image)

(a) ResNet-18  
(b) WRN

Fig. 7. The effect of $n_{\text{top}}$ on miniImageNet with ResNet-18 and WRN as backbone. The x-axis represents step number $r$, y-axis is the accuracy.

Next, we study the effect of total diffusion strength, which is step size times step numbers $r\gamma$. We fix $\gamma = 0.5$ and adjust $r$, ranging from 0 to 20. The results are shown in Figure 8. Based on our experiments, we should not push the strength to infinity as in synthetic data, because real data has much more complicated geometric structure such that we can not expect each class converge to a single point.

![Effect of total diffusion strength](image)

(a) ResNet-18  
(b) WRN

Fig. 8. The effect of total diffusion strength on miniImageNet with ResNet-18 and WRN as backbone. The x-axis is total strength $r\gamma$, y-axis is the accuracy.

Lastly, we fix total strength $r\gamma = 5.0$, and change $r$ from 0 to 20, to study the effect of the step size. We require $\gamma \leq 1$ for stability. When the total diffusion strength is too large when $r < 5$, we set $\gamma = 1.0$. As shown in Figure 9, when the total diffusion strength is fixed, the accuracy almost keeps the same. Thus, stacking too many layers will not benefit.

![Effect of step number](image)

(a) ResNet-18  
(b) WRN

Fig. 9. The effect of number of steps $r$ on miniImageNet with ResNet-18 and WRN as backbone. The x-axis represents step number $r$, y-axis is the accuracy.

At the end of the section, we want to emphasize that our Diff-ResNet can achieve state-of-the-art. For fair comparison, we adopt tricks used in LaplacianShot [47], which we elaborate in Appendix E.3. We randomly sample 10000 5-way-1-shot and 5-way-5-shot classification tasks and report

4. $\sigma(x_i) = k$ means $\sigma$ is chosen to be the $k$-th closest distance from a specific point $x_i$, so it varies with points.
the average accuracy and corresponding 95% confidence interval in Table 3. The results of networks for comparison in Table 3 are collected from [46, 47, 60]. In all datasets with various backbones, Diff-ResNets obtains the highest classification accuracy.

Additionally, we investigate the computational cost of diffusion mechanism. The implementation of diffusion layers is simply small-scale matrix multiplication, which is very efficient using GPU. We run 1000 classification tasks using Diff-ResNet with different number of diffusion layers \( r \), and report the average computation time per task and accuracy in Figure 10. The total diffusion strength is fixed as \( r \gamma = 2.0 \), except when \( r = 1 \) we choose \( \gamma = 1.0 \) for stability. We use a single GeForce RTX 2080 Ti to collect the running time. As stated before in Figure 9 with fixed diffusion strength, there is no need of stacking too many layers. In both subfigures, 2 diffusion layers can already achieve the best result, whereas the increase in time compared to no diffusion is approximately 25%. Moreover, the time of 10 diffusion layers roughly doubles that of without diffusion, and 10 layers is enough to achieve desired diffusion strength in all few-shot tasks. Thus, the computational cost is acceptable.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, inspired by the ODE model with diffusion mechanism, we propose a novel Diff-ResNets by adding a simple yet powerful diffusion layer to the residual blocks. We conduct theoretical analysis of the diffusion mechanism and prove that the diffusion term will significantly increase the ratio between local intra-class distance and inter-class distance. The performance of proposed Diff-ResNets is verified by extensive experiments on few-shot learning and semi-supervised graph learning problems.

| Methods       | Backbone | miniImageNet 1-shot | miniImageNet 5-shot | tieredImageNet 1-shot | tieredImageNet 5-shot | CUB 1-shot | CUB 5-shot |
|---------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| MAML [63]     | ResNet-18| 49.61 ± 0.92        | 65.72 ± 0.77        | -                     | -                     | 69.96 ± 1.01 | 82.70 ± 0.65 |
| Baseline [60] | ResNet-18| 51.87 ± 0.77        | 75.68 ± 0.63        | -                     | -                     | 67.02 ± 0.90 | 83.58 ± 0.54 |
| RelationNet 43 | ResNet-18| 52.48 ± 0.86        | 69.83 ± 0.68        | 54.48 ± 0.93          | 71.32 ± 0.78          | 67.59 ± 1.02 | 82.75 ± 0.58 |
| MatchingNet 16 | ResNet-18| 52.91 ± 0.88        | 68.88 ± 0.69        | -                     | -                     | 72.36 ± 0.90 | 83.64 ± 0.60 |
| ProtoNet 45    | ResNet-18| 54.16 ± 0.82        | 73.68 ± 0.65        | 53.31 ± 0.89          | 72.69 ± 0.74          | 71.88 ± 0.91 | 87.42 ± 0.48 |
| Gidaris 64     | ResNet-18| 55.45 ± 0.89        | 70.13 ± 0.68        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| SNAIL 65       | ResNet-18| 55.71 ± 0.99        | 68.88 ± 0.92        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| TADAN 55       | ResNet-18| 58.50 ± 0.30        | 76.70 ± 0.30        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| Transductive 66† | ResNet-12| 62.35 ± 0.66        | 74.53 ± 0.54        | -                     | -                     | 80.16 ± 0.52 | 87.17 ± 0.39 |
| MetaoptNet 67  | ResNet-18| 62.64 ± 0.61        | 78.63 ± 0.46        | -                     | -                     | 81.56 ± 0.53 | -         |
| TPN 68         | ResNet-12| 53.75 ± 0.86        | 69.43 ± 0.67        | -                     | -                     | 72.85 ± 0.74 | -         |
| TEAM 69        | ResNet-18| 60.07 ± 0.59        | 75.90 ± 0.38        | -                     | -                     | 80.16 ± 0.52 | 87.17 ± 0.39 |
| CAN+T 70†      | ResNet-18| 67.19 ± 0.55        | 80.64 ± 0.35        | 73.21 ± 0.58          | 84.93 ± 0.38          | -         | -         |
| SimpleShot 46† | ResNet-18| 63.32 ± 0.20        | 80.19 ± 0.14        | 69.64 ± 0.22          | 85.00 ± 0.16          | 71.63 ± 0.20 | 87.07 ± 0.12 |
| LaplacianShot 47† | ResNet-18| 70.66 ± 0.23        | 82.27 ± 0.14        | 77.55 ± 0.24          | 86.12 ± 0.16          | 80.08 ± 0.22 | 88.38 ± 0.12 |
| Diff-ResNet(ours) | ResNet-18| 71.54 ± 0.24        | 82.80 ± 0.14        | 78.57 ± 0.24          | 86.77 ± 0.16          | 80.92 ± 0.22 | 89.01 ± 0.12 |
| Qiao 71        | WRN      | 59.60 ± 0.41        | 73.74 ± 0.19        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| LEO 72         | WRN      | 61.76 ± 0.08        | 77.59 ± 0.12        | 66.33 ± 0.05          | 81.44 ± 0.09          | -         | -         |
| ProtoNet 45    | WRN      | 62.60 ± 0.20        | 79.97 ± 0.14        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| CC+rot 73      | WRN      | 62.93 ± 0.45        | 79.87 ± 0.33        | 70.53 ± 0.51          | 84.98 ± 0.36          | -         | -         |
| MatchingNet 16 | WRN      | 64.03 ± 0.20        | 76.32 ± 0.16        | -                     | -                     | -         | -         |
| FEAT 74        | WRN      | 65.10 ± 0.20        | 81.11 ± 0.14        | 70.41 ± 0.23          | 84.38 ± 0.16          | -         | -         |
| Transductive 66† | WRN      | 65.73 ± 0.68        | 78.40 ± 0.52        | 73.34 ± 0.71          | 85.50 ± 0.50          | -         | -         |
| BD-CSPN 48†   | WRN      | 70.31 ± 0.93        | 81.89 ± 0.60        | 78.74 ± 0.95          | 86.92 ± 0.63          | -         | -         |
| SimpleShot 46† | WRN      | 64.58 ± 0.20        | 81.03 ± 0.14        | 70.91 ± 0.22          | 85.93 ± 0.15          | 73.24 ± 0.21 | 87.61 ± 0.12 |
| LaplacianShot 47† | WRN      | 71.27 ± 0.23        | 82.42 ± 0.14        | 78.65 ± 0.24          | 86.92 ± 0.16          | 81.07 ± 0.22 | 88.45 ± 0.13 |
| Diff-ResNet(ours) | WRN      | 72.25 ± 0.24        | 83.12 ± 0.14        | 79.70 ± 0.24          | 87.55 ± 0.16          | 81.43 ± 0.22 | 89.01 ± 0.12 |

Fig. 10. The computation time of each task and accuracy on miniImageNet with ResNet-18 and WRN as backbone. The x-axis represents number of diffusion layers, 0 means no diffusion, right y-axis is the computation time (seconds) of each task, left y-axis is the average accuracy.
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APPENDIX A
PROOF OF STABILITY CONDITION

In this section, we will give the stability condition of discretization of the diffusion step. When the convection term equals zero, the forward Euler discretization of (7) is
\[ x^{k+1}_i = x^k_i - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} (x^k_i - x^k_j), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N. \]
\( \Delta t \) is again absorbed in \( \gamma \). Define \( X^k = [x^k_1, \ldots, x^k_N] \), the vectorized update scheme is
\[ X^{k+1} = X^k - \gamma \Lambda (\Lambda - W) X^k, \]
where \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(d_i) \) with \( d_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} \) for all \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). We demand all the \( \{d_i\} \) share the same value \( d_1 = d_2 = \cdots = d_N : = d \). The next proposition shows the stability condition of iteration (8).

Proposition 2. If \( \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{d}] \), the iteration (8) is a contraction.
Proof. Matrix with spectral radius smaller than 1 is a contraction matrix, since
\[
\|Ax\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2 \|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_2
\]
for any \( x \) if \( \|A\|_2 = \rho(A) \leq 1 \).

Thus, we are trying to prove that \( \rho(I - \gamma (\Lambda - W)) \leq 1 \). In fact, we will show that \( \rho(I - \gamma (\Lambda - W)) = 1 \). Denote \( A = I - \gamma (\Lambda - W) \).

First, it is obvious that 1 is an eigenvalue of \( A \). \( \Lambda - W \) is a matrix with row sum by construction of \( A \), thus 0 is an eigenvalue of \( \Lambda - W \) with 1 its corresponding eigenvector. Therefore, 1 is an eigenvalue of \( A = I - \gamma (\Lambda - W) \).

Then, as \( A \) is obviously a symmetric matrix, all of its eigenvalues \( \lambda \) are real. We will show that all the eigenvalues of \( A \) lies in \([-1, 1]\) using the Gershgorin disk theorem. In the \( i \)-th row of \( A \), the diagonal entry is \( 1 - \gamma (d - w_{ii}) \), and the off-diagonal entries are \( \gamma w_{ij} \) for all \( j \neq i \). Thus, the disk decided by this row is centered at \( 1 - \gamma (d - w_{ii}) \), with radius \( \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma w_{ij} \). Remind again that \( d = \sum w_{ij} \), so \( \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma w_{ij} = \gamma (d - w_{ii}) \).

Using \( \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{d}] \), we have
\[
-1 \leq 1 - 2\gamma d \\
\leq 1 - 2\gamma d + 2\gamma w_{ii} \\
= 1 - \gamma (d - w_{ii}) - \gamma (d - w_{ii}) \\
\leq \lambda \\
\leq 1 - \gamma (d - w_{ii}) + \gamma (d - w_{ii}) = 1
\]
The second inequality is because all entries in \( W \) are non-negative. In conclusion, the spectral radius of \( A \) is 1.

In the algorithm, weight matrix is symmetrically normalized, thus \( d = O(1) \). Therefore, in our batch diffusion mechanism, once the step size meets a relatively loose constraint, the stability can be guaranteed.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We write the weight of the second layer as \( \alpha^{(i)} = \lambda^{(i)} \cdot \beta^{(i)} \)
for proof convenience. \( \lambda^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}, \beta^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Then
\[
f(x(t), \theta(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{w} \lambda^{(i)} \sigma(w^{(i)} \cdot x(t) + b^{(i)}) \beta^{(i)}
\]

First of all, let us deal with the simplest situation. Each region \( S_{i,j}, (i,j) \in [k] \times [l] \) only has 1 point, and the width of the 2-layer network is also 1.

Lemma 1. Assume:
\[
f(x(t), \theta(t)) = \lambda_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x(t) + b_t) \beta_t
\]

Then, given the dataset \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N} \), we can construct the function \( f \) above with \( 2N + O(d) \) different variables and \( N \) layers, so that the final-step features of these data points are linear separable.

Proof. Given \( N \) data points \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d \) with their corresponding labels.

1) There exists \( w \in \mathbb{R}^d \), such that \( w \cdot x_i, i \in [N] \) are all distinct. This is obvious since \( W_{ij} = \{w|w \cdot x_i = w \cdot x_j\} \) forms a hyperplane of \( \mathbb{R}^d \), which has 0 measure. Therefore their finite union
\[
K = \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} W_{ij}
\]
also has 0 measure. We only need to pick a \( w^* \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K \), so that this \( w^* \) meets our need. Let \( w_i \) be a constant value function and \( w_i \equiv w^* \) holds for all \( t \in [0, 1] \). Since the dot products \( w^* \cdot x_i \) are pairwise distinct, we can assume:
\[
w^* \cdot x_1 < w^* \cdot x_2 < \cdots < w^* \cdot x_N
\]
Denote \( A_i = w^* \cdot x_i \) and then \( A_1 < A_2 < \cdots < A_N \)

2) Without loss of generality, we assume the \( d \)-th component \( w^*_d \neq 0 \), then we denote:
\[
\beta^* = \left( 1, 1, \ldots, 1, -\frac{w^*_1 + w^*_2 + \cdots + w^*_{d-1}}{w^*_d} \right)
\]
Let \( \beta_t \) also be a constant value function and \( \beta_t \equiv \beta^* \). Then we have: \( w^* \perp \beta^* \) and our main function \( f \) becomes:
\[
x'(t) = f(x(t), \theta(t)) = \lambda_t \sigma(w^* \cdot x(t) + b_t) \beta^*
\]
We notice that:
\[
(w^* \cdot x(t))^t = w^* \cdot (\lambda_t \sigma(w^* \cdot x(t) + b_t) \beta^*)
\leq \lambda_t \sigma(w^* \cdot x(t) + b_t) \cdot (w^* \cdot \beta^*) = 0
\]
which means during the flow, \( w^* \cdot x \) remains constant. Thus
\[
w^* \cdot x(t) \equiv w^* \cdot x_i(0) = w^* \cdot x_i = A_i, \forall t \in [0, 1], i \in [N]
\]
and \( x'(t) = \lambda_t \sigma(A_i + b_t) \beta^* \). Using the definition of ReLU activation function, when \( A_i + b_t < 0, x_i(t) \) remains unchanged.

3) Pick \( N \) real numbers \( B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_N \) such that:
\[
B_1 < A_1 < B_2 < A_2 < \cdots < B_N < A_N
\]
Now we construct the time-dependent scalar \( b_t \):
\[
b_t = -B_i, \forall t \in \left[ \frac{i-1}{N}, \frac{i}{N} \right], i \in [N]
\]
As we can see, \( b_t \) is piecewise constant with \( N \) pieces, or so-called layers.
4) Finally, we construct suitable time-dependent scalar $\lambda_t$ to make the final-step features $x_i(1)$, $i \in [N]$ linear separable. Pick 2 real numbers $C_1 < C_2$. We will choose a suitable position for $x_i(1)$ one by one. To be concrete, we will make the first component of $x_i(1)$:

$$(x_i(1))_1 = C_{y_i}$$

Here $y_i \in \{1, 2\}$ is the corresponding label of data point $x_i$.

Notice that, for each $j \in [N-1]$, when $t > \frac{1}{2}$, $x_i(j), x_i(2t), \cdots, x_i(jt)$ remains constant, because according to our construction of $b_i$ and sequence $\{B_i\}$, $A_i + b_i \leq A_j - B_{j+1} < 0$ when $t > \frac{1}{2}$ and $i \leq j$.

In the first time step, $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, data point $x_i(0) = x_1$ has its corresponding label $y_1 \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $b_t = -B_1$

$$x_1'(t) = \lambda_t(A_1 - B_1)\beta^*$$

Make

$$\lambda_t \equiv \lambda_1 = \frac{C_{y_1} - (x_1(0))_1}{A_1 - B_1} \cdot N \quad \forall t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{N}\right]$$

Then

$$x_1(1) = x_1\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = x_1(0) + \frac{1}{N}\lambda_1(A_1 - B_1)\beta^* = x_1(0) + (C_{y_1} - (x_1(0))_1)\beta^*$$

Note that the first component of $\beta^*$ is 1, so $(x_1(1))_1 = C_{y_1}$.

Similarly, in the $j$-th time step, $t \in \left[\frac{j-1}{N}, \frac{j}{N}\right)$ and $b_t = -B_j$. We choose a suitable position for $x_i(1)$. Make

$$\lambda_t \equiv \lambda_j = \frac{C_{y_j} - (x_j(\frac{j-1}{N}))_1}{A_j - B_j} \cdot N \quad \forall t \in \left[\frac{j-1}{N}, \frac{j}{N}\right)$$

so that:

$$x_j(1) = x_j\left(\frac{j}{N}\right) = x_j\left(\frac{j-1}{N}\right) + \frac{1}{N}\lambda_j(A_j - B_j)\beta^* = x_j\left(\frac{j-1}{N}\right) + (C_{y_j} - (x_j(\frac{j-1}{N}))_1)\beta^*$$

and then its first component $(x_j(1))_1 = C_{y_j}$.

To sum up, $\lambda_t$ is piecewise constant with $N$ pieces. $\lambda_t = \lambda_j$ when $t \in \left[\frac{j-1}{N}, \frac{j}{N}\right)$. Here:

$$\lambda_j = \frac{C_{y_j} - (x_j(\frac{j-1}{N}))_1}{A_j - B_j} \cdot N \quad \forall t \in \left[\frac{j-1}{N}, \frac{j}{N}\right)$$

After all these time steps, we can guarantee that for each $i \in [N]$,

$$(x_i(1))_1 = C_{y_i}$$

In other words, final-step features with the same corresponding label $y_i \in \{1, 2\}$ are on the same hyperplane, vectors with fixed first component $(v : (v)_1 = C_{y_i})$. Therefore, it is obvious that they can be easily separated by a hyperplane

$$\left\{v : (v)_1 = \frac{C_1 + C_2}{2}\right\}$$

which meets our satisfaction. In this construction of function $f$, $w_t$, $\beta_t$ remains constant, and $\lambda_t, b_t$ changes every time step. In all, there are $2N + O(d)$ variables.

In the setting above, the width of this network is 1. Now we will deal with a slightly harder situation: network with width $w$. And our next lemma can perfectly answer this question: it’s possible to use fewer layers (but same number of parameters) to make the final features linear separable when using wider network.

**Lemma 2.** Assume:

$$f(x(t), \theta(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{w} \lambda_i^{(i)} \sigma(w_t^{(i)}. x(t) + b_t^{(i)})$$

Here $w$ is the width of the network.

Then, given the dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N}$, we can construct the function $f$ above with $2N + O(d)$ different variables and $\lceil N/w \rceil$ layers, so that the final-step features of these data points are linear separable.

**Proof.** Exactly like Lemma 1, we let $w_t^{(i)} \equiv w^*$ and $\beta_t^{(i)} \equiv \beta^*$ for $\forall i \in [w]$. And we will construct suitable time-dependent scalars $\lambda_t^{(i)}$ in order to make:

$$(x_i(1))_1 = C_{y_i}$$

holds for all $i \in [N]$.

Define $B_{N+1} = B_{N+2} = \cdots = A_N + 1$, and denote $L = \lceil \frac{N}{w} \rceil$. Before further analysis, we split the whole time period $[0, 1]$ into $L$ equal time steps.

In the $j$-th time step, $t \in \left[\frac{j-1}{L}, \frac{j}{L}\right)$, let:

$$b_t^{(i)} \equiv -B_{(j-1)w+i}, \quad \lambda_t^{(i)} \equiv \lambda_{(j-1)w+i} \quad \forall i \in [w]$$

where $\lambda_i$ is undetermined.

Notice that each $b_t^{(i)}$ and $\lambda_t^{(i)}$ is piecewise constant with $L$ pieces. Similar to Lemma 1 after the $j$-th time step, $x_i(t), x_i(2t), \cdots, x_i(jt)$ remains unchanged, because $\forall i \in [w], t > \frac{1}{2}, A_i + b_t^{(i)} \leq A_i + B_{(j-1)w+i} < 0$. Therefore, our plan is to put $x_i(j-1)w+i(1), x_i(j-1)w+i(2), \cdots, x_i(jt)$ into suitable positions during the $j$-th time step, which means:

$$C_{y_i} = \left(x_i\left(\frac{j-1}{L}\right)\right)_1 + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=1}^{w} \lambda_{(j-1)w+k} \cdot (A_i + B_{(j-1)w+k})$$

$$= \left(x_i\left(\frac{j-1}{L}\right)\right)_1 + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=1}^{w} \lambda_{(j-1)w+k} \cdot (A_i + B_{(j-1)w+k})$$

$$\forall (j-1)w < i \leq jw$$

It is a linear system of equations, and we can solve these $\lambda_t, (j-1)w < i \leq jw$ through the linear functions above uniquely.

After all of these time steps, we can guarantee that:

$$(x_i(1))_1 = C_{y_i}$$

holds for all $i \in [N]$.

In this proceedings, we use only $L = \lceil \frac{N}{w} \rceil$ layers to meet our satisfaction. However, the number of variables we use is also $2N + O(d)$, which does not change with the increase of network width.

At last, we can deal with the original Theorem which has width $w$ and each region has several points. It is a simple extension of Lemma 2.
Proof. For simplicity, we reorganize $M = kl$ subsets and renumber them as $\Gamma_m = S_{i,j}, m \in [M], (i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$, as we do not have to distinguish whether regions are from the same class or different classes. Since they can be separated by a set of $M - 1$ parallel hyperplanes, there exists a vector $w^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, such that the following intervals do not intersect with each other:

$$w^* \cdot \Gamma_i \equiv \{w^* \cdot x_i | x_i \in \Gamma_i\} \ i \in [M]$$

We can assume $\forall x_1 \in \Gamma_1, x_2 \in \Gamma_2, \cdots, x_M \in \Gamma_M$:

$$w^* \cdot x_1 < w^* \cdot x_2 < \cdots < w^* \cdot x_M$$

Therefore, there exists real numbers $B_1 < A_1 < B_2 < A_2 < \cdots < B_M < A_M$ such that $w^* \cdot \Gamma \subseteq [B_i, A_i]$. Just like the proof of Lemma 2, we let $w_j^{(i)} \equiv w^*$ and $\beta_j^{(i)} \equiv \beta^*$ for $\forall i \in [w]$. Here, without loss of generality, assume the $d$-th component of $w^*$ is non-zero, and let

$$\beta^* = \left(1, 1, \cdots, 1, -\frac{w_1^2 + w_2^2 + \cdots + w_{d-1}^2}{w_d^2}\right)$$

After that, we can treat these $M$ regions just as $M$ data points. The only difference is: instead of making each final-step feature with the same corresponding label has the same first component, we make them in the same interval.

Pick 2 intervals $C_y = [a_y, b_y]$ such that: (1) $a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2$, therefore these two intervals don’t intersect with each other. (2) $b_y - a_y > D$ holds for each $y \in \{1, 2\}$. So that, each interval can hold a complete region $\Gamma_y$. Then we can use exactly the same way as Lemma 2 to make $x_i(1) \subseteq C_y$, and we only have to change the 2 real numbers $C_1 < C_2$ into the two intervals above. In the end, we can separate the final-step feature regions with the following parallel hyperplane:

$$\{v : (v)_1 = \frac{d_1 + d_2}{2}\}$$

Similar to Lemma 2, we use $L = \lceil \frac{M}{w} \rceil$ layers. Moreover, the number of variables we use decreases to $2M + O(d)$, which is a significant change.

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Proof. Similar to the last subsection, we reorganize $M = kl$ subsets and renumber them as $\Gamma_m = S_{i,j}, m \in [M], (i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$. According to the definition of upper bound of diameters $D$, assume $\Gamma_i \subseteq B(O_i, D/2)$ and denote $R = D/2$.

First we introduce some notations. Denote hypersphere in $d$-dimension with radius $r$ as $S^{d-1}(r)$. If $r = 1$, which is a unit hypersphere, we simply write $S^{d-1}$. Denote $A(\omega)$ as the surface area of $\omega$. $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma Function.

The goal to find a unit normal vector $w \in S^{d-1}$, such that $\forall b \in R$, hyperplane $w \cdot x + b = 0$ does not intersect with any regions $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$.

Denote:

$$K_{ij} = \{w : ||w||_2 = 1, \exists b \in \mathbb{R}, s.t. \text{hyperplane } w \cdot x + b = 0 \text{ intersects with both } \Gamma_i \text{ and } \Gamma_j\}$$

Then we need to prove:

$$\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant M} K_{ij} \subseteq S^{d-1} \quad (9)$$

so that every unit normal vector $w$ which doesn’t belong to any $K_{ij}$ meets our satisfaction. In order to prove (9), we compare the surface area of the two sides.

It is well known that on the right side

$$A(S^{d-1}) = \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}$$

We are going to calculate the surface area of the left side. For any $i \neq j \in [M]$, we do the scaling as follows:

$$K_{ij} = \{w : ||w||_2 = 1, \exists b \in \mathbb{R}, s.t. \text{hyperplane } w \cdot x + b = 0 \text{ intersects with both } \Gamma_i \text{ and } \Gamma_j\}$$

$$\subseteq \{w : ||w||_2 = 1, \exists b \in \mathbb{R}, s.t. \text{dist } O_i, O_j \leq R \}$$

$$= \{w : ||w||_2 = 1, |w \cdot O_i + b| \leq R, |w \cdot O_j + b| \leq R\}$$

$$\subseteq \{w : ||w||_2 = 1, |w \cdot \hat{O}_i O_j| \leq \frac{2R}{L} = D \}$$

Here, $\overrightarrow{O_i O_j}$ means the unit vector in the direction of $O_i O_j$ and the last step above is because $\|O_i O_j\| \geq \text{dist}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j) > L$. Denote $t = \frac{D}{L}, o_d = (0, 0, \cdots, 0, 1)$. By our assumption obviously $t < 1$. Next we will calculate the surface area of $K_{ij}$.

$$A(K_{ij}) \leq \int_{w \in S^{d-1}, |\overrightarrow{O_i O_j}| \leq t} dS = \int_{w \in S^{d-1}, |\overrightarrow{w \cdot o_d}| \leq t} dS$$

It is the surface area of a hyperspherical segment: the solid defined by cutting a hypersphere with a pair of parallel planes $\{v : (v)_d = t\}$ and $\{v : (v)_d = -t\}$. It can also be seen as a complete sphere excluding upper and lower hyperspherical caps. The area of a hyperspherical cap in a $d$-dimensional sphere of radius $r$ can be obtained by integrating the surface area of an $(d - 1)$-dimensional sphere of radius $r \sin(\theta)$ with arc element $rd\theta$ over a great circle arc $[\beta]$. Here $r = 1$, and $\theta$ is integrated over $0 < \varphi < \arccos(t)$, which is the cotangent angle, i.e., the angle between a vector of the sphere and its $d^\text{th}$ positive axis.

$$A(K_{ij}) \leq A(S^{d-1}) - 2 \int_0^{\arccos(t)} A(S^{d-2}(\sin \theta)) d\theta$$

$$= A(S^{d-1}) - 2 \int_0^{\arccos(t)} \frac{2\pi^{(d-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \sin^{d-2} \theta d\theta$$

It is obvious that when $t = 0$, the hyperspherical segment is just the whole sphere, which means

$$A(S^{d-1}) = 2 \frac{2\pi^{(d-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^{d-2} \theta d\theta$$

Thus

$$A(K_{ij}) \leq 2 \frac{2\pi^{(d-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \int_{\arccos(t)}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^{d-2} \theta d\theta$$

$$= A(S^{d-1}) - 2 \frac{2\pi^{(d-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \int_{\arccos(t)}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sin^{d-2} \theta d\theta$$
Therefore:

\[
A(K_{ij}) \leq \frac{2\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \int_{\arccos(t)}^{\pi/2} \sin^{d-2} \theta d\theta \\
\leq \frac{2\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \left(\pi/2 - \arccos(t)\right) \\
= \frac{2\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \arcsin(t)
\]

Next we will estimate its upper bound. From the graph of function, we can obtain the upper bound of \(\arcsin(t) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} t, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]\). The upper bound of the other part containing Gamma function is given in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.**

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} < \frac{d}{2} \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}
\]

**Proof.** When \(d \leq 5\), the lemma can be easily verified using exact values of the Gamma function. Suppose \(d \geq 6\). Note that Gamma function \(\Gamma(x)\) is monotonically increasing when \(x \geq 2\).

If \(d\) is odd, then \(\frac{d+1}{2}\) is an integer, and \(\frac{d}{2} > 2\)

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \leq \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2} - 1\right)} = \frac{d - 1}{2} < \frac{d}{2}
\]

In the equation above, we use the property of Gamma function: \(\Gamma(x + 1) = x \Gamma(x)\) if \(x\) is an integer.

Similarly, if \(d\) is even, then \(\frac{d}{2}\) is an integer, and \(\frac{d}{2} - 1 \geq 2\)

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right)} \leq \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2} - 1\right)} = \frac{d}{2} - 1 < \frac{d}{2}
\]

Therefore:

\[
A(K_{ij}) \leq \frac{2 \pi}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} t A(S^{d-1}) \\
\leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi} d}{2} t A(S^{d-1}) \cdot \binom{M}{2}
\]

Finally, we are able to calculate the surface area of the left side of (9):

\[
A \left( \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} K_{ij} \right) \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} A(K_{ij}) \\
\leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi} d}{2} t A(S^{d-1}) \cdot \binom{M}{2}
\]

Here, we use the assumption that:

\[
t = \frac{D}{L} \leq \left( \frac{M(M-1)\sqrt{\pi}}{4} d \right)^{-1}
\]

Thus, the correctness of (9) is obvious.

**APPENDIX D**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1**

**Proof.** Following proof of Theorem 1 and 2, renumber the \(M = kl\) subsets and denote them \(\Gamma_m = S_{i,j}, \quad m \in [M], (i,j) \in [k] \times [l]\) for notation convenience. We consider the forward Euler discretization of the diffusion process:

\[
x_i^{k+1} = x_i^k - \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij}(x_i^k - x_j^k), \quad \forall i \in [N]
\]

We will first prove that with each update scheme, the new region \(\Gamma^{k+1} \subseteq \Gamma^k\), thus \(L(t)\) in monotonic non-decreasing. For a specific data point \(x_i\), suppose \(x_i \in \Gamma_m\). Since \(\sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} = 1\) by normalization, the diffusion is:

\[
x_i^{k+1} = (1 - \gamma)x_i^k + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} x_j^k
\]

By assumption, points in each subset \(\Gamma_m\) forms a connected component in graph \(G\). Thus, the nearest \(n_{top}\) points of \(x_i\) are all from \(\Gamma_m\), i.e. \(w_{ij} > 0\) only if \(x_j \in \Gamma_m\). Use the condition \(\Gamma_m\) is convex, and \(\sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} = 1\) again, the weighted sum \(\sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij} x_j\) also lies in the convex region \(\Gamma_m\). Finally, as \((1 - \gamma) + \gamma = 1\), we get \(x_i^{k+1} \in \Gamma_m\). In other words, after batch diffusion, the new convex region \(\Gamma^{k+1} \subseteq \Gamma^k\).

Then we will show the upper bound of diameters \(D(t)\) decreases exponentially to 0 with \(t\). We may write diffusion mechanism in the vectorized form:

\[
\frac{dX(t)}{dt} + \gamma(\Lambda - W)X(t) = 0, \quad X(0) = X.
\]

where \(X(t) = [x_1(t), \ldots, x_N(t)], \quad X = [x_1, \ldots, x_N], \quad \Lambda = \text{diag}(d_i)\) with \(d_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij}\) for all \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, N\), \(W(i,j) = w_{ij}\). \(L = \Lambda - W\) is called graph Laplacian.

Denote the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors of \(L\) as \(\lambda_i\) and \(v_i\), \(i \in [N]\). Since \(L\) is a positive semi-definite symmetric matrix, \(\lambda_i\) are real and non-negative. Suppose \(0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_N\). In spectral clustering literatures [26], the reliance of graph diffusion on \(L\) is well studied. A well-known result is: the multiplicity of 0 eigenvalue of the Laplacian equals the number of connected components of graph \(G\).

We start with the simple case, where the graph \(G\) only admits one connected component, i.e. when all data points belong to the same subclass. In this case, \(\lambda_1 = 0\) with \(v_1 = 1\) its corresponding eigenvector, and \(\lambda_i > 0, \quad \forall i \neq 1\). We will prove all points converge to their central. The spectral solution of (10) is [26]:

\[
X(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{X(0) \cdot v_i}{|v_i|^2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_i t} v_i
\]

As \(t \to \infty, \quad e^{-\gamma \lambda_i t} \to 0\) if \(\lambda_i > 0\). Define

\[
m_c = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_N}{N}
\]

5. Reverse not necessarily true. \(x_j \in \Gamma_m\) does not necessarily imply \(w_{ij} > 0\).

6. Abuse of notation with the lower bound of distances \(L\).
as the central point of data points. Then
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} X(t) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{X(0) \cdot v_i}{|v_i|^2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_i t} v_i
\]
\[
= \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{X(0) \cdot v_1}{|v_1|^2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_1 t} v_1
\]
\[
= \frac{X(0) \cdot v_1}{|v_1|^2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_1 t} v_1
\]
\[
= \frac{X(0) \cdot v_1}{|v_1|^2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_1 t} v_1
\]
\[
= m_c, m_c, \ldots, m_c
\]

The result above implies that all data points eventually lie in the same position, which is their central point, as time \( t \) approaches infinity. Moreover, it is obvious from the equation that the growth rate is exponential. Thus, with the evolution of our diffusion mechanism, the diameter \( D(t) \) decreases exponentially to 0.

For the more general case where there are \( M \) connected components in the graph, the proof is identical by using the fact that the multiplicity of 0 eigenvalue of the Laplacian equals the number of connected components of graph \( G \). For each connected component, its points will converge to a specific central, and the diameter of each subset
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \text{diam}(\Gamma_m(t)) = 0, \forall m \in [M]
\]

Thus the upper bound of diameters \( D(t) \) decreases exponentially to 0. Combining the results \( L(t) \) is non-decreasing and \( D(t) \to 0 \) exponentially, we get
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{L(t)}{D(t)} = \infty.
\]

the growth rate is exponential.

**APPENDIX E**

**EXPERIMENT DETAILS AND RESULTS**

**E.1 Synthetic Data**

**E.1.1 Dataset**

**XOR** Uniformly collect 100 points each in four circles centered at \((0,0), (0,2), (2,0), (2,2)\), respectively. Circles are with radius 0.75.

**Moon** Uniformly collect 500 points each in two arcs of semi-circle: one is the upper arc of a circle centered at \((0, 0)\) with radius 1, the other is the lower arc of a circle centered at \((1, 0.5)\) also with radius 1. Points are added with a standard gaussian noise multiplied by 0.05.

**Circle** Uniformly collect 500 points each in two circumference of circles: both are centered at \((0, 0)\), one has radius 1 and the other has radius 2. Points are added with a standard gaussian noise multiplied by 0.05.

**Spiral** Uniformly collect 500 points each in two spirals: both are parametrized by \( r = a + b \theta \). One has \( a = 0 \) and the other has \( a = b = -1 \). Points are added with a standard gaussian noise multiplied by 0.1.

**E.1.2 Network Structure**

\[
x = x + FC2 ( \text{ReLU} ( FC1 ( x ) ) )
\]
\[
x = \text{Diffusion}(x) \quad \text{for} \ r \ \text{times}
\]
\[
y = FC3 ( x )
\]

We use one residual block, i.e. \( s = 1 \). All the fully connected layers are of size \( 2 \times 2 \) with bias (that is why we have totally \( 3 \times 2 \times 3 = 18 \) parameters). As for the diffusion layer, we use a fixed step size \( \gamma \), and iterate for \( r \) times.

**E.1.3 Parameters**

| \( n_{top} \) | \( \sigma \) | \( \gamma \) | \( r \) |
|-------------|---------|---------|------|
| XOR        | 20      | 0.5     | 1.0  | /    |
| Moon       | 25      | 0.5     | 1.0  | 60   |
| Circle     | 50      | 0.5     | 1.0  | 200  |
| Spiral     | 25      | 0.5     | 1.0  | 900  |

For the classification tasks, our optimizer is SGD with \( lr = 1.0 \), momentum = 0.9 and weight_decay = 5e-4. For spiral dataset, we adjust \( lr = 0.8 \).

**E.1.4 Additional Results**

We provide the figures describing the evolution of features with or without diffusion in residual network on the other two synthetic datasets in Figure 11 and Figure 12.

**E.2 Graph Learning**

**E.2.1 Dataset**

Here we give the statistics of each dataset. For each randomly chosen split, we pick 20 labeled points for training, and 30 points for validation in each class. All of the rest points
Fig. 12. ResNet and Diff-ResNet on spiral dataset, figures are arranged similar to Fig.4

Table 5

| Dataset | Node | Edge | Class | Feature Dim | Label Rate |
|---------|------|------|------|-------------|------------|
| Cora    | 2485 | 5069 | 7    | 1433        | 0.057      |
| Citeseer| 2120 | 3679 | 6    | 3703        | 0.056      |
| Pubmed  | 19717| 44324| 3    | 500         | 0.003      |

E.2.2 Preprocessing

We follow the normalization technique in GCN [52]: the adjacent matrix is first added with a self-loop, and then symmetrically normalized. The feature vectors are row normalized.

E.2.3 Network Structure

Since we observe severe overfitting problem in graph learning, we delete FC2 to reduce the number of parameters, and apply dropout on the feature vectors after each round of diffusion. The network structure is:

\[ x = x + \text{ReLU (FC1 (x))} \]
\[ x = \text{Dropout (Diffusion (x))} \text{ for } r \text{ times} \]
\[ y = \text{FC3 (x)} \]

The fully connected layers have input and output dimension the same as feature dimension. The new structure introduces a new parameter compared to toy examples: the dropout rate. But parameter \( n_{\text{top}} \) and \( \sigma \) is unnecessary in graph learning.

E.2.4 Parameters

Parameters are chosen based on the accuracy on the validation set.

Table 6

| Dataset | \( \gamma \) | \( r \) | dropout rate |
|---------|-------------|--------|-------------|
| Cora    | 20          | 0.25   | 0.25        |
| Citeseer| 20          | 0.2    | 0.35        |
| Pubmed  | 10          | 0.4    | 0.3         |

E.3 Few-shot Learning

E.3.1 Preprocessing

Following previous works [46], [47], [48], three additional feature transformation skills are used to enhance the performance.

1) Centering and Normalization

\[ x = x - \overline{x} \text{ then } x = \frac{x}{\|x\|_2}, \forall x \in X_s \cup X_q \]

\( \overline{x} \) is the base class average.

2) Cross-Domain Shift

\[ x = x + \Delta, \forall x \in X_q \]

where

\[ \Delta = \frac{1}{|X_s|} \sum_{x \in X_s} x - \frac{1}{|X_q|} \sum_{x \in X_q} x \]

is the difference between the mean of features within the support set and the mean of features within the query set.

we apply the first two transformations to all extracted features.

3) Prototype Rectification

\[ \tilde{m}_c = \frac{1}{|X_s| + |X_q|} \sum_{x \in X_c} \sum_{x \in \{X_s, X_q\}} \exp(\cos(x, m_c)) \]

Here \( m_c = \frac{1}{|X_s|} \sum_{x \in X_s} x \) is the mean of features within the support set of class \( c \). \( X_s^c \) is the support set with label \( c \). \( X_q^c \) is a pre-classified set based on nearest neighbors.

Prototype rectification is only applicable to classification methods that are based on prototype, and cannot be directly applied to our Cross-Entropy loss. Nonetheless, we observe in the ablation study [53] that in 5-shot tasks, merely nearest prototype classification can already achieve very competitive results, indicating the effectiveness of prototype in 5-shot tasks. So we mimic the first loss term in [47] and propose the prototypical loss below.

\[ \text{Prototypical Loss} = \sum_{x_i \in X_q} \sum_{c=1}^C f(x_i)_c d(x_i - \tilde{m}_c) \]

The final loss is a weighted sum of Cross-Entropy Loss and Prototypical Loss, with another parameter \( \alpha \) before Prototypical Loss.
E.3.2 Network Structure

The structure is identical to that in the toy examples, just changing the input and output dimension of each FC layer from 2 to $M$, where $M$ is the dimension of embedded features.

E.3.3 Parameters

In the few-shot setting, the meaning of $\sigma$ is slightly different: weight is now calculated by $\tilde{w}_{ij} = \exp(-\|x_i - x_j\|^2 / \sigma(x_i)^2)$, where $\sigma(x_i) = k$ means $\sigma$ is chosen to be the $k$-th closest distance from a specific point $x_i$, so it varies with points.

In ablation study, $n_{\text{top}} = 8$, $\sigma = 4$. The diffusion step size $\gamma$ is fixed to be 0.5 for all tasks. The diffusion step number $r = 10$ for 1-shot learning, $r = 5$ for 5-shot learning. $\lambda = 0.5$, $\mu = 0.01$.

In experiments with additional tricks, we also choose $n_{\text{top}} = 8$, $\sigma = 4$. The diffusion step size $\gamma$ is fixed to be 0.5 for all tasks. The diffusion step number $r$ varies with tasks: for 1-shot learning, $r = 5$ for miniImageNet and tieredImageNet, $r = 6$ for CUB; for 5-shot learning, $r = 3$ for all datasets and backbones. In addition, the weight before Prototypical Loss is $\alpha = 0$ for 1-shot tasks, and $\alpha = 0.5$ for 5-shot tasks.

The optimizer is SGD with initial learning rate $\theta = 0.1$, momentum $= 0.9$ and weight decay $= 1e-4$. We train $T = 100$ epochs. We use a multi-step scheduler, which decays the learning rate by 0.1 at $0.5T$ and $0.75T$. 