

Machine Learning: Science and Technology

Crossmark

PAPER

RECEIVED
1 October 2026REVISED
dd Month yyyyLearning without relearning physical symmetry: an $SO(3)$ -equivariant convolutional network (CNN) on the sphereJoshua Williamson^{1,*}, Niall Jeffrey^{2,1}, Lorne Whiteway¹¹Department of Physics & Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK²Department of Physics & King's Institute for Artificial Intelligence, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom

*Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: joshua.williamson.21@ucl.ac.uk**Keywords:** rotation equivariance, spherical convolutional neural networks, simulation-based inference**Abstract**

Many of the most important datasets in the physical sciences live natively on the sphere, and these data often carry no preferred position or orientation. Using methods that do not reflect this symmetry leads to far higher simulation requirements, which can be catastrophic for scientific analyses (forcing reliance on cheap, imperfect models that bias results). We present a novel spherical implementation of a gauge equivariant mesh architecture that is specifically designed for the Hierarchical Equal Area isoLatitude Pixelization (HEALPIX) of the sphere. The $SO(3)$ -equivariant convolution is built from steerable filters, parallel transport and spin-weighted features. The architecture supplies the exact symmetry, so the network does not spend training data learning it. The convolution operations are constructed to give provably exact equivariance, given a band-limit. Our full CNNs can achieve $SO(3)$ -invariance error at per-cent-level and lower, which is controlled through well-understood hyperparameters. On benchmarks, our technique gives the most accurate dense gradient regression and competitive cosmic microwave background foreground removal and denoising. The improved simulation efficiency matters most in simulation-based inference (SBI), where high-fidelity simulations are expensive and neural compressors require large training sets, so a fixed budget forces analyses with less accurate simulators. In cosmology lensing SBI, our technique yields the tightest posteriors at matched simulation count. This approach is a novel method that will enable new convolutional neural network analyses, including generative and inference tasks, for processes and data on the sphere.

1 Introduction

Many of the most important datasets in the physical sciences live natively on the sphere. The cosmic microwave background (CMB), a probe that is central to our standard model of cosmology, is measured over the full celestial sphere (Planck Collaboration *et al.*, 2020); weak gravitational lensing surveys map the large-scale structure of the Universe (Jeffrey *et al.*, 2025); and weather forecasting and climate science operate on fields covering the Earth's sphere (Bonev *et al.*, 2023).

Increasingly, extracting scientific information from these high-dimensional datasets relies on large suites of numerical simulations, most directly in simulation-based inference (SBI). High-fidelity simulations are often extremely expensive, however, forcing practical analyses to rely on cheaper, imperfect models in order to generate sufficient training data. Any mismatch between these models and reality propagates directly into the inferred posteriors. Reducing the number of simulations required can reduce this dependence on imperfect models. The more efficient the training, the less imperfect the models, as the simulation budget is spent on fidelity rather than simulation count. We provide one route to such a reduction: by encoding known physical structure as an inductive bias, the learning problem requires fewer examples. For spherical data, that structure is symmetry: these




Figure 1: Spherical data from cosmology for the benchmark tasks.

data often have no preferred position or orientation, motivating $SO(3)$ -equivariant architectures; here $SO(3)$ is the group of three-dimensional rotations.

Planar convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are poorly matched to this geometry: projections of the sphere onto the plane distort areas and distances, and translational weight sharing corresponds to no symmetry of the sphere. A network without rotation-equivariant filters must learn the same feature at every position and orientation, seeing it repeated across the training data through augmentation or natural variability. $SO(3)$ -equivariant representations remove this redundancy, sharply reducing training data requirements. When every training example is an expensive simulation, exploiting this symmetry offers a direct route to doing more science with fewer simulations. For SBI this matters twice over, since the simulation suite is both the training set and the sole source of the likelihood.

Convolutions that are both rotationally equivariant and scalable have proven difficult to construct (Table 1). Group-based spherical CNNs built on Wigner transforms (Cohen *et al.*, 2018; Esteves *et al.*, 2018; Kondor *et al.*, 2018; Cobb *et al.*, 2021) are exactly equivariant but costly, and their scalable spin-weighted descendants (Esteves *et al.*, 2020, 2023) remain bound to spectral transforms on full sky maps. Spatially localized alternatives, hybrid discrete-continuous (DISCO) convolutions (Ocampo *et al.*, 2023) and graph constructions on the Hierarchical Equal Area isoLatitude Pixelization (HEALPIX) (Perraudin *et al.*, 2019; Defferrard *et al.*, 2020) aim to be approximately rotationally equivariant, but in practice are not truly equivariant.

CNNs have been used already in SBI on probes of weak lensing and CMB maps (Jeffrey *et al.* 2025; Williamson & Makinen *et al.*, 2026; Thomsen *et al.* 2026; Wolz *et al.* 2023), and global weather forecasting (Hu *et al.*, 2025), yet few have attempted architectures that enforce strict $SO(3)$ equivariance. In this paper we demonstrate that exact $SO(3)$ equivariance can be carried onto the HEALPIX grid at practical cost, and that in a realistic weak lensing SBI task it yields tighter posteriors from the same simulation suite compared to planar, graph and axisymmetric alternatives.

2 $SO(3)$ convolution method

This section gives a self-contained account of the convolution layers used in this work. The ingredients are established: convolution on the rotation group (Cohen and Welling, 2016; Cohen *et al.*, 2018), its evaluation by quadrature with the filter kept continuous (Ocampo *et al.*, 2023), filters built from circular harmonics (Freeman and Adelson, 1991; Worrall *et al.*, 2017), and the treatment of local frames on a curved surface by parallel transport (de Haan *et al.*, 2021). Our contribution is their combination on the HEALPIX grid in a form that is exactly, rather than approximately, equivariant; derivations beyond those given here can be found in these papers and references therein.

2.1 Rotations as positions and orientations

Let S^2 be the unit sphere, with points labelled by colatitude $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ and longitude $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$, and let $SO(3)$ be the group of rotations of three-dimensional space. In the zyz Euler convention every rotation can be written as $R = Z(\phi)Y(\theta)Z(\gamma)$, where $Z(\cdot)$ and $Y(\cdot)$ denote rotations about the z and y axes. The first two factors carry the north pole $\hat{z}$ to the point $x = (\theta, \phi)$, and $\gamma \in [0, 2\pi]$ is a rotation about the axis through x , so a rotation specifies a position x on the sphere together with an orientation γ at that position. We write $g = (x, \gamma)$ for the rotation with these coordinates and call g a pose.




Figure 2: Coordinates of the SO(3) convolution: a pose, the relative pose of two points, and the transport angle.

The angle γ is measured from a reference direction in the tangent plane at x , which the Euler convention takes to be the meridian direction, i.e. local north. No such direction can be chosen continuously over the whole sphere, and this one is undefined at the two poles. This suffices for integration and, since no HEALPIX pixel centre lies at a pole, for every sample point that we use. The arbitrariness of north is the origin of the transport angle of Section 2.3.

Integration over the group uses the Haar measure μ , the unique measure up to normalization that is invariant under rotation, $\mu(QS) = \mu(S)$ for every rotation Q and every measurable set S . In Euler coordinates $d\mu = \sin \theta d\theta d\phi d\gamma$, the product of the area element $d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \sin \theta d\theta d\phi$ on the sphere and the uniform measure $d\gamma$ on the circle of orientations. A signal on the group is a function $F(x, \gamma)$ and a signal on the sphere a function $f(x)$; channel indices are suppressed.

2.2 Convolution on the rotation group

Given a signal F on SO(3) and a filter ψ , which is also a function on SO(3), their group convolution is

$$H(g) \equiv (F \star \psi)(g) = \int_{\text{SO}(3)} F(h) \psi(g^{-1}h) d\mu(h). \quad (1)$$

Here g is the pose at which the output H is evaluated, h is the integration variable running over all input poses, and $g^{-1}h$ is the pose of h relative to g , i.e. the rotation that carries the frame g to the frame h . Evaluating the filter on the relative pose is what makes equation (1) equivariant. For any rotation Q define the rotated signal $(Q \cdot F)(h) = F(Q^{-1}h)$; substituting $h = Qh'$ and using the invariance of μ ,

$$((Q \cdot F) \star \psi)(g) = \int F(h') \psi(g^{-1}Qh') d\mu(h') = (F \star \psi)(Q^{-1}g) = (Q \cdot H)(g), \quad (2)$$

so rotating the input rotates the output by the same rotation (Cohen and Welling, 2016). This is *equivariance*, the desired property.

Equation (1) maps signals on SO(3) to signals on SO(3) and is the form of every layer of the convolutional neural network, except for the first layer. The first layer receives a signal f on the sphere, and its lift to the group is

$$H(g) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f(x) \psi(g^{-1}x) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(x), \quad (3)$$

where ψ is now a function on the sphere and $g^{-1}x$ is the point x expressed in the frame g (Cohen *et al.*, 2018; Esteves *et al.*, 2018). The output depends on the orientation of g because the filter is anisotropic, and equivariance follows as in equation (2).

2.3 Relative pose in coordinates

We refer the reader to Fig. 2 to aid geometric understanding. To evaluate $\psi(g^{-1}h)$ we need coordinates for the relative pose. Let $g = (x_j, \gamma)$ and $h = (x_i, \gamma')$. The separation $\theta_{ij} \in [0, \pi]$ is the length of the shorter great-circle arc joining x_i and x_j . This is unique unless the points are antipodal, though our filters have a cutoff $\theta_c < \pi$ meaning that this never arises.

Writing $\hat{e}(x)$ for the unit tangent vector at x pointing along the meridian towards the north pole, the bearing $\alpha_{j \rightarrow i} \in [0, 2\pi)$ is the angle at x_j from $\hat{e}(x_j)$ to the direction of the arc towards x_i . The bearing $\alpha_{i \rightarrow j}$ is defined in the same way at x_i . These are two independent quantities.

The bearings depend on the choice of north, but the differences

$$u = \alpha_{j \rightarrow i} - \gamma, \quad v = \alpha_{i \rightarrow j} - \gamma' \quad (4)$$

do not: u is the direction of x_i measured from the reference direction of the frame g , and v the direction of x_j measured from that of the frame h . Since $g^{-1}h$ moves the pole to colatitude θ_{ij} and azimuth u in the frame g , with the remaining frame rotation given by v (up to an offset absorbed into the filter), $\psi(g^{-1}h)$ is a function $\psi(\theta_{ij}, u, v)$ of these three numbers.

A rotation Q carries x to Qx and carries $\hat{e}(x)$ to a tangent vector at Qx which in general is not $\hat{e}(Qx)$; the two differ by an angle $\chi_Q(x)$, the transport angle (Cohen *et al.*, 2019; de Haan *et al.*, 2021). In the coordinates of Section 2.1 the rotation therefore acts as

$$Q \cdot (x, \gamma) = (Qx, \gamma + \chi_Q(x)), \quad (5)$$

and since every bearing at x is measured from the same $\hat{e}(x)$, it shifts by the same $\chi_Q(x)$ as γ does. The differences in equation (4) are unchanged, as is θ_{ij} , which is why the integrand of equation (1) is invariant and the convolution equivariant.

2.4 Filter basis

The filter is a function on the cap $\theta \leq \theta_c$, periodic in u and in v , which we expand as

$$\psi(\theta, u, v) = \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{m=-M}^M \sum_{n=-N}^N c_{pmn} R_p(\theta) e^{imu} e^{inv}. \quad (6)$$

The R_p , $p = 1, \dots, P$, are fixed radial profiles vanishing for $\theta > \theta_c$ (we use Zernike radial polynomials), m and n are the angular orders in u and v , truncated at M and N , and the complex coefficients c_{pmn} are the only learnable parameters; smoothness at $\theta = 0$ requires $R_p(0) = 0$ whenever $m \neq 0$. These are the circular harmonic, or steerable, filters of planar rotation-equivariant networks (Freeman and Adelson, 1991; Worrall *et al.*, 2017) transferred to the sphere, adopted in place of the interpolated filters of Ocampo *et al.* (2023) for one reason: by equation (4), $e^{imu} = e^{-im\gamma} e^{im\alpha_{j \rightarrow i}}$, so changing the output orientation γ multiplies each term by a phase, and the filter is steered to any orientation exactly, without resampling.

2.5 Sampling and quadrature

Position is sampled at the $N_{\text{pix}} = 12N_{\text{side}}^2$ HEALPIX pixel centres x_i (Górski *et al.*, 2005), N_{side} being the resolution parameter, and orientation at N_γ equispaced angles $\gamma_a = 2\pi a/N_\gamma$, $a = 0, \dots, N_\gamma - 1$; the product is the equivolumetric SO(3) grid of Yershova *et al.* (2010), and a discrete signal is the set of values $F(x_i, \gamma_a)$. The integral in equation (1) is replaced by the weighted sum $\sum_i w_i (2\pi/N_\gamma) \sum_a$ over these points, with weights w_i for the sphere and $2\pi/N_\gamma$ for the circle of orientations, while the filter and the group action are kept continuous. This is the discrete-continuous approach of Ocampo *et al.* (2023), and it is what allows exact equivariance to be recovered rather than approximated.

The orientation samples integrate each Fourier mode exactly: for integer q with $|q| < N_\gamma$,

$$\frac{1}{N_\gamma} \sum_{a=0}^{N_\gamma-1} e^{iq\gamma_a} = \delta_{q0}. \quad (7)$$

For the sphere we require the w_i to integrate exactly every function whose spherical harmonic expansion contains no degree above a band limit L_w , i.e. to satisfy the moment conditions $\sum_i w_i Y_{\ell m}(x_i) = \sqrt{4\pi} \delta_{\ell 0} \delta_{m 0}$ for all $\ell \leq L_w$ and $|m| \leq \ell$, where $Y_{\ell m}$ are the spherical harmonics. HEALPIX pixels have equal area, so the natural weights $w_i = 4\pi/N_{\text{pix}}$ satisfy these conditions only approximately. We solve for quadrature weights using an initialisation of $4\pi/N_{\text{pix}}$ for all pixels (Keiner and Potts, 2008) at the band limit $L_w = 2N_{\text{side}}$, which produces small residuals of order 10^{-15} .

A signal on the group is 2π -periodic with respect to orientation and may be written as a Fourier series,

$$F(x, \gamma) = \sum_{n=-N}^N \hat{F}_n(x) e^{in\gamma}, \quad (8)$$

$$\hat{F}_n(x) = \frac{1}{N_\gamma} \sum_{a=0}^{N_\gamma-1} F(x, \gamma_a) e^{-in\gamma_a},$$

where $\hat{F}_n(x)$ is the orientation component of order n and N the orientation band limit; the second expression is exact, by equation (7), provided $N_\gamma > 2N$. We store signals as their components rather than their samples (compare Esteves *et al.*, 2020), and take the range of the filter order n in equation (6) to be the same N . The component $\hat{F}_0$ is the average of F over orientation; it transforms as a scalar field on the sphere, so its average over the sphere is rotation invariant and provides the invariant readout of the network, as explained in Section 2.8.

2.6 The discrete layers

Inserting equations (6) and (8) into the discretized equation (1), with u and v from equation (4), the sum over the input orientation samples $\gamma_{a'}$ contains the factor $(2\pi/N_\gamma) \sum_{a'} e^{i(n'-n)\gamma_{a'}}$, where n' is the order of the input component and n the order of the filter in v . By equation (7) this equals 2π if $n' = n$ and vanishes otherwise, since $|n' - n| \leq 2N < N_\gamma$, so the orientation integral can be evaluated in closed form. This is how we achieve exact $\text{SO}(3)$ -equivariance without onerous computational demands. The output of the convolution, in real-space, is give as

$$H(x_j, \gamma) = \sum_{m=-M}^M e^{-im\gamma} 2\pi \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{n=-N}^N c_{pmn} \times \sum_{i: \theta_{ij} \leq \theta_c} w_i R_p(\theta_{ij}) e^{im\alpha_{j \rightarrow i}} e^{in\alpha_{i \rightarrow j}} \hat{F}_n(x_i). \quad (9)$$

Comparing with equation (8), H is band limited in orientation and its component of order k , with $|k| \leq M$, is the coefficient of $e^{ik\gamma}$, i.e. the terms with $m = -k$. The convolution output, in Fourier-space, is calculated via

$$\hat{H}_k(x_j) = 2\pi \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{n=-N}^N c_{p,-k,n} \times \sum_{i: \theta_{ij} \leq \theta_c} w_i R_p(\theta_{ij}) e^{-ik\alpha_{j \rightarrow i}} e^{in\alpha_{i \rightarrow j}} \hat{F}_n(x_i). \quad (10)$$

This is the $\text{SO}(3)$ to $\text{SO}(3)$ layer. We note that we take $M = N$ so that the output can be passed to the next layer. The lifting layer is the case noted after equation (3): a spherical input f is the signal whose only non-zero component is $\hat{F}_0 = f$, so equation (10) retains only the $n = 0$ term and the coefficients $c_{p,-k,0}$. The innermost sum over neighbouring pixels contains no learnable parameters and depends only on the HEALPIX geometry, which we regenerate on the fly rather than store. Pointwise non-linearities act on the N_γ orientation samples given by the first expression in equation (8), after which the components are recovered by the second expression.

2.7 Equivariance of the discrete layers

The continuous convolution of equation (1) is equivariant by construction. Here we show that the discrete layer of equation (10) inherits this, exactly, whenever the two quadrature rules of Section 2.5 reproduce the integral. There are two conditions. The first relates to the orientation sum, in that the integrand contains frequencies up to $2N$, so by equation (7) it is integrated exactly provided $N_\gamma > 2N$, which we ensure by our choice of N_γ . The second relates to the sum over the sphere. At fixed output pixel j , the integrand is the product of the input component, band limited at some L_f , and the filter factor, which we take to be band limited at some effective L_ψ , so the sum equals the integral provided $L_f + L_\psi \leq L_w$. When both these conditions hold, the layer satisfies equation (2) exactly.

It is worth seeing how this works in the components, since this is what allows layers to be stacked. By equation (5), $(Q \cdot F)(Qx, \gamma) = F(x, \gamma - \chi_Q(x))$, and comparing Fourier coefficients in equation (8),

$$(\widehat{Q \cdot F})_n(Qx) = e^{-in\chi_Q(x)} \hat{F}_n(x). \quad (11)$$

Each component therefore transforms as a spin-weighted field of order n , picking up a phase set by the transport angle. Under the conditions above the sum over i in equation (10) equals the corresponding integral, so the rotated quantities can be substituted directly. The phase $e^{-in\chi_Q(x_i)}$ acquired by the input component is then cancelled by the phase $e^{in\chi_Q(x_i)}$ acquired by the back

Table 1: Comparison of convolution methods for spherical data. Columns 1–2 are described in Section 3.8. Columns 3–5 are validation RMSE for CMB foreground removal and denoising, dense gradient regression and weak lensing parameter estimation respectively; $\langle \text{FOM} \rangle$ is the mean joint posterior figure of merit for (Ω_m, S_8) inference. We use $N_\gamma = 8$, achieving per-cent-level $SO(3)$ invariance error at $N_{\text{side}} = 256$ – our error can be further reduced to 10^{-4} by introducing a spherical harmonic band limit (we leave the 1.39% value as a simpler direct comparison with the other methods).

Method	Invariance SO(3) err. (%)	Time (ms)	CMB RMSE	$ \nabla\delta $ RMSE	$\{\Omega_m, S_8\}$ RMSE	$\{\Omega_m, S_8\}$ $\langle \text{FOM} \rangle$
Planar	107.22	0.71±0.01	7.490×10^{-1}	4.37×10^{-2}	4.862×10^{-2}	561
DISCO	2.36	1.93±0.02	4.212×10^{-1}	4.08×10^{-2}	2.623×10^{-2}	1724
DeepSphere	71.56	54.86±0.02	1.755×10^{-1}	9.80×10^{-3}	2.291×10^{-2}	3467
This work	1.39	27.91±1.13	2.261×10^{-1}	4.43×10^{-3}	1.651×10^{-2}	5026

bearing $\alpha_{i \rightarrow j}$, which is only possible because the two carry the same order n ; the phase from the forward bearing $\alpha_{j \rightarrow i}$ depends only on the output pixel and factors out, so the output transforms as equation (11) requires. In other words, the orthogonality of the orientation modes that collapsed the orientation integral in Section 2.6 is also what makes the output an appropriate input to the next layer. This is the kernel constraint for rotation-equivariant features, solved for the plane by Weiler and Cesa (2019) and on curved surfaces by de Haan *et al.* (2021); here it is not imposed on the filter but falls out of the construction. The sampling conditions above are analogous to those of the $SO(3)$ sampling theorems (Kostelec and Rockmore, 2008; McEwen *et al.*, 2015), with HEALPIX and the weights of Section 2.5 playing the role of the rule for the polar angle.

These conditions apply to the convolution alone. Pointwise non-linearities, activation functions, broaden the spectrum of the signal in both orientation and position, so that the signal is no longer band limited. This is likely the source of the residual per-cent-level error in Table 1, and it can be mitigated by raising N_γ and the pixel resolution. We have tested this empirically – decreasing N_γ increases the error as expected.

2.8 Invariance for regression/classification tasks

For tasks like denoising, the convolutional neural network with equivariant layers, is itself equivariant. For tasks like regression or classification, where the network outputs a vector (so not matching the input spherical geometry), it does not make sense to consider equivariance of the entire network. Instead, we want a network $\mathcal{F}$ network to be invariant under a transformation $\mathcal{Q}$ for an input $\mathcal{S}$: $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$. To achieve this, the final network architecture’s layers, or *head*, must be constructed to preserve $SO(3)$ -invariance. We achieve this through global average pooling of each channel (i.e. averaging all elements in a channel) in advance of the final multi-layer perception (MLP) – this pooling erases any position or rotation information, as desired.

3 Benchmarking and data

3.1 Simulation-based inference

For a network summary of a weak lensing map the likelihood $p(d | \theta)$ has no closed form, but a simulator can draw $d \sim p(d | \theta)$. Simulation-based inference (SBI) learns the posterior from such simulated pairs (Cranmer *et al.*, 2020). Density estimation in $\mathcal{O}(N_{\text{pix}})$ dimensions is not feasible, so a network first compresses each map to a low-dimensional summary $\mathbf{t} = F(d)$. This compressor is where the convolution of Section 2 enters. We use neural posterior estimation (Papamakarios and Murray, 2016): a masked autoregressive flow $q_\varphi(\theta | \mathbf{t})$ (MAF; Papamakarios *et al.*, 2017) is fitted to the simulated pairs $(\theta_i, \mathbf{t}_i)$ by minimizing $-\sum_i \ln q_\varphi(\theta_i | \mathbf{t}_i)$. The fitted flow is amortized, yielding a posterior for any new observation with no further simulation and no MCMC.

3.2 Dense gradient-magnitude regression task

Each input is a Gaussian random field δ on S^2 , generated in harmonic space from a smooth power spectrum

$$C_\ell = A (\ell + 10^{-3})^{-\alpha} \exp(-(\ell/\ell_{\text{bl}})^2), \quad C_0 := 0, \quad (12)$$

with $\alpha = 1.8$, $\ell_{\text{bl}} = 2 N_{\text{side}}$, and the amplitude A fixed in closed form by requiring

$\text{Var}[\delta] = \sum_\ell \frac{2\ell+1}{4\pi} C_\ell = 1$, so every map has unit variance. Maps are band-limited at $\ell_{\text{max}} = 2 N_{\text{side}}$,




Figure 3: Cosmological parameter Ω_m – S_8 posteriors from simulation-based inference with lensing data, comparing a CNN from this work with a planar CNN, DISCO and DeepSphere compressors (i.e. embeddings) using the same number of expensive training simulations. The poor results from models not optimised for spherical data (especially the Planar CNN) given a fixed simulation budget forces a user to rely on imperfect simulators to increase the simulation count – our method avoids this by including a spherical symmetry as inductive bias.

the same band limit as our HEALPIX quadrature. The target is the smoothed gradient magnitude $|\nabla\delta| = \sqrt{(\partial_\theta\delta)^2 + (\partial_\phi\delta)^2}$, with the partial derivatives taken analytically in harmonic space, rather than by finite differencing.

3.3 Cosmic Microwave Background denoising

We evaluate on the CMB-ML benchmark (Amato *et al.*, 2025), which provides simulated Planck-like sky maps at nine frequencies ($N_{\text{side}} = 256$): a lensed CMB realization combined with Galactic and extragalactic foreground emission and correlated, frequency-dependent instrumental noise. The task is to recover the underlying CMB temperature map from these nine contaminated observations (Fig. 1b), a spherical analogue of denoising under structured, spatially correlated corruption rather than i.i.d. pixel noise.

3.4 Cosmological parameters from weak lensing maps via simulation-based inference

We use the Gower Street suite of full-sky simulations (Jeffrey *et al.*, 2025), from which we build a weak lensing convergence map at $N_{\text{side}} = 256$ for each realization (Fig. 1a), with a single source plane and a fixed source redshift; the construction is described in Section 3.5. Unlike the pixel-wise targets of the previous two tasks, the regression target here is a pair of numbers: the matter density Ω_m and the clustering amplitude S_8 , which is the combination of parameters that weak lensing constrains most tightly.

The summary given to the flow is the two-dimensional point estimate $\mathbf{t} = (\hat{\Omega}_m, \hat{S}_8)$ returned by the regression network under its mean squared error loss, so the density estimator is conditioned on two numbers per map rather than on the κ map itself. We fit a single MAF, with four networks in

the ensemble, using two autoregressive transforms and eight hidden features per transform, implemented with the `sbi` package (Tejero-Cantero *et al.*, 2020). It is trained on the parameter-summary pairs from the simulations, with the 78 maps used for the NDE validation loss. This choice comes from the limited number of simulations; as no overfitting is observed in any architecture, this does not induce a bias in our results. The joint figure of merit (FOM) in Table 1 is computed from the resulting average FOM of the 78 held out validation posteriors.

3.5 Weak lensing convergence maps

This section gives the details of the data used for the cosmological parameter regression task of Section 3.4. The Gower Street suite is a set of 791 full-sky N -body simulations of a seven-parameter νw CDM cosmology, run with PKDGRAV3 (Potter *et al.*, 2017) and described in Jeffrey *et al.* (2025). Each simulation provides pixelized matter overdensity shells $\delta(\hat{n}, \chi)$ along the observer’s lightcone, where $\hat{n}$ is a direction on the sky and χ is comoving distance. From these shells we build a Born-approximated convergence map for a single source plane fixed at $z = 0.8$,

$$\kappa(\hat{n}) = \frac{3\Omega_m H_0^2}{2c^2} \int_0^{\chi_s} \frac{\chi(\chi_s - \chi)}{\chi_s} \frac{\delta(\hat{n}, \chi)}{a(\chi)} d\chi, \quad (13)$$

with χ_s the comoving distance to the source plane, a the scale factor, H_0 the Hubble constant and c the speed of light. Every map is then downgraded to $N_{\text{side}} = 256$.

The two regression targets are the matter density Ω_m and the clustering amplitude $S_8 \equiv \sigma_8(\Omega_m/0.3)^{0.5}$. The five remaining parameters varied across the suite, namely w , $\Omega_b h^2$, m_ν , h and n_s , are not predicted by the network and are therefore marginalized over implicitly.

3.6 Networks

We compare the convolution of Section 2 against three alternatives. The architectures and network configurations for the weak lensing parameter estimation task are given in Section 3.7. The network of this work uses band limits $P = 4$, $M = N = 1$ and $N_\gamma = 8$ fibre samples, with radial profiles $R_{p,|m|}$ taken as Zernike radial polynomials of order $|m| + 2p$ in the haversine distance, multiplied by a quartic taper at the cutoff $\theta_c = 0.015590$ rad, and all computations in single precision.

DeepSphere: The HEALPIX grid is treated as a graph, with pixel centres as vertices and edge weights given by a Gaussian kernel of the Euclidean distance between the k nearest neighbours, and the convolution is a polynomial in the resulting graph Laplacian (Defferrard *et al.*, 2016; Perraudin *et al.*, 2019; Defferrard *et al.*, 2020). It costs $\mathcal{O}(N_{\text{pix}})$ and pools along the HEALPIX nested pixelization hierarchy, its filters are isotropic and the graph Laplacian produces asymptotic equivariance only as $N_{\text{pix}} \rightarrow \infty$, so equivariance is approximate at finite resolution.

DISCO: The signal and the quadrature are discretized on the sphere, while the filter and the rotation acting on it stay continuous (Ocampo *et al.*, 2023), as in equation (10), and we use the DISCO implementation of Bonev *et al.* (2023), where we port the convolutions to a HEALPIX sampling scheme. Rotations are restricted to the quotient space $\text{SO}(3)/\text{SO}(2)$, with a non-directional axisymmetric filter, which is $\text{SO}(3)$ equivariant.

Planar CNN: The sphere is unrolled onto a single equirectangular projection whose rows are the $4N_{\text{side}} - 1$ iso-latitude HEALPIX rings and whose columns are the $4N_{\text{side}}$ pixels of the equator, so that near-pole rings holding as few as four distinct pixels are stretched across every column. An ordinary two-dimensional convolution stack is applied to this raster, periodic in longitude, zero padded in latitude and read out through a solid-angle weighted pool. It encodes no rotational symmetry and heavily distorts the true spherical geometry. Every architecture is trained either to convergence or with early stopping on the validation loss to prevent overfitting. We use an 80/20 training-validation split for all datasets, apart from the weak lensing maps of Section 3.4, where the split is 90/10.

3.7 Network architectures

This section gives the parameter budget of the four networks compared on the weak lensing task of Section 3.4, as totals in Table 2 and layer by layer in Tables 3–6. All four use 16 hidden channels at a single resolution, $N_{\text{side}} = 256$, and read out the two parameters (Ω_m, S_8) through a linear head. Operations carrying no learnable parameters are omitted: activations, pooling, normalization by quadrature, and the fixed geometric quantities of each convolution, which are held as non-persistent buffers (the resampling indices and solid-angle pooling weights of the planar raster, the graph Laplacian of DeepSphere, and the separations, bearings and radial profiles of equation (10)).

Table 2: Total learnable parameters. The convolution of Section 2 carries an order of magnitude more parameters than DISCO, since its filter coefficients are complex and indexed by radial profile and by both bearing orders, yet it also gives the lowest validation RMSE and the tightest posteriors of the four (Table 1), so the gain is in how the parameters are constrained rather than in how many there are.

Network	Total params
This work	27,938
Planar CNN	11,794
DeepSphere	10,770
DISCO	2,450

Table 3: Learnable parameters of the planar CNN. Each convolution is padded manually, periodically in longitude and with zeros in colatitude.

Layer	Type	Weight shape	Bias shape	# Params
<code>blocks.0</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 1, 3, 3)	(16)	160
<code>blocks.1</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 16, 3, 3)	(16)	2,320
<code>blocks.2</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 16, 3, 3)	(16)	2,320
<code>blocks.3</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 16, 3, 3)	(16)	2,320
<code>blocks.4</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 16, 3, 3)	(16)	2,320
<code>blocks.5</code>	Conv2d (3×3)	(16, 16, 3, 3)	(16)	2,320
<code>head</code>	Linear	(2, 16)	(2)	34
Total				11,794

Table 4: Learnable parameters of DISCO, with an axisymmetric filter of three radial taps.

Layer	Type	Weight shape	Bias shape	# Params
<code>lift</code>	Discrete-continuous conv	(16, 1, 3)	(16)	64
<code>blocks.0</code>	Discrete-continuous conv	(16, 16, 3)	(16)	784
<code>blocks.1</code>	Discrete-continuous conv	(16, 16, 3)	(16)	784
<code>blocks.2</code>	Discrete-continuous conv	(16, 16, 3)	(16)	784
<code>head</code>	Linear	(2, 16)	(2)	34
Total				2,450

Table 5: Learnable parameters of DeepSphere, with Chebyshev order $K = 4$ and a 1→16→32→64 channel schedule, pooling between stages. Layer names are relative to the encoder, whose stages wrap the convolution and its normalization together.

Layer	Type	Weight shape	Bias shape	# Params
<code>blocks.0</code>	ChebConv ($K=4$)	(4, 1, 16)	(16)	80
<code>blocks.0</code>	BatchNorm1d	(16)	(16)	32
<code>blocks.1</code>	ChebConv ($K=4$)	(4, 16, 32)	(32)	2,080
<code>blocks.1</code>	BatchNorm1d	(32)	(32)	64
<code>blocks.2</code>	ChebConv ($K=4$)	(4, 32, 64)	(64)	8,256
<code>blocks.2</code>	BatchNorm1d	(64)	(64)	128
<code>head</code>	Linear	(2, 64)	(2)	130
Total				10,770

Table 6: Learnable parameters of the network of this work. The band limits of equation (6) give four radial profiles, up to two orders and three taps per channel pair; the coefficients c_{pmn} are complex, so real and imaginary parts are stored separately and the imaginary part of the $m = 0$ order is absent.

Layer	Type	Weight shapes (re, im)	Bias shape	# Params
lift	Lift $S^2 \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$	(16, 1, 4, 2), (16, 1, 4, 1)	(16)	208
blocks.0	SO(3) conv	(16, 16, 4, 2, 3), (16, 16, 4, 1, 3)	(16)	9,232
blocks.1	SO(3) conv	(16, 16, 4, 2, 3), (16, 16, 4, 1, 3)	(16)	9,232
blocks.2	SO(3) conv	(16, 16, 4, 2, 3), (16, 16, 4, 1, 3)	(16)	9,232
head	Linear	(2, 16)	(2)	34
Total				27,938

3.8 Equivariance, invariance, and time test protocols

The invariance error of Table 1 is measured end-to-end on the trained networks, which are comprised of our equivariant convolutional layers, of the weak lensing task. Each validation map is rotated on the sphere by a random Euler rotation, and both the original and rotated maps are normalized by the training-set statistics and passed through the same frozen network. The error is the percentage deviation of the predicted summaries under rotation, and Table 1 quotes the mean over rotations and validation maps. The rotations are drawn once from a fixed seed and reused across every architecture.

The time column of Table 1 times the first layer of each network, which maps the raw HEALPIX scalar map into the working representation of the given architecture, rather than the full forward pass, since the networks differ in depth and a whole-model timing would largely measure those unrelated choices. All four architectures are timed sequentially in a single process on one dedicated, otherwise idle GPU, since contention on shared nodes inflates latencies by tens to hundreds of per cent. A single $N_{\text{side}} = 256$ map is passed at batch size one; warm-up iterations are discarded to settle kernel selection, then 50 forward passes and 50 forward-backward passes are timed individually, each bracketed by paired CUDA events with device synchronization, so the quoted numbers are per-call latencies rather than throughput. Table 1 reports the mean and standard deviation of the forward pass in single precision.

3.9 Results

Referring to Table 1, as expected the planar architecture has poor SO(3) equivariance. DeepSphere also exhibits large equivariance error, due to the relatively poor resolution of the input maps. Our implementation, along with DISCO, offers near per-cent-level equivariance for the entire network. Under random rotations of the map, the inferred summaries shift on average only around a couple of per cent. Therefore any learned summary has SO(3) equivariant features extracted from it.

The usefulness of this is evidenced by the weak lensing parameter estimation task, where our architecture both provides the best validation loss and the largest average FOM, thereby resulting in the most precise constraints of all the methods. Fig. 3 shows the posteriors of each method for a map at the prior mean of Ω_m and S_8 from the Gower Street simulations.

We attribute this success not only to the exact equivariance of the network but also to the directionality of its filters: the non-zero bearing orders m and n of equation (6) carry oriented, spin-weighted features that an axisymmetric filter cannot represent. We note, however, that the κ maps are of relatively low resolution ($N_{\text{side}} = 256$), so the amount of non-linear (non-Gaussian) information available to be extracted beyond the power spectrum is limited. The planar CNN collapses to the trivial solution of predicting the ensemble mean of the dataset, so its posteriors in Ω_m are prior driven. The planar CNN cannot predict Ω_m at the resolution of the input maps.

In the remaining tasks of CMB denoising and dense gradient regression on Gaussian random fields, the spherical convolution methods all perform significantly better than the naive planar method. Our method performs particularly well in the Gaussian random field dense gradient regression task. DeepSphere performs best in the CMB denoising task. We note that this task is not strictly SO(3) equivariant, as the instrumental noise has a preferred orientation on the sky, so an exact symmetry inductive bias is not necessarily optimal here.

4 Discussion

The method has limitations. It is slower than the planar and DISCO baselines (Table 1). Its equivariance is exact only under the assumptions of Section 2, which real observations satisfy only approximately.

In this paper we have presented a $\text{SO}(3)$ -equivariant convolutional neural network and introduced four distinct contributions.

First, in Section 2 we have introduced a convolution for data on the sphere, defined directly on the HEALPIX grid, that is exactly equivariant under $\text{SO}(3)$, the group of three-dimensional rotations: rotating the input map rotates the network response in the same way. The symmetry is built into the structure of the network itself, through steerable filters, parallel transport of local reference frames and spin-weighted features, rather than being learned from training data.

Second, this exactness does not come at prohibitive cost: each filter acts only over a small neighbourhood of each pixel, no transform of the full sky is ever required, and in the tests of Section 3.8 the predictions of the trained networks shift by only around one per cent when the input maps are rotated, the smallest deviation of all the methods compared.

Third, on tasks where the true answer is known, the method recovers the gradient magnitude of Gaussian random fields (Section 3.2) more accurately than the planar, graph-based and axisymmetric alternatives, and removes noise and foreground contamination from cosmic microwave background maps (Section 3.3) with accuracy comparable to other methods in the literature.

Fourth, in Section 3.4 we have shown what the symmetry is worth for inference: given the same number of training simulations, our network yields the tightest and most accurate constraints on the cosmological parameters Ω_m and S_8 , the matter density and the amplitude of matter clustering from cosmology data. A given measurement precision therefore requires fewer training simulations, and a fixed budget can be spent making each simulation more faithful to reality rather than simply making more of them, reducing the reliance on imperfect models in scientific analyses. We have introduced a scalable, exactly $\text{SO}(3)$ equivariant convolution on the HEALPIX grid and demonstrated it in SBI from spherical cosmological data. The symmetry is supplied by the architecture rather than learned from data, so a given precision requires fewer training simulations.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Ofer Lahav for useful discussions. JW is supported by the STFC UCL Centre for Doctoral Training in Data Intensive Science (grant ST/W00674X/1) and by departmental and industry contributions. NJ acknowledges support from the King's AI+ Academic Fellowship at King's College London. NJ also acknowledges support from the ERC-selected UKRI Frontier Research Grant EP/Y03015X/1. The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability

The data and code will be made publicly available upon acceptance.

References

- Amato J, Xie Y, Medina-Varela L, Aljerwi A, McCutcheon A, Rippentrop T S, Gonzalez K, Delabrouille J, Ishak M and Ruozzi N 2025 in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* pp. 9418–9430
- Bonev B, Kurth T, Hundt C, Pathak J, Baust M, Kashinath K and Anandkumar A 2023 in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning* vol. 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* pp. 2806–2823
- Cobb O J, Wallis C G R, Mavor-Parker A N, Marignier A, Price M A, d'Avezac M and McEwen J D 2021 in *International Conference on Learning Representations*
- Cohen T S, Geiger M, Köhler J and Welling M 2018 in *International Conference on Learning Representations*
- Cohen T S, Weiler M, Kicanaoglu B and Welling M 2019 in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* pp. 1321–1330
- Cohen T S and Welling M 2016 in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* pp. 2990–2999
- Cranmer K, Brehmer J and Louppe G 2020 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**(48) 30055–30062
- de Haan P, Weiler M, Cohen T and Welling M 2021 in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*

- Defferrard M, Bresson X and Vandergheynst P 2016 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **1606.09375**
- Defferrard M, Milani M, Gusset F and Perraudin N 2020 in *International Conference on Learning Representations*
- Esteves C, Allen-Blanchette C, Makadia A and Daniilidis K 2018 in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)* pp. 52–68
- Esteves C, Makadia A and Daniilidis K 2020 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* vol. 33 pp. 8614–8625
- Esteves C, Slotine J J and Makadia A 2023 in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning* vol. 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* pp. 9396–9411
- Freeman W T and Adelson E H 1991 *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **13**(9) 891–906
- Górski K M, Hivon E, Banday A J, Wandelt B D, Hansen F K, Reinecke M and Bartelmann M 2005 *The Astrophysical Journal* **622** 759–771
- Hu Y, Yin F, Zhang W, Ren K, Song J, Deng K and Zhang D 2025 *Scientific Reports* **15** 11522
- Jeffrey N, Whiteway L, Gatti M, Williamson J, Alsing J, Porredon A *et al.* 2025 *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **536** 1303 **2403.02314**
- Keiner J and Potts D 2008 *Mathematics of Computation* **77**(261) 397–419
- Kondor R, Lin Z and Trivedi S 2018 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* vol. 31
- Kostelec P J and Rockmore D N 2008 *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* **14**(2) 145–179
- McEwen J D, Büttner M, Leistedt B, Peiris H V and Wiaux Y 2015 *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **22**(12) 2425–2429
- Ocampo J, Price M A and McEwen J D 2023 in *International Conference on Learning Representations*
- Papamakarios G and Murray I 2016 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* vol. 29 **1605.06376**
- Papamakarios G, Pavlakou T and Murray I 2017 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* vol. 30 **1705.07057**
- Perraudin N, Defferrard M, Kacprzak T and Sgier R 2019 *Astronomy and Computing* **27** 130–146
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim N, Akrami Y *et al.* 2020 *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **641** A6
- Potter D, Stadel J and Teyssier R 2017 *Computational Astrophysics and Cosmology* **4**(1) 2 **1609.08621**
- Tejero-Cantero A, Boelts J, Deistler M, Lueckmann J M, Durkan C, Gonçalves P J, Greenberg D S and Macke J H 2020 *Journal of Open Source Software* **5**(52) 2505
- Thomsen A *et al.* 2026 *Physical Review D* **2511.04681**
- Weiler M and Cesa G 2019 in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* vol. 32
- Williamson J, Makinen T L *et al.* 2026 *arXiv e-prints* p. arXiv:2606.11309 **2606.11309**
- Wolz K, Krachmalnicoff N and Pagano L 2023 *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **676** A30 **2301.09634**
- Worrall D E, Garbin S J, Turmukhambetov D and Brostow G J 2017 in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* pp. 5028–5037
- Yershova A, Jain S, LaValle S M and Mitchell J C 2010 *International Journal of Robotics Research* **29**(7) 801–812