

Geometric Algebra for Neural Networks: A Survey

Tao Zhong¹, Kaison Fong², Keqin Wang¹, Christine Allen-Blanchette¹

¹Princeton University · ²Stanford University

Geometric algebra (GA) unifies geometric primitives and transformations in a single algebraic framework. Neural networks designed around this framework often represent features as multivectors and constrain layer operations to respect the algebraic structure, enabling principled treatment of geometric transformations and, in many cases, built-in equivariance. This survey reviews geometric algebra neural networks, including their building blocks, equivariant properties, application domains, empirical performance, and software support. We provide an algebra-selection guide, an empirical comparison of GA-based and other equivariant architectures, and a failure-mode analysis covering training pathologies, deployment constraints, and performance limitations. Across the surveyed literature, the strongest evidence for GA-based architectures appears in settings with explicit geometric symmetries and heterogeneous geometric entities; evidence for broader advantages in parameter efficiency, interpretability, and dense prediction is comparatively limited and uneven. We therefore conclude that geometric algebra neural networks are not universally superior to well-tuned non-GA equivariant baselines, and outline open problems in algebra selection, numerical stability, scalable implementation, and reproducible evaluation.

Keywords Geometric algebra, Clifford algebra, geometric deep learning, equivariant neural networks, multivector representations, geometric transformations.

Date October 22, 2026

Project <https://cab-lab-princeton.github.io/AwesomeGANN>

Paper list github.com/CAB-Lab-Princeton/AwesomeGANN

Contact tzhong@princeton.edu, ca15@princeton.edu



Contents

I	Introduction	3
I-A	Survey Methodology	4
II	Foundational Concepts: GA for NNs	6
II-A	GA Fundamentals	6
II-B	Key Algebras	6
II-C	Representing Geometry and Transformations	7
II-D	Algebra Selection Guide	8
III	GDL Principles: Equivariance and Symmetries	8
III-A	Leveraging Symmetries in Deep Learning	8
III-B	Foundational Group Theory for Equivariance	9
III-C	Achieving Equivariance with Geometric Algebra	10

III-D	Comparison with Non-GA Equivariant Approaches	11
III-E	The Clifford Group and its Action in Equivariant Networks	11
IV	GA NN Layers	13
IV-A	Multivector Representations	13
IV-B	GA-Parametrized Linear and Bilinear Layers	14
IV-C	Transformation-based Layers	15
IV-D	Activations and Normalizations	15
IV-E	GA-based Attention Mechanisms	16
IV-F	Building GA-NN Architectures	17
V	Applications	18
V-A	Computer Vision and Graphics	18
V-B	Computational Biology and Chemistry	20
V-C	Physics-Informed Machine Learning	22
V-D	Robotics	22
V-E	Other Notable Applications	23
VI	Empirical Studies	23
VI-A	What transfers across the literature	24
VI-B	Comparative evidence by application family	25
VI-C	Computational cost and scalability	26
VI-D	Failure modes and limitations	26
VI-E	Summary of evidence status	27
VI-F	Recommended benchmarking practice	27
VII	Software Libraries and Implementation	28
VII-A	ML Libraries: PyTorch, TensorFlow, and JAX	28
VII-B	General Purpose Libraries	29
VII-C	Challenges and Future Needs for Software Support	29
VIII	Future Directions and Conclusion	29
	References	30

I Introduction

Neural networks (NNs) [1, 2] have achieved broad success across perception and representation learning [3, 4], but they often treat geometric data through scalar or tensor parameterizations that obscure its underlying structure. This limitation is especially acute in modern perception and reasoning systems, where models must jointly manipulate heterogeneous geometric entities, including points, pixels, poses, rays, lines, planes, rigid motions, and cross-sensor transformations. In conventional pipelines, these entities are typically encoded using disparate representations and connected through ad hoc conversions. When such information is flattened into unstructured feature vectors, relationships such as incidence, orientation, metric structure, and transformation equivariance are no longer explicit [5]. As a result, models may require extensive data augmentation to approximate basic symmetries [6, 7], generalize poorly to unseen geometric configurations [8, 9], and provide limited insight into the geometric computations they perform [10]. These difficulties point less to a lack of model capacity than to a mismatch between the structure of geometric data and the representations through which many neural architectures process it.

Clifford algebra [11, 12, 13, 14], often called geometric algebra (GA) in applied settings, offers a compelling response to this representational fragmentation. It provides an algebraically coherent framework in which diverse geometric entities, including points, lines, planes, circles, and spheres, and transformations, including rotations, translations, reflections, and dilations, can be represented within a common language. This contrasts with conventional pipelines in which directions, rotations, rigid motions, and projective transformations are often handled by separate formalisms such as vector algebra, quaternions, homogeneous coordinates, or transformation matrices. By encoding geometric structure directly into representations and operations, GA-native models can impose geometric priors that are difficult to express in unstructured scalar feature spaces. In selected settings, these priors have been associated with improved data efficiency [15, 16] and more interpretable intermediate representations [17]. For the pattern analysis and machine intelligence community, GA is especially relevant when a task requires joint reasoning over multiple geometric entity types, as in 3D vision, embodied perception, multi-sensor fusion, pose estimation, and manipulation. In these contexts, a unified algebraic framework can simplify layer design and reduce representational fragmentation.

Research on GA-based neural networks has grown rapidly alongside geometric deep learning (GDL), which seeks to encode geometric priors and symmetries directly into model architectures [18]. Recent GA-native models have appeared across biology [19, 20], physics [21], and computer science [16, 22], reflecting the appeal of GA as a common language for structured geometric computation. At the same time, the literature remains difficult to synthesize because methods differ in their choice of algebra, notation, equivariance target, architectural primitives, and evaluation protocol. This survey addresses that fragmentation by organizing GA-native neural networks according to shared mathematical foundations, design patterns, empirical evidence, and open limitations.

Within GDL, many successful architectures are designed around particular data structures or symmetry groups. Graph neural networks (GNNs) [5] operate on relational and non-Euclidean data, while group-equivariant [6, 9] and steerable [23] convolutional networks encode prescribed transformation laws for images, volumetric fields, and related grid-structured signals. These approaches provide strong inductive biases, but their mathematical formulations are often specialized to particular symmetry groups, domains, or representation types. GA-native networks offer a complementary route: they use multivector representations and Clifford-algebra operations to express geometric entities and transformations within a common algebraic language. This perspective has




Figure 1 | Positioning of this survey relative to adjacent literatures. Existing surveys either treat GA broadly across applications or GDL broadly across formalisms; this survey focuses on GA-native neural networks while covering foundations, architectures, applications, empirical evidence, and software.

been instantiated across graphs [24, 25], point clouds [26, 15], manifolds [27], and fields [15]. However, this generality does not automatically imply empirical superiority. As Section III-D and Section VI detail, mature non-GA equivariant architectures remain competitive in many settings, and a central aim of this survey is to assess where GA-native structure provides a genuine advantage.

This survey distinguishes itself from prior work through a focused treatment of what we term *GA-native* neural networks: models whose learnable representations and core operations act directly on multivectors or structured grade-wise GA objects. We exclude works that use GA only for preprocessing, feature engineering, or coordinate conversion while performing learning in conventional scalar or tensor spaces. Borderline cases, such as conformal-GA input embeddings followed by otherwise standard networks, are included only when GA operations remain part of the learned forward map. In contrast to general GA surveys [28, 29, 30, 31, 32] and broader GDL surveys [33, 34, 35, 36], we emphasize GA-native architectures and synthesize empirical conclusions only when methods are compared on shared tasks, datasets, and metrics. Fig. 1 situates the survey within this adjacent literature. Our main contributions are:

- A unified taxonomy of GA-native neural networks, organized by algebra choice, multivector representation, layer operation, equivariance target, architecture family, and application domain.
- An algebra-selection guide comparing Euclidean, projective, conformal, and spacetime algebras in terms of their geometric primitives, transformation groups, computational costs, and modeling trade-offs.
- A critical synthesis of empirical evidence comparing GA-native models with non-GA equivariant and geometric deep learning baselines on shared tasks, datasets, and metrics.
- A failure-mode and implementation analysis covering numerical stability, training pathologies, scalability, software support, deployment constraints, and reproducibility.
- A set of open problems and research directions for principled architecture design, benchmark construction, efficient implementation, and reliable evaluation.

I-A Survey Methodology

This survey follows a structured literature-search protocol. We searched major academic databases and preprint repositories using combinations of Clifford- and geometric-algebra terminology with neural-network and deep-learning terms, augmented by domain-specific modifiers such as vision,




Figure 2 | Generic GA-native neural-network pipeline. The choice of algebra fixes the geometric vocabulary and symmetry bias; multivector embeddings are then processed by GA primitives and assembled into architecture families matched to downstream tasks.

molecular, physics, and robotics. We also performed backward and forward citation tracking from foundational GA-NN papers [15, 22, 37]. Preprints that appeared at peer-reviewed venues by the time of writing are treated as published work.

Inclusion criteria. A work is included if its learnable forward map operates directly on multivectors or structured grade-wise GA objects, which we refer to as the *GA-native* criterion. Works that use GA only for preprocessing, feature engineering, or coordinate conversion, while carrying out the main learning process in conventional scalar or tensor spaces, are excluded from the core corpus. Borderline cases, such as CGA-based input embeddings followed by otherwise standard networks, are included only when GA operations remain part of the learned computational graph.

Exclusion criteria. We exclude pure-mathematics GA papers without a learning component, tutorial introductions, and works operating exclusively on quaternions or dual quaternions without broader Clifford-algebraic structure. Non-archival workshop abstracts that lack sufficient methodological detail for assessment are also omitted.

After deduplication and screening, the final corpus comprises approximately 80 GA-native works, together with approximately 40 contextual references spanning general GA, GDL, and non-GA baseline methods. In the empirical synthesis of Section VI, we grade each matched benchmark setting as *Strong*, *Moderate*, or *Preliminary* according to the reliability of the comparison. This grade reflects our confidence in the evidence rather than the magnitude or direction of any reported performance gap. It is set by the number of independent replications, the maturity and relevance of the benchmark, the availability of strong non-GA baselines, and the consistency of the evaluation protocol. A central outcome of this synthesis is partly negative: outside settings with explicit geometric symmetries or heterogeneous geometric entities, the current literature does not yet support broad claims of GA-native superiority, owing to sparse matched benchmarks, limited dense-prediction results, and heterogeneous evaluation practices.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows, with Fig. 2 providing a compact roadmap of the design space. Section II revisits foundational GA concepts with emphasis on their relevance to NN design and provides an algebra-selection decision aid. Section III discusses the GDL principles realized by GA-native architectures and compares them with non-GA equivariant alternatives. Section IV reviews GA-native layers and architecture families. Section V surveys applications. Section VI synthesizes empirical performance with evidence-strength grading. Section VII covers software support and implementation practice. Finally, Section VIII outlines open problems and concludes the survey.

II Foundational Concepts: GA for NNs

II-A GA Fundamentals

This section summarizes the GA concepts needed for neural-network design. Let V be an n -dimensional real vector space equipped with a quadratic form of signature (p, q, r) , where $n = p + q + r$. The associated geometric algebra $\mathbb{G}_{p,q,r}$ is the associative algebra generated by basis vectors $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ whose squares are $+1$, -1 , or 0 , depending on whether they correspond to positive, negative, or null directions of the metric. The geometric product of basis vectors satisfies $e_i e_j = -e_j e_i$ [38].

The fundamental element of GA is the *multivector*, which is a linear combination of components of different *grades*. In an n -dimensional algebra, a multivector M can be decomposed as $M = \langle M \rangle_0 + \langle M \rangle_1 + \langle M \rangle_2 + \cdots + \langle M \rangle_n$, where $\langle M \rangle_k$ denotes the grade- k component. Grade-0 elements are scalars, grade-1 elements are vectors, grade-2 elements are bivectors, grade-3 elements are trivectors, and the highest-grade element is the pseudoscalar $e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$. A *k-blade* is an outer product of k linearly independent vectors and represents an oriented k -dimensional subspace. Every multivector can be expressed as a linear combination of basis blades. Since there is one basis blade for each subset of the n basis vectors, $\mathbb{G}_{p,q,r}$ has $\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} = 2^n$ basis blades.

The geometric product is the central operation of GA. For vectors $x, y \in V$, it decomposes into symmetric and antisymmetric parts $xy = x \cdot y + x \wedge y$. The inner product (first term) measures metric similarity, while the outer product (second term) constructs oriented subspaces. In GA-native neural networks geometric-product layers can mix grades and introduce new grades unless the architecture constrains them.

A multivector R is called a *versor* if it can be written as a geometric product of invertible vectors $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_r$. Versors generate geometric transformations, vectors, through sandwich actions of the form $x \mapsto RxR^{-1}$. Even versors include rotors and motors, which are widely used to represent rotations and rigid motions in GA-native architectures. Thus, multivectors provide the representation space, the geometric product provides the primitive algebraic operation, and versors provide a compact mechanism for encoding transformation structure.

II-B Key Algebras

GA-native neural networks differ not only in architecture but also in the choice of underlying algebra. The most common choices in the current literature are Euclidean GA (EGA), projective GA (PGA), conformal GA (CGA), and spacetime algebra (STA). This choice determines the available basis blades, native geometric objects, transformation groups, equivariance constraints, and computational cost (see Table 1). Selecting the appropriate algebra therefore remains an active design question [39, 40, 41]: EGA is compact but lacks native translations, PGA represents rigid motions naturally, CGA adds conformal and distance-aware structure at higher dimension, and STA is tailored to Lorentzian geometry.

Euclidean GA (EGA) $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$ [45] has basis vectors $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ and is spanned by $2^3 = 8$ basis blades $\{1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{23}, e_{123}\}$. Its multivectors contain scalars, vectors, bivectors representing oriented planes, and the pseudoscalar e_{123} . EGA represents rotations and reflections naturally through the $O(3)$ action, but it does not encode translations or affine subspaces natively. Tasks involving rigid motions or incidence relations among affine objects therefore often require an augmented algebra such as PGA or CGA [12, 15, 46].

Table 1 | Principal algebras used in GA-native neural networks. Canonical references are listed in the rightmost column.

Algebra	Signature	Native symmetry	Native objects / actions	NN design takeaway	Representative works
EGA	$\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$	$O(3)/SO(3)$	vectors, bivectors, rotors; rotations, reflections	compact and stable; no native translations, often needs centering	CGENN [22], GCAN [16]
PGA	$\mathbb{G}_{3,0,1}$	$E(3)$	planes, lines, points, motors; rigid motions	native isometries for meshes and poses; inner product not distance-aware	GATr [15], GAGrasp [42]
CGA	$\mathbb{G}_{4,1,0}$	conformal $\supset E(3)$	null points, circles, spheres; dilations, inversions	richest object vocabulary, distance-aware; 32 blades, indefinite metric	CGA-PoseNet [43], C-GATr [39]
STA	$\mathbb{G}_{1,3,0}$	Lorentz	events, bivectors, spinors; boosts	natural for relativistic / Maxwell systems; not for Euclidean 3D tasks	STAResNet [40], L-GATr [44]

Projective GA (PGA) $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,1}$ [46, 47] augments 3D Euclidean directions with a null basis vector e_0 where ($e_0^2 = 0$), yielding $2^4 = 16$ basis blades. A vector $v = \mathbf{n} - \delta e_0$ represents an oriented plane with unit normal $\mathbf{n}$ at signed distance δ from the origin, and reflections are generated by sandwiching with such plane vectors. Rigid transformations decompose into products of plane reflections: two intersecting planes give a rotation, two parallel planes a translation [47]. This makes PGA well-suited for $E(3)$ -structured tasks [16, 15].

Conformal GA (CGA) $\mathbb{G}_{4,1,0}$ [11, 48] embeds 3D Euclidean space into a 5D space with $2^5 = 32$ basis blades by introducing two additional directions, often represented through origin and infinity null vectors o and ∞ . A Euclidean point p is embedded as a null vector $p = o + \mathbf{p} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}^2\infty$, and the inner product between embedded points encodes squared Euclidean distance [48]. Circles, spheres, and conformal transformations can be represented compactly as blades or versors, giving CGA the a broad geometric vocabulary. This expressiveness comes at the cost of 32-dimensional multivectors and an indefinite metric, which can introduce numerical and implementation challenges in neural architectures [47, 39].

Spacetime Algebra (STA) $\mathbb{G}_{1,3,0}$ [14, 49] models Minkowski spacetime using one timelike direction and three spacelike directions, with $e_0^2 = 1$ and $e_k^2 = -1$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Its multivectors encode events, spacetime bivectors, and spinorial representations of Lorentz transformations. The *spacetime split* decomposes a spacetime vector into temporal and spatial components relative to a reference frame, while Lorentz transformations are represented through versor sandwich actions. STA is natural for relativistic systems, electromagnetism, and high-energy physics [50, 51, 44], but it is usually unnecessary for purely Euclidean 3D perception tasks.

II-C Representing Geometry and Transformations

The practical appeal of GA for neural-network design is that geometric objects and transformations can often be represented within the same algebraic system. The precise interpretation of a multivector depends on the chosen algebra: vectors represent directed quantities in EGA, planes in common PGA conventions, null points in CGA, and spacetime events in STA. Higher-grade blades, formed through the outer product ($\wedge$), represent oriented subspaces or composite geometric entities such as lines, planes, circles, and spheres, depending on the algebra. Thus, the choice of algebra fixes both the geometric vocabulary available to the model and the transformations that can be expressed naturally.

Transformations in GA are commonly represented by *versors*, products of invertible vectors that act by sandwiching. For a unit vector n , the map $x' = -nxn$ reflects a vector x in the hyperplane orthogonal to n . More general orthogonal transformations are obtained by composing such reflections. In particular, the product of two unit vectors defines an even versor, or *rotor*, which represents a rotation in the plane spanned by the corresponding directions.

A rotor can be written in exponential form as $R = e^{-B\theta/2}$, where B is a unit bivector specifying the rotation plane and θ is the rotation angle. The rotated multivector is obtained by the sandwich action $x' = Rx\tilde{R}$, where $\tilde{R}$ denotes reversion. This formulation is dimension-independent: rotations are associated with oriented planes rather than with axes, making the same algebraic mechanism applicable beyond three dimensions.

Rigid-body motions require both rotations and translations. In projective geometric algebra, these are represented by *motors*, even versors that implement elements of $SE(3)$ through the same sandwich-action principle. Motors compactly encode rigid transformations and are therefore useful in GA-native models for poses, frames, articulated objects, and rigid-body tokens. However, motors represent orientation-preserving rigid motions; isometries involving an odd number of reflections require more general versors. For GA-native neural networks, these transformation mechanisms determine which quantities can be parameterized directly, which equivariances can be enforced by construction, and which operations require additional constraints or projections.

II-D Algebra Selection Guide

The choice of algebra is one of the most consequential design decisions in a GA-native network, yet the literature has not converged on a single selection procedure. Table 2 provides a compact decision aid distilled from the patterns observed across the surveyed works. The primary decision variables are: (i) the geometric objects required by the task, such as positions, directions, lines, planes, circles, or spheres; (ii) the target transformation group; (iii) whether metric quantities such as distances should be represented directly in the algebra; and (iv) the available engineering budget for numerical stability, memory, and implementation complexity. The table also makes explicit when GA may be unnecessary: if the task contains no structured geometric objects, if the relevant symmetry is already handled well by a mature non-GA architecture, or if the algebraic overhead exceeds the expected inductive-bias benefit, a non-GA equivariant or conventional neural architecture (see Section III-D) may be preferable.

III GDL Principles: Equivariance and Symmetries

Geometric Deep Learning (GDL) studies neural architectures whose inductive biases are matched to the structure and symmetries of the data domain. Following the Erlangen-inspired perspective of Bronstein et al. [18], a learning problem is characterized by the transformations under which predictions should be invariant or equivariant. GA-native networks fit into this programme by representing geometric quantities as multivectors and using algebraic operations designed to respect the associated transformation groups.

III-A Leveraging Symmetries in Deep Learning

Incorporating known symmetries into neural architectures is a central strategy in GDL. Translation equivariance in convolutional networks [52, 4], rotation equivariance in geometric and structural

Table 2 | Algebra-selection decision aid for GA-native neural network design. Each row corresponds to a primary task need; the recommended algebra, rationale, and avoidance conditions are synthesized from the surveyed literature.

Task need	Prefer	Why	Avoid if	Representative tasks
Rotation-only features on centerable data	EGA	compact (8 blades), stable, well-supported	translations matter; data cannot be centered	PDE fields, O(3) molecular features
Rigid-body tokens (positions + orientations)	PGA	native E(3) motors; 16 blades	distance-aware attention is critical	mesh regression, protein frames, grasps
Distance-sensitive or conformal geometry	CGA	squared-distance inner product; circles, spheres as blades	indefinite metric causes instability; 32-bit precision required	pose regression, distance-aware attention
Relativistic / Lorentz-covariant data	STA	native Lorentz group; spacetime split	task is purely Euclidean 3D	HEP jets, Maxwell surrogates
Only scalar / categorical features; no geometric objects	—	GA adds overhead without representational benefit	always	tabular data, NLP, standard image classification

Common failure mode if misapplied: EGA, loses translations; PGA, cannot represent circles/spheres; CGA, unnecessary overhead for rigid geometry; STA, over-specialized for non-relativistic tasks.

models [53], and permutation invariance or equivariance in point-set and graph models [54, 55] illustrate how architectural constraints can improve data efficiency, generalization under transformations, and robustness [18]. GA-native layers pursue the same goal through algebraic structure: multivector representations, geometric products, grade projections, and versor actions can be arranged so that features transform consistently under the target symmetry group [15, 22, 44, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60]. In favorable settings, this can reduce reliance on data augmentation and improve sample efficiency [16, 19, 15, 42]. A controlled GATr scaling study [61] finds that augmentation can close the data-efficiency gap given sufficient epochs, while GATr outperforms non-equivariant models at every tested compute budget.

III-B Foundational Group Theory for Equivariance

We briefly recall the group-theoretic notation needed for the Clifford-group discussion below. A *group* $(G, \circ)$ is a set equipped with a binary operation satisfying closure, associativity, identity, and inverse axioms. Important geometric groups include the orthogonal group $O(n)$, consisting of origin-preserving isometries such as rotations and reflections; the special orthogonal group $SO(n) \subset O(n)$, consisting of orientation-preserving rotations; and the special Euclidean group $SE(n)$, consisting of orientation-preserving rigid motions, i.e., rotations and translations. A subgroup $H \subseteq G$ is a subset that is itself a group under the same operation.

A *group action* $G \times X \rightarrow X$ specifies how each group element transforms elements of a set X , satisfying $e \cdot x = x$ and $(g \circ h) \cdot x = g \cdot (h \cdot x)$. When X is a vector space V , a linear action is often represented by a homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(V)$, so that $\rho(g_1 \circ g_2) = \rho(g_1)\rho(g_2)$. In neural networks, ρ_X and ρ_Y denote how the group acts on input and output feature spaces, respectively.

A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *G-equivariant* if $f(\rho_X(g)x) = \rho_Y(g)f(x)$ for all $g \in G$ and $x \in X$. Equivariance means that transforming the input and then applying f gives the same result as applying f first and




Figure 3 | Commutative view of equivariance. A NN layer is equivariant when transforming the input and then applying f_θ yields the same result as applying f_θ first and then transforming the output. Invariance is the special case with trivial output action.

then transforming the output. The special case in which the output action is trivial, $\rho_Y(g) = I$, gives G -invariance: $f(\rho_X(g)x) = f(x)$. Fig. 3 gives the standard commutative view.

III-C Achieving Equivariance with Geometric Algebra

GA provides a structured route to equivariant neural-network design because many geometric transformations can be represented as versor or Clifford-group actions on multivectors. When layers are built from operations that commute with these actions, such as geometric products, grade projections, invariant scalar functions, and appropriate sandwich actions, the resulting maps can be equivariant by construction [39, 19, 44, 15, 42].

Different GAs support different transformation groups and therefore induce different geometric biases. In Euclidean GA $\mathbb{G}_{n,0,0}$, rotations and reflections are represented through the associated $\text{Spin}(n)$ and $\text{Pin}(n)$ actions, which double-cover $\text{SO}(n)$ and $\text{O}(n)$, respectively [62, 16]. Operations such as geometric products, grade projections, and rotor actions can preserve $\text{SO}(n)$ - or $\text{O}(n)$ -covariance when used in architectures that respect these actions [63].

Projective GA $\mathbb{G}_{n,0,1}$ is well suited to Euclidean equivariance. Even versors, known as *motors*, implement orientation-preserving rigid motions from the $\text{SE}(n)$ group, and odd versors, including reflections, implement motions from the larger $\text{E}(n)$ group. These transformations act on PGA representations of points, lines, and planes through sandwich products. The Geometric Algebra Transformer (GATr) [15] and related models [19, 39, 42, 64, 65, 66] are among the architectures that use PGA-style multivectors for $\text{E}(3)$ - or $\text{SE}(3)$ -structured learning. Conformal GA $\mathbb{G}_{n+1,1,0}$ can also represent Euclidean transformations as a subgroup of conformal transformations [39].

Spacetime Algebra (STA) $\mathbb{G}_{1,3,0}$ is the natural algebraic setting for Lorentz-covariant modeling. Neural networks built using STA or Lorentzian GA variants, such as L-GATr [44, 67], can be made equivariant to Lorentz transformations, which is central in relativistic physics.

This hierarchy means that the choice of GA strongly influences the symmetry group that a network can represent naturally. Choosing an algebra that includes more structure than the task requires may introduce unnecessary dimensionality, constraints, or numerical complexity [15], whereas choosing an algebra with insufficient structure may leave important geometric relationships outside the model's native representation. GA-native models should therefore be understood as one route to geometry-

aware learning, alongside non-GA equivariant approaches such as group-equivariant CNNs [6], steerable CNNs [23], Tensor Field Networks [68], and $E(n)$ -equivariant GNNs [69]. The distinctive appeal of GA is not equivariance alone, which these alternatives also provide, but the possibility of expressing heterogeneous geometric entities and their transformations within a single algebraic framework, potentially simplifying layers that must reason jointly over positions, orientations, and higher-order objects.

III-D Comparison with Non-GA Equivariant Approaches

GA-native networks are one of several routes to geometry-aware learning. To help practitioners decide when GA is likely to be useful, Table 3 compares the principal equivariant paradigms along dimensions that matter for architecture selection. Three high-level takeaways emerge from this comparison:

1. **Standard $E(3)$ tasks with scalar/vector point features.** When the data consists of point clouds or graphs with primarily scalar and vector attributes and the target symmetry is $E(3)$, mature non-GA methods, particularly $E(n)$ -equivariant GNNs [69] and steerable or tensor-field architectures [23, 68], are strong defaults with well-optimized software stacks. GA adds value primarily when the task also involves heterogeneous geometric entities, such as lines, planes, frames, or rigid motions, or when a unified algebra simplifies layer design.
2. **Mixed geometric objects and frames.** Tasks that require joint reasoning over positions, orientations, higher-order subspaces, or coupled physical fields are where GA is most compelling. Representing points, lines, planes, motors, and their products within one algebraic framework can reduce the need for bespoke per-entity layers.
3. **Spacetime and conformal symmetries.** For Lorentz-covariant or conformally structured tasks, STA and CGA provide native algebraic support for the transformations and geometric objects. Non-GA alternatives may still be possible, but often require more specialized representation theory or task-specific engineering. For instance, Lorentz local canonicalization (LLoCa) [70] makes arbitrary backbones Lorentz-equivariant via equivariantly predicted local frames and reports lower training cost than L-GATr.

GA-native methods should not be interpreted as dominating other geometric learning paradigms. In many settings, group-equivariant, steerable, tensor-field, or $E(n)$ -equivariant architectures provide lower-complexity and better-validated choices, especially when the task symmetry is known and can be captured efficiently without multivector representations.

III-E The Clifford Group and its Action in Equivariant Networks

A more formal route to GA-native equivariance is through the *Clifford group*, also called the Lipschitz or Clifford–Lipschitz group [71, 72]. Let V be a finite-dimensional real vector space equipped with a non-degenerate quadratic form q , and let $Cl(V, q)$ be its Clifford algebra. The Clifford group $\Gamma(V, q)$ is the subgroup of invertible algebra elements whose twisted adjoint action on the generating vector space preserves (V) and acts as an orthogonal transformation with respect to (q) . In common conventions, this action takes the form $x \mapsto gxg^{-1}$ or $x \mapsto \alpha(g)xg^{-1}$, where α denotes the grade involution [22, 56, 73, 74]. The Pin and Spin groups arise as subgroups corresponding to orthogonal and orientation-preserving orthogonal transformations, respectively.

Table 3 | Comparison of equivariant paradigms for geometric learning. GA-native networks are most attractive when heterogeneous geometric entities or non-standard symmetry groups are central to the task; mature non-GA methods often remain preferable when the symmetry and data type are already well matched.

Paradigm	Latent repr.	Typical symmetry	Mixed entities?	Join / meet?	Software maturity	Best-fit regime	Limitations
Group-equiv. CNNs [6]	feature maps on group	discrete / compact	No	No	High	grid data with known discrete symmetry	fixed grid; limited to compact groups
Steerable CNNs [23]	irrep. fiber bundles	$SO(n)$, $O(n)$, $E(n)$	Partial	No	High	continuous rotation equiv. on grids	Clebsch–Gordan overhead; grid-based
TFN / SE(3)-Transf. [68]	spherical tensors	$SE(3)$	Partial	No	Medium	point clouds, molecules	high-order tensor products expensive
$E(n)$ -equiv. GNNs [69]	scalar + coord. vectors	$E(n)$	No	No	High	molecular graphs, n -body	limited to scalar & vector features
Lie-group / pose nets	Lie algebra elements	$SE(3)$, $SO(3)$	Partial	No	Medium	pose estimation, SLAM	task-specific parametrizations
GA-native networks	multivectors	$O(n)$, $E(n)$, conformal, Lorentz	Yes	Yes	Low–Med	mixed objects, coupled fields, non-standard symmetries	dim. overhead; numerical instability in CGA/STA

For neural networks, the significance of the Clifford-group action is that it extends consistently from vectors to the full Clifford algebra. An orthogonal transformation of V induces a grade-preserving algebra action on multivectors, so scalars, vectors, bivectors, and higher-grade components transform according to compatible rules [22]. This is essential for GA-native networks, which often operate on full multivectors rather than vector features alone. Without such an extended action, equivariance on the vector subspace would not determine how higher-grade components should transform, weakening the geometric interpretation of learned multivector features.

CGENNs [22] exploit this structure by constructing layers from operations that commute with the Clifford-group action. In particular, geometric products, grade projections, scalar linear combinations, and invariant scalar nonlinearities can be composed to form equivariant multivector maps. This provides a principled parameterization strategy: rather than learning arbitrary coordinate-wise maps on multivectors, the architecture restricts learnable functions to combinations of Clifford-compatible operations. Subsequent work extends or adapts this idea in several directions. Ali et al. [73] learn the underlying quadratic form while preserving Clifford-equivariant structure; Liu et al. [56] use related polynomial constructions in simplicial architectures; Brandstetter et al. [37] apply Clifford layers to PDE modeling; and Liu et al. [60] implement grade-structured polynomial multivector functions for $O(n)$ -equivariant architectures. Filimoshina and Shirokov [75] build parameter-light GLGENNs on generalized Lipschitz groups that also cover degenerate algebras such as PGA, sharing weights across grade subspaces. Across these examples, the common design principle is that equivariance follows from the closure of the chosen layer primitives under the Clifford-group action, not from arbitrary multivector-valued parameterization.

IV GA NN Layers

GA-native neural networks require layer primitives that operate directly on multivector-valued features while preserving the intended geometric transformation laws. This section reviews the main building blocks used in such architectures: multivector embeddings, GA-parametrized linear and bilinear maps, transformation-based layers, equivariant activations and normalizations, and GA-based attention mechanisms.

IV-A Multivector Representations

GA-native architectures begin by embedding data into a chosen geometric algebra. Scalars, vectors, and higher-order geometric objects are assigned to algebra-specific components, such as grade-0 scalars, grade-1 vectors, PGA points or motors, CGA null points, or bivectors. These multivectors then serve as the feature channels processed by the network. Depending on the architecture, grades may be preserved, mixed through geometric products, gated independently, or constrained to maintain equivariance [56, 60]. Thus, the algebra choice determines both the initial encoding and the layer operations, symmetry constraints, and computational overhead available to the model [39].

IV-A1 Embedding Primitive Data

The simplest embeddings map primitive feature types to algebraic components with matching transformation behavior. Scalar quantities, such as mass, charge, time-independent material parameters, or categorical labels, are invariant under spatial transformations and are therefore represented as grade-0 elements in $Cl^{(0)}(V, q)$ [22, 15]. Directional or vector-valued quantities, such as velocity, force, displacement, or local orientation features, transform covariantly under rotations and reflections and are commonly embedded as grade-1 elements in $Cl^{(1)}(V, q)$ [22, 15]. Position coordinates require more care: they may be represented as ordinary vectors in EGA, homogeneous objects in PGA, or null-point embeddings in CGA, depending on the target symmetry and algebra.

IV-A2 Representing Complex Geometric Structures

More structured inputs require embeddings that reflect both the task geometry and the chosen algebra. Point clouds and meshes illustrate the main trade-offs summarized in Table 4. In EGA $(\mathbb{G}_{n,0,0})$, a point is represented by an origin-relative position vector, giving natural $O(n)$ or $SO(n)$ transformation behavior but requiring centering or additional mechanisms for translation equivariance [39]. PGA $(\mathbb{G}_{n,0,1})$ introduces a null basis vector e_0 and represents Euclidean incidence geometry more directly: in 3D PGA, points are typically represented as trivectors, lines as bivectors, and planes as vectors. This makes PGA a natural choice for architectures such as GATr [15], which process point clouds or meshes without manual centering. CGA $(\mathbb{G}_{n+1,1,0})$ embeds Euclidean space into a higher-dimensional algebra in which null-point inner products encode squared Euclidean distance up to convention-dependent sign and scale [76]. It represents circles and spheres as blades, at the cost of higher dimensionality, e.g., $2^5 = 32$ basis blades in 3D, and possible numerical issues from the indefinite metric [39].

For graph-structured data, node, edge, or simplex features can be represented as multivectors [24]. Recent simplicial models [56] initialize higher-order relationships algebraically: an edge (v_i, v_j) may be represented through the geometric product $h_{v_i}h_{v_j}$, while a triangle may be initialized as $h_{v_i}h_{v_j}h_{v_k}$. These constructions encode higher-order interactions through GA operations rather than treating edges and simplices as unrelated feature channels.

Table 4 | Recurring object encodings in GA-native neural networks. The entries summarize common conventions; exact representations may vary with algebra conventions and implementation choices.

Algebra	Point	Affine objects	Motion	Distance cue	Best-fit tasks	Representative works
EGA	position vector (origin-relative)	origin-passing subspaces	rotors	Euclidean norm	rotation-aware features, PDE fields	CGENN [22], Clifford layers [37]
PGA	homog. trivector	planes, lines, points	motors	not directly distance-aware	$SE(3)$ tokens, meshes, poses	GATr [15], GAFL [19]
CGA	null-point embedding	lines, circles, spheres	versors / motors	squared-dist. inner product	distance-sensitive attention, richer geometry	iP-GATr / C-GATr [39], CGA-PoseNet [43]
STA	event / 4-vector	spacetime planes	rotors / boosts	Minkowski interval	relativistic physics, HEP	L-GATr [44], STAResNet [40]

GA representations are also useful for coupled physical fields. In computational fluid dynamics, a scalar pressure field $p(x)$ and vector velocity field $u(x)$ can be represented as a single multivector field $M(x) = p(x) + u(x)$, allowing Clifford convolutional layers to process coupled scalar-vector quantities jointly [37]. Similarly, in electromagnetic settings, the electric field $\mathbf{E}$ and magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ can be combined into a multivector field such as $F = \mathbf{E} + I\mathbf{B}$, where I is the pseudoscalar of the algebra. These examples illustrate how multivector encodings can align network channels with physically or geometrically coupled quantities.

Table 4 summarizes encoding choices for network design.

IV-B GA-Parametrized Linear and Bilinear Layers

Standard linear layers in NNs ($y = Wx + b$) must be constrained when inputs and outputs are multivectors and equivariance is required. CGENN [22] shows that a Clifford-group-equivariant linear map $\phi(V, q) \rightarrow Cl(V, q)$ can be parameterized by learnable scalar weights applied independently to grade projections:

$$\phi(x) = \sum_k w_k \langle x \rangle_k, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle x \rangle_k$ denotes the grade- k component of x and $w_k \in \mathbb{R}$ are learnable parameters. Because each grade subspace transforms consistently under the Clifford-group action, this grade-wise parameterization preserves equivariance while allowing the network to rescale different geometric types. Later architectures, such as GATr [15], extend this idea by allowing selected equivariant maps between grades when mediated by algebraically meaningful elements. In PGA, for example, multiplication by the null basis vector e_0 can be used to construct additional equivariant channels, yielding maps of the form $\phi(x) = \sum_k w_k \langle x \rangle_k + \sum_k v_k e_0 \langle x \rangle_k$.

Linear grade-wise maps alone provide limited interaction among geometric components. Bilinear layers address this limitation by using GA products to mix multivector channels while preserving the target symmetry when the product is compatible with the group action. Geometric-product layers, used in models such as CGENN, GATr, and related architectures [39, 19, 15, 22], compute products between input multivectors or multivector channels. A fully connected geometric-product layer [22] takes multivector channels x_i and y_i and computes

$$z_j = \sum_i P_{\phi_{ij}}(x_i, y_i), \quad (2)$$

where P_ϕ denotes a parameterized product with learnable scalar weights for allowed grade interactions. Such layers can generate scalar, vector, bivector, and higher-grade components from lower-grade inputs, enabling cross-grade feature construction that is unavailable to purely grade-wise linear maps.

Other algebraic bilinear operations can be useful in algebras with incidence structure. In PGA, for instance, join and meet operations can be implemented through combinations of duality and the outer product, such as dualized products of the form $(x^* \wedge y^*)^*$, depending on the convention. These operations allow networks to construct or compare geometric objects such as lines through points, planes through points, or intersections of subspaces. In architectures such as GATr and its variants [15, 39, 19], such incidence-aware operations provide additional equivariant pathways for mixing information beyond the geometric product alone.

IV-C Transformation-based Layers

The layers above learn equivariant feature representations. A complementary design strategy is to parameterize geometric transformations directly, so that some weights correspond to versors, rotors, motors, or other algebraic operators. This can provide a more structured inductive bias when the task involves rotations, rigid motions, pose updates, or transformation composition, although the interpretability depends on maintaining the algebraic constraints that make these parameters valid geometric transformations.

In GA, rotations and rigid motions can be represented by versors acting on multivectors through sandwich products, $x' = MxM^{-1}$, with $M^{-1} = \tilde{M}$ for normalized rotors or motors. CGA-PoseNet [43] uses this idea by designing layers where the inputs, outputs, weights and biases are represented as motors. A dense layer in this framework computes:

$$M_{\text{out}} = \sum_{i=1}^{C_{\text{in}}} W_i M_i \tilde{W}_i + B_i, \quad (3)$$

where each learned motor W_i applies a rigid-motion-like transformation to the input motor M_i . The layer can therefore be interpreted as aggregating transformed motor-valued features, provided the learned quantities are constrained or normalized to remain valid motors.

More generally, GCAN [16] introduces group-action layers, that learn a combinations of prescribed group actions: $T(x) = \sum_i w_i \cdot a_i x \tilde{a}_i$, where a_i are learnable versors or group elements and w_i are scalar weights. These layers can be viewed as learnable mixtures of geometric actions, offering an explicit transformation-based alternative to purely coordinate-wise or grade-wise feature mixing. Beyond geometric feature processing, Pence et al. [77] use compositions of rotors to construct structured approximations of linear transformations. Their approach requires only $O(\log^2 d)$ parameters, compared with $O(d^2)$ for dense linear maps, and achieves competitive performance when applied to attention projections in large language models. This illustrates how GA-based transformation parameterizations can also improve parameter efficiency in architectures without explicit geometric inputs.

IV-D Activations and Normalizations

Introducing non-linearity and ensuring stable training while preserving equivariance are central challenges in GA NN design. Standard scalar functions applied element-wise to a multivector's

coefficients will break the geometric structure.

In terms of activation functions, the most common and principled solution is gating, where a multivector is scaled by an invariant scalar computed from itself. For a multivector x , the activation is of the form $\psi(x) = \sigma(\phi(x))x$, where $\phi(x)$ is an invariant function. MSiLU in GCANs [16] applies a sigmoid gate to each k -vector component of a multivector independently: $\sigma(f_k(x)) \cdot \langle x \rangle_k$, where $f_k(x)$ is a learnable scalar function of x . Similarly, in CGENNs [22], this takes the form $\sigma(\|\langle x \rangle_k\|^2) \langle x \rangle_k$ for each non-scalar grade k , where the norm is invariant under the group action. Another common strategy [15, 67, 42] is to use the scalar part of a multivector to gate the entire multivector. GATr [15] employs a scalar-gated GELU [78]: $\text{GELU}(\langle x \rangle_0)x$, which preserves equivariance if the scalar part is invariant and the multiplication is the GA geometric product or scalar multiplication. More advanced, algebra-aware activations have been proposed, such as the GA-ReLU [79]. For 2D CFD problems, GA-ReLU decomposes a multivector into its "spinor" and "vector" parts (which are isomorphic to two complex numbers) and applies a phase-dependent cardioid activation. This models interactions between vector components in a geometrically meaningful way that a simple norm-based gating would miss. Recently, the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem [80] has been adapted to multivector spaces via Clifford Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (ClKAN) [81]. ClKAN proves that KANs can be natively implemented over Clifford algebras, utilizing Randomized Quasi Monte Carlo grid generation to manage high-dimensional scaling, thus offering a completely new paradigm for geometric non-linear function approximation.

Standard techniques like BatchNorm [82] are not equivariant. GA-NNs require normalization schemes that respect the algebraic structure. CGENNs [22] and GCANs [16] use variants of Group-Norm [83] or custom norm-based schemes that normalize each k -vector component of a multivector across channels, again preserving the grade structure by only involving subtraction of an average k -vector and scalar division/multiplication. GATr [15] employs a LayerNorm [84] defined using the GA inner product: $x/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_c[\langle x \cdot x \rangle_0]}$, which is invariant. This approach faces challenges in GAs with indefinite metrics (like CGA or STA), where $x \cdot x$ can be zero or negative. Adaptations [67, 39], such as using the absolute value of the inner product for each grade or careful numerical handling, are required.

IV-E GA-based Attention Mechanisms

With the success of Transformer architectures [85, 86], attention mechanisms have been adapted for GA NNs. The standard scaled dot-product attention relies on the vector dot product to compute a scalar similarity score between query and key vectors. The GA inner product, $\langle q \cdot k \rangle_0$, is the direct, geometrically principled replacement. Since the inner product between two multivectors is invariant to the action of the corresponding Clifford group, the resulting attention scores are guaranteed to be invariant [15, 39]. The value vectors v can remain as full multivectors, and the output is an attention-weighted sum of these multivectors. The result is a multivector that transforms equivariantly, making this the core mechanism in [39, 15, 67]. Clifford Frame Attention (CFA) [19] extends the Invariant Point Attention (IPA) from AlphaFold2 [53] for protein design. CFA uses multivectors in PGA to represent residue frames and geometric features. Messages between residues are constructed using geometric bilinear layers operating on these multivector features, and attention weights modulate these interactions. Geometric Algebra Attention Networks [87] compute attention scores from the geometric products of all input vector tuples (pairs, triplets, etc.). It achieves permutation equivariance and rotation invariance by summing over all permutations and




Figure 4 | Canonical design motifs in GA-native architectures. Different model families reuse a shared set of GA primitives but combine them in distinct computational patterns.

using invariant components of the geometric products. A key limitation of the PGA inner product is that it is not sensitive to the Euclidean distance between the points represented by the multivectors. To address this, iP-GATr and C-GATr [39] implement distance-aware attention by mapping the point-representing multivectors from PGA to CGA and using this CGA inner product to compute attention scores. This allows the attention mechanism to directly incorporate relative positions, which is a crucial inductive bias in many physical systems.

IV-F Building GA-NN Architectures

Building on the layer primitives above, researchers have developed a variety of complete GA-NN architectures. The earliest attempts to integrate Clifford algebras into neural networks viewed them as generalizations of complex-valued or quaternion-valued networks [88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93]. Pearson and Bisset [94] proposed Clifford MLPs for pattern recognition, and Buchholz and Sommer [95, 96, 97] further investigated Clifford neurons and learning rules. These pioneering works established the concept of multivector-valued neurons but focused on lower-dimensional algebras without fully exploiting equivariance. Modern architectures [22, 60, 98, 59] build on this foundation with principled equivariance guarantees, forming the backbone of more complex models.

As discussed in earlier sections, Geometric Clifford Algebra Networks (GCANs) [16] represent a significant step towards leveraging the geometric power of GA in a principled way. A key design principle in GCANs is that layers ensure k -vectors map to k -vectors, preserving the geometric type of features. GCANs have been successfully applied to modeling dynamical systems, including 3D rigid body transformations and fluid dynamics simulations (e.g., shallow water equations, Navier-Stokes equations, often using $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$ for these examples).

For data on regular grids, such as images or volumetric fields from PDE simulations, the convolution operation can be generalized. Clifford Convolutions [37] replace scalar-valued kernels with multivector-valued kernels that are convolved with multivector feature fields using the geometric product. GA-CNNs [99] further proposes representing different spectral bands of a hyperspectral image (HSI) as components of a GA multivector. Similarly, Clifford Fourier Layers [37, 100, 101] replace the standard Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) with a Clifford-Fourier Transform, enabling spectral methods on multivector fields. Clifford-Steerable CNNs [57] achieve equivariance to groups like Pseudo-Euclidean groups $E(p, q)$ by parameterizing the steerable convolution kernels implicitly with a CGENN-style MLP, which learns the kernel’s values as an equivariant function of the relative position vector. Conditional CS-CNNs (C-CSCNN) [102] show that this kernel basis is incomplete and improve

expressivity by conditioning kernels on equivariant representations of the input field.

GA primitives are readily integrated into the message-passing framework of GNNs. In models like [56, 58, 24], the message and update functions are implemented as GA-NN blocks (e.g., CGENNs [22]) or GA-based primitives (e.g., geometric products). Messages, aggregated information, and node/edge features are all represented as multivectors. This allows the network to pass and process rich geometric information, including higher-order simplex features derived from geometric products, across the graph structure while maintaining full equivariance.

The Transformer architecture [85], with its attention mechanism, has revolutionized sequence processing and is increasingly applied to other data modalities [86]. The Geometric Algebra Transformer (GATr) family [15, 39, 67, 44, 103] adapts this powerful paradigm for geometric data using GA. This family represents a significant advancement by combining the scalability and expressiveness of Transformers with the principled geometric equivariance provided by GA. The original GATr [15] is designed to be a general-purpose $E(3)$ -equivariant architecture. It utilizes Projective Geometric Algebra ($G_{3,0,1}$) to represent inputs, hidden states, and outputs as 16-dimensional multivectors. Follow-up work [39] explored variants of GATr using EGA (E-GATr), a simpler PGA (P-GATr), an improved PGA (iP-GATr, similar to the original GATr), and CGA (C-GATr). This study highlighted the trade-offs between these algebras in terms of expressivity, the size of the symmetry group effectively handled, sample efficiency, and training stability. ViNE-GATr [103] addresses the scalability of $E(3)$ -equivariant transformers by projecting dense geometric data into a coarse-grained latent space of virtual nodes. L-GATr [67] extends the GATr framework to achieve Lorentz equivariance by employing Spacetime Algebra ($G_{1,3,0}$). It introduces new equivariant layers (linear maps, attention, LayerNorm) specifically designed for STA. L-GATr has shown state-of-the-art results in high-energy physics applications, including amplitude regression, jet classification, and as the basis for Lorentz-equivariant generative models [44]. In core sequence modeling, Versor [104] replaces traditional linear vector sequence operations with CGA operations to inherently respect the symmetries of the physical universe, combating the "Euclidean Bottleneck".

Beyond these general architectural classes, GA is also being incorporated into models tailored for specific, complex geometric tasks, such as protein design [19], implicit neural volumes [105], and grasp generation [42]. Table 5 summarizes the main family structure. These specialized architectures highlight a trend towards deeply integrating the specific geometric algebra and its elements that best describe the intrinsic geometry and symmetries of the target problem domain. This tailored approach often yields significant benefits in performance and data efficiency. We will discuss these tailored methods and applications in the following sections.

V Applications


The theoretical advantages of Geometric Algebra are increasingly translated into practical benefits across a diverse range of applications. This section highlights key application areas; Fig. 5 and Table 6 summarize how domains, symmetry demands, and algebra choices align across the literature.

V-A Computer Vision and Graphics

Computer vision and graphics pipelines traditionally rely on disparate tools (homogeneous coordinates, quaternions, vector algebra), each with its own rules and limitations. GA unifies these, making it a natural substrate for geometrically-aware models [106, 107]. Many vision tasks reduce

Table 5 | Taxonomy of GA-native neural network families, with representative cited works.

Family	Core GA primitive	Typical data	Symmetry	Representative works	Main caveat
Early Clifford MLPs	multivector linear maps, adapted activations	low-dim. signals	limited	Clifford MLPs [90, 95]	weak equivariance framing
Equivariant blocks	grade projections, geometric products, gating	tokens, sets, graphs	$O(n)$, $E(n)$	CGENN [22], GCAN [16], MVN/MVP [60], GLGENN [75]	cost grows with algebra dim.
Clifford CNN / operator	Clifford convolution, Fourier layers, GP kernels	grids, fields, PDE states	translation + geometric	Clifford layers [37], CS-CNN [57], Fengbo [17], C-CSCNN [102]	specialized kernels
Graph / simplicial	multivector message passing, simplex GP features	graphs, molecules, simplicial complexes	perm. + $O(n)/E(n)$	CSMPN [56], CG-EGNN [58], GGAN [24]	fragmented benchmarks
Transformer / attention	GA inner-product attention, bilinear layers	meshes, proteins, HEP events	$E(3)$, Lorentz	GATr [15], iP-/C-GATr [39], L-GATr [44], CFA [19]	memory and norm. cost
Generative / control	motors, versor actions, equivariant diffusion	poses, grasps, trajectories	$SE(3)/E(3)$	CGA-PoseNet [43], GAGrasp [42], hPGA-DP [66]	narrow task scope

**Figure 5** | Application-domain map for GA-native neural networks. The recurring pairings among domains, geometric demands, and algebra choices explain much of the current literature structure.

to regression on rotations, where GA rotors avoid gimbal lock and quaternion double cover. Pepe et al. [43, 108] use CGA ($\mathbb{G}_{(4,0)}$) to represent $SE(3)$ pose as a motor, an 8-parameter even-grade multivector encoding both rotation and translation, improving accuracy over Cartesian parametrizations. CGAPoseNet+GCAN [43] adds GCAN layers [16] for equivariance, further reducing errors with fewer parameters.

In 3D shape representation, GA-Planes [105] parameterizes volumetric features on multivector “tensor planes,” becoming the first implicit neural volume model trainable via convex optimization, with competitive results on radiance field reconstruction, 3D segmentation, and video representation. Earlier work applied GA to indoor scene modeling [109] and UAV-based 3D reconstruction [110]. In graphics, Gunn [111] shows that GA transformations yield more numerically stable shader programs than matrices, and Kolyvakis et al. [98] integrate CGA with language models for text-driven 3D scene editing.

GA is also effective for point cloud processing. CGA ($\mathbb{G}_{(4,1,0)}$) represents geometric primitives as single blades, enabling RANSAC-based detection of planes, spheres, and cylinders [112, 113, 76].

For learned features, Geometric Algebra Attention Networks [87] generate rotationally invariant and covariant features via geometric products. CGENN [22] and GATr [15] treat points as tokens processed by fully equivariant layers, and recent work explores GA for generative tasks such as point cloud upsampling [26].

Standard CNNs must learn rotation equivariance through augmentation. For vectorial or coupled data (optical flow, fluid fields, hyperspectral images), treating channels as independent scalars discards structural information. Clifford Convolutions [37] and Clifford-Steerable CNNs [57] generalize convolution to multivector fields, processing coupled quantities (e.g., scalar pressure and vector velocity) as unified objects via the geometric product. CS-CNNs achieve full $E(p, q)$ equivariance by parameterizing steerable kernels with a CGENN-style MLP. For optical flow, GA-DDVM [114] restricts diffusion to 2D vector fields with scaling and rotation operations, lowering KITTI and Sintel endpoint error relative to a matched DDVM baseline. CliffordNet [115] restructures vision backbones using the geometric product as a unified interaction mechanism with $O(N)$ complexity. In hyperspectral imaging, GA-CNN [99] represents spectral bands as multivector components for holistic cross-band learning, recently extended to anomaly detection [116]. RGA-CNNs [117] similarly exploit geometric correlations for object detection and denoising.

V-B Computational Biology and Chemistry

GA’s 3D equivariance [65, 64, 87], ability to encode higher-order geometry [39, 19, 59, 20], and parameter efficiency [118, 60, 101] make it a natural fit for computational biology and chemistry. Multivector channels are also suited for large meshes, helping avoid oversquashing [64].

GA is well-suited for complex 3D biomedical meshes. The GATr architecture [15] has been applied to predict wall shear stress (WSS) on arterial walls. Following this, Suk et al. [64] propose LaB-GATr for anatomical 3D meshes. It embeds meshes in PGA $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,1}$ and uses a GA tokenization module with message passing for efficient, global processing. This $E(3)$ -equivariant model addresses canonical alignment issues across patients and was also applied to volume-based velocity field estimation and newborn postmenstrual age (PMA) estimation [64]. LaB-GATr++ [65] is an extension using cross-attention instead of message-passing pooling, achieving stronger accuracy and runtime on the same tasks. Separately, de Haan et al. [39] proposed several GATr variants (E-GATr, P-GATr, iP-GATr, and C-GATr) and tested them on the WSS prediction task [119]. They found all variants beat baselines, with the distance-aware C-GATr and iP-GATr performing best [39]. Based on LaB-GATr [65], Alblas et al. [118] develop a personalized growth prediction model for abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs), using local GA-embedded features to predict growth directly on the vascular surface. AB-GATr [120] is competitive with LaB-GATr at lower training cost and outperforms augmented non-equivariant hemodynamic baselines, though strong canonical alignment can favor non-equivariant models on ShapeNet-Car. Finally, Rao et al. [121] use a GATr-like algorithm (SNGNN-BTGO) to extract features from MRI scans for brain tumor diagnosis, where GA’s multidimensional representation helps distinguish between tumor types.

Another common application is molecular dynamics (MD) [122], where the goal is to predict molecule energy and trajectories. By preserving symmetries, GA-based models can simulate realistic thermodynamic behavior accurately and efficiently [87, 101]. In early work, Spellings [87] propose Geometric Algebra Attention Networks (GAANs), using a rotationally invariant and permutationally equivariant attention mechanism based on geometric products. For MD, this helps learn a conservative force field. Extending CGENNs [22], Liu et al. [56] introduce CSMPNs, which learn to embed higher-

order simplices via geometric products and equivariant simplicial message passing [123]. Similarly, Tran et al. [58] propose CG-EGNNs, which combine a GA embedding layer with Clifford graph convolution layers. This equivariant model reports low MSE on the MD task, especially for complex cyclic molecules, highlighting GA’s value in capturing high-order information [58]. More recently, GA-GNN [124] embeds all node attributes into a single multivector representation and relies entirely on geometric product layers as the core update mechanism. It exhibits high accuracy on targets with clear geometric interpretations, such as the dipole moment and electronic spatial extent. CliffordIP [125] builds $O(3)$ -equivariant $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$ interatomic potentials for heterogeneous catalysis without spherical harmonics, reducing energy MAE by 20–24% over the next-best baseline on adsorbate subsets.

Beyond MD, Alfarraj et al. [101] use GA to generate molecular surfaces. Their method uses the *Clifford-Fourier transform* [126], implemented via a *Fast Clifford-Fourier transform (FCFT)*, to produce surfaces free of geometric singularities. For 3D molecular generation, Liu et al. [20] propose Clifford Diffusion Models (CDMs). CDMs use Clifford-EGNNs [60] as latent encoders and perform diffusion and denoising entirely in GA space, operating on all multivector subspaces to capture rich geometric information and improve sample stability.

A prominent application is protein design and structure, where GA provides an efficient framework to describe amino acid positions and orientations using higher-order multivector subspaces [59]. Leveraging CGENN layers [22], Pepe et al. [59] apply Euclidean GA to protein structure prediction (PSP), using MVL and FCGP layers to project protein graphs. This avoids "flattening" geometry. The same authors also used CGA for PSP [127], modeling the backbone in CGA and applying their architecture to predict cost maps, which measure relative amino acid orientations. Hockey et al. [128] introduce CGA Transformer, a GATr variant, for PSP, specifically to predict amino acid inter-residue distances without directly predicting coordinates. To avoid expensive geometric product layers [22], Liu et al. [60] propose cheaper, MLP-based models: Clifford-EGNN (an extension of EGNN [69]), MVN-GNN (using multivector neurons), and MVP-GNN (using multivector perceptrons). These models were applied to protein structure denoising. Spellings [87] also applies GAANs to protein coarse-graining backmapping. This task reverses coarse-graining to recover original coordinates [129]. GAANs use permutation-covariant and rotation-covariant layers to predict heavy atom coordinates from coarse-grained centers of mass.

A significant application is generative protein backbone design. Wagner et al. [19] introduce Geometric Algebra Flow Matching (GAFL) for protein backbone design. It replaces the invariant point attention (IPA) from AlphaFold2 [53] with Clifford Frame Attention (CFA). CFA uses PGA to represent the backbone, secondary structures, and their relations, replacing point-valued attention with PGA multivectors. It also uses geometric bilinear layers [15] for message passing. GAFL is tested on a backbone generation task, showing good designability, diversity, and novelty. Additionally, Alfarraj et al. [130] propose a GA-based method for protein-protein docking [131], finding that rotors and the geometric product can express rotations more efficiently than traditional methods. Beyond proteins, RBFN [132] introduces a multivector parameterization for RNA, which conditions a Bayesian Flow Network with a novel time-step sampling distribution. This geometric enhancement allows RBFN to effectively align the sequence distribution with the underlying RNA backbone structure, achieving superior sequence recovery rates over both standard deep learning baselines (e.g., gRNAd [133]) and physics-based tools like Rosetta [134].

V-C Physics-Informed Machine Learning

Physics-Informed Machine Learning (PIML) [135, 136] seeks models consistent with known physical laws. GA-based PIML models embody a strong form of this prior: rather than treating coupled fields (e.g., scalar pressure $p(x)$ and vector velocity $u(x)$, or electric E and magnetic B fields) as separate channels, GA represents the entire physical state as a unified multivector field [37]. GA-based layers then process this object intrinsically, providing a deep architectural inductive bias beyond surface-level loss regularization.

In the field of computational fluid dynamics (CFD), initial work focuses on developing GA-based layers as direct, geometrically-aware replacements for standard NN components. Brandstetter et al. [37] introduce Clifford Convolutions and Clifford Fourier Transforms to replace standard layers in neural PDE surrogates for 2D Navier-Stokes equations and weather modeling. Similarly, GCAN [16] demonstrates strong performance on modeling shallow water equations and incompressible Navier-Stokes. This field has rapidly evolved from GA-based layers to full-fledged GA-based neural operators. The Fengbo [17] model, for instance, is a Clifford Neural Operator pipeline designed for 3D CFD. It conceptualizes the problem as an interpretable mapping from the geometry of the domain (represented as a multivector) to the physics of the solution (the resulting multivector-valued pressure and velocity field). It is built on Clifford-FNO layers and achieves competitive accuracy on 3D CFD benchmarks with significantly fewer parameters than competing graph-based methods.

The domain of electromagnetism and relativistic physics also provides compelling evidence for the GA-NN thesis, as it demonstrates that the choice of algebra is a critical, non-trivial design decision. STAResNet [40] directly tackles the problem of solving Maxwell's partial differential equations. Pepe et al. [40] compare a standard Clifford ResNet using Euclidean GA ($\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$) against their STAResNet, which operates natively in STA. The Euclidean model must learn from the "split" 3D vector and scalar time representation, whereas STAResNet operates directly on the unified STA multivector $F = E + IB$ and achieves a lower error with significantly fewer parameters. This principle extends directly to high-energy physics, where Lorentz covariance is the fundamental symmetry. Spinner et al. [44] propose L-GATr that operates entirely in Spacetime Algebra ($\mathbb{G}_{1,3}$) to achieve full Lorentz equivariance. It has been successfully applied to diverse Large Hadron Collider (LHC) tasks, including amplitude regression and jet classification [67]. It was also used to construct the first Lorentz-equivariant generative model for particle physics.

V-D Robotics

Classical robotics uses CGA for closed-form inverse kinematics of manipulators with spherical wrists [137], including 6-DOF and 7-DOF redundant arms [138], where forward kinematics is expressed as a chain of motors [139]. This framework has been extended to optimal control [140], but the limitations of analytic solvers [141] motivate learning-based alternatives. Early work by Bayro-Corrochano et al. [107] developed quaternion spiking neural networks for robot motion interpolation, but these were relatively small-scale. Recent GA-NNs leverage equivariance for data-efficient deep robot learning. GAGrasp [42] uses PGA ($\mathbb{G}_{3,0,1}$) to represent SE(3) transformations in a diffusion model for dexterous grasp generation, achieving robust generalization to novel poses while significantly outperforming non-equivariant baselines. GATr [15] serves as the backbone for E(3)-invariant motion planning, and hPGA-DP [66] integrates PGA-GATr into visuomotor diffusion policies for faster convergence and improved task performance. For self-driving, DriveGATr [142] encodes scene elements in 2D PGA ($\mathbb{G}_{2,0,1}$) for SE(2)-equivariant agent modeling, replacing costly

Table 6 | Representative applications of GA-native neural networks, organized by domain. Cited works are representative.

Domain	Geometry / symmetry	Algebra(s)	Canonical tasks	Representative works
Vision / pose	point clouds, multi-view; rotation / rigid motion	EGA, PGA, CGA	camera pose regression, implicit volumes, hyperspectral classification	CGA-PoseNet [43], GA-Planes [105], GA-CNN [99]
Biomedical meshes	3D anatomical surfaces; $E(3)$ equivariance	PGA	wall shear stress estimation, aortic aneurysm growth, velocity field prediction	GATr [15], LaB-GATr(++) [64, 65], iP/C-GATr [39], AAA model [118], AB-GATr [120]
Molecules / proteins	molecular graphs, residue frames; $E(3)$, higher-order geometry	PGA, EGA	molecular dynamics (MD17), protein denoising, backbone generation	CSMPN [56], GAFL [19], CDM [20], GA-GNN [124], CliffordIP [125]
Physics / PIML	coupled fields, PDE states; field / Lorentz symmetry	EGA, STA	Navier–Stokes surrogates, Maxwell PDEs, LHC tasks	Clifford layers [37], STAResNet [40], L-GATr [44]
Robotics / control	poses, grasps; $SE(3)$	PGA, CGA	grasp generation, motion planning, visuomotor policy	GAGrasp [42], hPGA-DP [66]
Graphs / time series	graphs, simplicial complexes, multivariate series	EGA, PGA	graph learning, few-shot transfer, forecasting	GGAN [24], CG-EGNN [58], GA-LSTNet [143]

pairwise relative positional encodings with standard multivector attention.

V-E Other Notable Applications

GA-based networks extend beyond geometry-heavy domains wherever data has multi-dimensional or relational structure. In graph representation learning, GGAN [24] generalizes message passing to a GA-defined feature space, encoding node attributes as multivectors and reporting improved expressiveness with reduced model complexity. GA embeddings have also been applied to cross-domain few-shot graph classification [25], where the geometric richness helps reduce feature distortion at depth.

In temporal and signal processing, GA-LSTNet [143] represents each time-step as a multivector encapsulating all sensor channels, modeling joint dynamics more effectively than channel-wise models. Parametrized Hypercomplex NNs [144] provide a unified framework that automatically infers the optimal algebra (complex, quaternion, or higher-dimensional Clifford) for a given dataset, operating with fewer parameters. Wi-GATr [145] applies GATr to wireless signal propagation, predicting channel observations from scene meshes and antenna poses, with lower real-world error than hybrid methods and a calibrated ray tracer.

Emerging interdisciplinary applications include CGA-based interfaces with language models for spatial instruction execution [98], GA multivectors as word embeddings [146], randomized GA methods for LLM fine-tuning [147], and GA networks for IoT anomaly detection on microcontrollers [148].

VI Empirical Studies

The empirical literature on GA-based neural networks is highly heterogeneous. Architectures differ in algebra, symmetry target, data modality, output type, and metric, so a single leaderboard would mix incomparable settings. This section does not propose such a ranking. Instead, we summarize

Table 7 | Empirical evidence map for GA-native neural networks, organized by matched benchmark setting. Each row is a within-task comparison unit; cross-row comparisons are intentionally avoided. The *Evidence* column grades each setting as **Moderate** (replicated gains on established benchmarks, but confounds or limited independent replication remain) or **Preliminary** (too few matched studies or too recent for confident conclusions). No setting currently reaches “Strong” by strict archival-survey standards.

Matched setting	GA works	Comparator class	Strongest supported claim	Evidence	Scope limit
Synthetic n -body dynamics	GATr [15], iP-/C-GATr [39], GCAN [16]	SEGNN, $SE(3)$ -Transf.	sample efficiency; robustness to translation shift	Moderate	synthetic only
Arterial WSS / biomed. meshes	GATr [15], LaB-GATr(++) [64, 65], iP-/C-GATr [39], AB-GATr [120]	mesh GDL, algebra ablations	accuracy on non-canon. meshes; sample efficiency	Moderate	biomed. mesh only
Navier–Stokes / weather / Maxwell	Clifford layers [37], GCAN [16], STAResNet [40], C-CSCNN [102]	CNN, FNO, operator baselines	param. efficiency; matched-algebra advantage	Moderate	PDE-specific
HEP regression / classif. / generation	L-GATr [44, 67, 149]	Lorentz-equiv. and standard HEP baselines	competitive or superior accuracy; Lorentz faithfulness	Moderate	HEP only
MD17 / protein denoising / higher-order	CSMPN [56], CG-EGNN [58], MVN [60]	EGNN, higher-order GNNs	higher-order geometry benefit; negative result on benzene	Moderate	benchmark-local
Protein backbone generation	GAFL / CFA [19]	structure-aware protein baselines	designability, diversity, novelty	Prelim.	not comparable to prediction
Camera pose regression	CGA-PoseNet [43]	pose-regression baselines	accuracy, parameter efficiency	Prelim.	pose studies only
Grasp / visuomotor control	GAGrasp [42], hPGA-DP [66]	diffusion / policy baselines	data efficiency, $SE(3)$ generalization	Prelim.	robotics; task-local

evidence only within matched experimental settings and distinguish recurring cross-paper trends from isolated positive reports. Because baselines, training budgets, and implementation quality differ substantially across papers, cross-paper comparisons should be interpreted cautiously; empirical gains reported for GA-native models should be weighed relative not only to non-geometric baselines, but also to strong non-GA symmetry-aware alternatives when such comparisons are available. Table 7 summarizes this evidence structure.

VI-A What transfers across the literature

The strongest recurring evidence concerns symmetry handling. Architectures such as CGENNs [22], GATr [15], L-GATr [44], and CSMPNs [56] are equivariant by construction under the relevant Clifford-group, Euclidean, or Lorentz action. Empirically, these guarantees matter most under transformation shift. In GATr [15], performance is retained on translated n -body systems, whereas non-equivariant baselines degrade markedly. On arterial wall-shear-stress estimation, GATr [15] is strongest on non-canonicalized meshes in the benchmark of Suk et al. [119], where the model must handle arbitrary orientation directly.

Data efficiency is the second consistent theme. GATr [15] is more sample-efficient than SEGNN and the SE(3)-Transformer on synthetic n -body data, while iP-GATr and C-GATr [39] improve further on the same family of tasks. GCAN [16] reports similar low-data gains on dynamical systems. In robotics, GAGrasp [42] and hPGA-DP [66] report faster convergence or stronger low-data behavior, though only within their own benchmarks.

A third pattern is geometric expressivity. Clifford neural layers [37] improve PDE surrogates by processing coupled scalar and vector fields as multivectors rather than as unrelated channels. On WSS estimation, the strongest GATr variants are precisely those with richer geometry-aware interactions, notably distance-aware attention in iP-GATr and C-GATr [39]. In higher-order graph learning, CSMPN [56] benefits from building simplex features algebraically via geometric products.

Interpretability remains the least established claim. CGENN-based protein models [59] and CGA-PoseNet variants [43] argue that motors, residue frames, or grade-structured channels are easier to inspect than unconstrained Euclidean features, but the field still lacks controlled interpretability benchmarks. At present, interpretability is better framed as a plausible representational advantage than as settled empirical evidence.

VI-B Comparative evidence by application family

Vision, graphics, and mesh-based geometry. This is the clearest shared-task setting. The arterial WSS benchmark of Suk et al. [119] appears in mesh neural networks, the original GATr work [15], the algebra-selection study of de Haan et al. [39], and the LaB-GATr line [64, 65]. Across these studies, the strongest support is for predictive accuracy on randomly oriented meshes, robustness to non-canonical orientation, and scalability to larger biomedical meshes.

Biology, chemistry, proteins, and molecules. Evidence here is broader but less standardized. CSMPN [56] improves over simplicial and equivariant graph baselines on convex-hull and trajectory tasks, but also includes a useful negative result: for rigid planar benzene, extra geometric capacity does not help uniformly. Multivector Neurons [60] and CG-EGNN [58] report gains on n -body, protein denoising, CMU motion, and MD17, though this evidence is still mostly preprint-era. In protein structure prediction, replacing linear layers with CGENN layers [59] improves the tested pipeline by up to 2.1% while using fewer parameters. GAFL [19] reports strong generative metrics for backbone design.

Physics, PDEs, operators, and high-energy physics. In physics-informed settings, the key question is often whether the *matched* algebra helps. Clifford neural layers [37] improve generalization on Navier–Stokes, weather, and Maxwell benchmarks at similar parameter counts. GCAN [16] reports analogous gains on rigid-body and fluid-dynamics problems. STAResNet [40] is especially informative: under a controlled comparison, the STA variant reaches up to $2.6\times$ lower MSE with $6\times$ fewer parameters than a Euclidean-GA ResNet on Maxwell prediction. In high-energy physics, L-GATr [44, 67] is competitive with or stronger than strong domain baselines on amplitude regression, jet classification, and Lorentz-equivariant generation. Large-scale jet-tagging studies find that Lorentz-equivariant transformers outperform standard ones when geometric features matter [149], and on precision unfolding and anomaly-detection tasks L-GATr performs comparably to the pretrained foundation model OmniLearn [150].

Robotics, control, and manipulation. Robotics evidence is positive but fragmented. GAGrasp [42] reports better pose generalization and stronger efficiency for dexterous grasp generation under

SE(3) transformations. hPGA-DP [66] reports faster convergence and better task performance than standard diffusion policies and architectures that rely only on P-GATr. These results support data efficiency and robustness, but not yet a fair cross-paper ranking.

Other graph and signal domains. A smaller set of papers extends GA-based learning beyond geometry-heavy domains. GGAN [24] reports strong graph-representation-learning results with reduced model complexity, and GA-LSTNet [143] argues that multivector recurrent states improve multivariate time-series modeling by preserving inter-channel structure. These results are promising, but the evidence base remains comparatively thin.

VI-C Computational cost and scalability

A recurring cost of GA is dimensional overhead: dense multivectors scale with the number of basis blades, which grows exponentially with algebra dimension. In practice, this means wider hidden states, denser bilinear products, costlier normalization, and a larger implementation burden. The algebra-selection study of de Haan et al. [39] makes the trade-off explicit: E-GATr is cheapest but weaker, simple P-GATr is under-expressive, and C-GATr is strong but harder to stabilize.

GA models are not uniformly unscalable. GATr [15] shows that a GA model can inherit Transformer-like scaling when its core interaction is efficient attention rather than dense message passing. LaB-GATr [64, 65] extends this to large biomedical meshes by compressing token sets while preserving Euclidean equivariance. By contrast, dense GA operations remain expensive in some PDE [16] and graph [56] settings.

VI-D Failure modes and limitations

We organize observed limitations into three categories: evidence quality, model and training failure modes, and practical deployment constraints.

Evidence-quality limitations. Benchmark fragmentation remains severe: many papers evaluate on one or two specialized tasks with metrics and preprocessing that differ substantially across studies, making broad claims easy to overstate. Reproducibility is uneven, with several influential results existing only as preprints or workshop papers. Apparent gains can narrow or vanish under compute-, memory-, or latency-matched comparisons, since lower parameter counts do not guarantee faster wall-clock throughput.

Model and training failure modes. Performance is highly sensitive to algebra choice: if the selected algebra or metric does not match the task geometry, GA introduces computational overhead without a commensurate inductive-bias benefit, and mature non-GA equivariant baselines may remain preferable; the benzene result in CSMPN [56] is a concrete example. Expressivity can also be structurally limited: vector–vector geometric products in $\mathbb{G}_{3,0,0}$ lack the rank-2 ($L = 2$) component, which limits force-direction accuracy in tested Clifford interatomic potentials [151]. Optimization difficulties extend beyond isolated normalization issues. In practice, multivector activations can collapse toward a subset of grades (grade collapse), constrained geometric objects such as rotors or versors may drift from their intended manifolds unless explicitly re-normalized, and initialization sensitivity can be acute. These problems are exacerbated in indefinite algebras such as CGA and STA, where the C-GATr study [39] reports that non-positive norms and cancellation effects make standard deep-learning heuristics less reliable and often necessitate full 32-bit precision. Equivariance can

also leak in practice through preprocessing choices, discretization, neighborhood construction, or coordinate conventions that inadvertently break the intended algebraic structure.

Practical deployment constraints. Geometric products and grade-coupled operations increase memory traffic and interact poorly with mixed-precision pipelines and current GPU kernel libraries, limiting throughput even when parameter counts are competitive. Nevertheless, slim and quantized L-GATr jet taggers are estimated to cut inference energy by an order of magnitude at a moderate performance loss [152]. For homogeneous point-feature tasks or dense 2D image/video pipelines, GA should currently be viewed as a specialized option rather than a default choice. Evidence on robustness under realistic perception perturbations (sensor noise, calibration error, partial observability, and distribution shift) remains limited. The strongest results arise when the task genuinely requires joint reasoning over heterogeneous geometric entities, frames, or coupled physical quantities.

VI-E Summary of evidence status

Across the settings surveyed above, the current evidence base can be summarized as follows:

- **Established:** improved inductive alignment for tasks with explicit geometric symmetries, transformations, or multi-entity geometric relations.
- **Plausible but not yet general:** gains in data efficiency, robustness under distribution shift, and compactness through structured parameterization.
- **Currently unproven:** broad superiority on dense perception, large-scale vision backbones, or standardized foundation-model-scale settings.

VI-F Recommended benchmarking practice

Future GA-NN papers should adopt the following protocol to make local comparisons cumulative without forcing the field into a misleading global leaderboard.

1. **State the algebraic hypothesis.** Specify the algebra, target symmetry group, and whether equivariance is exact or approximate.
2. **Use matched baselines.** Compare against both non-equivariant and strong equivariant baselines under matched parameter counts and training budgets.
3. **Include symmetry stress tests.** Report transformed-input evaluations and state whether canonicalization was required.
4. **Report low-data behavior.** Include learning curves or sub-sampling experiments when sample efficiency is claimed.
5. **Report cost alongside accuracy.** At minimum: parameter count, training precision, wall-clock time, and peak memory.
6. **Ablate the geometry.** Remove multivector channels, replace geometric products with linear mixing, or swap to a mismatched algebra.
7. **Release reproducibility materials.** Code, splits, preprocessing, and evaluation scripts are essential for custom pipelines.

Table 8 | Software ecosystem relevant to GA-native neural networks (as of 2026). “DL” marks libraries with native deep-learning tensor support; the remainder are usable for preprocessing or non-DL computation.

Library	Lang. / Framework	DL	Algebra scope	Primary use case
<i>ML-facing libraries</i>				
torch_ga [153]	Python / PyTorch	✓	tensor multivectors	rapid GA layer prototyping
tfga [154]	Python / TensorFlow	✓	tensor multivectors	Keras-style GA experiments
numga [155]	Python / JAX	✓	symbolic + numerical, $\leq 6D$	operator-fused algebra kernels
lgatr [156]	Python / PyTorch	✓	STA $\mathbb{G}_{1,3,0}$ (L-GATr)	Lorentz-equivariant transformers for HEP
<i>General-purpose scripting tooling</i>				
clifford [157]	Python		broad common algebras	preprocessing, general GA computation
Kingdon [158]	Python		symbolic + numerical	mixed symbolic / numerical prototyping
ganja.js [159]	JavaScript		code-generated, broad	pedagogy, visualization, code export
<i>Compiled / systems libraries</i>				
Versor [160]	C++		EGA, PGA, CGA, STA	performance-sensitive geometry engines
GATL [161]	C++		arbitrary algebras	compile-time-optimized kernels
Klein [162]	C++		3D PGA only	SIMD-optimized rigid-body PGA
Gaalop [163]	Java / codegen		compiled GA expressions	high-performance generated kernels
Garamon [164]	C++ generator		user-defined algebras	custom or uncommon algebras
TbGAL [165]	C++ tensor-based		blade / versor repr.	high-dimensional performance studies

VII Software Libraries and Implementation

GA neural networks rely on software libraries to represent multivectors, implement the geometric product and related Clifford operations, and integrate these objects into deep learning stacks. Recent libraries span Python, C++, Java, JavaScript, PyTorch, TensorFlow, and JAX. Table 8 summarizes the main ecosystem relevant to GA-native learning; the text below highlights representative tools and current bottlenecks.

VII-A ML Libraries: PyTorch, TensorFlow, and JAX

The primary ML-facing libraries are torch_ga [153] (PyTorch) and tfga [154] (TensorFlow), which both represent multivectors as framework tensors and provide Keras-style layers such as GeometricSandwichProductDense (analogous to Keras’s Dense). Both libraries feature a GeometricAlgebra class supporting low-level tensor operations and higher-level Multivector abstractions with operator overrides. numga [155] targets JAX (with NumPy/PyTorch fallbacks) and symbolically fuses GA operations into optimized linear operators at compile time; for example, it can deduce that the product of two quaternions remains a quaternion. However, numga is limited to algebras of dimension ≤ 6 due to computational overhead.

VII-B General Purpose Libraries

Among scripting tools, `ganja.js` [159] is a lightweight JavaScript code generator with visualization and cross-language export; `clifford` [157] is a mature Python numerical toolkit; and `Kingdon` [158] adds symbolic computation accepting `numpy`, `PyTorch`, and `sympy`. `Gaalop` [163, 166] compiles GA expressions into optimized C++, `OpenCL`, or `CUDA` code.

In C++, `Versor` [160] and `GATL` [161] use template meta-programming for compile-time optimization; `Klein` [162] provides SIMD-optimized 3D PGA; `Garamon` [164] generates code for user-defined algebras; and `TbGAL` [165] uses tensor-based blade representations for higher-dimensional performance. Benchmarking studies [167, 165] show `GATL` and `Versor` generally perform best, depending on operation mix and algebra dimension.

VII-C Challenges and Future Needs for Software Support

The 2^n scaling of basis blades limits most libraries to moderate dimensions: `Gaalop` [163, 166], `Garamon` [164], `GluCat` [168], and `Versor` [160] support at most 16-, 20-, 16-, and 7-dimensional spaces, respectively. Highly optimized libraries like `Klein` [162] sacrifice generality. Alternatives such as `TbGAL`'s tensor-based approach [165] and custom GPU kernels [22] are promising for higher-dimensional algebras.

ML-facing libraries such as `tfga` [154] (unmaintained since 2023) and `torch_ga` [153] are immature: APIs remain rough, and higher-dimensional convolutions are not yet supported. More broadly, GA's steep learning curve, inconsistent cross-library APIs, sparse documentation, and limited benchmarking [167, 165] remain barriers to wider adoption.

VIII Future Directions and Conclusion

GA-native neural networks have progressed from conceptual proposals to practical architectures with promising results in several geometry-centric domains, including high-energy physics, robotics, and computational biology. Empirical gains are most consistent when the task requires joint reasoning over heterogeneous geometric entities and explicit symmetries; for homogeneous point-feature or dense 2D settings, mature non-GA alternatives remain competitive. Several frontiers remain.

Algebra matching and numerical stability. Systematically mapping problem symmetries to the optimal algebra remains open. Indefinite algebras (CGA, STA) can break standard components like `LayerNorm` [39]; numerically robust layers for these spaces are critical.

Scalability and architectural depth. Dense multivector representations scale as 2^n , creating a tension between expressivity and feasibility that calls for sparse representations and custom GPU kernels [22]. Current non-linearities are typically scalar-gated; fully algebra-aware activations and richer GA attention mechanisms [39] remain underexplored.

Interpretability and foundation-model integration. GA representations are argued to be more inspectable, but controlled benchmarks are lacking. GA could serve as a geometric interface for embodied AI and language models [98], mapping symbolic instructions into continuous transformations.

Standardized evaluation. Benchmarking fragmentation (Section VI) is arguably the largest barrier to cumulative progress. A shared evaluation suite spanning mesh regression, molecular dynamics, PDE surrogates, pose estimation, and robotic control, with standardized metrics and cost reporting, would significantly accelerate the field.

Multiple GA-native architecture families now deliver reproducible gains on real-world tasks, supported by a growing software ecosystem, but larger-scale and more reproducible evidence is still needed before GA can be considered a standard tool. The central remaining challenges (algebra selection, numerical stability in indefinite metrics, scalable implementations, and reproducible benchmarking) are increasingly concrete; addressing them will determine whether GA becomes a routine component of the geometric deep learning toolkit. For the pattern analysis community, the most promising near-term opportunities lie in 3D vision, embodied perception, multi-sensor fusion, and manipulation, where heterogeneous geometric entities and explicit symmetries are central. We hope this survey provides both a practical reference for researchers entering the field and a concrete roadmap for the community.

References

- [1] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, *Deep learning*. MIT press Cambridge, 2016, vol. 1, no. 2.
- [2] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, “Deep learning,” *nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, 2015.
- [3] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 25, 2012.
- [4] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [5] Z. Wu, S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and S. Y. Philip, “A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 4–24, 2020.
- [6] T. Cohen and M. Welling, “Group equivariant convolutional networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2016, pp. 2990–2999.
- [7] C. Shorten and T. M. Khoshgoftaar, “A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning,” *Journal of big data*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–48, 2019.
- [8] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, “Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03530*, 2016.
- [9] C. Esteves, C. Allen-Blanchette, A. Makadia, and K. Daniilidis, “Learning so (3) equivariant representations with spherical cnns,” in *Proceedings of the european conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 52–68.
- [10] D. Bau, B. Zhou, A. Khosla, A. Oliva, and A. Torralba, “Network dissection: Quantifying interpretability of deep visual representations,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 6541–6549.
- [11] L. Dorst, D. Fontijne, and S. Mann, *Geometric algebra for computer science (revised edition): An object-oriented approach to geometry*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2009.
- [12] C. Doran and A. Lasenby, *Geometric algebra for physicists*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [13] Clifford, “Preliminary sketch of biquaternions,” *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 381–395, 1871.
- [14] D. Hestenes and A. Lasenby, *Space-time algebra*. Springer, 2015.
- [15] J. Brehmer, P. De Haan, S. Behrends, and T. S. Cohen, “Geometric algebra transformer,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 35 472–35 496, 2023.

- [16] D. Ruhe, J. K. Gupta, S. De Keninck, M. Welling, and J. Brandstetter, “Geometric clifford algebra networks,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 29 306–29 337.
- [17] A. Pepe, M. Montanari, and J. Lasenby, “Fengbo: a clifford neural operator pipeline for 3d pdes in computational fluid dynamics,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [18] M. M. Bronstein, J. Bruna, T. Cohen, and P. Veličković, “Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13478*, 2021.
- [19] S. Wagner, L. Seute, V. Viliuga, N. Wolf, F. Gräter, and J. Stühmer, “Generating highly designable proteins with geometric algebra flow matching,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 77 987–78 026, 2024.
- [20] C. Liu, S. Vadgama, D. Ruhe, E. Bekkers, and P. Forré, “Clifford group equivariant diffusion models for 3d molecular generation,” in *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Frontiers in Probabilistic Inference: Learning meets Sampling*, 2025.
- [21] S. Chen, P.-P. Dechant, Y.-H. He, E. Heyes, E. Hirst, and D. Riabchenko, “Machine learning clifford invariants of ade coxeter elements,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 34, no. 3, p. 20, 2024.
- [22] D. Ruhe, J. Brandstetter, and P. Forré, “Clifford group equivariant neural networks,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 62 922–62 990, 2023.
- [23] T. S. Cohen and M. Welling, “Steerable cnns,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08498*, 2016.
- [24] J. Zhong and W. Cao, “Graph geometric algebra networks for graph representation learning,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 170, 2025.
- [25] Q. Liu and W. Cao, “Geometric algebra graph neural network for cross-domain few-shot classification,” *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 12 422–12 435, 2022.
- [26] W. Xu, W. Dai, Z. Zheng, C. Li, J. Zou, and H. Xiong, “Point cloud upsampling with geometric algebra driven inverse heat dissipation,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2024, pp. 7385–7394.
- [27] B. Quackenbush and P. Atzberger, “Geometric neural operators (gnps) for data-driven deep learning in non-euclidean settings,” *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 045033, 2024.
- [28] E. Hitzer, C. Lavar, and D. Hildenbrand, “Current survey of clifford geometric algebra applications,” *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1331–1361, 2024.
- [29] E. Hitzer, M. Kamarianakis, G. Papagiannakis, and P. Vašík, “Survey of new applications of geometric algebra,” *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 47, no. 14, pp. 11 368–11 384, 2024.
- [30] E. Hitzer, T. Nitta, and Y. Kuroe, “Applications of clifford’s geometric algebra,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 23, pp. 377–404, 2013.
- [31] R. Wang, K. Wang, W. Cao, and X. Wang, “Geometric algebra in signal and image processing: A survey,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 156 315–156 325, 2019.
- [32] A. Macdonald, “A survey of geometric algebra and geometric calculus,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 27, pp. 853–891, 2017.
- [33] N. Heidari and A. Iosifidis, “Geometric deep learning for computer-aided design: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17695*, 2024.
- [34] Z. Zhang, J. Yan, Q. Liu, E. Chen, and M. Zitnik, “A systematic survey in geometric deep learning for structure-based drug design,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11768*, 2023.
- [35] S. Sanborn, J. Mathe, M. Papillon, D. Buracas, H. J. Lillemark, C. Shewmake, A. Bertics, X. Pennec, and N. Miolane, “Beyond euclid: An illustrated guide to modern machine learning with geometric, topological, and algebraic structures,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09468*, 2024.
- [36] R. Basheer and D. Mishra, “Symmetry group equivariant convolutions for representation learning: a survey,” *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 2, 2026.
- [37] J. Brandstetter, R. van den Berg, M. Welling, and J. K. Gupta, “Clifford neural layers for pde modeling,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

- [38] M. Roelfs and S. De Keninck, “Graded symmetry groups: plane and simple,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 33, no. 3, p. 30, 2023.
- [39] P. De Haan, T. Cohen, and J. Brehmer, “Euclidean, projective, conformal: Choosing a geometric algebra for equivariant transformers,” *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 3088–3096, 2024.
- [40] A. Pepe, S. Buchholz, and J. Lasenby, “Staresnet: a network in spacetime algebra to solve maxwell’s pdes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13619*, 2024.
- [41] F. X. Vasconcelos and J. C. Nascimento, “Correspondence free multivector cloud registration using conformal geometric algebra,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11732*, 2024.
- [42] T. Zhong and C. Allen-Blanchette, “GAGrasp: Geometric algebra diffusion for dexterous grasping,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2025, pp. 6771–6778.
- [43] A. Pepe, J. Lasenby, and S. Buchholz, “Cgaposenet+ gcan: A geometric clifford algebra network for geometry-aware camera pose regression,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2024, pp. 6593–6603.
- [44] J. Spinner, V. Bresó, P. De Haan, T. Plehn, J. Thaler, and J. Brehmer, “Lorentz-equivariant geometric algebra transformers for high-energy physics,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 37, pp. 22 178–22 205, 2024.
- [45] R. A. Miller, *Geometric algebra: An introduction with applications in Euclidean and conformal geometry*. San Jose State University, 2013.
- [46] C. G. Gunn, “Projective geometric algebra: A new framework for doing euclidean geometry,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.05873*, 2019.
- [47] L. Dorst and S. De Keninck, “A guided tour to the plane-based geometric algebra pga,” *URL <https://bivector.net/PGA4CS.html>*, 2022.
- [48] C. Doran, A. Lasenby, and J. Lasenby, “Conformal geometry, euclidean space and geometric algebra,” in *Uncertainty in Geometric Computations*. Springer, 2002, pp. 41–58.
- [49] D. Hestenes, “Spacetime physics with geometric algebra,” *American Journal of Physics*, vol. 71, no. 7, pp. 691–714, 07 2003. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1571836>
- [50] J. Dressel, K. Y. Bliokh, and F. Nori, “Spacetime algebra as a powerful tool for electromagnetism,” *Physics Reports*, vol. 589, pp. 1–71, 2015.
- [51] D. Bahns, S. Doplicher, G. Morsella, and G. Piacitelli, “Quantum spacetime and algebraic quantum field theory,” in *Advances in algebraic quantum field theory*. Springer, 2015, pp. 289–329.
- [52] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio *et al.*, “Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series,” *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks*, vol. 3361, no. 10, p. 1995, 1995.
- [53] J. Jumper, R. Evans, A. Pritzel, T. Green, M. Figurnov, O. Ronneberger, K. Tunyasuvunakool, R. Bates, A. Žídek, A. Potapenko *et al.*, “Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold,” *nature*, vol. 596, no. 7873, pp. 583–589, 2021.
- [54] C. R. Qi, H. Su, K. Mo, and L. J. Guibas, “Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 652–660.
- [55] M. Zaheer, S. Kottur, S. Ravanbakhsh, B. Poczos, R. R. Salakhutdinov, and A. J. Smola, “Deep sets,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [56] C. Liu, D. Ruhe, F. Eijkelboom, and P. Forré, “Clifford group equivariant simplicial message passing networks,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [57] M. Zhdanov, D. Ruhe, M. Weiler, A. Lucic, J. Brandstetter, and P. Forré, “Clifford-steerable convolutional neural networks,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 61 203–61 228.
- [58] V.-H. Tran, T. N. Vo, T. T. Huu, and T. M. Nguyen, “A clifford algebraic approach to e (n)-equivariant high-order graph neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04692*, 2024.

- [59] A. Pepe, S. Buchholz, and J. Lasenby, “Clifford group equivariant neural network layers for protein structure prediction,” in *Northern Lights Deep Learning Conference*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 205–211.
- [60] C. Liu, D. Ruhe, and P. Forré, “Multivector neurons: Better and faster o (n)-equivariant clifford graph neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04052*, 2024.
- [61] J. Brehmer, S. Behrends, P. De Haan, and T. Cohen, “Does equivariance matter at scale?” *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025.
- [62] J. Gallier, “Clifford algebras, clifford groups, and a generalization of the quaternions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0805.0311*, 2008.
- [63] M. Geiger and T. Smidt, “e3nn: Euclidean neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.09453*, 2022.
- [64] J. Suk, B. Imre, and J. M. Wolterink, “Lab-gatr: geometric algebra transformers for large biomedical surface and volume meshes,” in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2024, pp. 185–195.
- [65] J. Suk, P. De Haan, B. Imre, and J. M. Wolterink, “Geometric algebra transformers for large 3d meshes via cross-attention,” in *ICML 2024 Workshop on Geometry-grounded Representation Learning and Generative Modeling*, 2024.
- [66] X. Sun, Y. Wang, S. Yang, Y. Chen, and D. Rakita, “Hybrid diffusion policies with projective geometric algebra for efficient robot manipulation learning,” in *2026 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2026.
- [67] J. Brehmer, V. Bresó, P. de Haan, T. Plehn, H. Qu, J. Spinner, and J. Thaler, “A lorentz-equivariant transformer for all of the lhc,” *SciPost Physics*, vol. 19, no. 4, p. 108, 2025.
- [68] N. Thomas, T. Smidt, S. Kearnes, L. Yang, L. Li, K. Kohlhoff, and P. Riley, “Tensor field networks: Rotation- and translation-equivariant neural networks for 3d point clouds,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08219*, 2018.
- [69] V. G. Satorras, E. Hoogeboom, and M. Welling, “E (n) equivariant graph neural networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 9323–9332.
- [70] J. Spinner, L. Favaro, P. Lippmann, S. Pitz, G. Gerhartz, T. Plehn, and F. A. Hamprecht, “Lorentz local canonicalization: How to make any network Lorentz-equivariant,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 38, 2025.
- [71] J. Vaz Jr and R. da Rocha Jr, *An introduction to Clifford algebras and spinors*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [72] P. Lounesto, “Clifford algebras and spinors,” in *Clifford algebras and their applications in mathematical physics*. Springer, 2001, pp. 25–37.
- [73] R. Ali, P. Kulytė, H. Sáez de Ocáriz Borde, and P. Lio, “Metric learning for clifford group equivariant neural networks,” in *ICML 2024 Workshop on Geometry-grounded Representation Learning and Generative Modeling*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 132–145.
- [74] T. Maruyama and F. Alesiani, “Gradient of clifford neural networks,” in *NeurIPS 2024 Workshop on Data-driven and Differentiable Simulations, Surrogates, and Solvers*, 2024.
- [75] E. Filimoshina and D. Shirokov, “GLGENN: A novel parameter-light equivariant neural networks architecture based on Clifford geometric algebras,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 267. PMLR, 2025, pp. 17 153–17 188.
- [76] A. Sveier, A. L. Kleppe, L. Tingelstad, and O. Egeland, “Object detection in point clouds using conformal geometric algebra,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1961–1976, 2017.
- [77] T. Pence, D. Yamada, and V. Singh, “Composing linear layers from irreducibles,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 38, 2025.
- [78] D. Hendrycks and K. Gimpel, “Gaussian error linear units (gelus),” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016.
- [79] A. Pepe, S. Buchholz, and J. Lasenby, “Ga-relu: an activation function for geometric algebra networks applied to 2d navier-stokes pdes,” in *ICLR 2024 Workshop on AI4DifferentialEquations In Science*, 2024.

- [80] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, S. Vaidya, F. Ruehle, J. Halverson, M. Soljačić, T. Y. Hou, and M. Tegmark, “Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, 2024.
- [81] M. Wolff, F. Alesiani, C. Duhme, and X. Jiang, “Clifford kolmogorov-arnold networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.05977*, 2026.
- [82] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, “Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift,” in *International conference on machine learning*. pmlr, 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [83] Y. Wu and K. He, “Group normalization,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 3–19.
- [84] J. L. Ba, J. R. Kiros, and G. E. Hinton, “Layer normalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- [85] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [86] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [87] M. Spellings, “Geometric algebra attention networks for small point clouds,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.02393*, 2021.
- [88] A. Hirose, *Complex-valued neural networks*. Springer, 2006.
- [89] A. F. R. Rahman, W. G. J. Howells, and M. C. Fairhurst, “A multiexpert framework for character recognition: a novel application of clifford networks,” *IEEE Transactions on neural networks*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 101–112, 2001.
- [90] J. Pearson, “Clifford networks,” in *Complex-Valued Neural Networks: Theories and Applications*. World Scientific, 2003, pp. 81–106.
- [91] Q. Yi, “Learning rules for low-dimensional clifford neural networks,” Ph.D. dissertation, Portland State University, 2006.
- [92] S. Buchholz and N. Le Bihan, “Polarized signal classification by complex and quaternionic multi-layer perceptrons,” *International journal of neural systems*, vol. 18, no. 02, pp. 75–85, 2008.
- [93] Y. Li and C. Wenming, “An extended multilayer perceptron model using reduced geometric algebra,” *IEEE Access*, vol. PP, pp. 1–1, 09 2019.
- [94] J. Pearson and D. Bisset, “Neural networks in the clifford domain,” in *Proceedings of 1994 IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks (ICNN’94)*, vol. 3. IEEE, 1994, pp. 1465–1469.
- [95] S. Buchholz and G. Sommer, “On clifford neurons and clifford multi-layer perceptrons,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 925–935, 2008.
- [96] —, “Clifford algebra multilayer perceptrons,” in *Geometric computing with Clifford algebras: Theoretical foundations and applications in computer vision and robotics*. Springer, 2001, pp. 315–334.
- [97] —, “Introduction to neural computation in clifford algebra,” in *Geometric Computing with Clifford Algebras: Theoretical Foundations and Applications in Computer Vision and Robotics*, G. Sommer, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 291–314. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-04621-0_12
- [98] P. Kolyvakis, M. Kamarianakis, and G. Papagiannakis, “Geometric algebra meets large language models: Instruction-based transformations of separate meshes in 3d, interactive and controllable scenes,” in *2025 IEEE International Symposium on Emerging Metaverse (ISEMV)*, 2025, pp. 36–45.
- [99] Y. Li, Y. Wang, R. Wang, Y. Wang, K. Wang, X. Wang, W. Cao, and W. Xiang, “Ga-cnn: Convolutional neural network based on geometric algebra for hyperspectral image classification,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 60, pp. 1–14, 2022.
- [100] S. Roy, R. Shinde, C. E. Phillips, A. Kumar, W. J. Leong, M. Maskey, and R. Ramachandran, “Clifford neural operators on atmospheric data influenced partial differential equations,” in *Workshop on AI4Differential Equations In Science, 12th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

- [101] A. Alfarrarj and G.-W. Wei, “Geometric algebra generation of molecular surfaces,” *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, vol. 19, no. 189, p. 20220117, 2022.
- [102] B. L. Szarvas and M. Zhdanov, “Conditional Clifford-steerable CNNs for PDE modeling,” in *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 306. PMLR, 2026, pp. 117 890–117 905.
- [103] J. Suk, T. Hehn, A. Behboodi, and G. Cesa, “Vine-gatr: scaling geometric algebra transformers with virtual nodes embeddings,” in *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Machine Learning Multiscale Processes*, 2025.
- [104] T. M. Huy and E. Hirst, “Versor: A geometric sequence architecture,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10195*, 2026.
- [105] I. Sivgin, S. Fridovich-Keil, G. Wetzstein, and M. Pilanci, “Geometric algebra planes: Convex implicit neural volumes,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 55 828–55 853.
- [106] R. Wareham, J. Cameron, and J. Lasenby, “Applications of conformal geometric algebra in computer vision and graphics,” in *International workshop on mathematics mechanization*. Springer, 2004, pp. 329–349.
- [107] E. Bayro-Corrochano, *Geometric algebra applications vol. I: Computer vision, graphics and neurocomputing*. Springer, 2018.
- [108] A. Pepe and J. Lasenby, “Cga-posenet: Camera pose regression via a 1d-up approach to conformal geometric algebra,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05211*, 2023.
- [109] N. Liu, B. Lin, L. Yuan, G. Lv, Z. Yu, and L. Zhou, “An interactive indoor 3d reconstruction method based on conformal geometry algebra,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 28, no. 4, p. 73, 2018.
- [110] P. W. Khan, Y.-C. Byun, and M. A. Latif, “Clifford geometric algebra-based approach for 3d modeling of agricultural images acquired by uavs,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 226 297–226 308, 2020.
- [111] C. G. Gunn, “Course notes geometric algebra for computer graphics, siggraph 2019,” in *ACM SIGGRAPH*, 2019, pp. 1–140.
- [112] K. Kanatani, *Understanding geometric algebra: Hamilton, Grassmann, and Clifford for computer vision and graphics*. CRC Press, 2015.
- [113] J. Du, R. Goldman, and S. Mann, “Modeling 3d geometry in the clifford algebra $r(4, 4)$,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 3039–3062, 2017.
- [114] A. Pepe, P. dos Santos Mendonca, and J. Lasenby, “Geometric inductive priors in diffusion-based optical flow estimation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2025, pp. 655–665.
- [115] Z. Ji, “Cliffordnet: All you need is geometric algebra,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.06793*, 2026.
- [116] Y. Liu, Y. Luo, R. Wang, Y. Huang, M. Ju, and W. Xiang, “A geometric algebra-based model for enhanced hyperspectral anomaly detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2025.
- [117] R. Wang, M. Shen, X. Wang, and W. Cao, “Rga-cnns: Convolutional neural networks based on reduced geometric algebra,” *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 64, no. 129101, pp. 1–129 101, 2021.
- [118] D. Alblas, P. Rygiel, J. Suk, K. O. Kappe, M. Hofman, C. Brune, K. K. Yeung, and J. M. Wolterink, “Geometric deep learning for local growth prediction on abdominal aortic aneurysm surfaces,” *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, vol. 172, p. 103323, 2026.
- [119] J. Suk, P. de Haan, P. Lippe, C. Brune, and J. M. Wolterink, “Mesh neural networks for se (3)-equivariant hemodynamics estimation on the artery wall,” *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 173, p. 108328, 2024.
- [120] P. Rygiel, J. Suk, K. K. Yeung, C. Brune, and J. M. Wolterink, “When does equivariance help? Canonical alignment in neural fluid surrogates,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18816*, 2026.
- [121] B. R. K, P. Singh, G. S. Verma, L. M. Kannan, and S. Kadam, “Enhanced multiclass brain tumor detection in mri using similarity-navigated graph neural networks with banyan tree growth optimization,” in *2024 4th International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing and Intelligent Information Systems (ICUIS)*, 2024, pp. 626–631.

- [122] S. Chmiela, A. Tkatchenko, H. E. Sauceda, I. Poltavsky, K. T. Schütt, and K.-R. Müller, “Machine learning of accurate energy-conserving molecular force fields,” *Science advances*, vol. 3, no. 5, p. e1603015, 2017.
- [123] Y. Huang, Y. Zeng, Q. Wu, and L. Lü, “Higher-order graph convolutional network with flower-petals laplacians on simplicial complexes,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 11, 2024, pp. 12 653–12 661.
- [124] K. H. Petersen and M. N. Schmidt, “Design and evaluation of a geometric algebra-based graph neural network for molecular property prediction,” in *Northern Lights Deep Learning Conference 2026*, 2026.
- [125] C. Polat, E. Serpedin, M. Kurban, and H. Kurban, “CliffordIP: Clifford algebra equivariant interatomic potentials for heterogeneous catalysis,” *npj Computational Materials*, 2026.
- [126] E. M. Hitzer, “Multivector differential calculus,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 135–182, 2002.
- [127] A. Pepe, J. Lasenby, and P. Chacon, “Geometric algebra models of proteins for three-dimensional structure prediction: A detailed analysis,” in *Advanced Computational Applications of Geometric Algebra*, D. W. H. Araujo Da Silva, D. Hildenbrand, and E. Hitzer, Eds. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 141–159.
- [128] C. Hockey, Y. Yao, and J. Lasenby, “Simplifying and generalising equivariant geometric algebra networks,” in *Proceedings of the Applied Geometric Algebras in Computer Science and Engineering (AGACSE 2024)*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://staff.science.uva.nl/l.dorst/AGACSE2024/programme/Yao.pdf>
- [129] S. J. Marrink and D. P. Tieleman, “Perspective on the martini model,” *Chemical Society Reviews*, vol. 42, no. 16, pp. 6801–6822, 2013.
- [130] A. Alfarraj and G.-W. Wei, “Geometric algebra approaches to protein-protein docking,” Poster presented at ICERM 2023, Providence, Rhode Island, 2023, accessed August 3, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://users.math.msu.edu/users/weig/Docking_poster_icerm2023.pdf
- [131] I. A. Vakser, “Protein-protein docking: From interaction to interactome,” *Biophysical journal*, vol. 107, no. 8, pp. 1785–1793, 2014.
- [132] R. Wang, X. Gao, and P. Zhao, “Geometric algebra-enhanced bayesian flow network for RNA inverse design,” in *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.
- [133] C. K. Joshi and P. Lio, “grnade: A geometric deep learning pipeline for 3d rna inverse design,” in *RNA Design: Methods and Protocols*. Springer, 2024, pp. 121–135.
- [134] R. Das and D. Baker, “Macromolecular modeling with rosetta,” *Annu. Rev. Biochem.*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 363–382, 2008.
- [135] G. E. Karniadakis, I. G. Kevrekidis, L. Lu, P. Perdikaris, S. Wang, and L. Yang, “Physics-informed machine learning,” *Nature Reviews Physics*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 422–440, 2021.
- [136] Z. Hao, S. Liu, Y. Zhang, C. Ying, Y. Feng, H. Su, and J. Zhu, “Physics-informed machine learning: A survey on problems, methods and applications,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08064*, 2022.
- [137] I. Zaplana, H. Hadfield, and J. Lasenby, “Closed-form solutions for the inverse kinematics of serial robots using conformal geometric algebra,” *Mechanism and Machine Theory*, vol. 173, p. 104835, 2022.
- [138] Z. Fu, W. Yang, and Z. Yang, “Solution of inverse kinematics for 6r robot manipulators with offset wrist based on geometric algebra,” *Journal of mechanisms and robotics*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 031010, 2013.
- [139] D. Zhu, Z. Zhang, and D. Li, “A conformal geometric algebra method for inverse kinematics analysis of 6r robotic arm,” *Journal of Mechanisms and Robotics*, vol. 17, no. 9, 2025.
- [140] T. Löw and S. Calinon, “Geometric Algebra for Optimal Control with Applications in Manipulation Tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 2023.
- [141] O. Carbajal-Espinosa, L. González-Jiménez, J. Oviedo-Barriga, B. Castillo-Toledo, A. Loukianov, and E. Bayro-Corrochano, “Modeling and pose control of robotic manipulators and legs using conformal geometric algebra,” *Computación y Sistemas*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 475–486, 2015.

- [142] S. Xu, D. Chen, K. Wong, C. Zhang, K. Fallah, and R. Urtasun, “Efficient equivariant transformer for self-driving agent modeling,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2026, pp. 32 164–32 172.
- [143] Y. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, C. Qian, and R. Wang, “Geometric algebra based recurrent neural network for multi-dimensional time-series prediction,” *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, vol. 16, p. 1078150, 2022.
- [144] E. Grassucci, A. Zhang, and D. Comminiello, “Phnns: Lightweight neural networks via parameterized hypercomplex convolutions,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 8293–8305, 2022.
- [145] T. Hehn, M. Peschl, T. Orekondy, A. Behboodi, and J. Brehmer, “Differentiable and learnable wire-less simulation with geometric transformers,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [146] A. Mani, “Representing words in a geometric algebra,” *Princeton University*, 2023.
- [147] Y. Wang, S. Kim, P. Chu, I. Subramaniam, and M. Pilanci, “Randomized geometric algebra methods for convex neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02806*, 2024.
- [148] J. A. García-Limón, J. P. Serrano Rubio, R. Herrera-Guzmán, L. M. Rodríguez-Vidal, and C. M. Hernández-Mendoza, “Embedded implementation of the hypersphere neural network for energy consumption monitoring,” in *Mexican International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2022, pp. 38–51.
- [149] L. Favaro, T. Plehn, H. Qu, and J. Spinner, “Virtues and vices of equivariant transformers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.02735*, 2026.
- [150] V. Bresó-Pla, K. Greif, V. Mikuni, B. Nachman, T. Plehn, T. Wamorkar, and D. Whiteson, “Encoding physics at the precision frontier,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 114, no. 3, p. 036034, 2026.
- [151] C. Polat, E. Serpedin, M. Kurban, and H. Kurban, “Geometric algebra meets Cartesian tensors: Higher-order equivariance for interatomic potentials,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.29584*, 2026.
- [152] A. Petitjean, T. Plehn, J. Spinner, and U. Köthe, “Economical jet taggers – equivariant, slim, and quantized,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.17011*, 2025.
- [153] F. Alesiani, “Pytorch geometric algebra.” [Online]. Available: https://github.com/falesiani/torch_ga
- [154] R. Kahlow, “Tensorflow geometric algebra.” [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3902404>
- [155] E. Hoogendoorn, “numga.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/EelcoHoogendoorn/numga>
- [156] J. Spinner and V. Bresó-Pla, “lgatr: Lorentz-equivariant geometric algebra transformer.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/heidelberg-hepml/lgatr>
- [157] H. Hadfield, E. Wieser, A. Arsenovic, R. Kern, and The Pygae Team, “pygae/clifford.” [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1453978>
- [158] M. Roelfs, “The willing kingdom clifford algebra library,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.10451>
- [159] S. De Keninck, “ganja.js,” Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3635774>, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/3635774>
- [160] P. Colapinto, “Versor: Spatial computing with conformal geometric algebra,” Master’s thesis, University of California at Santa Barbara, 2011, available at <http://versor.mat.ucsb.edu>. [Online]. Available: <http://versor.mat.ucsb.edu>
- [161] L. A. F. Fernandes, “Exploring lazy evaluation and compile-time simplifications for efficient geometric algebra computations,” in *Systems, Patterns and Data Engineering with Geometric Calculi*, ser. SEMA SIMAI Springer Series, S. Xambó-Descamps, Ed. Springer, Cham, 2021, vol. 13, ch. 6, pp. 111–131. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/laffernandes/gatl>
- [162] J. Yong, “Klein.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/jeremyong/Klein>
- [163] D. Hildenbrand, “Gaalop.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/CallForSanity/Gaalop>

- [164] S. Breuils, V. Nozick, and L. Fuchs, “Garamon: A geometric algebra library generator,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 29, no. 4, p. 69, Jul 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00006-019-0987-7>
- [165] E. V. Sousa and L. A. Fernandes, “Tbgal: a tensor-based library for geometric algebra,” *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, vol. 30, no. 2, p. 27, 2020.
- [166] D. Hildenbrand, J. Pitt, and A. Koch, “Gaalop—high performance parallel computing based on conformal geometric algebra,” in *Geometric Algebra Computing: in Engineering and Computer Science*. Springer, 2010, pp. 477–494.
- [167] L. A. Fernandes, “Exploring lazy evaluation and compile-time simplifications for efficient geometric algebra computations,” in *Systems, Patterns and Data Engineering with Geometric Calculi*. Springer, 2021, pp. 111–131.
- [168] P. Leopardi, “Glucat.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/penguian/glucat>