arXiv:1911.04351v1 [stat.ML] 11 Nov 2019

Stronger Convergence Results for Deep Residual Networks: Network Width Scales Linearly with Training Data Size

Talha Cihad Gulcu *

November 13, 2021

Abstract

Deep neural networks are highly expressive machine learning models with the ability to interpolate arbitrary datasets. Deep nets are typically optimized via first-order methods and the optimization process crucially depends on the characteristics of the network as well as the dataset. This work sheds light on the relation between the network size and the properties of the dataset with an emphasis on deep residual networks (ResNets). Our contribution is that if the network Jacobian is full rank, gradient descent for the quadratic loss and smooth activation converges to the global minima even if the network width m of the ResNet scales linearly with the sample size n, and independently from the network depth. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work which provides a theoretical guarantee for the convergence of neural networks in the $m = \Omega(n)$ regime.

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks have gained remarkable success over a large variety of applications, including computer vision [1], natural language processing [2], speech recognition [3] and Go games [4]. But the reason why deep networks perform well over various tasks is still not exactly understood. The optimization performance of deep networks is one of the subjects which requires an involved theoretical study, given that gradient descent can achieve zero training loss even for random labels [5], and the loss of deep networks is highly non-convex. There are different lines of works investigating the optimization of deep networks from different perspectives. For example, a large number of works consider the optimization landscape corresponding to different activation functions [6–11], whereas some others [12–15] ensure global convergence by imposing some restrictions on the input distribution.

In the recent years, there has been considerably many papers providing convergence guarantees for over-parameterized two-layer and deep networks. It is shown in [16] that gradient descent can find the near-global minima of a single hidden layer network in polynomial time with respect to the accuracy and sample size. A similar observation has been made by [17] in regards to the single hidden layer networks where the network width has to taken as $m = \Omega(n^6)$. Later on, the convergence problem for over-parameterized multi-layer networks is considered by [18–20]. It is proved in [18] that convergence to near-global minima is possible when the network width m grows polynomially with the sample size n and the network depth H. The authors claim this result is valid for convolution

*ASELSAN Inc. e-mail:tcgulcu@gmail.com

neural networks(CNNs) and deep residual networks(ResNets) as well. [19] shows that convergence time is polynomial in H and n for deep ReLU networks when $m = \text{poly}(n, H)$. The paper [20] proves that the condition $m = \Omega(\text{poly}(n)2^{O(H)})$ suffices for the gradient descent to converge to zero training loss for fully-connected feedforward network, and $m = \text{poly}(n, H)$ is enough to have a similar convergence for ResNets and convolutional ResNets.

A dataset dependent convergence rate is specified in [21], where the condition $m = \Omega(n^7)$ ensures a linear convergence for the single hidden layer network, and the convergence rate is related to the Gram matrix $\mathbf{H}^\infty$ of the dataset. Another single hidden layer network analysis appears in [22], which shows that a moderate overparameterization of the form $m = O(n^2)$ is sufficient to have a global convergence when the network has single hidden layer. In the paper [23], the authors conclude m can grow independently of H and the linear convergence can still be maintained for the ResNet when $m = \Omega(n^{24})$. Later on, the same authors prove some convergence results (where m depends polynomially on H this time) for the case when the scaling factor of the ResNet is taken as $\tau = O(1/\sqrt{H})$ instead of $\tau = O(1/H)$. Convergence for the adversarial training is considered in [24], where it is shown that it is possible to find the optimal set of weight matrices inside a radius of B and within an error tolerance ϵ for the fully connected feedforward network if $m = \Omega(B^4 n 2^{O(H)}/\epsilon^2)$. A list of papers providing convergence guarantees along with the conditions and network types for which those convergences are valid is given by Table 1.

Paper	Network Type	Activation Function	Loss Function	Network Width m
[16]	Single hidden layer	ReLU	Cross Entropy	$\Omega(\text{poly}(n))$
[17]	Single hidden layer	ReLU	Quadratic	$\Omega(n^6)$
[18]	Multi-layer, CNN, ResNet	ReLU	Arbitrary	$\Omega(\text{poly}(n, H))$
[19]	Multi-layer feedforward	ReLU	Smooth	$\Omega(\text{poly}(n, H))$
[20]	Multi-layer feedforward	Smooth	Quadratic	$\Omega(\text{poly}(n)2^{O(H)})$
[20]	CNN, ResNet	Smooth	Quadratic	$\Omega(\text{poly}(n, H))$
[21]	Single hidden layer	ReLU	Quadratic	$\Omega(n^7)$
[22]	Single hidden layer	Smooth	Quadratic	$\Omega(n^2)$
[22]	Single hidden layer	ReLU	Quadratic	$\Omega(n^4)$
[23]	ResNet	ReLU	Quadratic	$\max(H, \Omega(n^{24}))$
[23]	ResNet with scaling $\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}$	ReLU	Quadratic	$\Omega(n^{24}H^7)$
[24]	Multi-layer feedforward	Smooth	Smooth	$\Omega(B^4 n 2^{O(H)})$
This paper	ResNet	Smooth	Quadratic	$\Omega(n)$

Table 1: A summary of the some recent convergence results for the overparameterized neural networks.

In this paper, we consider the ResNet model with the quadratic loss function. We assume the activation function has bounded first and second derivatives. Our convergence proof strategy relies on the meta theorem given by [25], which basically states that if the Lipschitz constant and the maximum eigenvalue of the Jacobian is bounded over a ball centered at the random initialization,

and if the minimum eigenvalue of the Jacobian is bounded away from zero in the same ball, then linear convergence rate is achievable for the quadratic loss function. After an involved analysis, it turns out that those conditions of the meta theorem can be met if $m = \Omega(n)$, i.e., the network width scales linearly with the sample size. A convergence result associated with the linear growth of network width is not available in the literature even for single-hidden layer networks. Moreover, this is the first global minima finding result for the deep networks with the properties

i. The growth rate of network width does not depend on the network depth,

ii. The dependence of the network width to the sample size is linear,

to the best of our knowledge.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We introduce the problem setup in Section 2. The derivation of Jacobian related parameters playing a crucial role in the linear convergence rate is performed in Section 3. An upper bound for the error term for the random initialization is found in Section 4. The calculations showing how much the Jacobian parameters change over a given ball centered at random initialization is presented in Section 5. Our main result and a list of some future work are stated in Section 6.

2 Problem Setup

In this work, we consider the empirical loss minimization problem for the quadratic loss function

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(f(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - y_i\right)^2 \tag{2.1}$$

where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ refer to the training inputs and labels, respectively, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the parameter set to be optimized, and f is the output of the neural network. We focus on deep residual networks, which forms a particular class of neural networks.

For the classical fully-connected neural network, the network output f is defined recursively as follows. Denoting the input as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the activation function as $\phi(\cdot)$, the first weight matrix as $\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times d}$, the weight matrix associated with the $h-$th layer for $2 \le h \le H$ as $\mathbf{W}^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$, and the output layer weight vector as $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we express $f(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(h)} &= \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\phi\left(\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}\right), \ 1 \le h \le H \\ f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{x}^{(H)} \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where we take $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{x}$, and $c_\phi = 1/\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)}[\phi(x)]^2$ is the normalization factor.

The network output for the deep residual network (ResNet) involves a similar recursion, with the difference of an additional term which makes it possible to skip some of the layers as the input propagates. The ResNet output model is defined formally in the next section.

2.1 ResNet model

Using the same notation as the fully-connected neural network output (2.2), the ResNet model is defined recursively as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^{(1)} &= \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\phi\left(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}\right),\\ \mathbf{x}^{(h)} &= \mathbf{x}^{(h-1)} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\phi\left(\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}\right),\ 2\le h\le H,\\ f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{x}^{(H)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where c_{res} is a positive constant less than 1. We assume the activation function ϕ satisfies $|\phi'(z)|\le B$ and $|\phi''(z)|\le M$ for some constants B and M. We observe from (2.3) that there is an extra term $\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}$ being added to the h-th layer output $\mathbf{x}^{(h)}$. Because of this term, for each subset $S=\{h_1,\dots,h_k\}$ of the set $\Omega\triangleq\{2,\dots,H\}$, there is a connected network $1\to h_1\to\cdots\to h_k$ contributing to the last layer output $\mathbf{x}^{(H)}$. More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbf{x}^{(H)}| \le{}& \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\left|\phi\left(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}\right)\right|\\ &+\sum_{\substack{\{h_1,\dots,h_k\}\\ \subseteq\{2,\dots,H\}}}\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left|\phi\left(\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbf{W}^{(h_k)}\phi\left(\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbf{W}^{(h_{k-1})}\dots\phi\left(\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\mathbf{W}^{(h_1)}\phi(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x})\right)\dots\right)\right)\right|\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

which can be proven easily via induction. The inequality (2.4) holds trivially for $H=1$, and the inductive step follows from the inequality $|\phi(\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b})|\le|\phi(\mathbf{a})|+|\phi(\mathbf{b})|$ which holds for commonly used activation functions such as ReLU and softplus.

2.2 Global Convergence Overview

Given a neural network with the label output f, parameter set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and loss function L, the gradient descent iterations of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)-\eta\frac{\partial L}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} \tag{2.5}$$

for $k=1,2,\dots$, where η is the step size. When the loss function is quadratic as in (2.1), the gradient descent update (2.5) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)&=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)-\eta\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)}\cdot\left(f(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1))-y_i\right)\\ &=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)-\eta\left[\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)}\ \dots\ \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}}\bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)}\right]\cdot\begin{bmatrix}f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1))-y_1\\ \vdots\\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1))-y_n\end{bmatrix}\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Using (2.6) and first order Taylor approximation, we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \end{bmatrix} - \eta \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) - y_1 \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) - y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

which can be written in more compactly as

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \end{bmatrix} - \eta[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)} \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) - y_1 \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) - y_n \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \triangleq \left[\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \dots \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\right]^T$ is the neural network Jacobian matrix, and $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is referred as neural tangent kernel(NTK) [26, 27]. Eq. (2.7) can be trivially transformed to

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 - f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \\ \vdots \\ y_n - f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k)) \end{bmatrix} \approx \left[\mathbf{I} - \eta\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1))\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1))\right] \begin{bmatrix} y_1 - f(\mathbf{x}_1,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \\ \vdots \\ y_n - f(\mathbf{x}_n,\boldsymbol{\theta}(k-1)) \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.8}$$

We observe from (2.8) that the convergence rate of the gradient descent iteration is related to the minimum singular value of the Jacobian $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. If we make sure that the parameter set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ stays inside a certain region during the gradient descent updates and the minimum singular value of $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is greater than a certain threshold in this region, then the global convergence of the training process should follow. Arguing the global convergence of the training in this way is encountered in numerous papers including [17, 20–22].

2.3 Meta convergence theorem

To prove our convergence results, we will utilize a result from [25] stated below.

Theorem 2.1 *Consider a nonlinear least-squares optimization problem given by* $\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}\left\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{y}\right\|_2^2$ *with* $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. *Given* $L, \alpha > 0$, *consider an Euclidean ball* $\mathcal{D}$ *of radius* $R = \frac{4\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\boldsymbol{y}\|_2}{\alpha}$ *around the initial point* $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. *Suppose the Jacobian associated with* f *obeys*

$$\alpha \le \phi_{\min}\left(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \le \left\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\| \le \beta. \tag{2.9}$$

at all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}$. *Furthermore, suppose* $\left\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)\right\| \le L\left\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1\right\|_2$ *holds for any* $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ *Then, setting* $\eta \le \frac{1}{2\beta^2} \cdot \min\left(1, \frac{\alpha^2}{L\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\boldsymbol{y}\|_2}\right)$ *and running gradient descent updates given by* $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau - \eta\nabla\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau)$ *starting from* $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, *all iterates obey*

$$\left\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\right\|_2^2 \le \left(1 - \frac{\eta\alpha^2}{2}\right)^\tau \left\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{y}\right\|_2^2, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\frac{\alpha}{4}\left\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\right\|_2 + \left\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\right\|_2 \le \left\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{y}\right\|_2. \tag{2.11}$$

To apply this theorem it suffices to prove the conditions above for proper choices of α, β, and L. Therefore, our aim is to compute the values those variable take for the ResNet. As a preliminary remark, we present the results proved in [22] for the one-hidden layer neural network model, defined as $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{v}^T \phi(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x})$, for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 2.2 (Spectral norm of the Jacobian) *Consider a one-hidden layer neural network model of the form $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \boldsymbol{v}^T \phi(\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{x})$ where the activation ϕ has bounded derivatives obeying $|\phi'(z)| \le B$. Also assume we have n data points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ aggregated as the rows of a matrix $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Then the Jacobian matrix with respect to the input-to-hidden weights obeys*

$$\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{W})\| \le \sqrt{k} B \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{X}\|.$$

Lemma 2.3 (Minimum eigenvalue of the Jacobian at initialization) *Consider a one-hidden layer neural network model of the form $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \boldsymbol{v}^T \phi(\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{x})$ where the activation ϕ has bounded derivatives obeying $|\phi'(z)| \le B$. Also assume we have n data points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with unit euclidean norm ($\|\boldsymbol{x}_i\|_2 = 1$) aggregated as the rows of a matrix $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Then, as long as*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty} \ge \sqrt{20 \log n} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{X}\|}{\sqrt{\lambda(\boldsymbol{X})}} B,$$

the Jacobian matrix at a random point $\boldsymbol{W}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries obeys

$$\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{W}_0)) \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda(\boldsymbol{X})},$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/n$, where $\lambda(\boldsymbol{X}) := \phi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{X}))$ for the matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{X}) := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_d)} \left[\left(\phi'(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{w}) \phi'(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{w})^T \right) \odot \left(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{X}^T \right) \right].$$

Lemma 2.4 (Jacobian Lipschitzness) *Consider a one-hidden layer neural network model of the form $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \boldsymbol{v}^T \phi(\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{x})$ where the activation ϕ has bounded second order derivatives obeying $|\phi''(z)| \le M$. Also assume we have n data points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with unit euclidean norm ($\|\boldsymbol{x}_i\|_2 = 1$) aggregated as the rows of a matrix $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Then the Jacobian mapping with respect to the input-to-hidden weights obeys*

$$\left\| \mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{W}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{W}) \right\| \le M \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{X}\| \left\| \widetilde{\boldsymbol{W}} - \boldsymbol{W} \right\|_F \quad \text{for all} \quad \widetilde{\boldsymbol{W}}, \boldsymbol{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}.$$

We will makes use of those lemmas and their proofs to evaluate the parameters α, β, L for the ResNet. But we first need to analyze the Jacobian of the ResNet and express it in a convenient way. This would be the subject of next section.

3 The Jacobian Analysis of the ResNet Model

We see from (2.3) that the ResNet output f_{res} depends on the weight matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{W}^{(H)}$ and $\mathbf{a}$. Here we take $\mathbf{a}$ to be a constant vector to which gradient descent iterations do not apply, so the

parameter set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of our ResNet model is taken to be $\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \dots \mathbf{W}^{(H)}]$. Hence the matrix product $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})]_{ij} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x}_j,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^{H} \left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x}_j,\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}} \right\rangle \\ &\triangleq \sum_{h=1}^{H} \mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(h)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

similarly to the matrix decomposition appearing in [20]. To compute $\frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}$ or $\mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(h)}$ for a given h, we consider the sequence of partials $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(l)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times md}$, $l = 1,\dots,H$ along with $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(l)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m^2}$, $l,h = 1,\dots,H$, and observe

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(l)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if} \quad l < h \\ \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\, \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x})] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}^T \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if} \quad l = h = 1 \\ \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\, \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)})] \begin{bmatrix} {\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & {\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}}^T \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if} \quad l = h > 1 \\ \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)})]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right] \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}, & \text{if} \quad l > h. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

It follows from (3.2) that the final layer partial $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}, h = 1,\dots,H$ can be derived as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}} = \begin{cases} \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)})]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right] \\ \quad \cdot \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\, \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x})] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}^T \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if} \quad h = 1, \\ \prod_{l=h+1}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)})]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right] \\ \quad \cdot \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\, \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)})] \begin{bmatrix} {\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & {\mathbf{x}^{(h-1)}}^T \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if} \quad h > 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

Then the partial derivative $\frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}$ can be computed as $\frac{\partial f_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}} = \mathbf{a}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}$ for all layers $h = 1,\dots,H$, where the partial $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}$ is as given by (3.3). Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(h)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}^T \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right] \cdot \frac{c_\phi}{m} \text{ diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_i)] \\ \quad \cdot \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_j)] \cdot \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} {\mathbf{W}^{(l)}}^T \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_j^{(l-1)})] \right] \mathbf{a} \\ \quad \cdot \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle, \quad \text{if } h = 1, \\ \mathbf{a}^T \prod_{l=h+1}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right] \cdot \frac{c_{\text{res}}^2}{H^2 m} \text{ diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)})] \\ \quad \cdot \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_j^{(h-1)})] \prod_{l=h+1}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} {\mathbf{W}^{(l)}}^T \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_j^{(l-1)})] \right] \mathbf{a} \\ \quad \cdot \left\langle \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}, \mathbf{x}_j^{(h-1)} \right\rangle, \quad \text{if } h > 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

Under the bounded derivative assumption $|\phi'(z)| \le B$ appearing in the statement of Lemma 2.2, we conclude from (3.4) that

$$\left| \mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(h)} \right| \le \begin{cases} \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 B^2 \frac{c_\phi}{m} \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \right)^2 |\langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle|, & \text{if } h = 1, \\ \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 B^2 \frac{c_{res}^2}{H^2 m} \prod_{l=h+1}^{H} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \right)^2 \left| \left\langle \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}, \mathbf{x}_j^{(h-1)} \right\rangle \right|, & \text{if } h > 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Now we are in a position to analyze α, β and L appearing in Theorem 2.1 for the ResNet case. Our first step would be to evaluate α for random initialization of weight matrices, β for a given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and L for a given pair of parameter sets $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then we will extend those results derived for single parameters to the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \frac{4\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathbf{y}\|_2}{\alpha}\right)$ described in Theorem 2.1.

3.1 Calculate lower bound

We start our analysis with α and examine (3.1) for that purpose. We assume the weight matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{W}^{(H)}$ are initialized with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries. Each matrix $\mathbf{G}^{(h)}$ in (3.1) is an inner product matrix, so they have to be positive semidefinite. This would imply $\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \ge \phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(h)})$ for all $h = 1, \ldots, H$. In particular, we have $\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \ge \phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(1)})$. Thus any lower bound for $\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(1)})$ would be a lower bound for $\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ as well. The formula for the entries $\mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(1)}$ of $\mathbf{G}^{(1)}$ is given by (3.4), and can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(1)} = \frac{c_\phi}{m} \left\{ \left[\mathbf{a}^T \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right) \right] \odot [\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_i)]^T \right\} \\ \cdot \left\{ [\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_j)] \odot \left[\prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} {\mathbf{W}^{(l)}}^T \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_j^{(l-1)})] \right) \mathbf{a} \right] \right\} \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Denoting the data matrix having rows $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n$ as $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, and denoting the matrix consisting of the rows $\mathbf{a}^T \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right), i = 1, \ldots, n$ as $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, it follows from (3.6) that

$$\mathbf{G}^{(1)} = \frac{c_\phi}{m} \left[\left(\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X}) \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^{(1)^T}) \right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X}) \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^{(1)^T}) \right)^T \right] \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T). \tag{3.7}$$

Then let the rows of $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}$ be $\mathbf{w}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_m$ and the columns of $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X})$ be $\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_m$ to rewrite (3.7) as

$$\mathbf{G}^{(1)} = \frac{c_\phi}{m} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m} [\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)] \cdot [\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)]^T \right) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T). \tag{3.8}$$

To analyze the Hadamard product given by (3.8), we first focus on the term $[\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)] \cdot [\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)]^T$, and observe

$$[\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)] \cdot [\mathbf{a}_l \odot \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)]^T = (\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot (\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T)$$

$$\mathbf{G}^{(1)} = \frac{c_\phi}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} (\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right] \tag{3.9}$$

We note that the randomness of the product $\left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right]$ is due to the weight matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}$ only, whereas the matrix $\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T$ depends on the matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathbf{W}^{(H)}$. Thus the expectation taken over the random initialization of $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{W}^{(H)}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right] \right\} &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \Sigma(\mathbf{X}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we take $\Sigma(\mathbf{X}) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right]$ as defined in Lemma 2.3. As a consequence of (3.10), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} (\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right] \right\} = \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \right] \odot \Sigma(\mathbf{X}) \tag{3.11}$$

Then we lower bound [28] the minimum eigenvalue of (3.11) as

$$\phi_{\min} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} (\mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{a}_l^T) \odot \left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l) \phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T) \odot (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \right] \right\} \right] \geq \min_i \frac{1}{m} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{a}_l(i)|^2 \right] \lambda(\mathbf{X}) \tag{3.12}$$

where $\lambda(\mathbf{X}) = \phi_{\min}(\Sigma(\mathbf{X}))$ is as defined in Lemma 2.3.

To estimate the term $\sum_{l=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{a}_l(i)|^2$, we consider the rows of $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{X})$, the norms of which can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathbf{a}^T \prod_{j=2}^{H} \left(\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(j)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(j-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(j)} \right) \right\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 \prod_{j=2}^{H} \phi_{\min}^2 \left(\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(j)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(j-1)})] \mathbf{W}^{(j)} \right) \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 \prod_{j=2}^{H} \left(1 - \frac{B c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\| \right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Taking the expectation of both sides in (3.13), we get

$$\sum_{l=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{a}_l(i)|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\mathbb{E}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)^2 \tag{3.14}$$

Since each entry of the weight matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(j)}$ is sampled with the standard normal distribution, Gordon's theorem for Gaussian matrices gives us $\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|}{\sqrt{m}} \leq 2$, for all $j = 1,\ldots,H$. Therefore the inequality

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{2Bc_{\text{res}}}{H}\right)^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2(1-\delta')\mathrm{e}^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}} \tag{3.15}$$

hold true for any given δ' between 0 and 1, and H being a function of δ' and large enough. Combining (3.14) with (3.15), we observe that expected squared norm of each row of $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta},\mathbf{X})$ is greater than $\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2(1-\delta')e^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}}$. Hence we get the inequality

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{a}_l(i)|^2 \geq (1-\delta')\frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2e^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}}}{m} \tag{3.16}$$

for any given i, meaning that

$$\min_i \frac{1}{m}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{a}_l(i)|^2\right] \geq (1-\delta')\frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2e^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}}}{m} \tag{3.17}$$

is satisfied. Then (3.12) gives us

$$\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}(\mathbf{a}_l\mathbf{a}_l^T)\odot\left[(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T)\odot(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)\right]\right\}\right] \geq (1-\delta')\frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2e^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}}}{m}\,\lambda(\mathbf{X}). \tag{3.18}$$

Applying matrix Chernoff bound for (3.8) yields the result

$$\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(1)}) \geq (1-\delta')^2c_\phi\frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2e^{-4Bc_{\text{res}}}}{m}\lambda(\mathbf{X}) \tag{3.19}$$

with an exponentially high probability of the form $1-\kappa_1 m\, e^{-\kappa_2 m\delta'}$, for some constants κ_1,κ_2. Then we lower bound the $\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]$ corresponding to the random initialization $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ of the weight matrices as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)] &= \left(\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\geq \left(\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(1)})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\geq (1-\delta')\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

with a high probability described above, where δ' is any positive number less than 1, and H depends on δ', B and c_{res} only and sufficiently large. So we can take the lower bound α_0 for the random initialization $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ to be

$$\alpha_0 = (1-\delta')\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}. \tag{3.21}$$

The constant $\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}$ appearing in (3.21) is due to the normalization applied after the first layer, see (2.3). Moreover comparing (3.21) with the α term stated in Lemma 2.3, we observe there is an additional factor of $e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}$ because of the ResNet structure.

3.2 Calculate upper bound

Our next step would be to focus on the β parameter. We see from (3.1) that $\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H}\|\mathbf{G}^{(h)}\|$ holds, and derive

$$\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H}\|\mathbf{G}^{(h)}\| \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H}\|\mathbf{G}^{(h)}\|_F = \sum_{h=1}^{H}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left|\mathbf{G}_{ij}^{(h)}\right|^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{3.22}$$

Then inserting the inequality (3.5) in (3.22), and letting the data matrix for the output of k-th layer be denoted as $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq{}& \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 B^2 \frac{c_\phi}{m}\prod_{l=2}^{H}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|\right)^2\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T\|_F \\ &+ \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 B^2 \frac{c_{\text{res}}^2}{H^2 m}\sum_{h=2}^{H}\prod_{l=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|\right)^2\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)^T}\|_F\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Consequently, β for the ResNet model can be taken as the square root of the right hand side of (3.23). In order to calculate β more precisely, we need to express or upper bound the norm $\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)^T}\|_F$ appearing in (3.23). Therefore we write

$$\left\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)^T}\right\|_F \leq \left\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\right\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}\|_2^2 \tag{3.24}$$

Then each squared norm of the $(h-1)$-th layer output contributing to the summation in (3.24) can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\left(1+\sum_{\substack{\{h_1,\ldots,h_k\}\\ \subseteq\{2,\ldots,h-1\}}}\left(\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\right)^k B^k\|\mathbf{W}^{(h_k)}\|\ldots\|\mathbf{W}^{(h_1)}\|\right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=2}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

using (2.4). Combining (3.24) with (3.25), we get

$$\left\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)^T}\right\|_F \leq \frac{c_\phi}{m}B^2\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|^2\prod_{j=2}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)^2\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2. \tag{3.26}$$

Then we insert (3.26) in (3.23) to conclude

$$\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \left(\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2B^2\frac{c_\phi}{m} + \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2B^4\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|^2\frac{c_\phi c_{\text{res}}^2}{Hm^2}\right)\prod_{l=2}^{H}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|\right)^2\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2. \tag{3.27}$$

Letting the set of inequalities $\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\| \leq A, j = 1,\dots,H$ be satisfied for some A, it follows from (3.27) that

$$\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathcal{J}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \left(\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2B^2\frac{c_\phi}{m} + \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2B^4A^2\frac{c_\phi c_{\text{res}}^2}{Hm^2}\right)e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \tag{3.28}$$

Hence using the inequality $\sqrt{a^2+b^2} \leq a+b$ for positive a and b, β for the ResNet can be taken as

$$\beta = \|\mathbf{a}\|_2\left(B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} + AB^2\frac{\sqrt{c_\phi}c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{H}m}\right)e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{X}\|_F \tag{3.29}$$

We see from (3.29) that β satisfies $\beta = O(\|\mathbf{a}\|_2\exp(B)\|\mathbf{X}\|)$, as opposed to the result for the single hidden layer model $\beta = O(\|\mathbf{a}\|_2B\|\mathbf{X}\|)$ given by Lemma 2.2. Note also that β does not increase with the number of layers H, meaning that larger depths for the ResNet does not have a negative effect on the norm of $\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|$.

3.3 Calculate Lipschitzness

We continue our analysis with finding a Lipschitz constant L for the Jacobian $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of the ResNet. In order to derive such a constant L, we need to analyze the norm of the difference $\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ given by the formula

$$\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right) & \dots & \mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(H)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(H)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_n^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_n^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right) & \dots & \mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_n^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(H)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_n^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(H)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right) \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.30}$$

where $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times md}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m^2}$, for all $i = 1,\dots,n$ and $h = 2,\dots,H$, as stated in the beginning of the section. The norm of (3.30) can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2^2 \\ \|\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| &\leq \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2^2} \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where we use the basic inequality $\sqrt{b_1^2+\cdots+b_H^2} \le |b_1|+\cdots+|b_H|$ in (3.31).

The next step is to consider the difference of partials $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]$. We start with the case $h=1$. Recall from (3.3) that

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] = \prod_{l=2}^{H}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right]\cdot\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\,\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)]\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we can expand the expression $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] = \prod_{l=2}^{H}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\right]\\
&\cdot\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\,\left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)] - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)]\right)\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T\end{bmatrix}\\
&+\left\{\prod_{l=2}^{H}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\right]\right.\\
&\left.-\prod_{l=2}^{H}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right]\right\}\cdot\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)]\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Equation (3.32) implies the matrix product $\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\\
&\triangleq \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\,\left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)] - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)]\right)\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T\end{bmatrix}\\
&\quad+\left[\mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)]\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T\end{bmatrix}\\
&\triangleq \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

where we take the row vectors $\mathbf{a}_{(h_i,h_f)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ to be

$$\mathbf{a}_{(h_i,h_f)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}) \triangleq \mathbf{a}^T\prod_{l=h_i+1}^{h_f}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right], \tag{3.34}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \triangleq \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)] - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)] \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.35}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \triangleq \left[\mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i)] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^T \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.36}$$

It follows from Lemma 6.8 of [22] that

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\|_\infty M \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)} - \mathbf{W}^{(1)} \right\|_F, \tag{3.37}$$

and the norm of the vector $\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ can straightforwardly be bounded as

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_\infty B \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2. \tag{3.38}$$

To provide a bound for the norm term $\left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\|_\infty$ in (3.37), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \left\| \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \right] \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{m} \left\| \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \right] \right\|_2 \\
\left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\|_\infty &\leq \sqrt{m} \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left\| \mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{m} \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(1 + \frac{B c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\| \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

Inserting (3.39) in (3.37), we get

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{c_\phi} \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \prod_{l=2}^{H} \left(1 + \frac{B c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\| \right) M \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)} - \mathbf{W}^{(1)} \right\|_F. \tag{3.40}$$

We proceed our analysis with the term $\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|$. To analyze the norm

$$\left\| \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_\infty$$

appearing in (3.38), we define the matrix

$$\mathbf{D}_{(h_i,h_f)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \triangleq \prod_{l=h_i+1}^{h_f}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\right] - \prod_{l=h_i+1}^{h_f}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right] \tag{3.41}$$

and observe

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\\ \left\|\mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_\infty &\le \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_1 \le \sqrt{m}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2\\ \left\|\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\right\| &\le \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 B\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Our next goal would be to derive an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$. For that purpose, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i) = &\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(H-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\right]\mathbf{D}_{(1,H-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\\ &+ \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(H-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)} - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(H)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(H-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(H)}\right)\\ &\cdot\prod_{l=2}^{H-1}\left[\mathbf{I}_m + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right]\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \le &\left(1 + \frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\|\right)\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2\\ &+ \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left\|\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(H-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)} - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(H)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(H-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(H)}\right\|\\ &\cdot\prod_{l=2}^{H-1}\left(1 + \frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\|\right)\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

We see from (3.43) that it is possible to derive a recursive upper bound for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ provided that we simplify or bound the norm given by

$$\left\|\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right\|, l = H$$

in terms of the network input $\mathbf{x}_i$, and the set of ResNet parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. So using triangle inequality, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right\| \\
&\quad \le \left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\right\| \cdot \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \\
&\qquad + \left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\right\| \cdot \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \\
&\qquad + \left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\right\| \cdot \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \qquad (3.44)
\end{aligned}
$$

To analyze the difference of diagonal matrices $\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]$ appearing in (3.44), we use the mean value theorem for each diagonal entry and observe the equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\phi'\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right)_j - \phi'\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)_j\right| \\
&\quad = \left|\phi''\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}\left[\alpha_{i,j}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + (1-\alpha_{i,j})\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right]\right)\right| \cdot \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}\left(\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\right| \qquad (3.45)
\end{aligned}
$$

is valid for some $\alpha_{i,j} \in [0,1]$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}$ refers to the j-th row of $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}$. Under the assumption of $|\phi''(z)| \le M$ stated in Lemma 2.4, it follows from (3.45) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\phi'\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right)_j - \phi'\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)_j\right| \le M\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}\right\|_2\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2 \\
&\left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\right\| \le M\max_j\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}\right\|_2\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2
\end{aligned} \qquad (3.46)
$$

In a similar way, the inequality

$$
\left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\right\| \le M\max_j\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)} - \mathbf{w}_j^{(l)}\right\|_2\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2 \qquad (3.47)
$$

can be derived. Inserting (3.46) and (3.47) in (3.44), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathrm{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right\| \\
&\le B\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \\
&\quad + M\left(\max_j\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)}\right\|_2\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2 + \max_j\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)} - \mathbf{w}_j^{(l)}\right\|_2\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2\right)\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|. \qquad (3.48)
\end{aligned}
$$

There are two terms in (3.48) depending on the network input $\mathbf{x}_i$, one is $\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2$ and the other one is $\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2$. We have already shown

$$
\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}\|_2 \le \sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\,\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=2}^{l-1}\left(1 + \frac{c_{\mathrm{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)
$$

in (3.25). To upper bound the norm $\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2$, we use mean value theorem for vector valued multi-variable functions and write

$$
\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2 \le \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}[\alpha\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right\| \cdot \left\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\right\|_F \qquad (3.49)
$$

for some number α such that $0 \le \alpha \le 1$. It follows from (3.49) that the only remaining quantity we need to consider the norm of is the partial $\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\|$. The norm $\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\|$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\| &\le \prod_{j=h+1}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(h)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\| \\
&\le \begin{cases} \prod_{j=h+1}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) \frac{B c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2, & \text{if } 1 < h < l, \\ \prod_{j=h+1}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2, & \text{if } h = 1 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\| \le \begin{cases} \prod_{j=2}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) \frac{B^2 c_{\text{res}} \sqrt{c_\phi}}{H m} \|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 & \text{if } 1 < h < l, \\ \prod_{j=2}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2, & \text{if } h = 1 \end{cases} \tag{3.50}$$

using (3.2) and (3.25). We invoke (3.50) to upper bound $\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}[\alpha\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\|$ and derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}[\alpha\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\| = \max_k \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(k)}}[\alpha\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right\| \\
&\le \prod_{j=2}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \cdot \max\left\{ \frac{B c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|, 1 \right\} \\
&\le \prod_{j=2}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\right) \\
&\le B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \prod_{j=1}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

Then inserting (3.51) and (3.25) in (3.48), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right\| \\
&\le B \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \\
&\quad + M \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \max_j \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)} \right\|_2 \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \prod_{k=1}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\|\right) \\
&\quad + M \|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \max_j \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_j^{(l)} - \mathbf{w}_j^{(l)} \right\|_2 B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} \|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \prod_{k=2}^{l-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} B \|\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\|\right) \triangleq f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{x}_i).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

The next step would be to combine (3.52) with (3.43), giving us

$$\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \leq \left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(H)}\|\right)\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H-1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\prod_{k=2}^{H-1}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right) f_H(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 &\leq \prod_{k=3}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\prod_{k=2}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)\sum_{l=3}^{H} f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i) \qquad (3.53)\end{aligned}$$

Then we evaluate (3.43) at $H=2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 &\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left\|\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))]\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(2)} - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(2)}\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} f_2(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i). \qquad (3.54)\end{aligned}$$

From (3.54) and (3.53), we get the ultimate upper bound

$$\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\prod_{k=2}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)\sum_{l=2}^{H} f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i) \qquad (3.55)$$

for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$.

Now let A be a constant such that $\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\| \leq A$ and $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)}\| \leq A$ for all $j = 1,\ldots,H$. Then the variable $f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i)$ given by (3.52) can be upper bounded as

$$f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i) \leq B\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| + A^2BM\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\left(\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F + \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|\right) \qquad (3.56)$$

Then we take the sum of both sides of (3.56) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=2}^{H} f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i) &\leq HA^2BM\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \\ &\quad + \left(B + A^2BM\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\right)\sum_{l=2}^{H}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \qquad (3.57)\end{aligned}$$

and invoke (3.55) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 &\leq A^2BM\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{H}\left(B\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}} + A^2BM\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\right)\sum_{l=2}^{H}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \qquad (3.58)\end{aligned}$$

Noting that Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives us $\sum_{l=1}^{H}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}-\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\| \leq \sqrt{H}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{H}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}-\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{H}\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F$, we conclude from (3.58) that

$$\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \leq \left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^2BM\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}B\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right]\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.59}$$

Then we combine (3.42) with (3.59) to derive the bound

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\right\| \leq \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^2BM\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}B\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right]B\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \cdot\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.60}$$

for $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\right\|$. This completes the bound derivation for the norm of the vector $\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

Now we return to $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\right\|$, and use (3.40) to get the inequality

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}M\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(1)}-\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\right\|_F \tag{3.61}$$

From (3.60) and (3.61), we derive the bound

$$\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]-\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \cdot\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^2B^2M\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2+Me^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}B^2\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right] \tag{3.62}$$

If $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,n$, then (3.62) implies

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]-\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(1)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{n}\sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \cdot\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^2B^2M\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}+Me^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}B^2\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right] \tag{3.63}$$

We need to bound the set of norms $\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]-\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2, h = 2,\ldots,H$ in a similar way. Recall from (3.3) that

$$\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] = \prod_{l=h+1}^{H}\left[\mathbf{I}_m+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(l-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right] \cdot\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)})]\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}\\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}\end{bmatrix}.$$

if $h > 1$. Similarly to (3.33), we expand the expression $\mathbf{a}^T \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{a}^T \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] - \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial \mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}] \right) &= \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \triangleq \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} &\left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] - \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] \right) \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \triangleq \left[\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] &\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\mathbf{W}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \triangleq \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} &\left(\text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] - \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] \right) \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \triangleq \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) &\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \text{diag}[\phi'(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))] \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)^T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

and $\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is as defined by (3.36).

Note that the definitions of $\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ and $\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ are identical to those of $\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ and $\mathbf{v}_{(1,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ given by (3.36), except for the difference that the multiplier $\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}$ is replaced by $\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}$. Similarly to the equations (3.37) and (3.38), we have

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \left\| \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\|_\infty M \|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2 \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)} - \mathbf{W}^{(h)} \right\|_F \tag{3.69}$$

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}} \left\| \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_\infty B \|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2 \tag{3.70}$$

Using (3.25) and (3.39), we rewrite (3.69) and (3.70) as

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}^{(1)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \prod_{l=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\|\right)M$$
$$\cdot\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=2}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right)\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}-\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\right\|_F \tag{3.71}$$

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}^{(2)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_\infty$$
$$\cdot\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}B^2\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=2}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right) \tag{3.72}$$

In terms of the constant A which is assumed to be larger than $\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|$ and $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)}\|$, for all $j=1,\ldots,H$, we express (3.71) as

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}^{(1)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty ABMe^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}-\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\right\|_F \tag{3.73}$$

The next part of our derivation would be to bound the norm $\left\|\mathbf{v}^{(2)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$. Similarly to (3.42), the equation $\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})=\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is valid. Here $\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the difference matrix defined in (3.41). Therefore we have the inequality

$$\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{m}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2, \tag{3.74}$$

and using (3.72) yields

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}^{(2)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2B^2\|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=2}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|\right). \tag{3.75}$$

We need an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ so that we can invoke (3.75) to bound the norm of $\mathbf{v}^{(2)}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ later on. But we have already derived an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ in (3.55), and it can be adapted to the norm $\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ as

$$\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\prod_{k=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)\sum_{l=h+1}^{H}f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i)$$
$$\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\prod_{k=2}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)\sum_{l=2}^{H}f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i) \tag{3.76}$$

where $f_l(\boldsymbol{\theta},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}},\mathbf{x}_i)$ is as defined by (3.52). Equation (3.76) implies the upper bound we have derived for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(1,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ is an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$ as well. Hence (3.59) should hold true for $\|\mathbf{D}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2$, meaning that (3.75) gives us

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^3B^3M\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{3ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}AB^3\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\right] \cdot\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.77}$$

In order to find an upper bound for $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$, we use the inequality

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(h,H)}(\mathbf{x}_i,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right\|_\infty M\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}\right\|_2 \tag{3.78}$$

which is quite similar to (3.69), and can be easily justified by the proof of Lemma 6.8 in [22]. From (3.78), we obtain

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\prod_{k=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)M\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}\right\|_2 \tag{3.79}$$

Then we use (3.51) to get

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\prod_{k=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}\|\right)M \cdot B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{k=1}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(k)}+(1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\|\right)\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}\right\|_2 \tag{3.80}$$

Lastly, we provide an upper bound for the term $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$, which is given by the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 &\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\prod_{l=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\|\right)B\left\|\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\prod_{l=h+1}^{H}\left(1+\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}\|\right)B \\ &\quad\cdot B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{l=1}^{h-1}\left(1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}B\|\alpha\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(l)}+(1-\alpha)\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|\right)\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\end{aligned} \tag{3.81}$$

As we did for $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$ and $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$, we express $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$ and $\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2$ in terms of the upper bound A for the 2-norm of the weight matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(j)}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)}$, $j=1,\ldots,H$ as

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty ABMe^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.82}$$

$$\left\|\mathbf{v}_{(h,H)}^{(4)}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(h-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty B^2 e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.83}$$

We use (3.73), (3.77), (3.82) and (3.83) in conjunction with (3.64) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]-\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty ABMe^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\left(\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}-\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\right\|_F+\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\right)\\
&+\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^3B^3M\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{3ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}AB^3\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\right]\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\\
&+\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty B^2e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F
\end{aligned} \tag{3.84}$$

If $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,n$, then (3.84) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n\left\|\mathbf{a}^T\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]-\frac{\partial\mathbf{x}_i^{(H)}}{\partial\mathbf{W}^{(h)}}[\boldsymbol{\theta}]\right)\right\|_2^2}\\
&\leq \frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty ABMe^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\sqrt{n}\left(\left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(h)}-\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\right\|_F+\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\right)\\
&+\sqrt{n}\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)A^3B^3M\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{m}e^{\frac{3ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}AB^3\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right]\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F\\
&+\frac{c_{\text{res}}\sqrt{c_\phi}}{H\sqrt{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty B^2e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\sqrt{n}\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F
\end{aligned} \tag{3.85}$$

Then we insert (3.85) and (3.63) in (3.31) and write

$$\|\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \sqrt{n}C\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F \tag{3.86}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
C \triangleq\ &\sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\left\{M+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}\left[ABM\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)+B^2\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}AB^3\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right]\right\}\\
&+\frac{c_{\text{res}}c_\phi}{m}\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty e^{\frac{2ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}A^2B^2M\left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{H}}\right)\left[1+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}ABe^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.87}$$

The conclusion of our derivation is that if $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| = 1$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,n$, then we can take the Lipschitz constant for the ResNet as $L = C\sqrt{n}$, where C is as given by (3.87).

4 Upper Bound Derivation for Initial Misfit

Theorem 2.1 is valid under the assumption that the Jacobian parameters $\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, $\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|$ and Lipschitz constant L stays within some predefined limits over the ball of radius $R = \frac{4\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\boldsymbol{y}\|_2}{\alpha}$

Therefore we need to analyze the error term (a.k.a. initial misfit) $\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathbf{y}\|$ associated with the random initialization $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ of weight parameters so that we can invoke Theorem 2.1 to prove the desired convergence result for the ResNet model. Our derivation here relies on the following theorem of [22] proved for one-hidden layer neural networks.

Theorem 4.1 (a modified version of Lemma 6.12 in [22]) *Consider a one-hidden layer neural neural network model of the form $\mathbf{x} \to \mathbf{v}^T\phi(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x})$ where the activation ϕ has bounded derivatives obeying $|\phi'(z)| \le B$. Also assume we have n data points $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ aggregated as rows of a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ and the corresponding labels given by $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, assume we set half of the entries of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ to $\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{kn}}$ and the other half to $-\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{kn}}$. Then for $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times d}$ with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries*

$$\left\|\phi(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^T)\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \le \|\mathbf{y}\|_2\left(1 + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}} + \delta\right)B\right) \tag{4.1}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}}$.

Let the data matrix for the output of k-th layer associated with the random initialization $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ be denoted as $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$. It follows from Theorem 4.1 that if we sample weight matrix entries with standard normal distribution, and set half of the entries of $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to $\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$ and the other half to $-\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\phi(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^{(1)^T})\mathbf{a} - \sqrt{c_\phi}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \le \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\left(1 + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}} + \delta\right)B\right)\\
&\left\|\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\phi(\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\mathbf{W}^{(h)^T})\mathbf{a} - \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \le \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\left(1 + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}} + \delta\right)B\right), \quad h = 2, \ldots, H
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

with probability $1 - e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}}$ and $1 - e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(h-1)}\|^2}}, h = 2, \ldots, H$, respectively. Then a basic induction argument applied with the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathbf{X}^{(k+1)}\mathbf{a} - \left(\sqrt{c_\phi} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}k\right)\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 &\le \left\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\mathbf{a} - \left(\sqrt{c_\phi} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}(k-1)\right)\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&\quad + \left\|\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\phi(\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)^T})\mathbf{a} - \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&\le \left\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\mathbf{a} - \left(\sqrt{c_\phi} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}(k-1)\right)\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\left(1 + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}} + \delta\right)B\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

holding true with probability $1 - e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^2}}, k = 1, \ldots, H-1$, gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathbf{X}^{(h)}\mathbf{a} - \left(\sqrt{c_\phi} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}(h-1)\right)\mathbf{y}\right\| &\le \left(\sqrt{c_\phi} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}(h-1)\right)\|\mathbf{y}\|_2(1 + \delta B)\\
&\quad + \left(\sqrt{c_\phi}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\sum_{k=1}^{h-1}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}\right)B\|\mathbf{y}\|_2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

with probability at least $1-e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}}-\sum_{k=1}^{h-1}e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^2}}$, for all $h=1,\dots,H$. For $h=H$, (4.4) reduces to the inequality

$$\left\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\left(\sqrt{c_\phi}+\frac{H-1}{H}c_{\text{res}}\right)\mathbf{y}\right\|\le\left(\sqrt{c_\phi}+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}(H-1)\right)\|\mathbf{y}\|_2(1+\delta B)$$
$$+\left(\sqrt{c_\phi}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\sum_{k=1}^{H-1}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}\right)B\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \tag{4.5}$$

holding true with probability $1-e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}}-\sum_{k=1}^{H-1}e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^2}}$. Equation (4.5) implies

$$\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|\le\left[(\sqrt{c_\phi}+c_{\text{res}})(2+\delta B)+\left(\sqrt{c_\phi}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\sum_{k=1}^{H-1}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}\right)B\right]\|\mathbf{y}\|_2$$
$$\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\mathbf{y}\|\le\kappa\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \tag{4.6}$$

with probability $1-e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}}-\sum_{k=1}^{H-1}e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^2}}$, where

$$\kappa\triangleq 1+(\sqrt{c_\phi}+c_{\text{res}})(2+\delta B)+\left(\sqrt{c_\phi}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}+\frac{c_{\text{res}}}{H}\sum_{k=1}^{H-1}\frac{\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}\right)B. \tag{4.7}$$

Note that κ we define here is a finite constant which does not grow with n or H, as the upper bound (3.25) implies.

This completes the derivation of upper bound for the misfit term $\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\mathbf{y}\|$. Comparing (4.6) with (4.1), we observe that the initial misfit for the ResNet is in the order of the label norm $\|\mathbf{y}\|$, similarly to the one-hidden layer network case.

5 Variation Analysis of α, β and L

In Section 3, we have derived a lower bound on $\phi_{\min}(\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ for the random initialization $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, together with upper bounds on $\|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|$ and the Lipschitz parameter $\|\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})-\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|/\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}-\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F$ for a given set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ of weight matrices. But this is not sufficient to use Theorem 2.1 as it requires those bounds to be valid over a certain region of parameter space, rather than for a single parameter set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (or a single pair $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ for the Lipschitz constant). In this section our goal is to extend the α, β and L analysis carried out in Section 3 to a region of weight matrices, which is taken to be a ball of radius $R=\frac{4\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\alpha}$ centered at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, so that Theorem 2.1 is applicable for the ResNet.

Let half of the entries of $\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{R}^m$ be $\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$ and the other half be $-\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$, and assume $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|=1$, for all $i=1,\dots,n$, to be consistent with the setup of Section 4. Recall from (3.21) that we have $\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)]\ge\alpha_0=(1-\delta')\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}$, as long as $0<\delta'<1$ and $H=H(\delta',B,c_{\text{res}})$ is sufficiently large. Inside the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0,\frac{4\|f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\alpha_0}\right)$, assume the inequality $\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\ge(1-\delta')\alpha_0$ is satisfied. From (4.6) and (3.21), an upper bound for $R=\frac{4\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)-\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\alpha}$ can be written as

$$R \leq \frac{4\kappa\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{(1-\delta')^2\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}} = \frac{4\kappa\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{(1-\delta')^2\sqrt{c_\phi}\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}}$$

$$R \leq \frac{4\kappa}{(1-\delta')^2\sqrt{c_\phi}}\frac{e^{2Bc_{\text{res}}}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}}\sqrt{n} \triangleq R_{\delta,\delta'} \tag{5.1}$$

where κ is as defined by (4.7).

If we can show $\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq (1-\delta')\alpha_0$ over the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$, then α in Theorem 2.1 can be taken as

$$\alpha_{\delta'} = (1-\delta')\alpha_0 = (1-\delta')^2\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.1 *If the network width m of the ResNet satisfies the inequalities*

$$m \geq \frac{64\kappa^2 B^2 c_{res}^2 e^{4Bc_{res}}}{(1-\delta')^4\left(\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right)^2 c_\phi\lambda(\mathbf{X})}\, n \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$m \geq \frac{32\kappa^2 e^{4Bc_{res}}}{d\delta'^2(1-\delta')^4 c_\phi\lambda(\mathbf{X})}n, \tag{5.4}$$

and $H = H(\delta', B, c_{res})$ is sufficiently large, then (5.2) follows, i.e., the inequality $\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq (1-\delta')\alpha_0$ is valid for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$.

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$. For such a $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, let each weight matrix belonging to it be written as $\mathbf{W}^{(h)} = \mathbf{W}_0^{(h)} + \mathbf{E}^{(h)}$ for all $h = 1, \ldots, H$, where $\mathbf{W}_0^{(h)}$ refers to the random weight matrix associated with the random initialization and $\mathbf{E}^{(h)}$ refers to the additional deterministic term for the h–th layer. Those additional weight matrix terms have to satisfy the constraint

$$\sum_{h=1}^{H}\|\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\|_F^2 \leq R_{\delta,\delta'}^2 \tag{5.5}$$

since the ball $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is in assumed to be of radius $R_{\delta,\delta'}$. Going back to Section 3.1, we see that the left hand side of (3.15) needs to be updated as

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_0^{(j)}+\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|\right)^2$$

to account for the non-random matrices $\mathbf{E}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{E}^{(H)}$ we consider here. To find a lower bound for this updated term, we write

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_0^{(j)}+\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|\right)^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}(\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_0^{(j)}\|+\|\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|)\right)^2$$

$$\geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left[1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H}\left(2+\frac{\|\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|}{\sqrt{m}}\right)\right]^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left[1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H}\left(2+\frac{\|\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|_F}{\sqrt{m}}\right)\right]^2 \tag{5.6}$$

where we use the inequality $\frac{\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_0^{(j)}\|}{\sqrt{m}} \leq 2$ in (5.6). Then we combine (5.5) with (5.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left(1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H\sqrt{m}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_0^{(j)}+\mathbf{E}^{(j)}\|\right)^2 &\geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{H}\left[1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H}\left(2+\frac{R_{\delta,\delta'}}{\sqrt{m}}\right)\right]^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\left[1-\frac{Bc_{\text{res}}}{H}\left(2+\frac{R_{\delta,\delta'}}{\sqrt{m}}\right)\right]^{2(H-1)} \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2\sqrt{1-\delta'}e^{-2\left(2+\frac{R_{\delta,\delta'}}{\sqrt{m}}\right)Bc_{\text{res}}} \qquad (5.7)\end{aligned}$$

for H sufficiently large. Additionally, if the inequality

$$e^{-\left(2+\frac{R_{\delta,\delta'}}{\sqrt{m}}\right)Bc_{\text{res}}} \geq \sqrt{1-\delta'}e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}} \qquad (5.8)$$

is satisfied along with the inequality

$$R_{\delta,\delta'}^2 \leq \frac{\delta'^2 md}{2} \qquad (5.9)$$

so that the deviation of the matrices

$$\left(\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))^T\right)\odot(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T), l=1,\ldots,m \qquad (5.10)$$

from the matrices $\left(\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T\right)\odot(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T), l=1,\ldots,m$ is controlled (here $\mathbf{e}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{e}_m$ correspond to the rows of $\mathbf{E}^{(1)}$) and we can write

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))^T\right\}\odot(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)\right] \\ &\geq \phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))\phi'(\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}_l+\mathbf{e}_l))^T\right\}\right] \\ &\geq \min\left\{\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{M}\\ |\mathcal{M}|\geq m(1-2R_{\delta,\delta'}^2/md)}}\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T\right\}\right]\right. \\ &\qquad \left.,\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\phi'(\mathbf{X}(1-\delta')\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}(1-\delta')\mathbf{w}_l)^T\right\}\right]\right\} \\ &\geq \min\left\{\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{M}\\ |\mathcal{M}|=m(1-\delta'^2)}}\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T\right\}\right]\right. \\ &\qquad \left.,(1-\delta')^2\phi_{\min}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{c_\phi}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)\phi'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_l)^T\right\}\right]\right\} \qquad (5.11)\end{aligned}$$

for some subset $\mathcal{M}$ of $\{1,\dots,m\}$, then repeating the derivation steps of (3.20) gives us

$$\phi_{\min}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \left(\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{G}^{(1)})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq (1-\delta')^2\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}}\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 e^{-2Bc_{\text{res}}}\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})} = (1-\delta')\alpha_0,$$

with a high probability converging to 1 as $m \to \infty$. (5.8) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right) &\geq Bc_{\text{res}}\frac{R_{\delta,\delta'}}{\sqrt{m}} \\ (1-\delta')^2\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right) &\geq \frac{8\kappa Bc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{c_\phi}}\frac{e^{2Bc_{\text{res}}}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\mathbf{X})}}\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Equation (5.12) can be rewritten as (5.3), and equation (5.9) can be rewritten as (5.4). As long as (5.3) holds true, the inequality (5.8) is true. If $H = H(\delta', B, c_{\text{res}})$ is sufficiently large, then (5.7) is also true. At the same time if (5.4) is valid, then $\alpha = (1-\delta')\alpha_0$ follows, i.e., we have shown (5.2). ■

The next step would be to consider how much the Jacobian upper bound β varies over the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$. Recall from (3.29) that for a given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we have

$$\beta = \|\mathbf{a}\|_2\left(B\sqrt{\frac{c_\phi}{m}} + AB^2\frac{\sqrt{c_\phi}c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{Hm}}\right)e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}}\|\mathbf{X}\|_F$$

where A refers to the upper bound satisfying $\|\mathbf{W}^{(j)}\|, \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^{(j)}\| \leq A, j = 1,\dots,H$. Note that half of the entries of $\mathbf{a}$ is chosen as $\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$ and the other half as $-\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$, so $\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{n}}$. Moreover, $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 = 1$ for all $i = 1,\dots,n$ implies $\|\mathbf{X}\|_F = \sqrt{n}$. In this case, (3.29) yields

$$\beta = \|\mathbf{y}\|_2\left(B\sqrt{c_\phi} + AB^2\frac{\sqrt{c_\phi}c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{Hm}}\right)e^{\frac{ABc_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}}} \tag{5.13}$$

If $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$, then the weight matrices are of the form $\mathbf{W}^{(h)} = \mathbf{W}_0^{(h)} + \mathbf{E}^{(h)}, h = 1,\dots,H$, as discussed above. Using (5.5) and concentration inequality for the random Gaussian matrix norms [29], we get

$$\|\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\| \leq \|\mathbf{W}_0^{(h)}\| + \|\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\| \leq 3\sqrt{m} + \|\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\| \leq 3\sqrt{m} + \|\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\|_F \leq 3\sqrt{m} + R_{\delta,\delta'} \tag{5.14}$$

with a probability $1 - e^{-m^2/2}$. Under the condition given by (5.12), we can write another bound for $\|\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\|$ as

$$\|\mathbf{W}^{(h)}\| \leq 3\sqrt{m} + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}}\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\sqrt{m} = \left[3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}}\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right]\sqrt{m} \tag{5.15}$$

for all $h = 1,\dots,H$ with a probability $1 - He^{-m^2/2}$. Therefore for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$ we can take A appearing in (5.13) to be

$$A = \left[3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}}\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right]\sqrt{m}, \tag{5.16}$$

which gives us the upper bound

$$\beta_{\delta'} = \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \left[B\sqrt{c_\phi} + B^2 \frac{\sqrt{c_\phi} c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{H}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right) \right] e^{\left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right) Bc_{\text{res}}}$$
$$= \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{1-\delta'}} \left[B\sqrt{c_\phi} + B^2 \frac{\sqrt{c_\phi} c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{H}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right) \right] e^{3Bc_{\text{res}}} \tag{5.17}$$

for β over the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$.

The last parameter we need to consider is the Lipschitz constant L. Combining (5.16) with (3.87), and using $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$, we derive the Lipschitz constant $L_{\delta'}$ over the ball $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$ as

$$L_{\delta'} \triangleq \sqrt{c_\phi}\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \frac{e^{3Bc_{\text{res}}}}{\sqrt{1-\delta'}} \Bigg[M + c_{\text{res}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right) BM \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{H}} \right) + c_{\text{res}} B^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{H}} \right)$$
$$+ c_{\text{res}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{H}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right) B^3 c_{\text{res}} \frac{e^{3Bc_{\text{res}}}}{\sqrt{1-\delta'}} \Bigg] + c_{\text{res}} c_\phi \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \frac{e^{6Bc_{\text{res}}}}{1-\delta'} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right)^2$$
$$\cdot B^2 M \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{H}} \right) \left[1 + \frac{c_{\text{res}}}{\sqrt{m}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{2Bc_{\text{res}}} \ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'} \right) B \frac{e^{3Bc_{\text{res}}}}{\sqrt{1-\delta'}} \right], \tag{5.18}$$

being valid with a probability $1 - H\, e^{-m^2/2}$.

This completes the derivation of α, β and L for the region $\mathcal{B}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, R_{\delta,\delta'}\right)$. Now we are ready to state our main result for ResNets, which is a consequence of Theorem 2.1.

6 Main Result and Future Work

Our main result in regards to the convergence of the gradient descent algorithm for the residual networks can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 6.1 *Consider a data set $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, i = 1, \ldots, n$ forming the data matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| = 1$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and the label vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f_{res}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the ResNet output as defined by (2.3), such that network width is m and network depth H. Let activation function ϕ satisfies $|\phi'(z)| \leq B$ and $|\phi''(z)| \leq M$, along with the property $|\phi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})| \leq |\phi(\mathbf{a})| + |\phi(\mathbf{b})|$. Let the data matrix associated with each layer output associated with the random initialization be denoted as $\mathbf{X}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, i = 1, \ldots, H$. Moreover let half of the entries of the output layer weight vector $\mathbf{a}$ be $\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$ and the other half of the entries be $-\frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}$, and let δ and δ' be positive numbers with $0 < \delta' < 1$. Define $\alpha_{\delta'}$, $\beta_{\delta'}$, $L_{\delta'}$ via the equations (5.2), (5.17) and (5.18), respectively. Define κ via equation (4.7). Starting from initial weight matrices $\mathbf{W}_0^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{W}_0^{(H)}$ with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries, update each weight matrix via gradient descent algorithm with step size*

$$\eta \leq \frac{1}{\beta_{\delta'}^2} \cdot \min\left(1, \frac{\alpha_{\delta'}^2}{L_{\delta'} \kappa \|\mathbf{y}\|_2}\right) \tag{6.1}$$

for the quadratic loss function. Then, as long as

$$m \geq K_{\delta,\delta'}\, n,$$
$$K_{\delta,\delta'} \triangleq \max\left\{ \frac{64\kappa^2 B^2 c_{res}^2 e^{4Bc_{res}}}{(1-\delta')^4 \left(\ln \frac{1}{1-\delta'}\right)^2 c_\phi \lambda(\mathbf{X})}, \frac{32\kappa^2 e^{4Bc_{res}}}{d\delta'^2 (1-\delta')^4 c_\phi \lambda(\mathbf{X})} \right\} \tag{6.2}$$

holds true, and $H = H(\delta', B, c_{res})$ *is large enough but does not depend on* m *or* n*, the iterations satisfy*

$$\|f_{res}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2^2 \le \left(1 - \frac{\eta\alpha_{\delta'}^2}{2}\right)^\tau \|f_{res}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2^2, \tag{6.3}$$

$$\frac{\alpha_{\delta'}}{4}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|_2 + \|f_{res}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \le \|f_{res}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2. \tag{6.4}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \kappa_1 m e^{-\kappa_2 m\delta'} - He^{-m^2/2} - e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}\|^2}} - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} e^{-\delta^2\frac{n}{2\|\mathbf{X}^{(k)}\|^2}}$ *where* κ_1 *and* κ_2 *are some constants.*

It follows from (6.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2 &\le \frac{\tau}{2}\log\left(1 - \frac{\eta\alpha_{\delta'}^2}{2}\right) + \log\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \\
&= \frac{\tau}{2}\log\left(1 - \frac{\eta\alpha_{\delta'}^2}{2}\right) + O(\log\sqrt{n}) \qquad (6.5) \\
&\le -\tau\frac{\eta\alpha_{\delta'}^2}{4} + O(\log\sqrt{n}) \qquad (6.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where (6.5) is a consequence of (4.6), and (6.6) is due to the basic inequality $\log x \le x - 1$. Therefore if the number of iterations τ satisfy

$$\tau \ge \frac{4}{\eta\alpha_{\delta'}^2} O\left(\log\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon}\right) \tag{6.7}$$

then we would have $\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \le \epsilon$. We have $\alpha_{\delta'} = O(1)$, $\beta_{\delta'} = O(\sqrt{n})$, and $L_{\delta'} = O(\sqrt{n})$ as (5.2),(5.17) and (5.18) implies. Hence we conclude from (6.1) and (6.7) that

$$\tau = \Omega\left(n^2\log\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon}\right) \tag{6.8}$$

iterations are sufficient to get $\|f_{\text{res}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) - \boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \le \epsilon$.

This completes our convergence analysis for the ResNet model. We see from Theorem 6.1 that the linear scaling of the network width with respect to the data size is enough to ensure a linear convergence to the globally optimal solution for ResNets when the loss function is quadratic. Future research topics include but are not limited to

i. To extend the analysis carried out here to more general loss functions, and to more general network types, such as feedforward networks,

ii. To extend the result proved here to non-smooth and common activation functions, such as ReLU,

iii. To extend the regular gradient descent analysis to the stochastic gradient case,

iv. To analyze the test loss, and derive a decent generalization bound.

References

[1] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.

[2] Tom Young, Devamanyu Hazarika, Soujanya Poria, and Erik Cambria. Recent trends in deep learning based natural language processing. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, 13(3):55–75, 2018.

[3] Geoffrey Hinton, Li Deng, Dong Yu, George E Dahl, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, Navdeep Jaitly, Andrew Senior, Vincent Vanhoucke, Patrick Nguyen, Tara N Sainath, et al. Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29(6):82–97, 2012.

[4] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484–489, 2016.

[5] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03530*, 2016.

[6] Daniel Soudry and Yair Carmon. No bad local minima: Data independent training error guarantees for multilayer neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08361*, 2016.

[7] Pan Zhou and Jiashi Feng. The landscape of deep learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07038*, 2017.

[8] Moritz Hardt and Tengyu Ma. Identity matters in deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04231*, 2016.

[9] Anna Choromanska, Mikael Henaff, Michael Mathieu, Gérard Ben Arous, and Yann LeCun. The loss surfaces of multilayer networks. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 192–204, 2015.

[10] Quynh Nguyen and Matthias Hein. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 2603–2612. JMLR. org, 2017.

[11] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, Adel Javanmard, and Jason D Lee. Theoretical insights into the optimization landscape of over-parameterized shallow neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2018.

[12] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Learning ReLUs via gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2007–2017, 2017.

[13] Simon S Du, Jason D Lee, Yuandong Tian, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent learns one-hidden-layer CNN: Don't be afraid of spurious local minima. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00779*, 2017.

[14] Alon Brutzkus and Amir Globerson. Globally optimal gradient descent for a convnet with gaussian inputs. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 605–614. JMLR. org, 2017.

[15] Yuandong Tian. An analytical formula of population gradient for two-layered relu network and its applications in convergence and critical point analysis. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 3404–3413. JMLR. org, 2017.

[16] Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8157–8166, 2018.

[17] Simon S Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02054*, 2018.

[18] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03962*, 2018.

[19] Difan Zou, Yuan Cao, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic gradient descent optimizes over-parameterized deep ReLU networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08888*, 2018.

[20] Simon S Du, Jason D Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03804*, 2018.

[21] Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Ruosong Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08584*, 2019.

[22] Samet Oymak and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Towards moderate overparameterization: global convergence guarantees for training shallow neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04674*, 2019.

[23] Huishuai Zhang, Da Yu, Wei Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. Training over-parameterized deep resnet is almost as easy as training a two-layer network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07120*, 2019.

[24] Ruiqi Gao, Tianle Cai, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Jason D Lee. Convergence of adversarial training in overparametrized networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07916*, 2019.

[25] Samet Oymak and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Overparameterized nonlinear learning: Gradient descent takes the shortest path? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.10004*, 2018.

[26] Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 8571–8580, 2018.

[27] Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Ruosong Wang. On exact computation with an infinitely wide neural net. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11955*, 2019.

[28] J. Schur. Bemerkungen zur theorie der beschränkten bilinearformen mit unendlich vielen veränderlichen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 140:1–28, 1911.

[29] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Non-asymptotic theory of random matrices: extreme singular values. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians 2010 (ICM 2010) (In 4 Volumes) Vol. I: Plenary Lectures and Ceremonies Vols. II–IV: Invited Lectures*, pages 1576–1602. World Scientific, 2010.