

Stationary Points of Shallow Neural Networks with Quadratic Activation Function

David Gamarnik*

Eren C. Kızıldağ†

Ilias Zadik‡

Abstract

We consider the problem of learning shallow noiseless neural networks with quadratic activation function and planted weights $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, where m is the width of the hidden layer and $d \leq m$ is the dimension of the data which consists of centered i.i.d. coordinates with second moment μ_2 and fourth moment μ_4 . We provide an analytical formula for the population risk $\mathcal{L}(W)$ of any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ in terms of μ_2, μ_4 , and the distance of W from W^* . We establish that the landscape of the population risk $\mathcal{L}(W)$ admits an energy barrier separating rank-deficient solutions: if $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W) < d$, then $\mathcal{L}(W)$ is bounded away from zero by an amount we quantify. We then establish that all full-rank stationary points of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ are necessarily global optimum. These two results propose a simple explanation for the success of the gradient descent in training such networks: when properly initialized, gradient descent algorithm finds global optimum due to absence of spurious stationary points within the set of full-rank matrices.

We then show that if the planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ has centered i.i.d. entries with unit variance and finite fourth moment (while the data still has centered i.i.d. coordinates as above), and is sufficiently wide, that is $m > Cd^2$ for large enough C , then it is easy to construct a full rank matrix W with population risk below the aforementioned energy barrier, starting from which gradient descent is guaranteed to converge to a global optimum.

Our final focus is on sample complexity: we identify a simple necessary and sufficient geometric condition on the training data under which any minimizer of the empirical loss has necessarily zero generalization error. We show that as soon as $n \geq n^* = d(d+1)/2$, randomly generated data enjoys this geometric condition almost surely. At the same time we show that if $n < n^*$, then when the data has centered i.i.d. coordinates, there always exists a matrix W with empirical risk equal to zero, but with population risk bounded away from zero by the same amount as rank deficient matrices.

Our results on sample complexity further shed light on an interesting phenomenon observed empirically about neural networks: we show that overparametrization does not hurt generalization, once the data is interpolated, for the networks with quadratic activations.

*MIT; e-mail: gamarnik@mit.edu. Research supported by the NSF grants CMMI-1335155.

†MIT; e-mail: kizildag@mit.edu

‡NYU; e-mail: zadik@nyu.edu. Research supported by a CDS Moore-Sloan Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Model	3
1.2	Summary of the Main Results and Comparison with the Prior Work	4
2	Main Results	8
2.1	Landscape of Population Risk: Band-Gap and Optimality of Full-Rank Stationary Points	8
2.1.1	An Analytical Expression for the Population Risk	8
2.1.2	Existence of a Band-Gap	9
2.1.3	Global Optimality of Full-Rank Stationary Points and Convergence of Gradient Descent	10
2.2	On Initialization: Randomly Generated Planted Weights	10
2.3	Critical Number of Training Samples	12
2.3.1	A Necessary and Sufficient Geometric Condition on the Training Data	12
2.3.2	Randomized Data Enjoys the Geometric Condition	13
2.3.3	Sample Complexity Bound for the Planted Network Model	14
3	Proofs	14
3.1	Auxiliary Results	14
3.2	Proof of Theorem 2.1	15
3.3	Proof of Theorem 2.2	16
3.4	Proof of Corollary 2.3	18
3.5	Proof of Theorem 2.4	19
3.6	Proof of Theorem 2.5	21
3.7	Proof of Theorem 2.6	22
3.8	Proof of Theorem 2.7	26
3.9	Proof of Corollary 2.8	27
3.10	Proof of Theorem 2.9	27
3.11	Proof of Theorem 2.10	28

1 Introduction

The main focus of many machine learning and statistics tasks is to extract information from a given collection of data, often by solving the following “canonical problem”: Let $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ be a data set, with $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The components Y_i are often called the *labels*. The problem, then, is to find a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which:

- Explains the unknown input-output relationship over the data set as accurately as possible, that is, if $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)^T$ and $f(\mathbf{X}) = (f(X_1), \dots, f(X_n))^T$, then it ensures that $c(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ is small, where $c(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is some cost function. The resulting $c(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$ is known as the “training error”.
- Has good prediction performance on the unseen data, that is, it generalizes well. In mathematical terms, if the training data (X_i, Y_i) is generated from a distribution \mathcal{D} on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, then one demands that $\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[c'(Y, f(X))]$ is small, where $c'(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is some (perhaps different) cost function. Here the expectation is with respect to a *fresh* sample (X, Y) . The resulting $\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[c'(Y, f(X))]$ is known as the “generalization error” or the “test error”.

One popular class of such functions $f(\cdot)$ are *neural networks*, which attempt to explain the (unknown) input-output relationship with the following form:

$$f(X) = a^T \sigma_L(W_{L-1} \sigma_{L-1}(W_{L-2} \cdots \sigma_2(W_2 \sigma_1(W_1 X)) \cdots)).$$

Here, L is the ‘depth’ of the neural network, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_L : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the non-linear functions called activations which act coordinate-wise, W_1, \dots, W_{L-1} are the weight matrices of appropriate sizes; and a is a vector, carrying the output weights. The process of finding parameters W_1, \dots, W_{L-1} and a which can interpolate the data set is called *training*.

Albeit being simple to state, neural networks turn out to be extremely powerful in tasks such as natural language processing [CW08], image recognition [HZRS16], image classification [KSH12], speech recognition [MDH11], and game playing [SSS⁺17]; and started becoming popular in other areas, such as applied mathematics [CRBD18, WHJ17], and clinical diagnosis [DFLRP⁺18], and so on.

1.1 Model

In this paper, we consider a shallow neural network model with one hidden layer ($L = 1$), consisting of m neurons (that is, the “width” of the network is m), a (planted) weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ (where for each $i \in [m]$, the i^{th} row $W_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of this matrix is the weight vector associated to the i^{th} neuron), and quadratic activation function $\sigma(x) = x^2$. This object, for every input vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, computes the function:

$$f(W^*; X) = \sum_{j=1}^m \langle W_j^*, X \rangle^2 = \|W^* X\|_2^2. \quad (1)$$

We note that, albeit being rarely used in practice, quadratic activations help us develop understanding for networks consisting of polynomials activations with higher degrees or sigmoid activations [LSSS14, SH18, VBB18].

The associated empirical risk minimization problem is then cast as follows: Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a sequence of input data. Generate the output labels Y_i using a shallow neural network (the so-called teacher network) with the planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, that is, $Y_i = f(W^*; X_i)$. This model is also known as the realizable model, as the labels Y_i are generated according to a teacher network with planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Assume the learner has access to the training data $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$. The empirical risk minimization problem (ERM) is the optimization problem

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) \tag{2}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - f(W; X_i))^2,$$

of finding a weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ that explains the input-output relationship for the training data set $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ in the best possible way. The focus is on tractable algorithms to solve this minimization problem and understanding its generalization ability, quantified by generalization error. The generalization error, also known as population risk associated with any solution candidate $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ (whether it is optimal with respect to (2) or not), is

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[(f(W^*; X) - f(W; X))^2],$$

where the expectation is with respect to a "fresh" sample X , which has the same distribution as $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, but is independent from the sample. This object provides information about how well W generalizes, that is, how much error on average it makes on prediction for the yet unseen data. Observe that due to the quadratic nature of the activation function, the ground truth matrix W^* , which is also an optimal solution to the empirical risk optimization problem $\min_W \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W)$ (with value zero) and population risk optimization problem $\min_W \mathcal{L}(W)$ (also with value zero), is invariant under rotation. Namely for every orthonormal $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $W = QW^*$ is also an optimal solution to both optimization problems.

The landscape of the loss function $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W)$ as a function of W is highly non-convex, rendering the underlying optimization problem potentially difficult. Nevertheless, it has been empirically observed, and rigorously proven under certain assumptions (references below), that the gradient descent algorithm, despite being a simple first order procedure, is rather successful in training such neural networks: it appears to find a $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) \approx 0$. Our paper suggests a novel explanation for this, when the network consists of quadratic activation functions.

1.2 Summary of the Main Results and Comparison with the Prior Work

We first study the landscape of the population risk function $\mathcal{L}(W)$ under the assumption that the data $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, 1 \leq i \leq n$ consists of centered i.i.d. coordinates with second moment μ_2 and (finite) fourth moment μ_4 . We provide an analytical expression for the population risk in terms of the moments μ_2 and μ_4 of the data; and the trace of the matrix $A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$ which measures how far W is from W^* . This analytical expression then yields a simple yet useful lower and upper bound for $\mathcal{L}(W)$. These results are the subject of Theorem 2.1.

By utilizing the lower bound on $\mathcal{L}(W)$ obtained in Theorem 2.1, we then establish the following result: If $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is full-rank, then for any rank-deficient matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $\mathcal{L}(W)$ is bounded away from zero, by an explicit constant controlled by the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(W^*)$ of the planted weight matrix W^* , and the data moments μ_2, μ_4 . In particular, this result highlights the existence of an “energy barrier” separating full-rank points with ‘small cost’ from rank-deficient points, and shows that near the ground state W^* one can only find full-rank points W . Moreover, we show that this bound is tight up to a multiplicative constant by explicitly constructing a rank-deficient W and studying its associated loss $\mathcal{L}(W)$ by utilizing the upper bound obtained in Theorem 2.1. These results are the subject of Theorem 2.2.

We next study the full-rank stationary points of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$. We establish in Theorem 2.4 that again for data with centered i.i.d. coordinates and finite fourth moment, when W^* is full rank, all full-rank stationary points $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ are necessarily global optimum, and in particular, for any such W , there exists an orthonormal matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that $W = QW^*$. This is done in an analogous manner as in Theorem 2.1: we first establish an explicit analytical formula for the population gradient which yields a stationarity equation; and we then study the implications of this equation when $\text{rank}(W) = d$. Combining Theorem 2.4 with Theorem 2.2 discussed above, as a corollary we obtain the following interesting conclusion: if the gradient descent algorithm is initialized at a point W which has a sufficiently small population risk, in particular if it is lower than smallest risk value achieved by rank deficient matrices \hat{W} , then the gradient descent converges to a global optimum of the population risk optimization problem $\min_W \mathcal{L}(W)$. This is the subject of Theorem 2.5.

We now briefly pause to make a comparison with some of the related prior work. Among these the most relevant to us is the work of Soltanolkotabi, Javanmard and Lee [SJJL18]. Here, in particular in [SJJL18, Theorem 2.2], the authors study the empirical loss landscape of a slightly more general version of our model: $Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^m v_j^* \sigma(\langle W_j^*, X_i \rangle)$, with the same quadratic activation function $\sigma(x) = x^2$, assuming $\sigma_{\min}(W^*) > 0$, and assuming all non-zero entries of v^* have the same sign. Thus our model is the special case where all entries of v^* equal unity. The authors establish that as long as $d \leq n \leq cd^2$ for some small fixed constant c , every local minima of the empirical risk function is also a global minima (namely, there exists no spurious local minima), and furthermore, every saddle point has a direction of negative curvature. As a result they show that gradient descent with an arbitrary initialization converges to a globally optimum solution of the empirical risk minimization problem. In particular, their result does not require the initialization point to be below some risk value, like in our case. Our result though shows that one needs not to worry about saddle points below some risk value as none exist per our first Theorem 2.2, when the population risk minimization problem is considered instead. We note also that the proof technique of [SJJL18], more concretely, the proof of [SJJL18, Theorem 2.1], which can be found in Section 6.2.1 therein, also appears to be a path to prove an empirical risk version of Theorem 2.4 with very minor modifications. Importantly, though, the regime $n < cd^2$ for small c is below the provable sample complexity value n^* , as per our results discussed below. In particular, as we discuss below and prove in the main body of our paper, when $n < n^* = d(d+1)/2$, the empirical risk minimization problem admits global optimum solutions with zero empirical risk value, but with generalization error bounded away from zero. Thus, the regime $n < n^*$ does not correspond to the regime where learning with guaranteed generalization error is possible.

It is also worth noting that albeit not being our focus in the present paper, the aforementioned

paper by Soltanolkotabi, Javanmard and Lee, more concretely [SJJL18, Theorem 2.1], also studies the landscape of the empirical loss when a quadratic network model $X \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^m v_j^* \langle W_j^*, X \rangle^2$ is used for interpolating arbitrary input/label pairs $(X_i, Y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, that is, without making an assumption that the labels are generated according to a network with planted weights. They establish similar landscape results; namely, the absence of spurious local minima, and the fact that every saddle point has a direction of negative curvature, as long as the output weights v^* has at least d positive and d negative entries (consequently, m has to be at least $2d$). While this result does not assume any rank condition on W like in our case, it bypasses this technicality at the cost of assuming that the output weights contain at least d positive and d negative weights, and consequently, by assuming m is at least $2d$, namely when the network is sufficiently wide.

Another work which is partially relevant to the present paper is the work by Du and Lee [DL18] who establish the following result: as long as $m \geq d$, and $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is any smooth and convex loss, the landscape of the regularized loss function $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(W; X_i), Y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|W\|_F^2$ admits favorable geometric characteristics, that is, all local minima is global, and all saddle points are strict.

Next, we study the question of proper initialization required by our analysis: is it possible to guarantee an initialization scheme under which one starts below the minimum loss value achieved by rank deficient matrices? We study this problem in the context of randomly generated weight matrices $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, and establish the following result: as long as the network is wide enough, specifically $m > Cd^2$ for some sufficiently large constant C , the spectrum of the associated Wishart matrix $(W^*)^T W^*$ is tightly concentrated, consequently, it is possible to initialize W_0 so that with high probability the population loss $\mathcal{L}(W_0)$ of W_0 is below the required threshold. This is the subject of our Theorem 2.6. This theorem relies on several results from the theory of random matrices regarding the concentration of the spectrum, both for the matrices with standard normal entries; as well as for matrices having i.i.d. centered entries with unit second and finite fourth moment, outside the proportional regime, that is, we focus on the regime where $d \rightarrow +\infty$, but $d/m \rightarrow 0$.

Our next focus is on the following question: in light of the fact that W^* (and any of its orthonormal equivalents) achieve zero generalization error for both the empirical and population risk, can we expect that an optimal solution to the problem of minimizing empirical loss function $\min_W \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W)$ achieves the same? The answer turns out to be positive and we give necessary and sufficient conditions on the sample $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ to achieve this. We show that, if $\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n])$ is the space of all $d \times d$ -dimensional real-valued symmetric matrices, then any global minimum of the empirical loss is necessarily a global optimizer of the population loss, and thus, has zero generalization error. Note that, this condition is not *retrospective* in manner: this geometric condition can be checked ahead of the optimization task by computing $\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n])$. Conversely, we show that if the span condition above is not met then there exists a global minimum W of the empirical risk function which induces a strictly positive generalization error. This is established in Theorem 2.7.

A common paradigm in statistical learning theory is that, overparametrized models, that is, models with more parameters than necessary, while being capable of interpolating the training data, tend to generalize poorly. Yet, it has been observed empirically that neural networks tend to not suffer from this complication [ZBH⁺16]: despite being overparametrized, they seem to have good generalization performance, provided the interpolation barrier is exceeded. The result of Theorem 2.7 (a) will shed light on this phenomenon for the case of shallow neural networks with quadratic activations. More concretely, we establish the following: suppose that the data

enjoys the aforementioned geometric condition. Then, one still retains good generalization, even when the interpolation is satisfied using a neural network with potentially larger number \widehat{m} of internal nodes, namely by using a weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$ where \widehat{m} is possibly larger than m . Hence, our result explains the aforementioned phenomenon in case of networks with quadratic activations: interpolation implies good generalization, even if the prediction is made using a larger network, provided the interpolated data satisfies a certain geometric condition, which essentially holds for almost any data.

To complement our analysis, we then ask the following question: what is the critical number n^* of the training samples, under which the (random) data $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ enjoys the aforementioned span condition? We prove the number to be $n^* = d(d+1)/2$, under a very mild assumption that the coordinates of $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are jointly continuous. This is shown in Theorem 2.9. Finally, in Theorem 2.10 we show that when $n < n^*$ not only there exists W with zero empirical risk and strictly positive generalization error, but we bound this error from below by the same amount as the bound for all rank deficient matrices discussed in our first Theorem 2.2.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2.1 we present our main results on the landscape of the population risk. In particular, we provide an analytical expression for the population risk $\mathcal{L}(W)$, state our energy barrier result for rank deficient matrices, our result about the absence of full-rank stationary points of a population risk function except the globally optimum points; and our result on the convergence of gradient descent. In Section 2.2, we present our results regarding randomly generated weight matrices W^* and sufficient conditions for good initializations. In Section 2.3, we study the critical number of training samples guaranteeing good generalization property. The proofs of all of our results are found in Section 3.

Notation

We provide a list of notational convention that we follow throughout. The set of real numbers is denoted by \mathbb{R} , and the set of positive real numbers is denoted by \mathbb{R}_+ . The set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ is denoted by $[k]$. Given any matrix A , $\sigma_{\min}(A)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(A)$ respectively denote the smallest and largest singular values of A ; $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A , that is, the set of all eigenvalues of A ; and $\text{trace}(A)$ denotes the sum of the diagonal entries of A . Given two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell}$, denote their Hadamard product by $A \circ B$, which is a $k \times \ell$ matrix where for every $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [\ell]$, $(A \circ B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$. Moreover, $\|A\|_2$ denotes the spectral norm of A , that is, the square root of the largest eigenvalue of $A^T A$. Denote by I_n the $n \times n$ identity matrix. The objects with an asterisk denotes the planted objects, for instance, $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ denotes the planted weight matrix of the network. Given any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|v\|_2$ denotes its Euclidean ℓ_2 norm, that is, $\|v\|_2 = \sqrt{v_1^2 + \dots + v_n^2}$. Given two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, their Euclidean inner product $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ is denoted by $\langle x, y \rangle$. Given a collection Z_1, \dots, Z_k of objects of the same kind (in particular, vectors or matrices), $\text{span}(Z_i : i \in [k])$ is the set, $\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j Z_j : \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$. $\Theta(\cdot), O(\cdot), o(\cdot)$, and $\Omega(\cdot)$ are standard (asymptotic) order notations for comparing the growth of two sequences. Finally, the population risk is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$; and its empirical variant is denoted by $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$.

2 Main Results

2.1 Landscape of Population Risk: Band-Gap and Optimality of Full-Rank Stationary Points

In this section, we present our results pertaining the landscape of the population risk, including an analytical expression for the population risk, the aforementioned band-gap; and the global optimality of full-rank stationary points, and a discussion on success of gradient descent on such networks. All of our results hold under a mild assumption on the data distribution: the data $X = (X_i : i \in [d]) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has centered i.i.d. coordinates, that is X_i are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$.

2.1.1 An Analytical Expression for the Population Risk

Our first result provides an analytical expression for the population risk $\mathcal{L}(W)$ of any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ in terms of how close it is to the planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$.

We recall that a random vector X in \mathbb{R}^d is defined to have jointly continuous distribution if there exists a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $i \in [n]$ and Borel set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{B}) = \int_{\mathcal{B}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_d),$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d .

Theorem 2.1. *Let $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $f(W^*; X)$ be the function computed by (1); and $f(W; X)$ be similarly the function computed by (1) for $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Recall,*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathbb{E}[(f(W^*; X) - f(W; X))^2],$$

where the expectation is with respect to the distribution of $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

- (a) *Suppose the distribution of X is jointly continuous. Then $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$, that is, $f(W^*; X) = f(W; X)$ almost surely with respect to X , if and only if $W = QW^*$ for some orthonormal matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.*

Suppose now that the coordinates of $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = \mu_2$, and $\mathbb{E}[X_i^4] = \mu_4$.

- (b) *It holds that:*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = \mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A^2) + (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \cdot \text{trace}(A \circ A),$$

where $A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and $A \circ A$ is the Hadamard product of A with itself. In particular, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has i.i.d. standard normal coordinates, we obtain $\mathcal{L}(W) = \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2\text{trace}(A^2)$.

- (c) *The following bounds hold:*

$$\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + \min \{ \mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2 \} \cdot \text{trace}(A^2) \leq \mathcal{L}(W),$$

and

$$\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + \max \{ \mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2 \} \cdot \text{trace}(A^2) \geq \mathcal{L}(W).$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is deferred to Section 3.2.

In a nutshell, Theorem 2.1 states that the population risk $\mathcal{L}(W)$ of any $W \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is completely determined by how close it is to the planted weights W^* as measured by the matrix $A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$; and the second and fourth moments of the data. This is not surprising: $\mathcal{L}(W)$ is essentially a function of the first four moments of the data, and the difference of the quadratic forms generated by W and W^* , which is precisely encapsulated by the matrix A . Note also that the characterization of the “optimal orbit” per part (a) is not surprising either: any matrix W with the property $W = QW^*$ where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is an orthonormal matrix, that is, $Q^T Q = I_m$, has the property that $f(W; X) = \|WX\|_2^2 = X^T W^T W X = f(W^*; X)$ for any data $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Part (a) then says the the reverse is true as well, provided that the distribution of X is jointly continuous. Note also that for X with centered i.i.d. entries the thesis of part (a) follows also from part (c): $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$ implies that $\text{trace}(A^2) = 0$, which, together with the fact that A is symmetric, then yields $A = 0$, that is, $W^T W = (W^*)^T W^*$.

2.1.2 Existence of a Band-Gap

Our next result, which is essentially a consequence of Theorem 2.1 (c), shows the appearance of a band gap structure in the landscape of the population risk $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$, below which any rank-deficient $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ ceases to exist.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has i.i.d. centered coordinates with variance μ_2 , (finite) fourth moment μ_4 , and $\text{rank}(W^*) = d$.*

(a) *It holds that*

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W) \geq \min\{\mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2\} \cdot \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4.$$

(b) *There exists a matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ such that $\text{rank}(W) \leq d - 1$ and*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \leq \max\{\mu_4, 3\mu_2^2\} \cdot \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is deferred to Section 3.3.

This theorem indicates that there is a threshold $\eta = \Theta(\sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4)$, such that for any W with $\mathcal{L}(W) < \eta$, it is the case that W is full rank. This value of η is the aforementioned energy value below which any rank-deficient W ceases to exist. Part (b) of Theorem 2.2 implies that our lower bound on the value is tight up to a multiplicative constant determined by the moments of the data. As a simple corollary to Theorem 2.2, we obtain that the landscape of the population risk still admits an energy barrier, even if we consider the same network architecture with planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, and quadratic activation function having lower order terms, that is, the activation $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = \alpha x^2 + \beta x + \gamma$, with $\alpha \neq 0$. This barrier is quantified by α , in addition to $\sigma_{\min}(W^*)$ and the corresponding moments of the data.

Corollary 2.3. *For any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, define $\tilde{f}(W; X) = \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}(\langle W_j, X \rangle)$, where $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = \alpha x^2 + \beta x + \gamma$ with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ arbitrary. Let*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(W) = \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{f}(W; X) - \tilde{f}(W^*; X))^2],$$

where X has centered i.i.d. coordinates. Then,

$$\min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(W) \geq \alpha^2 \min\{\mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2\} \cdot \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4.$$

The proof of this corollary is deferred to Section 3.4.

2.1.3 Global Optimality of Full-Rank Stationary Points and Convergence of Gradient Descent

Our next result establishes that any full-rank stationary point (of the population risk) is necessarily a global minimum.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W^*) = d$. Suppose $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has centered i.i.d. coordinates with $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = \mu_2$, $\mathbb{E}[X_i^4] = \mu_4$; and $\text{Var}(X_i^2) > 0$. Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be a stationary point of the population risk with full-rank, that is, $\nabla \mathcal{L}(W) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla(f(W^*; X) - f(W; X))^2] = 0$, and $\text{rank}(W) = d$. Then, $W = QW^*$ for some orthogonal matrix Q , and that, $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$.*

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is deferred to Section 3.5. Note that an implication of Theorem 2.4 is that the population loss admits no rank-deficient saddle points.

We now combine Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 to obtain the following potentially interesting conclusion on running the gradient descent for the population loss. If the gradient descent algorithm is initialized at a point W which has a sufficiently small population risk, in particular lower than the smallest risk value achieved by rank deficient matrices, then the gradient descent converges to a global optimum of the population risk optimization problem $\min_W \mathcal{L}(W)$, which is zero.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be a matrix of weights, with the property that*

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W).$$

Define

$$L = \sup \{ \|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W)\| : \mathcal{L}(W) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0) \},$$

where by $\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W)\|$ we denote the spectral norm of the matrix $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W)$. Then, $L < +\infty$ and the gradient descent algorithm with initialization $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ and a step size of $0 < \eta < 1/2L$ generates a trajectory $\{W_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ of weights such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(W_k) = \min_W \mathcal{L}(W) = 0$.

The proof of Theorem 2.5 is provided in Section 3.6.

In particular, the gradient descent, when initialized properly, finds global optimum due to absence of spurious stationary points within the set of full-rank matrices. In the next section, we address the question of proper initialization when the (planted) weights are generated randomly, and complement Theorem 2.5 by providing a deterministic initialization guarantee, which with high probability beats the aforementioned energy barrier.

2.2 On Initialization: Randomly Generated Planted Weights

As noted in the previous section, our Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 offer an alternative conceptual explanation for the success of training gradient descent in learning aforementioned neural network architectures from the landscape perspective; provided that the algorithm is initialized properly.

In this section, we provide a way to properly initialize such networks under the assumption that the data has centered i.i.d. coordinates with finite fourth moment and the (planted) weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ has i.i.d. centered entries with unit variance and finite fourth moment. Our result is valid provided that the network is sufficiently overparametrized: $m > Cd^2$ for some large constant C . Note that this implies W^* is a tall matrix sending \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R}^m .

The rationale behind this approach relies on the following observations:

- (a) Recalling from Theorem 2.1, we have that the spectrum of the matrix $A = W^T W - (W^*)^T W^*$ together with the moments of the data completely determines the population loss. In particular, if $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ are the eigenvalues of $W^T W - (W^*)^T W^*$, then Theorem 2.1 (c) reveals that:

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \leq \mu_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^2 + \max\{\mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \right).$$

- (b) Suppose that the spectrum of $(W^*)^T W^*$ is tightly concentrated around a value κ , that is, for some sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\sigma((W^*)^T W^*) \subset [\kappa - \epsilon, \kappa + \epsilon]$. Now, assume the initialization $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is such that $W_0^T W_0 = \kappa I_d$, and thus, $\sigma(W_0^T W_0 - (W^*)^T W^*) \subset [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Then, the population loss per equation above can be made small enough (in particular, smaller than the energy barrier stated in the previous section), provided $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, namely, provided that the concentration is tight enough.
- (c) The spectrum of tall random matrices are essentially concentrated (see [Ver10, Corollary 5.35] and references therein). Namely, sufficiently tall random matrices are approximately isometric embeddings of \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R}^m .

Equipped with these observations, we are now in a position to state our result, a high probability guarantee for the cost of a particular choice of initialization.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose that the data $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ consists of i.i.d. centered coordinates with $\text{Var}(X_i^2) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i^4] < \infty$. Recall that*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathbb{E} [(f(W; X) - f(W^*; X))^2],$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the randomness in a fresh sample X .

- (a) *Suppose that the planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ has i.i.d. standard normal entries. Let the initial weight matrix $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be defined by $(W_0)_{i,i} = \sqrt{m + 4d}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$, and $(W_0)_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise (hence, $W_0^T W_0 = \gamma I_d$ with $\gamma = m + 4d$). Then, provided $m > Cd^2$ for a sufficiently large absolute constant $C > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W),$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\Omega(d))$, where the probability is with respect to the draw of W^* .

- (b) *Suppose the planted weight matrix $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ has centered i.i.d. entries with unit variance and finite fourth moment. Let the initial weight matrix $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be defined by $(W_0)_{i,i} = \sqrt{m}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$, and $(W_0)_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise (hence, $W_0^T W_0 = m I_d$). Then, provided $m > Cd^2$ for a sufficiently large absolute constant $C > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W),$$

with high probability, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where the probability is with respect to the draw of W^* .

The proof of this theorem is provided in Section 3.7.

Note that, the part (a) of Theorem 2.6 gives an explicit rate for probability, in the case when the i.i.d. entries of the planted weight matrix W^* are standard normal, and is based on a non-asymptotic concentration result for the spectrum of such matrices. The extension in part (b) is based on a result of Bai and Yin [BY88].

With this, we now turn our attention to the number of training samples required to learn such models.

2.3 Critical Number of Training Samples

Our next focus is on the number of training samples required for controlling the generalization error. In particular we establish the following results: we identify a necessary and sufficient condition on the training data under which any minimizer of the empirical loss (which, in the case of planted weights, necessarily interpolates the data) has zero generalization error. Furthermore we identify the smallest number n^* of training samples, such that (randomly generated) training data X_1, \dots, X_n satisfies the aforementioned condition, so long as $n \geq n^*$.

2.3.1 A Necessary and Sufficient Geometric Condition on the Training Data

Below is a necessary and sufficient (geometric) condition on the training data under which any minimizer of the empirical loss (which, in the case of planted weights, necessarily interpolates the data) has zero generalization error.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of data.*

(a) *Suppose*

$$\text{span}\{X_i X_i^T : 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \mathcal{S},$$

where \mathcal{S} is the set of all $d \times d$ symmetric real-valued matrices. Let $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Then for any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{m} \times d}$ interpolating the data, that is $f(W^; X_i) = f(W; X_i)$ for every $i \in [n]$, it holds that $W^T W = (W^*)^T W^*$. In particular, if $\hat{m} \geq m$, then for some matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{m} \times m}$ with orthonormal columns, $W = QW^*$, and if $m \geq \hat{m}$, then for some matrix $Q' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \hat{m}}$ with orthonormal columns, $W^* = Q'W$.*

(b) *Suppose,*

$$\text{span}\{X_i X_i^T : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

is a strict subset of \mathcal{S} . Then, for any $W^ \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W^*) = d$ and any positive integer $\hat{m} \geq d$, there exists a $W \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{m} \times d}$ such that $W^T W \neq (W^*)^T W^*$, while W interpolates the data, that is, $f(W^*; X_i) = f(W; X_i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. In particular, for this $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $\mathcal{L}(W) > 0$, where \mathcal{L} is defined with respect to any jointly continuous distribution on \mathbb{R}^d .*

The proof of Theorem 2.7 is deferred to Section 3.8.

We now make the following remarks. The condition stated in Theorem 2.7 is not retrospective in manner: it can be checked ahead of the optimization process. Next, there are no randomness assumptions in the setting of Theorem 2.7, and it provides a purely geometric necessary and sufficient condition: as long as $\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n])$ is the space of all symmetric matrices (in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$) we have that any (global) minimizer of the empirical risk has zero generalization error.

Conversely, in the absence of this geometric condition, there are optimizers $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ of the empirical risk $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ such that while $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) = 0$, the generalization error of W is bounded away from zero, that is, $W^T W \neq (W^*)^T W^*$. Soon in Theorem 2.10, we give a more refined version of this result, with a concrete lower bound on $\mathcal{L}(W)$, in the more realistic setting, where the training data is generated randomly.

We further highlight the presence of the parameter $\widehat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, part (a) of Theorem 2.7 states that provided the span condition is satisfied, any neural network with \widehat{m} internal nodes interpolating the data has necessarily zero generalization error, regardless of whether \widehat{m} is equal to m , in particular, even when $\widehat{m} \geq m$. This, in fact, is an instance of an interesting phenomenon empirically observed about neural networks, which somewhat challenges one of the main paradigms in statistical learning theory: overparametrization does not hurt generalization performance of neural networks once the data is interpolated. Namely beyond the interpolation threshold, one retains good generalization property.

We note that Theorem 2.7 still remains valid under a slightly more general setup, where each node $j \in [m]$ has an associated positive but otherwise arbitrary output weight $a_j^* \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Corollary 2.8. *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and $\widehat{f}(a, W, X)$ be the function computed by the neural network with input $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, quadratic activation function, planted weights $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, and output weights $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, that is, $\widehat{f}(a, W, X) = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \langle W_j, X \rangle^2$. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of data.*

(a) Suppose,

$$\text{span}\{X_i X_i^T : 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \mathcal{S}.$$

Then for any $\widehat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a, W) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\widehat{m}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$ interpolating the data, that is $\widehat{f}(a^, W^*, X_i) = \widehat{f}(a, W, X_i)$ for every $i \in [n]$, it holds that $\widehat{f}(a, W, X) = \widehat{f}(a^*, W^*, X)$ for every $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (here, $a_j^* > 0$ for all j). In particular, (a, W) achieves zero generalization error.*

(b) Suppose

$$\text{span}\{X_i X_i^T : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

is a strict subset of \mathcal{S} . Then, for any $(a^, W^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, and every $\widehat{m} \geq d$, there is a pair $(a, W) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\widehat{m}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$, such that while (a, W) interpolates the data, that is, $\widehat{f}(a, W, X_i) = \widehat{f}(a^*, W^*, X_i)$ for every $i \in [n]$, (a, W) has strictly positive generalization error, with respect to any jointly continuous distribution on \mathbb{R}^d .*

The proof of this corollary is deferred to Section 3.9.

2.3.2 Randomized Data Enjoys the Geometric Condition

We now identify the smallest number n^* of training samples, such that (randomly generated) training data X_1, \dots, X_n satisfies the aforementioned geometric condition almost surely; as soon as $n \geq n^*$.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $n^* = d(d+1)/2$, and $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be i.i.d. random vectors with jointly continuous distribution. Then,*

(a) *If $n \geq n^*$, then $\mathbb{P}(\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n]) = \mathcal{S}) = 1$.*

(b) If $n < n^*$, then for arbitrary $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\text{span}(Z_i Z_i^T : i \in [n]) \subsetneq \mathcal{S}$.

The proof of Theorem 2.9 is deferred to Section 3.10.

The critical number n^* is obtained to be $d(d+1)/2$ since $\dim(\mathcal{S}) = \binom{d}{2} + d = d(d+1)/2$. Note also that, with this observation, part (b) of Theorem 2.9 is trivial, since we do not have enough number of matrices to span the space \mathcal{S} .

2.3.3 Sample Complexity Bound for the Planted Network Model

Combining Theorems 2.7 and 2.9, we arrive at the following sample complexity result.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ be i.i.d. with a jointly continuous distribution on \mathbb{R}^d . Let the corresponding outputs $(Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ be generated via $Y_i = f(W^*; X_i)$, with $W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W^*) = d$.*

- (a) *Suppose $n \geq n^*$, and $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then with probability one over the training data X_1, \dots, X_n , if $W \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{m} \times d}$ is such that $f(W; X_i) = Y_i$ for every $i \in [n]$, then $f(W; X) = f(W^*; X)$ for every $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*
- (b) *Suppose $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ are i.i.d. random vectors with i.i.d. centered coordinates having variance μ_2 and finite fourth moment μ_4 . Suppose that $n < n^*$. Then there exists a $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ such that $f(W; X_i) = Y_i$ for every $i \in [n]$, yet the generalization error satisfies*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \geq \min\{\mu_4 - \mu_2^2, 2\mu_2^2\} \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.10 is deferred to Section 3.11.

We highlight that the lower bound arising in Theorem 2.10 (b) is the same bound obtained in Theorem 2.2 (a) as the energy band regarding rank deficient matrices. Note also that the interpolating network in in part (a) can potentially be larger than the original network generating the data: any large network, despite being overparametrized, still generalizes well, provided it interpolates on a training set enjoying the aforementioned geometric condition.

Theorems 2.7 and 2.10 together provide the necessary and sufficient number of data points for training a shallow neural network with quadratic activation function so as to guarantee good generalization property.

3 Proofs

In this section, we present the proofs of the main results of this paper.

3.1 Auxiliary Results

Some of our results use the following auxiliary results:

Theorem 3.1. ([CT05]) *Let ℓ be an arbitrary positive integer; and $P : \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial. Then, either P is identically 0, or $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell : P(x) = 0\}$ has zero Lebesgue measure, namely, $P(x)$ is non-zero almost everywhere.*

Theorem 3.2. ([HJ12, Theorem 7.3.11]) For two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$ where $q \leq p$; $A^T A = B^T B$ holds if and only if $A = QB$ for some matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ with orthonormal columns.

Our results regarding the initialization guarantees use the several auxiliary results from random matrix theory: The spectrum of tall random matrices are essentially concentrated:

Theorem 3.3. ([Ver10, Corollary 5.35]) Let A be an $m \times d$ matrix with independent standard normal entries. For every $t \geq 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-t^2/2)$, we have:

$$\sqrt{m} - \sqrt{d} - t \leq \sigma_{\min}(A) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A) \leq \sqrt{m} + \sqrt{d} + t.$$

Theorem 3.4. ([BY+93],[Ver10, Theorem 5.31])

Let $A = A_{N,n}$ be an $N \times n$ random matrix whose entries are independent copies of a random variable with zero mean, unit variance, and finite fourth moment. Suppose that the dimensions N and n grow to infinity while the aspect ratio n/N converges to a constant in $[0, 1]$. Then

$$\sigma_{\min}(A) = \sqrt{N} - \sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\max}(A) = \sqrt{N} + \sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}),$$

almost surely.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

First, we have

$$f(W; X) - f(W^*; X) = X^T((W^*)^T W^* - W^T W)X \triangleq X^T A X, \quad (3)$$

where $A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a symmetric matrix. Note also that,

$$\text{trace}(A)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ii} A_{jj}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\text{trace}(A^2) = \text{trace}(A^T A) = \|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2, \quad (5)$$

where A^2 is equal to $A^T A$, as A is symmetric.

- (a) Recall Theorem 3.1. In particular, if $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$, then we have $P(X) = X^T A X = 0$ almost surely. Since $P(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a polynomial, it then follows that $P(X) = 0$ identically. Now, since A is symmetric, it has real eigenvalues, called $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ with corresponding (real) eigenvectors ξ_1, \dots, ξ_d . Now, taking $X = \xi_i$, we have $X^T A X = \xi_i^T A \xi_i = \lambda_i \langle \xi_i, \xi_i \rangle = 0$. Since $\xi_i \neq 0$, we get $\lambda_i = 0$ for any i . Finally, since $A = Q \Lambda Q^T$, it must necessarily be the case that $A = 0$. Hence, $W^T W = (W^*)^T W^*$, which imply $W = Q W^*$ for some $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ orthonormal, per Theorem 3.2.

(b) Using Equation (3), we first have

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j, i', j' \leq d} A_{ij} A_{i'j'} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j X_{i'} X_{j'}].$$

Note that if $|\{i, j, i', j'\}| \in \{3, 4\}$, then $\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j X_{i'} X_{j'}] = 0$, since X has centered i.i.d. coordinates. Keeping this in mind, and carrying out the algebra we then get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W) &= \sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^4] + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ii} A_{jj} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] + 4 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \\ &= \mu_4 \sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2\mu_2^2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ii} A_{jj} + 4\mu_2^2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using now Equations (4) and (5), we get:

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \cdot \text{trace}(A \circ A) + \mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A^2),$$

since $A_{ii}^2 = (A \circ A)_{ii}$.

(c) Define k to be such that $\mu_4 - \mu_2^2 = 2k\mu_2^2$, namely, k is related to measures of dispersion pertaining X_i : $\sqrt{2k}$ is the coefficient of variation and $(2k + 1)$ is the kurtosis associated to the random variable X_i . With this, we have:

$$\mathcal{L}(W) = \mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2\mu_2^2 \left(k \sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2 \right).$$

From here, the desired conclusion follows since

$$\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2 \min\{k, 1\} \mu_2^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2 \right) \leq \mathcal{L}(W),$$

and

$$\mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2 + 2 \max\{k, 1\} \mu_2^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_{i < j} A_{ij}^2 \right) \geq \mathcal{L}(W),$$

together with Equation (5).

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

(a) Note first that using Theorem 2.1 part (c), we have:

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \geq \min\{\text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2\} \text{trace}(A^2).$$

Now, fix any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W) < d$. Let $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_d$ be the eigenvalues of $(W^*)^T W^*$; $b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_d$ be the eigenvalues $-W^T W$; and $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$ be the eigenvalues of $(W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$. Since W is rank-deficient, we have $b_1 = 0$. Furthermore, $a_d =$

$\sigma_{\min}(W^*)^2$, since the eigenvalues of $(W^*)^T W^*$ are precisely the squares of the singular values of W^* . Now, recall the (Courant-Fischer) variational characterization of the eigenvalues [HJ12]. If M is a $d \times d$ matrix with eigenvalues $c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_d$, then:

$$c_1 = \max_{x: \|x\|_2=1} x^T M x \quad \text{and} \quad c_d = \min_{x: \|x\|_2=1} x^T M x.$$

With this, fix an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|_2 = 1$. Then,

$$x^T ((W^*)^T W^* - W^T W) x \geq \min_{x: \|x\|_2=1} x^T (W^*)^T W^* x + x^T (-W^T W) x = a_d + x^T (-W^T W) x.$$

Since this inequality holds for every x with $\|x\|_2 = 1$, we can take the max over all x , and arrive at,

$$\lambda_1 = \max_{x: \|x\|_2=1} x^T ((W^*)^T W^* - W^T W) x \geq a_d + b_1 = a_d \geq \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^2.$$

Now, since $\lambda_1^2, \dots, \lambda_d^2$ are precisely the eigenvalues of A^2 , we have $\text{trace}(A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \geq \lambda_1^2$. Hence, for any W with $\text{rank}(W) < d$, it holds that:

$$\mathcal{L}(W) \geq \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} \lambda_1^2.$$

Finally, since $\lambda_1^2 \geq \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4$, the desired conclusion follows by taking the minimum over all rank-deficient W .

- (b) Let the eigenvalues of $(W^*)^T W^*$ be denoted by $\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_d^*$, with the corresponding orthogonal eigenvectors q_1^*, \dots, q_d^* . Namely, diagonalize $(W^*)^T W^*$ as $Q^* \Lambda^* (Q^*)^T$ where the columns of $Q^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are q_1^*, \dots, q_d^* , and $\Lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a diagonal matrix with $(\Lambda^*)_{i,i} = \lambda_i^*$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let

$$\overline{W} = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_j^*} q_j^* (q_j^*)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}.$$

Observe that, $\overline{W}^T \overline{W} = Q^* \overline{\Lambda} Q^*$, where $\overline{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a diagonal matrix with $(\overline{\Lambda})_{i,i} = (\Lambda^*)_{i,i}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, and $(\overline{\Lambda})_{d,d} = 0$; and that, $\text{rank}(\overline{W}) = d-1$. Now, let $\overline{W}_1, \dots, \overline{W}_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the rows of \overline{W} , and fix a $j \in [d]$ such that $\overline{W}_j \neq 0$.

Having constructed a $\overline{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we now prescribe $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ as follows. For $1 \leq i \leq d$, $i \neq j$, let $W_i = \overline{W}_i$, where W_i is the i^{th} row of W . Then set $W_j = \frac{1}{2} \overline{W}_j$, and for every $d+1 \leq i \leq m$, set $W_i = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{m-d}} \overline{W}_j$. For this matrix, we now claim

$$W^T W = \overline{W}^T \overline{W}.$$

To see this, fix an $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and recall that $X^T W^T W X - X^T \overline{W}^T \overline{W} X = \|W X\|_2^2 - \|\overline{W} X\|_2^2$.

We now compute this quantity more explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|WX\|_2^2 - \|\overline{W}X\|_2^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^d \langle W_k, X \rangle^2 - \sum_{k=1}^m \langle \overline{W}_k, X \rangle^2 \\
&= \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^d \langle W_k, X \rangle^2 + \langle W_j, X \rangle^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^d \langle W_k, X \rangle^2 - \langle \frac{1}{2}W_j, X \rangle^2 - \sum_{k=d+1}^m \langle \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{m-d}}W_j, X \rangle^2 \\
&= \langle W_j, X \rangle^2 - \frac{1}{4}\langle W_j, X \rangle^2 - \frac{3}{4(m-d)}(m-d)\langle W_j, X \rangle^2 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have:

$$X^T W^T W X = X^T \overline{W}^T \overline{W} X.$$

Now let $\Xi = W^T W - \overline{W}^T \overline{W}$. Note that $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is symmetric, and $X^T \Xi X = 0$ for every $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, taking X to be e_i , that is, the i^{th} element of the standard basis for the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , we deduce $\Xi_{i,i} = 0$ for every $i \in [d]$. For the off-diagonal entries, let $X = e_i + e_j$. Then, $X^T \Xi X = \Xi_{i,i} + \Xi_{i,j} + \Xi_{j,i} + \Xi_{j,j} = 0$, which, together with the fact that the diagonal entries of Ξ are zero, imply $\Xi_{i,j} = -\Xi_{j,i}$; namely Ξ is skew-symmetric. Finally, since Ξ is also symmetric we have $\Xi_{i,j} = \Xi_{j,i}$, which then implies for every $i, j \in [d]$, $\Xi_{i,j} = 0$, that is, $\Xi = 0$, and thus, $W^T W = \overline{W}^T \overline{W}$.

Hence, we have for $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $\text{rank}(W) = d - 1$,

$$W^T W - (W^*)^T W^* = Q^* \Lambda'(Q^*)^T,$$

with $(\Lambda')_{i,i} = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$; and $(\Lambda')_{d,d} = -\lambda_d^*$. Namely, the spectrum of the matrix $A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$ contains only two values: 0 with multiplicity $d - 1$, and λ_d^* with multiplicity one. In particular,

$$\text{trace}(A) = \lambda_d^* \quad \text{and} \quad \text{trace}(A^2) = (\lambda_d^*)^2.$$

Using now the upper bound provided by Theorem (2.1) part (c) yields the desired claim. Therefore, the energy band lower bound is tight, up to a multiplicative constant.

3.4 Proof of Corollary 2.3

Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, and $\tilde{f}(W; X) = \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}(\langle W_j, X \rangle)$ where $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = \alpha x^2 + \beta x + \gamma$. Now, note the decomposition: $\tilde{f}(W; X) = \alpha f(W; X) + \beta g(W; X) + \gamma m$, where $f(W; X) = \sum_{j=1}^m \langle W_j, X \rangle^2$ and $g(W; X) = \sum_{j=1}^m \langle W_j, X \rangle$. In particular, defining:

$$\Delta_f = f(W; X) - f(W^*; X) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_g = g(W; X) - g(W^*; X),$$

we have $(\tilde{f}(W; X) - \tilde{f}(W^*; X))^2 = (\alpha\Delta_f + \beta\Delta_g)^2 \geq \alpha^2\Delta_f^2 + 2\alpha\beta\Delta_f\Delta_g$. Taking expectations on both sides with respect to $X \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, we then have:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(W) \geq \alpha^2\mathcal{L}(W) + 2\alpha\beta\mathbb{E}[\Delta_f\Delta_g] = \alpha^2\mathcal{L}(W) + 2\alpha\beta \sum_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq d} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j X_k] A_{ij} \theta_k = \alpha^2\mathcal{L}(W), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(W)$ is the quantity defined in Theorem 2.1, $A = W^T W - (W^*)^T W^*$, and $\theta_k = \sum_{j=1}^m W_{j,k} - W_{j,k}^*$. Taking the minimum over all rank deficient matrices in Equation (6), we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(W) &\geq \alpha^2 \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W) \\ &\geq \alpha^2 \min\{\text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2\} \cdot \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to Theorem 2.2 (a).

3.5 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We first establish the following proposition, for any W , which is a stationary point of the population risk.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{D}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be a diagonal matrix with $\mathcal{D}_{ii}^* = ((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii}$, and define $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ analogously. Then, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ enjoys the “stationarity equation”:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2)W\mathcal{D}^* + \mu_2^2 W \|W^*\|_F^2 + 2\mu_2^2 (W(W^*)^T W^*) \\ = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2)W\mathcal{D} + \mu_2^2 W \|W\|_F^2 + 2\mu_2^2 (W(W^T W)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To that end, fix a $k_0 \in [m]$ and $\ell_0 \in [d]$. Note that, $\nabla_{k_0, \ell_0} \mathcal{L}(W) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{k_0, \ell_0} (f(W^*; X) - f(W; X))^2]$, using dominated convergence theorem. Next, $\mathbb{E}[\nabla_{k_0, \ell_0} (f(W^*; X) - f(W; X))^2] = 0$ implies that, for every $k_0 \in [m]$ and $\ell_0 \in [d]$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\langle W_j^*, X \rangle^2 \langle W_{k_0}, X \rangle X_{\ell_0}] = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\langle W_j, X \rangle^2 \langle W_{k_0}, X \rangle X_{\ell_0}].$$

Note next that, $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\langle W_j^*, X \rangle^2 \langle W_{k_0}, X \rangle X_{\ell_0}]$ computes as,

$$\mu_4 \sum_{j=1}^m (W_{j, \ell_0}^*)^2 W_{k_0, \ell_0} + \mu_2^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq d, \ell \neq \ell_0} W_{k_0, \ell_0} (W_{j, \ell}^*)^2 + 2\mu_2^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq d, \ell \neq \ell_0} W_{k_0, \ell} W_{j, \ell}^* W_{j, \ell_0}^*.$$

We now put this object into a more convenient form. Notice that the expression above is

$$(\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2)A_{k_0, \ell_0} + \mu_2^2 B_{k_0, \ell_0} + 2\mu_2^2 C_{k_0, \ell_0},$$

where

$$A_{k_0, \ell_0} = W_{k_0, \ell_0} \sum_{j=1}^m (W_{j, \ell_0}^*)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B_{k_0, \ell_0} = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^d W_{k_0, \ell_0} (W_{j, \ell}^*)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad C_{k_0, \ell_0} = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^d W_{k_0, \ell} W_{j, \ell_0}^* W_{j, \ell}^*.$$

Observe that, $B_{k_0, \ell_0} = W_{k_0, \ell_0} \|W^*\|_F^2$. We now study A_{k_0, ℓ_0} and C_{k_0, ℓ_0} more carefully. Observe that $\sum_{j=1}^m (W_{j, \ell_0}^*)^2 = ((W^*)^T W^*)_{\ell_0, \ell_0}$. Now, let $\mathcal{D}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d \times d$ be a diagonal matrix where $(\mathcal{D}^*)_{ij} = ((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii}$, if $i = j$; and 0 otherwise. We then have $A_{k_0, \ell_0} = (W \mathcal{D}^*)_{k_0, \ell_0}$. We now study C_{k_0, ℓ_0} . Recall that W_i^* is the i^{th} row W^* . Observe that, $\sum_{j=1}^m W_{j, \ell_0}^* W_{j, \ell}^* = ((W^*)^T W^*)_{\ell_0, \ell}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^d W_{k_0, \ell} W_{j, \ell_0}^* W_{j, \ell}^* = \sum_{\ell=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^m W_{k_0, \ell} W_{j, \ell_0}^* W_{j, \ell}^* = \sum_{\ell=1}^d W_{k_0, \ell} ((W^*)^T W^*)_{\ell_0, \ell} = (W ((W^*)^T W^*))_{k_0, \ell_0},$$

that is, $C_{k_0, \ell_0} = (W ((W^*)^T W^*))_{k_0, \ell_0}$. Combining everything, we have that for every $k_0 \in [m]$ and $\ell_0 \in [d]$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\langle W_j^*, X \rangle^2 \langle W_{k_0}, X \rangle X_{\ell_0}] = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) (W \mathcal{D}^*)_{k_0, \ell_0} + \mu_2^2 W_{k_0, \ell_0} \|W^*\|_F^2 + 2\mu_2^2 (W ((W^*)^T W^*))_{k_0, \ell_0}.$$

In particular, stationarity yields:

$$(\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) W \mathcal{D}^* + \mu_2^2 W \|W^*\|_F^2 + 2\mu_2^2 (W ((W^*)^T W^*)) = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) W \mathcal{D} + \mu_2^2 W \|W\|_F^2 + 2\mu_2^2 W (W^T W), \quad (7)$$

where the $d \times d$ diagonal matrix \mathcal{D} is defined as $\mathcal{D}_{ii} = (W^T W)_{ii}$; and entrywise equalities are converted into equality of two matrices by varying $k_0 \in [m]$ and $\ell_0 \in [d]$. \square

Having now established the Proposition 3.5 for the "stationarity equation", we now study its implications for any full-rank W .

Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be a stationary point with $\text{rank}(W) = d$. We first establish $\|W\|_F = \|W^*\|_F$. Since $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is a stationary point, it holds that for every $(k_0, \ell_0) \in [m] \times [d]$, $\nabla_{k_0, \ell_0} \mathcal{L}(W) = 0$. In particular, Equation (7) holds.

Recalling now that W is full rank, it follows from the rank-nullity theorem that $\ker(W)$ is trivial, that is, $\ker(W) = \{0\}$. Hence, for matrices M_1, M_2 (with matching dimensions), whenever $W M_1 = W M_2$ holds, we deduce $M_1 = M_2$, since each column of $M_1 - M_2$ is contained in $\ker(W)$. Thus, Equation (7) then yields:

$$(\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \mathcal{D}^* + \mu_2^2 \|W^*\|_F^2 I_d + 2\mu_2^2 (W^*)^T W^* = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \mathcal{D} + \mu_2^2 \|W\|_F^2 I_d + 2\mu_2^2 W^T W. \quad (8)$$

Next, note that $\text{trace}(\mathcal{D}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^d ((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii} = \text{trace}((W^*)^T W^*) = \|W^*\|_F^2$, and similarly, $\text{trace}(\mathcal{D}) = \|W\|_F^2$. In particular, taking traces of both sides in Equation (8), we get

$$(\mu_4 - \mu_2^2) \|W^*\|_F^2 + \mu_2^2 d \|W^*\|_F^2 = (\mu_4 - \mu_2^2) \|W\|_F^2 + \mu_2^2 d \|W\|_F^2,$$

implying that $\|W^*\|_F^2 = \|W\|_F^2$. Incorporating this into Equation (8), we then arrive at:

$$(\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \mathcal{D}^* + 2\mu_2^2 (W^*)^T W^* = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) \mathcal{D} + 2\mu_2^2 W^T W.$$

Now, suppose $i \in [d]$. Note that inspecting (i, i) coordinate above, we get:

$$(\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) ((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii} + 2\mu_2^2 ((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii} = (\mu_4 - 3\mu_2^2) (W^T W)_{ii} + 2\mu_2^2 (W^T W)_{ii}.$$

Since $\mu_4 - \mu_2^2 = \text{Var}(X_i^2) > 0$, we then get

$$((W^*)^T W^*)_{ii} = (W^T W)_{ii}.$$

Now, focus on off-diagonal entries, by fixing $i \neq j$. Observe that since $\text{Var}(X_i^2) > 0$, it also holds $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = \mu_2 > 0$. Now note that, $\mathcal{D}_{ij}^* = \mathcal{D}_{ij} = 0$ in this case. We then have,

$$2\mu_2((W^*)^T W^*)_{ij} = 2\mu_2(W^T W)_{ij} \Rightarrow (W^*)^T W^* = W^T W.$$

We conclude that the matrix $(W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$ is a zero matrix. Hence, $W = QW^*$ for some orthonormal $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ per Theorem 3.2, and $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$.

3.6 Proof of Theorem 2.5

Let $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a sequence of $m \times d$ matrices corresponding to the weights along the trajectory of gradient descent, that is, $W_t \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is the weight matrix at iteration t of the algorithm.

We first show $L < \infty$. To see this, recall Theorem 2.1 (c): $\mathcal{L}(W) \geq \mu_2^2 \cdot \text{trace}(A)^2$, where $\text{trace}(A) = \|W\|_F^2 - \|W^*\|_F^2$. In particular, this yields $\mu_2^2(\|W\|_F^2 - \|W^*\|_F^2)^2 \leq \mathcal{L}(W)$. Hence, for any W with $\mathcal{L}(W) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0)$, it holds that

$$\|W\|_F \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{L}(W_0)}}{\mu_2} + \|W^*\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Namely, the (Frobenius) norm of the weights of any W with $\mathcal{L}(W) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0)$ remains uniformly bounded from above. This, in turn, yields that the (spectral norm of the) Hessian of the objective function remains uniformly bound from above for any such W , since the objective is a polynomial function of W , which is precisely what we denote by L .

We now run gradient descent with a step size of $\eta < 1/2L$: a second order Taylor expansion reveals that

$$\mathcal{L}(W_1) - \mathcal{L}(W_0) \leq -\eta \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_0)\|_2^2 / 2,$$

where $\nabla \mathcal{L}(W)$ is the gradient of the population risk, evaluated at W .

In particular, $\mathcal{L}(W_1) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0)$, and furthermore, $\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W_1)\| \leq L$, where $\|\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W)\|$ is the spectral norm of the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(W)$. From here, we induct on k : induction argument reveals we can retain a step size of $\eta < 1/2L$, and furthermore we deduce that the gradient descent trajectory $\{W_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is such that: (i) $\mathcal{L}(W_k) \geq \mathcal{L}(W_{k+1})$, for every $k \geq 0$, and furthermore, (ii) it holds for every $k \geq 0$:

$$\mathcal{L}(W_{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}(W_k) \leq -\eta \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_k)\|_2^2 / 2.$$

We now establish that $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_k)\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the objective function is lower bounded (by zero). If the gradient is non-vanishing then (by passing to a subsequence, if necessary) each step reduces the value of the objective function at least by a certain amount, that is (uniformly) bounded away from zero. But this contradicts with the fact that the objective is lower bounded. Thus we deduce

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_k)\|_2 = 0.$$

Now, recall that the trajectory is such that $\mathcal{L}(W_k) \geq \mathcal{L}(W_{k+1})$, and that, $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_k)\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that the initial value, $\mathcal{L}(W_0)$, is such that

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W).$$

In particular, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\mathcal{L}(W_k) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W). \quad (9)$$

and therefore $W_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is full-rank, for all k , per Theorem 2.2. We now establish

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(W_k) = 0.$$

To see this, observe that the sequence $\{\mathcal{L}(W_k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is monotonic (non-increasing), and furthermore, is bounded by zero from below. Hence,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(W_k) \triangleq \ell$$

exists [R⁺64, Theorem 3.14]. We now show $\ell = 0$.

Since the weights remain bounded along the trajectory, it follows that there exists a subsequence $\{W_{k_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with a limit, that is, $W_{k_n} \rightarrow W^\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $W^\infty \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Now, the continuity of $\nabla \mathcal{L}$, together with the continuity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, imply that $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^\infty)\|_2 = 0$. Furthermore, continuity of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ then implies $\mathcal{L}(W^\infty) = \ell$. Now, since W_{k_n} 's are such that $\mathcal{L}(W_{k_n}) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{L}(W_0)$ is strictly smaller than the rank-deficient energy barrier, by taking limits as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (9), we conclude that W^∞ is full rank. Since W^∞ is also a stationary point of the loss, by Theorem 2.4, we deduce $\mathcal{L}(W^\infty) = 0$, which yields $\ell = 0$, as desired.

3.7 Proof of Theorem 2.6

Part (a)

Let $t = \sqrt{d}$. Then, using Theorem 3.3, it holds that with probability $1 - 2 \exp(-d/2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{m} - 2\sqrt{d} &\leq \sigma_{\min}(W^*) &\leq \sigma_{\max}(W^*) &\leq \sqrt{m} + 2\sqrt{d} \\ \Rightarrow m + 4d - 4\sqrt{md} &\leq \lambda_{\min}((W^*)^T W^*) &\leq \lambda_{\max}((W^*)^T W^*) &\leq m + 4d + 4\sqrt{md}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A , i.e., $\sigma(A) = \{\lambda : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A\}$. We claim then the spectrum of $\gamma I - A$ is $\gamma - \sigma(A)$. To see this, simply note the following line of reasoning:

$$\gamma - \lambda \in \sigma(\gamma I - A) \iff \det((\gamma - \lambda)I - (\gamma I - A)) = 0 \iff \det(\lambda I - A) = 0 \iff \lambda \in \sigma(A).$$

Now, let $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be such that $W_0^T W_0 = \gamma I$ with $\gamma = m + 4d$. In particular, if $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d$ are the eigenvalues of $\gamma I - (W^*)^T W^*$ with $\gamma = m + 4d$; then, it holds that:

$$-4\sqrt{md} \leq \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d \leq 4\sqrt{md}.$$

Now, recall by Theorem 2.1 (c) that,

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) \leq \mu_2^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^2 + \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \right),$$

where $\sigma(W_0^T W_0 - (W^*)^T W^*) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$. For the second term, we immediately have $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \leq 16md^2$.

For the first term, note first that, if $\lambda'_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda'_d$ are the eigenvalues of $(W^*)^T W^*$, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \lambda'_k = \text{trace}((W^*)^T W^*) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d (W_{ij}^*)^2 \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^d (\lambda'_k - m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1),$$

where $W_{ij}^* \stackrel{d}{=} N(0, 1)$ i.i.d.. Note also that, $(W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1$ is a centered random variable, and has sub-exponential tail, see [Ver10, Lemma 5.14]. Now, letting $Z_{ij} = (W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1$, and applying the Bernstein-type inequality [Ver10, Proposition 5.16], we have that for some absolute constants $K, c > 0$, it holds:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d Z_{ij} \right| > d\sqrt{m} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-c \min \left(\frac{d}{K^2}, \frac{d\sqrt{m}}{K} \right) \right) \leq 2 \exp(-cd/K^2) = \exp(-\Omega(d)),$$

for m sufficiently large. In particular, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\Omega(d))$, it therefore holds that,

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^d (\lambda'_k - m) \right| \leq d\sqrt{m}.$$

Finally, using triangle inequality,

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k \right| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^d (\lambda'_k - (m + 4d)) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^d (\lambda'_k - m) \right| + 4d^2 \leq d\sqrt{m} + 4d^2,$$

with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(d))$. After squaring, we obtain that $\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^2 \leq 16d^4 + 8d^3\sqrt{m} + d^2m$. In particular, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W_0) &\leq \mu_2^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^2 + \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \right) \\ &\leq \mu_2^2 (16d^4 + 8d^3\sqrt{m} + md^2) + \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} 16md^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using now the overparametrization $m > Cd^2$, we further have:

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 (16d^4 + 8d^3\sqrt{m} + md^2) + \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} 16md^2 \leq \mathcal{C}'(C)m^2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}'(C) = \mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \left(\frac{16}{C^2} + \frac{8}{C^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{C} \right) + \frac{16}{C} \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\}.$$

Note that for the constant $\mathcal{C}'(C)$,

$$\mathcal{C}'(C) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } C \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Next, observe that, $\sqrt{m} - 2\sqrt{d} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m}$ for m large (in the regime $m > Cd^2$, with C large enough). Thus, using what we have established in Theorem 2.2, we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W) &> \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4 \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} (\sqrt{m} - 2\sqrt{d})^4 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} m^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe also that if $\text{Var}(X_i^2) > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] > 0$ as well: indeed observe that if $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = 0$, then $X_i = 0$ almost surely, for which $\text{Var}(X_i^2) = 0$. In particular, $\min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} > 0$. Equipped with this, we then observe that provided:

$$\frac{1}{16} \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} > C'(C) = \mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \left(\frac{16}{C^2} + \frac{8}{C^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{C} \right) + \frac{16}{C} \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\},$$

that is, provided $C > 0$ is sufficiently large, we are done.

Part (b)

Note that, the result of Bai and Yin [BY88] asserts that if $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d\}$ are the eigenvalues of

$$\mathcal{A} \triangleq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{md}}((W^*)^T W^* - mI_d),$$

and if we define the empirical measure

$$F^{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \frac{1}{d} |\{i : \mu_i \leq x\}|$$

then in the regime $d \rightarrow +\infty$, $d/m \rightarrow 0$, it holds that:

$$F^{\mathcal{A}}(x) \rightarrow \omega(x),$$

almost surely, where $\omega(x)$ is the semicircle law; and moreover

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mu_i^2 \rightarrow \int x^2 d\omega(x) \triangleq \chi_2$$

namely, χ_2 is respectively the second moment under semicircle law, whp. Now, define the same quantities as in proof of part (a), where this time $W_0^T W_0 = mI_d$, and $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\} = \sigma((W^*)^T W^* - mI_d)$. In particular, we still retain the inequality per Theorem 2.1 (c):

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) \leq \mu_2^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^2 + \max \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 \right\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \right).$$

Note that $\lambda_i = 2\sqrt{md}\mu_i$. Hence, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 < (4 + o(1))md^2\chi_2$$

whp. We now control $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i$ using central limit theorem (CLT). Observe that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = \text{trace}((W^*)^T W^* - mI_d) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1).$$

Now, note that

$$\sigma_*^2 \triangleq \text{Var}((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) = \text{Var}((W_{ij}^*)^2) < \mathbb{E}[(W_{ij}^*)^4] < \infty.$$

We now use CLT, as $d \rightarrow \infty$ and $m/d \rightarrow \infty$. To that end, let $1/2 > \epsilon > 0$ be fixed. Observe now that, for any arbitrary $M > 0$, and sufficiently large d ,

$$\left\{ -1 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_* \sqrt{mdd^\epsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) \leq 1 \right\} \supset \left\{ -M \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_* \sqrt{md}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) \leq M \right\}.$$

In particular, using central limit theorem, we deduce

$$\liminf_{d \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(-1 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_* \sqrt{mdd^\epsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) \leq 1 \right) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z \in [-M, M]),$$

where Z is a standard normal random variable. Now since $M > 0$ is arbitrary, we have, by sending $M \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{d \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(-1 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_* \sqrt{mdd^\epsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) \leq 1 \right) \geq 1,$$

and we then conclude

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(-1 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_* \sqrt{mdd^\epsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^d ((W_{ij}^*)^2 - 1) \leq 1 \right) = 1.$$

Hence,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right| \leq \sigma_* \sqrt{mdd^\epsilon},$$

with probability $1 - o_d(1)$, for d sufficiently large.

Moreover,

$$\sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4 \geq \frac{1}{16} m^2,$$

for m large, using yet another result of Bai and Yin, see Theorem 3.4. From here, carrying the exact same analysis as in part (a) we obtain provided $m > Cd^2$ for some large constant $C > 0$, and d sufficiently large the following holds with probability $1 - o_d(1)$:

$$\mathcal{L}(W_0) < \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}: \text{rank}(W) < d} \mathcal{L}(W),$$

where W_0 is prescribed such that $W_0^T W_0 = mI_d$.

3.8 Proof of Theorem 2.7

- (a) Let $\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n]) = \mathcal{S}$, the set of all $d \times d$ symmetric matrices, and let $M \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that for any i , $X_i^T M X_i = 0$. We will establish $M = 0$. Let $1 \leq k, \ell \leq d$ be two fixed indices. To that end, let $\theta_i^{(k,\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that, $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^{(k,\ell)} X_i X_i^T = e_k e_k^T + e_\ell e_\ell^T$, where the column vectors $e_k, e_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are respectively the k^{th} and ℓ^{th} elements of the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^d . Such $\theta_i^{(k,\ell)}$ indeed exist, due to the spanning property. Observe that $2M_{k,\ell} = e_k^T M e_\ell + e_\ell^T M e_k = \text{tr}(e_k^T M e_\ell + e_\ell^T M e_k)$. Now, using the fact that $\text{tr}(ABC) = \text{tr}(BCA) = \text{tr}(CAB)$ for every matrices A, B, C (with matching dimensions), we have:

$$2M_{k,\ell} = \text{tr}(M e_\ell e_k^T + M e_k e_\ell^T) = \text{tr} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^{(k,\ell)} M X_i X_i^T \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^{(k,\ell)} \text{tr}(X_i^T M X_i) = 0,$$

for every $k, \ell \in [d]$. Finally, if W is such that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) = 0$, then $X_i^T M X_i = 0$ for any i , where $M = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W$. Hence, provided that the geometric condition holds, we have $M = 0$, that is, $W^T W = (W^*)^T W^*$. From here, the final conclusion follows per Theorem 3.2. Since $W^T W = (W^*)^T W^*$, W clearly has zero generalization error, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(W) = 0$.

- (b) Our goal is to construct a $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $f(W^*; X_i) = f(W; X_i)$, for every $i \in [n]$, whereas $W^T W \neq (W^*)^T W^*$. Consider the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{trace}(AB)$, in the space of all symmetric $d \times d$ matrices. Find $0 \neq M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ a symmetric matrix, such that, $M \in \text{span}^\perp(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n])$, that is, $X_i^T M X_i = 0$ for every $i \in [n]$. We can find such M satisfying $\|M\|_2 = 1$. Consider the linear matrix function $M(\delta) = (W^*)^T W^* + \delta M$. Note that, $M(\delta)$ is symmetric for every δ . We claim that under the hypothesis of the theorem, there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $M(\delta)$ is positive semidefinite for every $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, and that there exists $W_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $W_\delta^T W_\delta = M(\delta)$, for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$. Observe that, since $\text{rank}(W^*) = d$, then $(W^*)^T W^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $\text{rank}((W^*)^T W^*) = d$. Therefore, the eigenvalues $\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_d^*$ of $(W^*)^T W^*$ are all positive. In particular $\{\lambda_i^* : i \in [d]\} \subset [\delta_1, \infty)$, with $\delta_1 = \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^2$. Now, let $\mu_1(\delta), \dots, \mu_d(\delta)$ be the eigenvalues of $M(\delta)$. Using Weyl's inequality [HJ12], we have $|\mu_i(\delta) - \lambda_i^*| \leq \delta \|M\|_2 = \delta$, for every i . In particular, taking $\delta \leq \delta_1$, we deduce for every $i \in [d]$, it holds that $\mu_i(\delta) \geq \lambda_i^* - \delta \geq 0$, that is, $\{\mu_i(\delta) : i \in [d]\} \subset [0, \infty)$. In particular, we also have $M(\delta)$ is symmetric, and thus, it is PSD. Thus, there exists a $\overline{W}_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\overline{W}_\delta^T \overline{W}_\delta = M(\delta)$. Now, using the same idea as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 part (c), we then deduce that for any $\widehat{m} \geq d$, there exists a matrix $W_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$ such that $W_\delta^T W_\delta = \overline{W}_\delta^T \overline{W}_\delta = M(\delta)$. In particular, for this W_δ , if $f(W_\delta, X)$ is the function computed by the neural network with weight matrix $W_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$, then on the training data $(X_i : i \in [n])$, $f(W_\delta; X_i) = X_i^T W_\delta^T W_\delta X_i = X_i^T (W^*)^T W^* X_i = f(W^*; X_i)$, since $X_i^T M X_i = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. At the same time $W_\delta^T W_\delta - (W^*)^T W^* = \delta M \neq 0$, since $\delta \neq 0$ and $M \neq 0$, and therefore $W_\delta^T W_\delta \neq (W^*)^T W^*$.

Finally, to show $\mathcal{L}(W_\delta) > 0$, we argue as follows. Suppose $\mathcal{L}(W_\delta) = 0$. Then, by Theorem 3.1, it follows that $\psi(X) = X^T A X = 0$ identically, where $A = W_\delta^T W_\delta - (W^*)^T W^*$. Now, letting ξ_1, \dots, ξ_d to be the eigenvectors of A (with corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$), we obtain $\xi_i^T A \xi_i = \lambda_i \xi_i^T \xi_i = \lambda_i \|\xi_i\|_2^2 = 0$, we namely obtain $\lambda_i = 0$ for every $i \in [d]$. Finally, since A is symmetric, and hence admits a diagonalization of form $A = Q \Lambda Q$ with diagonal entries of Λ being zero, we deduce A is identically zero, which contradicts with the fact that $A = \delta M$, which is a non-zero matrix.

3.9 Proof of Corollary 2.8

The proof relies on the following observation: given any pair $(a^*, W^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, construct a matrix $\widehat{W}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ whose j^{th} row is $\widehat{W}_j^* = \sqrt{a_j^*} W_j^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $\widehat{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m} \times d}$ similarly as the matrix whose j^{th} row is $\widehat{W}_j = \sqrt{a_j} W_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, let $e^{(m)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $e^{(\widehat{m})} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{m}}$ be the vector of all ones. Then note that,

$$\widehat{f}(a^*, W^*, X) = \widehat{f}(e^{(m)}, \widehat{W}^*, X) = f(\widehat{W}^*, X) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{f}(a, W, X) = \widehat{f}(e^{(\widehat{m})}, \widehat{W}, X) = f(\widehat{W}, X),$$

where $f(\widehat{W}; X)$ is the same quantity as in Theorem 2.7. Applying Theorem 2.7 then establishes both parts.

3.10 Proof of Theorem 2.9

Recall that, $\mathcal{S} = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : M^T = M\}$. Note that, this space has dimension $\binom{d}{2} + d$: for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq d$, it is easy to see that the matrices $e_k e_\ell^T + e_\ell e_k^T$ are linearly independent; and there are precisely $\binom{d}{2} + d$ such matrices. With this in mind, the statement of part (b) is immediate.

We now prove the part (a) of the theorem. For any X_i , let $X_i(j)$ be the j^{th} coordinate of X_i , with $j \in [d]$; and let \mathcal{Y}_i be a $d(d+1)/2$ -dimensional vector, obtained by retaining $X_i(1)^2, \dots, X_i(d)^2$; and the products, $X_i(k)X_i(\ell)$ with $1 \leq k < \ell \leq d$. Now, let \mathcal{X} be an $n \times d(d+1)/2$ matrix, whose rows are $\mathcal{Y}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Y}_n$. Our goal is to establish,

$$\mathbb{P}[\det(\mathcal{X}) = 0] = 0,$$

when $n = d(d+1)/2$, where the probability is taken with respect to the randomness in X_1, \dots, X_n (in particular, this yields for $n \geq d(d+1)/2$, $\mathbb{P}(\text{rank}(\mathcal{X}) = d(d+1)/2)$, almost surely). Now, recalling Theorem 3.1, it then suffices to show that $\det(\mathcal{X})$ is not identically zero, when viewed as a polynomial in $X_i(j)$ with $i \in [n]$, $j \in [d]$.

We now prove part (b) by providing a deterministic construction (of the matrix \mathcal{X}) under which $\det(\mathcal{X}) \neq 0$. Let $p_1 < \dots < p_d$ be distinct prime numbers. For every $1 \leq t \leq n$, set:

$$X_t = (p_1^{t-1}, \dots, p_d^{t-1})^T \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In particular, $X_1 = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which then implies \mathcal{Y}_1 is a vector of all ones. Now, we study \mathcal{Y}_2 . The entries of \mathcal{Y}_2 , called $z_1, \dots, z_{d(d+1)/2}$, are of form p_i^2 with $i \in [d]$; or $p_i p_j$, where $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. By the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, we have $p_i p_j = p_k p_\ell \Rightarrow \{p_i, p_j\} = \{p_k, p_\ell\}$; and therefore, $z_1, \dots, z_{d(d+1)/2}$ are pairwise distinct. With this construction, the matrix \mathcal{X} is a Vandermonde matrix with determinant:

$$\prod_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq d(d+1)/2} (z_k - z_\ell).$$

Since $z_k \neq z_\ell$ for every $k \neq \ell$ (from the construction on \mathcal{Y}_2 , which, in turn, is constructed from X_2), this determinant is non-zero, proving the claim.

3.11 Proof of Theorem 2.10

(a) Note that, if $n \geq n^*$, then combining parts (a) of Theorems 2.7 and 2.9, we have that with probability one, $\text{span}(X_i X_i^T : i \in [n]) = \mathcal{S}$, which, together with $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) = 0$, imply that,

$$\mathbb{P}(E \neq \emptyset) = 0,$$

where $E = \{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : W^T W \neq (W^*)^T W^*; \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(W) = 0\}$, from which the desired conclusion follows.

(b) Assume W is taken as in proof of Theorem 2.7 (b), that is,

$$A = (W^*)^T W^* - W^T W = \delta M \quad \text{where} \quad \delta = \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|M\| = 1,$$

with $M^T = M$. Let $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$ be the spectrum of the matrix δM . Using now Theorem 2.1 (c), we have the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W) &\geq \mathbb{E}[X_i(j)^2]^2 \text{trace}(A)^2 + \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i(j)^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i(j)^2]^2 \right\} \cdot \text{trace}(A^2) \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i(j)^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i(j)^2]^2 \right\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 \right) \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \text{Var}(X_i(j)^2), 2\mathbb{E}[X_i(j)^2]^2 \right\} \lambda_{\max}(\delta M)^2, \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{trace}(A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2$. Finally, since $\lambda_{\max}(\delta M)^2 = \delta^2 = \sigma_{\min}(W^*)^4$ (as the spectral norm of M is one), we arrive at the desired conclusion.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Orestis Plevrakis for providing useful feedback on the initial version of this paper.

References

- [BY88] Zhidong D Bai and Yong Q Yin, *Convergence to the semicircle law*, The Annals of Probability (1988), 863–875.
- [BY⁺93] ZD Bai, YQ Yin, et al., *Limit of the smallest eigenvalue of a large dimensional sample covariance matrix*, The Annals of Probability **21** (1993), no. 3, 1275–1294.
- [CRBD18] Tian Qi Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud, *Neural ordinary differential equations*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2018, pp. 6571–6583.
- [CT05] Richard Caron and Tim Traynor, *The zero set of a polynomial*, WSMR Report (2005), 05–02.

- [CW08] Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston, *A unified architecture for natural language processing: Deep neural networks with multitask learning*, Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning, ACM, 2008, pp. 160–167.
- [DFLRP⁺18] Jeffrey De Fauw, Joseph R Ledsam, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Nenad Tomasev, Sam Blackwell, Harry Askham, Xavier Glorot, Brendan ODonoghue, Daniel Visentin, et al., *Clinically applicable deep learning for diagnosis and referral in retinal disease*, Nature medicine **24** (2018), no. 9, 1342.
- [DL18] Simon S Du and Jason D Lee, *On the power of over-parametrization in neural networks with quadratic activation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01206 (2018).
- [HJ12] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [HZRS16] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, *Deep residual learning for image recognition*, Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [KSH12] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton, *Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2012, pp. 1097–1105.
- [LSSS14] Roi Livni, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, and Ohad Shamir, *On the computational efficiency of training neural networks*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2014, pp. 855–863.
- [MDH11] Abdel-rahman Mohamed, George E Dahl, and Geoffrey Hinton, *Acoustic modeling using deep belief networks*, IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing **20** (2011), no. 1, 14–22.
- [R⁺64] Walter Rudin et al., *Principles of mathematical analysis*, vol. 3, McGraw-hill New York, 1964.
- [SH18] Mohammadreza Soltani and Chinmay Hegde, *Towards provable learning of polynomial neural networks using low-rank matrix estimation*, International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 2018, pp. 1417–1426.
- [SJJ18] 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 **65** (2018), no. 2, 742–769.
- [SSS⁺17] David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al., *Mastering the game of go without human knowledge*, Nature **550** (2017), no. 7676, 354.
- [VBB18] Luca Venturi, Afonso S Bandeira, and Joan Bruna, *Spurious valleys in two-layer neural network optimization landscapes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06384 (2018).

- [Ver10] Roman Vershynin, *Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027 (2010).
- [WHJ17] E Weinan, Jiequn Han, and Arnulf Jentzen, *Deep learning-based numerical methods for high-dimensional parabolic partial differential equations and backward stochastic differential equations*, *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics* **5** (2017), no. 4, 349–380.
- [ZBH⁺16] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals, *Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03530 (2016).