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Abstract
We connect a large class of Generative Deep Networks (GDNs) with spline operators in order to derive their properties, limitations, and new opportunities. By characterizing the latent space partition, dimension and angularity of the generated manifold, we relate the manifold dimension and approximation error to the sample size. The manifold-per-region affine subspace defines a local coordinate basis; we provide necessary and sufficient conditions relating those basis vectors with disentanglement. We also derive the output probability density mapped onto the generated manifold in terms of the latent space density, which enables the computation of key statistics such as its Shannon entropy. This finding also enables the computation of the GDN likelihood, which provides a new mechanism for model comparison as well as providing a quality measure for (generated) samples under the learned distribution.

1. Introduction
Deep Generative Networks (DGNs), which map a low-dimensional latent variable $z$ to a higher-dimensional generated sample $x$, have made enormous leaps in capabilities in recent years. Popular DGNs include Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2014) and their variants (Dziugaite et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2016; Durugkar et al., 2016; Arjovsky et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2019); Variational Autoencoders (Kingma & Welling, 2013) and their variants (Fabius & van Amersfoort, 2014; van den Oord et al., 2017; Higgins et al., 2017; Tomczak & Welling, 2017; Davidson et al., 2018); and flow based models such as NICE (Dinh et al., 2014), Normalizing Flow (Rezende & Mohamed, 2015), and their variants (Dinh et al., 2016; Grathwohl et al., 2018; Kingma & Dhariwal, 2018). While DGNs are easy to describe and analyze locally in terms of simple affine operators and scalar nonlinearities, a general framework for their global structure has remained elusive. In this paper, we take a step in the direction of a better theoretical understanding of DGNs constructed using continuous, piecewise affine nonlinearities by leveraging recent progress on max-affine spline operators (MASOs) (Balestriero & Baraniuk, 2018b). Our main contributions are as follows;

[C1] We characterize the piecewise-affine manifold structure of the generated samples, including its intrinsic dimension (Section 3), which sheds new light on the impact of techniques like dropout (Section 3.3) and provides practitioners with sensible design principles for constructing a desired manifold.

[C2] We characterize the local coordinates of the generated manifold and the inverse mapping from data points $x$ back to latent variables $z$ (Section 4.1), which provides new necessary and sufficient conditions for disentanglement, interpretability and new links between DGNs and adaptive basis methods (Section 4.2). By characterizing the angles between adjacent local affine regions, we demonstrate how weight sharing in a DGN heavily constrains the curvature of the generated manifold despite the fact that the DGN might be tremendously overparameterized (Section 4.3).

[C3] We provide a DGN input-output formula that enables us to derive the analytical probability density on the generated manifold that is induced by the latent space (Section 5.1). We use this result to derive Normalizing Flows (NMFs) form first principles and highlight how the DGN design, $x \mapsto z$ (most NMFs) versus $z \mapsto x$ (DGNs) allow for either fast likelihood computation and slow sampling or vice-versa (Section 5.2). Finally, the Shannon entropy of the output density provide a new lens through which to study the difficulty of generating multidimensional, low-entropy distributions using DGNs (Section 5.3).

Reproducible code for the various experiments and figures is be provided on Github1.

1https://github.com/RandallBalestriero/GAN.git
2. Background

Deep Networks. A deep (neural) network (DN) is an operator \( f_\Theta \) with parameters \( \Theta \) that maps the input \( z \in \mathbb{R}^S \) to the output \( x \in \mathbb{R}^D \) by composing \( L \) intermediate layer mappings \( f_* \), \( \ell = 1, \ldots, L \), that combine affine and simple nonlinear operators such as the fully connected operator (simply the affine transformation defined by the weight matrix \( W_\ell \) and bias vector \( b_\ell \)), convolution operator (with circulant \( W_\ell \)), activation operator (applying a scalar nonlinearity such as the ubiquitous ReLU), or pooling operator. Precise definitions of these operators can be found in (Goodfellow et al., 2016). We will omit \( \Theta \) for conciseness unless it is needed.

We precisely define a layer \( f_\ell \) as comprising a single nonlinear operator composed with (if any) preceding linear operators that lie between it and the preceding nonlinear operator. Each layer \( f_\ell \) transforms its input feature map \( v_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{D_{\ell-1}} \) into an output feature map \( v_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{D_\ell} \) with the initializations \( v_0 := z, D_0 = S \), and \( v_L := x, D_L = D \). In this paper, we focus on DGNs, where \( S < D \), \( z \) is interpreted as a latent representation, and \( x \) is the generated data, e.g., a time-series or image. The feature maps \( v_\ell \) can be viewed equivalently as signals, flattened column vectors, or tensors depending on the context.

Max-Affine Spline Deep Networks. A \( K \)-dimensional max-affine spline operator (MASO) concatenates \( K \) independent max-affine spline (MAS) functions, with each MAS formed from the point-wise maximum of \( R \) affine mappings (Magnani & Boyd, 2009; Hannah & Dunson, 2013). Given an input vector \( u \), the output of a MASO is given by

\[
\text{MASO}(u; \{ A_r, b_r \}_{r=1}^R) = \max_{r=1, \ldots, R} A_r u + b_r, \tag{1}
\]

where \( A_r \in \mathbb{R}^{D_\ell \times D_{\ell-1}} \) are the slopes and \( b_r \in \mathbb{R}^{D_\ell} \) are the offset/bias parameters \( \forall r \) and the maximum is taken coordinate-wise. Note that a MASO is a continuous piecewise-affine (CPA) operator (\( ? \)).

The key background result for this paper is that the layers of DNs (DGNs) constructed from piecewise affine operators (e.g., convolution, ReLU, and max-pooling) are MASOs (Balestriero & Baraniuk, 2018b,a); hence a DN (DGN) is a composition of MASOs. For example, a layer comprising a fully connected operator with weights \( W_\ell \) and biases \( b_\ell \) followed by a ReLU activation operator has parameters \( R = 2, A_1 = W_\ell, A_2 = 0, b_1 = b_\ell, b_2 = 0 \).

The piecewise-affine spline interpretation provides a powerful global geometric interpretation of a DN (DGN) in which it partitions its input space \( \mathbb{R}^S \) into polyhedral regions (the set \( \Omega \)) and then assigns a different, fixed affine transformation to each region. The partition regions are built up over the layers via a subdivision process and are closely related to Voronoi and power diagrams (Balestriero et al., 2019).

3. The Generated Manifold of a DGN

In this section we study the properties of the mapping \( G_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D \) of a deep generative network (DGN) comprising \( L \) piecewise-affine MASO layers.

3.1. Input Space Partition and Region Mapping

While our approach holds for arbitrary piecewise affine layers, for concreteness of exposition, we will focus on nonlinearities with \( R = 2 \) (e.g., ReLU, leaky ReLU, absolute value). In all such cases, the state of the nonlinearity can be encoded as a value from \( \{ \alpha, 1 \} \) with \( \alpha = 0 \) for ReLU, \( \alpha = -1 \) for absolute value and \( \alpha > 0 \) for leaky-ReLU. At layer \( \ell \), observing an input \( v_{\ell-1} \) defines the state of the layer nonlinearities and in turn defines the “piece” of the layer MASO used to produce the output \( v_\ell \). We call the nonlinearity’s state its code \( q_\ell(v_{\ell-1}) \in \{ \alpha, 1 \}^{D_\ell}, v_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{D_{\ell-1}} \) with

\[
[q_\ell(v_{\ell-1})]_i = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & [W_\ell v_{\ell-1} + b_\ell]_i \leq 0 \\
1, & [W_\ell v_{\ell-1} + b_\ell]_i > 0 
\end{cases} \quad (2)
\]

leading to the simple forward formula for the layer

\[
f_\ell(v_{\ell-1}) = \text{diag}[q_\ell(v)](W_\ell v + b_\ell). \quad (3)
\]

We concatenate the per-layer codes into \( q(z) = [q_1(z)^T, \ldots, q_L(z)^T]^T \in \{ \alpha, 1 \}^{\prod_{\ell=1}^L D_\ell} \) with \( z \in \mathbb{R}^S \) the DGN input and \( q_\ell(v_{\ell-1}) \) abbreviated as \( q_\ell(z) \). The generated manifold of a DGN

\[
\omega_k = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^S : q(z) = k \}, \forall k \in \{ \alpha, 1 \}^{\prod_{\ell=1}^L D_\ell}, \quad (4)
\]

\[
\Omega = \{ \omega_k, k \in \{ \alpha, 1 \}^{\prod_{\ell=1}^L D_\ell} \} \setminus \emptyset. \quad (5)
\]

Note that \( \cup_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega = \mathbb{R}^S \) and \( \forall (\omega, \omega') \in \Omega^2, \omega \neq \omega', \omega \cap \omega' = \emptyset \), with \( \cdot \) the interior operator (Munkres, 2014).

Since \( G \) is formed from a composition of MASOs, it is itself a CPA with a fixed affine mapping over each region \( \omega \in \Omega \).

As a result, the generator \( G \) maps each \( S \)-dimensional convex latent space region \( \omega \in \Omega \) to the convex affine subspace \( G(\omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^D \) as

\[
\forall \omega \in \Omega, \quad G(\omega) = \{ \mathcal{A}_\omega z + b_\omega, z \in \omega \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D, \quad (6)
\]

with \( \mathcal{A}_\omega \) and \( b_\omega \) obtained by composing (3) and distributing the terms; we will call this the generated manifold.

Proposition 1. A DGN \( G \) comprised of MASO layers is a CPA operator with input space partition \( \Omega \) given by (5). Each region \( \omega \in \Omega \) is a convex polytope in \( \mathbb{R}^S \) that is affinely mapped to the affine subspace \( G(\omega) \) (recall (6), a convex polytope in \( \mathbb{R}^D \) given by (6). (Proof in Appendix C.1.)
Analytically, the form of (6) can be obtained directly by composing the per layer mappings from (3), distributing and rearranging the terms into the slope and bias terms of the affine mapping. Computationally, the affine parameters $A_\omega, b_\omega$ can be obtained efficiently in one of the two following ways. On the one hand, if one possesses an input $z$ belonging to the desired region $\omega$, then we simply perform

$$A_\omega = \nabla_z G(z), \quad b_\omega = G(z) - A_\omega z. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, in the case where one has access to the code $q(\omega)$ of the region (as opposed to a point in the region), one can directly impose the nonlinearity states (defined by $q(\omega)$) on the DGN mapping. Once the nonlinearities are fixed, one can feed an arbitrary input $z$ ∈ $\mathbb{R}^S$ and compute the affine parameters as in (7) on the fixed DGN.

We can extend (6) to the entire domain of the generator via

$$G(\text{supp}(p_z)) = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega} G(\omega \cap \text{supp}(p_z)), \quad (8)$$

with $p_z$ the probability distribution on the latent space that generates $z$, and where $G(\text{supp}(p_z))$ denotes the image of $G$ by considering all inputs $z$ ∈ $\text{supp}(p_z)$ with nonzero probability, e.g., $\mathbb{R}^S$ if the latent distribution is a Gaussian, and the $S$-dimensional hypercube if it is a standard Uniform distribution. Thus, the generated manifold (8) combines the per-region affine transformations of the input space partition per (6). With this formulation, we now characterize the intrinsic dimension of the per-region and overall manifold mapping of $G$.

3.2. Generated Manifold Intrinsic Dimension

We now turn into the intrinsic dimension of the per-region affine subspaces $G(\omega)$ that comprise the generated manifold. In fact, as per (8), its dimension depends not only on the latent dimension $S$ but also on the per layer parameters.

**Lemma 1.** The intrinsic dimension of the affine subspace $G(\omega)$ (recall (8)) has the following upper bound

$$\dim(G(\omega)) \leq \min \left( S, \min_{\ell} \left( \text{rank} (\text{diag}(q_{\ell}(\omega))W_{\ell}) \right) \right).$$

(Proof in Appendix C.2.)

We make three observations. First, we see that the choice of the nonlinearity (i.e., the choice of $\alpha$) and/or the choice of the per-layer dimensions (i.e., the “width” of the DGN) are the key elements controlling the upper bound of $\dim(G)$. For example, in the case of ReLU ($\alpha = 0$) then $\dim(G(\omega))$ is directly impacted by the number of 0s in the codes $q_{\ell}(\omega)$ of each layer in addition of the rank of $W_{\ell}$; this sensitivity does not occur when using other nonlinearities ($\alpha \neq 0$). Second, “bottleneck layers” impact directly the dimension of the subspace and thus should also be carefully picked based on the a priori knowledge of the target manifold intrinsic dimension. Third, we obtain the following condition relating the per-region dimension to the bijectivity and surjectivity of the mapping. The latter should be avoided in DGNs, since it implies that multiple different latent vectors will generate the same output sample.

**Proposition 2.** A DGN is bijective on $\omega$ iff $\dim(G(\omega)) = S, \forall \omega \in \Omega$ and surjective iff $\exists \omega \in \Omega$ s.t. $\dim(G(\omega)) < S$. A DGN is bijective on $\text{supp}(p_z)$ iff it is bijective for each region $\omega \in \Omega$ and $G(\omega) \cap G(\omega') = \emptyset, \forall \omega \neq \omega'$. (Proof in Appendix C.3.)

3.3. Application: Effect of Dropout/Dropconnect

Noise techniques, such as dropout (Wager et al., 2013) and dropconnect (Wan et al., 2013), alter the per-region affine mapping in a very particular way that we now characterize. Dropout and dropconnect techniques apply a multiplicative binary noise onto the feature maps and/or the weights; the multiplicative noise $\epsilon_{\ell} \in \{0, 1\}^{D_{\ell}}$ is typically an iid Bernoulli random variable. (Isola et al., 2017). To characterize how this noise impacts the DGN mapping, denote the generator $G$ equipped with random dropout/dropconnect by $G'$, and the generator in which the noise realization is fixed by $G(z|\epsilon) = A_{\omega}(\epsilon)z + b_{\omega}(\epsilon)$ where $\epsilon$ concatenates the random variables of each layer. Given the mapping form (recall (3)) with per layer parameters $W_{\ell}, b_{\ell}$, the presence of dropout noise leads to the following noisy input-output mapping on a region $\omega$ (recall (6)) as

$$G(z|\epsilon) = \left( \prod_{\ell=L}^{1} \text{diag}(q_{\ell}(\omega) \odot \epsilon_{\ell})W_{\ell} \right) z + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \left( \prod_{\ell'=\ell+1}^{\ell+1} \text{diag}(q_{\ell'}(\omega) \odot \epsilon_{\ell'})W_{\ell'} \right) b_{\ell}, \quad (9)$$

where $\odot$ is the Hadamard product and $z \in \omega$. (See Appendix G for the dropconnect formula.) Thus, the noisy generator actually combines all the above mappings for each noise realisation via

$$\tilde{G}(\text{supp}(p_z)) = \bigcup_{\epsilon \in \text{supp}(p_z)} G(\text{supp}(p_z)|\epsilon). \quad (10)$$
We now emphasize how the DGN dimension $N$ (recall Prop. 2). On the other hand, when used with wide $S$ (per-region dimension smaller than $E$ Proposition 3. Multiplicative binary dropout/dropconnect transforms the generator $G$ into the union of generators given by (10), each with per-region dimension between 0 and $\max_\omega \dim(G(\omega))$. (Proof in Appendix C.4.)

From the above, we see that the multiplicative binary noise does not make the generator $G$ dense in its output space, but rather turns $G$ into a collection of piecewise linear generators, each corresponding to a different realization of $\epsilon$ as depicted in Fig. 1. Furthermore, each noise realization produces a generator with a possibly different per-region dimension being upper bounded by the dimension of the original generator $G$. Also, each induced generator has a possibly different input space partition based on the noise realization. On the one hand, this highlights a potential limitation of those techniques for narrow models ($D_\ell \approx S$) for which the noisy generators will tend to be degenerate (per-region dimension smaller than $S$), implying surjectivity (recall Prop. 2). On the other hand, when used with wide DGNs ($D_\ell \gg S$) much more noisy generators will maintain the same affine subspace dimension that the original generator. The latter is crucial when $S$ is picked a priori to match exactly the true intrinsic dimension. We illustrate the above in Fig. 2.

3.4. Application: Optimal Dimension and Training Error Increase

We now emphasize how the DGN dimension $\hat{S} \triangleq \max_\omega \dim(G(\omega))$ impacts the training error loss and training sample recovery. We answer the following question: Can a generator generate $N$ training samples from a continuous $S^*$ dimensional manifold if $\hat{S} < S^*$? Denote the empirical error measuring the ability to generate the data samples by $E_N^* = \min_\theta \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \min_{\epsilon} \|G_{\theta}(x) - x_n\|$. We now demonstrate and empirically validate that if $\hat{S} < S^*$ then $E_N^*$ increases with $N$ for any data manifold.
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*Figure 2.* Impact of dropout and dropconnect on the dimension of the noisy generator affine subspaces $G(\omega|x)$, $\forall \omega$ (recall (10)). We depict two “drop” probabilities 0.1 and 0.3 for a generator $G$ with $S = 6$, $D = 10$, $L = 3$ and varying width $D_1 = D_2$ ranging in {6, 8, 10, 12, 24, 48} (x-axis); note that the architecture limits the dimension to $S = 6$. The boxplot represents the distribution of the per-region affine subspace dimensions for 2000 sampled regions over 2000 different noise realizations $\epsilon$. We make two observations. First, dropconnect tends to preserve the latent dimension $S$ even when the width $D_1, D_2$ is close to $S$. Second, the dropout-induced collection of generators tends to have degenerate dimension (much smaller than $S$) until the width is twice the latent space dimension ($D_\ell \geq 2S$). As a result, while dropout turns a generator into a collection of generators, those generators will have degenerate dimension unless $G$ is much wider that $S$.
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*Figure 3.* Error $E^*$ (y-axis) for a linear manifold with $S^* = 5$, for increasing dataset size $N \in \{100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200, 300, 400, 500, 1000\}$ (blue to green) for different latent space dimension $S \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ (x-axis) which forces $\hat{S} < S$, the $E^* = 0$ line is depicted in black. This demonstrates, as per Thm. 1, that whenever $\hat{S} < S^*$, the training error $E^*$ increases with the dataset size $N$ and is 0 otherwise whenever $\hat{S} \geq S^*$.

**Theorem 1.** Given the true intrinsic dimension of an arbitrary manifold $S^*$, any finite DGN with $\hat{S} < S^*$ will have increasing error $E^*$ with the dataset size $N$ as in $\exists \ell \in \{0, \ldots, L\} : D_\ell < S^* \implies \forall N > 0, \exists N' > N : E_{N'}^* > E_N^*$. (Proof in Appendix C.11.)

In general, it is clear that, for smooth manifolds, $E^*$ increases with $N$ since the DGN is piecewise linear. However, the above result extends this to any manifold, even when the data manifold is as simple as a linear manifold (translated subspace). We empirically validate this phenomenon in Fig. 3 for the simple case of a linear manifold. (The experimental details are given in Appendix F.)

It is clear that a direct implication of Thm. 1 is that there does not exist a finite architecture with $D_\ell < D$ for some $\ell$ and parameter $\theta$ such that a MASO DGN would be bijective with $\mathbb{R}^D$. The above results are key to understand the challenges and importance of the design of DGN starting...
with the width of the hidden layers and latent dimensions in conjunction with the choice of nonlinearities and constraints on \( W_f \) of all layers.

4. Manifold Local Coordinates and Curvature

We now turn to the study of the local coordinates of the affine mappings comprising a DGN’s generated manifold. We then study the coupling between the affine mappings of adjacent regionsto characterize the curvature/angularity of the generated manifold.

4.1. Local Coordinate Systems and Inverse Mapping

Recall from (8) that a DGN is a CPA operator. Inside region \( \omega \in \Omega \), points are mapped to the output space affine subspace which is itself governed by a coordinate system or basis. For the remaining of the section we assume that \( \dim(G(\omega)) = S \), \( \forall \omega \in \Omega \) and thus the columns of \( A_\omega \) are linearly independent. For cases where \( \dim(G(\omega)) < S \) then the following analysis also applies by considering a lower dimensional latent space \( S' < S \) and the corresponding sub-network that only depend on the kept latent space dimensions.

**Lemma 2**. A basis for the affine subspace \( G(\omega) \) (recall (6)) is given by the columns of \( A_\omega \).

In other words, the columns of \( A_\omega \) form the local coordinate space, and each latent space dimension moves a point in this region by adding to it the corresponding slope column. Prior leveraging this result for latent space characterization, we derive an inverse of the generator \( G \) that maps any point from the generated manifold to the latent space. This inverse is well-defined as long as the generator is injective, preventing that \( \exists z_1 \neq z_2 \) s.t. \( G(z_1) = G(z_2) \). Assuming injectivity, the inverse of \( G \) on a region \( G(\omega) \) in the output space is obtained by

\[
G_\omega^{-1}(x) = (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} A_\omega^T (x - b_\omega), \forall x \in G(\omega),
\]

leading to \( G_\omega^{-1}(G(\omega)) = \omega, \forall \omega \in \Omega \). Note that the inverse \((A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1}\) is well defined as \( A_\omega \) is full column rank since we only consider a generator with \( \tilde{S} = S \). We can then simply combine the region-conditioned inverses to obtain the overall generator inverse.

**Lemma 3**. The inverse mapping of an injective DGN is the CPA operator mapping \( G(\text{supp}(p_\omega)) \mapsto \text{supp}(p_\omega) \) given by \( G^{-1}(x) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} G_\omega^{-1}(x) 1_{\{x \in G(\omega)\}} \). (Proof in Appendix C.5.)

4.2. Application: Adaptive Basis and Disentanglement

As mentioned in the above section, \( A_\omega \) forms a basis of the affine subspace \( G(\omega) \). The latent vector \( v \) combines them to obtain the subspace which is then shifted by the bias \( b_\omega \).

This process is performed locally for each region \( \omega \), in a manner similar to an “adaptive basis” (Donoho et al., 1994). In this context, we aim to characterize the subspace basis in term of disentanglement, i.e., the alignment of the basis vectors with respect to each other. While there is not a unique definition, a disentangled basis should provide a “compact” and interpretable latent representation \( z \) for the associated \( x = G(z) \). In particular, it should ensure that a small perturbation of dimension \( d \) of \( z \) implies a transformation independent from a small perturbation of dimension \( d' \neq d \) (Schmidhuber, 1992; Bengio et al., 2013). That is, \( (G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d), G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d')) \approx 0 \) with \( \delta_d \) a one-hot vector at position \( d \) and length \( L \). A disentangled representation is thus considered to be most informative as each latent dimension imply a transformation that leaves the others unchanged (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995). For example, rotating an object should not alter its vertical or horizontal translation and vice-versa.

**Proposition 4**. A necessary condition for disentanglement is to have “near orthogonal” columns as \( \langle [A_\omega]_{.,i}, [A_\omega]_{.,j} \rangle \approx 0, \forall i \neq j, \forall \omega \in \Omega \). (Proof in Appendix C.6.)

Figure 4 visualizes one of the basis vectors of four different DGNs trained on the MNIST dataset with \( S = 10 \). Interpreatability of the transformation encoded by the dimension of the basis vector can be done as well as model comparison such as blurriness of VAE samples that is empirically observed across datasets (??). We also provide in Table 1 the value of \( \|Q_\omega - I\|_2 \) with \( Q_\omega \in [0,1]^{S \times S} \) the matrix of cosine angles between basis vector of \( A_\omega \) for 10,000 regions sampled randomly and where we report the average over the regions and the maximum. Finally, this process is performed over 8 runs, the mean and standard deviation are reported in the table. We observe that there does not seem
Table 1. Depiction of the cosine similarity summed over pairwise different columns of $A_\omega$. Measure of 0 means that the basis vectors are orthogonal, improving disentanglement (recall Prop. 4). The first line represents the maximum of this quantity over 10000 sampled regions $\omega$. The second line represents the average; the std of those quantities is given for 8 runs. We see that training increases disentanglement, and fully connected models offer increased disentanglement as compared to convolutional models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>FC GAN</th>
<th>CONV GAN</th>
<th>FC VAE</th>
<th>CONV VAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Init</td>
<td>8.84 ± 0.07</td>
<td>3.2 ± 0.33</td>
<td>5.23 ± 0.29</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>4.91 ± 0.26</td>
<td>1.84 ± 0.08</td>
<td>2.25 ± 0.08</td>
<td>1.74 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>FC GAN</th>
<th>CONV GAN</th>
<th>FC VAE</th>
<th>CONV VAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>1.36 ± 0.08</td>
<td>1.72 ± 0.07</td>
<td>1.32 ± 0.07</td>
<td>1.77 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.03</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.89 ± 0.03</td>
<td>1.15 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We illustrate the angles in a simple case $D = 2$ and $Z = 1$ in Fig. 5. It can be seen how a DGN with few parameters produces angles mainly at the points of curvature of the manifold. We also provide many additional figures with different training settings in Fig. 10 in the Appendix as well as repetitions of the same experiment with different random seeds.

4.4. Application: Angle Distribution of a DGN with Random Weights

We can use the above result to study the distribution of angles of different DGNs with random weights and study the impact of depth, width, as well as $Z$ and $D$, the latent and output dimensions respectively. Figure 6 summarizes the distribution of angles for several different settings.

Two key observations emerge. First, the codes of adjacent regions $q(\omega), q(\omega')$ share a large number of their values (see Appendix D for details) implying that most of the DGN parameters are shared in their composition to produce $A_\omega$ and $A_{\omega'}$. In turn, this weight sharing correlates adjacent hyperplanes, such that their angles are much smaller than if randomly picked form one another. The random case (in blue in Fig. 6) favors aggressively large angles as opposed to the ones of DGNs. Second, the distribution moments depend on the ratio $S/D$ rather than the order of $q(\omega)$ taken independently. In particular, as this ratio gets smaller, as the angle distribution becomes bi-modal with an emergence of high angles. That is, the manifold is “flat” overall except in some parts of the space where high angularity is present. This effect is strengthened with wider DGNs. Notice that this large ratio $S/D$ is the one encountered in practice where it is common to have $S \approx 100$ and $D > 800$.

The above experiment demonstrates the impact of width and latent space dimension into the angularity of the DGN output manifold and how to pick its architecture based on a priori knowledge of the target manifold. Under the often-made assumptions that the weights of overparametrized DGN do not move far from their initialization during training (Li & Liang, 2018), these results also hint at the distribution of angles after training.
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5. Density on the Generated Manifold

The study of DGNs would not be complete without considering that the latent space is equipped with a density distribution $p_z$ from which $z$ are sampled in turn leading to sampling of $G(z)$. Thus, we now study how this density is spread over the output space, covering the generated manifold and highlighting some key properties such as density concentration, entropy computation and training instabilities.

5.1. Analytical Output Density

Given a distribution $p_z$ over the latent space, we can explicitly compute the output distribution after the application of $G$, which lead to an intuitive result exploiting the piecewise affine property of the generator.

**Lemma 4.** Denote by $\sigma_i(A_\omega)$ the $i$th singular value of $A_\omega$. Then, the volume of a region $\omega \in \Omega$ denoted by $\mu(\omega)$ is related to the volume of $G(\omega)$ by

$$
\mu(G(\omega)) = \sqrt{\det(A_\omega^T A_\omega)} \mu(\omega) = \prod_{i : \sigma_i(A_\omega) > 0} \sigma_i(A_\omega) \mu(\omega).
$$

(*Proof in Appendix C.8.*)

**Theorem 3.** The generator probability density $p_G(x)$ given $p_z$ and an injective generator $G$ with per-region inverse $G_\omega^{-1}$ from (11) is given by

$$
p_G(x) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_z(G_\omega^{-1}(x)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(A_\omega^T A_\omega)}} I\{x \in G(\omega)\}.
$$

(*Proof in Appendix C.12.*)

That is, the distribution obtained in the output space naturally corresponds to a piecewise affine transformation of the original latent space distribution, weighted by the change in volume of the per-region mappings.

From the analytical derivation of the generator density distribution, we obtain its differential entropy, i.e., the Shannon entropy for continuous distributions.

**Corollary 1.** The differential entropy of the output distribution $p_G$ of the DGN is given by

$$
E(p_G) = E(p_z) + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(z \in \omega) \log(\sqrt{\det(A_\omega^T A_\omega)}).
$$

(*Proof in Appendix C.10.*)

As the result, the differential entropy of the output distribution $p_G$ corresponds to the differential entropy of the latent distribution $p_z$ plus a convex combination of the per-region volume change. Two results emerge directly. First, it is possible to optimize the latent distribution $p_z$ to better fit the target distribution entropy as been done for example in (Ben-Yosef & Weinshall, 2018). Second, whenever this distribution is fixed, any gap between the latent and output distribution entropy imply the need for high change in volumes between $\omega$ and $G(\omega)$.

**Gaussian Case.** We now demonstrate the use of the above derivation by considering practical examples for which we are able to gain insights into the DGN data modeling and generation. First, consider that the latent distribution is set as $z \sim N(0, I)$ we obtain the following result directly from Thm. 3.

**Corollary 2.** The generator density distribution $p_G(x)$ given $z \sim N(0, I)$ is

$$
p_G(x) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle x-b_c, A_\omega^{-1} A_\omega (x-b_c) \rangle}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^S \det(A_\omega^T A_\omega)}} I\{x \in G(\omega)\}.
$$

(*Proof in Appendix C.12.*)

The above formula is reminiscent of Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) (Rosenblatt, 1956) and in particular adaptive KDE (Breiman et al., 1977), where a partitioning of the data manifold is performed on each cell ($\omega$ in our case) different kernel parameters are used.

**Uniform Case.** We now turn into the uniform latent distribution case. Consider the following question: Suppose we start from a uniform distribution $z \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ on the hypercube in $\mathbb{R}^S$, will the samples be uniformly distributed on the manifold of $G$?

**Proposition 5.** Given a uniform latent distribution $v \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, the sampling of the manifold $G(\text{supp}(p_z))$ will be uniform iff $\det(A_\omega^T A_\omega) = c, \forall \omega : \omega \cap \text{supp}(p_z) \neq \emptyset, c > 0$. 
We demonstrated in Thm. 3 and Cor. 1 that the product of $Xavier$; then, half of the weights’ coefficients (picked randomly) are rescaled by $\sigma_1$ and the other half by $\sigma_2$. We observe that greater variance of the weights increase the spread of the log-determinants and increase the mean of the distribution.

5.2. Generative Deep Network Likelihood and Normalizing Flows

Note from Thm. 3 that we obtain an explicit density distribution. One possibility for learning thus corresponds to minimizing the negative log-likelihood (NLL) between the generator output distribution and the data. Recall from Thm. 3 that $\sqrt{\det (J(x_n))}$; thus we can write the log density from (14) over a sample $x_n$ as $L(x_n) = \log(p_z(G^{-1}(x_n)))$. We observe that this failure case (poor approximation of the true distribution) is due to the continuous properties of MASO DGNs, which makes the generator move continuously between modes while not being able to reduce enough the sampling probability $p_G$ in between the modes. Additional examples are contained in Fig. 14.

5.3. On the Difficulty of Generating Low entropy/Multimodal Distributions

We conclude this section with the study of the instabilities encountered when training DGNs on multimodal densities or other atypical cases. We also illustrate the variation of the learned generator log-determinant distribution across regions in Fig. 8, where we trained a GAN DGN on a mixture of 25 Gaussians. On the left is depicted the latent space per-region log-determinant (color coded) with values ranging from $-6$ to $4$ in log-scale (0.002 to 55 in linear scale). On the middle are depicted the true sample (blue) and generated ones (oranges), and on the right are depicted points sampled from the generator from regions with low determinant (green) and large determinant (red). We can observe that this failure case (poor approximation of the true distribution) is due to the continuous properties of MASO DGNs, which makes the generator move continuously between modes while not being able to reduce enough the sampling probability $p_G$ in between the modes. Additional examples are contained in Fig. 14.
A. Extra Figures

All the below pictures have been compressed to be uploaded on Arxiv.

A.1. Angles Histogram

Figure 10. Reproduction of Fig. 6. Histograms of the largest principal angles for DGNs with one hidden layer (first two rows) and two hidden layers (last two rows). In each case the latent space dimension and width of the hidden layers is in the top of the column. The observations reinforce the claims on the role of width and $S$ versus $D$ dimensions.
A.2. Angles Manifold

*Figure 11.* Reproduction of Fig. 5 for various GDNs topologies. The columns represent different widths $D_\ell \in \{6, 8, 16, 32\}$ and the rows correspond to repetition of the learning for different random initializations of the GDNs for consecutive seeds.
A.3. More on MNIST Disentanglement

Figure 12. Randomly generated digits from the trained GAN (top) and trained VAE (bottom) models for the experiment from Fig. 4. Each row represents a model that was training on a different random initialization (8 runs in total) which produced the result in Table 1.
Figure 13. Randomly generated digits from the trained CONV GAN (top) and trained CONV VAE (bottom) models for the experiment from Fig. 4. Each row represents a model that was training on a different random initialization (8 runs in total) which produced the result in Table 1.
A.4. More on Determinant Figures

Figure 14. Reproduction of Fig. 8 for multiple standard deviations and multiple random seeds. Each column represents a different standard deviation of the two Gaussians $\sigma \in \{0.002, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.3, 1, 2\}$ and each row is a run with a different seed. As can be seen in all cases (except when lack of convergence) the distribution of the determinants supports the claim and relates with the Entropy of the true distribution (blue points).
B. Architecture Details

We describe the used models below. The Dense(T) represents a fully connected layer with \( T \) units (activation function not included). The Conv2D(I, J, K) represent \( I \) filters of spatial shape \((J, K)\) and the input dilation and padding follow the standard definition. For the VAE models the encoder is given below and for the GAN models the discriminator is given below as well. FC GAN model means that the FC generator is used in conjunction with the discriminator, the CONV GAN means that the CONV generator is used in conjunction with the discriminator and similarly for the VAE case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FC generator</th>
<th>CONV generator</th>
<th>Encoder</th>
<th>Discriminator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dense(256)</td>
<td>Dense(256)</td>
<td>Dense(512)</td>
<td>Dense(1024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense(512)</td>
<td>Dense(8 * 6 * 6)</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>Dense(256)</td>
<td>Dense(512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense(1024)</td>
<td>Reshape(8, 6, 6)</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense(28*28)</td>
<td>Conv2D(8, 3, 3, inputdilation=2, pad=same)</td>
<td>Dense(2*S)</td>
<td>Dense(256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
<td>Dropout(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conv2D(8, 4, 4, inputdilation=3, pad=valid)</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
<td>leaky ReLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reshape(28*28)</td>
<td>Dense(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all the training procedures employ the Adam optimizer with a learning of 0.0001 which stays constant until training completion. In all cases training is done on 300 epochs, an epoch consisting of viewing the entire image training set once.

C. Proofs

C.1. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. The result is a direct application of Corollary 3 in (Balestriero et al., 2019) adapted to GDNs (and not classification based DNs). The input regions are proven to be convex polytopes. Then by linearity of the per region mapping, convexity is preserved and with form given by (6).

C.2. Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. First recall the standard result that

\[
\text{rank}(AB) \leq \min(\text{rank}(A), \text{rank}(B)),
\]

for any matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K} \) and \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times D} \) (see for example (?) chapter 5). Now, noticing that \( \min(\min(a, b), \min(c, d)) = \min(a, b, c, d) \) leads to the desired result by unrolling the product of matrices that make up the \( A_\omega \) matrix to obtain the desired result.

C.3. Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. First notice that there can only be two major cases. First for the dimension of the affinely mapped region \( G(\omega) \) to be \( S \) or to be smaller than \( S \). Let first consider the bijective case. For the GDN to be bijective on the region we need a one-to-one mapping from \( \omega \) to \( G(\omega) \). If the dimension of the subspace \( G(\omega) \) is \( S \), then it means that the matrix \( A_\omega \) is full-rank, with rank \( S \). In turn, this means that the columns of the matrix are linearly independent. This implies bijectivity on the region as each point in \( \omega \) is mapped to an unique point in \( G(\omega) \) and vice-versa. The surjectivity is direct as if the dimension is smaller than \( S \), then the matrix \( A_\omega \) is not full-rank and all the points in the region \( \omega \) that leave in the kernel of the matrix (lifted with the bias \( b_\omega \)) will be mapped to the same output points. This means that there exists different points in \( \omega \) s.t. they are mapped to the same point in \( G(\omega) \) which gives surjectivity.

For global bijectivity, we need an additional condition. In fact, to ensure that the entire GDN preserves a one-to-one mapping, we need per region bijectivity coupled with the fact that the mapping for different region do not intersect. In fact, we know look at bijectivity between \( \text{supp}(p_z) \) and \( G(\text{supp}(p_z)) \). Thus if the regions do not intersect after affine projections then there does not exist different latent vectors \( z \) and \( z' \) that would be mapped to the same output point. Yet because we have bijectivity on between \( \omega \) and \( G(\omega), \forall \omega \) it means that each point in \( \text{supp}(p_z) \) is mapped to an unique point in \( G(\text{supp}(p_z)) \) which gives global bijectivity.
C.4. Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. The first bound is obtained by taking the realization of the noise where \( r = 0 \), in that case the input space partition is the entire space as any input is mapped to the same VQ code. As such, the mapping associated to this trivial partition has 0 slope (matrix filled with zeros) and a possibly nonzeros bias; as such the mapping is zero-dimensional (any points is mapped to the same point). This gives the lower bound stating that in the mixture of GDNs, one will have dimension 0. For the other case, simply take the trivial case of \( r = 1 \) which gives the result.

C.5. Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. First, as we impose injectivity, we can not have multiple regions of the input space, say \( \omega \) and \( \omega' \) such that \( G(\omega) \cap G(\omega') \neq \emptyset \). Second, a region of the input space is mapped to another region in the output space by means of the affine transformation, thus even though the ambient space \( D \) might be of greater dimension that \( \dim(G) \), the injectivity implies that points in \( \omega \) are mapped to at most one point in \( G(\omega) \). They are affinely mapped meaning that the inverse is given by removing the bias and inverting the linear mapping which is given by the pseudo inverse. Recalling the above result on surjectivity, we see that for the GDN to be injective the per region dimension must be \( S \) showing existence of the pseudo inverse.

C.6. Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. The proof is straightforward from the used definition of disentanglement. In fact, recall that we aim to have \( \langle G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d), G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d') \rangle \approx 0 \). In our case, consider only small transformation such that \( z + \epsilon d \) and \( z + \epsilon d' \) remain the in the same region \( \omega \) in which was \( z \). Then it is clear that for any positive constant \( \epsilon \) fulfilling this condition, the above disentanglement definition translates into
\[
\langle G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d), G(z) - G(z + \epsilon d') \rangle \approx 0 \iff \langle [A_\omega]_{,d}, [A_\omega]_{,d'} \rangle \approx 0,
\]
This gives a necessary condition which is not sufficient as this alone does not guarantee that each dimension of the latent space only impacts a single transformation of the output. But a disentangled representation must have near orthogonal columns for the slope matrices \( A_\omega \).

C.7. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. First, notice that \( P(A_\omega) = A_\omega (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} A_\omega^T \) defines a projection matrix. In fact, we have that
\[
P(A_\omega)^2 = A_\omega (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} A_\omega^T A_\omega (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} A_\omega^T
= A_\omega (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} A_\omega^T
= P(A_\omega)
\]
and we have that \( (A_\omega^T A_\omega)^{-1} \) is well defined as we assume injectivity (\( \text{rank}(A_\omega) = S \)) making the \( S \times S \) matrix \( A_\omega^T A_\omega \) full rank. Now it is clear that this projection matrix maps an arbitrary point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^D \) to the affine subspace \( G(\omega) \) up to the bias shift. As we are interested in the angle between two adjacent subspaces \( G(\omega) \) and \( G(\omega') \) it is also clear that the biases (which do not change the angle) can be omitted. Hence the task simplifies to finding the angle between \( P(A_\omega) \) and \( P(A_{\omega'}) \). This can be done by means of the greatest principal angle (proof can be found in Stewart (1973)) with the result being \( \sin \left( \theta(G(\omega), G(\omega')) \right) = \| P(A_\omega) - P(A_{\omega'}) \|_2 \) as desired.

C.8. Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. In the special case of an affine transform of the coordinate given by the matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D} \) the well known result from demonstrates that the change of volume is given by \( | \text{det}(A) | \) (see Theorem 7.26 in (7)). However in our case the mapping is a rectangular matrix as we span an affine subspace in the ambient space \( \mathbb{R}^D \) making \( | \text{det}(A) | \) not defined. However by applying Sard’s theorem (7) we obtain that the change of volume from the region \( \omega \) to the affine subspace \( G(\omega) \) is given by \( \sqrt{\text{det}(A^T A)} \) which can also be written as follows with \( USVT \) the svd-decomposition of the matrix \( A \):
\[
\sqrt{\text{det}(A^T A)} = \sqrt{\text{det}((USVT)^T USVT)} = \sqrt{\text{det}((VSTU^T)(USVT))}
\]
\[
= \sqrt{\det(VS^T SV)}
= \sqrt{\det(STS)}
= \prod_{i : \sigma_i \neq 0} \sigma_i(A)
\]

C.9. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. We will be doing the change of variables \( z = (A^T_\omega A_\omega)^{-1} A^T_\omega (x - b_\omega) = A^+_\omega (x - b_\omega) \), also notice that \( J^{-1}_G(x) = A^+ \). First, we know that \( P_G(x \in w) = P_z(z \in G^{-1}(w)) = \int_{G^{-1}(w)} p_z(z)dz \) which is well defined based on our full rank assumptions. We then proceed by

\[
P_G(x \in w) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{\omega \cap w} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \sqrt{\det(JG^{-1}(x)^T JG^{-1}(x))} dx
= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{\omega \cap w} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \sqrt{\det((A^+_\omega)^T A^+_\omega)} dx
= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{\omega \cap w} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) (\prod_{i : \sigma_i(A^+_\omega) > 0} \sigma_i(A^+_\omega)) dx \quad \text{Etape 1}
\]

Let now prove the Etape 1 step by proving that \( \sigma_i(A^+) = (\sigma_i(A))^{-1} \) where we lighten notations as \( A := A_\omega \) and \( USV^T \) is the svd-decomposition of \( A \):

\[
A^+ = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T = ((USV^T)^T (USV^T))^{-1} (USV^T)^T = (VS^T U)^{-1} (VS^T U)^T = (VS^T SV)^{-1} V S^T U
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \sigma_i(A^+) = (\sigma_i(A))^{-1}
\]

with the above it is direct to see that \( \sqrt{\det((A^+_\omega)^T A^+_\omega)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(A^T_\omega A_\omega)}} \) as follows

\[
\sqrt{\det((A^+_\omega)^T A^+_\omega)} = \prod_{i : \sigma_i \neq 0} \sigma_i(A^+_\omega) = \prod_{i : \sigma_i \neq 0} \sigma_i(A_\omega)^{-1} = \left( \prod_{i : \sigma_i \neq 0} \sigma_i(A_\omega) \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(A^T_\omega A_\omega)}}
\]

which gives the desired result. \( \square \)
C.10. Proof of Cor. 1

Proof. The derivation of the Entropy will consist in rewriting the Entropy w.r.t. the distribution in the output space of the GDN and performing the change of coordinates leveraging the above result to finally obtain the desired result as follows:

\[ E(p_G) = - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} p_G(x) \log(p_G(x)) dx \]

\[ = - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log \left( p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \]

\[ = - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(p_z(G^{-1}(x))) + \log \left( \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right) \]

\[ = - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \log \left( \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \]

\[ = E(p_z) \quad (\text{apply the change of coordinate } z = G(x)) \]

\[ = E(p_z) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(z \in \omega) \log \left( \det(A^T \omega A_\omega) \right) \quad (\text{apply the change of coordinate } z = G(x)) \]

which gives the desired result. For a complete review of integrals on manifold please see (Cover & Thomas, 2012).

C.11. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. For very small \( N \) it is clear than in general, even if \( S < S^* \), the memorization capacity of the generator will be s.t. it can fit through those points. Just imagine a couple of points sampled from a 2D linear manifold, even though \( S = 1 \), the GDN can go through those two points and thus have \( E^* = 0 \) for \( N = 2 \). We now consider the case where \( N \) is large enough. Two cases have to be studied.

- Case \( S < S^* \): if \( S < S^* \), the generated manifold can never be dense in the true linear manifold. This means that the newly introduced point will almost surely not lie in the span of the current generated manifold. Thus, \( E^*(N + 1) > E^*(N) \).

- Case \( S \geq S^* \): in that case, it is clear that there always exist a setting of the parameters \( \Theta \) s.t. the DGN spans the linear manifold. For example if using ReLU, consider any weights for the first \( L - 1 \) layers s.t. the ReLU are always “on” and use the last layer affine mapping to rotate and translate the affine subspace to the true one. That is, \( E^*(N) = 0, \forall N > 0 \).

The above demonstrates how for the simplest target manifold (linear) an too narrow DN leading to \( S < S^* \) will have a training error \( E^* \) increasing with \( N \) or 0 if \( S \geq S^* \) for any \( N \).

C.12. Proof of Corollary 2

Proof. First, by applying the above results on the general density formula and setting \( p_z \) a standard Normal distribution we obtain that

\[ p_G(x \in w) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} 1_{x \in G(\omega)} p_z(G^{-1}(x)) \det(A^T \omega A_\omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx \]

\[ = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} 1_{x \in G(\omega)} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{S/2} \sqrt{\det(A^T \omega A_\omega)}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|G^{-1}(x)\|^2_2} dx \]

\[ = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_{G(\omega)} 1_{x \in G(\omega)} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{S/2} \sqrt{\det(A^T \omega A_\omega)}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (w + (A^T \omega A_\omega) x - b)^T (A^T \omega A_\omega) (w + (A^T \omega A_\omega) x - b)} dx \]
As opposed to the Dropout case which applies the binary noise onto the feature maps \( W \), the \( \ell \)-th layer of the network, making the mapping noise become

\[
\ell \cdot G(z) = \left( \prod_{\ell=L}^{1} \text{diag}(q_\ell)(W_\ell \odot R_\ell) \right) z + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \left( \prod_{\ell'=\ell}^{\ell+1} \text{diag}(q_{\ell'}) (W_{\ell'} \odot R_{\ell'}) \right) b_\ell,
\]

where the binary noise matrices are denoted by \( R_\ell \). Despite this change of noise application, the exact same result applies and Prop. 3 also holds. That is the dropconnect equipped GDN becomes a mixture of GDNs with varying dimensions and parameters. Notice however that dropconnect will be less likely to reduce the ablated generator dimension as opposed to dropout due to its application on each entry of the weight matrix as opposed to an entire row at a time as depicted in Fig. 2.
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