

A Note on the Global Convergence of Multilayer Neural Networks in the Mean Field Regime

Huy Tuan Pham^{*} and Phan-Minh Nguyen^{†‡}

November 26, 2021

Abstract

In a recent work, we introduced a rigorous framework to describe the mean field limit of the gradient-based learning dynamics of multilayer neural networks, based on the idea of a neuronal embedding. There we also proved a global convergence guarantee for three-layer (as well as two-layer) networks using this framework.

In this companion note, we point out that the insights in our previous work can be readily extended to prove a global convergence guarantee for multilayer networks of any depths. Unlike our previous three-layer global convergence guarantee that assumes i.i.d. initializations, our present result applies to a type of correlated initialization. This initialization allows to, at any finite training time, propagate a certain universal approximation property through the depth of the neural network. To achieve this effect, we introduce a bidirectional diversity condition.

1 Introduction

The mean field (MF) regime refers to a newly discovered scaling regime, in which as the width tends to infinity, the behavior of an appropriately scaled neural network under training converges to a well-defined and nonlinear dynamical limit. The MF limit has been investigated for two-layer networks [MMN18, CB18, RVE18, SS18] as well as multilayer setups [Ngu19, AOY19, SS19, NP20].

In a recent work [NP20], we introduced a framework to describe the MF limit of multilayer neural networks under training and proved a connection between a large-width network and its MF limit. Underlying this framework is the idea of a neuronal embedding that encapsulates neural networks of arbitrary sizes. Using this framework, we showed in [NP20] global convergence guarantees for two-layer and three-layer neural networks. It is worth noting that although these global convergence results were proven in the context of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) initializations, the framework is not restricted to initializations of this type. In [NP20], it was also proven that when there are more than three layers, i.i.d. initializations (with zero initial biases) can cause a certain strong simplifying effect, which we believe to be undesirable in general. This clarifies a phenomenon that was first discovered in [AOY19].

The present note complements our previous work [NP20]. Our main task here is to show that the approach in [NP20] can be readily extended to prove a similar global convergence guarantee for neural networks of any number of layers. We however do not assume i.i.d. initializations. Our result applies to a type of correlated initialization and the analysis crucially relies on the ‘neuronal embedding’ framework. As such, our result realizes the vision in [Ngu19] of a MF limit that does not exhibit the aforementioned simplifying effect. Furthermore our result cannot be established by the formulations in [AOY19, SS19] which are specific to i.i.d. initializations.

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Stanford University.

[†]Department of Electrical Engineering, Stanford University.

[‡]The author ordering is randomized.

Similar to the global convergence guarantees in [NP20] and unlike other works, our result does not rely critically on convexity and instead emphasizes on certain universal approximation properties of neural networks. To be precise, the key is a diversity condition, which is shown to hold at any finite training time. The insight on diversity first appeared in the work [CB18]: in the context of two-layer networks, it refers to the full support condition of the first layer’s weight in the Euclidean space. Our previous work [NP20] partially hinged on the same insight to analyze three-layer networks. Here our present result defines a new notion of diversity in the context of general multilayer networks. Firstly, it is realized in function spaces that are naturally described by the ‘neuronal embedding’ framework. Secondly, it is bidirectional: roughly speaking, for intermediate layers, diversity holds in both the forward and backward passes. The effect of bidirectional diversity is that a certain universal approximation property, at any finite training time, is propagated from the first layer to the second last one.

Organization. We first describe the multilayer setup and the MF limit in Section 2 to make the note self-contained. Our main result of global convergence (Theorem 2) is presented and proven in Section 3. This result is proven for the MF limit. Lastly Section 4 connects the result to large-width multilayer networks.

Since the emphasis here is on the global convergence result, to keep the note concise, other results are stated with proofs omitted, since they can be found or established in a similar manner to [NP20].

Notations. We use K to denote a generic constant that may change from line to line. We use $|\cdot|$ to denote the absolute value for a scalar, the Euclidean norm for a vector, and the respective norm for an element of a Banach space. For an integer n , we let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We write $\text{cl}(S)$ to denote the closure of a set S in a topological space.

2 Multilayer neural networks and the mean field limit

2.1 Multilayer neural network

We consider the following L -layer network:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{y}}(x; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \varphi_L(\mathbf{H}_L(x, 1; \mathbf{W}(k))), \\ \mathbf{H}_i(x, j_i; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \frac{1}{n_{i-1}} \sum_{j_{i-1}=1}^{n_{i-1}} \mathbf{w}_i(k, j_{i-1}, j_i) \varphi_{i-1}(\mathbf{H}_{i-1}(x, j_{i-1}; \mathbf{W}(k))), \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ \mathbf{H}_1(x, j_1; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \langle \mathbf{w}_1(k, j_1), x \rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

in which $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the input, $\mathbf{W}(k) = \{\mathbf{w}_1(k, \cdot), \mathbf{w}_i(k, \cdot, \cdot) : i = 2, \dots, L\}$ is the weight with $\mathbf{w}_1(k, j_1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{w}_i(k, j_{i-1}, j_i) \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the activation. Here the network has widths $\{n_i\}_{i \leq L}$ with $n_L = 1$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the time, i.e. we shall let the network evolve in (discrete) time.

We train the network with stochastic gradient descent (SGD) w.r.t. the loss $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We assume that at each time k , we draw independently a fresh sample $z(k) = (x(k), y(k)) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ from a training distribution \mathcal{P} . Given an initialization $\mathbf{W}(0)$, we update $\mathbf{W}(k)$ according to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{w}_i(k+1, j_{i-1}, j_i) &= \mathbf{w}_i(k, j_{i-1}, j_i) - \epsilon \xi_i(t\epsilon) \Delta_i^{\mathbf{w}}(z(k), j_{i-1}, j_i; \mathbf{W}(k)), \quad i = 2, \dots, L, \\ \mathbf{w}_1(k+1, j_1) &= \mathbf{w}_1(k, j_1) - \epsilon \xi_1(t\epsilon) \Delta_1^{\mathbf{w}}(z(k), j_1; \mathbf{W}(k)),\end{aligned}$$

in which $j_i \in [n_i]$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the learning rate, $\xi_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the learning rate schedule for \mathbf{w}_i , and

for $z = (x, y)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_L^{\mathbf{H}}(z, 1; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \partial_2 \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{\mathbf{y}}(x; \mathbf{W}(k))) \varphi'_L(\mathbf{H}_L(x, 1; \mathbf{W}(k))), \\ \Delta_{i-1}^{\mathbf{H}}(z, j_{i-1}; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j_i=1}^{n_i} \Delta_i^{\mathbf{H}}(z, j_i; \mathbf{W}(k)) \mathbf{w}_i(k, j_{i-1}, j_i) \varphi'_{i-1}(\mathbf{H}_{i-1}(x, j_{i-1}; \mathbf{W}(k))), \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ \Delta_i^{\mathbf{W}}(z, j_{i-1}, j_i; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \Delta_i^{\mathbf{H}}(z, j_i; \mathbf{W}(k)) \varphi_{i-1}(\mathbf{H}_{i-1}(x, j_{i-1}; \mathbf{W}(k))), \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ \Delta_1^{\mathbf{W}}(z, j_1; \mathbf{W}(k)) &= \Delta_1^{\mathbf{H}}(z, j_1; \mathbf{W}(k)) x.\end{aligned}$$

In short, for an initialization $\mathbf{W}(0)$, we obtain an SGD trajectory $\mathbf{W}(k)$ of an L -layer network with size $\{n_i\}_{i \leq L}$.

2.2 Mean field limit

The MF limit is a continuous-time infinite-width analog of the neural network under training. We first recall from [NP20] the concept of a neuronal ensemble. Given a product probability space $(\Omega, P) = \prod_{i=1}^L (\Omega_i, P_i)$ with $\Omega_L = \{1\}$, we independently sample $C_i \sim P_i$, $i = 1, \dots, L$. In the following, we use \mathbb{E}_{C_i} to denote the expectation w.r.t. the random variable $C_i \sim P_i$ and c_i to denote a dummy variable $c_i \in \Omega_i$. The space (Ω, P) is called a neuronal ensemble.

Given a neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) , the MF limit is described by a time-evolving system with parameter $W(t)$, where the time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $W(t) = \{w_1(t, \cdot), w_i(t, \cdot, \cdot) : i = 2, \dots, L\}$ with $w_1 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $w_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega_{i-1} \times \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. It entails the quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y}(x; W(t)) &= \varphi_L(H_L(x, 1; W(t))), \\ H_i(x, c_i; W(t)) &= \mathbb{E}_{C_{i-1}}[w_i(t, C_{i-1}, c_i) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(x, C_{i-1}; W(t)))], \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ H_1(x, c_1; W(t)) &= \langle w_1(t, c_1), x \rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

The MF limit evolves according to a continuous-time dynamics, described by a system of ODEs, which we refer to as the MF ODEs. Specifically, given an initialization $W(0) = \{w_1(0, \cdot), w_i(0, \cdot, \cdot) : i = 2, \dots, L\}$, the dynamics solves:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_i(t, c_{i-1}, c_i) &= -\xi_i(t) \mathbb{E}_Z[\Delta_i^{\mathbf{W}}(Z, c_{i-1}, c_i; W(t))], \quad i = 2, \dots, L, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_1(t, c_1) &= -\xi_1(t) \mathbb{E}_Z[\Delta_1^{\mathbf{W}}(Z, c_1; W(t))].\end{aligned}$$

Here $c_i \in \Omega_i$, \mathbb{E}_Z denotes the expectation w.r.t. the data $Z = (X, Y) \sim \mathcal{P}$, and for $z = (x, y)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_L^{\mathbf{H}}(z, 1; W(t)) &= \partial_2 \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}(x; W(t))) \varphi'_L(H_L(x, 1; W(t))), \\ \Delta_{i-1}^{\mathbf{H}}(z, c_{i-1}; W(t)) &= \mathbb{E}_{C_i}[\Delta_i^{\mathbf{H}}(z, C_i; W(t)) w_i(t, c_{i-1}, C_i) \varphi'_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(x, c_{i-1}; W(t)))], \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ \Delta_i^{\mathbf{W}}(z, c_{i-1}, c_i; W(t)) &= \Delta_i^{\mathbf{H}}(z, c_i; W(t)) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(x, c_{i-1}; W(t))), \quad i = L, \dots, 2, \\ \Delta_1^{\mathbf{W}}(z, c_1; W(t)) &= \Delta_1^{\mathbf{H}}(z, c_1; W(t)) x.\end{aligned}$$

In short, given a neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) , for each initialization $W(0)$, we have defined a MF limit $W(t)$.

3 Convergence to global optima

3.1 Main result: global convergence

To measure the learning quality, we consider the loss averaged over the data $Z \sim \mathcal{P}$:

$$\mathcal{L}(F) = \mathbb{E}_Z[\mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; F))],$$

where $F = \{f_i : i = 1, \dots, L\}$ a set of measurable functions $f_1 : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $f_i : \Omega_{i-1} \times \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 2, \dots, L$.

We also recall the concept of a neuronal embedding from [NP20]. Formally, in the present context, it is a tuple $(\Omega, P, \{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L})$, comprising of a neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) and a set of measurable functions $\{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L}$ in which $w_1^0 : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $w_i^0 : \Omega_{i-1} \times \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 2, \dots, L$. The neuronal embedding connects a finite-width neural network and its MF limit, via their initializations which are specified by $\{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L}$. We shall revisit this connection later in Section 4. In the following, we focus on the analysis of the MF limit.

Assumption 1. Consider a neuronal embedding $(\Omega, P, \{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L})$, recalling $\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^L \Omega_i$ and $P = \prod_{i=1}^L P_i$ with $\Omega_L = \{1\}$. Consider the MF limit associated with the neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) with initialization $W(0)$ such that $w_1(0, \cdot) = w_1^0(\cdot)$ and $w_i(0, \cdot, \cdot) = w_i^0(\cdot, \cdot)$. We make the following assumptions:

1. *Regularity:* We assume that

- φ_i is K -bounded for $1 \leq i \leq L-1$, φ'_i is K -bounded and K -Lipschitz for $1 \leq i \leq L$, and φ'_L is non-zero everywhere,
- $\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is K -Lipschitz in the second variable and K -bounded,
- $|X| \leq K$ with probability 1,
- ξ_i is K -bounded and K -Lipschitz for $1 \leq i \leq L$,
- $\sup_{k \geq 1} k^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[|w_1^0(C_1)|^k \right]^{1/k} \leq K$ and $\sup_{k \geq 1} k^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[|w_i^0(C_{i-1}, C_i)|^k \right]^{1/k} \leq K$ for $i = 2, \dots, L$.

2. *Diversity:* The functions $\{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L}$ satisfy that

- $\text{supp}(w_1^0(C_1), w_2^0(C_1, \cdot)) = \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$,
- $\text{supp}(w_i^0(\cdot, C_i), w_{i+1}^0(C_i, \cdot)) = L^2(P_{i-1}) \times L^2(P_{i+1})$ for $i = 2, \dots, L-1$.

(Remark: we write $w_i^0(\cdot, C_i)$ to denote the random mapping $c_{i-1} \mapsto w_i^0(c_{i-1}, C_i)$, and similar for $w_{i+1}^0(C_i, \cdot)$.)

3. *Convergence:* There exist limits $\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}$ such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|w_i(t, C_{i-1}, C_i) - \bar{w}_i(C_{i-1}, C_i)| \prod_{j=i+1}^L |\bar{w}_j(C_{j-1}, C_j)| \right] &\rightarrow 0, \quad i = 2, \dots, L, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[|w_1(t, C_1) - \bar{w}_1(C_1)| \prod_{j=2}^L |\bar{w}_j(C_{j-1}, C_j)| \right] &\rightarrow 0, \\ \text{ess-sup} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_L(t, C_{L-1}, 1) \right| &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

(Here we take $\prod_{j=i+1}^L = 1$ for $i = L$.)

4. *Universal approximation:* The set $\{\varphi_1(\langle u, \cdot \rangle) : u \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ has dense span in $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ (the space of square integrable functions w.r.t. the measure \mathcal{P}_X , which is the distribution of the input X). Furthermore, for each $i = 2, \dots, L-1$, φ_i is non-obstructive in the sense that the set $\{\varphi_i \circ f : f \in L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)\}$ has dense span in $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$.

The first assumption can be satisfied for several common setups and loss functions. The third assumption, similar to [CB18, NP20], is technical and sets the focus on settings where the MF dynamics converges with time, although we note it is an assumption on the mode of convergence only and not on the limits $\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}$. The fourth assumption is natural and can be satisfied by common activations. For example, φ_i

can be \tanh for $i = 1, \dots, L - 1$. In general, for a bounded and continuous φ_i to be non-obstructive, it suffices that φ_i is not a constant function. The second assumption is new: it refers to an initialization scheme that introduces correlation among the weights. In particular, i.i.d. initializations do not satisfy this assumption for $L \geq 3$.

Theorem 1. *Given any neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) and a set of functions $\{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L}$ such that the regularity assumption listed in Assumption 1 is satisfied, and given an initialization $W(0)$ such that $w_1(0, \cdot) = w_1^0(\cdot)$ and $w_i(0, \cdot, \cdot) = w_i^0(\cdot, \cdot)$, there exists a unique solution W to the MF ODEs on $t \in [0, \infty)$.*

This theorem can be proven in a similar manner to [NP20, Theorem 3], so we will not show the complete proof here. The main focus is on the global convergence result, which we state next.

Theorem 2. *Consider a neuronal embedding $(\Omega, P, \{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L})$ and the MF limit as in Assumption 1. Assume $\xi_L(\cdot) = 1$. Then:*

- *Case 1 (convex loss): If \mathcal{L} is convex in the second variable, then $\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}$ is a global minimizer of \mathcal{L} :*

$$\mathcal{L}(\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) = \inf_F \mathcal{L}(F) = \inf_{\tilde{y}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{L}(Y, \tilde{y}(X))].$$

- *Case 2 (generic non-negative loss): Suppose that $\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}) = 0$ implies $\mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}) = 0$. If $y = y(x)$ is a function of x , then $\mathcal{L}(\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) = 0$.*

The assumptions here are similar to those made in [NP20]. We remark on a special difference. In [NP20], the diversity assumption refers to a full support condition of the first layer's weight only. Here our diversity assumptions refers to a certain full support condition for all layers. At a closer look, the condition is in the function space and reflects certain *bidirectional diversity*. In particular, this assumption implies both $w_i^0(\cdot, C_i)$ and $w_i^0(C_{i-1}, \cdot)$ have full supports in $L^2(P_{i-1})$ and $L^2(P_i)$ respectively (which we shall refer to as *forward diversity* and *backward diversity*, respectively), for $2 \leq i \leq L - 1$.

The proof proceeds with several insights that have already appeared in [NP20]. The novelty of our present analysis lies in the use of the aforementioned bidirectional diversity. To clarify the point, let us give a brief high-level idea of the proof. At time t sufficiently large, we expect to have:

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_L(t, c_{L-1}, 1) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_Z [\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; W(t))) \varphi'_L(H_L(X, 1; W(t))) \varphi_{L-1}(H_{L-1}(X, c_{L-1}; W(t)))] \right| \approx 0$$

for P_{L-1} -almost every c_{L-1} . If the set of mappings $x \mapsto H_{L-1}(x, c_{L-1}; W(t))$, indexed by c_{L-1} , is diverse in the sense that $\text{supp}(H_{L-1}(\cdot, c_{L-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$, then since φ_{L-1} is non-obstructive, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_Z [\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; W(t))) | X = x] \varphi'_L(H_L(x, 1; W(t))) \approx 0$$

and consequently

$$\mathbb{E}_Z [\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; W(t))) | X = x] \approx 0$$

for \mathcal{P}_X -almost every x . The desired conclusion then follows.

Hence the crux of the proof is to show that $\text{supp}(H_{L-1}(\cdot, c_{L-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. In fact, we show that this holds for any finite time $t \geq 0$. This follows if we can prove the forward diversity property of the weights, in which $w_i(t, \cdot, C_i)$ has full support in $L^2(P_{i-1})$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $2 \leq i \leq L - 1$, and a similar property for $w_1(t, C_1)$. Interestingly to that end, we actually show that bidirectional diversity, and hence both forward diversity and backward diversity, hold at any time $t \geq 0$, even though we only need forward diversity for our purpose.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1: Diversity of the weights. We show that $\text{supp}(w_1(t, C_1)) = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\text{supp}(w_i(t, \cdot, C_i)) = L^2(P_{i-1})$ for $i = 2, \dots, L-1$, for any $t \geq 0$. We do so by showing a stronger statement, that the following bidirectional diversity condition holds at any finite training time:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(w_1(t, C_1), w_2(t, C_1, \cdot)) &= \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2), \\ \text{supp}(w_i(t, \cdot, C_i), w_{i+1}(t, C_i, \cdot)) &= L^2(P_{i-1}) \times L^2(P_{i+1}), \quad i = 2, \dots, L-1, \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \geq 0$.

We prove the first statement. Given a MF trajectory $(W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and $u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $u_2 \in L^2(P_2)$, we consider the following flow on $\mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_2^+(t, c_2; u) &= -\xi_2(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_2^H(Z, c_2; W(t)) \varphi_1(\langle a_1^+(t; u), X \rangle)], \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_1^+(t; u) &= -\xi_1(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathbb{E}_{C_2} [\Delta_2^H(Z, C_2; W(t)) a_2^+(t, C_2; u)] \varphi_1'(\langle a_1^+(t; u), X \rangle) X], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for $u = (u_1, u_2)$, with the initialization $a_1^+(0; u) = u_1$ and $a_2^+(0, c_2; u) = u_2(c_2)$. Existence and uniqueness of (a_1^+, a_2^+) follows similarly to Theorem 1. We next prove for all finite $T > 0$ and $u^+ = (u_1^+, u_2^+) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$, there exists $u^- = (u_1^-, u_2^-) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$ such that

$$a_1^+(T; u^-) = u_1^+, \quad a_2^+(T, \cdot; u^-) = u_2^+.$$

We consider the following auxiliary dynamics on $\mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_2^-(t, c_2; u) &= \xi_2(T-t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_2^H(Z, c_2; W(T-t)) \varphi_1(\langle a_1^-(t; u), X \rangle)], \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_1^-(t; u) &= \xi_1(T-t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathbb{E}_{C_2} [\Delta_2^H(Z, C_2; W(T-t)) a_2^-(t, C_2; u)] \varphi_1'(\langle a_1^-(t; u), X \rangle) X], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

initialized at $a_1^-(0; u) = u_1$ and $a_2^-(0, c_2; u) = u_2(c_2)$, for $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$. Existence and uniqueness of (a_1^-, a_2^-) follow similarly to Theorem 1. Observe that the pair

$$\tilde{a}_1^-(t) = a_1^-(T-t; u^+), \quad \tilde{a}_2^-(t, c_2) = a_2^-(T-t, c_2; u^+)$$

solves the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{a}_2^-(t, c_2) &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_2^-(T-t, c_2; u^+) = -\xi_2(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_2^H(Z, c_2; W(t)) \varphi_1(\langle \tilde{a}_1^-(t), X \rangle)], \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{a}_1^-(t) &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_1^-(T-t; u^+) = -\xi_1(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathbb{E}_{C_2} [\Delta_2^H(Z, C_2; W(t)) \tilde{a}_2^-(t, C_2)] \varphi_1'(\langle \tilde{a}_1^-(t), X \rangle) X], \end{aligned}$$

initialized at $\tilde{a}_2^-(0, c_2) = a_2^-(T, c_2; u^+)$ and $\tilde{a}_1^-(0) = a_1^-(T; u^+)$. Thus, by uniqueness of the solution to the ODE (3), $(\tilde{a}_1^-, \tilde{a}_2^-)$ forms a solution of the ODE (3) initialized at

$$\tilde{a}_1^-(0) = a_1^-(T; u^+), \quad \tilde{a}_2^-(0, c_2) = a_2^-(T, c_2; u^+).$$

In particular, the solution $(\tilde{a}_1^-, \tilde{a}_2^-)$ of the ODE (3) with this initialization satisfies

$$\tilde{a}_1^-(T) = a_1^-(0; u^+) = u_1^+, \quad \tilde{a}_2^-(T, \cdot) = a_2^-(0, \cdot; u^+) = u_2^+.$$

Let $u_1^- = a_1^-(T; u^+)$ and $u_2^- = a_2^-(T, \cdot; u^+)$. Then we have $a_1^+(T; u^-) = u_1^+$ and $a_2^+(T, \cdot; u^-) = u_2^+$ as desired.

Using this, by continuity of the map $u \mapsto (a_1^+(T; u), a_2^+(T, \cdot; u))$, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a neighborhood U of u^- such that for any $u \in U$, $|(a_1^+(T; u), a_2^+(T, \cdot; u)) - u^+| \leq \epsilon$. Notice that the MF trajectory $W(t)$ satisfies

$$w_1(t, c_1) = a_1^+(t; w_1(0, c_1), w_2(0, c_1, \cdot)), \quad w_2(t, c_1, \cdot) = a_2^+(t, \cdot; w_1(0, c_1), w_2(0, c_1, \cdot)).$$

Then since $(w_1(0, C_1), w_2(0, C_1, \cdot))$ has full support in $\mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$, for any finite $T > 0$, we have $(w_1(T, C_1), w_2(T, C_1, \cdot))$ has full support in $\mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(P_2)$, proving the first statement.

The other statements can be proven similarly by considering the following pairs of flows on $L^2(P_{i-1}) \times L^2(P_{i+1})$, for $u = (u_1, u_2) \in L^2(P_{i-1}) \times L^2(P_{i+1})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_i^+(t, c_{i-1}; u) &= -\xi_i(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_i^a(Z, a_i^+(t, \cdot; u), a_{i+1}^+(t, \cdot; u); W(t)) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(X, c_{i-1}; W(t)))] , \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_{i+1}^+(t, c_{i+1}; u) &= -\xi_{i+1}(t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_{i+1}^H(Z, c_{i+1}; W(t)) \varphi_i(H_i^a(Z, a_i^+(t, \cdot; u); W(t)))] ,\end{aligned}$$

initialized at $a_i^+(0, c_{i-1}; u) = u_1(c_{i-1})$ and $a_{i+1}^+(0, c_{i+1}; u) = u_2(c_{i+1})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_i^-(t, c_{i-1}; u) &= \xi_i(T-t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_i^a(Z, a_i^-(t, \cdot; u), a_{i+1}^-(t, \cdot; u); W(T-t)) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(X, c_{i-1}; W(T-t)))] , \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_{i+1}^-(t, c_{i+1}; u) &= \xi_{i+1}(T-t) \mathbb{E}_Z [\Delta_{i+1}^H(Z, c_{i+1}; W(T-t)) \varphi_i(H_i^a(Z, a_i^-(t, \cdot; u); W(T-t)))] ,\end{aligned}$$

initialized at $a_i^-(0, c_{i-1}; u) = u_1(c_{i-1})$ and $a_{i+1}^-(0, c_{i+1}; u) = u_2(c_{i+1})$, in which we define:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_i^a(z, f, g; W(t)) &= \mathbb{E}_{C_{i+1}} [\Delta_{i+1}^H(z, C_{i+1}; W(t)) g(C_{i+1}) \varphi'_i(H_i^a(z, f; W(t)))] , \\ H_i^a(z, f; W(t)) &= \mathbb{E}_{C_{i-1}} [f(C_{i-1}) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(x, C_{i-1}; W(t)))] ,\end{aligned}$$

for $f \in L^2(P_{i-1})$ and $g \in L^2(P_{i+1})$.

Step 2: Diversity of the pre-activations. We show that $\text{supp}(H_i(\cdot, C_i; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ for any $t \geq 0$, for $i = 2, \dots, L-1$ by induction.

Firstly consider the base case $i = 2$. Recall that

$$H_2(x, c_2; W(t)) = \mathbb{E}_{C_1} [w_2(t, C_1, c_2) \varphi_1(\langle w_1(t, C_1), x \rangle)] \equiv \mathcal{H}_2(t, x, w_2(t, \cdot, c_2)).$$

Observe that the set $\text{cl}(\{\mathcal{H}_2(t, \cdot, f) : f \in L^2(P_1)\})$ is a closed linear subspace of $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. Hence this set is equal to $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ if it has dense span in $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$, which we show now. Indeed, suppose that for some $g \in L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ such that $|g| \neq 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}_Z [g(X) \mathcal{H}_2(t, X, f)] = 0$ for all $f \in L^2(P_1)$. Equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}_{C_1} [f(C_1) \mathbb{E}_Z [g(X) \varphi_1(\langle w_1(t, C_1), X \rangle)]] = 0,$$

for all $f \in L^2(P_1)$. As such, for P_1 -almost every c_1 ,

$$\mathbb{E}_Z [g(X) \varphi_1(\langle w_1(t, c_1), X \rangle)] = 0.$$

Since $\text{supp}(w_1(t, C_1)) = \mathbb{R}^d$ and that the mapping $u \mapsto \varphi_1(\langle u, x \rangle)$ is continuous, by the universal approximation assumption for φ_1 , we then obtain $g(x) = 0$ for P_X -almost every x , which is a contradiction. We have thus proved that $\text{cl}(\{\mathcal{H}_2(t, \cdot, f) : f \in L^2(P_1)\}) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. Note that $f \mapsto \mathcal{H}_2(t, x, f)$ is continuous, and $\text{supp}(w_2(t, \cdot, C_2)) = L^2(P_1)$, we then have $\text{supp}(H_2(\cdot, C_2; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ as desired.

Now let us assume that $\text{supp}(H_{i-1}(\cdot, C_{i-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ for some $i \geq 3$ (the induction hypothesis). We would like to show $\text{supp}(H_i(\cdot, C_i; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. This is similar to the base case. In particular, recall that

$$H_i(x, c_i; W(t)) = \mathbb{E}_{C_{i-1}} [w_i(t, C_{i-1}, c_i) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(x, C_{i-1}; W(t)))] \equiv \mathcal{H}_i(t, x, w_i(t, \cdot, c_i)).$$

Now suppose that for some $g \in L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ such that $|g| \neq 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}_Z [g(X) \mathcal{H}_i(t, X, f)] = 0$ for all $f \in L^2(P_{i-1})$. Then, for P_{i-1} -almost every c_{i-1} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_Z [g(X) \varphi_{i-1}(H_{i-1}(X, c_{i-1}; W(t)))] = 0.$$

Recall the induction hypothesis $\text{supp}(H_{i-1}(\cdot, C_{i-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. Since φ_{i-1} is non-obstructive and continuous, we obtain $g(x) = 0$ for P_X -almost every x , which is a contradiction. Therefore the set $\text{cl}(\{\mathcal{H}_i(t, \cdot, f) : f \in L^2(P_{i-1})\})$ has dense span in $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$, and again, this implies it is equal to $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. Since $f \mapsto \mathcal{H}_i(t, x, f)$ is continuous and $\text{supp}(w_i(t, \cdot, C_i)) = L^2(P_{i-1})$, we have $\text{supp}(H_i(\cdot, C_i; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$.

Step 3: Concluding. Let $\mathbb{E}_Z [\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; W(t))) | X = x] \varphi'_L(H_L(x, 1; W(t))) = \mathcal{H}(x, W(t))$. From the last step, we have $\text{supp}(H_{L-1}(\cdot, C_{L-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ for any $t \geq 0$. Recall that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_L(t, c_{L-1}, 1) = -\mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{H}(X, W(t)) \varphi_{L-1}(H_{L-1}(X, c_{L-1}; W(t)))] .$$

By the convergence assumption, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $T(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for any $t \geq T(\epsilon)$, for P_{L-1} -almost every c_{L-1} ,

$$|\mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{H}(X, W(t)) \varphi_{L-1}(H_{L-1}(X, c_{L-1}; W(t)))]| \leq \epsilon .$$

We claim that $\mathcal{H}(x, W(t)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(x, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})$ in $L^1(\mathcal{P}_X)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Assuming this claim and recalling that φ_{L-1} is K -bounded by the regularity assumption, we then have that for some $T'(\epsilon) \geq T(\epsilon)$, for any $t \geq T'(\epsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess-sup} \left| \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\mathcal{H}(X, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) \varphi_{L-1}(H_{L-1}(X, C_{L-1}; W(t))) \right] \right| \\ & \leq K \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left| \mathcal{H}(X, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) - \mathcal{H}(X, W(t)) \right| \right] + \text{ess-sup} |\mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{H}(X, W(t)) \varphi_{L-1}(H_{L-1}(X, C_{L-1}; W(t)))]| \\ & \leq K\epsilon . \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp}(H_{L-1}(\cdot, C_{L-1}; W(t))) = L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$ and φ_{L-1} is continuous,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\mathcal{H}(X, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) f(X) \right] \right| \leq K\epsilon \quad \forall f \in S,$$

for $S = \{\varphi_{L-1} \circ g : g \in L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)\}$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\mathcal{H}(X, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) f(X) \right] \right| = 0 \quad \forall f \in S.$$

Furthermore, since φ_{L-1} is non-obstructive, S has dense span in $L^2(\mathcal{P}_X)$. Therefore $\mathcal{H}(x, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) = 0$ for \mathcal{P}_X -almost every x . Since φ'_L is non-zero everywhere,

$$\mathbb{E}_Z \left[\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{y}(X; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) \right] | X = x = 0$$

for \mathcal{P}_X -almost every x .

In Case 1, due to convexity of \mathcal{L} , for any measurable function \tilde{y} :

$$\mathcal{L}(y, \tilde{y}(x)) - \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}(x; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) \geq \partial_2 \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}(x; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) (\tilde{y}(x) - \hat{y}(x; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) .$$

Taking expectation, we get $\mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{L}(Y, \tilde{y}(X))] \geq \mathcal{L}(\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})$.

In Case 2, we have $\partial_2 \mathcal{L}(y(x), \hat{y}(x; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) = 0$, and hence $\mathcal{L}(y(x), \hat{y}(x; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})) = 0$, for \mathcal{P}_X -almost every x , since y is a function of x .

We are left with proving the claim that $\mathcal{H}(x, W(t)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(x, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L})$ in $L^1(\mathcal{P}_X)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. For brevity, we denote

$$\delta_i(t, x, c_i) = \left| H_i(x, c_i; W(t)) - H_i(x, c_i; \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) \right| .$$

First observe that by the regularity assumption, for $2 \leq i \leq L$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i(t, x, c_i) & \leq K \mathbb{E}_{C_{i-1}} [|w_i(t, C_{i-1}, c_i) - \bar{w}_i(C_{i-1}, c_i)| + |\bar{w}_i(C_{i-1}, c_i)| \delta_{i-1}(t, x, C_{i-1})] , \\ \delta_1(t, x, c_1) & \leq K |w_1(t, c_1) - \bar{w}_1(c_1)| . \end{aligned}$$

This thus gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left| \mathcal{H}(X, W(t)) - \mathcal{H}(X, \{\bar{w}_i\}_{i \leq L}) \right| \right] \\
& \leq K \mathbb{E}_Z [\delta_L(t, X, 1)] \\
& \leq K^L \sum_{i=2}^L \mathbb{E} \left[|w_i(t, C_{i-1}, C_i) - \bar{w}_i(C_{i-1}, C_i)| \prod_{j=i+1}^L |\bar{w}_j(C_{j-1}, C_j)| \right] \\
& \quad + K^L \mathbb{E} \left[|w_1(t, C_1) - \bar{w}_1(C_1)| \prod_{j=2}^L |\bar{w}_j(C_{j-1}, C_j)| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the convergence assumption, the right-hand side tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This proves the claim and concludes the proof. \square

4 Connection to large-width neural networks

Theorem 2 concerns with the global convergence of the MF limit. To make the connection with a finite-width neural network, we recall the neuronal embedding $(\Omega, P, \{w_i^0\}_{i \leq L})$, as well as the following coupling procedure in [NP20]:

1. We form the MF limit $W(t)$ (for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$) associated with the neuronal ensemble (Ω, P) by setting the initialization $W(0)$ to $w_1(0, \cdot) = w_1^0(\cdot)$, $w_i(0, \cdot, \cdot) = w_i^0(\cdot, \cdot)$ and running the MF ODEs described in Section 2.2.
2. We independently sample $C_i(j_i) \sim P_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, L$ and $j_i = 1, \dots, n_i$. We then form the neural network initialization $\mathbf{W}(0)$ with $\mathbf{w}_1(0, j_1) = w_1^0(C_1(j_1))$ and $\mathbf{w}_i(0, j_{i-1}, j_i) = w_i^0(C_{i-1}(j_{i-1}), C_i(j_i))$ for $j_i \in [n_i]$. We obtain the network's trajectory $\mathbf{W}(k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ as in Section 2.1, with the data $z(k)$ generated independently of $\{C_i(j_i)\}_{i \leq L}$ and hence $\mathbf{W}(0)$.

Here in our present context, the neuronal embedding forms the basis on which the finite-width neural network is realized. Furthermore the neural network and its MF limit are coupled. One can establish a result on their connection, showing that the coupled trajectories are close to each other with high probability, similar to [NP20, Theorem 10]. Together with Theorem 2, one can obtain the following result on the optimization efficiency of the neural network with SGD:

Corollary 3. *Consider the neural network (1) as described by the coupling procedure. Under the same setting as Theorem 2, in Case 1,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\{n_i\}_{i \leq L}} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{L}(Y, \hat{\mathbf{y}}(X; \mathbf{W}(\lfloor t/\epsilon \rfloor))] = \inf_F \mathcal{L}(F) = \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}} \mathbb{E}_Z [\mathcal{L}(Y, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}(X))]$$

in probability, where the limit of the widths is such that $(\min \{n_i\}_{i \leq L-1})^{-1} \log(\max \{n_i\}_{i \leq L}) \rightarrow 0$. In Case 2, the same holds with the right-hand side being 0.

References

- [AOY19] Dyego Araújo, Roberto I Oliveira, and Daniel Yukimura, *A mean-field limit for certain deep neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00193 (2019). 1
- [CB18] Lénaïc Chizat and Francis Bach, *On the global convergence of gradient descent for over-parameterized models using optimal transport*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2018, pp. 3040–3050. 1, 3.1

- [MMN18] Song Mei, Andrea Montanari, and Phan-Minh Nguyen, *A mean field view of the landscape of two-layers neural networks*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 115, 2018, pp. 7665–7671. [1](#)
- [Ngu19] Phan-Minh Nguyen, *Mean field limit of the learning dynamics of multilayer neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.02880 (2019). [1](#)
- [NP20] Phan-Minh Nguyen and Huy Tuan Pham, *A rigorous framework for the mean field limit of multilayer neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.11443 (2020). [1](#), [1](#), [2.2](#), [3.1](#), [3.1](#), [3.1](#), [3.1](#), [4](#), [4](#)
- [RVE18] Grant Rotskoff and Eric Vanden-Eijnden, *Parameters as interacting particles: long time convergence and asymptotic error scaling of neural networks*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31, 2018, pp. 7146–7155. [1](#)
- [SS18] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos, *Mean field analysis of neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.01053 (2018). [1](#)
- [SS19] ———, *Mean field analysis of deep neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.04440 (2019). [1](#)