

From deep to Shallow: Equivalent Forms of Deep Networks in Reproducing Kernel Kreĭn Space and Indefinite Support Vector Machines

Alistair Shilton, Sunil Gupta, Santu Rana, Svetha Venkatesh

Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute (A2I2)
Deakin University, Geelong, Australia
alistair.shilton@deakin.edu.au

Abstract

In this paper we explore a connection between deep networks and learning in reproducing kernel Kreĭn space. Our approach is based on the concept of push-forward - that is, taking a fixed non-linear transform on a linear projection and converting it to a linear projection on the output of a fixed non-linear transform, *pushing* the weights *forward* through the non-linearity. Applying this repeatedly from the input to the output of a deep network, the weights can be progressively “pushed” to the output layer, resulting in a flat network that has the form of a fixed non-linear map (whose form is determined by the structure of the deep network) followed by a linear projection determined by the weight matrices - that is, we take a deep network and convert it to an equivalent (indefinite) kernel machine. We then investigate the implications of this transformation for capacity control and uniform convergence, and provide a Rademacher complexity bound on the deep network in terms of Rademacher complexity in reproducing kernel Kreĭn space. Finally, we analyse the sparsity properties of the flat representation, showing that the flat weights are (effectively) L_p -“norm” regularised with $p \in (0, 1)$ (bridge regression).

1 Introduction

In machine learning, a clear distinction is often drawn between kernel methods such as support vector machines, which were overwhelmingly popular in the early-mid 2000s, and deep networks that have come to dominate the field since. Kernel methods are often characterised as elegant but limited - founded on beautiful mathematical theory (reproducing kernel Hilbert space etc), and intuitive (max-margin in feature space, geometric interpretation of support vectors etc), but inflexible and incapable of scaling to the needs of big-data - while deep networks are characterised as utilitarian but superior in terms of performance, scalability, and flexibility. So deep networks now dominate in many areas, while kernel methods survive in niche applications.

An argument often made to explain the superior expressive power and performance of deep networks is the apparent complexity (and hence capacity) of such networks. Kernel methods learn a linear relation in a feature space, with all nonlinearity contained in the fixed map from input space to feature space; while deep networks are built from many layers of non-linearity interspersed with linear maps (weight

matrices). Thus it may appear that (a) there is little or no crossover between the two methods, and (b) that deep networks are naturally more flexible and expressive.

In this paper we show that the distinction is not clear-cut. In particular, a large family of deep networks can be precisely represented as single-layer networks of the SVM type - single-layer networks consisting of a fixed non-linear layer (a feature map encoded by a Kreĭn kernel) followed by a trainable linear projection. The structure of the deep network (number and width of layers, activation functions) is precisely encoded by a Kreĭn kernel. We show that the set of possible trained networks is in fact *smaller* than the set of possible trained machines for the corresponding single-layer network, which will allow us to analyse the capacity and generalisation of deep networks.

With regard to capacity analysis and uniform convergence bounds, in recent years a significant body of literature has been generated with bounds based on various assumptions [Neyshabur et al. 2015, 2018, 2019, 2017, Harvey et al. 2017, Bartlett et al. 2017, Golowich et al. 2018, Arora et al. 2018, Allen-Zhu et al. 2018, Drăxler et al. 2018, Li and Liang 2018, Nagarajan and Kolter 2019a,b, Zhou et al. 2019]. In this paper we approach the problem indirectly, which both simplifies the derivation and generalises the results. By constructing an equivalence between deep networks and kernel methods using indefinite support vector machines, we are able to analyse the capacity of a deep network by bounding it by the capacity of a corresponding indefinite SVM. Assuming the deep network is regularised using Frobenius norm on the weight matrices (weight decay), we give an equivalent regularisation scheme for the “flat” deep network representation. We then show that the resulting (effective) regularisation term imposed by the deep network weight regularisation places an upper bound on the corresponding (naïve) regularisation term for an SVM-type approach. This allows us to show that the set of reachable functions in the deep network with bounded (norm) weight matrices is a subset of the corresponding set of reachable functions in the SVM approach. Thus we can bound for example the Rademacher complexity of deep networks in terms of the Rademacher complexity of a corresponding indefinite (Kreĭn) SVM, allowing a set of results to be directly transferred from the SVM context to the

deep network context.

We finish by considering sparsity in the flat representation. Sparsity in neural networks reduces the complexity, but can also improve accuracy and robustness [Wen et al. 2016, Guo et al. 2018]. In this paper we show that simply applying standard, L_2 -norm (weight) regularisation leads to sparsity in the flat representation by effectively applying bridge regression [Frank and Friedman 1993] (L_p -norm regularisation for $p \in (0, 1)$) to the flat weights. This is particularly interesting when we consider recent results [Bertsimas et al. 2016, Hastie et al. 2017], where it was shown that bridge regularisation can perform significantly better than alternatives e.g. L_1 - or L_2 -norm regularisation.

1.1 Notation

We use $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $\bar{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\mathbb{N}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x > 0\}$. Hilbert spaces are denoted $\mathcal{H}$ and Kreĭn spaces $\mathcal{K}$. For (countable) vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$, a_i denotes the i^{th} element of $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{a} \odot \mathbf{b}$ is the elementwise product, $\mathbf{a}^{\odot c}$ the elementwise power, $|\mathbf{a}|$ the elementwise absolute, $\text{sgn}(\mathbf{a})$ the elementwise sign, and $\text{sum}(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_i a_i$. We define $(a)_+ = \max\{a, 0\}$, and $(\mathbf{a})_+$ elementwise. We use a number of variations of inner product, denoted as follows [Horváth 2010, Dragomir 2004, Salzo and Suykens 2016, Salzo et al. 2018, Crăşmareanu and Dragomir 2002]:

	Definite	Indefinite
Inner-product:	$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$	$[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
m -inner-product:	$\langle \langle \cdot, \dots \rangle \rangle : \mathbb{V}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$	$[\langle \cdot, \dots \rangle] : \mathbb{V}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

all of which are symmetric and multilinear, and $[a, a'] = 0$ or $\llbracket a, a', \dots \rrbracket = 0 \forall a', \dots \Rightarrow a = 0$. The (m) -inner product is norm-inducing ($\|x\|^2 = \langle x, x \rangle$ and $\|x\|^m = \langle \langle x, x, \dots \rangle \rangle$), and must satisfy the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|\langle \langle a, a', \dots \rangle \rangle|^m \leq |\langle \langle a, a, \dots \rangle \rangle| |\langle \langle a', a', \dots \rangle \rangle| \dots$. We also define weighted indefinite and definite m -inner products on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see [Dragomir 2004] regarding $\langle \langle \dots \rangle \rangle_{m, \mathbf{g}}$):

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}'''' \rrbracket_{m, \mathbf{g}} &= \sum_i g_i x_i x'_i \dots x''''_i \text{ (where } \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n) \\ \langle \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}'''' \rangle \rangle_{m, \mathbf{g}} &= \sum_i g_i x_i x'_i \dots x''''_i \text{ (} \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{g} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{)} \end{aligned}$$

Likewise $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}} = \llbracket \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rrbracket_{2, \mathbf{g}}$, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_{\mathbf{g}} = \langle \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle \rangle_{2, \mathbf{g}}$.¹

2 Related Work

The study of the connection between kernel methods and deep networks has a long history. In [Neal 1996] it was shown that, as the width of a single-layer neural network goes to infinity, and assuming iid random weights, the network converges to a draw from a Gaussian process. This was extended to multi-layered nets [Lee et al. 2018, Matthews et al. 2018] by assuming random weights up to (but not including) the output layer. Indeed, deriving approximate kernels through random weights is a popular means of linking deep networks and kernel methods [Rahimi and Benjamin 2009, Bach 2014, 2017, Daniely et al. 2016, Daniely 2017].

¹Technically $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_{\mathbf{g}}$ defined here is a positive semidefinite Hermitian form (inducing a seminorm rather than a norm) and not an inner product unless $\mathbf{g} > \mathbf{0}$. However this makes no substantive difference to our results, so we use the less verbose definition.




Figure 1: Machine learning architectures. Left shows the physical deep network architecture, and right shows the *representation* of the same deep network in “flat” (feature space) form consisting of feature map $\varphi_{\text{NN}} : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and a linear projection onto $\mathbb{R}$, where the weight vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{F}$ is the “push-forward” of the weight matrices in the deep network.

More recently, neural tangent kernels [Jacot et al. 2018, Arora et al. 2019] have been investigated. If $f(\cdot; \theta) : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a neural network parameterised by θ (weight matrices), the neural tangent kernel is the kernel associated with the feature map $x \rightarrow \nabla_{\theta} f(x; \theta)$ via $K_{\text{NTK}}(x, x') = \langle \nabla_{\theta} f(x; \theta), \nabla_{\theta} f(x'; \theta) \rangle$. Neural tangent kernels allow us to analyse the generalization features of deep networks, particularly in the infinite width case where K_{NTK} converges to an explicit limit that does not change during training. However neural tangent kernels do not provide a 1-1 equivalence in general, which is our goal here. Arc-cosine kernels [Cho and Saul 2009] work on a similar premise. For activation functions of the form $\sigma(\xi) = (\xi)_+^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, letting the width of the network go to infinity, arc-cosine kernels capture the feature map of the network (depth is achieved by composition of kernels), effectively flattening it. However once again this approach is restricted to networks of infinite width, whereas our approach works for arbitrary networks.

3 Preliminaries I: Deep Networks

For the purposes of this paper, a (fully connected and layered) d -layer feedforward neural network computes a function $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is as shown in figure 1, where the layers are indexed $0, 1, \dots, d-1$, and layer q has width H_q . We assume that all nodes in layer q share the same activation function $\sigma_q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, the output is:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{d-1}(\mathbf{W}_{[d-1]} \sigma_{d-2}(\mathbf{W}_{[d-2]} \dots \sigma_0(\mathbf{W}_{[0]} \mathbf{x}))) \quad (1)$$

where σ_q operates elementwise and $\mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1}}$ is the weight matrix for each layer q ; and we let $H_{-1} = D$ and $H_{d-1} = 1$ (scalar output). Weight matrices are chosen to solve the regularised risk minimisation problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

where the first term is the empirical risk (ℓ is the loss function, which will vary depending on the purpose of the network (classification, regression etc)) and the second term is a regularisation penalty. As noted in [Bishop 1995], if ℓ is quadratic and the training data is noisy then we do not require the explicit regularisation term as there is an *implicit*

Tikhonov regularisation present. Note that:

1. We use minimise in the local sense, as local minima suffice.
2. Any topologically equivalent norm can be substituted for the Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_F$, with the effect of introducing additional constants into certain bounds but otherwise with no substantive change.
3. We assume the activation functions σ_q are increasing, entire,² positive at 0 and Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with constant L_q . Hence σ_q has an everywhere convergent Taylor expansion $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_{[q]i} \xi^i$, where $a_{[q]0}, a_{[q]1} > 0 \forall q$.
4. For each layer $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ we define an associated (convex) activation function $\bar{\sigma}_{[q]}(\xi) = \sum_i |a_{[q]i}| \xi^i$, where $\bar{\sigma}_q = \sigma_q$ if $a_{[q]i} \geq 0 \forall i$. Note that $\bar{\sigma}_q$ is Lipschitz on any finite interval $[0, m]$ with constant $\bar{L}_q$, where $\bar{L}_q \neq L_q$ in general.
5. When discussing the network width and Lipschitz constants of σ_q and $\bar{\sigma}_q$ we find it most convenient to use the geometric mean, which we write as $H = \text{GM}(H_0, H_1, \dots)$, $L = \text{GM}(L_0, L_1, \dots)$ and $\bar{L} = \text{GM}(\bar{L}_0, \bar{L}_1, \dots)$.

We will show that the deep network (1) can be rewritten in feature-space form as per figure 1:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}} = \sum_i g_i v_i \varphi_i(\mathbf{x})$$

which will allow us to build a connection between deep networks and support vector machines. Before proceeding, however, we first present some background on the theory of indefinite (Kreĭn) support vector machines.

4 Preliminaries II: Indefinite SVMs

Indefinite (or Kreĭn) support vector machines (SVMs) [Lin and Lin 2003, Luss and d’Aspremont 2008, Haasdonk 2005, Ying et al. 2009, Schleif et al. 2016] are an extension of support vector machines [Cortes and Vapnik 1995, Burges 1998, Smola and Schölkopf 1998b, Cristianini and Shawe-Taylor 2005, Steinwart and Christman 2008] that relax the usual positive definiteness requirement on the kernel, based on the observation that indefinite kernels, naively applied, outperform positive definite kernels in some cases. They may be interpreted [Ong et al. 2004, Oglic and Gärtner 2019, 2018] as a form of regularised learning in reproducing kernel Kreĭn space RKKS [Bognàr 1974, Azizov and Iokhvidov 1989]. Typically, indefinite SVMs are introduced without reference to the primal formulation often found in standard SVM theory (for example [Cortes and Vapnik 1995]), but as we require the primal formulation here we now give a brief introduction from this perspective using the Kreĭn-kernel trick. Our approach is loosely based on [Cortes and Vapnik 1995], extended to the indefinite case. For a more conventional introduction see the supplementary material.

We consider a function of the simple, linear form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}} = \sum_i g_i v_i \varphi_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

where, denoting the feature space by $\mathcal{F}$, the feature map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and the metric $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{F}$ are defined a-priori (implicitly, as we will see, by a Kreĭn kernel). We note that this

²We discuss how the entire function requirement may be relaxed in the supplementary.

is the same as the primal form of the trained machine in SVM theory, excepting that it involves a weighted indefinite inner product rather than the usual inner product; that is, it is an *indefinite* SVM primal. In SVM learning, as in deep networks, the goal is to mimic the input/output relation embodied by the training set $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{R} | i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$. In an indefinite SVM this is done by minimising the stabilised risk minimisation problem ([Oglic and Gärtner 2018, equation (1)], [Loosli et al. 2013]), noting that the regularisation penalty $[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathbf{g}}$ here is not a norm (it may be positive, negative or zero):

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}}) + \lambda [\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathbf{g}} \quad (4)$$

where once again we use min in the loose sense, as local minima are allowed (see [Loosli et al. 2013] for discussion, as well as an alternative notation). Representer theory follows as usual (proof in supplementary):

Theorem 1 (Representer Theory) *Any solution $\mathbf{v}^*$ to (4) can be represented as $\mathbf{v}^* = \sum_i \alpha_i \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Defining $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}}$, the optimal $f^* : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $f^*(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \alpha_i^* K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$.*

Note that, for K as per theorem 1, the stabilised risk minimisation problem (4) can be rewritten in terms of α as:

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell\left(y_i, \sum_j \alpha_j K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)\right) + \lambda \sum_{i,j} \alpha_i \alpha_j K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \quad (5)$$

In this formulation K is a *Kreĭn kernel*. That is, $K : \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that can be written as a difference $K = K_+ - K_-$ between positive definite kernels $K_{\pm}$ [Ong et al. 2004, Proposition 7]. Note that K in theorem 1 can be split in this manner (writing $(a)_+ = \max\{0, a\}$ and $(\mathbf{a})_+$ elementwise):

$$K_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{(\pm \mathbf{g})_+} \quad (6)$$

where $K_{\pm}$ are trivially positive definite. Conversely, given a Kreĭn kernel K , by definition there exist positive definite $K_{\pm}$ (non-uniquely) such that $K = K_+ - K_-$. Hence there exists implicit, finite or countably infinite dimensional expansions:

$$K_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_1$$

(using Mercer’s theorem), so $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}}$ where $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = [\varphi_+(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_-(\mathbf{x})]$ and $\mathbf{g} = [+1, -1]$. Consequently, as for standard SVMs, we don’t need to know the feature map and metric; rather, we just need a Kreĭn kernel to implicitly define a feature map and metric. We call this the Kreĭn kernel trick by analogy with the more familiar (non-Kreĭn) kernel trick commonly used in kernel methods.

When analysing the *capacity* of indefinite SVMs we also need to define the associated kernel. Given a Kreĭn kernel $K = K_+ - K_-$, the associated kernel is $\bar{K} = K_+ + K_-$, which we note is positive definite. In terms of the metric $\mathbf{g}$ if $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}}$ then, using (6):

$$\bar{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|}$$

As discussed in the supplementary, the Kreĭn kernel K defines a reproducing kernel Kreĭn space (RKKS) $\mathcal{K}_K$, and the associated kernel $\bar{K}$ defines a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{K}}$ [Ong et al. 2004]:

$$\mathcal{K}_K = \{f(\cdot) = [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}\} \\ \mathcal{H}_{\bar{K}} = \{f(\cdot) = \langle \mathbf{v}, \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} | \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_K$ is equipped with an indefinite inner product $[[\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}}, [\mathbf{v}', \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}}]_{\mathcal{K}_K} = [\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}']_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{K}}$ is equipped with an inner product $\langle\langle \mathbf{v}, \varphi(\cdot) \rangle\rangle_{[\mathbf{g}]}, \langle\langle \mathbf{v}', \varphi(\cdot) \rangle\rangle_{[\mathbf{g}]} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\bar{K}}} = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}' \rangle_{[\mathbf{g}]}$ ($\mathcal{K}_K$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{K}}$ coincide if K is positive definite). Hence $f \in \mathcal{K}_K$ and (4) can be rewritten:

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{K}_K} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda [f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_K} \quad (7)$$

5 Flat Representation for Deep Network

We aim to show that the deep network (1) can be rewritten in the simpler, flattened representation:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = \sum_i g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i} \varphi_{\text{NN}i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (8)$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}}$ is an indefinite-inner-product, $\varphi_{\text{NN}} : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a feature map and $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}$ is a metric; φ_{NN} and $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}$ are defined by the network structure; and $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$ is a weight vector that solves the regularised risk minimisation problem:³

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda r_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}) \quad (9)$$

for appropriate $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and $r_{\text{NN}} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; such that the trained networks (1) and (8) are functionally equivalent. This representation is analogous to the trained indefinite SVM primal (3), which will allow us to analyse deep networks from the same perspective as indefinite SVMs.

As an intermediate step we begin showing that the deep network (1) can be rewritten in a semi-flat form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{v}_{[0]}, \mathbf{v}_{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{[d-1]}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{d+1, \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = \sum_i g_{\text{NN}i} v_{[0]i} v_{[1]i} \dots v_{[d-1]i} \varphi_{\text{NN}i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (10)$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot, \dots]_{d+1, \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}}$ is an indefinite $(d+1)$ -inner-product and, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$, the weight vectors $\mathbf{v}_{[q]} \in \mathcal{F}_q \subset \mathcal{F}$ solve the regularised risk minimisation problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_{[q]} \in \mathcal{F}_q} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \lambda \sum_q r_q(\mathbf{v}_{[q]}) \quad (11)$$

Central to our approach is the push-forward operation, converting a nonlinear function of a multilinear product of vectors to a multilinear product of the non-linear images of the original vectors - that is:

Lemma 2 *Let σ be an entire function with Taylor expansion $\sigma(\xi) = \sum_i a_i \xi^i$, and let $[\cdot, \cdot, \dots]_{m, \mu}$ be an m -indefinite-inner-product defined by metric $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (section 1.1). Then:*

$$\sigma([\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}'''])_{m, \mu} = [\phi(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}''')]_{m, \gamma \odot \phi(\mu)} \quad (12)$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a feature map and $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$, both independent of m and μ . Using multi-index notation, $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = [\phi_i(\mathbf{x})]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ and $\gamma = [\gamma_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$, where:

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_j x_j^{i_j}, \quad \gamma_i = \left(\frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}{\prod_j i_j!} \right) a_{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})} \quad (13)$$

Proof: Equations (12) and (13) follows from the multinomial expansion of σ and subsequent collection of terms. See supplementary for details. $\square$

³We use the subscript NN on $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ as a visual reminder that $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ corresponds, possibly non-uniquely, to some set of weight matrices $\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots$ in a deep network satisfying our assumptions such that (1) and (8) are functionally equivalent




Figure 2: Push-forward on a simple 2-layer neural network. Starting with the original network (top), we apply push-forward to layer 0, so by (14) the output of neuron i in layer 0 is $o_{[0],i}(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_0([\mathbf{W}_{[0]i, \cdot}, \mathbf{x}]_{2,1}) = [\mathbf{w}_{[0,1]i}, \phi(\mathbf{x})]_{2, \mathbf{g}_{[1]}}$. Repeating for layer 1 (with some housekeeping as per the supplementary) we find $f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{w}_{[0,2]}, \mathbf{w}_{[1,2]0}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{3, \mathbf{g}_{[2]}}$.

We call the image $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ of $\mathbf{x}$ the *push-forward* of $\mathbf{x}$, as it heuristically represents the result of pushing $\mathbf{x}$ forwards through σ . Recalling that we are assuming entire activation functions, by (12) and (13), using multi-index notation, the activation functions satisfy the following:

$$\sigma_q([\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}'''])_{m, \mu} = [\phi(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}''')]_{m, \gamma_{[q]} \odot \phi(\mu)} \quad (14)$$

$$\gamma_{[q]i} = \left(\frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}{\prod_j i_j!} \right) a_{[q]\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}$$

where the indices $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ again denotes layer q (we do not place a subscript on ϕ as, by Lemma 2, this depends on the input dimension, not the activation function σ_q). The next step is to apply push-forward repeatedly, starting with $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{[0]}$ at the input to layer 0, applying (14) to obtain the push-forward representation at the input to layer 1, and repeating until the output layer is reached. This is shown in figure 2 for a simple 2-layer network with $d = D = H_0 = 2$. The result of this procedure is the semi-flat form (10), where the feature map is (theorem 11 in supplementary):

$$\varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{x}))) \quad (15)$$

with weight vectors and metric:

$$\mathbf{v}_{[q]} = \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T) \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} = \gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes (\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes (\gamma_{[0]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_D))))$$

where, writing $\mathbf{W}_{i, \cdot}$ for row i of matrix $\mathbf{W}$:

$$\phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T) = \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi \left(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi(\mathbf{W}_{0, \cdot} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]}) \\ \phi(\mathbf{W}_{1, \cdot} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]}) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{[q]} = \mathbf{1}_{H_{q-1}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_D))$$

To rewrite the original regularised risk minimisation problem (2) in terms of the weight vectors $\mathbf{v}_{[q]}$ in (11) we can simply note the correspondence (16) between $\mathbf{v}_{[q]} \in \mathcal{F}_q$ and $\mathbf{W}_{[q]}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ and define the regularisation penalty as:

$$r_q(\mathbf{v}_{[q]}) = \min_{\mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1}} : \mathbf{v}_{[q]} = \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T)} \frac{1}{d} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \quad (18)$$

where sel means “select” (this may not be unique), and:

$$\mathcal{F}_q = \left\{ \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \mid \mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1}} \right\} \quad (19)$$

Having derived a semi-flat representation it is straightforward to derive the (fully) flat form (8) by noting that $\llbracket \mathbf{v}_{[0]}, \mathbf{v}_{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{[d-1]}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}) \rrbracket_{m+1, \mathbf{g}} = [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}}$, where $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} = \odot_q \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$ and:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} = \left\{ \odot_q \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \mid \mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1}} \right\} \quad (20)$$

Thus we see that (10) reduces to (8) where φ_{NN} is as per (15). To derive an appropriate regularisation penalty to ensure that solving (9) makes (1) and (8) functionally identical, we can once again note the correspondence between $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ and $\{\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots\}$ and define the regularisation penalty (non-uniquely - see below) as:

$$r_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}) = \underset{\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} = \odot_q \mathbf{v}_{[q]} : \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \in \mathcal{F}_q}{\text{sel}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \quad (21)$$

We note that neither the flat or semi-flat are intended for direct application. Rather, they will (a) allow us to derive Kreĭn kernels that will allow us to construct indefinite SVMs with the same feature map in flat form (but different regularisation) as the deep network, and subsequently (b) allow us to analyse the properties of the deep network in terms of complexity analysis from a novel angle.

5.1 Regularisation Properties

As presented in the (18-21) in the previous section, the flat and semi-flat regularised risk penalties are uninformative. Ideally we would prefer to regularise in terms of $\mathbf{v}_{[q]}$ or $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ directly without reference to the corresponding weight matrices. While this does not appear to be precisely possible, the following theorem shows that we can bound the regularisation penalties in terms of either $[\mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]}]_{\mathbf{g}}$ or $\langle \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|}$ (see supplementary for proof):

Theorem 3 *Recalling that $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_{[q]i} \xi^i$, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$, and $\bar{\sigma}_q(\xi) = \sum_i |a_{[q]i}| \xi^i$. Defining $[\mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]})$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]})$, where:*

$$p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) = \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \sigma_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \sigma_q \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q}\|_2^2 \sigma_{q-1} \left(\dots H_0 \sigma_0(D) \dots \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (22)$$

$$\bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \bar{\sigma}_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \bar{\sigma}_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \bar{\sigma}_q \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q}\|_2^2 \bar{\sigma}_{q-1} \left(\dots H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(D) \dots \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (23)$$

we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) &\leq (HL)^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \\ 0 \leq \bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) &\leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where H , L and $\bar{L}$ are geometric means of H_q , L_q and $\bar{L}_q$.

Note that $\sqrt{p_{[q]}}$ is an F -norm and $\sqrt{\bar{p}_{[q]}}$ is a quasi- F -norm⁴ on weight-matrix space if $\sigma_q(0) = 0$ and σ_q is concave, both being topologically equivalent to the Frobenius

⁴ A quasi- F -norm is like an F -norm, except that it satisfies a weaker form of the triangle inequality $\sqrt{p_{[q]}}(\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{W}') \leq c(\sqrt{p_{[q]}}(\mathbf{W}) + \sqrt{p_{[q]}}(\mathbf{W}'))$ for some $c > 0$.

norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ (see supplementary). The analogous result for the flat representation is as follows (p_{NN} and $\bar{p}_{\text{NN}}$ are not norms - see supplementary for proof):

Theorem 4 *Using the notation of theorem 3, defining $[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = p_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots)$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \bar{p}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots)$, where:*

$$p_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots) = \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}|^2 \dots \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|^2 \sigma_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0], i_0}\|_2^2 \right) \right) \right) \quad (24)$$

$$\bar{p}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots) = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}|^2 \dots \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(\dots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|^2 \bar{\sigma}_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0], i_0}\|_2^2 \right) \right) \right) \quad (25)$$

we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} &\leq L^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq \left(\frac{L}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^d \\ 0 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} &\leq \bar{L}^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^d \end{aligned}$$

where L and $\bar{L}$ are geometric means of L_q and $\bar{L}_q$.

5.2 Equivalent SVMs for Deep Networks

We have shown that any deep network satisfying our assumptions can be flattened to obtain an equivalent flat representation (8) with feature map and metric defined by (15) and (16); and training the deep network is functionally equivalent to solving the regularised risk minimisation problem (9):

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, [\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}}) + \lambda r_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{v})$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and r_{NN} are defined by (20) and (21). We define an *equivalent* (indefinite) SVM for a given deep network to be an indefinite SVM using the same feature map $\varphi_{\text{NN}} : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and metric $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}$ as the deep network (in flat form) that solves the regularised risk minimisation problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, [\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}}) + \lambda r_{\text{SVM}}(\mathbf{v}) \quad (26)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}} = \mathcal{F}$ and $r_{\text{SVM}}(\mathbf{v}) = [\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}}$. Clearly the feature map is countably infinite dimensional, so the primal form of the equivalent SVM is not useful; however we may use the Kreĭn kernel trick to encapsulate the feature map in a Kreĭn kernel and then solve (5) to get $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \alpha_i K_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$:

Theorem 5 *Let the feature map $\varphi_{\text{NN}} : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and metric $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}$ be defined by the deep network (1) by (15), (16). Then:*

$$K_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = \sigma_{d-1}(\dots H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2}(H_{d-3} \dots H_1 \sigma_1(H_0 \sigma_0(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1))) \dots) \quad (27)$$

is the corresponding Kreĭn kernel, and:

$$\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1}(\dots H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2}(H_{d-3} \dots H_1 \bar{\sigma}_1(H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1))) \dots) \quad (28)$$

is the associated kernel ($\bar{\sigma}_q$ is the associated activation function - that is, if $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_{[q]i} \xi^i$ then $\bar{\sigma}_q(\xi) = \sum_i |a_{[q]i}| \xi^i$ (e.g. see table 1 in the supplementary)). Note that if σ_q is convex (eg linear, exponential) then $K = \bar{K}$.

Proof: The proof follows by direct application of the definitions (theorem 11 and lemma 2). See supplementary. $\square$

An indefinite SVM using Krein kernel K_{NN} trained on a particular dataset will learn a relation $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the same form (in primal representation), but with different weights, as that learned by the deep network (flat representation) from whose structure (49) was derived and that has been trained on the same dataset.

The differences between the deep network and its equivalent SVM are (a) the definition of the restricted feature space $\mathcal{F}_{\text{M}}$ and (b) the form of regularisation r_{M} . Note that the space of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$ of realisable weights of the deep network is smaller than the space of realisable weights for the equivalent SVM. We may therefore expect that the capacity of the equivalent SVM will be larger than the capacity of the deep network from which it was derived (a fact that we demonstrate shortly).

6 Capacity, Sparsity and Convergence

In this section we use the flat (and semi-flat) representations of deep networks, and the observed connection between these and indefinite SVMs, to analyse the capacity, sparsity and convergence of deep networks. First we apply Rademacher complexity theory to the flat representation of the deep network and show that it is bounded by the (known [Ong et al. 2004]) Rademacher complexity of the equivalent indefinite SVM, with depth and width dependence similar to those reported elsewhere [Bartlett et al. 2017, Neyshabur et al. 2018]. Next, we derive a stronger bound in the case where the activation functions σ_q are concave (which is typical) using the properties of the weight space $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$, which decouples capacity and network width if σ_q is bounded (tanh-like). Finally, we use the semi-flat representation of the deep network to derive a bound on the L_p -“norm”, with $p = \frac{2}{d} \in (0, 1]$, of the weight vector $\mathbf{v}$, demonstrating that deep networks actually implement a form of bridge regression [Frank and Friedman 1993] approaching the best-subset limit [Beale et al. 1967, Hocking and Leslie 1967] on the flat representation, which we find particularly interesting in light of recent developments regarding the promise of best-subset selection, particularly in noisy scenarios [Bertsimas et al. 2016, Hastie et al. 2017].

6.1 Rademacher Complexity Analysis

The Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F})$ of a hypothesis space $\mathcal{F}$ of real-valued functions is a measure of its capacity. Let $\{\mathbf{x}_i \sim \nu : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$ be a set of vectors drawn from distribution ν and let $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \dots \in \{-1, 1\}$ be Rademacher random variables. Then by definition [Mendelson 2003]:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu, \epsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \quad (29)$$

Rademacher complexity may be used in uniform convergence analysis to bound how quickly the empirical loss $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(f) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i))$ converges to the expected loss $\mathcal{L}(f) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(y, f(\mathbf{x}))]$ for a given $f \in \mathcal{F}$ as the dataset size increases. For example, if ℓ is Lipschitz with constant L_ℓ and bounded by c then for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, with probability $> 1 - \delta$:

$$\mathcal{L}(f) \leq \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f) + 2L_\ell \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) + c \sqrt{\frac{\log(\frac{1}{\delta})}{2N}}$$

It is well known (eg [Bartlett and Mendelson 2002, Theorem 12]) that if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$ then $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}')$. Thus we may bound Rademacher complexity by showing that the hypothesis space is a subset of a larger hypothesis space whose Rademacher complexity is known. We will bound the complexity of the deep network by showing that its hypothesis space is a subset of the hypothesis space of the associated equivalent (indefinite) SVM.

In the usual, non-flat form a trained deep network has the form (1), where the weight matrices $\mathbf{W}_{[q]}$ are selected to solve the regularised risk minimisation problem (2). If we interpret $\lambda \geq 0$ in (2) as a Lagrange multiplier, this is equivalent to the constrained optimisation problem:

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_q \times H_{q-1} : \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad (30)$$

for appropriate R_{NN} . Hence the hypothesis space is:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} = \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{d-1}(\mathbf{W}_{[d-1]} \dots \sigma_0(\mathbf{W}_{[0]} \mathbf{x})) \mid \dots \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq R_{\text{NN}} \right\} \quad (31)$$

Likewise, the regularised risk minimisation problem (26) for the equivalent SVM defined by the deep network can be rewritten as a constrained optimisation problem:⁵

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} : [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \leq R_{\text{SVM}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad (32)$$

for some R_{SVM} , so the corresponding hypothesis space is:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}} = \{ f = [\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \mid \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F} \wedge [\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \leq R_{\text{SVM}} \} \\ = \{ f \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{K}_{\text{NN}}} \mid [f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_{\text{NN}}} \leq R_{\text{SVM}} \} \quad (33)$$

which is a ball of radius R_{SVM} in RKKS $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{K}_{\text{NN}}}$ specified by the Krein kernel defined by the form of the deep network as per (49) in theorem 5.

In the equivalent, flat form, a trained deep network has the form (8), where the weight vector $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$ are selected to solve the regularised risk minimisation problem (9). Applying the usual procedure, the hypothesis space is:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} = \{ f = [\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \mid \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \wedge r_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{v}) \leq R_{\text{NN}} \} \quad (34)$$

noting that (31) and (34) are in fact identical as the conditions in (34) simply assert that $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ corresponds to some set of weight matrices $\mathbf{W}_{[q]}$ satisfying the conditions of (31), where f is functionally equivalent for either representation.⁶

Given the above, using theorem 4 and (30), we have that:

$$[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^d \leq (LR_{\text{NN}})^d$$

which, recalling that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}}$ and using (33), implies that:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}} \mid R_{\text{SVM}} = (LR_{\text{NN}})^d \quad (35)$$

and hence $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}})$ if $R_{\text{SVM}} = (LR_{\text{NN}})^d$. Moreover as noted in [Ong et al. 2004, Lemma 9], the Rademacher complexity in RKKS $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{K}_{\text{NN}}}$ is equivalent to the Rademacher complexity in the associated RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}_{\text{NN}}}$, so we can bound $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\text{SVM}})$ as per the following theorem [Ong et al. 2004]:

⁵In formulating this we use the fact that we are using min in the loose sense (allowing local minima), so we may apply Lagrange multiplier theory, which in this case guarantees only local optima as the regularisation term is non-convex.

⁶That is, $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} = \odot_q \phi_{q+}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]})$ as per (15-17).

Theorem 6 Let K_{NN} be a Krein kernel and $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$ be its associated kernel, such that $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^D, \nu)$ and $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{SVM}}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(R_{\text{SVM}} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D} \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\nu(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (36)$$

Proof: See [Ong et al. 2004]. Alternatively we provide a weight-space proof in the supplementary material. $\square$

Combining (35) and theorem 6 we obtain the following bound on the Rademacher complexity of the deep network:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{(LR_{\text{NN}})^d}{N}} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D} \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\nu(\mathbf{x}) \quad (37)$$

This bound grows exponentially with depth d and polynomially (order $\frac{d}{2}$) with activation function Lipschitz constant L . Width and data distribution dependence come through the integral of the equivalent associated kernel $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$ and thus depend on the network structure. For example, a linear network has $K_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = H^d \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$, so (37) reduces to:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{(HLR_{\text{NN}})^d}{N}} \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2 \right] \quad (38)$$

which grows polynomially (order $\frac{d}{2}$) with width, which is similar to bounds reported elsewhere [Bartlett et al. 2017, Neyshabur et al. 2018]. However it follows from the convexity of $\bar{K}$ that (38) is the best-case behaviour of the bound (37), and table 1 in the supplementary indicates that the bound can be very loose.

The difficulty with (37) arises from the presense of the associated kernel $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$. Roughly speaking, $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$ enters the picture in the proof of theorem 6 when we apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to separate out the feature-map dependence - that is, $[\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}}^2 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbf{g}} \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\mathbf{g}}$. There is no obvious way around this in the general case, but as an alternative we may use the fact that $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}$ to cast $[\mathbf{v}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}}$ into weight matrix space before separating factors, which leads to the following in the concave case (proof in supplementary):

Theorem 7 Let σ_q be concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$, $\sigma_q(0) = 0$ and $\sigma_q(-\xi) = -\sigma_q(\xi)$ in addition to the usual assumptions. Let: $\chi_{\text{NN}}(\xi) = \sigma_{d-1}(d\sqrt{H_{d-2}\sigma_{d-2}}(d\sqrt{H_{d-3}\sigma_{d-3}}(\dots d\sqrt{H_0\sigma_0}(\xi))))$. If $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \chi_{\text{NN}}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^D, \nu)$ then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D} \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) d\nu(\mathbf{x})}$$

Moreover if σ_q is unbounded for all q then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} (d\sqrt{HL})^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\nu [\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2]}$$

and otherwise, if $\sigma_q(\xi) \leq 1 \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} (d\sqrt{H_{[q+]}L_{[q+]}})^{d-q-1}$$

where $H_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(H_{q+1}, H_{q+2}, \dots, H_{d-1})$ and $L_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(L_{q+1}, L_{q+2}, \dots, L_{d-1})$ are geometric means.

Neglecting width dependence, like (37), this bound on Rademacher complexity grows exponentially with depth d as R_{NN}^d . However, unlike (37), the *worst-case* width dependency (not best case, as in (37)) is polynomial of order d , where the order decreases if bounded activation functions are used in the network and vanishes entirely if the output layer activation function σ_{d-1} is bounded.

6.2 Sparsity Analysis

Considering the form of the semi-flat (10) and flat (8) representations of the deep network, and in light of theorem 3, we see that the (flat) weight vector $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ is an elementwise product of a set of d vectors with constrained (regularised) 2-norms. Thus we might expect that $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ will have a constrained $\frac{2}{d}$ -“norm”, which would imply a form of (effectively) sparsity-inducing regularisation in the flat representation. Precisely (proof in supplementary material):

Theorem 8 For a given deep network satisfying our assumptions, using the notations described, we have that $\|\mathbf{v}_{[q]}\|_\infty \leq dR_{\text{NN}}$, $\|\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty \leq R_{\text{NN}}^d$, and:

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_{2/d} \leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \quad (39)$$

where $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\gamma = \sum_i |a_i|^\gamma$ is the L_γ -“norm” $\forall \gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Thus we see that when we train the deep network using weight-decay we are effectively selecting the weight vector in the flat representation using $\frac{2}{d}$ -“norm” regularised (bridge) regression [Frank and Friedman 1993], approaching best-subset regression [Beale et al. 1967, Hocking and Leslie 1967] for larger d , which has been shown [Bertsimas et al. 2016, Hastie et al. 2017] to have significant benefits, particularly for noisy data, as it may help explain the remarkable performance of deep networks. We finish with the following corollary of theorem 8, which characterises the distribution of magnitudes of weights in $\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ (proof in supplementary):

Corollary 9 The total weight vector $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ of the flat representation is ϵ -sparse - that is, there are at most $\lfloor (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{d}} \rfloor$ elements in this vector with magnitude $|g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i}|$ greater than $\epsilon \in (0, dR_{\text{NN}} \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty]$.

That is, as ϵ increases, the number of elements in the (total) weight vector $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ that have magnitude greater than ϵ will decrease as the reciprocal of $\epsilon^{2/d}$. So we may expect a relatively small number (at most $\lfloor (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \rfloor$) of dominant features with (relatively, in magnitude) large total weight, combined with a much larger number of features with relatively small total weight (we call this sort of “approximate” form of sparsity ϵ -sparsity). This happens even though the feature map is infinite dimensional in general.

7 Conclusions

We have explored a novel connection between deep networks and learning in reproducing kernel Krein space. We have shown how a deep network can be converted to an equivalent (flat) form consisting of a fixed non-linear feature map followed by a learned linear projection onto $\mathbb{R}$, which is functionally identical to an indefinite SVM. Using this, we have explored capacity and generalisation in deep networks by bounding in terms of capacity in regularised learning in reproducing kernel Krein space; and shown that the flat form is effectively implementing sparsity-inducing bridge regression, approaching best-subset regression as the depth of the network increases.

References

- Milton Abramowitz, Irene A. Stegun, and Donald A. McQuarrie. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. Dover, 1972.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Yingyu Liang. Learning and generalization in overparameterized neural networks, going beyond two layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04918*, 2018.
- Daniel Alpay. Some remarks on reproducing krein spaces. *Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, 21(4):1189–1205, 1991.
- N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 68:337–404, Jan–Jun 1950.
- Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Behnam Neyshabur, and Yi Zhang. Stronger generalization bounds for deep nets via a compression approach. In *Proceedings of ICML*, 2018.
- Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Ruosong Wang. On exact computation with an infinitely wide neural net. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8139–8148, 2019.
- T. Y. Azizov and I. S. Iokhvidov. *Linear Operators in spaces with an indefinite metric*. John Wiley & Sons, 1989.
- Francis Bach. On the equivalence between kernel quadrature rules and random feature expansions. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):714–751, 2017.
- Francis R. Bach. Breaking the curse of dimensionality with convex neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1412.8690, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.8690>.
- P. L. Bartlett and S. Mendelson. Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:463–482, 2002.
- Peter L. Bartlett, Dylan J. Foster, and Matus J. Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6240–6249, 2017.
- E. M. L. Beale, M. G. Kendall, and D. W. Mann. The discarding of variables in multivariate analysis. *Biometrika*, 54(3–4):357–366, 1967.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Angela King, and Rahul Mazumder. Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens. *The annals of statistics*, pages 813–852, 2016.
- Chris M. Bishop. Training with noise is equivalent to tikhonov regularization. *Neural Computation*, 7(1):108–116, 1995.
- J. Bognár. *Indefinite inner product spaces*. Springer Verlag, 1974.
- C. J. C. Burges. A tutorial on support vector machines for pattern recognition. *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2(2):121–167, 1998.
- Youngmin Cho and Lawrence K. Saul. Kernel methods for deep learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 22, pages 342–350. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- Sayak Ray Chowdhury and Aditya Gopalan. On kernelized multi-armed bandits. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 844–853, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia, Aug 2017. PMLR.
- Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support vector networks. *Machine Learning*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.
- M. Crăşmareanu and S. S. Dragomir. $2k$ -inner products on real linear spaces. *Demonstratio Math.*, 35(3):645–656, 2002.
- Nello Cristianini and John Shawe-Taylor. *An Introductino to Support Vector Machines and other Kernel-Based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2005.
- Amit Daniely. Sgd learns the conjugate kernel class of the network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30, pages 2422–2430. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- Amit Daniely, Roy Frostig, and Yoram Singer. Toward deeper understanding of neural networks: The power of initialization and a dual view on expressivity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 29, pages 2253–2261. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- Ricky Der and Danial Lee. Large-margin classification in banach spaces. In *Proceedings of the JMLR Workshop and Conference 2: AISTATS2007*, pages 91–98, 2007.
- Sever S. Dragomir. *Semi-Inner Products and Applications*. Nova Science Publishers New York, 2004.
- Felix Dräxler, Kambis Veschgini, Manfred Salmhofer, and Fred A. Hamprecht. Essentially no barriers in neural network energy landscape. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018*, 2018.
- LLdiko E. Frank and Jerome H. Friedman. A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools. *Technometrics*, 35(2):109–135, 1993.
- Marc G. Genton. Classes of kernels for machine learning: A statistics perspective. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2:299–312, 2001.
- Noah Golowich, Alexander Rakhlin, and Ohad Shamir. Size-independent sample complexity of neural networks. In *COLT*, 2018.
- Mehmet Gönen and Ethem Alpaydin. Multiple kernel learning algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2211–2268, 2011.
- I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik. *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*. Academic Press, London, 2000.
- Yiwen Guo, Chao Zhang, Changshui Zhang, and Yurong Chen. Sparse dnns with improved adversarial robustness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31, pages 242–251. 2018.
- Bernard Haasdonk. Feature space interpretation of SVMs with indefinite kernels. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 27(4):482–492, April 2005.
- Nick Harvey, Christopher Liaw, and Abbas Mehrabian. Nearly-tight VC-dimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2017*, 2017.
- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Ryan J. Tibshirani. Extended comparisons of best subset selection, forward stepwise selection, and the lasso, 2017.
- Ralf Herbrich. *Learning Kernel Classifiers: Theory and Algorithms*. MIT Press, 2002.
- Ronald R. Hocking and R. N. Leslie. Selection of the best subset in regression analysis. *Technometrics*, 9(4):531–540, 1967.
- Á.G. Horváth. Semi-indefinite inner product and generalized minkowski spaces. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 60(9):1190–1208, 2010.
- Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 8571–8580, 2018.

- Eugene Jahnke and Fritz Emde. *Table of Functions with Formulae and Curves*. Dover Publications, 4 edition, 1945.
- Jaehoon Lee, Jascha Sohl-dickstein, Jeffrey Pennington, Roman Novak, Sam Schoenholz, and Yasaman Bahri. Deep neural networks as gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Chen Li, Luca Venturi, and Ruitu Xu. Learning the kernel for classification and regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08597*, 2017.
- Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- Hsuan-Tien Lin and Chih-Jen Lin. A study on sigmoid kernels for svm and the training of non-psd kernels by smo-type methods. *Neural Computation*, June 2003.
- Gaëlle Loosli, Cheng Soon Ong, and Stephane Canu. Svm in krein spaces. Technical Report hal-00869658, HAL, 2013.
- Ronny Luss and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Support vector machine classification with indefinite kernels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 953–960, 2008.
- Alexander G. de G. Matthews, Mark Rowland, Jiri Hron, Richard E. Turner, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. *arXiv e-prints*, 2018.
- Shahar Mendelson. A few notes on statistical learning theory. In Shahar Mendelson and Alexander J. Smola, editors, *Advanced Lectures on Machine Learning: Machine Learning Summer School 2002 Canberra, Australia, February 11–22, 2002 Revised Lectures*, pages 1–40. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
- Charles A. Micchelli, Yuesheng Xu, and Haizhang Zhang. Universal kernels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7, 2006.
- K.-R. Müller, S. Mika, G. Rätsch, K. Tsuda, and Bernhard Schölkopf. An introduction to kernel-based learning algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 12(2):181–198, March 2001.
- Vaishnavh Nagarajan and J. Zico Kolter. Uniform convergence may be unable to explain generalization in deep learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 11615–11626. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019a.
- Vaishnavh Nagarajan and Zico Kolter. Deterministic PAC-Bayesian generalization bounds for deep networks via generalizing noise-resilience. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019b.
- Radford M. Neal. *Priors for infinite networks*, pages 29–53. Springer, 1996.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. Norm-based capacity control in neural networks. In *Proceedings of Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1376–1401, 2015.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, David McAllester, and Nathan Srebro. Exploring generalization in deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5949–5958, 2017.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, and Nathan Srebro. A PAC-bayesian approach to spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. In *Proceedings of ICLR*, 2018.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Zhiyuan Li, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Yann LeCun, and Nathan Srebro. The role of over-parametrization in generalization of neural networks. In *Proceedings of ICLR*, 2019.
- Dino Oglic and Thomas Gärtner. Learning in reproducing kernel krein spaces. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Stockholm, Sweden, 2018.
- Dino Oglic and Thomas Gärtner. Scalable learning in reproducing kernel krein spaces. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Long Beach, California, 2019.
- Frank W. Olver, Daniel W. Lozier, Ronald F. Boisvert, and Charles W. Clark. *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1st edition, 2010. ISBN 0521140633.
- Cheng Soon Ong, Mary Xavier, Stéphane Canu, and Alexander J. Smola. Learning with non-positive kernels. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, page 81, 2004.
- Ali Rahimi and Recht Benjamin. Weighted sums of random kitchen sinks: Replacing minimization with randomization in learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, pages 1313–1320. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- Saverio Salzo and Johan A. K. Suykens. Generalized support vector regression: duality and tensor-kernel representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.05876*, 2016.
- Saverio Salzo, Johan A. K. Suykens, and Lorenzo Rosasco. Solving ℓ^p -norm regularization with tensor kernels. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS) 2018*, April 2018.
- Frank-Michael Schleif, Peter Tino, and Yingyu Liang. Learning in indefinite proximity spaces - recent trends. In *Proceedings of ESANN 2016, European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks, Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning*, Bruges (Belgium), April 2016.
- Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2001. ISBN 0262194759.
- Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels*. MIT Press, 2002.
- Bernhard Schölkopf, J. C. Burges, and Alexander J. Smola. *Advances in Kernel Methods: Support Vector Machines*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1999.
- John Shawe-Taylor and Nello Cristianini. *Kernel Methods for Pattern Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Alistair Shilton, Sunil Gupta, Santu Rana, Pratibha Vellanki, Cheng Li, Svetha Venkatesh, Laurence Park, Alessandra Sutti, David Rubin, Thomas Dorin, Alireza Vahid, Murray Height, and Teo Slezak. Accelerated bayesian optimisation through weight-prior tuning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS) 2020*, 2020.
- Alexander J. Smola and Bernhard Schölkopf. On a kernel-based method for pattern recognition, regression, approximation and operator inversion. *Algorithmica*, 22:211–231, 1998a. Technical Report 1064, GMD First, April 1997.
- Alexander J. Smola and Bernhard Schölkopf. A tutorial on support vector regression. Technical Report NeuroCOLT2 Technical Report Series, NC2-TR-1998-030, Royal Holloway College, University of London, UK, October 1998b.
- Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christman. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer, 2008.
- Wei Wen, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li. Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2074–2082, 2016.

Yiming Ying, Colin Campbell, and Mark Girolami. Analysis of SVM with indefinite kernels. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2205–2213, 2009.

Wenda Zhou, Victor Veitch, Morgane Austern, Ryan P. Adams, and Peter Orbanz. Nonvacuous generalization bounds at the imagenet scale: a PAC-Bayesian compression approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.

From deep to Shallow: Equivalent Forms of Deep Networks in Reproducing Kernel Kreĭn Space and Indefinite Support Vector Machines - Supplementary Material

1 Supplementary: Reproducing Kernel Kreĭn Space - Standard Approach

Reproducing kernel Hilbert space theory [Aronszajn 1950, Steinwart and Christman 2008, Shawe-Taylor and Cristianini 2004] is ubiquitous in machine learning [Cortes and Vapnik 1995, Chowdhury and Gopalan 2017, Cristianini and Shawe-Taylor 2005, Genton 2001, Gönen and Alpaydin 2011, Herbrich 2002, Li et al. 2017, Müller et al. 2001, Schölkopf and Smola 2001, Schölkopf et al. 1999, Schölkopf and Smola 2002, Shawe-Taylor and Cristianini 2004, Smola and Schölkopf 1998a]. Motivated by the observation that indefinite kernels outperform RKHS kernels in some cases [Lin and Lin 2003, Luss and d’Aspremont 2008, Haasdonk 2005, Ying et al. 2009], reproducing kernel Kreĭn spaces (RKKSs) have been studied in [Ong et al. 2004, Oglic and Gärtner 2019, 2018, Loosli et al. 2013, Schleif et al. 2016]. In the supplementary we present a quick overview of reproducing kernel Kreĭn space theory (see [Bognår 1974, Azizov and Iokhvidov 1989, Ong et al. 2004, Oglic and Gärtner 2019, 2018] for alternatives) from a more conventional standpoint than in the body of the paper. As per [Bognår 1974, Azizov and Iokhvidov 1989], we begin by defining Kreĭn space:

Definition 1 A Kreĭn space $\{\mathcal{K}, [\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{K}}\}$ is a vector space $\mathcal{K}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with an indefinite inner product $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that may be decomposed into a direct difference $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}_+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_-$ of $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathcal{K}}$ -orthogonal Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\pm}$ (that is, $[f_+, g_-]_{\mathcal{K}} = 0 \forall f_+ \in \mathcal{H}_+, g_- \in \mathcal{H}_-$) such that:

$$[f, g]_{\mathcal{K}} = \langle f_+, g_+ \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_+} - \langle f_-, g_- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_-}$$

where $f = f_+ \oplus f_-$, $g = g_+ \oplus g_-$, and $f_{\pm}, g_{\pm} \in \mathcal{H}_{\pm}$ (here $\oplus$ denotes the orthogonal sum). The associated Hilbert space $\{\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\}$ is a Hilbert space $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{H}_+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_-$ over $\mathbb{R}$ with:

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \langle f_+, g_+ \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_+} + \langle f_-, g_- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_-}$$

The strong topology on $\mathcal{K}$ is induced by the metric $d^2(f, g) = \|f - g\|_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}^2 = \langle f - g, f - g \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$.

Note that the decomposition of $\mathcal{K}$ into $\mathcal{H}_{\pm}$ is not unique in general. However the strong topology induced by the associated Hilbert space norm is independent of the decomposition [Oglic and Gärtner 2018]. Reproducing kernel Kreĭn space is defined as [Alpay 1991, Ong et al. 2004]:

Definition 2 (Reproducing Kernel Kreĭn Space) A reproducing kernel Kreĭn space (RKKS) $\mathcal{K}$ is a Kreĭn space of functions $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall x \in \mathbb{X}$ the point evaluation functional $L_x : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $L_x(f) = f(x)$, is continuous with respect to the strong topology.

([Ong et al. 2004, Proposition 6]) For every RKKS $\mathcal{K}$ there exists a symmetric reproducing (Kreĭn) kernel $K : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $f(x) = [f, K(x, \cdot)]_{\mathcal{K}} \forall f \in \mathcal{K}$ and $K(x, x') = [K(x, \cdot), K(\cdot, x')]_{\mathcal{K}}$, and K can be decomposed as $K =$

$K_+ - K_-$ where $K_{\pm}$ are positive-definite reproducing kernels for $\mathcal{H}_{\pm}$. The associated Hilbert space $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is a RKHS with reproducing kernel (associated kernel) $\bar{K} = K_+ + K_-$.

Any Kreĭn kernel K that can be decomposed as $K = K_+ - K_-$ defines a reproducing kernel Kreĭn space $\mathcal{K}_K$, and it can be shown that any symmetric, jointly analytic $K : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Kreĭn kernel [Alpay 1991]. In this paper we are primarily concerned with Kreĭn kernels of the form:

$$K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}})$$

where we use the notation $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}} = \sum_i g_i x_i x'_i$ to represent the weighted indefinite inner product (in the special case $\mathbf{g} > 0$ we instead write $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_{\mathbf{g}}$ to emphasise that this is an inner-product in this case). Clearly if k is analytic then K must be a Kreĭn-kernel. Indeed, if k is entire then we can construct the Taylor expansion $k(\chi) = \sum_i a_i \chi^i$, and it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') &= k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &= k_+([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) - k_-([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &= [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})} \\ \bar{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') &= k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &= k_+([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) + k_-([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &= \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})|} \end{aligned}$$

where, using multi-index notation $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = [\varphi_i(\mathbf{x})]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^{\dim(\mathbf{x})}}$ and $\gamma = [\gamma_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^{\dim(\mathbf{x})}}$, where $\varphi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_j x_j^{i_j}$ and $\gamma_i = (\frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}{\prod_j i_j!}) a_{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}$. We may further note that:

$$K_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k_{\pm}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}}) = \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{(\pm \gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g}))_{+}}$$

where $(a)_{+} = \max\{a, 0\}$ and $(\mathbf{a})_{+} = [(a_0)_{+}, (a_1)_{+}, \dots]$. See table 1 for examples of functions k defining Kreĭn kernels, along with the functions $\bar{k}$ defining the associated kernel. Importantly in our context, we note that this expansion applies to more general entire functions of m -indefinite-inner-products, specifically:

$$\begin{aligned} &k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) \\ &= k_+([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) - k_-([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) \\ &= [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}'), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{m, \gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})} \\ &\bar{k}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) \\ &= k_+([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) + k_-([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) \\ &= \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}'), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{m, |\gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})|} \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where φ_i and γ_i are as before, independent of m and $\mathbf{g}$, and:⁷

$$\begin{aligned} &k_{\pm}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) \\ &= \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}'), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{m, (\pm \gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g}))_{+}} \end{aligned}$$

The map $\varphi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an example of a feature map

⁷We note in passing that $\bar{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots) = \bar{k}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots]_{m, \mathbf{g}})$ is an m -kernel [Shilton et al. 2020] (tensor kernel [Salzo and Suykens 2016, Salzo et al. 2018], moment function [Der and Lee 2007]).

	k	$\bar{k}$	a_i	r
Linear	$k(\xi) = \xi$	$\bar{k}(\xi) = \xi$	$\delta_{i,1}$	∞
Erf	$k(\xi) = \text{erf}(\xi)$	$\bar{k}(\xi) = \text{erfi}(\xi)$	$\begin{cases} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{(-1)^{\frac{i-1}{2}}}{i(\frac{i-1}{2})!} & \text{if } i \text{ odd} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	∞
Tanh	$k(\xi) = \tanh(\xi)$	$\bar{k}(\xi) = \tan(\xi)$	$\begin{cases} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{2^{k+1}(2^{k+1}-1)B_{k+1}}{(k+1)!} & \text{if } i \text{ odd} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$\frac{\pi}{2}$
Logistic	$k(\xi) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-\xi)}$	$\bar{k}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \tan(\frac{\xi}{2}))$	$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{(2^{k+1}-1)B_{k+1}}{(k+1)!} & \text{if } i \text{ odd} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$\frac{\pi}{2}$

Table 1: Expansion series for Kreĭn kernels. In each case $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}})$ is a Kreĭn kernel with associated kernel $\bar{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \bar{k}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']_{\mathbf{g}})$ (the latter were obtained by comparison of the adjusted Taylor series $\bar{k}(\xi) = \sum_i |a_i| \xi^i$ with Taylor series of known functions - eg [Gradshteyn and Ryzhik 2000, Olver et al. 2010, Abramowitz et al. 1972, Jahnke and Emde 1945]) on $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} | [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq r\}$. Taylor series expansions are $k(\xi) = \sum_i a_i \chi^i$, $\bar{k}(\xi) = \sum_i |a_i| \chi^i$, so $k([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}'), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{x}''')]_{m, \gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})}$, $\bar{k}([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mathbf{g}}) = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}'), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{x}''')]_{m, |\gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})|}$, where, in multi index notation, $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = [\varphi_i(\mathbf{x})]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^{\dim(\mathbf{x})}}$, $\gamma = [\gamma_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^{\dim(\mathbf{x})}}$, where $\varphi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_j x_j^{i_j}$, $\gamma_i = (\frac{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}{\prod_j i_j!}) a_{\text{sum}(\mathbf{i})}$.

to a feature (Kreĭn) space $\{\mathcal{F}, [\cdot, \cdot]_{\gamma \odot \varphi(\mathbf{g})}\}$. As for positive definite kernels, it is natural to think of Kreĭn kernels being associated (non-uniquely) with feature maps in this way:

Theorem 10 (Feature Maps) *Let $\phi = \phi_+ \oplus \phi_- : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_+ \oplus \mathcal{F}_-$ (where $\phi_{\pm} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\pm}$) be a feature map from input space $\mathbb{X}$ to Kreĭn feature space $\mathcal{F}$, where the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{F}_{\pm}$ are imbued with inner-products $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_{\pm}}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is imbued with indefinite inner product $[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}']_{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathbf{v}_+, \mathbf{v}'_+ \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_+} - \langle \mathbf{v}_-, \mathbf{v}'_- \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_-}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_+ \oplus \mathcal{F}_-$ be the associated Hilbert feature space, imbued with inner product $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}' \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}} = \langle \mathbf{v}_+, \mathbf{v}'_+ \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_+} + \langle \mathbf{v}_-, \mathbf{v}'_- \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_-}$. Then:*

- $K(x, x') = [\phi(x), \phi(x')]_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a Kreĭn kernel for RKKS $\mathcal{K}_K = \{[\mathbf{v}, \phi(\cdot)]_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}\}$.
- $\bar{K}(x, x') = \langle \phi(x), \phi(x') \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}$ is a kernel for associated RKHS $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\bar{K}} = \{\langle \mathbf{v}, \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}} | \mathbf{v} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}\}$.
- $[\langle \mathbf{v}, \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}, \langle \mathbf{v}', \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}]_{\mathcal{K}_K} = [\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}']_{\mathcal{F}}$.
- $\langle \langle \mathbf{v}, \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}, \langle \mathbf{v}', \phi(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\bar{K}}} = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}' \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}$.

where the vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'$ are called weight vectors.

Regularised risk minimization in RKKS can be formulated in a number of ways [Loosli et al. 2013, Ong et al. 2004, Oglic and Gärtner 2018, 2019]. In [Ong et al. 2004] a stabilised risk minimisation problem is given that combines empirical risk minimisation with a regularisation term of the form $\lambda[f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_K}$. The result is non-convex, but nevertheless representer theory applies to all saddle points. Alternatively, [Oglic and Gärtner 2018] apply regularisation via the associated RKHS norm - that is, a regularisation term of the form $\lambda\langle f, f \rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}_{\bar{K}}}$. Once again the problem is non-convex, but superior results are reported. Following [Ong et al. 2004], consider the following (equivalent) regularised risk minimisation

problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^* &= \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_i \ell([\mathbf{v}, \phi(x_i)]_{\mathcal{F}} - y_i) + \lambda h([\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathcal{F}}) \\ &\quad \text{(weight-centric form)} \\ f^* &= \min_{f \in \mathcal{K}_K} \sum_i \ell(o(x_i) - y_i) + \lambda h([f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_K}) \\ &\quad \text{(function-centric form)} \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where $\{(x_i, y_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}_n\}$ is some training set, ℓ is a (differentiable) loss function, and h is differentiable. As per [Ong et al. 2004], it is not difficult to see that this has a solution of the form $f^*(\cdot) = \sum_i \alpha_i K(\cdot, x_i)$ (or, equivalently in weight-centric notation, $\mathbf{v}^* = \sum_i \alpha_i \phi(x_i)$), where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that, while (41) appears directly analogous to a typical regularised risk minimisation problem in reproducing kernel Hilbert space, the non-convexity of this form makes finding α somewhat complicated [Ong et al. 2004], which may explain why it does not appear to have been widely adopted despite promising performance.

2 Supplementary: Non-Entire Activation Functions

While the “entire function” requirement on the activation functions σ_q is necessary, we note that more general concave functions σ_q can be approximated to arbitrary precision using an entire, concave surrogate. For example, if σ_q is continuous then it may always be approximated to arbitrary precision by a finite sum $\tilde{\sigma}_q(\cdot) = \sum_i \beta_i \kappa(\cdot, \xi_i)$, where $\beta_i, \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and κ is an entire, concave, integrated universal kernel [Micchelli et al. 2006] (for example, $\kappa(\xi) = \text{erf}(\xi)$). In this way we may construct arbitrarily close entire approximations to e.g. the tanh activation function. Thus, though our analysis is restricted to entire activation functions, this should not be seen as a serious limiting factor.

2.1 A Note on the ReLU Activation Function

The ReLU (Rectified Linear Unit) activation $\sigma_+(\xi) = (\xi)_+$ function is popular in deep networks, so it is worth considering it in more detail. It is not entire, but can be approximated to arbitrary accuracy by $\sigma_{c+}(\xi) = \lim_{c \rightarrow 0+} \frac{1}{2}\xi(1 + \operatorname{erf}(\frac{1}{c}\xi))$, which is an entire function. When discussing ReLU networks we implicitly mean the limit of some sequence $\sigma_{c_0+}, \sigma_{c_1+}, \dots$, where $c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \dots \rightarrow 0$.

3 Supplementary: Details of Proofs

In this section we present the full proofs for the theorems presented in the body of the paper.

3.1 Preliminaries II: Indefinite SVMs

Theorem 1 (Representer Theory) Any solution $\mathbf{v}^*$ to (4) can be represented as $\mathbf{v}^* = \sum_i \alpha_i \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Defining $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}}$, the optimal $f^* : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $f^*(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \alpha_i^* K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$.

Proof: Applying first order stationarity conditions, denoting the derivative of ℓ as ℓ' , we have:

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v_k} = 0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \ell'(y_i, [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}}) g_k \varphi_k(\mathbf{x}_i) + 2\lambda g_k v_k$$

and so $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \alpha_i \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{2\lambda N} \sum_i \ell'(y_i, [\mathbf{v}, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}})$. Substituting into (3) we have $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \alpha_i K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ for K defined. $\square$

3.2 Flat Representations of Deep Networks

Lemma 2 (Extended Version): Let σ be an entire function with Taylor expansion $\sigma(\xi) = \sum_i a_i \xi^i$, and let $[\cdot, \cdot, \dots]_{m, \mu}$ be an m -indefinite-inner-product defined by metric $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (section 1.1). Then:

$$\sigma([\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}''']_{m, \mu}) = [\phi(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}''')]_{m, \gamma \odot \phi(\mu)} \quad (12)$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a feature map and $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$, both independent of m and μ . Using multi-index notation, $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = [\phi_i(\mathbf{x})]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ and $\gamma = [\gamma_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$, where:

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_j x_j^{i_j}, \quad \gamma_i = \left(\frac{\sum(\mathbf{i})}{\prod_j i_j!} \right) a_{\sum(\mathbf{i})} \quad (13)$$

Moreover, $\forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^D, \forall \mathbf{u}_{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{(n-1)}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \dots, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$:

$$\sigma \left(\sum_j t_j [\mathbf{u}_{(j)}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \dots]_{m, \mu} \right) = \dots \quad (42)$$

$$[\phi(\mathbf{t}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{u}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{v}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{v}'_{\bullet}), \dots]_{m+1, \gamma \odot \phi(\mu_{\bullet})}$$

where $\mathbf{t}_{\bullet} = \mathbf{t} \otimes \mathbf{1}_p$ and $\mathbf{u}_{\bullet} = [\mathbf{u}_{(0)}^T \mathbf{u}_{(1)}^T \dots]^T$, $\mathbf{v}_{\bullet} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{v}'_{\bullet} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \mathbf{v}'$, $\dots$, $\mu_{\bullet} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \mu$.

Proof: Equation (12) follows directly by substituting the m -indefinite-inner-product into the Taylor expansion of σ and applying the multinomial expansion. For (42) we expand, noting that:

$$t_{\bullet i} = t_{\lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor}, u_{\bullet i} = u_{(\lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor), i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor}, v_{\bullet i} = v_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor},$$

$$v'_{\bullet i} = v'_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor}, \dots, \mu_{\bullet i} = \mu_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is floor:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_n} t_j [\mathbf{u}_{(j)}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \dots]_{m, \mu} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_n, k \in \mathbb{N}_p} t_j u_{(j), k} v_k v'_k \dots \mu_k \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{np}} t_{\lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor} u_{(\lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor), i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor} v_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor} v'_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor} \dots \mu_{i-p \lfloor \frac{i}{p} \rfloor} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{np}} t_{\bullet i} u_{\bullet i} v_{\bullet i} v'_{\bullet i} \dots \mu_{\bullet i} \\ &= [\mathbf{t}_{\bullet}, \mathbf{u}_{\bullet}, \mathbf{v}_{\bullet}, \mathbf{v}'_{\bullet}, \dots]_{m+1, \mu_{\bullet}} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting and apply (12):

$$\sigma \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_n} t_j [\mathbf{u}_{(j)}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \dots]_{m, \mu} \right) = [\varphi(\mathbf{t}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{u}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{v}_{\bullet}), \phi(\mathbf{v}'_{\bullet}), \dots]_{m+1, \gamma \odot \phi(\mu_{\bullet})}$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 11 The deep network (1) has equivalent form (10), where $\varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{x})))$ is the feature map and the weight vectors $\mathbf{v}_{[0]}, \mathbf{v}_{[1]}, \dots$ in (10) correspond to the weight matrices in (1) via:

$$\mathbf{v}_{[q]} = \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T) \quad \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} = \gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi \left(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \left(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \left(\gamma_{[0]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_D) \right) \right) \right) \quad (43)$$

(which depend only on the deep network structure) where:

$$\phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T) = \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi \left(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi(\mathbf{W}_{0,:} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]}) \\ \phi(\mathbf{W}_{1,:} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]}) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{[q]} = \mathbf{1}_{H_{q-1}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_D))$$

(here $\mathbf{W}_{i,:}$ is row i of matrix $\mathbf{W}$ (Matlab style notation)).

Proof: Let $m_0 = 1$ and $m_q = \dim(\mathbf{x}_{[q-1]})$ (see below). Let $\mathbf{w}_{[q],(i)} = \mathbf{W}_{[q]i,:}$, and let $\mathbf{o}_{[q]}(\mathbf{x})$ denote the output of layer q . We proceed as follows:

Layer 0: As per figure 1 and equation (12), the output of layer 0 is:

$$\mathbf{o}_{[0]}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_0([\mathbf{w}_{[0],(0)}, \mathbf{x}]_{2,1}) \\ \sigma_0([\mathbf{w}_{[0],(1)}, \mathbf{x}]_{2,1}) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [\mathbf{w}_{[0],(0)}, \mathbf{x}]_{2, \mathbf{g}_{[1] \bullet}} \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[0],(1)}, \mathbf{x}]_{2, \mathbf{g}_{[1] \bullet}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \quad (44)$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ has been propagated through layer 0 to obtain $\mathbf{x}_{[1]}$, and likewise $\mathbf{W}_{[0]}$ has been propagated through layer 0 to obtain $\mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}$. Specifically ($\mathbf{1}_{m_0} = [\mathbf{1}]$):

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x}_{[1] \bullet} = \phi(\mathbf{x}) \\ \mathbf{g}_{[1] \bullet} = \gamma_{[0]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_D) \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x}_{[1]} = \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{[1] \bullet} \\ \mathbf{g}_{[1]} = \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[1] \bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[0,1],(i)} = \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[0],(i)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_0}) \end{array} \quad \mathbf{w}_{[0,1]} = [\mathbf{w}_{[0,1],(0)}^T \mathbf{w}_{[0,1],(1)}^T \dots]^T$$

Layer 1: As per figure 1 and equation (42), the output of

layer 1 is (where $\mathbf{1}_{m_1} = \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_D)$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{o}_{[1]}(\mathbf{x}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1(\sum_i w_{[1],(0)i} [\mathbf{w}_{[0,1],(i)}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]\bullet}]_{2,\mathbf{g}_{[1]\bullet}}) \\ \sigma_1(\sum_i w_{[1],(1)i} [\mathbf{w}_{[0,1],(i)}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]\bullet}]_{2,\mathbf{g}_{[1]\bullet}}) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_1([\mathbf{w}_{[1],(0)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_1}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[1]}}) \\ \sigma_1([\mathbf{w}_{[1],(1)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_1}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[1]}}) \\ \vdots \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(0)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(1)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1([\mathbf{w}_{[1],(0)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_1}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[1]}}) \\ \sigma_1([\mathbf{w}_{[1],(1)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_1}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[1]}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[1]}}) \\ \vdots \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(0)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(1)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(0)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(1)}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet}]_{3,\mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{[1]}$ has been propagated through layer 1 to obtain $\mathbf{x}_{[2]}$, and likewise for the weights ($\mathbf{w}_{[i,j]}$ is the result of propagating weights $\mathbf{W}_{[i]}$ through layers $i, i+1, \dots, j-1$). So:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_{[1]}) & \mathbf{x}_{[2]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_1} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{[2]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet} &= \gamma_{[1]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{g}_{[1]}) & \mathbf{g}_{[2]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_1} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[2]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[0,1]}) & \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_1} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{[0,2]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(i)} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[1],(i)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_1}) & \mathbf{w}_{[1,2]} &= [\mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(0)}^T \mathbf{w}_{[1,2],(1)}^T \dots]^T \\ &\dots & & \end{aligned}$$

Layer q: Repeating the same approach, at layer q (where $\mathbf{1}_{m_q} = \mathbf{1}_{H_{q-1}} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{q-2}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \phi(\mathbf{1}_D)))$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{o}_{[q]}(\mathbf{x}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_q(\sum_i w_{[q],(0)i} [\mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q]\bullet}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[q]\bullet}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q]\bullet}}) \\ \sigma_q(\sum_i w_{[q],(1)i} [\mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q]\bullet}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[q]\bullet}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q]\bullet}}) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_q([\mathbf{w}_{[q],(0)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_q}, \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q]}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q]}, \mathbf{x}_{[q]}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q]}}) \\ \sigma_q([\mathbf{w}_{[q],(1)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_q}, \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q]}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q]}, \mathbf{x}_{[q]}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q]}}) \\ \vdots \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1],(0)}, \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q+1]\bullet}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q+1]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[q+1]\bullet}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q+1]\bullet}} \\ [\mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1],(1)}, \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q+1]\bullet}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[0,q+1]\bullet}, \mathbf{x}_{[q+1]\bullet}]_{q+2,\mathbf{g}_{[q+1]\bullet}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where propagation through layer q gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{[q+1]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_{[q]}) & \mathbf{x}_{[q+1]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{[q+1]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{g}_{[q+1]\bullet} &= \gamma_{[q]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{g}_{[q]}) & \mathbf{g}_{[q+1]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[q+1]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[0,q+1]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[0,q]}) & \mathbf{w}_{[0,q+1]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{[0,q+1]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[1,q+1]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[1,q]}) & \mathbf{w}_{[1,q+1]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{[1,q+1]\bullet} \\ &\dots & \dots & \\ \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q+1]\bullet} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q]}) & \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q+1]} &= \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{[q-1,q+1]\bullet} \\ \mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1],(i)} &= \phi(\mathbf{w}_{[q],(i)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_q}) & \mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1]} &= [\mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1],(0)}^T \dots \mathbf{w}_{[q,q+1],(1)}^T \dots]^T \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Output layer: Propagation through the output layer $d-1$ follows the same formula, noting that $n_{d-1} = 1$ and so $\mathbf{x}_{[d]} = \mathbf{x}_{[d]\bullet}$, $\mathbf{w}_{[d-1,d]} = \mathbf{w}_{[d-1,d],0\bullet}$ etc. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{o}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{o}_{[d-1]}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= [\mathbf{w}_{[d-1,d],0}, \mathbf{w}_{[d-2,d]}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{[1,d]}, \mathbf{w}_{[0,d]}, \mathbf{x}_{[d]}]_{d+1,\mathbf{g}_{[d]}} \end{aligned}$$

where (45) applies with $q = d-1$.

To simplify our notation we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{x}))) \\ \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T) &= \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi(\left[\begin{array}{c} \phi(\mathbf{W}_{0,:} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_q}) \\ \phi(\mathbf{W}_{1,:} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_q}) \\ \vdots \end{array} \right])) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Using this notation, it is not difficult to see that $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}_d$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_{[q,d]} &= \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T) \\ \mathbf{x}_{[d]} &= \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and hence, defining:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} &= \mathbf{w}_{[d-1,d]} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{w}_{[1,d]} \odot \mathbf{w}_{[0,d]} \\ \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} &= \mathbf{g}_{[d]} = \gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes (\gamma_{[d-2]} \odot \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes (\gamma_{[0]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_D)) \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

the overall network may be written in the simple form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \quad (48)$$

Finally, using the form of φ_{NN} (a monomial map with terms of the form $x_j^{i_j}$) we have that:

$$\mathbf{1}_{m_i} = \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_1} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_0} \otimes \phi(\mathbf{1}_D)))$$

and also $\phi(\mathbf{a} \odot \mathbf{b}) = \phi(\mathbf{a}) \odot \phi(\mathbf{b})$ and $\phi(\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}) = \phi(\mathbf{a}) \otimes \phi(\mathbf{b})$ (recalling that ϕ is purely polynomial, and hence $(\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b})^{\odot n} = \mathbf{a}^{\odot n} \otimes \mathbf{b}^{\odot n}$). It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{[i+]}(\mathbf{W}) &= \mathbf{1}_{H_j} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{i+1}} \otimes \phi(\left[\begin{array}{c} \phi(\mathbf{W}_{0,:} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_i}) \\ \phi(\mathbf{W}_{1,:} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{m_i}) \\ \vdots \end{array} \right])) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{H_j} \otimes \phi(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{i+1}} \otimes \phi(\left[\begin{array}{c} \phi(\mathbf{W}_{0,:} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[i]}) \\ \phi(\mathbf{W}_{1,:} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[i]}) \\ \vdots \end{array} \right])) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

3.3 Regularisation Properties

Theorem 3 Recalling that $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_{[q]i} \xi^i$, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$, and $\bar{\sigma}_q(\xi) = \sum_i |a_{[q]i}| \xi^i$. Defining $[\mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]})$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \rangle_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = \bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]})$, where:

$$p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) = \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \sigma_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \sigma_q \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,\cdot}\|_2^2 \sigma_{q-1}(\dots H_0 \sigma_0(D) \dots) \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (22)$$

$$\bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \bar{\sigma}_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \bar{\sigma}_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \bar{\sigma}_q \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,\cdot}\|_2^2 \bar{\sigma}_{q-1}(\dots H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(D) \dots) \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (23)$$

we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq p_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) &\leq (HL)^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \\ 0 \leq \bar{p}_q(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) &\leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where H , L and $\bar{L}$ are geometric means of H_q , L_q and $\bar{L}_q$. Furthermore, if $\mathbb{W}_q$ is compact for a given $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ then $p_{[q]}^{1/2}, \bar{p}_{[q]}^{1/2} : \mathbb{W}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are, respectively, an F -norm and

a quasi- F -norm on $\mathbb{W}_q$, both of which are topologically equivalent to the Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ with bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{H}{L'}\right)^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 &\leq p_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \leq (HL)^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \\ \left(\frac{H}{\bar{L}}\right)^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 &\leq \bar{p}_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where L' and $\bar{L}$ are geometric means of L'_q and $\bar{L}'_q$, respectively, where $L'_q|a-b| \leq |\sigma_q(a) - \sigma_q(b)| \leq L_q|a-b|$ and $\bar{L}'_q|a-b| \leq |\bar{\sigma}_q(a) - \bar{\sigma}_q(b)| \leq \bar{L}_q|a-b|$ (that is, both σ_q and $\bar{\sigma}_q$ are bi-Lipschitz on the bounded domain implied by the compactness of $\mathbb{W}_q$).

Proof: We first note that, using the properties of ϕ :

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T \odot \mathbf{U}^T) &= \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T) \odot \phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{U}^T) \\ \phi_{[q+]}(|\mathbf{W}|^T) &= |\phi_{[q+]}(\mathbf{W}^T)| \end{aligned}$$

and so, using theorem 11, we can derive (22):

$$\begin{aligned} p_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) &= [\phi_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T), \phi_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T)]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \\ &= \llbracket \phi_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^T) \odot^2 \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \\ &= \llbracket \phi_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}^{\odot 2T}) \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \\ &= \llbracket \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-1}} \otimes \phi \left(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \\ &= H_{d-1} \llbracket \phi \left(\dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots \rrbracket_{1, \gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi(\mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[d-2]})} \\ &= H_{d-1} \sigma_{d-1} \left(\llbracket \dots \mathbf{1}_{H_{q+1}} \otimes \phi \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \dots \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{1}_{H_{d-2}} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[d-2]}} \right) \right) \\ &= H_{d-1} \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \dots \llbracket \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{1}_{H_q} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{[q]}} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= H_{d-1} \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_q} \sigma_q \left(\llbracket \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{g}_{[q]}} \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &= H_{d-1} \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_q} \sigma_q \left(\sum_{i_{q-1}} W_{[q]i_q, i_{q-1}}^2 \llbracket \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \rrbracket_{1, \mathbf{g}_{[q-1]}} \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &= H_{d-1} \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]0,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \phi \left(\mathbf{W}_{[q]1,:}^{\odot 2} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{[q]} \right) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \right) \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_q} \sigma_q \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \sigma_{q-1} \left(H_{q-1} \dots H_0 \sigma_0(D) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The derivation of (23) follows the same procedure, except that in this case we use $|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|$, and so the functions are $\bar{\sigma}_q$ with Taylor series coefficients $|a_{[q]i}|$.

Recall that an F -norm on $\mathbb{W}_q$ is a function $p : \mathbb{W}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $p(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}) \leq p(\mathbf{U}) + p(\mathbf{W})$ and $p(\mathbf{W}) = 0$ iff $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$, and a quasi- F -norm satisfies the weaker conditions $p(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}) \leq c(p(\mathbf{U}) + p(\mathbf{W}))$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $p(\mathbf{W}) = 0$ iff $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$. Clearly the right-hand-sides of (22) and (23) satisfy the positivity requirement, and it is not difficult to see from the concavity assumption on σ_q (and hence convexity on $\bar{\sigma}_q$) that the condition $p(\mathbf{W}) = 0$ iff $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$ is satisfied. The increasing, concave assumption on σ_q , combined with the fact that $\mathbf{W}_{[q]}$ on the right-hand-side of (refeq:vgiip) only occurs in a norm (and hence satisfies the triangle inequality) suffices to show that the right-side of (22) satisfies $p(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}) \leq p(\mathbf{U}) + p(\mathbf{W})$. So the right-side of (22) is an F -norm on $\mathbb{W}_q$. Note that σ_q bi-Lipschitz implies $\bar{\sigma}_q$ bi-Lipschitz with $\bar{L}'_q^{-1}|x-x'| \leq |\bar{\sigma}_q(x) - \bar{\sigma}_q(x')| \leq \bar{L}_q|x-x'|$ for some $\bar{L}_q, \bar{L}'_q$. Then this, the previously noted facts, and the compactness (hence boundedness) of $\mathbb{W}_q$, then implies that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that the right-hand-side of (23) will satisfy $p(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}) \leq c(p(\mathbf{U}) + p(\mathbf{W}))$, and hence is a quasi- F -norm on $\mathbb{W}_q$.

Finally, we recall that by assumption σ_q is bi-Lipschitz for all q with constant L_q . Hence, trivially, recalling that $\sigma_q(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \sigma_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \left. \sigma_q \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \sigma_{q-1} \left(H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \sigma_0(D) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i_q} L_{d-1} H_{d-2} L_{d-2} H_{d-3} L_{d-3} \dots H_{q+1} L_{q+1} L_q \dots \\ &\quad \left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 L_{q-1} H_{q-2} \dots H_0 L_0 D \\ &\sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \sigma_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \sigma_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \left. \sigma_q \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \sigma_{q-1} \left(H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \sigma_0(D) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i_q} L_{d-1}^{-1} H_{d-2} L_{d-2}^{-1} H_{d-3} L_{d-3}^{-1} \dots H_{q+1} L_{q+1}^{-1} L_q^{-1} \dots \\ &\quad \left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 L_{q-1}^{-1} H_{q-2} \dots H_0 L_0^{-1} D \end{aligned}$$

and so:

$$\frac{(HL^{-1})^d D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \leq p_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \leq \frac{(HL)^d D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2$$

We also note that by the assumptions on σ_q we have $\bar{\sigma}_q$ convex, bi-Lipschitz, and $\bar{\sigma}_q(0) = 0$. Let $\bar{L}_q$ be the associated Lipschitz constant. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \bar{\sigma}_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \bar{\sigma}_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \left. \bar{\sigma}_q \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \bar{\sigma}_{q-1} \left(H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(D) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i_q} \bar{L}_{d-1} H_{d-2} \bar{L}_{d-2} H_{d-3} \bar{L}_{d-3} \dots H_{q+1} \bar{L}_{q+1} \bar{L}_q \dots \\ &\quad \left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \bar{L}_{q-1} H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \bar{L}_0 D \\ &\bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \bar{\sigma}_{d-3} \left(\dots H_{q+1} \bar{\sigma}_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \left. \bar{\sigma}_q \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \bar{\sigma}_{q-1} \left(H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(D) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i_q} \bar{L}_{d-1}^{-1} H_{d-2} \bar{L}_{d-2}^{-1} H_{d-3} \bar{L}_{d-3}^{-1} \dots H_{q+1} \bar{L}_{q+1}^{-1} \bar{L}_q^{-1} \dots \\ &\quad \left\| \mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q,:} \right\|_2^2 \bar{L}_{q-1}^{-1} H_{q-2} \dots H_0 \bar{L}_0^{-1} D \end{aligned}$$

and so:

$$\frac{(H\bar{L}^{-1})^d D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \leq \bar{p}_{[q]}(\mathbf{W}_{[q]}) \leq \frac{(H\bar{L})^d D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2$$

hence these are topologically equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_F$. The final result follows from simple arithmetic. $\square$

Theorem 4 Using the notation of theorem 3, defining $[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = p_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots)$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \bar{p}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots)$, where:

$$p_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots) = \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}|^2 \cdots \right. \\ \left. \sigma_{d-2} \left(\cdots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|^2 \sigma_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0], i_0, :}\|_2^2 \right) \right) \right) \quad (24)$$

$$\bar{p}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{W}_{[0]}, \mathbf{W}_{[1]}, \dots) = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}|^2 \cdots \right. \\ \left. \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(\cdots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|^2 \bar{\sigma}_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0], i_0, :}\|_2^2 \right) \right) \right) \quad (25)$$

we have that:

$$0 \leq [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq L^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq \left(\frac{L}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^d \\ 0 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} \leq \bar{L}^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \leq \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^d$$

Furthermore:

$$\left(\frac{1}{L^d} \right)^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \leq [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} \leq L^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \\ \left(\frac{1}{\bar{L}^d} \right)^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} \leq \bar{L}^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2$$

Proof: The derivations of (24) and (25) follows a similar structure to the derivation of (22) and (23) in the proof of theorem 3, except that at every layer we encounter a weight matrix, so the result is as shown. Subsequently we apply the bi-Lipschitz property to bound the activation functions, thereby obtaining the second result, and finally simple arithmetic and the AM-GM inequality for the final bounds. $\square$

3.4 Equivalent SVMs for Deep Networks

Theorem 5 Let the feature map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and metric $\mathbf{g}$ be defined by the deep network (1) as per theorem 11. Then:

$$K_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}} = \sigma_{d-1}(\cdots \\ H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2}(H_{d-3} \cdots H_1 \sigma_1(H_0 \sigma_0(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1)))) \quad (49)$$

is the corresponding Kreĭn kernel, and:

$$\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1}(\cdots \\ H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2}(H_{d-3} \cdots H_1 \bar{\sigma}_1(H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1)))) \quad (50)$$

the associated kernel where, if $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_i \xi^i$ then $\bar{\sigma}_q(\xi) = \sum_i |a_i| \xi^i$ (e.g. see table 1 in the supplementary).

Proof: Using the notation and definitions in the proof of theorem 11, and applying the definitions (theorem 11 and lemma 2):

$$K_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = [\varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}} \\ = [\phi_{[0, d-1]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-1]}(\mathbf{x}')]_{\mathbf{g}} \\ = [\phi(\phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x})), \phi(\phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}'))]_{\gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi(\cdots)} \\ = \sigma_{d-1} \left([\phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}')]_{1_{H_{d-2}} \otimes (\gamma_{[d-2]} \odot \phi(\cdots))} \right) \\ = \sigma_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} \left([\phi_{[0, d-3]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-3]}(\mathbf{x}')]_{1_{H_{d-3}} \otimes (\gamma_{[d-3]} \odot \phi(\cdots))} \right) \right) \\ = \cdots \\ = \sigma_{d-1} (H_{d-2} \sigma_{d-2} (\cdots H_1 \sigma_1 (H_0 \sigma_0 (\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1))))$$

and likewise, the associated kernel $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$ is:

$$\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \varphi(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} \\ = \langle \phi_{[0, d-1]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-1]}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} \\ = \langle \phi(\phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x})), \phi(\phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}')) \rangle_{|\gamma_{[d-1]} \odot \phi(\cdots)|} \\ = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(\langle \phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-2]}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|1_{H_{d-2}} \otimes (\gamma_{[d-2]} \odot \phi(\cdots))|} \right) \\ = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(\langle \phi_{[0, d-3]}(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{[0, d-3]}(\mathbf{x}') \rangle_{|1_{H_{d-3}} \otimes (\gamma_{[d-3]} \odot \phi(\cdots))|} \right) \right) \\ = \cdots \\ = \bar{\sigma}_{d-1} (H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} (\cdots H_1 \bar{\sigma}_1 (H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0 (\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle_1))))$$

where, if $\sigma_q(\xi) = \sum_i a_i \xi^i$ (recall that σ_q is entire, so this Taylor series exists) then $\bar{\sigma}_q(\xi) = \sum_i |a_i| \xi^i$. See table 1 in the supplementary for examples. $\square$

3.5 Rademacher Complexity Analysis

Theorem 6 Let K_{NN} be a Kreĭn kernel and $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}$ be its associated kernel such that $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \in L_1(\mathbb{X}, \nu)$ and $\bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$. Then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{SVM}}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(R_{\text{SVM}} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\nu(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (36)$$

Proof: Following [Mendelson 2003], we first prove the following, where we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality at step #, the fact that the Rademacher complexity of a ball in RKKS is the same as the Rademacher complexity of the same ball in the associated RKHS at step *, Jensen's inequality at step ^, and independence at step \vee:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}_{K_{\text{NN}}}[f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_{K_{\text{NN}}} \leq R_{\text{SVM}}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{v} \right|_{\mathbf{g}} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup \left| \langle \sum_i \epsilon_i |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \text{sgn}(\mathbf{g}) \odot |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \mathbf{v} \rangle_1 \right| \right] \\ \leq^{\#} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup \left\| \sum_i \epsilon_i |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \left\| |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \mathbf{v} \right\|_2 \right] \\ = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup \left\| \sum_i \epsilon_i |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ \leq^* \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\left\| \sqrt{R_{\text{SVM}}} \sum_i \epsilon_i |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq^{\wedge} \frac{1}{N} \left[R_{\text{SVM}} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left\| \sum_i \epsilon_i |\mathbf{g}|^{\odot \frac{1}{2}} \odot \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_2^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ = \frac{1}{N} \left[R_{\text{SVM}} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \sum_{ij} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j \langle \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_j) \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ =^{\vee} \frac{1}{N} \left(R_{\text{SVM}} \sum_i \langle \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i), \varphi_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}|} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} [\epsilon_i^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{R_{\text{SVM}} \sum_i \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i)}$$

Then, using the properties of Rademacher complexity (again following [Mendelson 2003]), we have that:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{SVM}}) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}_{K_{\text{NN}}}[f, f]_{\mathcal{K}_{K_{\text{NN}}} \leq R_{\text{SVM}}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{R_{\text{SVM}} \sum_i \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \\ \leq^{\wedge} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{R_{\text{SVM}} \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \sum_i \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i)} \\ \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{R_{\text{SVM}} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \bar{K}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\nu(\mathbf{x})}$$

□

Theorem 7 Let σ_q be concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$, $\sigma_q(0) = 0$ and $\sigma_q(-\xi) = -\sigma_q(\xi)$ in addition to the usual assumptions. Let:

$\chi_{\text{NN}}(\xi) = \sigma_{d-1}(d\sqrt{H_{d-2}}\sigma_{d-2}(d\sqrt{H_{d-3}}\sigma_{d-3}(\dots d\sqrt{H_0}\sigma_0(\xi))))$
If $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \chi_{\text{NN}}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \in L_1(\mathbb{X}, \nu)$ then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\int \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2) d\nu(\mathbf{x})}$$

Moreover if σ_q is unbounded for all q then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} (d\sqrt{HL})^d \sqrt{\int \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2 d\nu(\mathbf{x})}$$

and otherwise, if $\sigma_q(\xi) \leq 1 \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}_d$ then:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} (d\sqrt{H_{[q+]}}L_{[q+]})^{d-q-1}$$

where $H_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(H_{q+1}, \dots, H_{d-1})$ and $L_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(L_{q+1}, \dots, L_{d-1})$ are geometric means.

Proof: We start by considering:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}_{[q]} \in \mathbb{W}_q | \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_F^2 \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{\mathbf{g}} \right| \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_0} W_{[1]i_1, i_0} \sigma_0(\mathbf{W}_{[0]i_0, :}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using our assumptions on σ_q and subsequently the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots, s_i = \pm 1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}| \sigma_0 \left(|\mathbf{W}_{[0]i_0, :}^T \mathbf{x}_i| \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}| \sigma_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0]i_0, :}\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Jensen's inequality on concave functions and subsequently the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and that $\|\cdot\|_2 \leq \|\cdot\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n} \|\cdot\|_2$ for the 1- and 2-norms on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \left(\sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}| \right) \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}| \|\mathbf{W}_{[0]i_0, :}\|_2}{\sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_1 \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_1} \|\mathbf{W}_{[0]}\|_F \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_2 \sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_2} \|\mathbf{W}_{[0]}\|_F \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}| \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \|\mathbf{W}_{[1]i_1, :}\|_2 \sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0]}\|_F \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same procedure at each level of the nested activation functions and using the definition of $\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[d-1]}\|_F \sqrt{H_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots \|\mathbf{W}_{[1]}\|_F \sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0]}\|_F \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{s_i = \pm 1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(dR_{\text{NN}} \sqrt{H_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots dR_{\text{NN}} \sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(dR_{\text{NN}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any concave increasing function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $a \in [1, \infty)$, $b \in [0, \infty)$ we have that $g(ab) \leq ag(b)$. Using this, and subsequently applying Jensen's inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{N} \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left| \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(d\sqrt{H_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots d\sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(d\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right] \\ \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{N} \left(\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\left(\sup_{\dots} \sum_i \epsilon_i s_i \sigma_{d-1} \left(d\sqrt{H_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots d\sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(d\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right) \right]^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{N} \left(\mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{\dots} \left(\sum_i (\epsilon_i s_i)^2 \right) \left(\sum_i \left(\sigma_{d-1} \left(d\sqrt{H_{d-2}} \sigma_{d-2} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \left. \dots d\sqrt{H_0} \sigma_0 \left(d\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \right) \right) \right) \right)^2 \right) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\sum_i \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2)} \end{aligned}$$

where χ_{NN} is as defined in the theorem. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) &= \mathbb{E}_\nu \mathbb{E}_\epsilon \left[\sup_{f=[\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \varphi(\cdot)]_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NN}}, [\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}]_{\mathbf{g}} \leq R_{\text{NN}}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \epsilon_i f(\mathbf{x}_i) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\nu \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\sum_i \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2)} \\ &\leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\sum_i \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2) \right]} \\ &\leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\int \chi_{\text{NN}}^2(\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2) d\nu(\mathbf{x})} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider the special cases. In the fully bounded case $\sigma_{d-1}(\xi) \leq 1$ we may bound the integral by replacing χ_{NN} with 1, so it follows that:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\int d\nu(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}}$$

In the unbounded case we use that σ_q is Lipschitz and positive on $\mathbb{R}_+$ to obtain $0 \leq \sigma_q(\xi) \leq L_q \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and hence:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq (d\sqrt{HL})^d \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\int \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2 d\nu(\mathbf{x})}$$

and in the partially bounded case we observe that the definition of χ_{NN} can be “pinched off” at σ_q in a manner similar to the fully bounded case, while the remainder of the activation functions to the output contribute a Lipschitz constant and a width term, so:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathfrak{f}_{\text{NN}}) \leq (d\sqrt{H_{[q+]}}L_{[q+]})^{d-q-1} \frac{\max\{1, R_{\text{NN}}^d\}}{\sqrt{N}}$$

where $H_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(H_{q+1}, \dots, H_{d-1})$ and $L_{[q+]} = \text{GM}(L_{q+1}, \dots, L_{d-1})$ are geometric means. □

3.6 Sparsity Analysis

Theorem 8 For a given deep network satisfying our assumptions, using the notations described, we have that $\|\mathbf{v}_{[q]}\|_\infty \leq dR_{\text{NN}}, \|\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty \leq R_{\text{NN}}^d$, and:

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_{2/d} \leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \quad (39)$$

where $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\gamma = \sum_i |a_i|^\gamma$ is the L_γ -“norm” $\forall \gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Proof: Using the Cauchy-Schwarz and theorem 3:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i |g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i}|^{\frac{2}{d}} &= \langle |\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}} \rangle_{1, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} = \langle \odot_q |\mathbf{v}_{[q]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}} \rangle_{1, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} \\ &= \langle |\mathbf{v}_{[0]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}}, |\mathbf{v}_{[1]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}}, \dots, |\mathbf{v}_{[d-1]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}} \rangle_{d, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} \\ &\leq \left(\prod_q \left| \langle |\mathbf{v}_{[q]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}}, |\mathbf{v}_{[q]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}}, \dots, |\mathbf{v}_{[q]}|^{\odot \frac{2}{d}} \rangle_{d, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} \right| \right)^{1/d} \\ &= \left(\prod_q \langle \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \rangle_{|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|} \right)^{1/d} \\ &\leq \left(\prod_q \frac{(H\bar{L})^d D}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^{1/d} \\ &= (H\bar{L})^d D^{\frac{1}{H^2}} D^{\frac{1}{d}} \left(\prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^{1/d} \\ &= H^{d-2} \bar{L}^d D^{1-\frac{1}{d}} \left(\prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \right)^{1/d} \\ &\leq (H\bar{L})^d \left(\frac{1}{H} \right)^2 D^{1-\frac{1}{d}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_{[q]}^2 \\ &= (H\bar{L})^d \left(\frac{1}{H} \right)^2 D^{1-\frac{1}{d}} R_{\text{NN}} \\ &\leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \end{aligned}$$

Likewise:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \odot |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|^{\odot \frac{1}{m}} \right\|_m &= \langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}, \dots \rangle_{m, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|}^{1/m} \\ &= \left(\bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(\sum_{i_{d-2}} |W_{[d-1]0, i_{d-2}}|^m \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \dots \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(\dots \sum_{i_0} |W_{[1]i_1, i_0}|^m \bar{\sigma}_0 \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[0], i_0, :}\|_m^m \right) \right) \right) \right)^{1/m} \\ &= \left(\bar{L}^d \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_m^m \right)^{1/m} = \bar{L}^{d/m} \prod_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_m \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\bar{L}^{1/m}}{d} \sum_q \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_m \right)^d \leq \left(\bar{L}^{\frac{1}{m}} R_{\text{NN}} \right)^d \end{aligned}$$

so:

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}} \odot |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|^{\odot \frac{1}{m}} \right\|_m \leq R_{\text{NN}}^d$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \odot |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|^{\odot \frac{1}{m}} \right\|_m &= \langle \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \mathbf{v}_{[q]}, \dots \rangle_{m, |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|}^{1/m} \\ &= \left(\bar{\sigma}_{d-1} \left(H_{d-2} \bar{\sigma}_{d-2} \left(H_{d-3} \bar{\sigma}_{d-3} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \dots H_{q+1} \bar{\sigma}_{q+1} \left(\sum_{i_q} \bar{\sigma}_q \left(\|\mathbf{W}_{[q]i_q, :}\|_m^m \sigma_{q-1} \left(H_{q-2} \dots \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \dots H_0 \bar{\sigma}_0 \left(D \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right)^{1/m} = \left(\frac{D \bar{L}^d \bar{H}^d}{H_q H_{q-1}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_m^m \right)^{1/m} \\ &= \frac{D^{1/m} \bar{L}^{d/m} \bar{H}^{d/m}}{(H_q H_{q-1})^{1/m}} \|\mathbf{W}_{[q]}\|_m \leq \left(\frac{D \bar{L}^d \bar{H}^d}{H_q H_{q-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} dR_{\text{NN}} \end{aligned}$$

so:

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{[q]}\|_\infty = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{v}_{[q]} \odot |\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}|^{\odot \frac{1}{m}} \right\|_m \leq dR_{\text{NN}}$$

□

Corollary 9 The total weight vector $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ of the flat representation is ϵ -sparse - that is, there are at most $\lfloor (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{d}} \rfloor$ elements in this vector with magnitude $|g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i}|$ greater than $\epsilon \in (0, dR_{\text{NN}} \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty]$.

Proof: Suppose n_{max} elements of the total weight vector $\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}$ have $|g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i}| \geq \epsilon$. To satisfy theorem 8 we must have:

$$n_{\text{max}} \epsilon^{\frac{2}{d}} \leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2}$$

and so:

$$n_{\text{max}} \leq (H\bar{L})^d \frac{DR_{\text{NN}}}{H^2} \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{d}}$$

Using theorem 8 we have that $\|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}} \odot \mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{v}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty R_{\text{NN}}^d$, so we see that $|g_{\text{NN}i} v_{\text{NN}i}| \leq \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{NN}}\|_\infty R_{\text{NN}}^d$, which provides our upper bound on ϵ . □