

Generalized Leverage Score Sampling for Neural Networks*

Jason D. Lee[†] Ruoqi Shen[‡] Zhao Song[§] Mengdi Wang[¶] Zheng Yu^{||}

Abstract

Leverage score sampling is a powerful technique that originates from theoretical computer science, which can be used to speed up a large number of fundamental questions, e.g. linear regression, linear programming, semi-definite programming, cutting plane method, graph sparsification, maximum matching and max-flow. Recently, it has been shown that leverage score sampling helps to accelerate kernel methods [Avron, Kapralov, Musco, Musco, Velingker and Zandieh 17].

In this work, we generalize the results in [Avron, Kapralov, Musco, Musco, Velingker and Zandieh 17] to a broader class of kernels. We further bring the leverage score sampling into the field of deep learning theory.

- We show the connection between the initialization for neural network training and approximating the neural tangent kernel with random features.
- We prove the equivalence between regularized neural network and neural tangent kernel ridge regression under the initialization of both classical random Gaussian and leverage score sampling.

*The authors would like to thank Michael Kapralov for suggestion of this topic.

[†]jasonlee@princeton.edu Princeton University.

[‡]shenr3@cs.washington.edu University of Washington. Work done while visiting Institute for Advanced Study.

[§]magic.linuxkde@gmail.com Columbia University, Princeton University and Institute for Advanced Study.

[¶]mengdiw@princeton.edu Princeton University.

^{||}zhengy@princeton.edu Princeton University.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Related work	2
3	Main results	3
3.1	Kernel approximation with leverage score sampling	3
3.2	Application in training regularized neural network	5
3.2.1	Equivalence I, training with random Gaussian initialization	5
3.2.2	Equivalence II, training with leverage scores	6
4	Overview of techniques	7
5	Conclusion	10
A	Preliminaries	11
A.1	Probability tools	11
A.2	Neural tangent kernel and its properties	12
B	Equivalence between sufficiently wide neural net and kernel ridge regression	13
B.1	Preliminaries	13
B.2	Definitions	14
B.3	Gradient, gradient flow, and linear convergence	16
B.4	Proof sketch	20
B.5	Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for test data prediction	21
B.5.1	Upper bounding $ u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^* $	21
B.5.2	Upper bounding $ u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T) $ by bounding initialization and kernel perturbation	22
B.5.3	Upper bounding initialization perturbation	26
B.5.4	Upper bounding kernel perturbation	27
B.5.5	Final result for upper bounding $ u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T) $	34
B.5.6	Main result for test data prediction equivalence	35
B.6	Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction	35
C	Generalization result of leverage score sampling for approximating kernels	36
C.1	Preliminaries	36
C.2	Main result	38
D	Equivalence between training neural network with regularization and kernel ridge regression under leverage score sampling	41
D.1	Preliminaries	41
D.2	Definitions	42
D.3	Leverage score sampling, gradient flow, and linear convergence	44
D.4	Proof sketch	50
D.5	Main result	51
D.5.1	Upper bounding $\ u^* - \bar{u}^*\ _2$	51
D.5.2	Upper bounding $\ \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - \bar{u}^*\ _2$	52
D.5.3	Main result for equivalence with leverage score sampling initialization	59
E	Extension to other neural network models	59
	References	61

1 Introduction

Kernel method is one of the most common techniques in various machine learning problems. One classical application is the kernel ridge regression (KRR). Given training data $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, corresponding labels $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$, the output estimate of KRR for any given input z can be written as:

$$f(z) = \mathbf{K}(z, X)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{K}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the kernel function and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denotes the kernel matrix.

Despite being powerful and well-understood, the kernel ridge regression suffers from the costly computation when dealing with large datasets, since generally implementation of Eq. (1) requires $O(n^3)$ running time. Therefore, intensive research have been dedicated to the scalable methods for KRR [Bac13, AM15, ZDW15, ACW17, MM17, ZNV⁺20]. One of the most popular approach is the random Fourier features sampling originally proposed by [RR08] for shift-invariant kernels. They construct a finite dimensional random feature vector $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^s$ through sampling that approximates the kernel function $\mathbf{K}(x, z) \approx \phi(x)^* \phi(z)$ for data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The random feature helps approximately solves KRR in $O(ns^2 + n^2)$ running time, which improves the computational cost if $s \ll n$. The work [AKM⁺17] advanced this result by introducing the leverage score sampling to take the regularization term into consideration.

In this work, we follow the the approach in [AKM⁺17] and naturally generalize the result to a broader class of kernels, which is of the form

$$\mathbf{K}(x, z) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x, w)^\top \phi(z, w)],$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ is a finite dimensional vector and $p : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a probability distribution. We apply the leverage score sampling technique in this generalized case to obtain a tighter upper-bound on the dimension of random features.

Further, We discuss the application of our theory in neural network training. Over the last two years, there is a long line of over-parametrization theory works on the convergence results of deep neural network [LL18, DZPS19, AZLS19b, AZLS19a, DLL⁺19, ADH⁺19b, ADH⁺19a, SY19, BPSW20], all of which either explicitly or implicitly use the property of neural tangent kernel [JGH18]. However, most of those results focus on neural network training without regularization, while in practice regularization (which is originated from classical machine learning) has been widely used in training deep neural network. Therefore, in this work we rigorously build the equivalence between training a ReLU deep neural network with ℓ_2 regularization and neural tangent kernel ridge regression. We observe that the initialization of training neural network corresponds to approximating the neural tangent kernel with random features, whose dimension is proportional to the width of the network. Thus, it motivates us to bring the leverage score sampling theory into the neural network training. We present a new equivalence between neural net and kernel ridge regression under the initialization using leverage score sampling, which potentially improves previous equivalence upon the upper-bound of network width needed.

We summarize our main results and contribution as following:

- Generalize the leverage score sampling theory for kernel ridge regression to a broader class of kernels.
- Connect the leverage score sampling theory with neural network training.

- Theoretically prove the equivalence between training regularized neural network and kernel ridge regression under both random Gaussian initialization and leverage score sampling initialization.

2 Related work

Leverage scores Given a $m \times n$ matrix A . Let a_i^\top be the i -th rows of A and the leverage score of the i -th row of A is $\sigma_i(A) = a_i^\top (A^\top A)^\dagger a_i$. A row’s leverage score measures how important it is in composing the row space of A . If a row has a component orthogonal to all other rows, its leverage score is 1. Removing it would decrease the rank of A , completely changing its row space. The coherence of A is $\|\sigma(A)\|_\infty$. If A has low coherence, no particular row is especially important. If A has high coherence, it contains at least one row whose removal would significantly affect the composition of A ’s row space.

Leverage score is a fundamental concept in graph problems and numerical linear algebra. There are many works on how to approximate leverage scores [SS11, DMIMW12, CW13, NN13] or more general version of leverages, e.g. Lewis weights [Lew78, BLM89, CP15]. From graph perspective, it has been applied to maximum matching [BLN⁺20, LSZ20], max-flow [DS08, Mad13, Mad16, LS20b, LS20a], generate random spanning trees [Sch18], and sparsify graphs [SS11]. From matrix perspective, it has been used to give matrix CUR decomposition [BW14, SWZ17, SWZ19] and tensor CURT decomposition [SWZ19]. From optimization perspective, it has been used to approximate the John Ellipsoid [CCLY19], linear programming [LS14, BLSS20, JSWZ20], semi-definite programming [JKL⁺20], and cutting plane methods [Vai89, LSW15, JLSW20].

Kernel methods Kernel methods can be thought of as instance-based learners: rather than learning some fixed set of parameters corresponding to the features of their inputs, they instead “remember” the i -th training example (x_i, y_i) and learn for it a corresponding weight w_i . Prediction for unlabeled inputs, i.e., those not in the training set, is treated by the application of similarity function K , called a kernel, between the unlabeled input x' and each of the training inputs x_i .

There are three lines of works that are closely related to our work. First, our work is highly related to the recent discoveries of the connection between deep learning and kernels [DFS16, Dan17, JGH18, CB18]. Second, our work is closely related to development of connection between leverage score and kernels [RR08, CW17, CMM17, MW17b, MW17a, LTOS18, AKM⁺17, AKM⁺19, ACSS20]. Third, our work is related to kernel ridge regression [Bac13, AM15, ZDW15, ACW17, MM17, ZNV⁺20].

Convergence of neural network There is a long line of work studying the convergence of neural network with random input assumptions [BG17, Tia17, ZSJ⁺17, Sol17, LY17, ZSD17, DLT⁺18, GLM18, BJW19]. For a quite while, it is not known to remove the randomness assumption from the input data points. Recently, there is a large number of work studying the convergence of neural network in the over-parametrization regime [LL18, DZPS19, AZLS19b, AZLS19a, DLL⁺19, ADH⁺19b, ADH⁺19a, SY19, BPSW20]. These results don’t need to assume that input data points are random, and only require some much weaker assumption which is called “data-separable”. Mathematically, it says for any two input data points x_i and x_j , we have $\|x_i - x_j\|_2 \geq \delta$. Sufficiently wide neural network requires the width m to be at least $\text{poly}(n, d, L, 1/\delta)$, where n is the number of input data points, d is the dimension of input data point, L is the number of layers.

Continuous Fourier transform The continuous Fourier transform is defined as a problem [JLS20] where you take samples $f(t_1), \dots, f(t_m)$ from the time domain $f(t) := \sum_{j=1}^n v_j e^{2\pi i \langle x_j, t \rangle}$, and try to reconstruct function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ or even recover $\{(v_j, x_j)\} \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. The data separation connects to the sparse Fourier transform in the continuous domain. We can view the n input data points [LL18, AZLS19b, AZLS19a] as n frequencies in the Fourier transform [Moi15, PS15]. The separation of the data set is equivalent to the gap of the frequency set ($\min_{i \neq j} \|x_i - x_j\|_2 \geq \delta$). In the continuous Fourier transform, there are two families of algorithms: one requires to know the frequency gap [Moi15, PS15, CM20, JLS20] and the other doesn't [CKPS16]. However, in the over-parameterized neural network training, all the existing work requires a gap for the data points.

Notations We use \mathbf{i} to denote $\sqrt{-1}$. For vector x , we use $\|x\|_2$ to denote the ℓ_2 norm of x . For matrix A , we use $\|A\|$ to denote the spectral norm of A and $\|A\|_F$ to denote the Frobenius norm of A . For matrix A and B , we use $A \preceq B$ to denote that $B - A$ is positive semi-definite. For a square matrix, we use $\text{tr}[A]$ to denote the trace of A . We use A^{-1} to denote the true inverse of an invertible matrix. We use A^\dagger to denote the pseudo-inverse of matrix A . We use A^\top to denote the transpose of matrix A .

3 Main results

In this section, we state our results. In Section 3.1, we consider the large-scale kernel ridge regression (KRR) problem. We generalize the Fourier transform result [AKM⁺17] of accelerating the running time of solving KRR using the tool of leverage score sampling to a broader class of kernels. In Section 3.2, we discuss the interesting application of leverage score sampling for training deep learning models due to the connection between regularized neural nets and kernel ridge regression.

3.1 Kernel approximation with leverage score sampling

In this section, we generalize the leverage score theory in [AKM⁺17], which analyzes the number of random features needed to approximate kernel matrix under leverage score sampling regime for the kernel ridge regression task. In the next a few paragraphs, we briefly review the settings of classical kernel ridge regression.

Given training data given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, corresponding labels $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and feature map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, a classical kernel ridge regression problem can be written as¹

$$\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \phi(X)^\top \beta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter. By introducing the corresponding kernel function $K(x, z) = \langle \phi(x), \phi(z) \rangle$ for any data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the output estimate of the kernel ridge regression for any data $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be denoted as $f^*(x) = K(x, X)^\top \alpha$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the solution to

$$(K + \lambda I_n) \alpha = Y.$$

Here $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the kernel matrix with $K_{i,j} = K(x_i, x_j)$, $\forall i, j \in [n] \times [n]$.

¹Strictly speaking, the optimization problem should be considered in a hypothesis space defined by the reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with the feature/kernel. Here, we use the notation in finite dimensional space for simplicity.

Note a direct computation involves $(K + \lambda I_n)^{-1}$, whose $O(n^3)$ running time can be fairly large in tasks like neural network due to the large number of training data. Therefore, we hope to construct feature map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$, such that the new feature approximates the kernel matrix well in the sense of

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n) \preceq \Phi \Phi^\top + \lambda I_n \preceq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n), \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is small and $\Phi = [\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}$. Then by Woodbury matrix equality, we can approximate the solution by $u^*(z) = \phi(z)^\top (\Phi^\top \Phi + \lambda I_s)^{-1} \Phi^\top Y$, which can be computed in $O(ns^2 + n^2)$ time. In the case $s = o(n)$, computational cost can be saved.

In this work, we consider a generalized setting of [AKM⁺17] as a kernel ridge regression problem with positive definite kernel matrix $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$K(x, z) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x, w)^\top \phi(z, w)], \quad (3)$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ denotes a finite dimensional vector and $p : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denotes a probability density function.

Due to the regularization $\lambda > 0$ in this setting, instead of constructing the feature map directly from the distribution q , we consider the following ridge leveraged distribution:

Definition 3.1 (Ridge leverage function). *Given data $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and parameter $\lambda > 0$, we define the ridge leverage function as*

$$q_\lambda(w) = p(w) \cdot \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w)],$$

where $p(\cdot)$, ϕ are defined in Eq. (3), and $\Phi(w) = [\phi(x_1, w)^\top, \dots, \phi(x_n, w)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$. Further, we define statistical dimension $s_\lambda(K)$ as

$$s_\lambda(K) = \int q_\lambda(w) dw = \text{tr}[(K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} K]. \quad (4)$$

The leverage score sampling distribution $q_\lambda/s_\lambda(K)$ takes the regularization term into consideration and achieves Eq. (2) using the following modified random features vector:

Definition 3.2 (Modified random features). *Given any probability density function $q(\cdot)$ whose support includes that of $p(\cdot)$. Given m vectors $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, we define modified random features $\bar{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md_2}$ as $\bar{\Psi} := [\bar{\varphi}(x_1), \dots, \bar{\varphi}(x_n)]^\top$, where*

$$\bar{\varphi}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left[\frac{\sqrt{p(w_1)}}{\sqrt{q(w_1)}} \phi(x, w_1)^\top, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{p(w_m)}}{\sqrt{q(w_m)}} \phi(x, w_m)^\top \right]^\top.$$

Now we are ready to present our result.

Theorem 3.3 (Kernel approximation with leverage score sampling, generalization of Lemma 8 in [AKM⁺17]). *Given parameter $\lambda \in (0, \|K\|)$. Let $q_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the leverage score defined in Definition 3.1. Let $\tilde{q}_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable function such that $\tilde{q}_\lambda(w) \geq q_\lambda(w)$ holds for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$. Assume $s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_1}} \tilde{q}_\lambda(w) dw$ is finite. Let $\bar{q}_\lambda(w) = \tilde{q}_\lambda(w)/s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda}$. Given any accuracy parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ denote m samples draw independently from the distribution associated with the density $\bar{q}_\lambda(\cdot)$, and construct the modified random features $\bar{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md_2}$ as in Definition 3.2 with $q = \bar{q}_\lambda$. Let $s_\lambda(K)$ be the statistical dimension defined in (4). If $m \geq 3\epsilon^{-2} s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \ln(16s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \cdot s_\lambda(K)/\delta)$, then we have*

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n) \preceq \bar{\Psi} \bar{\Psi}^\top + \lambda I_n \preceq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n) \quad (5)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Remark 3.4. Above results can be generalized to the complex domain \mathbb{C} . Note for the random Fourier feature case discussed in [AKM⁺17], we have $d_1 = d$, $d_2 = 1$, $\phi(x, w) = e^{-2\pi i w^\top x} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $p(\cdot)$ denotes the Fourier transform density distribution, which is a special case in our setting.

3.2 Application in training regularized neural network

In this section, we consider the application of leverage score sampling in training ℓ_2 regularized neural networks.

Past literature such as [DZPS19], [ADH⁺19a] have already witnessed the equivalence between training a neural network and solving a kernel regression problem in a broad class of network models. In this work, we first generalize this result to the regularization case, where we connect regularized neural network with kernel ridge regression. Then we apply the above discussed the leverage score sampling theory for KRR to the task of training neural nets.

3.2.1 Equivalence I, training with random Gaussian initialization

To illustrate the idea, we consider a simple model two layer neural network with ReLU activation function as in [DZPS19, SY19]².

$$f_{\text{nn}}(W, a, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r^\top x) \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the input, $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r \in [m]$ is the weight vector of the first layer, $W = [w_1, \dots, w_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $a_r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r \in [m]$ is the output weight, $a = [a_1, \dots, a_m]^\top$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU activation function: $\sigma(z) = \max\{0, z\}$.

Here we consider only training the first layer W with fixed a , so we also write $f_{\text{nn}}(W, x) = f_{\text{nn}}(W, a, x)$. Again, given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and labels $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote $f_{\text{nn}}(W, X) = [f_{\text{nn}}(W, x_1), \dots, f_{\text{nn}}(W, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We formally define training neural network with ℓ_2 regularization as follows:

Definition 3.5 (Training neural network with regularization). *Let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ be a small multiplier³. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. We initialize the network as $a_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{unif}[\{-1, 1\}]$ and $w_r(0) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Then we consider solving the following optimization problem using gradient descent:*

$$\min_W \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|W\|_F^2. \quad (6)$$

Let $w_r(t), r \in [m]$ be the network weight at iteration t . We denote the training data predictor at iteration t as $u_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Further, given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R}$ as the test data predictor at iteration t .

On the other hand, we consider the following neural tangent kernel ridge regression problem:

$$\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2, \quad (7)$$

²Our results directly extends to multi-layer deep neural networks with all layers trained together

³To establish the training equivalence result, we assign $\kappa = 1$ back to the normal case. For the training equivalence result, we pick $\kappa > 0$ to be a small multiplier only to shrink the initial output of the neural network. The is the same as what is used in [AKM⁺17].

where κ, λ are the same parameters as in Eq. (6), $f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x) = \Phi(x)^\top \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X) = [f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_1), \dots, f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the test data predictors. Here, Φ is the feature map corresponding to the neural tangent kernel (NTK):

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x, z) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, x)}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, z)}{\partial W} \right\rangle \right] \quad (8)$$

where $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are any input data, and the expectation is taken over $w_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, $r = 1, \dots, m$.

Under the standard assumption \mathbf{K}_{ntk} being positive definite, the problem Eq. (7) is a strongly convex optimization problem with the optimal predictor $u^* = \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} Y$ for training data, and the corresponding predictor $u_{\text{test}}^* = \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} Y$ for the test data x_{test} , where $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the kernel matrix with $[H^{\text{cts}}]_{i,j} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_i, x_j)$.

We connect the problem Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) by building the following equivalence between their training and test predictors with polynomial widths:

Theorem 3.6 (Equivalence between training neural net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction). *Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. Let multiplier $\kappa = 1$, number of iterations $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4 d}{\Lambda_0^4 \epsilon})$ and the regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the Gaussian random initialization, we have*

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \delta \Lambda_0))$.

We can further show the equivalence between the test data predictors with the help of the multiplier κ .

Theorem 3.7 (Equivalence between training neural net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for test data prediction). *Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. Let multiplier $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon \Lambda_0}{n})$, number of iterations $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0})$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^{10} d}{\epsilon^6 \Lambda_0^{10}})$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the Gaussian random initialization, we have*

$$\|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \delta \Lambda_0))$.

3.2.2 Equivalence II, training with leverage scores

To apply the leverage score theory discussed in Section 3.1, Note the definition of the neural tangent kernel is exactly of the form:

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x, z) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, x)}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, z)}{\partial W} \right\rangle \right] = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x, w)^\top \phi(z, w)]$$

where $\phi(x, w) = x \sigma'(w^\top x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function of standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Therefore, we try to connect the theory of training regularized neural network with leverage score sampling. Note the width of the network corresponds to the size of the feature vector in approximating the kernel. Thus, the smaller feature size given by the

leverage score sampling theory helps us build a smaller upper-bound on the width of the neural nets.

Specifically, given regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$, we can define the ridge leverage function with respect to neural tangent kernel H^{cts} defined in Definition 3.1 as

$$q_\lambda(w) = p(w) \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top (H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w)]$$

and corresponding probability density function

$$q(w) = \frac{q_\lambda(w)}{s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} \quad (9)$$

where $\Phi(w) = [\phi(x_1, w)^\top, \dots, \phi(x_n, w)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$.

We consider training the following reweighed neural network using leverage score initialization:

Definition 3.8 (Training reweighed neural network with regularization). *Let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ be a small multiplier. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. Let $q(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ defined in (9). Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function of Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. We initialize the network as $a_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{unif}[\{-1, 1\}]$ and $w_r(0) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} q$. Then we consider solving the following optimization problem using gradient descent:*

$$\min_W \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|W\|_F^2. \quad (10)$$

where

$$\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r^\top X) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \text{ and } \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, X) = [\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x_1), \dots, \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x_n)]^\top.$$

We denote $w_r(t), r \in [m]$ as the estimate weight at iteration t . We denote $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X)$ as the training data predictor at iteration t . Given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})$ as the test data predictor at iteration t .

We show that training this reweighed neural net with leverage score initialization is still equivalence to the neural tangent kernel ridge regression problem (7) as in following theorem:

Theorem 3.9 (Equivalence between training reweighed neural net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction). *Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. Let multiplier $\kappa = 1$, number of iterations $T = O(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$, network width $m = \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0}, n, d, \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \log(\frac{1}{\delta}))$ and regularization parameter $\lambda = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random leverage score initialization, we have*

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \delta \Lambda_0))$.

4 Overview of techniques

Generalization of leverage score theory To prove Theorem 3.3, we follow the similar proof framework as Lemma 8 in [AKM⁺17].

Let $K + \lambda I_n = V^\top \Sigma^2 V$ be an eigenvalue decomposition of $K + \lambda I_n$. Then conclusion (5) is equivalent to

$$\|\Sigma^{-1} V \overline{\Psi} \Psi^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} V K V^\top \Sigma^{-1}\| \leq \epsilon \quad (11)$$

Let random matrix $Y_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ defined as

$$Y_r := \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1}.$$

where $\Phi(w) = [\phi(x_1, w), \dots, \phi(x_n, w)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$. Then we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_l]}{\bar{q}_\lambda} = \frac{\mathbb{E}}{\bar{q}_\lambda} \left[\frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \overline{\Phi}(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \right] = \Sigma^{-1} V K V^\top \Sigma^{-1},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m Y_r = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \overline{\Phi}(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1} V \overline{\Psi} \Psi^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m Y_r - \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_l]}{\bar{q}_\lambda} \right\| \leq \epsilon \quad (12)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, which can be shown by applying matrix concentration results. Note

$$\|Y_l\| \leq s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_r^2]}{\bar{q}_\lambda} \preceq s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} \cdot \text{diag}\{\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda), \dots, \lambda_n/(\lambda_n + \lambda)\}.$$

Applying matrix concentration Lemma 7 in [AKM⁺17], we complete the proof.

Equivalence between regularized neural network and kernel ridge regression To establish the equivalence between training neural network with regularization and neural tangent kernel ridge regression, the key observation is that the dynamic kernel during the training is always close to the neural tangent kernel.

Specifically, given training data $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the dynamic kernel matrix $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ along training process as

$$[H(t)]_{i,j} = \left\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i)}{dW(t)}, \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)}{dW(t)} \right\rangle$$

Then we can show the gradient flow of training regularized neural net satisfies

$$\frac{d\|u^* - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2^2}{dt} = -2(u^* - u_{\text{nn}}(t))^\top (H(t) + \lambda I)(u^* - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) \quad (13)$$

$$+ 2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top (H(t) - H^{\text{cts}})(Y - u^*) \quad (14)$$

where term (13) is the primary term characterizing the linear convergence of $u_{\text{nn}}(t)$ to u^* , and term (14) is the additive term that can be well controlled if $H(t)$ is sufficiently close to H^{cts} . We argue the closeness of $H(t) \approx H^{\text{cts}}$ as the consequence of the following two observations:

- Initialization phase: At the beginning of the training, $H(0)$ can be viewed as approximating the neural tangent kernel H^{cts} using finite dimensional random features. Note the size of these random features corresponds to the width of the neural network (scale by the data dimension d). Therefore, when the neural network is sufficiently wide, it is equivalent to approximate the neural tangent kernel using sufficient high dimensional feature vectors, which ensures $H(0)$ is sufficiently close to H^{cts} .

In the case of leverage score initialization, we further take the regularization into consideration. We use the tool of leverage score to modify the initialization distribution and corresponding network parameter, to give a smaller upper-bound of the width of the nets needed.

- Training phase: If the net is sufficiently wide, we can observe the over-parametrization phenomenon such that the weight estimate $W(t)$ at time t will be sufficiently close to its initialization $W(0)$, which implies the dynamic kernel $H(t)$ being sufficiently close to $H(0)$. Due to the fact $H(0) \approx H^{\text{cts}}$ argued in initialization phase, we have $H(t) \approx H^{\text{cts}}$ throughout the algorithm.

Combining both observations, we are able to iteratively show the (nearly) linear convergence property of training the regularized neural net as in following lemma:

Lemma 4.1 (Bounding kernel perturbation, informal). *For any accuracy $\Delta \in (0, 1/10)$. If the network width $m = \text{poly}(1/\Delta, 1/T, 1/\epsilon_{\text{train}}, n, d, 1/\kappa, 1/\Lambda_0, \log(1/\delta))$ and $\lambda = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, with probability $1 - \delta$, there exist $\epsilon_W, \epsilon'_H, \epsilon'_K \in (0, \Delta)$ that are independent of t , such that the following hold for all $0 \leq t \leq T$:*

1. $\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W, \forall r \in [m]$
2. $\|H(0) - H(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'_H$
3. $\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\epsilon_{\text{train}}^2, e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2} \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2\}$

Given arbitrary accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, if we choose $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \epsilon$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0})$ and m sufficiently large in Lemma D.14, then we have $\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, indicating the equivalence between training neural network with regularization and neural tangent kernel ridge regression for the training data predictions.

To further argue the equivalence for any given test data x_{test} , we observe the similarity between the gradient flows of neural tangent kernel ridge regression $u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)$ and regularized neural networks $u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)$ as following:

$$\frac{du_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t). \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{du_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t). \quad (16)$$

By choosing the multiplier $\kappa > 0$ small enough, we can bound the initial difference between these two predictors. Combining with above similarity between gradient flows, we are able to show $|u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(T)| \geq \epsilon/2$ for appropriate $T > 0$. Finally, note the linear convergence property of the gradient of the kernel ridge regression, we can prove $|u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}^*| \geq \epsilon$.

Using the similar idea, we can also show the equivalence for test data predictors and the case of leverage score initialization. We refer to the Appendix for a detailed proof sketch and rigorous proof.

Remark 4.2. *Our results can be naturally extended to multi-layer ReLU deep neural networks with all parameters training together. Note the core of the connection between regularized NNs and KRR is to show the similarity between their gradient flows, as in Eq. (15), (16). The gradient flows consist of two terms: the first term is from normal NN training without regularizer, whose similarity has been shown in broader settings, e.g. [DZPS19, SY19, ADH⁺19a, AZLS19b, AZLS19a]; the second term is from the ℓ_2 regularizer, whose similarity is true for multi-layer ReLU DNNs if the regularization parameter is divided by the number of layers of parameters trained, due to the piecewise linearity of the output with respect to the training parameters.*

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we generalize the leverage score sampling theory for kernel approximation. We discuss the interesting application of connecting leverage score sampling and training regularized neural networks. We present two theoretical results: 1) the equivalence between the regularized neural nets and kernel ridge regression problems under the classical random Gaussian initialization for both training and test predictors; 2) the new equivalence under the leverage score initialization. We believe this work can be the starting point of future study on the use of leverage score sampling in neural network training.

Roadmap In the appendix, we present our complete results and rigorous proofs. Section A presents some well-known mathematical results that will be used in our proof. Section B discusses our first equivalence result between training regularized neural network and kernel ridge regression. Section C discusses our generalization result of the leverage score sampling theory. Section D discusses our second equivalence result under leverage score initialization and potential benefits compared to the Gaussian initialization. Section E discusses how to extend our results to a broader class of neural network models.

Appendix

A Preliminaries

A.1 Probability tools

In this section we introduce the probability tools we use in the proof.

We state Chernoff, Hoeffding and Bernstein inequalities.

Lemma A.1 (Chernoff bound [Che52]). *Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where $X_i = 1$ with probability p_i and $X_i = 0$ with probability $1 - p_i$, and all X_i are independent. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$. Then*

1. $\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \exp(-\delta^2\mu/3)$, $\forall \delta > 0$;
2. $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu] \leq \exp(-\delta^2\mu/2)$, $\forall 0 < \delta < 1$.

Lemma A.2 (Hoeffding bound [Hoe63]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n denote n independent bounded variables in $[a_i, b_i]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, then we have*

$$\Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right).$$

Lemma A.3 (Bernstein inequality [Ber24]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent zero-mean random variables. Suppose that $|X_i| \leq M$ almost surely, for all i . Then, for all positive t ,*

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] + Mt/3}\right).$$

We state three inequalities for Gaussian random variables.

Lemma A.4 (Anti-concentration of Gaussian distribution). *Let $X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, that is, the probability density function of X is given by $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}$. Then*

$$\Pr[|X| \leq t] \in \left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{t}{\sigma}, \frac{4}{5} \frac{t}{\sigma}\right).$$

Lemma A.5 (Gaussian tail bounds). *Let $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ be a Gaussian random variable with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Then for all $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\Pr[|X - \mu| \geq t] \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}}.$$

Lemma A.6 (Lemma 1 on page 1325 of Laurent and Massart [LM00]). *Let $X \sim \chi_k^2$ be a chi-squared distributed random variable with k degrees of freedom. Each one has zero mean and σ^2 variance. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X - k\sigma^2 \geq (2\sqrt{kt} + 2t)\sigma^2] &\leq \exp(-t), \\ \Pr[k\sigma^2 - X \geq 2\sqrt{kt}\sigma^2] &\leq \exp(-t). \end{aligned}$$

We state two inequalities for random matrices.

Lemma A.7 (Matrix Bernstein, Theorem 6.1.1 in [Tro15]). Consider a finite sequence $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ of independent, random matrices with common dimension $n_1 \times n_2$. Assume that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0, \forall i \in [m] \quad \text{and} \quad \|X_i\| \leq M, \forall i \in [m].$$

Let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$. Let $\text{Var}[Z]$ be the matrix variance statistic of sum:

$$\text{Var}[Z] = \max \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^\top] \right\|, \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[X_i^\top X_i] \right\| \right\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|] \leq (2\text{Var}[Z] \cdot \log(n_1 + n_2))^{1/2} + M \cdot \log(n_1 + n_2)/3.$$

Furthermore, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Pr[\|Z\| \geq t] \leq (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\text{Var}[Z] + Mt/3} \right).$$

Lemma A.8 (Matrix Bernstein, Lemma 7 in [AKM⁺17]). Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ be a fixed matrix. Construct a random matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[R] = B \quad \text{and} \quad \|R\| \leq L.$$

Let M_1 and M_2 be semidefinite upper bounds for the expected squares:

$$\mathbb{E}[RR^\top] \preceq M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[R^\top R] \preceq M_2.$$

Define the quantities

$$m = \max\{\|M_1\|, \|M_2\|\} \quad \text{and} \quad d = (\text{tr}[M_1] + \text{tr}[M_2])/m.$$

Form the matrix sampling estimator

$$\bar{R}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n R_k$$

where each R_k is an independent copy of R . Then, for all $t \geq \sqrt{m/n} + 2L/3n$,

$$\Pr[\|\bar{R}_n - B\|_2 \geq t] \leq 4d \exp \left(\frac{-nt^2}{m + 2Lt/3} \right)$$

A.2 Neural tangent kernel and its properties

Lemma A.9 (Lemma 4.1 in [SY19]). We define $H^{\text{cts}}, H^{\text{dis}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as follows

$$H_{i,j}^{\text{cts}} = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [x_i^\top x_j \mathbf{1}_{w^\top x_i \geq 0, w^\top x_j \geq 0}],$$

$$H_{i,j}^{\text{dis}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m [x_i^\top x_j \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0}].$$

Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^{\text{cts}})$. If $m = \Omega(\lambda^{-2} n^2 \log(n/\delta))$, we have

$$\|H^{\text{dis}} - H^{\text{cts}}\|_F \leq \frac{\lambda}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}(H^{\text{dis}}) \geq \frac{3}{4}\lambda$$

hold with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Lemma A.10 (Lemma 4.2 in [SY19]). *Let $R \in (0, 1)$. If $\tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_m$ are i.i.d. generated from $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$. For any set of weight vectors $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfy for any $r \in [m]$, $\|\tilde{w}_r - w_r\|_2 \leq R$, then the $H : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ defined*

$$H(W) = \frac{1}{m} x_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0}.$$

Then we have

$$\|H(w) - H(\tilde{w})\|_F < 2nR$$

holds with probability at least $1 - n^2 \cdot \exp(-mR/10)$.

B Equivalence between sufficiently wide neural net and kernel ridge regression

In this section, we extend the equivalence result in [JGH18, ADH⁺19a] to the case with regularization term, where they showed the equivalence between a fully-trained infinitely wide/sufficiently wide neural net and the kernel regression solution using the neural tangent kernel (NTK). Specifically, we prove Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.7 in this section.

Section B.1 introduces key notations and standard data assumptions. Section B.2 restates and supplements the definitions introduced in the paper. Section B.3 presents several key lemmas about the gradient flow and linear convergence of neural network and kernel ridge regression predictors, which are crucial to the final proof. Section B.4 provides a brief proof sketch. Section B.5 restates the main equivalence Theorem 3.7 and provides a complete proof following the proof sketch. Section B.6 restates and proves Theorem 3.6 by showing it as a by-product of previous proof.

B.1 Preliminaries

Let's define the following notations:

- $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be the training data
- $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the test data
- $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), X) = \kappa \Phi(X) \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the prediction of the kernel ridge regression for the training data at time t . (See Definition B.5)
- $u^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_{\text{ntk}}(t)$ (See Eq. (24))
- $u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}) = \kappa \Phi(x_{\text{test}}) \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the prediction of the kernel ridge regression for the test data at time t . (See Definition B.5)
- $u_{\text{test}}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)$ (See Eq. (25))
- $K_{\text{ntk}}(x, y) = \mathbb{E}[\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, x)}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, y)}{\partial W} \rangle]$ (See Definition B.5)
- $K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the induced kernel between the training data and test data at time t , where

$$[K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)]_i = K_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) = \left\langle \frac{\partial f(W(t), x_{\text{test}})}{\partial W(t)}, \frac{\partial f(W(t), x_i)}{\partial W(t)} \right\rangle$$

(see Definition B.6)

- $u_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the prediction of the neural network for the training data at time t . (See Definition B.3)
- $u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the prediction of the neural network for the test data at time t (See Definition B.3)

Assumption B.1 (data assumption). *We made the following assumptions:*

1. For each $i \in [n]$, we assume $|y_i| = O(1)$.
2. H^{cts} is positive definite, i.e., $\Lambda_0 := \lambda_{\min}(H^{\text{cts}}) > 0$.
3. All the training data and test data have Euclidean norm equal to 1.

B.2 Definitions

To establish the equivalence between neural network and kernel ridge regression, we prove the similarity of their gradient flow and initial predictor. Note kernel ridge regression starts at 0 as initialization, so we hope the initialization of neural network also close to zero. Therefore, using the same technique in [ADH⁺19a], we apply a small multiplier $\kappa > 0$ to both predictors to bound the different of initialization.

Definition B.2 (Neural network function). *We define a two layer neural networks with rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation as the following form*

$$f_{\text{nn}}(W, a, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r^\top x) \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the input, $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r \in [m]$ is the weight vector of the first layer, $W = [w_1, \dots, w_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $a_r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r \in [m]$ is the output weight, $a = [a_1, \dots, a_m]^\top$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU activation function: $\sigma(z) = \max\{0, z\}$. In this paper, we consider only training the first layer W while fix a . So we also write $f_{\text{nn}}(W, x) = f_{\text{nn}}(W, a, x)$. We denote $f_{\text{nn}}(W, X) = [f_{\text{nn}}(W, x_1), \dots, f_{\text{nn}}(W, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition B.3 (Training neural network with regularization, restatement of Definition 3.5). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let f_{nn} be defined as in Definition B.2. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be a small multiplier. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. We initialize the network as $a_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{unif}[\{-1, 1\}]$ and $w_r(0) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Then we consider solving the following optimization problem using gradient descent:*

$$\min_W \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|W\|_F^2. \quad (17)$$

We denote $w_r(t), r \in [m]$ as the variable at iteration t . We denote

$$u_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X) = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top X) \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (18)$$

as the training data predictor at iteration t . Given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote

$$u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}) = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R} \quad (19)$$

as the test data predictor at iteration t .

Definition B.4 (Neural tangent kernel and feature function). We define the neural tangent kernel (NTK) and the feature function corresponding to the neural networks f_{nn} defined in Definition B.2 as following

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x, z) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, x)}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, z)}{\partial W} \right\rangle \right]$$

where $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are any input data, and the expectation is taking over $w_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, $r = 1, \dots, m$. Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we define $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as the kernel matrix between training data as

$$[H^{\text{cts}}]_{i,j} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_i, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We denote the smallest eigenvalue of H^{cts} as $\Lambda_0 > 0$, where we assume H^{cts} is positive definite. Further, given any data $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write the kernel between test and training data $\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(z, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(z, X) = [\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(z, x_1), \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(z, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We denote the feature function corresponding to the kernel \mathbf{K}_{ntk} as we defined above as $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, which satisfies

$$\langle \Phi(x), \Phi(z) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x, z),$$

for any data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. And we write $\Phi(X) = [\Phi(x_1), \dots, \Phi(x_n)]^\top$.

Definition B.5 (Neural tangent kernel ridge regression). Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let \mathbf{K}_{ntk} , $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and Φ be the neural tangent kernel and corresponding feature functions defined as in Definition B.4. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be a small multiplier. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. Then we consider the following neural tangent kernel ridge regression problem:

$$\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2. \quad (20)$$

where $f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x) = \Phi(x)^\top \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the prediction function is corresponding RKHS and $f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X) = [f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_1), \dots, f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the gradient flow of solving problem (20) with initialization $\beta(0) = 0$. We denote $\beta(t)$ as the variable at iteration t . We denote

$$u_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa \Phi(X) \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (21)$$

as the training data predictor at iteration t . Given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote

$$u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \Phi(x_{\text{test}})^\top \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R} \quad (22)$$

as the test data predictor at iteration t . Note the gradient flow converge the to optimal solution of problem (20) due to the strongly convexity of the problem. We denote

$$\beta^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta(t) = \kappa (\kappa^2 \Phi(X)^\top \Phi(X) + \lambda I)^{-1} \Phi(X)^\top Y \quad (23)$$

and the optimal training data predictor

$$u^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa \Phi(X) \beta^* = \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (24)$$

and the optimal test data predictor

$$u_{\text{test}}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \Phi(x_{\text{test}})^\top \beta^* = \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (25)$$

Definition B.6 (Dynamic kernel). Given $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ as the parameters of the neural network at training time t as defined in Definition B.3. For any data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $K_t(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$K_t(x, z) = \left\langle \frac{df_{nn}(W(t), x)}{dW(t)}, \frac{df_{nn}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)} \right\rangle$$

Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we define $H^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as

$$[H(t)]_{i,j} = K_t(x_i, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Further, given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) = [K_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_1), \dots, K_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

B.3 Gradient, gradient flow, and linear convergence

Lemma B.7 (Gradient flow of kernel ridge regression). Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let f_{ntk} be defined as in Definition B.5. Let $\beta(t)$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.5. Let $K_{\text{ntk}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Then for any data $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\frac{df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{dt} = \kappa \cdot K_{\text{ntk}}(z, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z).$$

Proof. Denote $L(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\beta(t)\|_2^2$. By the rule of gradient descent, we have

$$\frac{d\beta(t)}{dt} = -\frac{dL}{d\beta} = \kappa \Phi(X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \beta(t),$$

where Φ is defined in Definition B.4. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{dt} &= \frac{df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{d\beta(t)} \frac{d\beta(t)}{dt} \\ &= \Phi(z)^\top (\kappa \Phi(X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \beta(t)) \\ &= \kappa K_{\text{ntk}}(z, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \Phi(z)^\top \beta(t) \\ &= \kappa K_{\text{ntk}}(z, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step is due to chain rule, the second step follows from the fact $df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, z)/d\beta = \Phi(z)$, the third step is due to the definition of the kernel $K_{\text{ntk}}(z, X) = \Phi(X)\Phi(z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the last step is due to the definition of $f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z) \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Corollary B.8 (Gradient of prediction of kernel ridge regression). Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let f_{ntk} be defined as in Definition B.5. Let $\beta(t)$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.5. Let $K_{\text{ntk}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ \frac{du_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Plugging in $z = x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma B.7, we have

$$\frac{df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i)}{dt} = \kappa K_{\text{ntk}}(x_i, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i).$$

Note $[u_{\text{ntk}}(t)]_i = \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i)$ and $[H^{\text{cts}}]_{:,i} = K_{\text{ntk}}(x_i, X)$, so writing all the data in a compact form, we have

$$\frac{du_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{ntk}}(t).$$

Plugging in data $z = x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma B.7, we have

$$\frac{df_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}})}{dt} = \kappa K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}).$$

Note by definition, $u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R}$, so we have

$$\frac{du_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t).$$

□

Lemma B.9 (Linear convergence of kernel ridge regression). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.5. Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined in Definition B.5. Let $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Let $\lambda > 0$ be the regularization parameter. Then we have*

$$\frac{d\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2}{dt} \leq -2(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2.$$

Further, we have

$$\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \leq e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2.$$

Proof. Let $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(Y - u^*) &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(Y - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y) \\ &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(I_n - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1}) Y \\ &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}})(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \lambda H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \lambda u^*, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the first step follows the definition of $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the second to fourth step simplify the formula, and the last step use the definition of $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ again. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2}{dt} &= 2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top \frac{du_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top H^{\text{cts}}(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - 2\lambda(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top H^{\text{cts}}(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*) + 2\kappa^2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top H^{\text{cts}}(Y - u^*) \\ &\quad - 2\lambda(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top H^{\text{cts}}(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*) + 2\lambda(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top u^* \\ &\quad - 2\lambda(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*)^\top (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)(u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*) \\ &\leq -2(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where the first step follows the chain rule, the second step follows Corollary B.8, the third step uses basic linear algebra, the fourth step follows Eq. (26), the fifth step simplifies the expression, and the last step follows the definition of Λ_0 . Further, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d(e^{2(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2)}{dt} \\ &= 2(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)e^{2(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 + e^{2(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t} \cdot \frac{d\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2}{dt} \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step calculates the gradient, and the second step follows from Eq. (27). Thus, $e^{2(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2$ is non-increasing, which implies

$$\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \leq e^{-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2.$$

□

Lemma B.10 (Gradient flow of neural network training). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f_{\text{nn}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in Definition B.2. Let $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.3. Let $\mathbf{K}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.6. Then for any data $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dt} = \kappa \mathbf{K}_t(z, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z).$$

Proof. Denote $L(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\|W(t)\|_F^2$. By the rule of gradient descent, we have

$$\frac{dw_r}{dt} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial w_r} = \left(\frac{\partial u_{\text{nn}}}{\partial w_r}\right)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}) - \lambda w_r. \quad (28)$$

Also note for ReLU activation σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \lambda W(t) \right\rangle &= \sum_{r=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r z \sigma'(w_r(t)^\top z) \right)^\top (\lambda w_r(t)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r w_r(t)^\top z \sigma'(w_r(t)^\top z) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top z) \\ &= \lambda f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the first step calculates the derivatives, the second step follows basic linear algebra, the third step follows the property of ReLU activation: $\sigma(l) = l\sigma'(l)$, and the last step follows from the

definition of f_{nn} . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dt} \\
&= \left\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \frac{dW(t)}{dt} \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)) \left\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \frac{d\kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)}{dW(t)} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \lambda W(t) \right\rangle \\
&= \kappa \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)) K_t(z, x_j) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z) \\
&= \kappa K_t(z, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from chain rule, the second step follows from Eq. (28), the third step follows from the definition of K_t and Eq. (29), and the last step rewrites the formula in a compact form. \square

Corollary B.11 (Gradient of prediction of neural network). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $f_{\text{nn}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in Definition B.2. Let $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition B.3. Let $K_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition B.6. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{du_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 H(t) (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{nn}}(t) \\
\frac{du_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Plugging in $z = x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma B.10, we have

$$\frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i)}{dt} = \kappa K_t(x_i, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i).$$

Note $[u_{\text{nn}}(t)]_i = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i)$ and $[H(t)]_{:,i} = K_t(x_i, X)$, so writing all the data in a compact form, we have

$$\frac{du_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 H(t) (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{nn}}(t).$$

Plugging in data $z = x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma B.10, we have

$$\frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})}{dt} = \kappa K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}).$$

Note by definition, $u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})$, so we have

$$\frac{du_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t).$$

\square

Lemma B.12 (Linear convergence of neural network training). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Fix the total number of iterations $T > 0$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition B.3. Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined in Eq. (24). Let $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Let $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition B.6. Let $\lambda > 0$ be the regularization parameter. Assume $\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \Lambda_0/2$ holds for all $t \in [0, T]$. Then we have*

$$\frac{d\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2}{dt} \leq -(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - u^*\|_2.$$

Proof. Note same as in Lemma B.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(Y - u^*) &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(Y - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y) \\ &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(I_n - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1}) Y \\ &= \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n - \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}})(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \lambda H^{\text{cts}}(\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \lambda u^*, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where the first step follows the definition of $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the second to fourth step simplify the formula, and the last step use the definition of $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ again. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2}{dt} \\ &= 2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top \frac{du_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top H(t)(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - Y) - 2\lambda(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top H(t)(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*) + 2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top H^{\text{cts}}(Y - u^*) \\ &\quad + 2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top (H(t) - H^{\text{cts}})(Y - u^*) - 2\lambda(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top H(t)(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*) + 2\lambda(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top u^* \\ &\quad + 2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top (H(t) - H^{\text{cts}})(Y - u^*) - 2\lambda(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top u_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top (\kappa^2 H(t) + \lambda I)(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*) + 2\kappa^2(u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*)^\top (H(t) - H^{\text{cts}})(Y - u^*) \\ &\leq -(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \|Y - u^*\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows the chain rule, the second step follows Corollary B.11, the third step uses basic linear algebra, the fourth step follows Eq. (30), the fifth step simplifies the expression, and the last step follows the assumption $\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \Lambda_0/2$. \square

B.4 Proof sketch

Our goal is to show with appropriate width of the neural network and appropriate training iterations, the neural network predictor will be sufficiently close to the neural tangent kernel ridge regression predictor for any test data. We follow similar proof framework of Theorem 3.2 in [ADH⁺19a]. Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we divide this proof into following steps:

1. Firstly, according to the linear convergence property of kernel ridge regression shown in Lemma B.9, we can choose sufficiently large training iterations $T > 0$, so that $|u_{\text{test}}^* - u_{\text{ntk, test}}(T)| \leq \epsilon/2$, as shown in Lemma B.13.

2. Once fix training iteration T as in step 1, we bound $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| \leq \epsilon/2$ by showing the following:
 - (a) Due to the similarity of the the gradient flow of neural network training and neural tangent kernel ridge regression, we can reduce the task of bounding the prediction perturbation at time T , i.e., $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)|$, back to bounding
 - i. the initialization perturbation $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)|$ and
 - ii. kernel perturbation $\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\|$, $\|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2$, as shown in Lemma B.14.
 - (b) According to concentration results, we can bound the initialization perturbation $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)|$ small enough by choosing sufficiently small $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, as shown in Lemma B.20.
 - (c) We characterize the over-parametrization property of the neural network by inductively show that we can bound kernel perturbation $\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\|$, $\|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2$ small enough by choosing network width $m > 0$ large enough, as shown in Lemma B.21.
3. Lastly, we combine the results of step 1 and 2 using triangle inequality, to show the equivalence between training neural network with regularization and neural tangent kernel ridge regression, i.e., $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*| \leq \epsilon$, as shown in Theorem B.28.

B.5 Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for test data prediction

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.7 following the proof sketch in Section B.4.

B.5.1 Upper bounding $|u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*|$

In this section, we give an upper bound for $|u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*|$.

Lemma B.13. *Let $u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_{\text{test}}^* \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition B.5. Given any accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, if $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, then by picking $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0})$, we have*

$$|u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*| \leq \epsilon/2.$$

where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ here hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \Lambda_0))$.

Proof. Due to the linear convergence of kernel ridge regression, i.e.,

$$\frac{d\|\beta(t) - \beta^*\|_2^2}{dt} \leq -2(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|\beta(t) - \beta^*\|_2^2$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*| &= |\kappa \Phi(x_{\text{test}})^\top \beta(T) - \kappa \Phi(x_{\text{test}})^\top \beta^*| \\ &\leq \kappa \|\Phi(x_{\text{test}})\|_2 \|\beta(T) - \beta^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)T} \|\beta(0) - \beta^*\|_2 \\ &\leq e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)T} \cdot \text{poly}(\kappa, n, 1/\Lambda_0) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from $\beta(0) = 0$ and $\|\beta^*\|_2 = \text{poly}(\kappa, n, 1/\Lambda_0)$.

Note $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Thus, by picking $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0})$, we have

$$\|u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2,$$

where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ here hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \Lambda_0))$. □

B.5.2 Upper bounding $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)|$ by bounding initialization and kernel perturbation

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma B.14, which reduces the problem of bounding prediction perturbation to the problem of bounding initialization perturbation and kernel perturbation.

Lemma B.14 (Prediction perturbation implies kernel perturbation). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Fix the total number of iterations $T > 0$. Given arbitrary test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_{\text{ntk,test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the test data predictors defined in Definition B.3 and Definition B.5 respectively. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be the corresponding multiplier. Let $K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $H^{\text{cts}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be defined in Definition B.4 and Definition B.6. Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Eq. (24). Let $\lambda > 0$ be the regularization parameter. Let $\epsilon_K \in (0, 1)$, $\epsilon_{\text{init}} \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_H \in (0, 1)$ denote parameters that are independent of t , and the following conditions hold for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

- $\|u_{\text{nn}}(0)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}}$ and $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(0)| \leq \epsilon_{\text{init}}$
- $\|K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_K$
- $\|H(t) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \epsilon_H$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| &\leq (1 + \kappa^2 n T) \epsilon_{\text{init}} + \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|_2}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} T^2 \kappa^4 \epsilon_H (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combining results from Lemma B.15, Claim B.16, B.17, B.18, we complete the proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| &\leq |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| \\ &\quad + \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T (K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^{\top} (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) dt \right| \\ &\quad + \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^{\top} (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) dt \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon_{\text{init}} + \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right) \\ &\quad + \kappa^2 n \epsilon_{\text{init}} T + \sqrt{n} T^2 \cdot \kappa^4 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \\ &\leq (1 + \kappa^2 n T) \epsilon_{\text{init}} + \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|_2}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} T^2 \kappa^4 \epsilon_H (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Lemma B.15, the second step follows from Claim B.16, B.17 and B.18, and the last step simplifies the expression. \square

To prove Lemma B.14, we first bound $|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)|$ by three terms in Lemma B.15, then we bound each term individually in Claim B.16, Claim B.17, and Claim B.18.

Lemma B.15. *Follow the same notation as Lemma B.14, we have*

$$|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| \leq A + B + C,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| \\
B &= \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) dt \right| \\
C &= \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) dt \right|
\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| \\
&= \left| u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0) + \int_0^T \left(\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right| \\
&\leq |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| + \left| \int_0^T \left(\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right|, \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of integral, the second step follows from the triangle inequality. Note by Corollary B.8, B.11, their gradient flow are given by

$$\frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} = -\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - \lambda u_{\text{ntk,test}}(t) \tag{32}$$

$$\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} = -\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{nn}}(t) - Y) - \lambda u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) \tag{33}$$

where $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the predictors for training data defined in Definition B.5 and Definition B.3. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \\
&= -\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{nn}}(t) - Y) + \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - \lambda(u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)) \\
&= \kappa^2 (\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) \\
&\quad - \lambda(u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)), \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (32) and Eq. (33), the second step rewrites the formula. Note the term $-\lambda(u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(t))$ will only make

$$\left| \int_0^T \left(\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right|$$

smaller, so we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^T \left(\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_0^T \kappa^2 ((\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t))) dt \right| \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| \\
& \leq |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| + \left| \int_0^T \left(\frac{du_{\text{nn,test}}(t)}{dt} - \frac{du_{\text{ntk,test}}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right| \\
& \leq |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| + \left| \int_0^T \kappa^2 ((\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t))) dt \right| \\
& \leq |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0)| + \left| \int_0^T \kappa^2 (\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) dt \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \int_0^T \kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) dt \right| \\
& = A + B + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (31), the second step follows from Eq. (35), the third step follows from triangle inequality, and the last step follows from the definition of A , B , C . \square

Now let us bound these three terms A , B and C one by one. We claim

Claim B.16 (Bounding the term A). *We have*

$$A \leq \epsilon_{\text{init}}.$$

Proof. Note $u_{\text{ntk,test}}(0) = 0$, so by assumption we have

$$A = |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0)| \leq \epsilon_{\text{init}}.$$

\square

Claim B.17 (Bounding the term B). *We have*

$$B \leq \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right).$$

Proof. Note

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T (\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X))^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) dt \right| \\
&\leq \kappa^2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \int_0^T \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y\|_2 dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from definition of B , and the second step follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Note by Lemma B.9, the kernel ridge regression predictor $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ converges linearly to the optimal predictor $u^* = \kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} (\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e.,

$$\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \leq e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2. \quad (36)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y\|_2 dt &\leq \int_0^T \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2 dt + \int_0^T \|u^* - Y\|_2 dt \\
&\leq \int_0^T e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2 dt + \int_0^T \|u^* - Y\|_2 dt \\
&\leq \frac{\|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \\
&= \frac{\|u^*\|}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T,
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where the first step follows from the triangle inequality, the second step follows from Eq. (36), the third step calculates the integration, and the last step follows from the fact $u_{\text{ntk}}(0) = 0$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B &\leq \kappa^2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \cdot \int_0^T \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y\|_2 dt \\
&\leq \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right).
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (36), the second step follows from Eq. (37) and definition of ϵ_K . \square

Claim B.18 (Bounding the term C). *We have*

$$C \leq n \epsilon_{\text{init}} T + \sqrt{n} T^2 \cdot \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2)$$

Proof. Note

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= \kappa^2 \left| \int_0^T \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)) dt \right| \\
&\leq \kappa^2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2 \cdot T
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of C , and the second step follows the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

To bound term $\max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2$, notice that for any $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2 &\leq \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u_{\text{nn}}(0)\|_2 + \left\| \int_0^t \frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} d\tau \right\|_2 \\
&= \sqrt{n} \epsilon_{\text{init}} + \left\| \int_0^t \frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} d\tau \right\|_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the first step follows the triangle inequality, and the second step follows the assumption. Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} &= -\kappa^2 H^{\text{cts}}(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - Y) - \lambda u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) + \kappa^2 H(\tau)(u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - Y) + \lambda u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) \\
&= -(\kappa^2 H(\tau) + \lambda I)(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau)) + \kappa^2 (H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}})(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - Y),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows the Corollary B.8, B.11, the second step rewrites the formula. Since the term $-(\kappa^2 H(\tau) + \lambda I)(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))$ makes $\left\| \int_0^t \frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} d\tau \right\|_2$ smaller.

Taking the integral and apply the ℓ_2 norm, we have

$$\left\| \int_0^t \frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} d\tau \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \int_0^t \kappa^2 (H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}})(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - Y) d\tau \right\|_2. \quad (40)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \int_0^t \frac{d(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau))}{d\tau} d\tau \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \int_0^t \kappa^2 (H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}})(u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - Y) d\tau \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \kappa^2 \|H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \cdot \|u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - Y\|_2 d\tau \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \left(\int_0^t \|u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 d\tau + \int_0^t \|u^* - Y\|_2 d\tau \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \left(\int_0^t \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2 d\tau + \int_0^t \|u^* - Y\|_2 d\tau \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + \max_{t \in [0, T]} t \cdot \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} + T \cdot \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (39), the second step follows from Eq. (40), the third step follows from triangle inequality, the fourth step follows from the condition $\|H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \epsilon_H$ for all $\tau \leq T$ and the triangle inequality, the fifth step follows from the linear convergence of $\|u_{\text{ntk}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2$ as in Lemma B.9, the sixth step follows the fact $u_{\text{ntk}}(0) = 0$, and the last step calculates the maximum. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq \kappa^2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2 \cdot T \\ &\leq \kappa^2 \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \cdot (\sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}}T + T^2 \cdot \kappa^2 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2)) \\ &\leq \kappa^2 n \epsilon_{\text{init}} T + \sqrt{n} T^2 \cdot \kappa^4 \epsilon_H \cdot (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (38), and the second step follows from Eq. (41), and the last step follows from the fact that $K_t(x, z) \leq 1$ holds for any $\|x\|_2, \|z\|_2 \leq 1$. \square

Remark B.19. Given final accuracy ϵ , to ensure $|u_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(T)| \leq \epsilon$, we need to choose $\kappa > 0$ small enough to make $\epsilon_{\text{init}} = O(\epsilon)$ and choose width $m > 0$ large enough to make ϵ_H and ϵ_{test} both $O(\epsilon)$. And we discuss these two tasks one by one in the following sections.

B.5.3 Upper bounding initialization perturbation

In this section, we bound ϵ_{init} to our wanted accuracy ϵ by picking κ large enough. We prove Lemma B.20.

Lemma B.20 (Bounding initialization perturbation). *Let f_{nn} be as defined in Definition B.2. Assume the initial weight of the network work $w_r(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r = 1, \dots, m$ as defined in Definition B.3 are drawn independently from standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. And $a_r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r = 1, \dots, m$ as defined in Definition B.2 are drawn independently from $\text{unif}[\{-1, +1\}]$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $u_{\text{nn}}(t)$*

and $u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in Definition B.3. Then for any data $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|_2 \leq 1$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$|f_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x)| \leq 2 \log(2m/\delta).$$

Further, given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, if $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\epsilon(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/n)$, let $\epsilon_{\text{init}} = \epsilon(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/n$, we have

$$|u_{\text{nn}}(0)| \leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} \text{ and } |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0)| \leq \epsilon_{\text{init}}$$

hold with probability $1 - \delta$, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides the $\text{poly log}(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

Proof. Note by definition,

$$f_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(0)^\top x).$$

Since $w_r(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, so $w_r(0)^\top x_{\text{test}} \sim N(0, \|x_{\text{test}}\|_2)$. Note $\|x_{\text{test}}\|_2 \leq 1$, by Gaussian tail bounds Lemma A.5, we have with probability $1 - \delta/(2m)$:

$$|w_r(0)^\top x| \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2m/\delta)}. \quad (42)$$

Condition on Eq. (42) holds for all $r \in [m]$, denote $Z_r = a_r \sigma(w_r(0)^\top x)$, then we have $\mathbb{E}[Z_r] = 0$ and $|Z_r| \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2m/\delta)}$. By Lemma A.2, with probability $1 - \delta/2$:

$$\left| \sum_{r=1}^m Z_r \right| \leq 2\sqrt{m} \log(2m/\delta). \quad (43)$$

Since $u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum Z_r$, by combining Eq. (42), (43) and union bound over all $r \in [m]$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$:

$$|u_{\text{nn,test}}(0)| \leq 2 \log(2m/\delta).$$

Further, note $[u_{\text{nn}}(0)]_i = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_i)$ and $u_{\text{nn,test}}(0) = \kappa f_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_{\text{test}})$. Thus, by choosing $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\epsilon(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/n)$, taking the union bound over all training and test data, we have

$$|u_{\text{nn}}(0)| \leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon_{\text{init}} \text{ and } |u_{\text{nn,test}}(0)| \leq \epsilon_{\text{init}}$$

hold with probability $1 - \delta$, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides the $\text{poly log}(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$. \square

B.5.4 Upper bounding kernel perturbation

In this section, we try to bound kernel perturbation by induction. We want to prove Lemma B.21, which also helps to show the equivalence for training data prediction as shown in Section B.6.

Lemma B.21 (Bounding kernel perturbation). *Given training data $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $T > 0$ denotes the total number of iterations, $m > 0$ denotes the width of the network, ϵ_{train} denotes a fixed training error threshold, $\delta > 0$ denotes the failure probability. Let $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the training data predictors defined in Definition B.3 and Definition B.5 respectively. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be the corresponding multiplier. Let $\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be the kernel related quantities defined in Definition B.4 and Definition B.6. Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Eq. (24). Let $\lambda > 0$ be the*

regularization parameter. Let $W(t) = [w_1(t), \dots, w_m(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ be the parameters of the neural network defined in Definition B.3.

For any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$. If $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon \Lambda_0}{n})$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)})$, $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \tilde{O}(\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2)$, $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^{10}d}{\epsilon^6 \Lambda_0^{10}})$ and $\lambda = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, with probability $1 - \delta$, there exist ϵ_W , ϵ'_H , $\epsilon'_K > 0$ that are independent of t , such that the following hold for all $0 \leq t \leq T$:

- 1. $\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W$, $\forall r \in [m]$
- 2. $\|H(0) - H(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'_H$
- 3. $\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$
- 4. $\|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'_K$

Further, $\epsilon_W \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon \Lambda_0^2}{n^2})$, $\epsilon'_H \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon \Lambda_0^2}{n})$ and $\epsilon'_K \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon \Lambda_0^2}{n^{1.5}})$. Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides the $\text{poly log}(n/(\epsilon \delta \Lambda_0))$.

We first state some concentration results for the random initialization that can help us prove the lemma.

Lemma B.22 (Random initialization result). Assume initial value $w_r(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r = 1, \dots, m$ are drawn independently from standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, then with probability $1 - 3\delta$ we have

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)} \text{ for all } r \in [m] \quad (44)$$

$$\|H(0) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \quad (45)$$

$$\|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq (2n \log(2n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \quad (46)$$

Proof. By lemma A.6, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}$$

holds for all $r \in [m]$.

Using Lemma A.9 in [SY19], we have

$$\|H(0) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \epsilon''_H = 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Note by definition,

$$\mathbb{E}[K_0(x_{\text{test}}, x_i)] = K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, x_i)$$

holds for any training data x_i . By Hoeffding inequality, we have for any $t > 0$,

$$\Pr[|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) - K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, x_i)| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp(-mt^2/2).$$

Setting $t = (\frac{2}{m} \log(2n/\delta))^{1/2}$, we can apply union bound on all training data x_i to get with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [n]$,

$$|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) - K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, x_i)| \leq (2 \log(2n/\delta)/m)^{1/2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq (2n \log(2n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \quad (47)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Using union bound over above three events, we finish the proof. \square

Now conditioning on Eq. (44), (45), (46) holds, We show all the four conclusions in Lemma B.21 holds using induction.

We define the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_W &:= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{4\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2/(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda), \epsilon_{\text{train}} \cdot T\} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \lambda(2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}) \right) \cdot T \\
\epsilon'_H &:= 2n\epsilon_W \\
\epsilon_K &:= 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon_W
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

which are independent of t .

Note the base case when $t = 0$ trivially holds. Now assuming Lemma B.21 holds before time $t \in [0, T]$, we argue that it also holds at time t . To do so, Lemmas B.23, B.24, B.25 argue these conclusions one by one.

Lemma B.23 (Conclusion 1). *If for any $\tau < t$, we have*

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$$

and

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(\tau)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W \leq 1$$

and

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log(m/\delta)} \text{ for all } r \in [m]$$

hold, then

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W$$

Proof. Recall the gradient flow as Eq. (28)

$$\frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r(y_i - u_{\text{nn}}(\tau)_i) x_i \sigma'(w_r(\tau)^\top x_i) - \lambda w_r(\tau) \tag{49}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\|_2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r(y_i - u_{nn}(\tau)_i) x_i \sigma'(w_r(\tau)^\top x_i) - \lambda w_r(\tau) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - u_{nn}(\tau)_i| + \lambda \|w_r(\tau)\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda \|w_r(\tau)\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda (\|w_r(0)\|_2 + \|w_r(\tau) - w_r(0)\|_2) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda (\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log(m/\delta)} + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda (2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} (\|Y - u^*\|_2 + \|u_{nn}(\tau) - u^*\|_2) + \lambda (2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}) \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|u_{nn}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \lambda (2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/4} \|u_{nn}(0) - u^*\|_2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}\} \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \lambda (2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}), \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (49), the second step follows from triangle inequality, the third step follows from Cauchy-schwarz inequality, the fourth step follows from triangle inequality, the fifth step follows from condition $\|w_r(0) - w_r(\tau)\|_2 \leq 1$, $\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}$, the seventh step follows from triangle inequality, the last step follows from $\|u_{nn}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/2) \cdot \|u_{nn}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$.

Thus, for any $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 &\leq \int_0^t \left\| \frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\|_2 d\tau \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{4\|u_{nn}(0) - u^*\|_2/(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda), \epsilon_{\text{train}} \cdot T\} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \lambda (2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}) \right) \cdot T \\
&= \epsilon_W
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows triangle inequality, the second step follows Eq. (50), and the last step follows the definition of ϵ_W as Eq. (48). \square

Lemma B.24 (Conclusion 2). *If $\forall r \in [m]$,*

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W < 1,$$

then

$$\|H(0) - H(t)\|_F \leq 2n\epsilon_W$$

holds with probability $1 - n^2 \cdot \exp(-m\epsilon_W/10)$.

Proof. Directly applying Lemma A.10, we finish the proof. \square

Lemma B.25 (Conclusion 3). *Fix $\epsilon'_H > 0$ independent of t . If for all $\tau < t$*

$$\|H(0) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \leq \Lambda_0/4$$

and

$$\|H(0) - H(\tau)\| \leq \epsilon'_H \leq \Lambda_0/4$$

and

$$4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \quad (51)$$

and

$$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \quad (52)$$

then we have

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}.$$

Proof. By triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}}\| &\leq \|H(0) - H(\tau)\| + \|H(0) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \\ &\leq \epsilon'_H + 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Lambda_0/2 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

holds for all $\tau < t$. Denote $\epsilon_H = \epsilon'_H + 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2}$, we have $\|H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \leq \epsilon_H \leq \Lambda_0/2$, which satisfies the condition of Lemma B.12. Thus, for any $\tau < t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2}{d\tau} &\leq -(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|H(\tau) - H^{\text{cts}}\| \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - u^*\|_2 \\ &\leq -(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\epsilon_H \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - u^*\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where the first step follows from Lemma B.12, the second step follows from Eq. (53). Now let us discuss two cases:

Case 1. If for all $\tau < t$, $\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon_{\text{train}}$ always holds, we want to argue that

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2.$$

Note by assumption (51) and (52), we have

$$\epsilon_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{4\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$$

implies

$$2\kappa^2\epsilon_H \cdot \|Y - u^*\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/2 \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2$$

holds for any $\tau < t$. Thus, plugging into (54),

$$\frac{d\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2}{d\tau} \leq -(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/2 \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2,$$

holds for all $\tau < t$, which implies

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2.$$

Case 2. If there exist $\bar{\tau} < t$, such that $\|u_{\text{nn}}(\bar{\tau}) - u^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}$, we want to argue that $\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}$. Note by assumption (51) and (52), we have

$$\epsilon_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{4\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$$

implies

$$2\kappa^2\epsilon_H \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(\bar{\tau}) - u^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - u^*\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2.$$

Thus, plugging into (54),

$$\frac{d(\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)}{d\tau} \leq -(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot (\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$$

holds for $\tau = \bar{\tau}$, which implies $e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau}(\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$ is non-increasing at $\tau = \bar{\tau}$. Since $\|u_{\text{nn}}(\bar{\tau}) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2 < 0$, by induction, $e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau}(\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$ being non-increasing and $\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2 < 0$ holds for all $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau \leq t$, which implies

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}.$$

Combine above two cases, we conclude

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}.$$

□

Lemma B.26 (Conclusion 4). *Fix $\epsilon_W \in (0, 1)$ independent of t . If $\forall r \in [m]$, we have*

$$\|w_r(t) - w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W$$

then

$$\|\mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'_K = 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon_W$$

holds with probability at least $1 - n \cdot \exp(-m\epsilon_W/10)$.

Proof. Recall the definition of K_0 and K_t

$$\begin{aligned} K_0(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m x_{\text{test}}^\top x_i \sigma'(x_{\text{test}}^\top w_r(0)) \sigma'(x_i^\top w_r(0)) \\ K_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m x_{\text{test}}^\top x_i \sigma'(x_{\text{test}}^\top w_r(t)) \sigma'(x_i^\top w_r(t)) \end{aligned}$$

By direct calculation we have

$$\|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m s_{r,i} \right)^2,$$

where

$$s_{r,i} = \mathbf{1}[w_r(0)^\top x_{\text{test}} \geq 0, w_r(0)^\top x_i \geq 0] - \mathbf{1}[w_r(t)^\top x_{\text{test}} \geq 0, w_r(t)^\top x_i \geq 0], \forall r \in [m], i \in [n].$$

Fix $i \in [n]$, by Bernstein inequality (Lemma A.3), we have for any $t > 0$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m s_{r,i} \geq 2\epsilon_W \right] \leq \exp(-m\epsilon_W/10).$$

Thus, applying union bound over all training data x_i , $i \in [n]$, we conclude

$$\Pr[\|K_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - K_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon_W] \leq 1 - n \cdot \exp(-m\epsilon_W/10).$$

Note by definition $\epsilon'_K = 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon_W$, so we finish the proof. \square

Now we summarize all the conditions need to be satisfied so that the induction works as in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of conditions for induction

No.	Condition	Place
1	$\epsilon_W \leq 1$	Lem. B.23
2	$\epsilon'_H \leq \Lambda_0/4$	Lem. B.25
3	$4n(\frac{\log(n/\delta)}{m})^{1/2} \leq \Lambda_0/4$	Lem. B.25
4	$4n(\frac{\log(n/\delta)}{m})^{1/2} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\ Y-u^*\ _2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$	Lem. B.25
5	$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\ Y-u^*\ _2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$	Lem. B.25

Note by choosing If $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0}{n})$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2(\Lambda_0+\lambda)})$, $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \tilde{O}(\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2)$, $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^{10}d}{\epsilon^6\Lambda_0^{10}})$ and $\lambda = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y - u^*\|_2 &= \|(\kappa^2\lambda(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1}Y)\|_2 \\ &\leq \lambda\|(\kappa^2H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1}\| \|Y\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\lambda\sqrt{n}}{\kappa^2\Lambda_0}\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{2.5}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of u^* , the second step follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the third step follows from $Y = O(\sqrt{n})$, and the last step follows from the choice of the parameters.

Further, with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2 &\leq \|u_{\text{nn}}(0)\|_2 + \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \|Y\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{2.5}}\right) + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}) \\ &\leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from triangle inequality, the second step follows from Lemma B.20, Eq. (55) and $Y = O(\sqrt{n})$, and the last step follows $\epsilon, \Lambda_0 < 1$. With same reason,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2 &\geq -\|u_{\text{nn}}(0)\|_2 - \|Y - u^*\|_2 + \|Y\|_2 \\ &\geq -\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{2.5}}\right) + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}) \\ &\geq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2 = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$.

Now, by direct calculation, we have all the induction conditions satisfied with high probability. Note the failure probability only comes from Lemma B.20, B.22, B.24, B.26, which only depend on the initialization. By union bound over these failure events, we have all four conclusions in Lemma B.21 holds with high probability, which completes the proof.

B.5.5 Final result for upper bounding $|u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T)|$

In this section, we prove Lemma B.27.

Lemma B.27 (Upper bounding test error). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Fix the total number of iterations $T > 0$. Given arbitrary test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the test data predictors defined in Definition B.3 and Definition B.5 respectively. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be the corresponding multiplier. Given accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, if $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0}{n})$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2\Lambda_0})$, $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^{10}d}{\epsilon^6\Lambda_0^{10}})$ and $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Then for any $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random initialization, we have*

$$\|u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T)\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2,$$

where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

Proof. By Lemma B.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(T)| &\leq (1 + \kappa^2 n T) \epsilon_{\text{init}} + \kappa^2 \epsilon_K \cdot \left(\frac{\|u^*\|_2}{\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda} + \|u^* - Y\|_2 T \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} T^2 \kappa^4 \epsilon_H (\|u^*\|_2 + \|u^* - Y\|_2)\end{aligned}\tag{56}$$

By Lemma B.20, we can choose $\epsilon_{\text{init}} = \epsilon(\Lambda_0)/n$.

Further, note

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \\ &\leq (2n \log(2n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} + \|\mathbf{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X) - \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0^2}{n^{1.5}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from triangle inequality, the second step follows from Lemma B.22, and the last step follows from Lemma B.21. Thus, we can choose $\epsilon_K = \frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0^2}{n^{1.5}}$.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}\|H^{\text{cts}} - H(t)\| &\leq \|H^{\text{cts}} - H(0)\| + \|H(0) - H(t)\|_2 \\ &\leq 4n(\log(n/\delta)/m)^{1/2} + \|H(0) - H(t)\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0^2}{n}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from triangle inequality, the second step follows from Lemma B.22, and the last step follows from Lemma B.21. Thus, we can choose $\epsilon_H = \frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0^2}{n}$.

Note $\|u^*\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}$ and $\|u^* - Y\| \leq \sqrt{n}$, plugging the value of ϵ_{init} , ϵ_K , ϵ_H into Eq. (56), we have

$$|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)| \leq \epsilon/2.$$

□

B.5.6 Main result for test data prediction equivalence

In this section, we restate and prove Theorem 3.7.

Theorem B.28 (Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for test data prediction, restatement of Theorem 3.7). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $T > 0$ be the total number of iterations. Given arbitrary test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $u_{\text{nn,test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_{\text{test}}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the test data predictors defined in Definition B.3 and Definition B.5 respectively.*

For any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$, if $\kappa = \tilde{O}(\frac{\epsilon\Lambda_0}{n})$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\kappa^2\Lambda_0})$, $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^{10}d}{\epsilon^6\Lambda_0^{10}})$ and $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Then for any $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random initialization, we have

$$\|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

Proof. It follows from combining results of bounding $\|u_{\text{nn,test}}(T) - u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T)\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ as shown in Lemma B.27 and $\|u_{\text{ntk,test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ as shown in Lemma B.13 using triangle inequality. □

B.6 Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction

In this section, we restate and proof Theorem 3.6.

Note the proof of equivalence results for the test data in previous sections automatically gives us an equivalence results of the prediction for training data. Specifically, the third conclusion in Lemma B.21 characterizes the training prediction $u_{\text{nn}}(t)$ throughout the training process. Thus, we have the following theorem characterize the equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for the training data.

Theorem B.29 (Equivalence between training net with regularization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction, restatement of Theorem 3.6). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $T > 0$ be the total number of iterations. Let $u_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$*

Table 2: Summary of parameters of main results in Section B

Statement	κ	T	m	λ	Comment
Theorem B.28	$\epsilon\Lambda_0/n$	$1/(\kappa^2\Lambda_0)$	$\Lambda_0^{-10}\epsilon^{-6}n^{10}d$	$1/\sqrt{m}$	test
Theorem B.29	1	$1/\Lambda_0$	$\Lambda_0^{-4}\epsilon^{-1}n^4d$	$1/\sqrt{m}$	train

and $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the training data predictors defined in Definition B.3 and Definition B.5 respectively. Let $\kappa = 1$ be the corresponding multiplier.

Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$, if $\kappa = 1$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4d}{\lambda_0^4\epsilon})$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random initialization, we have

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

Proof. Let $\kappa = 1$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4d}{\lambda_0^4\epsilon})$ and $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \epsilon$ in Lemma B.21. We can see all the conditions in Table 1 hold. Thus, the third conclusion in Lemma B.21 holds. So with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2^2 &\leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\} \\ &\leq \max\{\exp(-(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)T/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon^2\} \\ &\leq \epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Lemma B.21, the second step follows from $\kappa = 1$ and $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \epsilon$, the last step follows from $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$ and $\|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq n$ with high probability. \square

C Generalization result of leverage score sampling for approximating kernels

In this section, we generalize the result of Lemma 8 in [AKM⁺17] for a more broad class of kernels and feature vectors. Specifically, we prove Theorem 3.3.

Section C.1 introduces the related kernel and random features, we also restate Definition 3.1 and 3.2 for leverage score sampling and random features in this section. Section C.2 restates and proves our main result Theorem 3.3.

C.1 Preliminaries

Definition C.1 (Kernel). Consider kernel function $k : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which can be written as

$$K(x, z) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x, w)^\top \phi(z, w)],$$

for any data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ denotes a finite dimensional vector and $p : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denotes probability density function. Given data $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the corresponding kernel matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as

$$K_{i,j} = K(x_i, x_j) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x_i, w)^\top \phi(x_j, w)]$$

Definition C.2 (Random features). *Given m weight vectors $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{md_2}$ be define as*

$$\varphi(x) = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \phi(x, w_1)^\top, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \phi(x, w_m)^\top \right]^\top$$

If w_1, \dots, w_m are drawn according to $p(\cdot)$, then

$$K(x, z) = \mathbb{E}_p[\varphi(x)^\top \varphi(z)]$$

Given data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, define $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$ as

$$\Phi(w) = [\phi(x_1, w)^\top, \dots, \phi(x_n, w)^\top]^\top$$

If w are drawn according to $p(\cdot)$, then

$$K = \mathbb{E}_p[\Phi(w)\Phi(w)^\top] \quad (57)$$

Further, define $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md_2}$ as

$$\Psi = [\varphi(x_1), \dots, \varphi(x_n)]^\top.$$

Then we have

$$\Psi\Psi^\top = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \Phi(w_r)\Phi(w_r)^\top$$

If w_1, \dots, w_m are drawn according to $p(\cdot)$, then

$$K = \mathbb{E}_p[\Psi\Psi^\top]$$

Definition C.3 (Modified random features, restatement of Definition 3.2). *Given any probability density function $q(\cdot)$ whose support includes that of $p(\cdot)$. Given m weight vectors $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$. Let $\bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{md_2}$ be defined as*

$$\bar{\varphi}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left[\frac{\sqrt{p(w_1)}}{\sqrt{q(w_1)}} \phi(x, w_1)^\top, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{p(w_m)}}{\sqrt{q(w_m)}} \phi(x, w_m)^\top \right]^\top$$

If w_1, \dots, w_m are drawn according to $q(\cdot)$, then

$$K(x, z) = \mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\varphi}(x)^\top \bar{\varphi}(z)]$$

Given data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, define $\bar{\Phi} : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$ as

$$\bar{\Phi}(w) = \frac{\sqrt{p(w)}}{\sqrt{q(w)}} [\phi(x_1, w)^\top, \dots, \phi(x_n, w)^\top]^\top = \frac{\sqrt{p(w)}}{\sqrt{q(w)}} \Phi(w)$$

If w are drawn according to $q(\cdot)$, then

$$K = \mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\Phi}(w)\bar{\Phi}(w)^\top]$$

Further, define $\overline{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md_2}$ as

$$\overline{\Psi} = [\overline{\varphi}(x_1), \dots, \overline{\varphi}(x_n)]^\top.$$

then

$$\overline{\Psi}\overline{\Psi}^\top = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \overline{\Phi}(w_r)\overline{\Phi}(w_r)^\top = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{p(w_r)}{q(w_r)} \Phi(w_r)\Phi(w_r)^\top \quad (58)$$

If w_1, \dots, w_m are drawn according to $q(\cdot)$, then

$$K = \mathbb{E}_q[\overline{\Psi}\overline{\Psi}^\top]$$

Definition C.4 (Leverage score, restatement of Definition 3.1). Let $p : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denote the probability density function defined in Definition C.1. Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$ be defined as Definition C.2. For parameter $\lambda > 0$, we define the ridge leverage score as

$$q_\lambda(w) = p(w) \operatorname{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w)].$$

Definition C.5 (Statistical dimension). Given kernel matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and parameter $\lambda > 0$, we define statistical dimension $s_\lambda(K)$ as:

$$s_\lambda(K) = \operatorname{tr}[(K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} K].$$

Note we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_2}} q_\lambda(w) dw = s_\lambda(K)$. Thus we can define the leverage score sampling distribution as

Definition C.6 (Leverage score sampling distribution). Let $q_\lambda(w)$ denote the leverage score defined in Definition C.4. Let $s_\lambda(K)$ denote the statistical dimension defined in Definition C.5. We define the leverage score sampling distribution as

$$q(w) = \frac{q_\lambda(w)}{s_\lambda(K)}.$$

C.2 Main result

Theorem C.7 (Restatement of Theorem 3.3, generalization of Lemma 8 in [AKM⁺17]). Given n data points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $k : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the kernel defined in Definition C.1, with corresponding vector $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ and probability density function $p : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Given parameter $\lambda \in (0, \|K\|)$, let $q_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the leverage score defined in Definition C.4. Let $\tilde{q}_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable function such that $\tilde{q}_\lambda(w) \geq q_\lambda(w)$ holds for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$. Assume $s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_1}} \tilde{q}_\lambda(w) dw$ is finite. Denote $\overline{q}_\lambda(w) = \tilde{q}_\lambda(w)/s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda}$. For any accuracy parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote m samples draw independently from the distribution associated with the density $\overline{q}_\lambda(\cdot)$, and construct the matrix $\overline{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md_2}$ according to Definition C.3 with $q = \overline{q}_\lambda$. Let $s_\lambda(K)$ be defined as Definition C.5. If $m \geq 3\epsilon^{-2}s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \ln(16s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \cdot s_\lambda(K)/\delta)$, then we have

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n) \preceq \overline{\Psi}\overline{\Psi}^\top + \lambda I_n \preceq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot (K + \lambda I_n) \quad (59)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

To prove the theorem, we follow the same proof framework as Lemma 8 in [AKM⁺17].

Proof. Let $K + \lambda I_n = V^\top \Sigma^2 V$ be an eigenvalue decomposition of $K + \lambda I_n$. Note that Eq. (59) is equivalent to

$$K - \epsilon(K + \lambda I_n) \preceq \overline{\Psi} \overline{\Psi}^\top \preceq K + \epsilon(K + \lambda I_n). \quad (60)$$

Multiplying $\Sigma^{-1}V$ on the left and $V^\top \Sigma^{-1}$ on the left for both sides of Eq. (60), it suffices to show that

$$\|\Sigma^{-1}V \overline{\Psi} \overline{\Psi}^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}V K V^\top \Sigma^{-1}\| \leq \epsilon \quad (61)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Let

$$Y_r = \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1}V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_l] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1}V \Phi(w_r) \overline{\Phi}(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1}\right] \\ &= \Sigma^{-1}V \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top\right] V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\ &= \Sigma^{-1}V \mathbb{E}_p[\Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top] V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\ &= \Sigma^{-1}V K V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of Y_r , the second step follows the linearity of expectation, the third step calculates the expectation, and the last step follows Eq. (57).

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m Y_r &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Sigma^{-1}V \Phi(w_r) \overline{\Phi}(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\ &= \Sigma^{-1}V \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top \right) V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\ &= \Sigma^{-1}V \overline{\Psi} \overline{\Psi}^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of Y_r , the second step follows from basic linear algebra, and the last step follows from Eq. (58).

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m Y_r - \mathbb{E}[Y_l] \right\| \leq \epsilon \quad (62)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We can apply matrix concentration Lemma A.8 to prove Eq. (62), which requires us to bound $\|Y_r\|$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_r^2]$. Note

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Y_l\| &\leq \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \text{tr}[\Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1}] \\
&= \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \text{tr}[\Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r)] \\
&= \frac{p(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \text{tr}[\Phi(w_r)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w_r)] \\
&= \frac{q_\lambda(w_r) s_{\bar{q}_\lambda}}{\tilde{q}_\lambda(w_r)} \\
&\leq s_{\bar{q}_\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from $\|A\| \leq \text{tr}[A]$ for any positive semidefinite matrix, the second step follows $\text{tr}[AB] = \text{tr}[BA]$, the third step follows from the definition of V, Σ , the fourth step follows from the definition of leverage score $q_\lambda(\cdot)$ as defined in Definition C.4, and the last step follows from the condition $\tilde{q}_\lambda(w) \geq q_\lambda(w)$.

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_r^2 &= \frac{p(w_r)^2}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)^2} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\
&= \frac{p(w_r)^2}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)^2} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\
&\preceq \frac{p(w_r)^2}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)^2} \text{tr}[\Phi(w_r)^\top (K + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w_r)] \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\
&= \frac{p(w_r) q_\lambda(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)^2} \Sigma^{-1} V \Phi(w_r) \Phi(w_r)^\top V^\top \Sigma^{-1} \\
&= \frac{q_\lambda(w_r)}{\bar{q}_\lambda(w_r)} Y_r \\
&= \frac{q_\lambda(w_r) s_{\bar{q}_\lambda}}{\tilde{q}_\lambda(w_r)} Y_r \\
&\preceq s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} Y_r.
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of Y_r , the second step follows from the definition of V, Σ , the third step follows from $\|A\| \leq \text{tr}[A]$ for any positive semidefinite matrix, the fourth step follows from the definition of leverage score $q_\lambda(\cdot)$ as defined in Definition C.4, the fifth step follows from the definition of Y_r , the sixth step follows from the definition of $\bar{q}_\lambda(\cdot)$, and the last step follows from the condition $\tilde{q}_\lambda(w) \geq q_\lambda(w)$.

Thus, let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of K , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_r^2]}{\bar{q}_\lambda} &\preceq \frac{\mathbb{E}[s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} Y_r]}{\bar{q}_\lambda} \\
&= s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} \Sigma^{-1} V K V \Sigma^{-1} \\
&= s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} (I_n - \lambda \Sigma^{-2}) \\
&= s_{\bar{q}_\lambda} \cdot \text{diag}\{\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda), \dots, \lambda_n/(\lambda_n + \lambda)\} := D.
\end{aligned}$$

So by applying Lemma A.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m Y_r - \mathbb{E}[Y_r] \right\| \geq \epsilon &\leq \frac{8 \operatorname{tr}[D]}{\|D\|} \exp \left(\frac{-m\epsilon^2/2}{\|D\| + 2s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \epsilon/3} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{8s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \cdot s_\lambda(K)}{\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda)} \exp \left(\frac{-m\epsilon^2}{2s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} (1 + 2\epsilon/3)} \right) \\
&\leq 16s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \cdot s_\lambda(K) \exp \left(\frac{-m\epsilon^2}{2s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} (1 + 2\epsilon/3)} \right) \\
&\leq 16s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda} \cdot s_\lambda(K) \exp \left(\frac{-3m\epsilon^2}{8s_{\tilde{q}_\lambda}} \right) \\
&\leq \delta
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Lemma A.8, the second step follows from the definition of D and $s_\lambda(K) = \operatorname{tr}[(K + \lambda I_n)^{-1}K] = \sum_i^n \lambda_i/(\lambda_i + \lambda) = \operatorname{tr}[D]$, the third step follows the condition $\lambda \in (0, \|K\|)$, the fourth step follows the condition $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, and the last step follows from the bound on m . \square

Remark C.8. Above results can be generalized to \mathbb{C} . Note in the random Fourier feature case, we have $d_1 = d$, $d_2 = 1$, $\phi(x, w) = e^{-2\pi i w^\top x} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $p(\cdot)$ denotes the Fourier transform density distribution. In the Neural Tangent Kernel case, we have $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $\phi(x, w) = x\sigma'(w^\top x)$ and $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function of standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. So they are both special cases in our framework.

D Equivalence between training neural network with regularization and kernel ridge regression under leverage score sampling

In this section, we connected the neural network theory with the leverage score sampling theory by showing a new equivalence result between training reweighed neural network with regularization under leverage score initialization and corresponding neural tangent kernel ridge regression. Specifically, we prove Theorem D.21. Due to the similarity of the results to Section B, we present this section in the same framework.

Section D.1 introduces new notations and states the standard data assumptions again. Section D.2 restates and supplements the definitions in the paper. Section D.3 presents the key lemmas about the leverage score initialization and related properties, which are crucial to the proof. Section D.4 provides a brief proof sketch. Section D.5 restates and proves the main result Theorem D.21 following the proof sketch.

Here, we list the locations where definitions and theorems in the paper are restated. Definition 3.8 is restated in Definition D.2. Theorem 3.9 is restated in Theorem D.21.

D.1 Preliminaries

Let's define the following notations:

- $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), X) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(X)\beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the prediction of the kernel ridge regression for the training data with respect to $\bar{H}(0)$ at time t . (See Definition D.4)
- $\bar{u}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)$ (See Eq. (70))

- $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(x_{\text{test}}) \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the prediction of the kernel ridge regression for the test data with respect to $\bar{H}(0)$ at time t . (See Definition D.4)
- $\bar{u}_{\text{test}}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t)$ (See Eq. (71))
- $\bar{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the induced kernel between the training data and test data at time t , where

$$[\bar{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)]_i = \bar{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_i) = \left\langle \frac{\partial \bar{f}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})}{\partial W(t)}, \frac{\partial \bar{f}(W(t), x_i)}{\partial W(t)} \right\rangle$$

(see Definition D.3)

- $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the prediction of the reweighed neural network with leverage score initialization for the training data at time t . (See Definition D.2)
- $\bar{u}_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the prediction of the reweighed neural network with leverage score initialization for the test data at time t (See Definition D.2)

Assumption D.1 (data assumption). *We made the following assumptions:*

1. For each $i \in [n]$, we assume $|y_i| = O(1)$.
2. H^{cts} is positive definite, i.e., $\Lambda_0 := \lambda_{\min}(H^{\text{cts}}) > 0$.
3. All the training data and test data have Euclidean norm equal to 1.

D.2 Definitions

Definition D.2 (Training reweighed neural network with regularization, restatement of Definition 3.8). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be a small multiplier. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. Given any probability density distribution $q(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. We initialize the network as $a_r \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{unif}[\{-1, 1\}]$ and $w_r(0) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} q$. Then we consider solving the following optimization problem using gradient descent:*

$$\min_W \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|W\|_F^2. \quad (63)$$

where $\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r^\top x) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}}$ and $\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, X) = [\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x_1), \dots, \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote $w_r(t), r \in [m]$ as the variable at iteration t . We denote

$$\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), X) = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top X) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \quad (64)$$

as the training data predictor at iteration t . Given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote

$$\bar{u}_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}) = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top x_{\text{test}}) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \quad (65)$$

as the test data predictor at iteration t .

Definition D.3 (Reweighed dynamic kernel). *Given $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ as the parameters of the neural network at training time t as defined in Definition D.2. For any data $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $\mathbf{K}_t(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}$ as*

$$\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x, z) = \left\langle \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x)}{dW(t)}, \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)} \right\rangle$$

Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we define $\bar{H}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as

$$[\bar{H}(t)]_{i,j} = \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_i, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We denote $\bar{\Phi}(x) = [x^\top \sigma'(w_1(0)^\top x) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_1(0))}{q(w_1(0))}}, \dots, x^\top \sigma'(w_m(0)^\top x) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$ as the feature vector corresponding to $\bar{H}(0)$, which satisfies

$$[\bar{H}(0)]_{i,j} = \bar{\Phi}(x_i)^\top \bar{\Phi}(x_j)$$

for all $i, j \in [n]$. We denote $\bar{\Phi}(X) = [\bar{\Phi}(x_1), \dots, \bar{\Phi}(x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times md}$. Further, given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) = [\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_1), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Definition D.4 (Kernel ridge regression with $\bar{H}(0)$). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_0, \bar{H}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\bar{\Phi}$ be the neural tangent kernel and corresponding feature functions defined as in Definition D.3. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be a small multiplier. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be the regularization parameter. Then we consider the following neural tangent kernel ridge regression problem:*

$$\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2. \quad (66)$$

where $\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x) = \bar{\Phi}(x)^\top \beta$ denotes the prediction function is corresponding RKHS and $\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, X) = [\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_1), \dots, \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, x_n)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the gradient flow of solving problem (66) with initialization $\beta(0) = 0$. We denote $\beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$ as the variable at iteration t . We denote

$$\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(X) \beta(t) \quad (67)$$

as the training data predictor at iteration t . Given any test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote

$$\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(x_{\text{test}})^\top \beta(t) \quad (68)$$

as the test data predictor at iteration t . Note the gradient flow converge the to optimal solution of problem (66) due to the strongly convexity of the problem. We denote

$$\bar{\beta}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta(t) = \kappa (\kappa^2 \bar{\Phi}(X)^\top \bar{\Phi}(X) + \lambda I)^{-1} \bar{\Phi}(X)^\top Y \quad (69)$$

and the optimal training data predictor

$$\bar{u}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(X) \bar{\beta}^* = \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) (\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \quad (70)$$

and the optimal test data predictor

$$\bar{u}_{\text{test}}^* = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(x_{\text{test}})^\top \bar{\beta}^* = \kappa^2 \bar{\mathbf{K}}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} Y. \quad (71)$$

D.3 Leverage score sampling, gradient flow, and linear convergence

Recall in the main body we connect the leverage score sampling theory and convergence theory of the neural network training by observing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x, z) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, x)}{\partial W}, \frac{\partial f_{\text{nn}}(W, z)}{\partial W} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p} [\phi(x, w)^\top \phi(z, w)] \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi(x, w) = x\sigma'(w^\top x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function of standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Thus, given regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$, we can define the ridge leverage function with respect to H^{cts} defined in Definition B.4 as

$$q_\lambda(w) = p(w) \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top (H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w)]$$

and corresponding probability density function

$$q(w) = \frac{q_\lambda(w)}{s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} \quad (72)$$

where $\Phi(w) = [\phi(x_1, w)^\top, \dots, \phi(x_n, w)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$.

Lemma D.5 (property of leverage score sampling distribution). *Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Let $q(\cdot)$ be defined as in (72). Assume $\text{tr}[\Phi(w)\Phi(w)^\top] = O(n)$ and $\lambda \leq \Lambda_0/2$. Then for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$c_1 p(w) \leq q(w) \leq c_2 p(w)$$

where $c_1 = O(\frac{1}{n})$ and $c_2 = O(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$.

Proof. Note by assumption $s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}}) = \text{tr}[(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} H^{\text{cts}}] = O(n)$. Further, note for any $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} q_\lambda(w) &= p(w) \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top (H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi(w)] \\ &\leq p(w) \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top \Phi(w)] \cdot \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \\ &= p(w) \text{tr} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i, w) \phi(x_i, w)^\top \right] \cdot \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \\ &= p(w) \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}[\phi(x_i, w) \phi(x_i, w)^\top] \cdot \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \\ &= p(w) \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}[\phi(x_i, w)^\top \phi(x_i, w)] \cdot \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \\ &= p(w) \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2 \sigma'(w^\top x_i)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \\ &\leq p(w) \frac{n}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from $H^{\text{cts}} \succeq \Lambda_0 I_n$, the second step follows from the definition of Φ , the third step follows from the linearity of trace operator, the fourth step follows from $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)$, the fifth step follows from the definition of ϕ , and the last step follows from $\|x_i\|_2 = 1$ and $\sigma'(\cdot) \leq 1$.

Thus, combining above facts, we have

$$q(w) = \frac{q_\lambda(w)}{s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} \leq p(w) \frac{n}{(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} = c_2 p(w)$$

hold for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $c_2 = O(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$.

Similarly, note $H^{\text{cts}} \preceq nI_n$, we have

$$q_\lambda(w) \geq p(w) \text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top \Phi(w)] \cdot \frac{1}{n + \lambda}$$

which implies

$$q(w) = \frac{q_\lambda(w)}{s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} \geq p(w) \frac{\text{tr}[\Phi(w)^\top \Phi(w)]}{(n + \lambda)s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})} = c_1 p(w)$$

hold for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $c_1 = O(\frac{1}{n})$. Combining above results, we complete the proof. \square

Lemma D.6 (leverage score sampling). *Let $\overline{H}(t)$, H^{cts} be the kernel defined as in Definition D.3 and Definition B.4. Let $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function for Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Let $q(\cdot)$ denotes the leverage sampling distribution with respect to $p(\cdot)$, $\overline{H}(0)$ and λ defined in Definition C.6. Let $\Delta \in (0, 1/4)$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_q[\overline{H}(0)] = H^{\text{cts}}.$$

By choosing $m \geq \tilde{O}(\Delta^{-2}s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}}))$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(1 - \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I) \preceq \overline{H}(0) + \lambda I \preceq (1 + \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)$$

Further, if $\lambda \leq \Lambda_0$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\overline{H}(0) \succeq \frac{\Lambda_0}{2} I_n.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(s_\lambda(\overline{H}(0))/\delta)$.

Proof. Note for any $i, j \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbb{E}_q[\overline{H}(0)]]_{i,j} &= \mathbb{E}_q[\overline{\Phi}(x_i)^\top \overline{\Phi}(x_j)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_q[\langle \frac{d\overline{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_i)}{dW}, \frac{d\overline{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_j)}{dW} \rangle] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_p[\langle \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_i)}{dW}, \frac{df_{\text{nn}}(W(0), x_j)}{dW} \rangle] \\ &= [H^{\text{cts}}]_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $\overline{H}(0)$, the second step follows the definition of $\overline{\Phi}$, the third step calculates the expectation, and the last step follows the definition of H^{cts} .

Also, by applying Theorem C.7 directly, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(1 - \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I) \preceq \overline{H}(0) + \lambda I \preceq (1 + \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)$$

if $m \geq \tilde{O}(\Delta^{-2} s_\lambda(\overline{H}(0)))$.

Since

$$\overline{H}(0) + \lambda I \succeq (1 - \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I) \succeq (1 - \Delta)(\Lambda_0 + \lambda)I_n,$$

we have

$$\overline{H}(0) \succeq [(1 - \Delta)(\Lambda_0 + \lambda) - \lambda]I_n \succeq \frac{\Lambda_0}{2}I_n,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma D.7 (Gradient flow of kernel ridge regression, parallel to Lemma B.7). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}, \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition D.4. Let $\bar{\Phi}, \bar{K}_t$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Then for any data $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{dt} = \kappa \cdot \bar{K}_0(z, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z).$$

Proof. Denote $L(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\|\beta(t)\|_2^2$. By the rule of gradient descent, we have

$$\frac{d\beta(t)}{dt} = -\frac{dL}{d\beta} = \kappa \bar{\Phi}(X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \beta(t).$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{dt} &= \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z)}{d\beta(t)} \frac{d\beta(t)}{dt} \\ &= \bar{\Phi}(z)^\top (\kappa \bar{\Phi}(X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \beta(t)) \\ &= \kappa \bar{K}_0(z, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \bar{\Phi}(z)^\top \beta(t) \\ &= \kappa \bar{K}_0(z, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step is due to chain rule, the second step follows from the fact $d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta, z)/d\beta = \bar{\Phi}(z)$, the third step is due to the definition of the kernel $\bar{K}_0(z, X) = \bar{\Phi}(X)\bar{\Phi}(z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the last step is due to the definition of $\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), z) \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Corollary D.8 (Gradient of prediction of kernel ridge regression, parallel to Corollary B.8). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}, \beta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in Definition D.4. Let $\bar{K}_t, \bar{H}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ \frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 \bar{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Plugging in $z = x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma D.7, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i)}{dt} = \kappa \bar{K}_0(x_i, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i).$$

Note $[\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)]_i = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_i)$ and $[\bar{H}(0)]_{:,i} = \bar{K}_0(x_i, X)$, so writing all the data in a compact form, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t).$$

Plugging in data $z = x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma D.7, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}})}{dt} = \kappa \bar{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}).$$

Note by definition, $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{ntk}}(\beta(t), x_{\text{test}}) \in \mathbb{R}$, so we have

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \bar{K}_0(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}, \text{test}}(t).$$

□

Lemma D.9 (Linear convergence of kernel ridge regression, parallel to Lemma B.9). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition D.4. Let $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be defined as in Definition B.4. Let $\lambda > 0$ be the regularization parameter. Then we have*

$$\frac{d\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2}{dt} \leq -(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda) \|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2.$$

Further, we have

$$\|u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - u^*\|_2 \leq e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2} \|u_{\text{ntk}}(0) - u^*\|_2.$$

Proof. Let $\bar{H}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}^*) &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y) \\ &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(I_n - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0))(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0))(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \lambda \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \lambda \bar{u}^*, \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the first step follows the definition of $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the second to fourth step simplify the formula, and the last step use the definition of $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ again. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2}{dt} &= 2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t)}{dt} \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(0)(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(0)(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) + 2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}^*) \\ &\quad - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(0)(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) + 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}^* \\ &\quad - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) \\ &= -2(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top (\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)(\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) \\ &\leq -(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda) \|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where the first step follows the chain rule, the second step follows Corollary D.8, the third step uses basic linear algebra, the fourth step follows Eq. (73), the fifth step simplifies the expression, and

the last step follows from Lemma D.6. Further, since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d(e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2)}{dt} \\
&= (\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 + e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t} \cdot \frac{d\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2}{dt} \\
&\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step calculates the gradient, and the second step follows from Eq. (74). Thus, $e^{(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t}\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2$ is non-increasing, which implies

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \leq e^{-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0+\lambda)t/2}\|\bar{u}_{\text{ntk}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2.$$

□

Lemma D.10 (Gradient flow of neural network training, Parallel to Lemma B.10). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\bar{f}_{\text{nn}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition D.2. Let $\bar{K}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Then for any data $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dt} = \kappa \bar{K}_t(z, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z).$$

Proof. Denote $L(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\|W(t)\|_F^2$. By the rule of gradient descent, we have

$$\frac{dw_r}{dt} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial w_r} = \left(\frac{\partial \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}}{\partial w_r}\right)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}) - \lambda w_r. \quad (75)$$

Also note for ReLU activation σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \lambda W(t) \right\rangle &= \sum_{r=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r z \sigma'(w_r(t)^\top z) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \right)^\top (\lambda w_r(t)) \\
&= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r w_r(t)^\top z \sigma'(w_r(t)^\top z) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \\
&= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r(t)^\top z) \sqrt{\frac{p(w_r(0))}{q(w_r(0))}} \\
&= \lambda \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z),
\end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where the first step calculates the derivatives, the second step follows basic linear algebra, the third step follows the property of ReLU activation: $\sigma(l) = l\sigma'(l)$, and the last step follows from the

definition of \bar{f}_{nn} . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dt} \\
&= \left\langle \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \frac{dW(t)}{dt} \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)) \left\langle \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \frac{d\kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)}{dW(t)} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z)}{dW(t)}, \lambda W(t) \right\rangle \\
&= \kappa \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_j)) \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(z, x_j) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z) \\
&= \kappa \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(z, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), z),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from chain rule, the second step follows from Eq. (75), the third step follows from the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t$ and Eq. (76), and the last step rewrites the formula in a compact form. \square

Corollary D.11 (Gradient of prediction of neural network, Parallel to Lemma B.11). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\bar{f}_{\text{nn}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $W(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Definition D.2. Let $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{H}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(t) (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \\
\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= \kappa^2 \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Plugging in $z = x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma D.10, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i)}{dt} = \kappa \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_i, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i).$$

Note $[\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)]_i = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_i)$ and $[\bar{H}(t)]_{:,i} = \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_i, X)$, so writing all the data in a compact form, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \bar{H}(t) (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t).$$

Plugging in data $z = x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in Lemma D.10, we have

$$\frac{d\bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})}{dt} = \kappa \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}}).$$

Note by definition, $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t) = \kappa \bar{f}_{\text{nn}}(W(t), x_{\text{test}})$, so we have

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t)}{dt} = \kappa^2 \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (Y - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)) - \lambda \cdot \bar{u}_{\text{nn}, \text{test}}(t).$$

\square

Lemma D.12 (Linear convergence of neural network training, Parallel to Lemma B.12). *Given training data matrix $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition D.2. Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined in Eq. (70). Let $\bar{H}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined as in Definition D.3. Let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda_0)$ be the regularization parameter. Assume $\|\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0)\| \leq \Lambda_0/4$ holds for all $t \in [0, T]$. Then we have*

$$\frac{d\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2}{dt} \leq -\frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0)\| \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2.$$

Proof. Note same as in Lemma D.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}^*) &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(Y - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y) \\ &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(I_n - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0))(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n - \kappa^2 \bar{H}(0))(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \kappa^2 \lambda \bar{H}(0)(\kappa^2 \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y \\ &= \lambda \bar{u}^*, \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where the first step follows the definition of $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the second to fourth step simplify the formula, and the last step use the definition of $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ again. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2}{dt} \\ &= 2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \frac{d\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t)}{dt} \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(t)(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - Y) - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(t)(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) + 2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(0)(Y - \bar{u}^*) \\ &\quad + 2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top (\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0))(Y - \bar{u}^*) - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{H}(t)(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) + 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}^* \\ &\quad + 2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top (\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0))(Y - \bar{u}^*) - 2\lambda(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \\ &= -2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top (\kappa^2 \bar{H}(t) + \lambda I)(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*) + 2\kappa^2(\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*)^\top (\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0))(Y - \bar{u}^*) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0)\|\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2\|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows the chain rule, the second step follows Corollary D.11, the third step uses basic linear algebra, the fourth step follows Eq. (77), the fifth step simplifies the expression, and the last step follows the assumption $\|\bar{H}(t) - \bar{H}(0)\| \leq \Lambda_0/4$ and the fact $\|\bar{H}(0)\| \leq \Lambda_0/2$. \square

D.4 Proof sketch

We introduce a new kernel ridge regression problem with respect to $\bar{H}(0)$ to decouple the prediction perturbation resulted from initialization phase and training phase. Specifically, given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we divide this proof into following steps:

1. Firstly, we bound the prediction perturbation resulted from initialization phase $\|u^* - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ by applying the leverage score sampling theory, as shown in Lemma D.13.
2. Then we use the similar idea as section B to bound the prediction perturbation resulted from training phase $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ by showing the over-parametrization and convergence property of neural network inductively, as shown in Lemma D.14 and Corollary D.20.

3. Lastly, we combine the results of step 1 and 2 using triangle inequality to show $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, as shown in Theorem D.21.

D.5 Main result

In this section, we prove Theorem D.21 following the above proof sketch.

D.5.1 Upper bounding $\|u^* - \bar{u}^*\|_2$

Lemma D.13. *Let $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the optimal training data predictors defined in Definition B.5 and Definition D.4. Let $\bar{H}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be defined in Definition D.3. Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function for Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Let $q(\cdot)$ denotes the leverage sampling distribution with respect to $p(\cdot)$, $\bar{H}(0)$ and λ defined in Definition C.6. Let $\Delta \in (0, 1/2)$. If $m \geq \tilde{O}(\Delta^{-2} s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}}))$, then we have*

$$\|\bar{u}^* - u^*\|_2 \leq \frac{\lambda \Delta \sqrt{n}}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Particularly, given arbitrary $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, if $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n}{\epsilon \Lambda_0})$ and $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, we have

$$\|\bar{u}^* - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}})/\delta)$.

Proof. Note

$$Y - u^* = \lambda(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y$$

and

$$Y - \bar{u}^* = \lambda(\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1} Y$$

So

$$\bar{u}^* - u^* = \lambda[(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} - (\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1}] Y$$

By Lemma D.6, if $m \geq \tilde{O}(\Delta^{-2} s_\lambda(H^{\text{cts}}))$, we have

$$(1 - \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I) \preceq \bar{H}(0) + \lambda I \preceq (1 + \Delta)(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{1 + \Delta}(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq (\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq \frac{1}{1 - \Delta}(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1}$$

i.e.,

$$-\frac{\Delta}{1 + \Delta}(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq (\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} - (H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq \frac{\Delta}{1 - \Delta}(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1}$$

Assume $\Delta \in (0, 1/2)$, we have

$$-\Delta(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq (\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I)^{-1} - (H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \preceq 2\Delta(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \quad (78)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{u}^* - u^*\|_2 &\leq \lambda \|(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I_n)^{-1} - (\bar{H}(0) + \lambda I_n)^{-1}\| \|Y\|_2 \\
&\leq 2\lambda\Delta \|(H^{\text{cts}} + \lambda I)^{-1}\| \|Y\|_2 \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{\lambda\Delta\sqrt{n}}{\Lambda_0 + \lambda}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the second step follows from Eq. (78), and the last step follows from the definition of Λ_0 and $\|Y\|_2 = O(\sqrt{n})$. \square

D.5.2 Upper bounding $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - \bar{u}^*\|_2$

Lemma D.14 (Bounding kernel perturbation, Parallel to Lemma B.21). *Given training data $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a test data $x_{\text{test}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $T > 0$ denotes the total number of iterations, $m > 0$ denotes the width of the network, ϵ_{train} denotes a fixed training error threshold, $\delta > 0$ denotes the failure probability. Let $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the training data predictors defined in Definition D.2. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be the corresponding multiplier. Let $\bar{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{H}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Lambda_0 > 0$ be the kernel related quantities defined in Definition D.3. Let $\bar{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as in Eq. (70). Let $\lambda > 0$ be the regularization parameter. Let $W(t) = [w_1(t), \dots, w_m(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ be the parameters of the neural network defined in Definition D.2. Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. If $\kappa = 1$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \epsilon/2$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4 d}{\lambda_0^4 \epsilon})$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, then there exist $\epsilon_W, \epsilon'_H, \epsilon'_K > 0$ that are independent of t , such that the following hold for all $0 \leq t \leq T$:*

- 1. $\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W, \forall r \in [m]$
- 2. $\|\bar{H}(0) - \bar{H}(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'_H$
- 3. $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/4) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides the $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

We first state the following concentration result for the random initialization that can help us prove the lemma.

Lemma D.15 (Random initialization result). *Assume initial value $w_r(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r = 1, \dots, m$ are drawn independently according to leverage score sampling distribution $q(\cdot)$ defined in (72), then with probability $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(mc_2/\delta)} := \alpha_{w,0} \quad (79)$$

hold for all $r \in [m]$, where $c_2 = O(n)$.

Proof. By lemma A.6, if $w_r(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(m/\delta)}$$

holds for all $r \in [m]$. By Lemma D.5, we have $q(w) \leq c_2 p(w)$ holds for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $c_2 = O(1/\Lambda_0)$ and $p(\cdot)$ is the probability density function of $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Thus, if $w_r(0) \sim q$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{d} + 2\sqrt{\log(mc_2/\delta)}$$

holds for all $r \in [m]$. \square

Now conditioning on Eq. (44), (45), (46) holds, We show all the four conclusions in Lemma B.21 holds using induction.

We define the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_W &:= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{4\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2/(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda), \epsilon_{\text{train}} \cdot T\} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 + 2\lambda\alpha_{w,0} \right) \cdot T \\
\epsilon'_H &:= 2n\epsilon_W \\
\epsilon_K &:= 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon_W
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

which are independent of t . Here $\alpha_{w,0}$ are defined in Eq. (79).

Note the base case when $t = 0$ trivially holds. Now assuming Lemma D.14 holds before time $t \in [0, T]$, we argue that it also holds at time t . To do so, Lemmas D.16, D.17, D.19 argue these conclusions one by one.

Lemma D.16 (Conclusion 1). *If for any $\tau < t$, we have*

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/4) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$$

and

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(\tau)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W \leq 1$$

and

$$\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \alpha_{w,0} \text{ for all } r \in [m]$$

hold, then

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W$$

Proof. Recall the gradient flow as Eq. (75)

$$\frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r(y_i - \bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau)_i) x_i \sigma'(w_r(\tau)^\top x_i) - \lambda w_r(\tau) \tag{81}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\|_2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} a_r(y_i - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)_i) x_i \sigma'(w_r(\tau)^\top x_i) - \lambda w_r(\tau) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)_i| + \lambda \|w_r(\tau)\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda \|w_r(\tau)\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda (\|w_r(0)\|_2 + \|w_r(\tau) - w_r(0)\|_2) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + \lambda (\alpha_{W,0} + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}_{nn}(\tau)\|_2 + 2\lambda \alpha_{W,0} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} (\|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 + \|\bar{u}_{nn}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2) + 2\lambda \alpha_{W,0} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|\bar{u}_{nn}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 + 2\lambda \alpha_{W,0} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{e^{-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/8} \|\bar{u}_{nn}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}\} \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 + 2\lambda \alpha_{W,0}, \tag{82}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (81), the second step follows from triangle inequality, the third step follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the forth step follows from triangle inequality, the fifth step follows from condition $\|w_r(0) - w_r(\tau)\|_2 \leq 1$, $\|w_r(0)\|_2 \leq \alpha_{W,0}$, the seventh step follows from triangle inequality, the last step follows from $\|\bar{u}_{nn}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/4) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{nn}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}$.

Thus, for any $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 &\leq \int_0^t \left\| \frac{dw_r(\tau)}{d\tau} \right\|_2 d\tau \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \max\{4\|\bar{u}_{nn}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2/(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda), \epsilon_{\text{train}} \cdot T\} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{m}} \|Y - \bar{u}^*\|_2 + 2\lambda \alpha_{W,0} \right) \cdot T \\
&= \epsilon_W
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows triangle inequality, the second step follows Eq. (82), and the last step follows the definition of ϵ_W as Eq. (80). \square

Lemma D.17 (Conclusion 2). *If $\forall r \in [m]$,*

$$\|w_r(0) - w_r(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon_W < 1,$$

then

$$\|H(0) - H(t)\|_F \leq 2n\epsilon_W$$

holds with probability $1 - n^2 \cdot \exp(-m\epsilon_W c_1/10)$, where $c_1 = O(1/n)$.

Proof. Directly applying Lemma D.18, we finish the proof. \square

Lemma D.18 (perturbed w). *Let $R \in (0, 1)$. If $\tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_m$ are i.i.d. generated from the leverage score sampling distribution $q(\cdot)$ as in (72). Let $p(\cdot)$ denotes the standard Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. For any set of weight vectors $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfy for any $r \in [m]$, $\|\tilde{w}_r - w_r\|_2 \leq R$, then the $H : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ defined*

$$\overline{H}(w)_{i,j} = \frac{1}{m} x_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0} \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)}.$$

Then we have

$$\|\overline{H}(w) - \overline{H}(\tilde{w})\|_F < 2nR,$$

holds with probability at least $1 - n^2 \cdot \exp(-mRc_1/10)$, where $c_1 = O(1/n)$.

Proof. The random variable we care is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |\overline{H}(\tilde{w})_{i,j} - \overline{H}(w)_{i,j}|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{r=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{w}_r^\top x_i \geq 0, \tilde{w}_r^\top x_j \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0} \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)} \right)^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s_{r,i,j} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from for each r, i, j , we define

$$s_{r,i,j} := (\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{w}_r^\top x_i \geq 0, \tilde{w}_r^\top x_j \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0}) \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)}.$$

We consider i, j are fixed. We simplify $s_{r,i,j}$ to s_r .

Then s_r is a random variable that only depends on \tilde{w}_r . Since $\{\tilde{w}_r\}_{r=1}^m$ are independent, $\{s_r\}_{r=1}^m$ are also mutually independent.

Now we define the event

$$A_{i,r} = \left\{ \exists u : \|u - \tilde{w}_r\|_2 \leq R, \mathbf{1}_{x_i^\top \tilde{w}_r \geq 0} \neq \mathbf{1}_{x_i^\top u \geq 0} \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$\Pr_{\tilde{w}_r \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [A_{i,r}] = \Pr_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)} [|z| < R] \leq \frac{2R}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \quad (83)$$

where the last step follows from the anti-concentration inequality of Gaussian (Lemma A.4).

If $\neg A_{i,r}$ and $\neg A_{j,r}$ happen, then

$$\left| \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{w}_r^\top x_i \geq 0, \tilde{w}_r^\top x_j \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0} \right| = 0.$$

If $A_{i,r}$ or $A_{j,r}$ happen, then

$$\left| \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{w}_r^\top x_i \geq 0, \tilde{w}_r^\top x_j \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{w_r^\top x_i \geq 0, w_r^\top x_j \geq 0} \right| \leq 1.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} [s_r] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} \left[\mathbf{1}_{A_{i,r} \vee A_{j,r}} \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim p} [\mathbf{1}_{A_{i,r} \vee A_{j,r}}] \\ &\leq \Pr_{\tilde{w}_r \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)} [A_{i,r}] + \Pr_{\tilde{w}_r \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)} [A_{j,r}] \\ &\leq \frac{4R}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &\leq 2R, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} \left[\left(s_r - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} [s_r] \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} [s_r^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} [s_r]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} [s_r^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim q} \left[\left(\mathbf{1}_{A_{i,r} \vee A_{j,r}} \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w}_r \sim p} \left[\mathbf{1}_{A_{i,r} \vee A_{j,r}} \frac{p(\tilde{w}_r)}{q(\tilde{w}_r)} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2R}{c_1} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemma D.5 and $c_1 = O(n)$. We also have $|s_r| \leq 1/c_1$. So we can apply Bernstein inequality (Lemma A.3) to get for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{r=1}^m s_r \geq 2mR + mt \right] &\leq \Pr \left[\sum_{r=1}^m (s_r - \mathbb{E}[s_r]) \geq mt \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{m^2 t^2 / 2}{2mR/c_1 + mt/3c_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $t = R$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{r=1}^m s_r \geq 3mR \right] &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{m^2 R^2 / 2}{2mR/c_1 + mR/3c_1} \right) \\ &\leq \exp(-mRc_1/10). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging back, we complete the proof. \square

Lemma D.19 (Conclusion 3). Fix $\epsilon'_H > 0$ independent of t . If for all $\tau < t$

$$\|H(0) - H(\tau)\| \leq \epsilon'_H \leq \Lambda_0/4$$

and

$$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \quad (84)$$

then we have

$$\|u_{\text{nn}}(t) - u^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|u_{\text{nn}}(0) - u^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}.$$

Proof. Note $\|\overline{H}(\tau) - \overline{H}(0)\| \leq \epsilon_H \leq \Lambda_0/4$. By Lemma D.12, for any $\tau < t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2}{d\tau} &\leq -\frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\|\overline{H}(\tau) - \overline{H}(0)\| \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2 + 2\kappa^2\epsilon'_H \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where the first step follows from Lemma D.12, the second step follows from definition of ϵ'_H .

Now let us discuss two cases:

Case 1. If for all $\tau < t$, $\|u_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - u^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon_{\text{train}}$ always holds, we want to argue that

$$\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/4) \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2.$$

Note by assumption (84), we have

$$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\|Y - u^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$$

implies

$$2\kappa^2\epsilon_H \cdot \|Y - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/4 \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2$$

holds for any $\tau < t$. Thus, plugging into (85),

$$\frac{d\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2}{d\tau} \leq -(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)/4 \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2,$$

holds for all $\tau < t$, which implies

$$\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \exp(-(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/4) \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \overline{u}^*\|_2^2.$$

Case 2. If there exist $\overline{\tau} < t$, such that $\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\overline{\tau}) - \overline{u}^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}$, we want to argue that $\|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \overline{u}^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}$. Note by assumption (84), we have

$$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\|Y - \overline{u}^*\|_2}(\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda)$$

implies

$$4\kappa^2\epsilon'_H \cdot \|\overline{u}_{\text{nn}}(\overline{\tau}) - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \cdot \|Y - \overline{u}^*\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2\Lambda_0 + \lambda) \cdot \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2.$$

Thus, plugging into (85),

$$\frac{d(\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)}{d\tau} \leq -(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)/2 \cdot (\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$$

holds for $\tau = \bar{\tau}$, which implies $e^{(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/2}(\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$ is non-increasing at $\tau = \bar{\tau}$. Since $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\bar{\tau}) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2 < 0$, by induction, $e^{(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)\tau/2}(\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2)$ being non-increasing and $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(\tau) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 - \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2 < 0$ holds for all $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau \leq t$, which implies

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 < \epsilon_{\text{train}}.$$

Combine above two cases, we conclude

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/2) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \epsilon_{\text{train}}^2\}.$$

□

Now we summarize all the conditions need to be satisfied so that the induction works as in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of conditions for induction

No.	Condition	Place
1	$\epsilon_W \leq 1$	Lem. D.16
2	$\epsilon'_H \leq \Lambda_0/4$	Lem. D.19
3	$\epsilon'_H \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{train}}}{8\kappa^2\ Y - u^*\ _2}(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)$	Lem. D.19

Compare Table 1 and Table 3, we can see by picking the same value for the parameters as in Theorem B.29, we have the induction holds, which completes the proof.

As a direct corollary, we have

Corollary D.20. *Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. If $\kappa = 1$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4 d}{\lambda_0^4 \epsilon})$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - \bar{u}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides the $\text{poly log}(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$.

Proof. By choosing $\epsilon_{\text{train}} = \epsilon/2$ in Lemma D.14, the induction shows

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)t/4) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2, \epsilon^2/4\}$$

holds for all $t \leq T$. By picking $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, we have

$$\exp(-(\kappa^2 \Lambda_0 + \lambda)T/4) \cdot \|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(0) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon^2/4$$

which implies $\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - \bar{u}^*\|_2^2 \leq \max\{\epsilon^2/4, \epsilon^2/4\} = \epsilon^2/4$.

□

D.5.3 Main result for equivalence with leverage score sampling initialization

Theorem D.21 (Equivalence between training reweighed neural net with regularization under leverage score initialization and kernel ridge regression for training data prediction, restatement of Theorem 3.9). *Given training data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and corresponding label vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $T > 0$ be the total number of iterations. Let $\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the training data predictors defined in Definition D.2 and Definition B.5 respectively. Let $\kappa = 1$ be the corresponding multiplier. Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, if $\kappa = 1$, $T = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\Lambda_0})$, network width $m \geq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^4 d}{\lambda_0^4 \epsilon})$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random initialization, we have*

$$\|\bar{u}_{\text{nn}}(T) - u^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon \delta \Lambda_0))$.

Proof. Combining results of Lemma D.13 and Corollary D.20 using triangle inequality, we finish the proof. \square

Remark D.22. *Despite our given upper-bound of network width under leverage score sampling is asymptotically the same as the Gaussian initialization, we point out the potential benefits of introducing leverage score sampling to training regularized neural networks.*

Note the bound for the width consists of two parts: 1) initialization and 2) training. Part 1, requires the width to be large enough, so that the initialized dynamic kernels $H(0)$ and $\bar{H}(0)$ are close enough to NTK by concentration, see Lem B.20 and D.13. Part 2, requires the width to be large enough, so that the dynamic kernels $H(t)$ and $\bar{H}(t)$ are close enough to the NTK during the training by the over-parameterization property, see Lem B.21 and D.14. Leverage score sampling optimizes the bound for part 1 while keeping the bound for part 2 the same. The current state-of-art analysis gives a tighter bound in part 2, so the final bound for width is the same for both cases. If analysis for part 2 can be improved and part 1 dominates, then initializing using leverage score will be beneficial in terms of the width needed.

E Extension to other neural network models

In previous sections, we discuss a simple neural network model: 2-layer ReLu neural network with first layer trained. We remark that our results can be naturally extended to multi-layer ReLU deep neural networks with all parameters training together.

Note the core of the connection between regularized NNs and KRR is to show the similarity between their gradient flows, as shown in Corollary B.8 and Corollary B.11: their gradient flow are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= -\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_{\text{ntk}}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{ntk}}(t) - Y) - \lambda u_{\text{ntk},\text{test}}(t) \\ \frac{du_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t)}{dt} &= -\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}_t(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u_{\text{nn}}(t) - Y) - \lambda u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Note these gradient flows consist of two terms: the first term $-\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u(t) - Y)$ comes from the normal neural network training without ℓ_2 regularization, the second term $-\lambda u_{\text{test}}(t)$ comes from the regularizer and can be directly derived using the piece-wise linearity property of the 2-layer ReLu NN (in this case, with respect to the parameters in the first layer).

Now consider the case of training multi-layer ReLu neural network with regularization. We claim above similarity between the gradient flows of NN and KRR still holds as long as we scale

up the network width by the number of layers trained: as 1) the similarity of the first term $-\kappa^2 \mathbf{K}(x_{\text{test}}, X)^\top (u(t) - Y)$ has already been shown in previous literature [ADH⁺19a, AZLS19a], and 2) the similarity of the second term $-\lambda u_{\text{test}}(t)$ comes from the piece-wise linearity property of deep ReLU neural network with respect to all training parameters. In the common case where we train all the parameters together, the equivalence still holds as long as we scale up the network width by the number of layers, as shown in the following theorem:

Theorem E.1. *Consider training a L -layer ReLU neural network with ℓ_2 regularization. Let $u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(t)$ denote the neural network predictor at time t , and u_{test}^* denote the kernel ridge regression predictor. Then Given any accuracy $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ and failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$. Let multiplier $\kappa = \text{poly}(\epsilon, \Lambda_0, 1/n, 1/L)$, number of iterations $T = \text{poly}(1/\epsilon, 1/\Lambda_0, n, L)$, network width $m \geq \text{poly}(n, d, 1/\epsilon, 1/\Lambda_0, L)$ and regularization parameter $\lambda \leq \text{poly}(1/n, 1/d, \epsilon, \Lambda_0, 1/L)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over random initialization, we have*

$$\|u_{\text{nn},\text{test}}(T) - u_{\text{test}}^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Here we omit $\text{poly} \log(n/(\epsilon\delta\Lambda_0))$ factors.

The results under leverage score sampling can be argued in the same way.

We also remark that it is possible to extend our results further to the model of convolutional neural network (CNN) by making use the convolutional neural tangent kernel (CNTK) discussed in [ADH⁺19a], and to the case using stochastic gradient descent in training rather than gradient descent. However, these discussion require more detailed proof and is out of the scope of this work.

References

- [ACSS20] Josh Alman, Timothy Chu, Aaron Schild, and Zhao Song. Algorithms and hardness for linear algebra on geometric graphs. In *FOCS*, 2020.
- [ACW17] Haim Avron, Kenneth L Clarkson, and David P Woodruff. Faster kernel ridge regression using sketching and preconditioning. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 38(4):1116–1138, 2017.
- [ADH⁺19a] Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Ruosong Wang. On exact computation with an infinitely wide neural net. In *NeurIPS*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11955, 2019.
- [ADH⁺19b] Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Ruosong Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. In *ICML*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08584, 2019.
- [AKM⁺17] Haim Avron, Michael Kapralov, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Ameya Velingker, and Amir Zandieh. Random fourier features for kernel ridge regression: Approximation bounds and statistical guarantees. In *ICML*, 2017.
- [AKM⁺19] Haim Avron, Michael Kapralov, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Ameya Velingker, and Amir Zandieh. A universal sampling method for reconstructing signals with simple fourier transforms. In *STOC*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08723, 2019.
- [AM15] Ahmed Alaoui and Michael W Mahoney. Fast randomized kernel ridge regression with statistical guarantees. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 775–783, 2015.
- [AZLS19a] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [AZLS19b] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. On the convergence rate of training recurrent neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [Bac13] Francis Bach. Sharp analysis of low-rank kernel matrix approximations. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 185–209, 2013.
- [Ber24] Sergei Bernstein. On a modification of chebyshev’s inequality and of the error formula of laplace. *Ann. Sci. Inst. Sav. Ukraine, Sect. Math*, 1(4):38–49, 1924.
- [BG17] Alon Brutzkus and Amir Globerson. Globally optimal gradient descent for a convnet with gaussian inputs. In *ICML*, 2017.
- [BJW19] Ainesh Bakshi, Rajesh Jayaram, and David P Woodruff. Learning two layer rectified neural networks in polynomial time. In *COLT*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/:1811.01885>, 2019.
- [BLM89] Jean Bourgain, Joram Lindenstrauss, and V Milman. Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes. *Acta mathematica*, 162(1):73–141, 1989.
- [BLN⁺20] Jan van den Brand, Yin-Tat Lee, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, Zhao Song, and Di Wang. Bipartite matching in nearly-linear time on moderately dense graphs. In *FOCS*, 2020.

- [BLSS20] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Zhao Song. Solving tall dense linear programs in nearly linear time. In *STOC*, 2020.
- [BPSW20] Jan van den Brand, Binghui Peng, Zhao Song, and Omri Weinstein. Training (over-parametrized) neural networks in near-linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11648*, 2020.
- [BW14] Christos Boutsidis and David P Woodruff. Optimal cur matrix decompositions. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 353–362. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1405.7910>, 2014.
- [CB18] Lenaïc Chizat and Francis Bach. A note on lazy training in supervised differentiable programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07956*, 8, 2018.
- [CCLY19] Michael B Cohen, Ben Cousins, Yin Tat Lee, and Xin Yang. A near-optimal algorithm for approximating the john ellipsoid. In *COLT*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11580, 2019.
- [Che52] Herman Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 493–507, 1952.
- [CKPS16] Xue Chen, Daniel M Kane, Eric Price, and Zhao Song. Fourier-sparse interpolation without a frequency gap. In *57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 741–750. IEEE, 2016.
- [CM20] Sitan Chen and Ankur Moitra. Algorithmic foundations for the diffraction limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07659*, 2020.
- [CMM17] Michael B Cohen, Cameron Musco, and Christopher Musco. Input sparsity time low-rank approximation via ridge leverage score sampling. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1758–1777. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1511.07263.pdf>, 2017.
- [CP15] Michael B. Cohen and Richard Peng. ℓ_p row sampling by lewis weights. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, STOC ’15, pages 183–192, New York, NY, USA, 2015. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1412.0588>.
- [CW13] Kenneth L. Clarkson and David P. Woodruff. Low rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 81–90. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1207.6365>, 2013.
- [CW17] Kenneth L Clarkson and David P Woodruff. Low-rank psd approximation in input-sparsity time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2061–2072. SIAM, 2017.
- [Dan17] Amit Daniely. Sgd learns the conjugate kernel class of the network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 2422–2430, 2017.
- [DFS16] 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 (NeurIPS)*, pages 2253–2261, 2016.

- [DLL⁺19] Simon S Du, Jason D Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *ICML*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.03804>, 2019.
- [DLT⁺18] Simon S. Du, Jason D. Lee, Yuandong Tian, Barnabás Póczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent learns one-hidden-layer CNN: don’t be afraid of spurious local minima. In *ICML*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1712.00779>, 2018.
- [DMIMW12] Petros Drineas, Malik Magdon-Ismail, Michael W Mahoney, and David P Woodruff. Fast approximation of matrix coherence and statistical leverage. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Dec):3475–3506, 2012.
- [DS08] Samuel I Daitch and Daniel A Spielman. Faster approximate lossy generalized flow via interior point algorithms. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 451–460, 2008.
- [DZPS19] Simon S Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczsoz, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *ICLR*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02054, 2019.
- [GLM18] Rong Ge, Jason D. Lee, and Tengyu Ma. Learning one-hidden-layer neural networks with landscape design. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [Hoe63] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- [JGH18] Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 8571–8580, 2018.
- [JKL⁺20] Haotian Jiang, Tarun Kathuria, Yin Tat Lee, Swati Padmanabhan, and Zhao Song. A faster interior point method for semidefinite programming. In *FOCS*, 2020.
- [JLS20] Yaonan Jin, Daogao Liu, and Zhao Song. A robust multi-dimensional sparse fourier transform in the continuous setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06156*, 2020.
- [JLSW20] Haotian Jiang, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. An improved cutting plane method for convex optimization, convex-concave games and its applications. In *STOC*, 2020.
- [JSWZ20] Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Hengjie Zhang. Faster dynamic matrix inverse for faster lps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07470*, 2020.
- [Lew78] D. Lewis. Finite dimensional subspaces of L_p . *Studia Mathematica*, 63(2):207–212, 1978.
- [LL18] Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [LM00] Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.

- [LS14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Path finding methods for linear programming: Solving linear programs in $O(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$ iterations and faster algorithms for maximum flow. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 424–433. IEEE, 2014.
- [LS20a] Yang P Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster divergence maximization for faster maximum flow. In *FOCS*, 2020.
- [LS20b] Yang P Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster energy maximization for faster maximum flow. In *STOC*, 2020.
- [LSW15] Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*, pages 1049–1065. IEEE, 2015.
- [LSZ20] S. Cliff Liu, Zhao Song, and Hengjie Zhang. Breaking the n -pass barrier: A streaming algorithm for maximum weight bipartite matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.06106*, 2020.
- [LTOS18] Zhu Li, Jean-Francois Ton, Dino Oglic, and Dino Sejdinovic. Towards a unified analysis of random fourier features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09178*, 2018.
- [LY17] Yuanzhi Li and Yang Yuan. Convergence analysis of two-layer neural networks with ReLU activation. In *NeurIPS*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.09886>, 2017.
- [Mad13] Aleksander Madry. Navigating central path with electrical flows: From flows to matchings, and back. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 253–262. IEEE, 2013.
- [Mad16] Aleksander Madry. Computing maximum flow with augmenting electrical flows. In *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 593–602. IEEE, 2016.
- [MM17] Cameron Musco and Christopher Musco. Recursive sampling for the nystrom method. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 3833–3845, 2017.
- [Moi15] Ankur Moitra. The threshold for super-resolution via extremal functions. In *STOC*, 2015.
- [MW17a] Cameron Musco and David Woodruff. Is input sparsity time possible for kernel low-rank approximation? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 4435–4445, 2017.
- [MW17b] Cameron Musco and David P Woodruff. Sublinear time low-rank approximation of positive semidefinite matrices. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 672–683. IEEE, 2017.
- [NN13] Jelani Nelson and Huy L Nguyễn. Osnap: Faster numerical linear algebra algorithms via sparser subspace embeddings. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 117–126. IEEE, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1211.1002>, 2013.

- [PS15] Eric Price and Zhao Song. A robust sparse Fourier transform in the continuous setting. In *56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 583–600, 2015.
- [RR08] Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht. Random features for large-scale kernel machines. In *Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 1177–1184, 2008.
- [Sch18] Aaron Schild. An almost-linear time algorithm for uniform random spanning tree generation. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 214–227, 2018.
- [Sol17] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Learning ReLUs via gradient descent. In *arXiv preprint. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.04591>*, 2017.
- [SS11] Daniel A Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1913–1926, 2011.
- [SWZ17] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Low rank approximation with entrywise ℓ_1 -norm error. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2017.
- [SWZ19] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Relative error tensor low rank approximation. In *SODA*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08246, 2019.
- [SY19] Zhao Song and Xin Yang. Quadratic suffices for over-parametrization via matrix chernoff bound. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03593*, 2019.
- [Tia17] Yuandong Tian. An analytical formula of population gradient for two-layered ReLU network and its applications in convergence and critical point analysis. In *ICML. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1703.00560>*, 2017.
- [Tro15] Joel A Tropp. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(1-2):1–230, 2015.
- [Vai89] Pravin M Vaidya. A new algorithm for minimizing convex functions over convex sets. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1989., 30th Annual Symposium on*, pages 338–343. IEEE, 1989.
- [ZDW15] Yuchen Zhang, John Duchi, and Martin Wainwright. Divide and conquer kernel ridge regression: A distributed algorithm with minimax optimal rates. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3299–3340, 2015.
- [ZNV⁺20] Amir Zandieh, Navid Nouri, Ameya Velingker, Michael Kapralov, and Ilya Razenshteyn. Scaling up kernel ridge regression via locality sensitive hashing. In *AISTATS*, 2020.
- [ZSD17] Kai Zhong, Zhao Song, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Learning non-overlapping convolutional neural networks with multiple kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.03440*, 2017.
- [ZSJ⁺17] Kai Zhong, Zhao Song, Prateek Jain, Peter L. Bartlett, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. Recovery guarantees for one-hidden-layer neural networks. In *ICML*, 2017.