arXiv:2010.00885v2 [cs.LG] 13 Jan 2021

Optimization Landscapes of Wide Deep Neural Networks Are Benign

Johannes Lederer JOHANNES.LEDERER@RUB.DE
Department of Mathematics, Ruhr-University Bochum, www.johanneslederer.com

Abstract

We analyze the optimization landscapes of deep learning with wide networks. We highlight the importance of constraints for such networks and show that constraint—as well as unconstraint—empirical-risk minimization over such networks has no confined points, that is, suboptimal parameters that are difficult to escape from. Hence, our theories substantiate the common belief that wide neural networks are not only highly expressive but also comparably easy to optimize.

Keywords: Deep Learning, Optimization Landscape, Global Optimization

1. Introduction

Deep learning depends on optimization problems that seem impossible to solve, and yet, deep-learning pipelines outperform their competitors in many applications. A common suspicion is that the optimizations are often easier than they appear to be. In particular, while most objective functions are nonconvex and, therefore, can have suboptimal local minima, recent findings suggest that optimizations are not hampered by such suboptimal local minima as long as the neural networks are sufficiently wide. For example, Goodfellow et al. (2014) give empirical evidence for stochastic-gradient descent to converge to a global minimum of the objective function of wide networks; Livni et al. (2014) show that the optimizations over some classes of wide networks can be reduced to a convex problem; Soudry and Carmon (2016) suggest that differentiable local minima of objective functions over wide networks are typically global minima; Nguyen and Hein (2018) indicate that critical points in wide networks are often global minima; and Allen-Zhu et al. (2019) and Du et al. (2019b) suggest that stochastic-gradient descent typically converges to a global minimum for large networks.

These findings raise the question of whether common optimization landscapes over wide (but finite) neural networks have no "problematic points" altogether.

Progress in this direction has recently been made in Venturi et al. (2019) and then Lacotte and Pilanci (2020). They characterize the "problematic points" as parameters from which there is no nonincreasing path to a global minimum. We call these parameters *confined points* (see Section 2.2 for a formal definition). While the absence of confined points does not preclude saddle points or suboptimal local minima in general, it means that algorithms are not necessarily trapped in suboptimal points—see Figure 1 for an illustration. Venturi et al. (2019) prove that there are no confined points in some classes of wide networks. Their theory has two main features that had not been established before: First, it holds for the entire landscapes—rather than for subsets of them. This feature is crucial, because even randomized algorithms typically converge to sets of Lebesgue measure zero with probability

©2021 Johannes Lederer.
License: CC-BY 4.0, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.




Figure 1: hypothetical objective function: confined points are typically very difficult to escape from, while other local minima and saddle points can often be handled by using momentum, stochastic approaches, and so forth

one, which means that statements about "almost all" local minima are not necessarily meaningful. Second, their theory allows for arbitrary convex loss functions. This feature is important, for example, in view of the trends toward robust alternatives of the least-squares loss (Belagiannis et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2016). On the other hand, their theory has three major limitations: it is restricted to polynomial activation, which is convenient mathematically but much less popular than ReLU activation in practice, it disregards regularizers and constraints, which have become standard in deep learning and in machine learning at large (Hastie et al., 2015) and, as we will show, are essential for wide networks in any case, and it is restricted to shallow networks, that is, networks with only one hidden layer, which contrasts the deep architectures that are used in practice (LeCun et al., 2015).

Lacotte and Pilanci (2020) made progress on two of these limitations: first, their theory caters to ReLU activation rather than polynomial activation; second, their theory allows for weight decay, which is a standard way to regularize estimators. However, their work is still restricted to shallow, one-hidden-layer networks. The interesting question is, therefore, whether such results can also be established for deep networks. And more generally, it would be highly desirable to have a theory for the absence of confined points in a broad deep-learning framework.

In this paper, we establish such a theory. We prove that the optimization landscapes of empirical-risk minimizers over wide feedforward networks have no confined points. In other words, we show that every parameter is connected to a global minimum by a nonincreasing path. Our theory combines the features of the two mentioned works, as it applies to the entire optimization landscapes, allows for a wide spectrum of loss functions and activation functions, and constraint and unconstraint estimation. Moreover, it generalizes these works, as it allows for multiple outputs and arbitrary depths. Additionally, our proof techniques are considerably different from the ones used before and, therefore, are of independent interest.

Guide to the paper Sections 2 and 5 are the basic parts of the paper: they contain our main results and the practical implications. Readers who are interested in the underpinning principles should also study Section 3, and readers who want additional insights on the proof techniques are referred to Section 4. The actual proofs are stated in the Appendix.

2. Deep-Learning Framework and Main Result

In this section, we specify the deep-learning framework and state our main results. The framework includes a wide range of feedforward neural networks; in particular, it allows for arbitrarily many outputs and layers, a wide range of activation and loss functions, and constraint as well as unconstraint estimation. Our main result guarantees that if the networks are sufficiently wide, the objective function of the empirical-risk minimizer does not have any confined points.

2.1 Feedforward Neural Networks

We consider input data from a domain $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and output data from a domain $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Typical examples are regression data with $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}} = \mathbb{R}^m$ and classification data with $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}} = \{\pm 1\}^m$. We model the data with layered, feedforward neural networks, that is, we study sets of functions $\mathcal{G} := \{\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} : \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \to \mathbb{R}^m \ : \ \boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{G}} := \{\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} : \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \to \mathbb{R}^m \ : \ \boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}\}$ with

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}] := \Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1} \cdots \mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 \boldsymbol{x}]\big] \qquad \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}} := \big\{\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\Theta^l, \dots, \Theta^0) \ : \ \Theta^j \in \mathbb{R}^{p^{j+1} \times p^j}\big\}.$$

The quantities $p^0 = d$ and $p^{l+1} = m$ are the input and output dimensions, respectively, l the depth of the networks, and $\underline{w} := \min\{p^1, \dots, p^l\}$ the minimal width of the networks. The functions $\mathfrak{f}^j : \mathbb{R}^{p^j} \to \mathbb{R}^{p^j}$ are called the activation functions. We assume that the activation functions are elementwise functions in the sense that $\mathfrak{f}^j[\boldsymbol{b}] = (\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j[b_1], \dots, \underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j[b_{p^j}])^\top$ for all $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p^j}$, where $\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary function. This allows for an unlimited variety in the type of activation, including ReLU $\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j : b \mapsto \max\{0, b\}$, leaky ReLU $\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j : b \mapsto \max\{0, b\} + \min\{0, cb\}$ for a fixed $c \in (0, 1)$, polynomial $\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j : b \mapsto cb^k$ for fixed $c \in (0, \infty)$ and $k \in [1, \infty)$, and sigmoid activation $\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j : b \mapsto 1/(1 + e^{-b})$ as popular examples, and it allows for different activation functions in each layer.

We study the most common approaches to parameter estimation in this setting: constraint and unconstraint empirical-risk minimization. The loss function $\mathfrak{l} : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ is assumed convex in its first argument; this includes all standard loss functions, such as the least-squares loss $\mathfrak{l} : (\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \mapsto \|\boldsymbol{a} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2$, the absolut-deviation loss $\mathfrak{l} : (\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \mapsto \|\boldsymbol{a} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_1$ (both typically used for regression), the logistic loss $\mathfrak{l} : (a, b) \mapsto -(1 + b)\log[1 + a] - (1 - b)\log[1 - a]$, the hinge loss $\mathfrak{l} : (a, b) \mapsto \max\{0, 1 - ab\}$ (both typically used for binary classification $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}} = \{\pm 1\}$), and so forth. The optimization domain is the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \big\{\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}} \ : \ \mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Theta}] \le 1\big\}$$

for a constraint $\mathfrak{r} : \overline{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathbb{R}$. Given data $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{y}_1), \dots, (\boldsymbol{x}_n, \boldsymbol{y}_n) \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \times \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$, the empirical-risk minimizers are then the networks $\mathfrak{g}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_{\text{erm}}}$ with

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_{\text{erm}} \in \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}_i], \boldsymbol{y}_i\big] \right\}. \tag{2}$$

Another formulation of such estimators is based on the Lagrange form

$$\operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}_i], \boldsymbol{y}_i\big] + \mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Theta}] \right\},$$

which replaces the constraint by a regularization term. Imposing constraints and adding regularization terms are really two sides of the same coin, so that we can focus on constraints for simplicity.

It has been shown that regularizers/constraints can facilitate the optimization as well as improve generalization—see Krizhevsky et al. (2012) and Livni et al. (2014), among others. For ease of presentation, we limit ourselves to the following class of constraints:

$$\mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Theta}] := \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l\}} |\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^0|\!|\!|_q\Big\} \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}} \tag{3}$$

for fixed tuning parameters $a_{\mathfrak{r}}, b_{\mathfrak{r}} \in [0,\infty)$, a parameter $q \in (0,\infty]$, and $|\!|\!|\cdot|\!|\!|_q$ the usual row-wise ℓ_q"-norm," that is, $|\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_q := \max_k(\sum_i|(\Theta^j)_{ki}|^q)^{1/q}$ for $q \in (0,\infty)$ and $|\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_\infty := \max_{ki}|(\Theta^j)_{ki}|$. This class of constraints includes the following four important cases:

- *Unconstraint estimation:* $a_{\mathfrak{r}} = b_{\mathfrak{r}} = 0$.

In other words, $\mathcal{M} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Unconstraint estimation had been the predominant approach in the earlier days of deep learning (Anthony and Bartlett, 1999).

- *Connection sparsity:* $q = 1$.

This constraint yields connection-sparse networks, which have received considerable attention recently (Barron and Klusowski, 2018, 2019; Kim et al., 2016; Taheri et al., 2020).

- *Strong sparsity:* $q < 1$.

Nonconvex constraints have been popular in statistics for many years (Fan and Li, 2001; Zhang, 2010), but our paper is probably the first one to include such constraints in a theoretical analysis in deep learning.

- *Input constraints:* $a_{\mathfrak{r}} = 0$.

Some researchers have argued for applying certain constraints, such as node-sparsity, only to the input level (Feng and Simon, 2017). In general, while our proof techniques also apply to many other types of constraints, there are two main reasons for using the mentioned sparsity-inducing constraints to illustrate our results: First, sparsity has become very popular in deep learning, because it can lower the burden on memory and optimization as well as increase interpretability (Hebiri and Lederer, 2020). And second, the above examples allow us to demonstrate that the discussed features of wide networks do not depend on smooth and convex constraints such as weight decay.

One line of research develops statistical theories for constraint and unconstraint empirical-risk minimizers—see Bartlett and Mendelson (2002) and Lederer (2020), among others. As detailed above, empirical-risk minimizers are the networks whose parameters are global minima of the objective function

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta} \;\mapsto\; \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}] := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}_i], \boldsymbol{y}_i\big] \tag{4}$$

over $\mathcal{M}$ for fixed data $(\boldsymbol{x}_1,\boldsymbol{y}_1),\dots,(\boldsymbol{x}_n,\boldsymbol{y}_n)$. While the function $\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}]$ is convex by assumption, the objective function $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \;\mapsto\; \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}]$ is usually nonconvex. It is thus unclear, per se, whether deep-learning pipelines can be expected to yield global minima of the objective function and, therefore, whether the statistical theories are valid in practice. Our goal is, broadly speaking, to establish conditions under which global minimization of (4) can indeed be expected.

2.2 Absence of Confined Points

Objective functions in deep learning usually have many suboptimal local minima and saddle points (see (Petzka and Sminchisescu, 2018) and references therein). Since the slopes (or appropriate generalizations of them) at local minima and saddle points are zero, basic gradient-descent algorithms can get stuck in these points. But contemporary optimization schemes are based on stochastic-gradient descent rather than basic gradient descent and often use momentum and other additional schemes, so that a zero-valued gradient alone is not worrisome (see Goldblum et al. (2019), for example). This means that we have to characterize the points that are most problematic for global optimization more carefully. We do this by introducing the notion of *confined points* and show that such points do not exist in sufficiently wide networks.

Recall first that a parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies

$$\mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}] \leq \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}] \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M} \text{ with } \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\| \leq c$$

for a value $c \in (0, \infty)$ and a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is called a *local minimum* of the objective function (4). If the statement holds for every $c \in (0, \infty)$, the parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ is called a *global minimum*. We then formalize the notion of confined points as follows:

Definition 1 (Confined points) *Consider a parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$. If there is no continuous function $\mathfrak{h} : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies (i) $\mathfrak{h}[0] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\mathfrak{h}[1] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ for a global minimum $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$ of the objective function (4) and (ii) $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}[t]}]$ is nonincreasing, we call the parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ a* confined point*.*

The notion of confined points aligns with previous notions such as "setwise strict local minima" (Li et al., 2018, Definition 1), "non-attracting regions of local minima" (Petzka and Sminchisescu, 2018, Definition 1), "bad local valleys" (Nguyen, 2019, Definition 4.1), and "spurious valleys" (Venturi et al., 2019, Definition 1); (Lacotte and Pilanci, 2020, Definition 1). The two main reasons for giving another formal definition are 1. the convenience of a pointwise (rather than setwise) notion and 2. the ambiguity of the term "spurious" in the literature.

In brief, confined points are suboptimal parameters that are difficult to escape from—see Figure 1. Confined points can be local minima, but in constraint estimation, for example, there can be boundary effects that also make other parameters confined points. In any case, confined points are typically the most problematic parameters for a global optimization of the objective function. In contrast, saddle points and plateaus that "have an exit" (see again Figure 1) are not characterized as confined points, because they can be escaped from—at least in principle—by using momentum or other schemes (Dauphin et al., 2014; Goldblum et al., 2019).

Our main technical result in this paper is that the objective function (4) has no confined points if the networks are sufficiently wide.

Theorem 2 (Absence of confined points) *Consider the setup of Section 2.1. If $\underline{w} \geq 2m(n+1)^l$, the objective function (4) has no confined points.*

In other words, empirical-risk minimization over sufficiently wide networks does not involve "problematic" parameters. Hence, as long as there are means to circumvent potentially difficult but "handleable" parameters such as saddle points (Dauphin et al., 2014), it is

reasonable to expect global optimization in wide networks. More broadly speaking, the main message of Theorem 2 is that optimizations become easier with increasing widths.

The theorem applies very generally. First, it includes all problematic points rather than "many" or "almost all" problematic points. This feature is important, because even randomized algorithms usually converge to a few, fixed points with high probability. Second, the framework allows for arbitrary convex loss functions. This feature caters, for example, to a current trend toward robust alternatives of the least-squares loss function (Barron, 2019; Lederer, 2020). Third, the framework includes ReLU activation. ReLU activation is nondifferentiable and, therefore, mathematically more challenging than, for example, linear and polynomial activation, but it has become the predominant type of activation in practice. Forth, the framework includes constraint as well as unconstraint estimation. Constraint estimation is particularly suitable for wide networks, and for overparameterized networks more generally, because it can avoid overfitting and facilitate optimizations; moreover, as we see below, unconstraint networks are questionable in any case. Fifth, our statement holds for arbitrary output dimensions and depths. The latter is particularly important in view of the current trend toward deep architectures. In sum, our result is sweeping proof for the fact that wide networks have no confined points, and it sheds light on the optimization landscapes of deep learning more generally.

Despite its generality, the theorem specializes correctly. The bound on the network widths becomes $2m(n+1)^l = 2(n+1)$ in the case of a single output ($m = 1$) and a single hidden layer ($l = 1$), which coincides with the bounds that have been established for shallow networks with one output and specific activation functions and estimators—see Lacotte and Pilanci (2020) and references therein.

In addition, we can remove the dependence on l completely in the case of linear activation:

Theorem 3 (Linear activation) *Consider the setup of Section 2.1 with linear activation. If* $\underline{w} \geq 2m(n+1)$*, the objective function* (4) *has no confined points.*

Hence, the lower bound $2m(n+1)^l$ is reduced to $2m(n+1)$ in the case of linear activation $\underline{f}^j : b \mapsto b$. Linear-activation networks are pointless from a statistical perspective, but insights into their optimization are still valuable, since the optimization landscapes of these networks are surprisingly involved—potentially as involved as the landscapes of any other type of network.

The fact that the rates coincide with known rates in the case $m = l = 1$ indicates that our theory takes account of the sample size n somewhat optimally. In contrast, the question of whether the rate's dependence on m and l is optimal is completely open, as there are no corresponding results in the literature—neither empirical nor theoretical results. Indeed, (i) empirical studies usually concern generalization errors, which includes many confounding aspects, such as expressivity and overfitting.

And (ii) theories that indicate no dependence on l, such as Li et al. (2018); Nguyen (2019) and many others, restrict the activation functions, structure of the network, estimator, or other aspects. Most importantly, they omit constraints and consider only "almost all" parameters. The inclusion of constraints (or similarly regularization) makes our proofs much more interesting and challenging from a technical perspective and is essential from a practical perspective. On the technical side, observe that approaches that use basis functions do no longer apply in the presence of constraints (cf. Li et al. (2018); Venturi et al. (2019), for




Figure 2: a hypothetical objective function that has Lebesgue-almost no confined points but is very hard to optimize

example); the technical reasons are boundary effects and the lack of necessary symmetries. Besides, our approach provides a more intuitive understanding of the forces at play than approaches based on basis functions—see our Section 3—and avoids any assumptions on the data—cf. Li et al. (2018, Assumption 1.1), for example.

On the practical side, confined points and similar concepts are questionable in wide networks without constraints, and unconstraint wide networks are essentially meaningless altogether. We support this claim with two arguments: First, in the absence of constraints, a point could be connected only to global optima that are extremely far from the origin; however, such global optima are likely useless due to overfitting, which means that the point is unproblematic from a pure optimization perspective but still problematic more generally. Second, we can repurpose the elegant convergence arguments of Li et al. (2018) to derive the following insight:

Theorem 4 (Unconstraint networks) *Consider the setup of Section 2.1 without constraints, that is, $\mathcal{M} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. If $\underline{w} \geq 2m(n+1)$, it holds for Lebesgue-almost every $\Theta^{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p^l \times p^{l-1}}, \ldots, \Theta^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p^1 \times p^0}$ that there is a Θ^l such that $\mathbf{\Theta} = (\Theta^l, \ldots, \Theta^0) \in \mathcal{M}$ is a global minimum of the objective function* (4).

This means that we can arbitrarily fix the inner layers and just optimize the outer layer, which is—of course—just a linear regression on arbitrarily transformed data and, therefore, has little to do with neural networking and deep learning.

Most previous papers on the topic do not include constraints. Notable exceptions are Haeffele and Vidal (2017) and Lacotte and Pilanci (2020); however, the results in those two papers are limited (or essentially limited—see Haeffele and Vidal (2017, Sections 5 and 6)) to shallow networks, that is, $l = 1$, and make strict assumptions on the network architecture (such as ReLU activation). We could, therefore, think of Theorem 2 as a generalization of their results.

In addition to the lack of constraints, most existing results in our context are restricted to Lebesgue-almost all parameters—see Nguyen and Hein (2018) and many others. But this restriction can make the results almost meaningless—see the illustration in Figure 2. Hence, our inclusion of the entire landscape is of high practical relevance.

3. Underlying Concepts

In this section, we introduce concepts that we use in our proofs and that might also be of interest more generally. We first formulate the notion of path equivalence, which yields

a practical characterization of confined points. We then devise specific parameters that can act as mediators between path-equivalent parameters. The main reason why our proof techniques are quite different from what can be found in the literature is that we cater to deep networks and a range of activation functions.

3.1 Path Relations

The objective functions for optimizing neural networks are typically continuous but not convex or differentiable. In the following, we characterize the absence of confined point in a way that suits these characteristics of neural networks. The key concept is formulated in the following definition.

Definition 5 (Path relations) *Consider two parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$. If there is a continuous function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[0] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[1] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, and $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[t]}]$ is constant, we say that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ are* path constant *and write $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$.*

If there is a continuous function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[0] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[1] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, and $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[t]}]$ is convex, we say that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ are path convex *and write $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \smile \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$.*

If there are parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta}', \boldsymbol{\Gamma}' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that (i) $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$ and (ii) $\boldsymbol{\Theta}' \smile \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$, we say that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ are path equivalent *and write $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$.*

Path constantness means that two parameters are connected by a continuous path of parameters that is constant with respect to the loss; path convexity relaxes "constant" to "convex;" path equivalence allows for additional mediators. The three relations are ordered in the sense that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta} \smile \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, and they satisfy a number of other basic properties.

Lemma 6 (Basic properties) *It holds for all $\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}, \boldsymbol{\Psi} \in \mathcal{M}$ that*

1. *$\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}$; $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \smile \boldsymbol{\Theta}$; and $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ (reflexivity);*
2. *$\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}$; $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \smile \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \smile \boldsymbol{\Theta}$; and $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ (symmetry).*
3. *$\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Psi} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Psi}$ (transitivity).*

The proof is straightforward and, therefore, omitted. The lemma illustrates that the path relations equip the parameter space with solid mathematical structures.

We can finally use the above-stated concepts to characterize confined points.

Proposition 7 (Characterization of confined points) *Assume that for all $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a global minimum of the objective function* (4)*, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, such that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$. Then, the objective function* (4) *has no confined points.*

Hence, path equivalence of all parameters to a global minimum is a sufficient condition for the absence of confined points. This statement is the main result of Section 3.1.

3.2 Block Parameters

The parameterization of neural networks is typically ambiguous: many different parameters yield the same network. We leverage this ambiguity to make the networks more tractable. The key concept is formulated in the following definition.



Figure 3: Illustration of the parameters of an s-upper block parameter (left) and an s-lower block parameter (right) for $l = 2$. The dark areas of the matrices can consist of arbitrary values; the light areas consist of zeros.

Definition 8 (Block parameters) *Consider a number $s \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and a parameter $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$. If*

1. $(\Theta^0)_{ji} = 0$ *for all* $j > s$;
2. $(\Theta^v)_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $v \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ *and* $i > s$ *and for all* $v \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ *and* $j > s$;
3. $(\Theta^l)_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $j > s$,

we call $\mathbf{\Theta}$ an s-upper-block parameter of depth l.

Similarly, if

1. $(\Theta^0)_{ji} = 0$ *for all* $j \leq p^1 - s$;
2. $(\Theta^v)_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $v \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ *and* $i \leq p^{v+1} - s$ *and for all* $v \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ *and* $j \leq p^v - s$;
3. $(\Theta^l)_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $j \leq p^l - s$,

we call $\mathbf{\Theta}$ an s-lower-block parameter of depth l. *We denote the sets of the s-upper-block and s-lower-block parameters of depth l by $\mathcal{U}_{s,l}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{s,l}$, respectively.*

Trivial examples are the 0-block parameters $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{L}_0 = \{\mathbf{0} = (\mathbf{0}_{p^{l+1} \times p^l}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{p^1 \times p^0})\}$ and the s-block parameters $\mathcal{U}_{s,l} = \mathcal{L}_{s,l} = \mathcal{M}$ for $s \geq \max\{p^1, \dots, p^l\}$. More generally, the block parameters consist of block matrices: see Figure 3. We show in the following that block parameters can be mediators in the sense of path equivalence.

We first show that every parameter is path constant to a block parameter.

Proposition 9 (Path connections to block parameters) *For every $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s := m(n+1)^l$, there are $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}, \underline{\mathbf{\Theta}} \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}} \in \mathcal{U}_{s,l}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{\Theta}} \in \mathcal{L}_{s,l}$ such that $\mathbf{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ and $\mathbf{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \underline{\mathbf{\Theta}}$.*

In particular, every parameter is path connected to both an upper-block parameter and a lower-block parameter. The interesting cases are wide networks: for fixed s, the wider the network, the more pronounced the block structure.

We then show that there is a connection between upper-block and lower-block parameters.

Proposition 10 (Path connections among block parameters) *Consider two block parameters $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{U}_{s,l}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{L}_{s,l}$. If $\underline{w} \geq 2s$, it holds that $\mathbf{\Theta} \leftrightsquigarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}$.*




Figure 4: path-equivalence between two parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$—see Corollary 11 and Definition 5

Hence, every upper-block parameter is path connected to every lower-block parameter—as long as the minimal width of the networks is sufficiently large.

We finally combine Propositions 9 and 10.

Corollary 11 (All parameters are path equivalent) *Consider two arbitrary parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\underline{w} \geq 2m(n+1)^l$, it holds that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$.*

See Figure 4 for an illustration. The corollary ensures that as long as the minimal width is sufficiently large, all networks are path equivalent. This result, therefore, connects directly to the characterization of confined points in Proposition 7 of the previous section.

4. Auxilliary Results

In this section, we state four auxiliary results.

4.1 Two-Layer Networks

Here, we show that two-layer networks can be reparametrized such that they are indexed by block parameters. We first introduce the notation

$$\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[M, q] := |\!|\!| M |\!|\!|_q = \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,b\}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{c} |M_{aj}|^q \right)^{1/q} \qquad \text{for all } M \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c},\ q \in (0, \infty)$$

and $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[M, \infty] := |\!|\!| M |\!|\!|_\infty = \max_{aj} |M_{aj}|$ for all $M \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$. These functions are the building blocks of the constraint on Page 4. Next, given a permutation $\mathfrak{p} : \{1, \dots, c\} \to \{1, \dots, c\}$ and a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$, we define the matrix $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$ through $(M_{\mathfrak{p}})_{ij} := M_{i\mathfrak{p}[j]}$. Similarly, given a permutation $\mathfrak{p} : \{1, \dots, b\} \to \{1, \dots, b\}$ and a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$, we define the matrix $M^{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$ through $(M^{\mathfrak{p}})_{ji} := M_{\mathfrak{p}[j]i}$. The result is then the following:

Lemma 12 (Two-Layer networks) *Consider three matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times o}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{o \times r}$, two constants $q_A \in (0, 1]$ and $q_B \in (0, \infty]$, and a function $\mathfrak{h} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. With some abuse of notation, define $\mathfrak{h} : \mathbb{R}^{v \times r} \to \mathbb{R}^{v \times r}$ through $(\mathfrak{h}[M])_{ji} := \mathfrak{h}[M_{ji}]$ for all $M \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times r}$. Then, there are matrices $\overline{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$ and $\overline{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times o}$ and a permutation $\mathfrak{p} : \{1, \dots, v\} \to \{1, \dots, v\}$ such that*

- $\overline{A}\mathfrak{h}[\overline{B}C] = A_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{h}[B^{\mathfrak{p}}C]$;

- $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\overline{A}, q_A] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[A_\mathfrak{p}, q_A]$ *and* $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\overline{B}, q_B] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[B^\mathfrak{p}, q_B]$*;*
- $\overline{A}_{ij} = 0$ *for* $j > u(r+1)$*;* $\overline{B}_{ji} = 0$ *for* $j > u(r+1)$ *and* $\overline{B}_{ji} = (B^\mathfrak{p})_{ji}$ *otherwise.*

Similarly, there are matrices $\underline{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$ *and* $\underline{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{v \times o}$ *and a permutation* $\mathfrak{p} : \{1, \ldots, v\} \to \{1, \ldots, v\}$ *such that*

- $\underline{A}\mathfrak{h}[\underline{B}C] = A_\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}[B^\mathfrak{p}C]$*;*
- $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\underline{A}, q_A] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[A_\mathfrak{p}, q_A]$ *and* $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\underline{B}, q_B] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[B^\mathfrak{p}, q_B]$*;*
- $\underline{A}_{ij} = 0$ *for* $j \leq v - u(r+1)$*;* $\overline{B}_{ji} = 0$ *for* $j \leq v - u(r+1)$ *and* $\overline{B}_{ji} = (B^\mathfrak{p})_{ji}$ *otherwise.*

Hence, the parameter matrices of two-layer networks can be brought into the shapes illustrated in Figure 3. We apply this result repeatedly in the proof of Proposition 9.

4.2 Symmetry Property of Neural Networks

Next, we point out a symmetry in our setup for the neural networks.

Lemma 13 (Symmetry property) *Consider permutations* $\mathfrak{p}^j : \{1, \ldots, p^j\} \to \{1, \ldots, p^j\}$ *for* $j \in \{0, \ldots, l+1\}$*. Assume that* $\mathfrak{p}^0$ *and* $\mathfrak{p}^{l+1}$ *are the identity functions:* $\mathfrak{p}^0[j] = \mathfrak{p}^{l+1}[j] = j$ *for all* j*. The parameter* $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ *is a confined point of the objective function* (4) *if and only if* $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$ *defined through* $(\Gamma^j)_{uv} := (\Theta^j)_{\mathfrak{p}^{j+1}[u]\mathfrak{p}^j[v]}$ *for all* $j \in \{0, \ldots, l\}$*,* $u \in \{1, \ldots, p^{j+1}\}$*, and* $v \in \{1, \ldots, p^j\}$ *is a confined point of the objective function* (4)*.*

The proof follows readily from our setup in Section 2.1 and, therefore, is omitted. The lemma illustrates that the parameterizations of neural networks are highly ambiguous. But in this case, the ambiguity is convenient, because it allows us to permute the rows and columns of the parameters to bring the parameters in shapes that are easy to manage.

4.3 Property of Convex Functions

We now establish a simple property of convex functions.

Lemma 14 (Property of convex functions) *Consider a convex function* $\mathfrak{h} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$*. If* $\mathfrak{h}[0] > \mathfrak{h}[\bar{t}]$ *for a* $\bar{t} \in (0, 1]$*, there is a* $c \in \arg\min_{t \in (0,1]}\{\mathfrak{h}[t]\}$ *such that the function* $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ *defined through* $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[t] := \mathfrak{h}[ct]$ *for all* $t \in [0, 1]$ *is nonincreasing and* $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[0] > \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1]$*.*

This lemma connects the convexity from Definition 5 with the confined points from Definition 1. We use this result in the proof of Proposition 7.

4.4 Carathéodory-Type Result

Carathéodory's theorem goes back to Carathéodory (1911); see Boltyanski and Martini (2001); Fenchel (1929); Hanner and Rådström (1951) for related results. The following statement combines the classical theorem and the much more recent results Bastero et al. (1995, Theorem 1 and Lemma 1).

Lemma 15 (Carathéodory-Type result) *Consider a number $q \in (0,1]$, vectors $\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_h \subset \mathbb{R}^r$, and the vectors' q-convex hull $\mathrm{conv}_q[\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_h] := \{\sum_{j=1}^h \tilde{t}_j \boldsymbol{z}_j \ : \ \tilde{\boldsymbol{t}} \in [0,1]^h, \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{t}}\|_q = 1\}$. Then, every vector $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathrm{conv}_q[\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_h]$ can be written as $\boldsymbol{v} = \sum_{j=1}^h t_j \boldsymbol{z}_j$ with $\boldsymbol{t} \in [0,1]^h$, $\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_q \leq 1$, and $\#\{j \in \{1, \ldots, h\} \ : \ t_j \neq 0\} \leq r+1$.*

The cardinality of a set $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\#\{\mathcal{A}\}$ and the ℓ_q-norm of a vector $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^a$ by $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_q := (\sum_{j=1}^a |v_j|^q)^{1/q}$. The lemma follows readily from the mentioned results; therefore, its proof is omitted. The lemma states that every vector in the q-convex hull is a q-convex combination of at most $r+1$ vectors from the set of vectors that generate the q-convex hull. (Note that for $q < 1$, our definition of the q-convex hull is more restrictive than the standard definition—cf. Bastero et al. (1995, Remark on Page 142)—but it leads to a concise statement and is sufficient for our purposes.)

5. Discussion

We have proved that the optimization landscapes of empirical-risk minimization over wide networks have no confined points. This finding is not surprising: empirical evidence has long suggested that wide networks are comparatively easy to optimize. Our main contribution is the fact that we underpin these empirical findings with mathematical theory. More generally, we contribute rigorous and detailed mathematical arguments and techniques to a discussion that is currently dominated by heuristics.

A key feature of the results themselves is their generality: our framework allows for arbitrary depths, for constraint as well as unconstraint estimation, essentially arbitrary activation, and for a very wide spectrum of loss functions and input and output data. This generality demonstrates that the absence of confined points is not a feature of specific estimators, network functions, or data but, instead, a universal property of wide networks.

Also the underlying techniques are novel: the main idea of most approaches in the field is to construct basis functions for the networks; in contrast, we formulate parametrizations that make the networks easy to work with. We could thus envision applications of our new concepts beyond the presented topic.

A limitation of Theorem 2, our final result in the general case, is that it only applies to networks that are much wider than the networks currently used in practice. The most critical aspect is the exponential dependence on the depth. We have removed this dependence in Theorem 3 on linear activation, but it remains unclear whether this improvement can be established more generally—see our discussion in Section 2.2. Despite this limitation, our results give clear support for the hypothesis that increasing network widths makes optimization landscapes more benign. This is the first time such clear support, especially in terms of generality, has been established.

While we analyze the optimization landscape itself, another line of research analyzes specific descent schemes. For example, for certain settings, Allen-Zhu et al. (2019) and Du et al. (2019a) show that (stochastic-)gradient descent can find global optima in linear time if the network widths are of some polynomial order in n and l (they only consider $m = 1$). Their rates have additional terms that might depend on the depth (such as eigenvalues of intricate kernel matrices), and their polynomials have unspecified factors and orders (compare to our clean formula $2m(n+1)^l$), which makes their bounds intractable in practice.

Moreover, their setup does not account for regularization and constraints. Nevertheless, similarly to our theory, their theories highlight the usefulness of wide networks in practice.

There is also current research about the role of constraints/regularization in deep learning—see (Zhang et al., 2017), for example. Our Theorem 4 adds to this discussion by pointing out that explicit constraints/regularization are necessary for wide networks to be meaningful at all. This finding supports, for example, the recent interest in sparsity in deep learning (Frankle and Carbin, 2019; Hebiri and Lederer, 2020; Schmidt-Hieber, 2020).

Standard competitors to deep learning are "classical" high-dimensional estimators, such as the ridge estimator and the lasso estimator (Hoerl and Kennard, 1970; Tibshirani, 1996), which have been studied in statistics extensively (Zhuang and Lederer, 2018). A common argument for these estimators is that their objective functions are convex or equipped with efficient algorithms for optimization (Bien et al., 2018; Friedman et al., 2010), but our results—and the research on this topic more generally—indicate that global optimization of the objective functions in deep learning can be feasible as well.

Acknowledgments

We thank Yannick Düren, Shih-Ting Huang, Sophie-Charlotte Klose, Mike Laszkiewicz, Nils Müller, Mahsa Taheri, and Christoph Thäle for their valuable input.

References

Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, and Z. Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 242–252, 2019.

M. Anthony and P. Bartlett. *Neural network learning: theoretical foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

A. Barron and J. Klusowski. Approximation and estimation for high-dimensional deep learning networks. *arXiv:1809.03090*, 2018.

A. Barron and J. Klusowski. Complexity, statistical risk, and metric entropy of deep nets using total path variation. *arXiv:1902.00800*, 2019.

J. Barron. A general and adaptive robust loss function. In *Proc. CVPR*, pages 4326–4334, 2019.

P. Bartlett and S. Mendelson. Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: risk bounds and structural results. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 3:463–482, 2002.

J. Bastero, J. Bernués, and A. Pena. The theorems of Caratheodory and Gluskin for $0 < p < 1$. In *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, pages 141–144, 1995.

V. Belagiannis, C. Rupprecht, G. Carneiro, and N. Navab. Robust optimization for deep regression. In *Proc. ICCV*, pages 2830–2838, 2015.

J. Bien, I. Gaynanova, J. Lederer, and C. Müller. Non-convex global minimization and false discovery rate control for the trex. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 27(1):23–33, 2018.

V. Boltyanski and H. Martini. Carathéodory's theorem and h-convexity. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 93:292–309, 2001.

C. Carathéodory. Über den Variabilitätsbereich der Fourier'schen Konstanten von positiven harmonischen Funktionen. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, 32(1):193–217, 1911.

Y. Dauphin, R. Pascanu, C. Gulcehre, K. Cho, S. Ganguli, and Y. Bengio. Identifying and attacking the saddle point problem in high-dimensional non-convex optimization. In *Proc. NIPS*, pages 2933–2941, 2014.

S. Du, Jason Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 1675–1685, 2019a.

S. Du, X. Zhai, B. Poczos, and A. Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2019b.

J. Fan and R. Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001.

W. Fenchel. Über Krümmung und Windung geschlossener Raumkurven. *Math. Ann.*, 101: 238–252, 1929.

J. Feng and N. Simon. Sparse-input neural networks for high-dimensional nonparametric regression and classification. *arXiv:1711.07592*, 2017.

J. Frankle and M. Carbin. The lottery ticket hypothesis: finding sparse, trainable neural networks. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2019.

J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *J. Stat. Softw.*, 33(1):1, 2010.

M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, A. Schwarzschild, M. Moeller, and T. Goldstein. Truth or backpropaganda? an empirical investigation of deep learning theory. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2019.

I. Goodfellow, O. Vinyals, and A. Saxe. Qualitatively characterizing neural network optimization problems. *arXiv:1412.6544*, 2014.

B. Haeffele and R. Vidal. Global optimality in neural network training. In *Proc. CVPR*, pages 7331–7339, 2017.

O. Hanner and H. Rådström. A generalization of a theorem of Fenchel. In *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, volume 2, pages 589–593, 1951.

T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and M. Wainwright. *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*. CRC press, 2015.

M. Hebiri and J. Lederer. Layer sparsity in neural networks. *arXiv:2006.15604*, 2020.

A. Hoerl and R. Kennard. Ridge regression: biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics*, 12(1):55–67, 1970.

L. Jiang, Z. Zhou, T. Leung, L.-J. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. Mentornet: learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 2304–2313, 2018.

J. Kim, V. Calhoun, E. Shim, and J.-H. Lee. Deep neural network with weight sparsity control and pre-training extracts hierarchical features and enhances classification performance: Evidence from whole-brain resting-state functional connectivity patterns of schizophrenia. *Neuroimage*, 124:127–146, 2016.

A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Proc. NIPS*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.

J. Lacotte and M. Pilanci. All local minima are global for two-layer ReLU neural networks: the hidden convex optimization landscape. *arXiv:2006.05900*, 2020.

Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521:436–444, 2015.

J. Lederer. Risk bounds for robust deep learning. *arXiv:2009.06202*, 2020.

D. Li, T. Ding, and R. Sun. On the benefit of width for neural networks: disappearance of bad basins. *arXiv:1812.11039*, 2018.

R. Livni, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and O. Shamir. On the computational efficiency of training neural networks. In *Proc. NIPS*, pages 855–863, 2014.

Q. Nguyen. On connected sublevel sets in deep learning. *Proc. ICML*, 2019.

Q. Nguyen and M. Hein. Optimization landscape and expressivity of deep CNNs. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 3730–3739, 2018.

H. Petzka and C. Sminchisescu. Non-attracting regions of local minima in deep and wide neural networks. *arXiv:1812.06486*, 2018.

J. Schmidt-Hieber. Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(4):1875–1897, 2020.

D. Soudry and Y. Carmon. No bad local minima: data independent training error guarantees for multilayer neural networks. *arXiv:1605.08361*, 2016.

M. Taheri, F. Xie, and J. Lederer. Statistical guarantees for regularized neural networks. *arXiv:2006.00294*, 2020.

R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.

L. Venturi, A. Bandeira, and J. Bruna. Spurious valleys in one-hidden-layer neural network optimization landscapes. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20(133):1–34, 2019.

Z. Wang, S. Chang, Y. Yang, D. Liu, and T. Huang. Studying very low resolution recognition using deep networks. In *Proc. CVPR*, pages 4792–4800, 2016.

C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2017.

C.-H. Zhang. Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(2):894–942, 2010.

R. Zhuang and J. Lederer. Maximum regularized likelihood estimators: a general prediction theory and applications. *Stat*, 7(1):e186, 2018.

Appendix A. Proofs

A.1 Proofs of Theorems 2, 3, and 4 and an Extension

Proof [Proof of Theorem 2] The proof combines the main results of Sections 3.1 and 3.2. Let $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary parameter and $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$ a global minimum of the objective function (4). In view of Proposition 7 in Section 3.1, we need to show that $\mathbf{\Theta} \leftrightsquigarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}$, and this follows directly from Corollary 11 in Section 3.2. ■

Figure 1 illustrates that a nonconvex objective function can have confined points, but Theorem 2 proves that this is not the case for deep learning with wide networks. Figure 1 also illustrates that a nonconvex objective function can have "disconnected" global minima, but, in view of Corollary 11 and our results more generally, we can rule out this case as well. In other words, the set of global minima is "connected" in the sense that it is a set of path-constant parameters. The connectedness of the global minima is of minor importance in practice but an interesting topological property nevertheless.

Proof [Proof of Theorem 3] The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 2 with one exception: In the case of linear activation, the matrices in the proof of Proposition 9 can be merged; for example,

$$\Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l \Big[\Theta^{l-1} \mathfrak{f}^{l-1} \big[\Theta^{l-2} \cdots \mathfrak{f}^1 [\Theta^0 X] \big] \Big] = (\Theta^l \Theta^{l-1}) \mathfrak{f}^{l-1} \big[\Theta^{l-2} \cdots \mathfrak{f}^1 [\Theta^0 X] \big] .$$

Hence, rather than the output dimension of Θ^j, the relevant dimension in the induction step is the output dimension of Θ^l; in other words, the induction step does not accumulate the dimensions of the matrices. This observation improves the term $m(n+1)^l$ in Proposition 9 to $m(n+1)$, which can then be translated into an improved lower bound in the theorem. ■

Proof [Proof of Theorem 4] The proof can be readily established by repurposing the arguments from Li et al. (2018). ■

A.2 Proof of Proposition 7

Proof [Proof of Proposition 7] The key idea is to exploit the properties of monotone functions and convex functions. Let $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary parameter and $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}$ a global minimum of the objective function (4) such that $\mathbf{\Theta} \leftrightsquigarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}$. Let $\mathbf{\Theta}', \mathbf{\Gamma}' \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta}', \mathbf{\Gamma}'} : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ be as described in Definition 5. Note first that, since $\mathbf{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}'$ (see Definition 5), the parameter $\mathbf{\Gamma}'$ is also a global minimum of the objective function. We then use 1. simple algebra, 2. the assumed convexity of the function $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta}', \mathbf{\Gamma}'}}]$ (see Definition 5 again), 3. the assumed endpoints of the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta}', \mathbf{\Gamma}'}$ (see Definition 5 once more), 4. the fact that $\mathbf{\Gamma}'$ is a global

minimum of (4), and 5. the fact that $(1-t)+t=1$ to derive for all $t \in [0,1]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]}\big] &= \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[(1-t)\cdot 0+t\cdot 1]}\big] \\
&\leq (1-t)\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}\big] + t\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[1]}\big] \\
&= (1-t)\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}\big] + t\mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}] \\
&\leq (1-t)\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}\big] + t\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}\big] \\
&= \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}\big] .
\end{aligned}$$

Assume first that the inequality is strict: $\mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[\bar{t}]}] < \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}]$ for a $\bar{t} \in [0,1]$. Then, by the assumed convexity of $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]}]$ (see Definition 5) and Lemma 14, there is a $c \in \arg\min_{t\in(0,1]}\{\mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]}]\}$ such that $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined through $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[t] := \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[ct]}]$ for all $t \in [0,1]$ is nonincreasing, $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1]$ is a global minimum of the objective function (4), and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[0] = \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0]}] = \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}] > \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1] = \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[c]}]$. Hence, the function $\overline{\mathfrak{h}} : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ defined through $\overline{\mathfrak{h}}[t] := \mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[ct]$ for all $t \in [0,1]$ is a function that satisfies the conditions of Definition 1 for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta}'$ and the global minimum $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1]$. Combining this result with the assumed relationship $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$ (see Definition 5) yields—see Definition 1—the fact that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ is not a confined point of the objective function (4).

We can thus assume that $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]}]$ is constant, which implies $\boldsymbol{\Theta}' \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$ by Definition 5. The fact that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$ (see Definition 5 again) and the transitivity of the path constantness (see Property 3 in Lemma 6) then yield the fact that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ is a global minimum and, therefore, not a confined point—see Definition 1 again. ■

A.3 Proof of Proposition 9

Proof [Proof of Proposition 9] Our proof strategy is to apply Lemma 12, which is designed for one individual layer, layer by layer. We first introduce some convenient notation. We define, with some abuse of notation, $\mathfrak{f}^j : \mathbb{R}^{p^j \times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{p^j \times n}$ through $(\mathfrak{f}^j[M])_{uv} := \underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j[M_{uv}]$ for all $j \in \{1,\dots,l\}$, $u \in \{1,\dots,p^j\}$, $v \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, and $M \in \mathbb{R}^{p^j \times n}$. We also define the data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}$ through $X_{ji} := (\boldsymbol{x}_i)_j$ for all $j \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, that is, each column of X consists of one sample. We finally write

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[X] := \big(\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}_1],\dots,\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}_n]\big) = \Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big] \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M} .$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[X]$ summarizes the network's outputs for the given data.

Given a parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$, we establish a corresponding upper-block parameter $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \in \mathcal{U}_{s,l}$ layer by layer, starting from the outermost layer. We write

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[X] = \underbrace{\Theta^l}_{=:A\in\mathbb{R}^{p^{l+1}\times p^l}} \underbrace{\mathfrak{f}^l}_{=:\mathfrak{h}}\Big[\underbrace{\Theta^{l-1}}_{=:B\in\mathbb{R}^{p^l\times p^{l-1}}} \underbrace{\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\big[\Theta^{l-2}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big]}_{=:C\in\mathbb{R}^{p^{l-1}\times n}}\Big] .$$

Lemma 12 for two-layer networks then gives (by Lemma 13, we can assume without loss of generality the fact that $\mathfrak{p}$ is the identity function, that is, $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = A$ and $B^{\mathfrak{p}} = B$)

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[X] = \overline{\Theta}^l \mathfrak{f}^l\left[\begin{pmatrix}\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}\\ \mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\big[\Theta^{l-2}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big]\right]$$

for a matrix $\overline{\Theta}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{p^{l+1}\times p^l}$ that satisfies $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\overline{\Theta}^l, 1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^l, 1]$ (recall the definition of $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}$ on Page 10) and meets Condition 3 in the first part of Definition 8 on block parameters as long as $s \geq p^{l+1}(n+1) = m(n+1)$, and for a matrix $\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(n+1)\times p^{l-1}}$ that satisfies $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}, 1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-1}, 1]$ (or $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}, q] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-1}, q]$ if $l = 1$) and consists of the first $m(n+1)$ rows of the matrix Θ^{l-1}. (We implicitly assume here and in the following $p^j \geq m(n+1)^{l-j+1}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$—which is the generic case in view of Corollary 11—to keep the notation manageable, but extending the proof to the general case is straightforward.)

Now, define a parameter $\mathbf{\Gamma}^l \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ through

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^l := (\overline{\Theta}^l, \Theta^{l-1}, \dots, \Theta^0)$$

and a function $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l} : [0,1] \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ through

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t] := (1-t)\mathbf{\Theta} + t\mathbf{\Gamma}^l \qquad \text{for all } t \in [0,1]\,.$$

The function $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}$ is continuous and satisfies $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[0] = \mathbf{\Theta}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[1] = \mathbf{\Gamma}^l$. Moreover, we can 1. use the definitions of the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}$ and the networks, 2. split the network along the outermost layer, 3. invoke the block shape of $\overline{\Theta}^l$ and the definition of $\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}$ as the $m(n+1)$ first rows of the matrix Θ^{l-1}, 4. use the above-stated inequalities for the network $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{\Theta}}[X]$, and 5. consolidate the terms to show for all $t \in [0,1]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t]}[X] &= \big((1-t)\Theta^l + t\overline{\Theta}^l\big)\mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big] \\
&= (1-t)\Theta^l\mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big] + t\overline{\Theta}^l\mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big] \\
&= (1-t)\Theta^l\mathfrak{f}^l\big[\Theta^{l-1}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\big] + t\overline{\Theta}^l\mathfrak{f}^l\left[\begin{pmatrix}\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}\\ \mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}\cdots\mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\right] \\
&= (1-t)\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{\Theta}}[X] + t\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{\Theta}}[X] \\
&= \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{\Theta}}[X]\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the function $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t]}]$ is constant. Finally, we use 1. the definition of the constraint in (3), 2. the definition of the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}$, 3. the convexity of the ℓ_1-norm, 4. the above stated fact that $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\overline{\Theta}^l, 1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^l, 1]$, 5. a consolidation, 6. again the definition of the regularizer, and 7. the fact that $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathcal{M}$ to show for all $t \in [0,1]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{r}\big[\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t]\big] &= \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l\}} \big|\!\big|\!\big|\big(\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t]\big)^j\big|\!\big|\!\big|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}\big|\!\big|\!\big|\big(\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{\Gamma}^l}[t]\big)^0\big|\!\big|\!\big|_q\Big\} \\
&= \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l-1\}} |\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_1, a_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|(1-t)\Theta^l + t\overline{\Theta}^l|\!|\!|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^0|\!|\!|_q\Big\} \\
&\leq \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l-1\}} |\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_1, (1-t)a_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^l|\!|\!|_1 + ta_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\overline{\Theta}^l|\!|\!|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^0|\!|\!|_q\Big\} \\
&\leq \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l-1\}} |\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_1, (1-t)a_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^l|\!|\!|_1 + ta_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^l|\!|\!|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^0|\!|\!|_q\Big\} \\
&= \max\Big\{a_{\mathfrak{r}} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,l-1\}} |\!|\!|\Theta^j|\!|\!|_1, a_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^l|\!|\!|_1, b_{\mathfrak{r}}|\!|\!|\Theta^0|\!|\!|_q\Big\} \\
&= \mathfrak{r}[\mathbf{\Theta}] \\
&\leq 1\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l}[t] \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. In conclusion, we have shown—see Definition 5—that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l$ are path constant: $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l$.

We then move one layer inward. Lemma 12 ensures that (recall again Lemma 13)

$$\underbrace{\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1}}_{A \in \mathbb{R}^{m(n+1)\times p^{l-1}}} \underbrace{\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}}_{\mathfrak{h}}\Big[\underbrace{\Theta^{l-2}}_{B \in \mathbb{R}^{p^{l-1}\times p^{l-2}}} \underbrace{\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]}_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{p^{l-2}\times n}}\Big] = \dot{\Theta}^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-2}\\ \mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\right]$$

for a matrix $\dot{\Theta}^{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(n+1)\times p^{l-1}}$ that satisfies $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\dot{\Theta}^{l-1},1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-1},1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-1},1]$ and meets Condition 3 in the first part of Definition 8 on block parameters as long as $s \geq m(n+1)^2$, and for a matrix $\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(n+1)^2\times p^{l-2}}$ that satisfies $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-2},1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-2},1]$ (or $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-2},q] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-2},q]$ if $l=2$) and consists of the first $m(n+1)^2$ rows of the matrix Θ^{l-2}.

Next, we define $\overline{\Theta}^{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p^l \times p^{l-1}}$ through $(\overline{\Theta}^{l-1})_{uv} := (\dot{\Theta}^{l-1})_{uv}$ for $u \leq m(n+1)$ and $(\overline{\Theta}^{l-1})_{uv} := 0$ otherwise. Combining this definition with the above-derived results yields

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[X] = \overline{\Theta}^l \mathfrak{f}^l\left[\overline{\Theta}^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\widetilde{\Theta}^{l-2}\\ \mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1[\Theta^0 X]\right]\right],$$

and the matrix $\overline{\Theta}^{l-1}$ satisfies $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\overline{\Theta}^{l-1},1] = \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\dot{\Theta}^{l-1},1] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\Theta^{l-1},1]$ and meets Condition 2 in the first part of Definition 8 on block parameters as long as $s \geq m(n+1)^2$.

Similarly as above, define a parameter $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ through

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1} := (\overline{\Theta}^l, \overline{\Theta}^{l-1}, \Theta^{l-2}, \ldots, \Theta^0)$$

and a function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l,\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1}} : [0,1] \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ through

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l,\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1}}[t] := (1-t)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l + t\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1} \qquad \text{for all } t \in [0,1]$$

to show that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^l \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1}$. In view of Property 3 in Lemma 6, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{l-1}$.

Finish the proof by induction over the layers, and note that the lower-block parameters can be established in the same way. ■

A.4 Proof of Proposition 10

Proof [Proof of Proposition 10] The key ingredient of the proof is the assumed block structure of the parameters. Consider two block parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathcal{U}_{s,l}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{L}_{s,l}$ and define the parameters

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}' := (\Theta^l, \Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1}, \ldots, \Theta^0 + \Gamma^0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}' := (\Gamma^l, \Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1}, \ldots, \Theta^0 + \Gamma^0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$$

and the function

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'} \;:\; [0,1] &\to \overline{\mathcal{M}}\\ t &\mapsto (1-t)\boldsymbol{\Theta}' + t\boldsymbol{\Gamma}' = \left((1-t)\Theta^l + t\Gamma^l, \Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1}, \ldots, \Theta^0 + \Gamma^0\right).\end{aligned}$$

By the row-wise structure of the constraint (see Page 4 again), the convexity of the ℓ_1-norm, and the block shapes of the parameters (see Figure 3 again), we can find that $\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]] \leq \max\{\mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Theta}], \mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}]\} \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, that is, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t] \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. One can also verify readily the fact that the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}$ is continuous, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[0] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$, and $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[1] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$. Next, we define

$$[\boldsymbol{\Theta}', \boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{c_1,c_2} \coloneqq (c_1\Theta^l + c_2\Gamma^l, \Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1}, \dots, \Theta^0 + \Gamma^0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}} \qquad \text{for all } c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

which generalizes $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}$ in the sense that $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t] = [\boldsymbol{\Theta}', \boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{1-t,t}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. We then 1. invoke the definition of $[\boldsymbol{\Theta}', \boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{c_1,c_2}$ and the definition of the networks in (1), 2. split the network along the outer layer, 3. use the block structures of the parameters and the assumption that $\mathfrak{f}^j[\boldsymbol{b}] = (\underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j[b_1], \dots, \underline{\mathfrak{f}}^j[b_{p^j}])^\top$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p^j}$, 4. continue in this fashion, and 5. invoke the definition of the networks in (1) again to find for all $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{g}_{[\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{c_1,c_2}}[\boldsymbol{x}] \\
&= (c_1\Theta^l + c_2\Gamma^l)\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[(\Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1})\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[(\Theta^0 + \Gamma^0)\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] \\
&= c_1\Theta^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[(\Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1})\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[(\Theta^0 + \Gamma^0)\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] \\
&\qquad\qquad + c_2\Gamma^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[(\Theta^{l-1} + \Gamma^{l-1})\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[(\Theta^0 + \Gamma^0)\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] \\
&= c_1\Theta^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[\Theta^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[(\Theta^0 + \Gamma^0)\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] + c_2\Gamma^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[\Gamma^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[(\Theta^0 + \Gamma^0)\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] \\
&= \cdots = c_1\Theta^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[\Theta^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[\Theta^0\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] + c_2\Gamma^l\mathfrak{f}^l\Big[\Gamma^{l-1}\mathfrak{f}^{l-1}\Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1\big[\Gamma^0\boldsymbol{x}\big]\Big]\Big] \\
&= c_1\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}[\boldsymbol{x}] + c_2\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}[\boldsymbol{x}]\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use 1. the definition of the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}$ and of the parameter $[\boldsymbol{\Theta}', \boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{c_1,c_2}$, 2. the above display with $c_1 = 1-(1-a)t_1 - at_2$ and $c_2 = (1-a)t_1 + at_2$, 3. a rearrangement of the terms, 4. the assumed convexity of the loss function $\mathfrak{l}$, 5. again the above display, and 6. again the definition of $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}$, to find for all $a, t_1, t_2 \in [0,1]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[(1-a)t_1 + at_2]}\big] \\
&= \mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{[\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{1-(1-a)t_1-at_2,(1-a)t_1+at_2}}\big] \\
&= \mathfrak{l}\Big[\big(1-(1-a)t_1 - at_2\big)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + \big((1-a)t_1 + at_2\big)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\Big] \\
&= \mathfrak{l}\Big[\big((1-a) - (1-a)t_1\big)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + (a - at_2)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + (1-a)t_1\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} + at_2\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\Big] \\
&= \mathfrak{l}\Big[(1-a)\big((1-t_1)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t_1\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\big) + a\big((1-t_2)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t_2\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\big)\Big] \\
&\leq (1-a)\mathfrak{l}\big[(1-t_1)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t_1\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\big] + a\mathfrak{l}\big[(1-t_2)\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t_2\mathfrak{g}_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\big] \\
&= (1-a)\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{[\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{1-t_1,t_1}}\big] + a\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{[\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}']_{1-t_2,t_2}}\big] \\
&= (1-a)\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t_1]}\big] + a\mathfrak{l}\big[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t_2]}\big]\,,
\end{aligned}$$

which means that $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}',\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'}[t]}]$ is convex. We conclude—see Definition 5—that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}' \smile \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$.

In view of Definition 5, it is left to show that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$. Consider now the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'} \; : \; [0,1] &\to \overline{\mathcal{M}} \\ t &\mapsto (\Theta^l, \Theta^{l-1} + t\Gamma^{l-1}, \dots, \Theta^0 + t\Gamma^0) \,. \end{aligned}$$

By the row-wise structure of the constraint (see Page 4 once more) and the block shapes of the parameters (see Figure 3 once more), we can find that $\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[t]] \leq \max\{\mathfrak{r}[\boldsymbol{\Theta}], \mathfrak{r}[t\boldsymbol{\Gamma}]\} \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, that is, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[t] \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. One can also verify readily the fact that the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}$ is continuous, $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[0] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, and $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[1] = \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$. Moreover, we can 1. invoke the definition of $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}$ and the definition of the networks in (1), 2. use the block structures of the parameters and the elementwise structure of the activation function, 3. continue in this fashion, and 4. invoke the definitions of the function $\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}$ and the networks in (1) again to find for all $t \in [0,1]$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[t]}[\boldsymbol{x}] &= \Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l \Big[(\Theta^{l-1} + t\Gamma^{l-1}) \mathfrak{f}^{l-1} \Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1 \big[(\Theta^0 + t\Gamma^0) \boldsymbol{x} \big] \Big] \Big] \\ &= \Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l \Big[\Theta^{l-1} \mathfrak{f}^{l-1} \Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1 \big[(\Theta^0 + t\Gamma^0) \boldsymbol{x} \big] \Big] \Big] \\ &= \cdots = \Theta^l \mathfrak{f}^l \Big[\Theta^{l-1} \mathfrak{f}^{l-1} \Big[\cdots \mathfrak{f}^1 \big[\Theta^0 \boldsymbol{x} \big] \Big] \Big] \\ &= \mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[0]}[\boldsymbol{x}] \,, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the function $t \mapsto \mathfrak{l}[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta},\boldsymbol{\Theta}'}[t]}]$ is constant. We conclude that—see Definition 5—that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}'$.

We can show in a similar way that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$. Hence, given Definition 5, we find that $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \leftrightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$, as desired. ■

A.5 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof [Proof of Lemma 12] The proof is essentially a careful reparametrization. We proceed in three steps: see Figure 5 for an overview.

Step 1: Fix a $k \in \{1, \dots, u\}$. We first show that there is a matrix $\dot{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$ such that

1. $\dot{A}\mathfrak{h}[BC] = A\mathfrak{h}[BC]$;
2. $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\dot{A}, q_A] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[A, q_A]$;
3. $\#\{j \in \{1, \dots, v\} \, : \, \dot{A}_{kj} \neq 0\} \leq r + 1$;
4. $\dot{A}_{aj} = A_{aj}$ for all $a \neq k$.

Hence, we replace the matrix A, which contains the "output parameters," by a matrix whose kth row has at most $r + 1$ nonzero entries—see the illustration in Figure 5.

The proof of this step is based on our version of Carathéodory's theorem in Lemma 15. For every $k \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, elementary matrix algebra yields that

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ki} = \sum_{j=1}^{v} A_{kj} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ji} .$$

Denoting the row vectors of a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{a\times b}$ by $M_{1\bullet}, \dots, M_{a\bullet} \in \mathbb{R}^b$, we then get

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{k\bullet} = \sum_{j=1}^{v} A_{kj} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{j\bullet} .$$

The case $\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} = 0$ is straightforward to deal with: all elements of $A_{k\bullet}$ are then equal to zero, and we can just set $\dot{A} := A$.

We can thus assume the fact that $\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} \neq 0$. We then get from the preceding equality that

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{k\bullet} = \sum_{j=1}^{v} \underbrace{\frac{A_{kj}}{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}}}_{=:\tilde{t}_j} \underbrace{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{j\bullet}}_{=:\boldsymbol{z}_j} .$$

Since

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{t}}\|_{q_A} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{v} |\tilde{t}_j|^{q_A}\right)^{1/q_A} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{v} \left|\frac{A_{kj}}{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}}\right|^{q_A}\right)^{1/q_A}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{kj}|^{q_A}\right)^{1/q_A} = \frac{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}}{\|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}} = 1 ,$$

the previous equality means that the vector $(A\mathfrak{h}[BC])_{k\bullet} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is a q_A-convex combination of the $2v$ vectors $\boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{z}_v, -\boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, -\boldsymbol{z}_v \in \mathbb{R}^r$, that is, $(A\mathfrak{h}[BC])_{k\bullet} \in \mathrm{conv}_q[\boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{z}_v, -\boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, -\boldsymbol{z}_v]$. Hence, by Lemma 15, there is a $\boldsymbol{t} \in [-1, 1]^v$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_{q_A} \leq 1$, $\#\{j \in \{1, \dots, v\} : t_j \neq 0\} \leq r + 1$, and

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{k\bullet} = \sum_{j=1}^{v} t_j \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{j\bullet} .$$

Hence, by the definition of the row vectors,

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ki} = \sum_{j=1}^{v} t_j \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ji}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and, more generally, we find for all $a \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ that

$$\big(A\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ai} = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{v} t_j \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ji} & \text{for } a = k ; \\ \sum_{j=1}^{v} A_{aj} \big(\mathfrak{h}[BC]\big)_{ji} & \text{otherwise} . \end{cases}$$




Figure 5: overview of the proof of Lemma 12

This motivates us to define $\dot{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$ through

$$\dot{A}_{aj} := \begin{cases} t_j \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A} & \text{for } a = k\,; \\ A_{aj} & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

Properties 1, 3, and 4 then follow immediately. Property 2 can be derived by using 1. the definition of the basic regularizer $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}$ on Page 10, 2. the definition of $\dot{A}$, 3. the linearity of finite sums, 4. the definition of the ℓ_q-norms on Page 12, 5. the above-derived property $\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_{q_A} \leq 1$, 6. a consolidation, and 7. again the definition of the basic regularizer $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}$ on Page 10:

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\dot{A}, q_A]\big)^{q_A} &= \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \sum_{j=1}^{v} |\dot{A}_{aj}|^{q_A} \\
&= \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{v} \big|t_j \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}\big|^{q_A} & \text{for } a = k \\ \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{aj}|^{q_A} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&= \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \begin{cases} \|A_{k\bullet}\|_{q_A}^{q_A} \sum_{j=1}^{v} |t_j|^{q_A} & \text{for } a = k \\ \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{aj}|^{q_A} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&= \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \begin{cases} \big(\sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{kj}|^{q_A}\big) \|\boldsymbol{t}\|_{q_A}^{q_A} & \text{for } a = k \\ \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{aj}|^{q_A} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\leq \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{kj}|^{q_A} & \text{for } a = k \\ \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{aj}|^{q_A} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&= \max_{a \in \{1,\dots,u\}} \sum_{j=1}^{v} |A_{aj}|^{q_A} \\
&= \big(\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[A, q_A]\big)^{q_A}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. This concludes the proof of the first step.

Step 2: We now show that there is a matrix $\widetilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{u \times v}$ such that

1. $\widetilde{A}\mathfrak{h}[BC] = A\mathfrak{h}[BC]$;
2. $\underline{\mathfrak{r}}[\widetilde{A}, q_A] \leq \underline{\mathfrak{r}}[A, q_A]$;
3. $\#\{j \in \{1,\dots,v\} : \widetilde{A}_{aj} \neq 0\} \leq r + 1$ for all $a \in \{1,\dots,u\}$.

Hence, we replace the matrix A by a matrix whose every row has at most $r + 1$ nonzero entries—see the illustration in Figure 5 again.

Since Step 1 changes only the kth row of A (see Property 4 derived in Step 1), we can apply it to one row after another.

Step 3: We finally prove the first part of the lemma—see the illustration in Figure 5 again.

By Property 3 of the previous step, the matrix $\widetilde{A}$ has at most $u(r+1)$ nonzero columns. Verify that replacing A by $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and B by $B^{\mathfrak{p}}$ for a suitable permutation $\mathfrak{p}$ leads to an $\widetilde{A}$ whose entries outside the first $u(r+1)$ columns are equal to zero—while all other properties remain intact. We denote this version of $\widetilde{A}$ by $\overline{A}$. We then derive for all $j \in \{1,\dots,v\}$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\mathfrak{h}[B^{\mathfrak{p}}C]\big)_{ji} = \mathfrak{h}\big[(B^{\mathfrak{p}}C)_{ji}\big] = \mathfrak{h}\left[\sum_{b=1}^{o}(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{jb}C_{bi}\right] = \mathfrak{h}\left[\sum_{b=1}^{o}(C^\top)_{ib}(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{jb}\right] \\ = \mathfrak{h}\big[(C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet})_i\big] = \big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet}]\big)_i\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we define (with some abuse of notation) $\mathfrak{h} : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathbb{R}^r$ through $(\mathfrak{h}[\boldsymbol{b}])_i := \mathfrak{h}[b_i]$ for all $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Combining this result with the results of Step 2 (with A and B replaced by $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $B^{\mathfrak{p}}$, respectively) yields for all $a \in \{1,\dots,u\}$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(A_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{h}[B^{\mathfrak{p}}C]\big)_{ai} = \sum_{j=1}^{v}(A_{\mathfrak{p}})_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[B^{\mathfrak{p}}C]\big)_{ji} = \sum_{j=1}^{v}(A_{\mathfrak{p}})_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet}]\big)_i \\ = \sum_{j=1}^{v}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet}]\big)_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{u(r+1),v\}}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet}]\big)_i\,.\end{aligned}$$

We then define $\overline{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{v\times o}$ through

$$\overline{B}_{ji} := \begin{cases}(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{ji} = B_{\mathfrak{p}[j]i} & \text{for } j \le u(r+1)\,;\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\,.\end{cases}$$

We then use 1. the above-stated equality, 2. the definition of $\overline{B}$, 3. a similar derivation as above, 4. the block structure of $\overline{A}$, and 5. a similar derivation as above to establish for all $a \in \{1,\dots,u\}$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(A_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{h}[B^{\mathfrak{p}}C]\big)_{ai} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{u(r+1),v\}}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top(B^{\mathfrak{p}})_{j\bullet}]\big)_i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{u(r+1),v\}}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}[C^\top\overline{B}_{j\bullet}]\big)_i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{u(r+1),v\}}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}\big[\overline{B}C\big]\big)_{ji} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{v}\overline{A}_{aj}\big(\mathfrak{h}\big[\overline{B}C\big]\big)_{ji} \\ &= \big(\overline{A}\mathfrak{h}[\overline{B}C]\big)_{ai}\,.\end{aligned}$$




Figure 6: quantities in the proof of Lemma 14

The other properties stated in the lemma follow readily.

The second part of the lemma can be derived in the same way. ■

A.6 Proof of Lemma 14

Proof [Proof of Lemma 14] The proof is a simple exercise in calculus. An illustration of the quantities involved in the proof is given in Figure 6. The function $\mathfrak{h}$ is convex by assumption; hence, it is continuous. Then, according to the extreme value theorem, there is a number

$$c \in \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{t\in[0,1]} \big\{ \mathfrak{h}[t] \big\} .$$

Since $\mathfrak{h}[\bar{t}] < \mathfrak{h}[0]$ for a $\bar{t} \in (0,1]$, it holds that $c \in (0,1]$. Now consider $t_2 \in [0,1]$ and $t_1 \in [0,t_2)$, that is, $t_2 > t_1$. Basic calculus ensures that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[t_2] &= \mathfrak{h}[ct_2] \\
&= \mathfrak{h}\big[ct_1 + ct_2 - ct_1\big] \\
&= \mathfrak{h}\left[ct_1 + \frac{ct_2 - ct_1}{c - ct_1}(c - ct_1)\right] \\
&= \mathfrak{h}\left[ct_1 + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}(c - ct_1)\right] \\
&= \mathfrak{h}\left[\Big(1 - \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}\Big)ct_1 + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}c\right] \\
&\leq \Big(1 - \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}\Big)\mathfrak{h}[ct_1] + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}\mathfrak{h}[c] \\
&\leq \Big(1 - \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}\Big)\mathfrak{h}[ct_1] + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{1 - t_1}\mathfrak{h}[ct_1] \\
&= \mathfrak{h}[ct_1] \\
&= \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[t_1] .
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ is nonincreasing.

Moreover,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[0] = \mathfrak{h}[c \cdot 0] = \mathfrak{h}[0] > \mathfrak{h}[\bar{t}] \geq \mathfrak{h}[c] = \mathfrak{h}[c \cdot 1] = \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1] .$$

Hence, $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[0] > \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}[1]$. This concludes the proof. ■