Continuous vs. Discrete Optimization of Deep Neural Networks

Omer Elkabetz OMER.ELKABETZ@CS.TAU.AC.IL
Tel Aviv University

Nadav Cohen COHENNADAV@CS.TAU.AC.IL
Tel Aviv University

arXiv:2107.06608v3 [cs.LG] 28 Dec 2021

Abstract

Existing analyses of optimization in deep learning are either continuous, focusing on (variants of) gradient flow, or discrete, directly treating (variants of) gradient descent. Gradient flow is amenable to theoretical analysis, but is stylized and disregards computational efficiency. The extent to which it represents gradient descent is an open question in the theory of deep learning. The current paper studies this question. Viewing gradient descent as an approximate numerical solution to the initial value problem of gradient flow, we find that the degree of approximation depends on the curvature around the gradient flow trajectory. We then show that over deep neural networks with homogeneous activations, gradient flow trajectories enjoy favorable curvature, suggesting they are well approximated by gradient descent. This finding allows us to translate an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks into a guarantee that gradient descent efficiently converges to global minimum *almost surely* under random initialization. Experiments suggest that over simple deep neural networks, gradient descent with conventional step size is indeed close to gradient flow. We hypothesize that the theory of gradient flows will unravel mysteries behind deep learning.

Keywords: *Deep Learning*, *Non-Convex Optimization*, *Gradient Flow*, *Gradient Descent*

1. Introduction

The success of deep neural networks is fueled by the mysterious properties of gradient-based optimization, namely, the ability of (variants of) gradient descent to minimize non-convex training objectives while exhibiting tendency towards solutions that generalize well. Vast efforts are being directed at mathematically analyzing this phenomenon, with existing results typically falling into one of two categories: continuous or discrete. Continuous analyses usually focus on gradient flow (or variants thereof), which corresponds to gradient descent (or variants thereof) with infinitesimally small step size. Compared to their discrete (positive step size) counterparts, continuous settings are oftentimes far more amenable to theoretical analysis (*e.g.* they admit use of the theory of differential equations), but on the other hand are stylized, and disregard the critical aspect of computational efficiency (number of steps required for convergence). Works analyzing gradient flow over deep neural networks either accept the latter shortcomings (see for example Saxe et al. (2014); Arora et al. (2018); Razin and Cohen (2020)), or attempt to reproduce part of the results via completely separate analysis of gradient descent (*cf.* Ji and Telgarsky (2019); Du et al. (2018); Arora et al. (2019a)). The extent to which gradient flow represents gradient descent is an open question in the theory of deep learning.

The current paper formally studies the foregoing question. Viewing gradient descent as a numerical method for approximately solving the initial value problem corresponding to gradient flow,

we turn to the literature on numerical analysis, and invoke a fundamental theorem concerning the approximation error. The theorem implies that in general, the match between gradient descent and gradient flow is determined by the curvature around gradient flow's trajectory. In particular, the "more convex" the trajectory, *i.e.* the larger the (possibly negative) minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is around the trajectory, the better the match is guaranteed to be.[1] We show that when applied to deep neural networks (fully connected as well as convolutional) with homogeneous activations (*e.g.* linear, rectified linear or leaky rectified linear), gradient flow emanating from near-zero initialization (as commonly employed in practice) follows trajectories that are "roughly convex," in the sense that the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian along them is far greater than in arbitrary points in space, particularly towards convergence. This implies that over deep neural networks, gradient descent with moderately small step size may in fact be close to its continuous limit, *i.e.* to gradient flow. We exemplify an application of this finding by translating an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks into a convergence guarantee for gradient descent. The guarantee we obtain is, to our knowledge, the first to ensure that a conventional gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network of fixed (data-independent[2]) size efficiently converges[3] to global minimum *almost surely* under random (data-independent) near-zero initialization.

We corroborate our theoretical analysis through experiments with basic deep learning settings, which demonstrate that reducing the step size of gradient descent often leads to only slight changes in its trajectory. This confirms that, in basic settings, central aspects of deep neural network optimization may indeed be captured by gradient flow. Recent works (*e.g.* Barrett and Dherin (2021); Kunin et al. (2021); Smith et al. (2021)) suggest that by appropriately modifying gradient flow it is possible to account for advanced settings as well, including ones with momentum, stochasticity and large step size. Encouraged by these developments, we hypothesize that the vast bodies of knowledge on continuous dynamical systems, and gradient flow in particular (see, *e.g.*, Glendinning (1994); Ambrosio et al. (2008)), will pave way to unraveling mysteries behind deep learning.

1.1. Contributions

The main contributions of this work are: *(i)* we conduct the first formal study for the discrepancy between continuous and discrete optimization of deep neural networks; *(ii)* we demonstrate the use of *generic* mathematical machinery for translating a continuous non-convex convergence result into a discrete one; *(iii)* to our knowledge, the discrete result we obtain forms the first guarantee of random (data-independent) near-zero initialization *almost surely* leading a conventional gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network of fixed (data-independent) size to efficiently converge to global minimum; *(iv)* the fundamental theorem (from numerical analysis) we employ is seldom used in machine learning contexts and may be of independent interest; and *(v)* we provide empirical evidence suggesting that gradient descent over simple deep neural networks is often close to gradient flow.

1. In addition to the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian, local smoothness and Lipschitz constants also affect the guaranteed match between gradient descent and gradient flow. However, the impact of these constants is exponentially weaker than that of the Hessian's minimal eigenvalue. For details see Theorem 3.
2. By data-independence we mean that no assumptions on training data are made beyond it being subject to standard whitening and normalization procedures.
3. We regard convergence as efficient if its computational complexity is polynomial in training set size and dimensions, as well as the desired level of accuracy.

1.2. Paper Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 delivers preliminary background in numerical analysis, and in particular the fundamental theorem concerning numerical solution of initial value problems. Implications of the theorem on the role of curvature in determining the match between gradient flow and gradient descent are presented in Section 3. Section 4 shows that over deep neural networks, trajectories of gradient flow enjoy favorable curvature. An application of this finding for translating a convergence result from gradient flow to gradient descent is demonstrated in Section 5. Our experiments are presented in Section 6. In Section 7 we review related work. Finally, Section 8 concludes.

2. Preliminaries: Numerical Solution of Initial Value Problems

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a function $\mathbf{g} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ (viewed as a time-dependent vector field) and a point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$, consider the *initial value problem*:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_s \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) = \mathbf{g}(t, \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \;\; \text{for } t \geq 0 \,. \tag{1}$$

The following result — an extension of the well known Picard-Lindelöf Theorem — establishes that local Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ suffices for ensuring existence and uniqueness of a solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$.

Theorem 1 (Existence-Uniqueness) *Consider the initial value problem in Equation (1), and suppose $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Then, there exists a solution $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, where either:* (i) $t_e = \infty$*; or* (ii) $t_e < \infty$ *and* $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$*. Moreover, the solution is unique in the sense that any other solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}' : [0, t'_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ must satisfy $t'_e \leq t_e$ and $\forall t \in [0, t'_e) : \boldsymbol{\theta}'(t) = \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$.*

Proof The theorem is a direct consequence of the results in Section 1.5 of Grant (2014).[4] ■

It is typically the case that the solution to Equation (1) cannot be expressed in closed form, and a numerical approximation is sought after. Various numerical methods for approximately solving initial value problems have been developed over the years (see Chapter 12 in Süli and Mayers (2003) for an introduction). The most basic one, *Euler's method*, is parameterized by a *step size* $\eta > 0$, and when applied to Equation (1) follows the recursive scheme:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_k + \eta \, \mathbf{g}(t_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k) \;\; \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{2}$$

where $t_k := k\eta$ and the initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is typically set to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$. The motivation behind Euler's method is straightforward — a first order Taylor expansion of the exact solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ around time t_k yields:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_{k+1}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k + \eta) \approx \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k) + \eta \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k) = \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k) + \eta \, \mathbf{g}(t_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k)) \,,$$

therefore if $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_k)$ is well approximated by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$, we may expect $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1}$ to resemble $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_{k+1})$. The numerical solution produced by Euler's method may be viewed as a continuous polygonal curve:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d \quad , \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) = \mathbf{g}(t_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k) \;\; \text{for } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}) \,, k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots . \tag{3}$$

The quality of the numerical solution then boils down to the distance between this curve and the exact solution, *i.e.* between $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Many efforts have been made to derive tight bounds for this distance. We provide below a modern result known as "Fundamental Theorem."

4. A minor subtlety is that in Grant (2014) the vector field $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ is defined over an open domain. To account for this requirement, simply extend $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ to the domain $(-\infty, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by setting $\mathbf{g}(t, \mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{g}(0, \mathbf{q})$ for all $t < 0$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 2 (Fundamental Theorem) *Consider the initial value problem in Equation (1), and suppose $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be the solution to this problem (see Theorem 1), and let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous polygonal curve (Equation (3)) born from Euler's method (Equation (2)). For any $t \in [0, t_e), \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $J(t, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d,d}$ the Jacobian of $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ with respect to its second argument at the point $(t, \mathbf{q})$, and by $\lambda_{max}(t, \mathbf{q})$ the maximal eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{2}(J(t, \mathbf{q}) + J(t, \mathbf{q})^\top)$.[5] Let $m : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}$ be an integrable function satisfying:*

$$\lambda_{max}(t, \mathbf{q}) \leq m(t) \quad \textit{for all } t \in [0, t_e) \textit{ and } \mathbf{q} \in [\boldsymbol{\theta}(t), \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)]\,,$$

where $[\boldsymbol{\theta}(t), \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)]$ stands for the line segment (in $\mathbb{R}^d$) between $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)$. Let $\delta : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be an integrable function that meets:

$$\| \tfrac{d}{dt} \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t^+) - \mathbf{g}(t, \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)) \|_2 \leq \delta(t) \quad \textit{for all } t \in [0, t_e)\,,$$

where $\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t^+)$ represents the right derivative of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ at time t. Then, for all $t \in [0, t_e)$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)\|_2 \leq e^{\mu(t)} \Big(\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2 + \textstyle\int_0^t e^{-\mu(t')} \delta(t') dt' \Big)\,, \tag{4}$$

where $\mu(t) := \int_0^t m(t')dt'$.

Proof The theorem is simply a restatement of Theorem 10.6 in Hairer et al. (1993). ■

The result of Theorem 2 — bound on distance between exact solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ and numerical one $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ (Equation (4)) — primarily depends on: *(i)* the function $m(\cdot)$, which corresponds to maximal eigenvalue of symmetric part of the Jacobian of the vector field $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ around exact solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$; and *(ii)* the function $\delta(\cdot)$, corresponding to the discrepancy between the vector field $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ and the velocity of the numerical solution $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$. The numerical scheme employed (Euler's method; Equation (2)) has little control over $m(\cdot)$. However, by taking its step size η to be sufficiently small, $\delta(\cdot)$ can be brought arbitrarily close to zero, which, assuming exact initialization (*i.e.* that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is set to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ from Equation (1)), ensures that $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ stay arbitrarily close for an arbitrary amount of time. We thus observe a tradeoff — on one hand the step size η is required to be small so as to ensure accuracy of the numerical solution, while on the other a large step size is preferred for computational efficiency (less iterations per time unit). The largest value of η that still ensures desired accuracy highly depends on $m(\cdot)$, as will be exemplified in Section 3.

3. Continuous vs. Discrete Optimization: Match Determined by Convexity

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, where $d \in \mathbb{N}$, be a twice continuously differentiable function which we would like to minimize. Consider continuous optimization via *gradient flow* initialized at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_s \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) = -\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \;\text{ for } t \geq 0\,. \tag{5}$$

This is a special case of the initial value problem presented in Equation (1).[6] By Theorem 1, it admits a unique solution $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, where either: *(i)* $t_e = \infty$; or *(ii)* $t_e < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$.

5. This maximal eigenvalue is known as the *logarithmic norm* of $J(t, \mathbf{q})$ (*cf.* Section I.10 in Hairer et al. (1993)).
6. The vector field in this case is time-independent (given by $\mathbf{g}(t, \mathbf{q}) = -\nabla f(\mathbf{q})$ for all $t \in [0, \infty), \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$). Initial value problems of this type are known as *autonomous*.

Numerically approximating this solution via Euler's method (Equation (2)) yields a discrete optimization algorithm which is no other than *gradient descent*:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \eta \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{6}$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the chosen step size. We may thus invoke the Fundamental Theorem (Theorem 2) and obtain a bound on the distance between the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent.

Theorem 3 *Consider the trajectory of gradient flow (solution to Equation (5)) $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\tilde{t} \in (0, t_e)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} := \bigcup_{t\in[0,\tilde{t}]} \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))$, where $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ stands for the (closed) Euclidean ball of radius ϵ centered at $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$. Let $\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}, \gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} > 0$ be such that:*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}} \|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})\|_{spectral} \leq \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} \;\;,\;\; \sup_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{q})\|_2 \leq \gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} \,.$$

Let $m : [0, \tilde{t}\,] \to \mathbb{R}$ be an integrable function satisfying:

$$-\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})) \leq m(t) \;\; \textit{for all } t \in [0, \tilde{t}\,] \textit{ and } \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \,,$$

where $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ stands for the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})$. Then, if the step size $\eta > 0$ chosen for gradient descent (Equation (6)) satisfies:

$$\eta < \inf_{t\in(0,\tilde{t}\,]} \frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^t m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} \int_0^t e^{\int_{t'}^t m(t'')dt''} dt'} \,, \tag{7}$$

the first $\lfloor \tilde{t}/\eta \rfloor$ iterates of gradient descent will ϵ-approximate the trajectory of gradient flow up to time $\tilde{t}$, i.e. we will have $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \tilde{t}/\eta \rfloor\}$.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.2) The result follows from applying the Fundamental Theorem (Theorem 2) with $\delta(\cdot)$ fixed at $\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\eta$. ■

Theorem 3 gives a sufficient condition — upper bound on step size η (Equation (7)) — for gradient descent to follow gradient flow up to a given time $\tilde{t}$. The bound is inversely proportional to smoothness and Lipschitz constants ($\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}$ and $\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}$ respectively), and more importantly, depends exponentially on the integral of $m(\cdot)$ along the gradient flow trajectory, where $m(\cdot)$ corresponds to minus the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian. The smaller the integral of $m(\cdot)$, *i.e.* the larger (less negative or more positive) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian around the trajectory is, the more relaxed the bound will be. That is, *the "more convex" the objective function is around the gradient flow trajectory, the better the match between gradient flow and gradient descent* is guaranteed to be.

Corollary 4 below coarsely applies Theorem 3 by fixing $m(\cdot)$ to minus the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian *across the entire space*. If $m(\cdot) \equiv m$ (now a constant) is negative, *i.e.* the objective function $f(\cdot)$ is strongly convex, the upper bound on the step size η becomes constant, meaning it is independent of the time $\tilde{t}$ until which gradient descent is required to follow gradient flow. If m is equal to zero, *i.e.* $f(\cdot)$ is non-strongly convex, the upper bound on η mildly decreases with $\tilde{t}$, namely it scales as $1/\tilde{t}$. If on the other hand m is positive, meaning $f(\cdot)$ is non-convex, the bound on η shrinks to zero (becoming prohibitively restrictive) exponentially fast as $\tilde{t}$ grows. This suggests that as opposed to (strongly or non-strongly) convex objectives, over which gradient descent can easily be made to follow gradient flow, over non-convex objectives, in the worst case, gradient descent will

immediately divert from gradient flow unless its step size is exponentially small. In Appendix B we present a simple example of such a worst case scenario. In this worst case, the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is bounded below and away from zero around the gradient flow trajectory. A question is then whether there are non-convex objectives in which the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian around gradient flow trajectories is large enough for them to be followed by gradient descent. We will see that training losses of deep neural networks can meet this property.

Corollary 4 *Assume that the objective function $f(\cdot)$ is non-negative and β-smooth with $\beta > 0$.*[7] *Denote $m := -\inf_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$, where $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ stands for the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})$. Consider the trajectory of gradient flow (solution to Equation (5)) $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$,*[8] *and let $\tilde{t} \in (0, t_e)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then, if the step size $\eta > 0$ for gradient descent (Equation (6)) satisfies:*

$$\eta < \begin{cases} c\left(\epsilon - \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2\right)|m| & \text{, if } m < 0 \quad \text{(strong convexity)} \\ c\left(\epsilon - \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2\right)(1/\tilde{t}\,) & \text{, if } m = 0 \quad \text{(non-strong convexity)} \\ c\left(\epsilon - \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2 e^{m\tilde{t}}\right)(e^{m\tilde{t}} - 1)^{-1} m & \text{, if } m > 0 \quad \text{(non-convexity)} \end{cases} ,$$

where $c := \left(\sqrt{2\beta^3 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0))} + \beta^2\epsilon\right)^{-1}$, we will have $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \tilde{t}/\eta \rfloor\}$.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.3) The result follows from applying Theorem 3 with $\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} = \beta$, $\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} = \sqrt{2\beta f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0))} + \beta\epsilon$ and $m(\cdot) \equiv m$. ■

4. Optimization of Deep Neural Networks is Roughly Convex

Section 3 has shown that the extent to which gradient descent matches gradient flow depends on "how convex" the objective function is around the gradient flow trajectory. More precisely, the larger (less negative or more positive) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is around this trajectory, the longer gradient descent (with given step size) is guaranteed to follow it.[1] In this section we establish that over training losses of deep neural networks (fully connected as well as convolutional) with homogeneous activations (*e.g.* linear, rectified linear or leaky rectified linear), when emanating from near-zero initialization (as commonly employed in practice), trajectories of gradient flow are "roughly convex," in the sense that the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian along them is far greater than in arbitrary points in space, particularly towards convergence. This finding suggests that when optimizing deep neural networks, gradient descent may closely resemble gradient flow. We demonstrate a formal application of the finding in Section 5, translating an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks into a guarantee of efficient convergence (to global minimum) for gradient descent, which applies *almost surely* with respect to a random near-zero initialization.

4.1. Fully Connected Architectures

Consider the mappings realized by a fully connected neural network with depth $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, input dimension $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, hidden widths $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{n-1} \in \mathbb{N}$, and output dimension $d_n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \;\;,\;\; h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = W_n\, \sigma(W_{n-1}\, \sigma(W_{n-2} \cdots \sigma(W_1 \mathbf{x})) \cdots) , \tag{8}$$

7. Namely, $\|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})\|_{spectral} \leq \beta$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

8. Lemma 19 in Appendix A shows that in the current context (β-smoothness of the objective function $f(\cdot)$), it necessarily holds that $t_e = \infty$, *i.e.* the trajectory of gradient flow is defined over $[0, \infty)$. For simplicity, the statement of the corollary does not rely on this fact.

where: $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_{j-1}}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, are learned weight matrices; $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d := \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_j d_{j-1}$, is their arrangement as a vector;[9] and $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a predetermined activation function that operates element-wise when applied to a vector.[10] We assume that $\sigma(\cdot)$ is (positively) *homogeneous*, meaning $\sigma(cz) = c\,\sigma(z)$ for all $c \geq 0, z \in \mathbb{R}$. This allows for linear ($\sigma(z) = z$), as well as the commonly employed rectified linear ($\sigma(z) = \max\{z, 0\}$) and leaky rectified linear ($\sigma(z) = \max\{z, \bar{\alpha} z\}$ for some $0 < \bar{\alpha} < 1$) activations.

Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a set of possible labels, and let $\mathcal{S} = \big((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\big)_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$, with $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$, be a sequence of labeled inputs. Given a loss function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}$ convex and twice continuously differentiable in its first argument (common choices include square, logistic and exponential losses), we learn the weights of the neural network by minimizing its *training loss* — average loss over elements of $\mathcal{S}$:

$$f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \;\;,\;\; f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell(h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i)\,. \tag{9}$$

Subsubsections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 below show (for linear and non-linear activation functions, respectively) that although the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (Hessian of training loss) — denoted $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ — can in general be arbitrarily negative, along trajectories of gradient flow (which emanate from near-zero initialization) it is no less than moderately negative, approaching non-negativity towards convergence. In light of Section 3, this suggests that over fully connected deep neural networks, gradient flow may lend itself to approximation by gradient descent — a prospect we confirm (for a case with linear activation) in Section 5.

4.1.1. LINEAR ACTIVATION

Assume that the activation function of the fully connected neural network (Equation (8)) is linear, *i.e.* $\sigma(z) = z$, and define the *end-to-end matrix*:

$$W_{n:1} := W_n W_{n-1} \cdots W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_0}\,. \tag{10}$$

The mappings realized by the network can then be written as $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = W_{n:1}\mathbf{x}$, and the training loss as $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi(W_{n:1})$, where

$$\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_0} \to \mathbb{R} \;\;,\;\; \phi(W) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell(W\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \tag{11}$$

is convex and twice continuously differentiable. Lemma 5 below expresses $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in this case.

Lemma 5 *For any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, regard $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ not only as a (symmetric) matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d,d}$, but also as a quadratic form $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\,\cdot\,]$ that intakes a tuple $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1, d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2, d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_{n-1}}$, arranges it as a vector $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (in correspondence with how weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are arranged to create $\boldsymbol{\theta}$), and returns $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, for any*

9. The exact order by which the entries of $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are placed in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is insignificant for our purposes — all that matters is that the same order be used throughout.
10. Our analysis can easily be extended to account for different activation functions at different hidden layers. We assume identical activation functions for simplicity of presentation.

$W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$, regard $\nabla^2\phi(W)$ as a quadratic form $\nabla^2\phi(W)[\,\cdot\,]$ that intakes a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$ and returns a scalar (non-negative since $\phi(\cdot)$ is convex). Then, $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is given by:

$$\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n] = \nabla^2\phi(W_{n:1})\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] \\ +2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})^\top \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right), \tag{12}$$

where $W_{j':j}$, for any $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, is defined as $W_{j'}W_{j'-1}\cdots W_j$ if $j \leq j'$, and as an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.4) With $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}$ an arbitrary vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n)$ its corresponding matrix tuple, we expand:

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi\big((W_n + \Delta W_n)(W_{n-1} + \Delta W_{n-1})\cdots(W_1 + \Delta W_1)\big)\,,$$

and extract $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ from the second order terms. ■

The following proposition makes use of Lemma 5 to show that (under mild conditions) $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ can be arbitrarily negative, *i.e.* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = -\infty$.

Proposition 6 *Assume that the network is deep ($n \geq 3$), and that the zero mapping is not a global minimizer of the training loss (meaning $\nabla\phi(0) \neq 0$).*[11] *Then $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = -\infty$.*

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.5) The proof is constructive — with $c > 0$ arbitrary, we define a point $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a non-zero translation vector $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, such that $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} = -c\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2$. ■

Building on Lemma 5, Lemma 7 below provides a lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$.

Lemma 7 *For any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*[12]

$$\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_{Frobenius} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\} \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_{spectral}. \tag{13}$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.6) Appealing to Lemma 5, we lower bound the right-hand side of Equation (12). Convexity of $\phi(\cdot)$ implies that the first summand is non-negative. For the second summand, we use known matrix inequalities to establish a lower bound of $c\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\Delta W_j\|_{Frobenius}^2$, with c being the expression on the right-hand side of Equation (13). ■

Assuming the training loss is non-constant and the network is deep ($n \geq 3$), the infimum (over $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$) of the lower bound in Equation (13) is minus infinity. In particular, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is not a global minimizer ($\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}) \neq 0$) and at least $n-2$ of its weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are non-zero, then by rescaling the latter it is possible to take the lower bound to minus infinity while keeping the end-to-end matrix $W_{n:1}$ (and thus the input-output mapping $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ and the training loss value $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) intact. However, gradient flow over fully connected neural networks (with homogeneous activations) initialized near zero is known to maintain balance between weight matrices — see Du et al. (2018) — and so along its trajectories the lower bound in Equation (13) takes a much tighter form. This is formalized in Proposition 8 below.

11. Both of these assumptions are necessary, in the sense that removing any of them (without imposing further assumptions) renders the proposition false — see Claim 27 in Appendix E.
12. Note that by convention, an empty product (*i.e.* a product over the elements of the empty set) is equal to one.

Proposition 8 *If $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ resides on a trajectory of gradient flow (over $f(\cdot)$) emanating from some point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2n}\right]$, then:*

$$\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_{Frobenius}\|W_{n:1}\|_{spectral}^{1-2/n} - c\,\epsilon^{1-2/n}\,, \quad (14)$$

where $c := \frac{4n(n-1)}{(4n)^{2/n}}\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_{Frobenius}\max\left\{1, \max\{\|W_j\|_{spectral}\}_{j=1}^{n}\right\}^{2(n-2)}$.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.7) By the analysis of Du et al. (2018), the quantities $W_{j+1}^\top W_{j+1} - W_j W_j^\top$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, are invariant (constant) along a gradient flow trajectory, and therefore small if initialization is such. This implies that along a trajectory emanating from near-zero initialization, for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, the singular values of W_j are similar to those of W_{j+1}, and the left singular vectors of W_j match the right ones of W_{j+1}. Products of adjacent weight matrices thus simplify, and we obtain $\|W_j\|_{spectral} \approx \|W_{n:1}\|_{spectral}^{1/n}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Plugging this into Equation (13) yields the desired result (Equation (14)). ■

Assume the network is deep ($n \geq 3$), and consider a trajectory of gradient flow (over $f(\cdot)$) emanating from near-zero initialization. For every point on the trajectory, Proposition 8 may be applied with small ϵ, leading the lower bound in Equation (14) to depend primarily on the sizes (norms) of the end-to-end matrix $W_{n:1}$ and the gradient of the loss with respect to it, *i.e.* $\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})$ (see Equations (10) and (11)). In the course of optimization, $W_{n:1}$ is initially small, and (since the loss $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi(W_{n:1})$ is monotonically non-increasing) remains confined to sublevel sets of $\phi(\cdot)$ (which is convex) thereafter. $\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})$ on the other hand tends to zero upon convergence to global minimum. We conclude that the lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ in Equation (14) starts off slightly negative, and approaches non-negativity (if and) as the trajectory converges to global minimum. In light of Section 3, this implies that the gradient flow trajectory may lend itself to approximation by gradient descent. Indeed, the results of the current Subsubsection are used in Section 5 to establish proximity between gradient flow and gradient descent, thereby translating an analysis of gradient flow into a guarantee of efficient convergence (to global minimum) for gradient descent.

4.1.2. NON-LINEAR ACTIVATION

When the (homogeneous) activation function of the fully connected neural network (Equation (8)) is non-linear, *i.e.* $\sigma(z) = \alpha\max\{z, 0\} - \bar{\alpha}\max\{-z, 0\}$ for some $\alpha, \bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}$, the training loss $f(\cdot)$ is (typically) not everywhere differentiable. It is however locally Lipschitz thus differentiable almost everywhere (see Theorem 9.1.2 in Borwein and Lewis (2010)). Moreover, as established by Proposition 25 in Appendix D, for almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist diagonal matrices $D'_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_j}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, such that $f(\cdot)$ coincides with the function

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \mapsto \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell(W_n D'_{i,n-1} W_{n-1} D'_{i,n-2} W_{n-2} \cdots D'_{i,1} W_1 \mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \quad (15)$$

on an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, that is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices (*i.e.* under $(W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n) \mapsto (c_1 W_1, c_2 W_2, \ldots, c_n W_n)$ with $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n > 0$). The notion of gradient flow over a non-differentiable locally Lipschitz objective function is typically formalized via differential inclusion and Clarke subdifferentials (*cf.* Davis et al. (2020); Du et al. (2018)). To our knowledge there exists no analogue of the Fundamental Theorem (Theorem 2) that applies

to this formalization, thus we focus on (open) regions of the form $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, where $f(\cdot)$ is given by Equation (15), and in particular is twice continuously differentiable. On such regions the analysis of Section 3 applies, and since they constitute the entire weight space but a negligible (closed and zero measure) set, they can facilitate a "piecewise characterization" of the discrepancy between gradient flow and gradient descent.

Lemma 9 below expresses $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$.

Lemma 9 *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. For any $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ define $(D'_{i,*} W_*)_{j':j}$ to be the matrix $D'_{i,j'} W_{j'} D'_{i,j'-1} W_{j'-1} \cdots D'_{i,j} W_j$ (where by convention $D'_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_n}$ stands for identity) if $j \leq j'$, and an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. For $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ let $\nabla \ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\nabla^2 \ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_n}$ be the gradient and Hessian (respectively) of the loss $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $\big((D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ with respect to its first argument. Then, regarding Hessians as quadratic forms (see examples in Lemma 5), it holds that:*

$$\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1} \mathbf{x}_i \right] \tag{16}$$
$$+ \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top \sum_{1 \leq j < j' \leq n} (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'} (\Delta W_{j'}) (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1} \mathbf{x}_i \,.$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.8) The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5. Namely, it expands the function in Equation (15) and then extracts second order terms. ■

The following proposition employs Lemma 9 to show that (under mild conditions) there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ is arbitrarily negative.

Proposition 10 *Assume that:* (i) *the network is deep ($n \geq 3$); and* (ii) *the loss function $\ell(\cdot)$ and training set $\mathcal{S}$ are non-degenerate, in the sense that there exists a weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$, where $\nabla \ell(\cdot)$ stands for the gradient of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument, and $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ is the input-output mapping realized by the network (Equation (8)).*[13] *Then, it holds that* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = -\infty$.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.9) Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a weight setting realizing the non-degeneracy condition, *i.e.* for which $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ satisfies the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$ (if this is not the case then simply flip the signs of the entries in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ corresponding to the last weight matrix W_n). From continuity, there exists a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ consisting of weight settings that all meet the latter condition. There must exist a region of the form $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ intersecting this neighborhood (since these regions constitute all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ but a zero measure set), so we may assume, without loss of generality, that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Lemma 9 then applies. Moreover, since $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices (*i.e.* of $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$), the lemma remains applicable even when $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is subject to such rescaling. The proof proceeds by fixing $\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n$ to certain values, and positively rescaling

13. Assumptions *(i)* and *(ii)* are both necessary, in the sense that removing any of them (without imposing further assumptions) renders the proposition false — see Claim 28 in Appendix E. Assumption *(ii)* in particular is extremely mild, *e.g.* if $\ell(\cdot)$ is the square loss (*i.e.* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\ell(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2$), the slightest change in a single label ($\mathbf{y}_i$) corresponding to a non-zero prediction ($h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq \mathbf{0}$) can ensure the inequality.

$W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ in a certain way, such that the expression for $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n]$ provided in Lemma 9 becomes arbitrarily negative. ■

Relying on Lemma 9, Lemma 11 below provides a lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$.

Lemma 11 *With the notations of Lemma 9, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$:*[12]

$$\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_{Frobenius}. \quad (17)$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.10) The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 7. Namely, it appeals to Lemma 9, and lower bounds the right-hand side of Equation (16). Convexity of $\ell(\cdot)$ (with respect to its first argument) implies that the first summand is non-negative. For the second summand, we use known matrix inequalities (as well as the fact that $\|D'_{i,j}\|_{spectral}$ is no greater than $\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, and equal to one for $j = n$) to establish a lower bound of $c \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|^2_{Frobenius}$, with c being the expression on the right-hand side of Equation (17). ■

The lower bound in Equation (17) is highly sensitive to the scales of the individual weight matrices. Specifically, assuming the network is deep ($n \geq 3$), if $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ does not perfectly fit all non-zero training inputs (meaning there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ for which $\nabla \ell_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \mathbf{0}$), and if at least $n-2$ of its weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are non-zero, then it is possible to rescale each W_j by $c_j > 0$, with $\prod_{j=1}^{n} c_j = 1$, such that the lower bound in Equation (17) becomes arbitrarily negative[14] despite the input-output mapping $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ (and thus the training loss value $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) remaining unchanged. Nevertheless, similarly to the case of linear activation (Subsubsection 4.1.1), we may employ the fact that gradient flow over fully connected neural networks (with homogeneous activations) initialized near zero maintains balance between weight matrices — *cf.* Du et al. (2018) — to show that along its trajectories, the lower bound in Equation (17) assumes a tighter form. This is done in Proposition 12 below.

Proposition 12 *If $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ resides on a trajectory of gradient flow (over $f(\cdot)$)*[15] *initialized at some point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, then, using the notations of Lemma 9:*

$$\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \Big(\min_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \|W_j\|_{Frobenius} + \epsilon \Big)^{n-2}. \quad (18)$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.11) By the analysis of Du et al. (2018), for any $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, the quantity $\|W_{j'}\|^2_{Frobenius} - \|W_j\|^2_{Frobenius}$ is invariant (constant) along a gradient flow trajectory. This implies that along a trajectory emanating from a point with (Euclidean) norm $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, it holds that $\|W_{j'}\|^2_{Frobenius} - \|W_j\|^2_{Frobenius} \in \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ for all $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, which in turn implies $\|W_{j'}\|_{Frobenius} \leq \min_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \|W_j\|_{Frobenius} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ for all $j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Plugging this into Equation (17) yields the desired result (Equation (18)). ■

14. The bound remains applicable since $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices.
15. Recall that in the current context, the optimized objective function $f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz but (typically) non-differentiable. Following a conventional formalization in such settings (*cf.* Davis et al. (2020); Du et al. (2018)), we regard a curve in $\mathbb{R}^d$ as a trajectory of gradient flow if it satisfies the differential inclusion $\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) \in -\partial f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))$ for almost every time t, where $\partial f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ stands for the Clarke subdifferential (see Clarke (1975)) of $f(\cdot)$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$.

Assume the network is deep ($n \geq 3$), and consider a trajectory of gradient flow (over $f(\cdot)$) emanating from near-zero initialization. For every point on the trajectory, Proposition 12 may be applied with small ϵ, leading the lower bound in Equation (18) to depend primarily on the *minimal* size (Frobenius norm) of a weight matrix W_j, and on $\nabla\ell_1, \nabla\ell_2, \ldots, \nabla\ell_{|\mathcal{S}|}$ — gradients of the loss function with respect to the predictions over the training set. In the course of optimization, $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are initially small, and if a perfect fit of the training set is ultimately achieved, $\nabla\ell_1, \nabla\ell_2, \ldots, \nabla\ell_{|\mathcal{S}|}$ will converge to zero. Therefore, if not *all* weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ become large during optimization, the lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ in Equation (18) will only be moderately negative before approaching non-negativity (if and) as the trajectory converges to a perfect fit. In light of Section 3, this suggests that the gradient flow trajectory may lend itself to approximation by gradient descent. For a case with linear activation (Subsubsection 4.1.1) such prospect is theoretically verified in Section 5. For non-linear activation we provide empirical corroboration in Section 6, deferring to future work a complete theoretical affirmation.

4.2. Convolutional Architectures

We account for convolutional neural networks by allowing for weight sharing and sparsity patterns to be imposed on the layers of the fully connected model analyzed in Subsection 4.1. Namely, we consider the exact same mappings as in Equation (8), but now, rather than being learned directly, the matrices $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_{j-1}}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, are determined by learned weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_j}$, with $d'_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, such that each entry of W_j is either fixed at zero or connected to a predetermined coordinate of $\mathbf{w}_j$ (with no repetition of coordinates within the same row). The weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is then simply a concatenation of the weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$, and its dimension is accordingly $d = \sum_{j=1}^{n} d'_j$. Our analysis for this model (which includes convolutional neural networks as a special case) is essentially the same as that presented for fully connected neural networks with non-linear activation (Subsubsection 4.1.2). In particular, we use the fact that even with weight sharing and sparsity patterns imposed on the layers of a fully connected neural network (with homogeneous activation), when initialized near zero, gradient flow over the network maintains balance between weights of different layers — *cf.* Du et al. (2018). For the complete analysis see Appendix C.

5. Continuous Proof of Discrete Convergence for Deep Linear Neural Networks

Section 3 invoked the Fundamental Theorem for numerical solution of initial value problems (Theorem 2) to show that, in general, the extent to which gradient descent provably matches gradient flow is determined by how large (less negative or more positive) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is around the gradient flow trajectory.[1] Section 4 established that for training losses of deep neural networks, along trajectories of gradient flow emanating from near-zero initialization (as commonly employed in practice), the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is far greater than in arbitrary points in space, particularly towards convergence. In this section we combine the two findings, translating an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks into a convergence guarantee for gradient descent. The guarantee we obtain is, to our knowledge, the first to ensure that a conventional gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network of fixed (data-independent[2]) size efficiently converges[3] to global minimum *almost surely* under random (data-independent) near-zero initialization.

Deep linear neural networks — fully connected neural networks with linear activation (see Subsection 4.1) — are perhaps the most common subject of theoretical study in the context of optimization in deep learning. Though trivial from an expressiveness point of view (realize only linear input-output mappings), they induce highly non-convex training losses, giving rise to highly non-trivial phenomena under gradient-based optimization. In recent years, various results concerning gradient flow over deep linear neural networks have been proven, most notably for the case of *balanced initialization* (see for example Saxe et al. (2014); Arora et al. (2018); Lampinen and Ganguli (2019); Arora et al. (2019b); Razin and Cohen (2020)). Under the notations of Subsection 4.1 (in particular with $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ standing for network weight matrices), balanced initialization means that when optimization commences:

$$W_{j+1}^\top W_{j+1} = W_j W_j^\top \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1 \,. \tag{19}$$

The condition holds approximately with any near-zero initialization, and exactly when the following procedure (adaptation of Procedure 1 in Arora et al. (2019a)) is employed.

Procedure 13 (random balanced initialization) *With a distribution $\mathcal{P}$ over d_n-by-d_0 matrices of rank at most $\min\{d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_n\}$, initialize $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_{j-1}}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, via following steps:* (i) *sample $A \sim \mathcal{P}$;* (ii) *take singular value decomposition $A = U\Sigma V^\top$, where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, \min\{d_0, d_n\}}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0, \min\{d_0, d_n\}}$ have orthonormal columns, and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{d_0, d_n\}, \min\{d_0, d_n\}}$ is diagonal and holds the singular values of A; and* (iii) *set $W_n \simeq U\Sigma^{1/n}$, $W_{n-1} \simeq \Sigma^{1/n}$, $W_{n-2} \simeq \Sigma^{1/n}$, $\ldots$, $W_2 \simeq \Sigma^{1/n}$, $W_1 \simeq \Sigma^{1/n} V^\top$, where "$\simeq$" stands for equality up to zero-valued padding.*

Compared to gradient flow, little is known about gradient descent when it comes to optimization of deep (three or more layer) linear neural networks. Indeed, there are relatively few results along this line (*cf.* Bartlett et al. (2018); Ji and Telgarsky (2019); Arora et al. (2019a)), and these are typically highly specific, built upon technical proofs that are difficult to generalize. Being able to obtain results via translation of gradient flow analyses is thus of prime interest.

We focus in this section on deep[16] linear neural networks trained for scalar regression per least-squares criterion. In the context of Subsection 4.1, this means that the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is linear ($\sigma(z) = z$), the output dimension d_n is one, and the loss function $\ell(\cdot)$ is the square loss (*i.e.* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\ell(\hat{y}, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{y} - y)^2$). We assume that training inputs are whitened, *i.e.* have been transformed such that their empirical (uncentered) covariance matrix $\Lambda_{xx} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0, d_0}$ is equal to identity. A standard calculation (see Appendix F) shows that in this case the function $\phi(\cdot)$ defined by Equation (11) becomes $\phi(W) = \frac{1}{2}\|W - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 + c$, where $\Lambda_{yx} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} y_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{1, d_0}$ is the empirical (uncentered) cross-covariance matrix between training labels and inputs, and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant (independent of W). We may thus write the training loss $f(\cdot)$ (Equation (9)) as:

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\|W_{n:1} - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 + c \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\|W_{n:1} - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 + \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \,, \tag{20}$$

where $W_{n:1} \in \mathbb{R}^{1, d_0}$ is the network's end-to-end matrix (Equation (10)). We disregard the degenerate case where $\Lambda_{yx} = 0$, *i.e.* where the zero mapping attains the global minimum, and assume that training labels are normalized (jointly scaled) such that Λ_{yx} has unit length ($\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius} = 1$).

16. Our results apply to shallow (two layer) networks as well. We highlight the deep (three or more layer) setting as it is far less understood (*cf.* Arora et al. (2019a)), and arguably more central to deep learning.

Proposition 14 below analyzes gradient flow over the training loss in Equation (20). Relying on a known characterization for the dynamics of the end-to-end matrix (*cf.* Arora et al. (2018)), it establishes convergence to global minimum. Moreover, harnessing the results of Section 4, it derives a lower bound on (the integral of) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian around the gradient flow trajectory.

Proposition 14 *Consider minimization of the training loss $f(\cdot)$ in Equation (20) via gradient flow (Equation (5)) starting from initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that meets the balancedness condition (Equation (19)). Denote by $W_{n:1,s}$ the initial value of the end-to-end matrix (Equation (10)), and suppose that $\|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius} \in (0, 0.2]$ (initialization is small but non-zero). Assume that $W_{n:1,s}$ is not antiparallel to Λ_{yx}, i.e. $\nu := \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_{yx}^\top W_{n:1,s}) / \big(\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius} \|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius}\big) \neq -1$. Then, the trajectory of gradient flow is defined over infinite time, and with $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ representing this trajectory, for any $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$, the following time $\bar{t}$ satisfies $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\bar{t})) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$:*

$$\bar{t} = \frac{2n \big(\max\big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\} \big)^n}{\|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius}} \ln \left(\frac{15n \max\big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\}}{\|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1, 2\bar{\epsilon}\}} \right) . \tag{21}$$

Moreover, under the notations of Theorem 3, for any $t > 0$ and $\epsilon \in \big(0, \frac{1}{2n}\big]$ with corresponding $\mathcal{D}_{t,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time t), we have the smoothness and Lipschitz constants $\beta_{t,\epsilon} = 16n$ and $\gamma_{t,\epsilon} = 6\sqrt{n}$ respectively, and the following (upper) bound on the integral of (minus) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian:

$$\int_0^t m(t')dt' \leq \frac{15n^3 \big(\max\big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\} \big)^n t\epsilon}{\|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius}} + \ln \left(\frac{n^2 \big(e^2 \max\big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\} \big)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,s}\|_{Frobenius}^2} \right) , \tag{22}$$

where the function $m : [0, t] \to \mathbb{R}$ is non-negative.

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.12) By result of Arora et al. (2018), gradient flow induces on the end-to-end matrix the following dynamics:

$$\tfrac{d}{dt} W_{n:1}(t) = -\nabla \phi\big(W_{n:1}(t)\big) \Big(\|W_{n:1}(t)\|_{Frobenius}^{2-2/n} I_{d_0} + (n-1) \big[W_{n:1}^\top(t) W_{n:1}(t) \big]^{1-1/n} \Big) ,$$

where $I_{d_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0, d_0}$ represents identity, and $[\,\cdot\,]^c$, $c \geq 0$, stands for a power operator defined over positive semi-definite matrices (with $c = 0$ yielding identity by definition). Carefully analyzing these dynamics, we characterize $W_{n:1}(\cdot)$ — trajectory of end-to-end matrix — and show that, with $\bar{t}$ given by Equation (21), $\frac{1}{2}\|W_{n:1}(\bar{t}) - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ as required. For establishing Equation (22), we use the characterization of $W_{n:1}(\cdot)$, along with a lower bound on the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian provided in Subsubsection 4.1.1. The expressions for $\beta_{t,\epsilon}$ and $\gamma_{t,\epsilon}$ are also derived using the characterization of $W_{n:1}(\cdot)$ and geometric bounds (bounds on Hessian eigenvalues and gradient norm, respectively), but they involve much coarser computations. ■

Plugging the gradient flow results of Proposition 14 into the generic Theorem 3 translates them to the following convergence guarantee for gradient descent.

Theorem 15 *Assume the same conditions as in Proposition 14, but with minimization via gradient descent (Equation (6)) instead of gradient flow.*[17] *Then, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \ldots$ representing the iterates of gradient descent, $W_{n:1,0}$ standing for the end-to-end matrix (Equation (10)) of the initial*

17. The conditions on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ in Proposition 14 are now satisfied by the initialization of gradient descent, *i.e.* by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$.

point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$*, and* $\nu := \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_{yx}^\top W_{n:1,0}) / \big(\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius} \|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}\big)$*, for any* $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$*, if the step size* η *meets:*

$$\eta \leq \frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^5 \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}}{n^{17/2} e^{7n+6} \big(\max\big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\}\big)^{(11n-5)/2}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{15n \max\big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}} \right) \right)^{-2} \in \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^5 \tilde{\epsilon}}{n^{17/2} \big(poly\big(\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big)\big)^n} \right), \quad (23)$$

it holds that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$*, where:*

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{2n \big(\max\big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\} \big)^n}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \eta} \ln\left(\frac{15n \max\big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}} \right) + 1 \right\rfloor \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{n \big(poly\big(\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\big)\big)^n \ln\big(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\big)}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \eta} \right). \quad (24)$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.13) The proof calls Proposition 14 with $\bar{\epsilon}$ and ϵ small enough such that for any $t > 0$ and $\mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if gradient flow at time t is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal (meaning $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$) and is ϵ-approximated by $\mathbf{q}'$ (*i.e.* $\|\mathbf{q}' - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$), then $\mathbf{q}'$ is $\tilde{\epsilon}$-optimal ($f(\mathbf{q}') - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$). The proposition implies that gradient flow is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal at the time $\bar{t}$ given in Equation (21). Since gradient flow monotonically non-increases $f(\cdot)$, it is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal at any time after $\bar{t}$ as well. With η and k adhering to Equations (23) and (24) respectively, we have $k\eta \geq \bar{t}$, so it suffices to show that when its step size is η, the first k iterates of gradient descent ϵ-approximate the trajectory of gradient flow up to time $k\eta$. This follows directly from delivering to Theorem 3 the geometric results of Proposition 14 (bound on integral of minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian, as well as smoothness and Lipschitz constants) corresponding to $\mathcal{D}_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ — ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$. ■

Remark 16 *Theorem 3 — our generic tool for translating analyses between gradient flow and gradient descent — allows for the two to be initialized differently. Accordingly, the convergence guarantee of Theorem 15 may be extended to account for initialization which is not perfectly balanced, i.e. which satisfies Equation* (19) *only approximately. For details see Appendix G.*

Remark 17 *The convergence guarantee of Theorem 15 requires a number of iterates that scales exponentially with network depth* (n)*. Shamir (2019) has proven that under mild conditions, for a deep linear neural network whose input, hidden and output dimensions are all equal to one (i.e., in our notations,* $d_0 = d_1 = \cdots = d_n = 1$*), such exponential dependence on depth is unavoidable. We defer to future work the question of whether this also holds in the context of Theorem 15.*

Combining Theorem 15 with random balanced initialization (Procedure 13) yields what is, to our knowledge, the first guarantee of random (data-independent) near-zero initialization *almost surely* leading a conventional gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network of fixed (data-independent) size to efficiently converge to global minimum.

Corollary 18 *Consider minimization of the training loss* $f(\cdot)$ *in Equation* (20) *via gradient descent (Equation* (6)*) emanating from a random balanced initialization (Procedure 13) whose underlying distribution* $\mathcal{P}$ *is continuous and satisfies* $\mathrm{Pr}_{A \sim \mathcal{P}}\big[\|A\|_{Frobenius} \leq 0.2\big] = 1$*. Assume* d_0 *(network input dimension) is greater than one, and let* $W_{n:1,0}$ *and* ν *be as defined in Theorem 15. Then, almost surely with respect to (i.e. with probability one over) initialization, for any* $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$*, if the step size* η *meets Equation* (23)*, the value of* $f(\cdot)$ *after* k *iterates will be within* $\tilde{\epsilon}$ *from global minimum, where* k *is given by Equation* (24)*.*

Proof It suffices to show that the conditions of Theorem 15 are almost surely satisfied. Initialization is balanced by construction, and since $W_{n:1,0}$ (initial end-to-end matrix) follows the distribution $\mathcal{P}$, it almost surely has Frobenius norm no greater than 0.2. Moreover, since $\mathcal{P}$ is continuous, and the line in $\mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$ passing through the origin and Λ_{yx} has (Lebesgue) measure zero, $W_{n:1,0}$ is almost surely not equal to zero and not antiparallel to Λ_{yx}. This completes the proof. ■

6. Experiments

In this section we corroborate our theory by presenting experiments suggesting that over simple deep neural networks, gradient descent with conventional step size is indeed close to the continuous limit, *i.e.* to gradient flow. Our experimental protocol is simple — on several deep neural networks classifying MNIST handwritten digits (LeCun (1998)), we compare runs of gradient descent differing only in the step size η. Specifically, separately on each evaluated network, with $\eta_0 = 0.001$ (standard choice of step size) and r ranging over $\{2, 5, 10, 20\}$, we compare, in terms of training loss value and location in weight space, every iteration of a run using $\eta = \eta_0$ to every r'th iteration of a run in which $\eta = \eta_0 / r$. Figure 1 reports the results obtained on fully connected neural networks (as analyzed in Subsection 4.1), with both linear and non-linear activation. As can be seen, reducing the step size η leads to only slight changes, suggesting that the trajectory of gradient descent with $\eta = \eta_0$ is already close to the continuous limit. Similar results obtained on convolutional neural networks (see Subsection 4.2 for corresponding analysis) are reported by Figure 3 in Subappendix H.1.

Our experimental findings suggest that in practice, proximity between gradient descent and gradient flow may take place even when the step size of gradient descent is larger than permitted by current theory. Indeed, the theoretical machinery developed in this paper brings forth upper bounds on step size that guarantee proximity, and while such upper bounds can be asymptotically tight under worst case conditions (see Appendix B), they are by no means tight in every given scenario, and therefore larger step sizes may also admit proximity. For illustration, a step size of η_0, which in our experiments was seemingly sufficient for ensuring proximity, is many orders of magnitude greater than the upper bound on step size required by Theorem 15 (Equation (23)).

7. Related Work

Theoretical study of gradient-based optimization in deep learning is an extremely active area of research. While far too wide to fully cover here, we note that analyses in this area can broadly be categorized as continuous (see for example Saxe et al. (2014); Arora et al. (2018); Lampinen and Ganguli (2019); Arora et al. (2019b); Advani et al. (2020); Eftekhari (2020); Vardi and Shamir (2020); Razin and Cohen (2020); Ji and Telgarsky (2020); Razin et al. (2021); Woodworth et al. (2020); Azulay et al. (2021); Yun et al. (2021)) or discrete (*e.g.* Bartlett et al. (2018); Gunasekar et al. (2018); Du et al. (2019); Allen-Zhu et al. (2019); Du and Hu (2019); Zou et al. (2020); Hu et al. (2020)). There are works comprising analyses of both types (*cf.* Du et al. (2018); Ji and Telgarsky (2019); Arora et al. (2019a); Wu et al. (2019); Lyu and Li (2019); E et al. (2019); Chizat and Bach (2020); Chou et al. (2020)), but with these developed separately, wherein continuous proofs typically serve as inspiration for discrete ones (which are often far more technical and brittle).

When relating continuous and discrete optimization, the algorithms at play are most commonly gradient flow and gradient descent. There are however works that draw analogies between other algorithms, replacing gradient flow on the continuous end and/or gradient descent on the discrete one




Figure 1: Over deep fully connected neural networks, trajectories of gradient descent with conventional step size barely change when step size is reduced, suggesting they are close to the continuous limit, *i.e.* to trajectories of gradient flow. Presented results were obtained on fully connected neural networks as analyzed in Subsection 4.1, trained to classify MNIST handwritten digits (28-by-28 grayscale images, each labeled as an integer between 0 and 9 — *cf.* LeCun (1998)). Networks had depth $n = 3$, input dimension $d_0 = 784$ (corresponding to $28 \cdot 28 = 784$ pixels), hidden widths $d_1 = d_2 = 50$ and output dimension $d_3 = 10$ (corresponding to ten possible labels). Training was based on gradient descent applied to cross-entropy loss with no regularization, starting from a near-zero point drawn from Xavier distribution (*cf.* Glorot and Bengio (2010)). Separately on each network, we compared runs differing only in the step size η. Specifically, with $\eta_0 = 0.001$ (standard choice of step size) and r ranging over $\{2, 5, 10, 20\}$, we compared, in terms of training loss value and location in weight space, every iteration of a run using $\eta = \eta_0$ to every r'th iteration of a run in which $\eta = \eta_0 / r$. Left pair of plots reports results obtained on a network with linear activation ($\sigma(z) = z$), while right pair corresponds to a network with rectified linear activation ($\sigma(z) = \max\{z, 0\}$). In each pair, left plot displays training loss values, and right one shows (Euclidean) distances in weight space, namely, distance between initialization and run with $\eta = \eta_0$, alongside distances between run with $\eta = \eta_0$ and runs having $\eta = \eta_0 / r$ for different values of r. Horizontal axes represent time in units of $\eta = \eta_0$ iterations (meaning each time unit corresponds to r iterations of a run with $\eta = \eta_0 / r$). Notice that the drift between runs with different step sizes is minor compared to the distance traveled. For further implementation details, and results of similar experiments on convolutional neural networks, see Appendix H.

(see, *e.g.*, Su et al. (2014); Wibisono et al. (2016); Wilson et al. (2016); Raginsky et al. (2017); Scieur et al. (2017); Li et al. (2017); Shi et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2018); Franca et al. (2018); Orvieto and Lucchi (2019); Merkulov and Oseledets (2020); Barrett and Dherin (2021); Kunin et al. (2021); Smith et al. (2021)). The literature includes works which, similarly to the current paper, provide formal results concerning the accumulated (non-local) discrepancy between continuous and discrete optimization (*cf.* Scieur et al. (2017); Orvieto and Lucchi (2019)). However, such works typically focus on simple objective functions (for example convex or quadratic), whereas we center on (non-convex and non-smooth) training losses of deep neural networks. Several recent works (*e.g.* Barrett and Dherin (2021); Kunin et al. (2021); Cohen et al. (2021)) also considered continuous *vs.* discrete optimization of deep neural networks, but they did not provide formal results concerning the accumulated discrepancy. We are not aware of any study (prior to the current) formally quantifying the accumulated discrepancy between continuous and discrete optimization of deep neural networks.

With regards to the convergence guarantee we obtain in Section 5 (via translation of gradient flow analysis to gradient descent) — Theorem 15 and Corollary 18 — relevant results are those that establish efficient convergence[3] to global minimum for a conventional (discrete) gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network. Existing results meeting this criterion either: *(i)* apply to neural networks (linear or non-linear) whose size depends on the data

(*i.e.* is not data-independent[2]), predominantly in an impractical fashion (*cf.* Zou et al. (2018); Du et al. (2019); Allen-Zhu et al. (2019); E et al. (2019); Zou and Gu (2019); Noy et al. (2021)); or *(ii)* apply to linear neural networks of fixed (data-independent) size, similarly to our guarantee. Results of type *(ii)* often treat the residual setting, which boils down to (possibly scaled) identity initialization, perhaps with input and/or output layers initialized differently (see for example Bartlett et al. (2018); Wu et al. (2019); Zou et al. (2020)). Exceptions include Arora et al. (2019a), Du and Hu (2019) and Hu et al. (2020). Arora et al. (2019a) allows for random balanced initialization, as we do. Its results account for networks with multi-dimensional output, and require a number of iterates polynomial in network depth. Our guarantee on the other hand is limited to networks with one-dimensional output, and calls for a number of iterates scaling exponentially with network depth. However, while Arora et al. (2019a) demands that initialization be sufficiently close to global minimum, thereby excluding the possibility of saddle points being encountered, our guarantee holds *almost surely* (*i.e.* with probability one) under random (data-independent) near-zero initialization. The fact that we account for evasion of saddle points (in particular that at the origin, which is non-strict[18] when network depth is three or more) may be the source of the gap in number of iterates — see Remark 17. As for the results of Du and Hu (2019) and Hu et al. (2020), these also hold with high probability under random initialization, but they require network size to grow towards infinity in order for the probability to approach one.

8. Conclusion

8.1. Summary

The extent to which gradient flow represents gradient descent is an open question in the theory of deep learning. Appealing to the literature on numerical analysis, we invoked a fundamental theorem scarcely used in machine learning contexts (Section 2), and found that in general, the larger (less negative or more positive) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian is around gradient flow trajectories, the better the match between gradient flow and gradient descent is guaranteed to be[1] (Section 3). We then analyzed trajectories of gradient flow over deep neural networks (fully connected as well as convolutional) with homogeneous activations (*e.g.* linear, rectified linear or leaky rectified linear), and showed that the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian along them is far greater than in arbitrary points in space, particularly towards convergence (Section 4). This allowed us to translate an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks into a convergence result for gradient descent, which to our knowledge forms the first guarantee of random (data-independent[2]) near-zero initialization *almost surely* leading a conventional gradient-based algorithm optimizing a deep (three or more layer) neural network of fixed (data-independent) size to efficiently convergence[3] to global minimum (Section 5). Experiments complemented our theory, suggesting that over simple deep neural networks, gradient descent with conventional step size is indeed close to the continuous limit, *i.e.* to gradient flow (Section 6).

8.2. Discussion

Our work puts forth a potential explanation to a puzzling phenomenon in deep learning, namely, the effect of weight decay (L_2 regularization). While traditionally viewed as a regularizer, it is

18. A saddle point is said to be non-strict if its Hessian has no negative eigenvalues. Saddle points that are non-strict are generally regarded as more difficult to evade — *cf.* Arora et al. (2019a).

known (*cf.* Krizhevsky et al. (2012)) that in deep learning, weight decay can assist in minimizing the training loss. In light of our findings, a possible reason for this is that weight decay translates to adding a positive constant to Hessian eigenvalues, thereby bringing gradient descent closer to gradient flow, which often enjoys favorable convergence properties. Theoretical and/or empirical investigation of this prospect is a potential avenue for future work.

Emerging evidence (*cf.* Li et al. (2019); Lewkowycz et al. (2020); Jastrzebski et al. (2020)) suggests that for (variants of) gradient descent optimizing deep neural networks, large step size is often beneficial in terms of generalization (*i.e.* in terms of test accuracy). While the large step size regime is not necessarily captured by standard (variants of) gradient flow (see Cohen et al. (2021)), recent works (*e.g.* Barrett and Dherin (2021); Kunin et al. (2021); Smith et al. (2021)) argue that it is captured by a certain modified version of (variants of) gradient flow. Formally quantifying the discrepancy between gradient descent with large step size and such modified version of gradient flow is a promising direction for future research.

The demonstration we provided for translation of a gradient flow analysis to gradient descent (Section 5) culminated in a convergence guarantee, but in fact entails much more information. Namely, since the translated gradient flow analysis includes a careful trajectory characterization, not only do we know that gradient descent converges to global minimum (and how fast that happens), but we also have access to information about the trajectory it takes to get there. This allows, for example, shedding light on how saddle points (non-strict ones in particular[18]) are evaded. A nascent belief (*cf.* Arora et al. (2019a,b)) is that understanding the trajectories of gradient descent is key to unraveling mysteries behind optimization and generalization (implicit regularization) in deep learning. The machinery developed in the current paper may contribute to this understanding, by translating results from the vast bodies of literature on continuous dynamical systems.

Acknowledgments

We thank Sanjeev Arora, Noah Golowich, Wei Hu, Michael Lee, Zhiyuan Li, Kaifeng Lyu, Govind Menon and Zsolt Veraszto for helpful discussions. This work was supported by a Google Research Scholar Award, a Google Research Gift, the Yandex Initiative in Machine Learning, the Israel Science Foundation (grant 1780/21), Len Blavatnik and the Blavatnik Family Foundation, and Amnon and Anat Shashua.

References

Madhu S Advani, Andrew M Saxe, and Haim Sompolinsky. High-dimensional dynamics of generalization error in neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 132:428–446, 2020.

Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 2019.

Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, and Elad Hazan. On the optimization of deep networks: Implicit acceleration by overparameterization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 244–253, 2018.

Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, Noah Golowich, and Wei Hu. A convergence analysis of gradient descent for deep linear neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019a.

Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, Wei Hu, and Yuping Luo. Implicit regularization in deep matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 7413–7424, 2019b.

Shahar Azulay, Edward Moroshko, Mor Shpigel Nacson, Blake Woodworth, Nathan Srebro, Amir Globerson, and Daniel Soudry. On the implicit bias of initialization shape: Beyond infinitesimal mirror descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09769*, 2021.

David GT Barrett and Benoit Dherin. Implicit gradient regularization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Peter Bartlett, Dave Helmbold, and Phil Long. Gradient descent with identity initialization efficiently learns positive definite linear transformations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 520–529, 2018.

Jonathan Borwein and Adrian S Lewis. *Convex analysis and nonlinear optimization: theory and examples*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

Lenaic Chizat and Francis Bach. Implicit bias of gradient descent for wide two-layer neural networks trained with the logistic loss. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1305–1338. PMLR, 2020.

Hung-Hsu Chou, Carsten Gieshoff, Johannes Maly, and Holger Rauhut. Gradient descent for deep matrix factorization: Dynamics and implicit bias towards low rank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13772*, 2020.

Frank H Clarke. Generalized gradients and applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 205:247–262, 1975.

Jeremy Cohen, Simran Kaur, Yuanzhi Li, J Zico Kolter, and Ameet Talwalkar. Gradient descent on neural networks typically occurs at the edge of stability. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Damek Davis, Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy, Sham Kakade, and Jason D Lee. Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 20(1):119–154, 2020.

Simon Du and Wei Hu. Width provably matters in optimization for deep linear neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1655–1664. PMLR, 2019.

Simon Du, Jason Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1675–1685. PMLR, 2019.

Simon S Du, Wei Hu, and Jason D Lee. Algorithmic regularization in learning deep homogeneous models: Layers are automatically balanced. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 384–395, 2018.

Weinan E, Chao Ma, Qingcan Wang, and Lei Wu. Analysis of the gradient descent algorithm for a deep neural network model with skip-connections. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05263*, 2019.

Armin Eftekhari. Training linear neural networks: Non-local convergence and complexity results. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2836–2847. PMLR, 2020.

Omer Elkabetz and Nadav Cohen. Continuous vs. discrete optimization of deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06608*, 2021.

Guilherme Franca, Daniel Robinson, and Rene Vidal. Admm and accelerated admm as continuous dynamical systems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1559–1567. PMLR, 2018.

Paul Glendinning. *Stability, instability and chaos: an introduction to the theory of nonlinear differential equations*. Cambridge university press, 1994.

Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.

Christopher P Grant. Theory of ordinary differential equations. *Brigham Young University*, 2014.

Suriya Gunasekar, Jason D Lee, Daniel Soudry, and Nati Srebro. Implicit bias of gradient descent on linear convolutional networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31:9461–9471, 2018.

Ernst Hairer, Syvert P Nørsett, and Gerhard Wanner. Solving ordinary differential equations i. nonstiff problems, volume 8 of, 1993.

Wei Hu, Lechao Xiao, and Jeffrey Pennington. Provable benefit of orthogonal initialization in optimizing deep linear networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Maciej Szymczak, Stanislav Fort, Devansh Arpit, Jacek Tabor, Kyunghyun Cho, and Krzysztof Geras. The break-even point on optimization trajectories of deep neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

Ziwei Ji and Matus Telgarsky. Gradient descent aligns the layers of deep linear networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.

Ziwei Ji and Matus Telgarsky. Directional convergence and alignment in deep learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25:1097–1105, 2012.

Daniel Kunin, Javier Sagastuy-Brena, Surya Ganguli, Daniel LK Yamins, and Hidenori Tanaka. Neural mechanics: Symmetry and broken conservation laws in deep learning dynamics. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Andrew K Lampinen and Surya Ganguli. An analytic theory of generalization dynamics and transfer learning in deep linear networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.

Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. *http://yann. lecun. com/exdb/mnist/*, 1998.

Aitor Lewkowycz, Yasaman Bahri, Ethan Dyer, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Guy Gur-Ari. The large learning rate phase of deep learning: the catapult mechanism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02218*, 2020.

Qianxiao Li, Cheng Tai, and E Weinan. Stochastic modified equations and adaptive stochastic gradient algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2101–2110. PMLR, 2017.

Yuanzhi Li, Colin Wei, and Tengyu Ma. Towards explaining the regularization effect of initial large learning rate in training neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.

Kaifeng Lyu and Jian Li. Gradient descent maximizes the margin of homogeneous neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.

Daniil Merkulov and Ivan Oseledets. Stochastic gradient algorithms from ode splitting perspective. In *International Conference on Learning Representations, Workshop on Integration of Deep Neural Models and Differential Equations*, 2020.

Leon Mirsky. A trace inequality of john von neumann. *Monatshefte für mathematik*, 79(4):303–306, 1975.

Asaf Noy, Yi Xu, Yonathan Aflalo, Lihi Zelnik-Manor, and Rong Jin. A convergence theory towards practical over-parameterized deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04243*, 2021.

Antonio Orvieto and Aurelien Lucchi. Shadowing properties of optimization algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:12692–12703, 2019.

Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. In *NIPS-W*, 2017.

Maxim Raginsky, Alexander Rakhlin, and Matus Telgarsky. Non-convex learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics: a nonasymptotic analysis. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1674–1703. PMLR, 2017.

Noam Razin and Nadav Cohen. Implicit regularization in deep learning may not be explainable by norms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

Noam Razin, Asaf Maman, and Nadav Cohen. Implicit regularization in tensor factorization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021.

Halsey Lawrence Royden and Patrick Fitzpatrick. *Real analysis*, volume 32. Macmillan New York, 1988.

Andrew M Saxe, James L McClelland, and Surya Ganguli. Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.

Damien Scieur, Vincent Roulet, Francis Bach, and Alexandre d'Aspremont. Integration methods and accelerated optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06751*, 2017.

Ohad Shamir. Exponential convergence time of gradient descent for one-dimensional deep linear neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2691–2713. PMLR, 2019.

Bin Shi, Simon S Du, Michael I Jordan, and Weijie J Su. Understanding the acceleration phenomenon via high-resolution differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08907*, 2018.

Samuel L Smith, Benoit Dherin, David GT Barrett, and Soham De. On the origin of implicit regularization in stochastic gradient descent. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Weijie Su, Stephen Boyd, and Emmanuel J Candès. A differential equation for modeling nesterov's accelerated gradient method: theory and insights. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2510–2518, 2014.

Endre Süli and David F Mayers. *An introduction to numerical analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2003.

Flemming Topsøe. Some bounds for the logarithmic function. *RGMIA Res. Rep. Collection*, 7(2):1–20, 2004.

Gal Vardi and Ohad Shamir. Implicit regularization in relu networks with the square loss. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05156*, 2020.

Andre Wibisono, Ashia C Wilson, and Michael I Jordan. A variational perspective on accelerated methods in optimization. *proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(47):E7351–E7358, 2016.

Ashia C Wilson, Benjamin Recht, and Michael I Jordan. A lyapunov analysis of momentum methods in optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02635*, 2016.

Blake Woodworth, Suriya Gunasekar, Jason D Lee, Edward Moroshko, Pedro Savarese, Itay Golan, Daniel Soudry, and Nathan Srebro. Kernel and rich regimes in overparametrized models. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3635–3673. PMLR, 2020.

Lei Wu, Qingcan Wang, and Chao Ma. Global convergence of gradient descent for deep linear residual networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 13389–13398, 2019.

Chulhee Yun, Shankar Krishnan, and Hossein Mobahi. A unifying view on implicit bias in training linear neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Jingzhao Zhang, Aryan Mokhtari, Suvrit Sra, and Ali Jadbabaie. Direct runge-kutta discretization achieves acceleration. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3904–3913, 2018.

Difan Zou and Quanquan Gu. An improved analysis of training over-parameterized deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2019.

Difan Zou, Yuan Cao, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic gradient descent optimizes over-parameterized deep relu networks. arxiv e-prints, art. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08888*, 2018.

Difan Zou, Philip M Long, and Quanquan Gu. On the global convergence of training deep linear resnets. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

Appendix A. Infinite Time for Gradient Flow Over Smooth Objective

By Theorem 1, gradient flow over a twice continuously differentiable objective function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ (Equation (5)) admits a unique solution $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, where either: *(i)* $t_e = \infty$; or *(ii)* $t_e < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$. Lemma 19 below shows that if $f(\cdot)$ is β-smooth then necessarily $t_e = \infty$.

Lemma 19 *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be twice continuously differentiable and β-smooth with $\beta > 0$ (meaning $\|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})\|_{spectral} \leq \beta$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$). Then, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a solution $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ to gradient flow over $f(\cdot)$ initialized at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ (Equation (5)).*

Proof In light of Theorem 1, there exists a solution (to gradient flow over $f(\cdot)$ initialized at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$) $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, where either: *(i)* $t_e = \infty$; or *(ii)* $t_e < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$. It suffices to prove that condition *(ii)* is not satisfied. Assume by way of contradiction that it is. Then, there exists $t_0 \in [0, t_e)$ such that for every $t \in [t_0, t_e)$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 \neq 0$ and we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 &= \big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)/\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2\big)^\top \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) \\
&= \big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)/\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2\big)^\top \big(-\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\big) \\
&\leq \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\|_2 \\
&= \|\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) + \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \beta\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from the chain rule, the second holds since $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ is a solution to gradient flow over $f(\cdot)$, the third is an application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the fourth is trivial, the fifth results from the triangle inequality, and the sixth is due to β-smoothness of $f(\cdot)$. Dividing by the right-hand side above and integrating between t_0 and some $t' \in [t_0, t_e)$, we obtain:

$$\beta^{-1} \ln\big(\|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \beta\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2\big) - \beta^{-1} \ln\big(\|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \beta\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_0)\|_2\big) \leq t' - t_0 \,,$$

which in turn implies:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2 \leq \beta^{-1}\Big(\big(\|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \beta\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_0)\|_2\big) \exp\big(\beta(t' - t_0)\big) - \|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2\Big) \,.$$

We conclude that for any $t' \in [t_0, t_e)$, it holds that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2 \leq c$, where:

$$c := \beta^{-1}\Big(\big(\|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2 + \beta\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_0)\|_2\big) \exp\big(\beta(t_e - t_0)\big) - \|\nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_2\Big) < \infty \,.$$

This of course contradicts $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$, affirming that condition *(ii)* above is false. ■

Appendix B. Worst Case Scenario

Theorem 3 in Section 3 established that if gradient descent (Equation (6)) is applied with step size η meeting a certain upper bound (Equation (7)), then its trajectory will ϵ-approximate that of gradient flow (Equation (5)) up to a given time $\tilde{t}$. The upper bound on η decays exponentially with the integral of $m(\cdot)$ along the gradient flow trajectory up to time $\tilde{t}$, where $m(\cdot)$ corresponds to minus

the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian. Replacing $m(\cdot)$ by a constant m equal to minus the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian *across the entire space* results in a coarse bound, which for a non-convex objective ($m > 0$) scales as $e^{-m\tilde{t}}$ — see Corollary 4. The current appendix shows that in the worst case, such exponential scaling is necessary. That is, there exist objective functions and initializations with which the location of gradient flow at time $\tilde{t}$ will not be ϵ-approximated by the trajectory of gradient descent (at any iteration) unless the step size of gradient descent is $\mathcal{O}(e^{-m\tilde{t}})$. We prove this via an example, whose crux is that the gradient flow trajectories it entails traverse through regions where Hessian eigenvalues coincide with the minimal one across space.

Let $a > 0$, $b \geq 3$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Define the "cut points" $z_c := be^{30} + 1$ and $\bar{z}_c := b + 1$, and the "transition width" $\bar{\rho} := \min\{e^{-12}/2, \epsilon/2b\}$. Consider the functions $\varphi, \bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by:

$$\varphi(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}a(z_c+1)^2 - \frac{5}{12}a - \frac{1}{2}az_c & , z = 0 \\ \varphi(0) - \frac{1}{2}az^2 & , z \in (0, z_c) \\ \varphi(0) - \frac{1}{2}az^2 + a\left(\frac{2}{3}+z_c\right)(z-z_c)^3 - a\left(\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{2}z_c\right)(z-z_c)^4 & , z \in [z_c, z_c+1] \\ 0 & , z \in (z_c+1, \infty) \\ \varphi(|z|) & , z \in (-\infty, 0) \end{cases} , \quad (25)$$

$$\bar{\varphi}(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}a(\bar{z}_c+1)^2 + \frac{1}{12}a - \frac{1}{2}a\bar{z}_c - a\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - \frac{7}{48}\bar{\rho}^2\right) & , z = \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - 1 \\ \bar{\varphi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right) - \frac{1}{4}a\left(z - \left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right)\right)^2 & , z \in \left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1, 1-\bar{\rho}\right) \\ \bar{\varphi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right) - \frac{1}{2}a + a\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - \frac{7}{48}\bar{\rho}^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}az^2 - \frac{1}{12}a\bar{\rho}^{-1}(z-1)^3 & , z \in [1-\bar{\rho}, 1] \\ \bar{\varphi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right) - \frac{1}{2}a + a\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - \frac{7}{48}\bar{\rho}^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}az^2 & , z \in (1, \bar{z}_c) \\ \bar{\varphi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right) - \frac{1}{2}a + a\left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - \frac{7}{48}\bar{\rho}^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}az^2 & \\ \qquad + a\left(\frac{2}{3}+\bar{z}_c\right)(z-\bar{z}_c)^3 - a\left(\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\bar{z}_c\right)(z-\bar{z}_c)^4 & , z \in [\bar{z}_c, \bar{z}_c+1] \\ 0 & , z \in (\bar{z}_c+1, \infty) \\ \bar{\varphi}\left(\left|z - \left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right)\right| + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho} - 1\right) & , z \in \left(-\infty, \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}-1\right) \end{cases} . \quad (26)$$

Both $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ are twice continuously differentiable, non-negative and smooth,[19] with minimal curvature (second derivative) equal to $-a$. $\varphi(\cdot)$ comprises three parts — *(i)* constant zero over $(-\infty, -z_c - 1)$; *(ii)* quadratic with curvature $-a$ over $(-z_c, z_c)$; and *(iii)* constant zero over $(z_c + 1, \infty)$ — with twice continuously differentiable transitions in-between. $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ consists of five parts — *(i)* constant zero over $(-\infty, -\bar{z}_c - 3 + \bar{\rho})$; *(ii)* quadratic with curvature $-a$ over $(-\bar{z}_c - 2 + \bar{\rho}, -3 + \bar{\rho})$; *(iii)* quadratic with curvature $-a/2$ over $(-3 + 2\bar{\rho}, 1 - \bar{\rho})$; *(iv)* quadratic with curvature $-a$ over $(1, \bar{z}_c)$; and *(v)* constant zero over $(\bar{z}_c + 1, \infty)$ — also joined by twice continuously differentiable transitions. Illustrations of $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ are presented in Figure 2.

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$, and consider the objective function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by:

$$f(\mathbf{q}) = \varphi(q_1) + \bar{\varphi}(q_2) + 6aq_3^2 \,, \quad (27)$$

where q_1, q_2 and q_3 stand for the first, second and third coordinates (respectively) of $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. $f(\cdot)$ meets the conditions of Corollary 4 — it is twice continuously differentiable, non-negative and smooth.[20] The minimal eigenvalue of its Hessian across space (*i.e.* $\inf_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$,

19. Their second derivatives are bounded.
20. There exists $\beta > 0$ such that $\|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})\|_{spectral} \leq \beta$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.




Figure 2: Illustrations of the functions $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ defined in Equations (25) and (26) respectively.

where $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ represents the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ is $-a$, meaning the constant $m := -\inf_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ is equal to a. Building on the fact that in the region $(0, z_c)\times(1, \bar{z}_c)\times \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$ the Hessian has eigenvalues coinciding with the minimum (*i.e.* equal to $-a$), Proposition 20 below establishes the sought-after result — over $f(\cdot)$, there exist gradient flow trajectories whose ϵ-approximation at a given time $\tilde{t}$ requires gradient descent to have step size $\mathcal{O}(e^{-m\tilde{t}})$.

Proposition 20 *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s = (\theta_{s,1}, \theta_{s,2}, \ldots, \theta_{s,d}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that $\theta_{s,1} \in (0.5, 1)$, $\theta_{s,2} \in (e^{-12}/2 - 1, e^{-12} - 1)$ and $\theta_{s,3} > 2$. In the above context (in particular with the objective function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by Equation (27), for which $m := -\inf_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})) = a$), denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ the trajectory of gradient flow initialized at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ (solution to Equation (5)), and by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \ldots$ the iterates of gradient descent with step size $\eta > 0$ (Equation (6)) emanating from the same point (i.e. with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_s$). Then, for any time $\tilde{t} \in \big[\frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\theta_{s,2}-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2}{1-\bar{\rho}}\big)\,,\ \frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\theta_{s,2}-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b)\big]$,[21] if $\eta \geq \frac{10^{14}}{a} e^{-a\tilde{t}}\epsilon$, it holds that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 > \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$.*[22]

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.14) Since $f(\cdot)$ is additively separable (can be expressed as a sum of terms, each depending on a single input variable), the dynamics in $\mathbb{R}^d$ induced by gradient flow and gradient descent can be analyzed separately for different coordinates. Restricting our attention to the first two coordinates, we observe that gradient flow and gradient descent initially traverse through an "anisotropic" region, where curvature is $-a$ in the first coordinate and $-a/2$ in the second, and from there move to an "isotropic" region, where curvature is $-a$ in both the first and second coordinates. In the isotropic region, if gradient descent is placed along a gradient flow trajectory it will continue down the same path, but otherwise, if there is any discrepancy between gradient descent and gradient flow, this discrepancy will grow exponentially with time, namely will scale as e^{at}. Carefully characterizing the dynamics along the anisotropic region reveals that upon entrance to the isotropic one, there is indeed a discrepancy between gradient descent and gradient flow, the magnitude of which is proportional to η (step size of gradient descent). Since this magnitude scales as e^{at} thereafter, it will exceed ϵ at time $\tilde{t}$ if $\eta \notin \mathcal{O}(e^{-a\tilde{t}}\epsilon)$, which is what we set out to prove. The above analysis assumes η is no greater than a certain constant. However, larger values for η lead to divergence in the third coordinate (due to the term $6aq_3^2$ in the definition of $f(\cdot)$ — Equation (27)), thus these are accounted for as well (they preclude the possibility of gradient descent ϵ-approximating gradient flow at time $\tilde{t}$). ■

21. Note that the upper bound on $\tilde{t}$ can be made arbitrarily large via suitable (sufficiently large) choice of b.
22. Since $f(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable and smooth, $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})$ necessarily exists (see Lemma 19 in Appendix A).

Appendix C. Analysis for Convolutional Architectures

In this appendix we provide our analysis for convolutional architectures, outlined in Subsection 4.2.

Suppose we modify the fully connected neural network defined in Equation (8) (and surrounding text) by converting each learned weight matrix $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}}$, $j = 1,2,\ldots,n$, into a function $W_j : \mathbb{R}^{d'_j} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}}$, with $d'_j \in \mathbb{N}$, that intakes a learned weight vector $\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_j}$, and returns a matrix where each element is either fixed at zero or connected to a predetermined coordinate of $\mathbf{w}_j$, with no repetition of coordinates within the same row (that is, each row of $W_j(\cdot)$ realizes a function of the form $\mathbf{w}_j \mapsto P\mathbf{w}_j$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j-1},d'_j}$ is a matrix in which no row or column includes more than a single non-zero element, and all non-zero elements are equal to one). This allows imposing various weight sharing and sparsity patterns on the layers of the model, in particular ones giving rise to convolutional neural networks. The resulting input-output mapping has the form:

$$h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \ , \ h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = W_n(\mathbf{w}_n)\,\sigma\big(W_{n\text{-}1}(\mathbf{w}_{n\text{-}1})\,\sigma\big(W_{n\text{-}2}(\mathbf{w}_{n\text{-}2})\,\cdots\,\sigma\big(W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}\big)\big)\cdots\big)\,, \quad (28)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d := \sum_{j=1}^n d'_j$, is the concatenation of the weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$,[23] and as before, $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a predetermined activation function (operating element-wise when applied to a vector) that is (positively) homogeneous, meaning there exist $\alpha, \bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sigma(z) = \alpha \max\{z,0\} - \bar{\alpha}\max\{-z,0\}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$.[24]

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the training loss defined by applying Equation (9) (and surrounding text) to the above neural network (*i.e.* with $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ given by Equation (28)). In line with our analysis of fully connected architectures (Subsection 4.1), we will show that although the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (Hessian of training loss) — denoted $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ — can in general be arbitrarily negative, along trajectories of gradient flow (which emanate from near-zero initialization) it is no less than moderately negative, approaching non-negativity towards convergence. In light of Section 3, this suggests that over deep convolutional neural networks, gradient flow may lend itself to approximation by gradient descent — a prospect we empirically corroborate in Subappendix H.1.

Proposition 26 in Appendix D establishes that for almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist diagonal matrices $D'_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_j}$, $i = 1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|$, $j = 1,2,\ldots,n-1$, with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}\}$, such that $f(\cdot)$ coincides with the function

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \mapsto \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\big(W_n(\mathbf{w}_n)D'_{i,n\text{-}1}W_{n\text{-}1}(\mathbf{w}_{n\text{-}1})D'_{i,n\text{-}2}W_{n\text{-}2}(\mathbf{w}_{n\text{-}2})\cdots D'_{i,1}W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) \quad (29)$$

on an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, that is closed under positive rescaling of weight vectors (*i.e.* under $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n) \mapsto (c_1\mathbf{w}_1, c_2\mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, c_n\mathbf{w}_n)$ with $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n > 0$). Analogously to the case of fully connected architectures with non-linear activation (Subsubsection 4.1.2), we will focus on (open) regions of the form $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, where $f(\cdot)$ is given by Equation (29), and in particular is twice continuously differentiable. On such regions the analysis of Section 3 applies, and since they constitute the entire weight space but a negligible (closed and zero measure) set, they can facilitate a "piecewise characterization" of the discrepancy between gradient flow and gradient descent.[25]

Lemma 21 below expresses $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$.

23. The exact order by which $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$ are concatenated is insignificant for our purposes — all that matters is that the same order be used throughout.
24. Similarly to our analysis of fully connected architectures (Subsection 4.1), that of convolutional architectures (current appendix) readily extends to the case of different (homogeneous) activation functions at different hidden layers.
25. Such "piecewise characterization" is holistic when the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is linear, *i.e.* $\sigma(z) = z$ (or more generally, $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$). Indeed, in this case $f(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable throughout, and we may take $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 21 *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. For any $i \in \{1,2,...,|\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $j, j' \in \{1,2,...,n\}$ define $(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j':j}$ to be the matrix $D'_{i,j'}W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})D'_{i,j'\text{-}1}W_{j'\text{-}1}(\mathbf{w}_{j'\text{-}1}) \cdots D'_{i,j}W_j(\mathbf{w}_j)$ (where by convention $D'_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_n}$ stands for identity) if $j \leq j'$, and an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. For $i \in \{1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|\}$ let $\nabla\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\nabla^2\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_n}$ be the gradient and Hessian (respectively) of the loss $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ with respect to its first argument. Then, regarding Hessians as quadratic forms (see examples in Lemma 5), it holds that:*

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \Delta\mathbf{w}_n] = \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*)\big)_{n:j+1}D'_{i,j}W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j)\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*)\big)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\right] + \\ \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i^\top\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*)\big)_{n:j'+1}D'_{i,j'}W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'})\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*)\big)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1}\cdot \\ D'_{i,j}W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j)\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*)\big)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\,.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.15) The proof is similar to those of Lemmas 5 and 9. Namely, it expands the function in Equation (29) and then extracts second order terms. ■

The following proposition employs Lemma 21 to show that (under mild conditions) there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ is arbitrarily negative.

Proposition 22 *Assume that:* (i) *the network is deep ($n \geq 3$); and* (ii) *the network, loss function $\ell(\cdot)$ and training set $\mathcal{S}$ are non-degenerate, in the sense that there exists a weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$, where $\nabla\ell(\cdot)$ stands for the gradient of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument, and $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ is the input-output mapping realized by the network (Equation (28)).*[26] *Then, it holds that $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = -\infty$.*

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.16) The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 10. Specifically, it establishes that there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ for which $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$, and then makes use of Lemma 21 to show that fixing $\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \Delta\mathbf{w}_n$ to certain values, and positively rescaling $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$ in a certain way, leads $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \Delta\mathbf{w}_n]$ to become arbitrarily negative. ■

Relying on Lemma 21, Lemma 23 below provides a lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$.

Lemma 23 *With the notations of Lemma 21, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$:*[12]

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1}\frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \cdot \\ \prod_{j=1}^{n}\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq\{1,2,\ldots,n\}\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}}\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2\,,\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

26. Assumptions *(i)* and *(ii)* are both necessary, in the sense that removing any of them (without imposing further assumptions) renders the proposition false — see Claim 29 in Appendix E. Assumption *(ii)* in particular is extremely mild, *e.g.* if $\ell(\cdot)$ is the square loss (*i.e.* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\ell(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2$), the slightest change in a single label ($\mathbf{y}_i$) corresponding to a non-zero prediction ($h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq \mathbf{0}$) can ensure the inequality.

where $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$, $j=1,2,...,n$, *denotes the operator norm of* $W_j(\cdot)$ *induced by the Frobenius norm.*[27]

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.17) The proof mirrors those of Lemmas 7 and 11 — it establishes that the right-hand side of Equation (30) in Lemma 21 is lower bounded by $c\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2$, with c being the expression on the right-hand side of Equation (31). ■

The lower bound in Equation (31) is highly sensitive to the scales of the individual weight vectors. Specifically, assuming the network is deep ($n \geq 3$) and is non-degenerate, in the sense that all of its layers can realize non-zero mappings (that is, the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is not identically zero, *i.e.* α and $\bar{\alpha}$ are not both equal to zero, and for all $j \in \{1,2,...,n\}$, $W_j(\cdot)$ is not the zero mapping, *i.e.* $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} > 0$), if $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ does not perfectly fit all non-zero training inputs (meaning there exists $i \in \{1,2,...,|\mathcal{S}|\}$ for which $\nabla\ell_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \mathbf{0}$), and if at least $n-2$ of its weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n$ are non-zero, then it is possible to rescale each $\mathbf{w}_j$ by $c_j > 0$, with $\prod_{j=1}^{n} c_j = 1$, such that the lower bound in Equation (31) becomes arbitrarily negative[28] despite the input-output mapping $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ (and thus the training loss value $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) remaining unchanged. Nevertheless, as with fully connected architectures (see Subsection 4.1), gradient flow over convolutional architectures (*i.e.* over neural networks as defined in Equation (28) and surrounding text) initialized near zero maintains balance between weight vectors — *cf.* Du et al. (2018) — and so along its trajectories the lower bound in Equation (31) assumes a tighter form. This is formalized in Proposition 24 below.

Proposition 24 *If* $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ *resides on a trajectory of gradient flow (over* $f(\cdot)$*)*[15] *initialized at some point* $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$*, with* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ *for some* $\epsilon > 0$*, then, using the notations of Lemmas 21 and 23:*

$$\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|,|\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1}\frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n}\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}\Big(\min_{j\in\{1,2,...,n\}}\|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2+\epsilon\Big)^{n-2}. \tag{32}$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.18) By the analysis of Du et al. (2018), for any $j, j' \in \{1,2,...,n\}$, the quantity $\|\mathbf{w}_{j'}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2$ is invariant (constant) along a gradient flow trajectory. This implies that along a trajectory emanating from a point with (Euclidean) norm $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, it holds that $\|\mathbf{w}_{j'}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 \in \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ for all $j, j' \in \{1,2,...,n\}$, which in turn implies $\|\mathbf{w}_{j'}\|_2 \leq \min_{j\in\{1,2,...,n\}}\|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ for all $j' \in \{1,2,...,n\}$. Plugging this into Equation (31) yields the desired result (Equation (32)). ■

Assume the network is deep ($n \geq 3$) and non-degenerate (α and $\bar{\alpha}$ are not both equal to zero, and $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} > 0$ for all $j \in \{1,2,...,n\}$), and consider a trajectory of gradient flow (over $f(\cdot)$) emanating from near-zero initialization. For every point on the trajectory, Proposition 24 may be applied with small ϵ, leading the lower bound in Equation (32) to depend primarily on the *minimal* size (Euclidean norm) of a weight vector $\mathbf{w}_j$, and on $\nabla\ell_1, \nabla\ell_2, ..., \nabla\ell_{|\mathcal{S}|}$ — gradients of the loss function with respect to the predictions over the training set. In the course of optimization, $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n$ are initially small, and if a perfect fit of the training set is ultimately achieved, $\nabla\ell_1, \nabla\ell_2, ..., \nabla\ell_{|\mathcal{S}|}$

27. From the structure of $W_j(\cdot)$ (see beginning of this appendix) it follows that $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$ is equal to square root of the maximal number of elements in $W_j(\mathbf{w}_j)$ connected to the same coordinate of $\mathbf{w}_j$.
28. The bound remains applicable since $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is closed under positive rescaling of weight vectors.

will converge to zero. Therefore, if not *all* weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$ become large during optimization, the lower bound on $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ in Equation (32) will only be moderately negative before approaching non-negativity (if and) as the trajectory converges to a perfect fit. In light of Section 3, this suggests that the gradient flow trajectory may lend itself to approximation by gradient descent. For a case of fully connected neural networks with linear activation (analyzed in Subsubsection 4.1.1), such prospect is theoretically verified in Section 5. For convolutional architectures (subject of the current appendix) we provide empirical corroboration in Subappendix H.1, deferring to future work a complete theoretical affirmation.

Appendix D. Regions of Differentiability

In this appendix we prove that for fully connected and convolutional architectures with non-linear activation, there exist regions of differentiability $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ as described in Subsubsection 4.1.2 and Appendix C respectively.

Proposition 25 (regions of differentiability for fully connected architectures) *Consider a fully connected neural network as defined in Equation (8) (and surrounding text), and assume that its (homogeneous) activation function is non-linear, i.e. $\sigma(z) = \alpha \max\{z, 0\} - \bar{\alpha} \max\{-z, 0\}$ for some $\alpha, \bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}$. Then, for almost every (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist diagonal matrices $D'_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_j}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, such that the training loss $f(\cdot)$ (Equation (9)) coincides with the function defined in Equation (15) on an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, that is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices (i.e. under $(W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n) \mapsto (c_1 W_1, c_2 W_2, \ldots, c_n W_n)$ with $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n > 0$).*

Proof If for $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist diagonal matrices $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ and an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ as above, then we refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ as an *admissible* weight setting, to $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ as its *activation matrices*, and to $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ as its *differentiability region*.[29]

Without loss of generality, we may assume $|\mathcal{S}| = 1$, *i.e.* that the training set comprises a single labeled input $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \times \mathcal{Y}$, meaning the training loss takes the form $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \ell(h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), y)$. To see this, assume the sought-after result holds for a single labeled input, and suppose $|\mathcal{S}| > 1$. We may then apply the result separately for each labeled input $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$, and obtain, for every admissible $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, activation matrices $(D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and a differentiability region $\mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Since the weight settings not admissible for a certain labeled input $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ form a set of zero (Lebesgue) measure, those not admissible for any of the $|\mathcal{S}|$ labeled inputs also constitute a zero measure set. That is, almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is jointly admissible for all $\big((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\big)_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$. Given such $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, consider the activation matrices and differentiability regions obtained for the different labeled inputs — $(D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$. Defining $D'_{i,j} := D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_j$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$, and $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} := \cap_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, we have that $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is admissible for $\mathcal{S}$, with activation matrices $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ and differentiability region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. The sought-after result thus holds for $\mathcal{S}$.

In light of the above, we assume hereafter that $\mathcal{S} = \big((\mathbf{x}, y)\big)$. Recursively define the functions $\mathbf{f}^{(j)} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$:

$$\mathbf{f}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \mathbf{x} \quad , \quad \mathbf{f}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma\big(W_j \mathbf{f}^{(j-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\big) \ \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1 \,.$$

29. Note that given an admissible weight setting, activation matrices and differentiability region are not necessarily determined uniquely.

We will prove by induction that given $j' \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$, for almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist diagonal matrices $D'_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j, d_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, j'$, with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, such that $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ meets the following conditions on an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, that is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices:

(i) $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ coincides with the function $\boldsymbol{\theta} \mapsto D'_{j'} W_{j'} D'_{j'-1} W_{j'-1} \cdots D'_1 W_1 \mathbf{x}$; and

(ii) each entry of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ is either nowhere zero or identically zero.

Continuing the terminology defined earlier, in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$, $j' = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, we refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, $(D'_j)_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ satisfying the above as *admissible*, *activation matrices* and *differentiability region*, respectively. Note that the training loss $f(\cdot)$ can be expressed as $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \ell(W_n \mathbf{f}^{(n-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), y)$, and therefore proving the inductive hypothesis for $j' = n-1$ yields the desired result. The base case for the induction ($j' = 0$) is trivial, so all that remains is to establish the induction step.

Given $j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$, assume that the inductive hypothesis holds for $j'-1$, and in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$, let $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ be an admissible weight setting, with corresponding activation matrices $(D'_j)_{j=1}^{j'-1}$ and differentiability region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. We refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ as *nullifying* if $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}') = \mathbf{0}$, which implies $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. In this case $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is clearly admissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ (as activation matrices we may take $(D'_j)_{j=1}^{j'-1}$ along with any diagonal matrix $D'_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}, d_{j'}}$ whose diagonal elements are in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, and as differentiability region we can simply use $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$). Consider now the case where $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is non-nullifying, *i.e.* where $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}') \neq \mathbf{0}$. We refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ as *regular* if all entries of $W'_{j'} \mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ are non-zero, with $W'_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}, d_{j'-1}}$ denoting the value of weight matrix j' held in $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$. If $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is regular then it is admissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$. To see this, note that a valid choice of activation matrices is $(D'_j)_{j=1}^{j'-1}$ along with the diagonal matrix $D'_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}, d_{j'}}$ whose diagonal elements corresponding to positive entries of $W'_{j'} \mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ hold α, and those corresponding to negative entries hold $\bar{\alpha}$. From continuity, and homogeneity with slopes α and $\bar{\alpha}$ of the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$, there exists an open neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ (subset of $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$) on which conditions *(i)* and *(ii)* hold. Extending this neighborhood to include, for each of its weight settings $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, all positive rescalings of weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$, yields a valid differentiability region for $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$, thereby confirming admissibility.

We conclude the proof by showing that almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is admissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$. Per the above, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ does not meet this condition then it must either be inadmissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$, or be non-nullifying and irregular. By our inductive hypothesis, weight settings inadmissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$ form a set of measure zero, so it suffices to show that the collection of non-nullifying and irregular weight settings, denoted $\mathcal{C}$, is also of measure zero. Note that whether a weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is nullifying (*i.e.* $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$) or not depends only on the weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_{j'-1}$, and given these matrices, whether it is regular (*i.e.* all entries of $W'_{j'} \mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ are non-zero) or not depends only on $W_{j'}$. We may thus apply Fubini's Theorem (*cf.* Royden and Fitzpatrick (1988)), and compute the measure of $\mathcal{C}$ by integrating over non-nullifying configurations of $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_{j'-1}$, where for each, the measure of values for $W_{j'}, W_{j'+1}, \ldots, W_n$ leading to irregularity is integrated. The latter measure is zero, since for any $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'-1}}$, the set $\left\{W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}, d_{j'-1}} : \text{there exists a coordinate of } W\mathbf{q} \text{ equal to zero}\right\}$ has measure zero, thus its Cartesian product with $\mathbb{R}^{d_{j'+1}, d_{j'}} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'+2}, d_{j'+1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_{n-1}}$ is also of measure zero. This implies that $\mathcal{C}$ has measure zero, thereby completing the proof. ■

Proposition 26 (regions of differentiability for convolutional architectures) *Consider a neural network with weight sharing and sparsity as defined in Equation (28) (and surrounding text), and assume that its (homogeneous) activation function is non-linear, i.e.* $\sigma(z) = \alpha\max\{z,0\} - \bar{\alpha}\max\{-z,0\}$ *for some* $\alpha,\bar{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}$, $\alpha\neq\bar{\alpha}$. *Then, for almost every (in the sense of Lebesgue measure)* $\boldsymbol{\theta}'\in\mathbb{R}^d$, *there exist diagonal matrices* $D'_{i,j}\in\mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_j}$, $i=1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|$, $j=1,2,\ldots,n-1$, *with diagonal elements in* $\{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}\}$, *such that the training loss* $f(\cdot)$ *(Equation (9)) coincides with the function defined in Equation (29) on an open region* $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ *containing* $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, *that is closed under positive rescaling of weight vectors (i.e. under* $(\mathbf{w}_1,\mathbf{w}_2,\ldots,\mathbf{w}_n)\mapsto(c_1\mathbf{w}_1,c_2\mathbf{w}_2,\ldots,c_n\mathbf{w}_n)$ *with* $c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_n>0$*).*

Proof The proof begins similarly to that of Proposition 25, and then takes a slightly different (more involved) route. We provide a self-contained presentation, repeating details from the proof of Proposition 25 as needed.

If for $\boldsymbol{\theta}'\in\mathbb{R}^d$ there exist diagonal matrices $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ and an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ as in proposition statement, then we refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ as an *admissible* weight setting, to $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ as its *activation matrices*, and to $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ as its *differentiability region*.[29]

Without loss of generality, we may assume $|\mathcal{S}|=1$, *i.e.* that the training set comprises a single labeled input $(\mathbf{x},y)\in\mathbb{R}^{d_0}\times\mathcal{Y}$, meaning the training loss takes the form $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\ell(h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}),y)$. To see this, assume the sought-after result holds for a single labeled input, and suppose $|\mathcal{S}|>1$. We may then apply the result separately for each labeled input $(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)$, $i=1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|$, and obtain, for every admissible $\boldsymbol{\theta}'\in\mathbb{R}^d$, activation matrices $(D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and a differentiability region $\mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Since the weight settings not admissible for a certain labeled input $(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)$ form a set of zero (Lebesgue) measure, those not admissible for any of the $|\mathcal{S}|$ labeled inputs also constitute a zero measure set. That is, almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}'\in\mathbb{R}^d$ is jointly admissible for all $\big((\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)\big)_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$. Given such $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, consider the activation matrices and differentiability regions obtained for the different labeled inputs — $(D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, $i=1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|$. Defining $D'_{i,j}:=D'^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_j$, $i=1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{S}|$, $j=1,2,\ldots,n-1$, and $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}:=\cap_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\mathcal{D}^{(\mathbf{x}_i,y_i)}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, we have that $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is admissible for $\mathcal{S}$, with activation matrices $(D'_{i,j})_{i,j}$ and differentiability region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. The sought-after result thus holds for $\mathcal{S}$.

In light of the above, we assume hereafter that $\mathcal{S}=\big((\mathbf{x},y)\big)$. Recursively define the functions $\mathbf{f}^{(j)}:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$, $j=0,1,\ldots,n-1$:

$$\mathbf{f}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\equiv\mathbf{x}\quad,\quad\mathbf{f}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\sigma\big(W_j(\mathbf{w}_j)\mathbf{f}^{(j-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\big)\ \text{ for } j=1,2,\ldots,n-1\,.$$

We will prove by induction that given $j'\in\{0,1,\ldots,n-1\}$, for almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}'\in\mathbb{R}^d$, there exist diagonal matrices $D'_j\in\mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_j}$, $j=1,2,\ldots,j'$, with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}\}$, such that $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ meets the following conditions on an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, that is closed under positive rescaling of weight vectors:

(i) $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ coincides with the function $\boldsymbol{\theta}\mapsto D'_{j'}W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})D'_{j'\text{-}1}W_{j'\text{-}1}(\mathbf{w}_{j'\text{-}1})\cdots D'_1W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}$; and

(ii) each entry of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$ is either nowhere zero or identically zero.

Continuing the terminology defined earlier, in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$, $j'=0,1,\ldots,n-1$, we refer to $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, $(D'_j)_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ satisfying the above as *admissible*, *activation matrices* and *differentiability region*, respectively. Note that the training loss $f(\cdot)$ can be expressed as $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\ell(W_n(\mathbf{w}_n)\mathbf{f}^{(n-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),y)$,

and therefore proving the inductive hypothesis for $j' = n-1$ yields the desired result. The base case for the induction ($j' = 0$) is trivial, so all that remains is to establish the induction step.

Given $j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$, assume that the inductive hypothesis holds for $j'-1$, and in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$, let $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ be an admissible weight setting, with corresponding activation matrices $(D'_j)_{j=1}^{j'-1}$ and differentiability region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. We define the *nullity pattern* of $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ to be the vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'-1}}$ holding zero in the coordinates where $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ holds zero, and one elsewhere (that is, $\mathbf{e}$ is the vector obtained by setting to one all non-zero entries of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$). With $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'}}$ standing for an all-ones vector, we refer to the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}}$ where $W_{j'}(\mathbf{1})\mathbf{e}$ holds zero as *infeasible*, and to the rest as *feasible*. Note that a coordinate of $\mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}}$ is infeasible if and only if $W_{j'}(\mathbf{q})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ holds zero in that coordinate for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'}}$. We shall say that $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ is *regular* if $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}'_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ is non-zero in all feasible coordinates, where $\mathbf{w}'_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'}}$ denotes the value of weight vector j' in $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$. Hereafter we show that regularity of $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ implies that it is admissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$. By admissibility in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$ we have that across $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, each entry of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$ is either nowhere zero or identically zero. This implies the nullity pattern is constant across $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, which in turn means the same for the set of infeasible coordinates. The coordinates where $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}'_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ holds zero thus vanish in $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. From continuity, and the fact that around any $z \neq 0$, the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is either nowhere zero or identically zero,[30] it follows that there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ on which condition *(ii)* holds. Let $D'_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'}, d_{j'}}$ be a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements corresponding to positive entries in $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}'_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$ hold α, those corresponding to negative entries hold $\bar{\alpha}$, and the rest hold either α or $\bar{\alpha}$. Since $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$ coincides with the function $\boldsymbol{\theta} \mapsto D'_{j'\text{-}1}W_{j'\text{-}1}(\mathbf{w}_{j'\text{-}1})D'_{j'\text{-}2}W_{j'\text{-}2}(\mathbf{w}_{j'\text{-}2}) \cdots D'_1 W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, and since $\sigma(\cdot)$ is homogeneous with slopes α and $\bar{\alpha}$, condition *(i)* holds across $\mathcal{N}$. Consider the extension of $\mathcal{N}$ comprising, for each of its weight settings, all positive rescalings of weight vectors. Along with $(D'_j)_{j=1}^{j'}$ as activation matrices, this extension serves as a valid differentiability region for $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$. The sought-after admissibility is thus established.

We conclude the proof by showing that almost every $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is admissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j')}(\cdot)$. Per the above, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ does not meet this condition then either it is inadmissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$, or it is irregular. By our inductive hypothesis, weight settings inadmissible in the context of $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\cdot)$ form a set of measure zero, so it suffices to show that the collection of irregular weight settings, denoted $\mathcal{C}$, is also of measure zero. We first establish that $\mathcal{C}$ is measurable. Let $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j'-1}}$ be an arbitrary nullity pattern (vector with entries in $\{0, 1\}$), and consider the feasible coordinates it induces. The following two sets are measurable: weight settings with nullity pattern $\mathbf{e}$; and weight settings $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ for which $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ holds zero in at least one of the feasible coordinates induced by $\mathbf{e}$. The collection of irregular weight settings with nullity pattern $\mathbf{e}$, denoted $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{e}}$, is equal to the intersection of these two sets, and therefore is measurable. Taking union of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{e}}$ with $\mathbf{e}$ ranging over all (finitely many) possible nullity patterns yields $\mathcal{C}$, from which it follows that the latter is indeed measurable. Given weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{j'-1}$, whether or not a weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is regular depends only on $\mathbf{w}_{j'}$. We may thus apply Fubini's Theorem (*cf.* Royden and Fitzpatrick (1988)), and compute the measure of $\mathcal{C}$ by integrating over configurations of $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{j'-1}$, where for each, the measure of values for $\mathbf{w}_{j'}, \mathbf{w}_{j'+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_n$ leading to irregularity is integrated. We now establish that the latter measure is zero, which in turn implies that $\mathcal{C}$ has measure zero (thereby completing the proof). Since the Cartesian product of a zero

30. The latter is possible only if $\alpha = 0$ or $\bar{\alpha} = 0$.

measure subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'}}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'+1}} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_{j'+2}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ has zero measure, it suffices to show that given any configuration of $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{j'-1}$, the measure of values for $\mathbf{w}_{j'}$ leading to irregularity is zero. $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{j'-1}$ fully determine $\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and as a consequence, the nullity pattern of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Consider the feasible coordinates induced by this nullity pattern. On each of these, the linear function $\mathbf{w}_{j'} \mapsto W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is not identically zero. The measure of values for $\mathbf{w}_{j'}$ leading $W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'})\mathbf{f}^{(j'-1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to vanish in a feasible coordinate, *i.e.* leading $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to be irregular, is thus zero. This completes the proof. ■

Appendix E. Necessity of Assumptions in Propositions 6, 10 and 22

In this appendix we prove that the assumptions in Propositions 6, 10 and 22 are necessary, in the sense that each of the latter becomes false if any of its assumptions are removed (and no further assumptions are imposed).

Claim 27 (necessity of assumptions in Proposition 6) *In the context of Proposition 6, if the network is shallow ($n = 2$) or the zero mapping is a global minimizer of the training loss (meaning $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$), then the stated result may not hold, i.e. it may be that* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$.

Proof Suppose the network is shallow ($n = 2$). With the notations of Lemma 5, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2] &= \nabla^2\phi(W_{2:1})\,[W_2(\Delta W_1) + (\Delta W_2)W_1] + 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})^\top(\Delta W_2)(\Delta W_1)\right) \\
&\geq 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})^\top(\Delta W_2)(\Delta W_1)\right) \\
&\geq -2\|\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})\|_{Frobenius}\|(\Delta W_2)(\Delta W_1)\|_{Frobenius} \\
&\geq -2\|\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})\|_{Frobenius}\|\Delta W_2\|_{Frobenius}\|\Delta W_1\|_{Frobenius} \\
&\geq -\|\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})\|_{Frobenius}\left(\|\Delta W_2\|^2_{Frobenius} + \|\Delta W_1\|^2_{Frobenius}\right) \\
&= -\|\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})\|_{Frobenius}\|(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2)\|^2_{Frobenius}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from Lemma 5, the second holds since $\phi(\cdot)$ is convex, the third is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fourth follows from submultiplicativity of the Frobenius norm, and the latter two are based on simple arithmetics. It follows from the above that $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\|\nabla\phi(W_{2:1})\|_{Frobenius}$. Therefore if $\nabla\phi(\cdot)$ is bounded (*e.g.* if $\ell(\cdot)$ is the logistic loss — see Equation (11)) we will have $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$, as required.

It remains to show that if the zero mapping is a global minimizer of the training loss (meaning $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$), then, regardless of network depth (*i.e.* with either $n \geq 3$ or $n = 2$), it may be that $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$. This is trivial — simply consider the case where the training set $\mathcal{S}$ is such that $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$. The training loss in this case is constant (see Equations (8) and (9)), implying $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 0$. ■

Claim 28 (necessity of assumptions in Proposition 10) *In the context of Proposition 10, if assumptions* (i) *or* (ii) *are not satisfied, then the stated result may not hold, i.e. it may be that* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$.

Proof Suppose that assumption *(i)* is not satisfied, *i.e.* that the network is shallow ($n = 2$). With the notations of Lemma 9, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2\right] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i \left[W_2 D'_{i,1}(\Delta W_1)\mathbf{x}_i + (\Delta W_2) D'_{i,1} W_1 \mathbf{x}_i\right] \\
&\qquad + \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top (\Delta W_2) D'_{i,1}(\Delta W_1)\mathbf{x}_i \\
&\geq \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top (\Delta W_2) D'_{i,1}(\Delta W_1)\mathbf{x}_i \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|(\Delta W_2) D'_{i,1}(\Delta W_1)\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \|(\Delta W_2) D'_{i,1}(\Delta W_1)\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \|\Delta W_2\|_{spectral} \|D'_{i,1}\|_{spectral} \|\Delta W_1\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\} \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \|\Delta W_2\|_{spectral} \|\Delta W_1\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\} \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \|\Delta W_2\|_{Frobenius} \|\Delta W_1\|_{Frobenius} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \left(\|\Delta W_2\|^2_{Frobenius} + \|\Delta W_1\|^2_{Frobenius}\right) \\
&= -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \|(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2)\|^2_{Frobenius} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from Lemma 9, the second holds since $\ell(\cdot)$ is convex with respect to its first argument (recall from Lemma 9 that $\nabla^2 \ell_i$ is defined to be the Hessian of $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $(W_2 D'_{i,1} W_1 \mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ with respect to its first argument), the third is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fourth follows from the spectral norm being the operator norm induced by the Euclidean norm, the fifth is due to submultiplicativity of the spectral norm, the sixth results from $D'_{i,1}$ being diagonal with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, the seventh holds since spectral norm is upper bounded by Frobenius norm, and the latter two are based on simple arithmetics. It follows from the above that $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla \ell_i\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2$. Consider the case where the gradient of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument has Euclidean norm bounded by some constant $c > 0$ (this holds, for example, if $\ell(\cdot)$ is the logistic loss). Recalling (from Lemma 9) that $\nabla \ell_i$ stands for this gradient at the point $(W_2 D'_{i,1} W_1 \mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$, we obtain $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -c \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2$. The latter holds for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ belonging to any region of the form $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Since these regions constitute the entire weight space but a zero measure set, and since by definition existence of $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ implies that $f(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable (and therefore $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\cdot))$ is continuous) on a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, it necessarily holds that $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -c \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 > -\infty$. This establishes necessity of assumption *(i)*.

It remains to show that if assumption *(ii)* is not satisfied, *i.e.* if $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then, regardless of whether or not assumption *(i)* holds (*i.e.* of whether $n \geq 3$ or $n = 2$), it may be that $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$. This is trivial — simply consider the case where the training set $\mathcal{S}$ is such that $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$. The training loss in this case is constant (see Equations (8) and (9)), implying $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 0$. ■

Claim 29 (necessity of assumptions in Proposition 22) *In the context of Proposition 22, if assumptions* (i) *or* (ii) *are not satisfied, then the stated result may not hold, i.e. it may be that* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$.

Proof Suppose that assumption *(i)* is not satisfied, *i.e.* that the network is shallow ($n = 2$). With the notations of Lemmas 21 and 23, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, $(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2\right] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2\ell_i\left[W_2(\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i + W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla\ell_i^\top W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i \\
&\geq \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla\ell_i^\top W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)\|_{spectral}\|D'_{i,1}\|_{spectral}\|W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\}\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)\|_{spectral}\|W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{spectral} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\}\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\Delta\mathbf{w}_2)\|_{Frobenius}\|W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{Frobenius} \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\}\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\cdot)\|_{op}\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_2\|_2\|W_1(\cdot)\|_{op}\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_1\|_2 \\
&\geq -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\|W_2(\cdot)\|_{op}\|W_1(\cdot)\|_{op}\left(\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_2\|_2^2 + \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_1\|_2^2\right) \\
&= -\max\left\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\right\}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod\nolimits_{j=1}^{2}\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}\|(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2)\|_{Frobenius}^2 ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first transition follows from Lemma 21, the second holds since $\ell(\cdot)$ is convex with respect to its first argument (recall from Lemma 21 that $\nabla^2\ell_i$ is defined to be the Hessian of $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $(W_2(\mathbf{w}_1)D'_{i,1}W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ with respect to its first argument), the third is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fourth follows from the spectral norm being the operator norm induced by the Euclidean norm, the fifth is due to submultiplicativity of the spectral norm, the sixth results from $D'_{i,1}$ being diagonal with diagonal elements in $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$, the seventh holds since spectral norm is upper bounded by Frobenius norm, the eighth is due to the definition of $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$ (operator norm of $W_j(\cdot)$ induced by the Frobenius norm), and the latter two are based on simple arithmetics. The above implies that $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$. Consider the case where the gradient of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument has Euclidean norm bounded by some constant $c > 0$ (this holds, for example, if $\ell(\cdot)$ is the logistic loss). Recalling (from Lemma 21) that $\nabla\ell_i$ stands for this gradient at the point $(W_2(\mathbf{w}_2)D'_{i,1}W_1(\mathbf{w}_1)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$, we obtain $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -c\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$. The latter holds for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ belonging to any region of the form $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Since these regions constitute the entire weight space but a zero measure set, and since by definition existence of $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ implies that $f(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable (and therefore $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\cdot))$ is continuous) on a

neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, it necessarily holds that:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -c \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} > -\infty \,.$$

This establishes necessity of assumption *(i)*.

It remains to show that if assumption *(ii)* is not satisfied, *i.e.* if $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then, regardless of whether or not assumption *(i)* holds (*i.e.* of whether $n \geq 3$ or $n = 2$), it may be that $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\infty$. This is trivial — simply consider the case where the training set $\mathcal{S}$ is such that $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$. The training loss in this case is constant (see Equations (28) and (9)), implying $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 0$. ■

Appendix F. Training Loss for Least-Squares Linear Regression on Whitened Data

In this appendix we derive a simplified expression for the training loss corresponding to scalar linear regression on whitened data per least-squares criterion. Concretely, we simplify the function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_0} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by Equation (11) in the special case where: $d_n = 1$; the empirical (uncentered) covariance matrix of the training inputs — $\Lambda_{xx} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0, d_0}$ — is equal to identity; and the loss function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the square loss, *i.e.* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\ell(\hat{y}, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{y} - y)^2$.

Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0, |\mathcal{S}|}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{1, |\mathcal{S}|}$ be the matrices whose i'th columns hold, respectively, the training input $\mathbf{x}_i$ and its label y_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|$. Denote by Λ_{yx} the empirical (uncentered) cross-covariance matrix between training labels and inputs, *i.e.* $\Lambda_{yx} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} Y X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{1, d_0}$. In the special case under consideration, for any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{1, d_0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(W) &= \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} (W\mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2 \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \|WX - Y\|_{Frobenius}^2 \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left((WX - Y)(WX - Y)^\top\right) \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(WXX^\top W^\top\right) - \tfrac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YX^\top W^\top\right) + \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YY^\top\right) \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(W\Lambda_{xx} W^\top\right) - \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Lambda_{yx} W^\top\right) + \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YY^\top\right) .
\end{aligned}$$

Since Λ_{xx} is equal to identity, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(W) &= \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(WW^\top\right) - \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Lambda_{yx} W^\top\right) + \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YY^\top\right) \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left((W - \Lambda_{yx})(W - \Lambda_{yx})^\top\right) - \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Lambda_{yx}\Lambda_{yx}^\top\right) + \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YY^\top\right) \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \|W - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 - \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Lambda_{yx}\Lambda_{yx}^\top\right) + \tfrac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(YY^\top\right) .
\end{aligned}$$

$c := -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(\Lambda_{yx}\Lambda_{yx}^\top) + \frac{1}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \operatorname{Tr}(YY^\top)$ does not depend on W, so we arrive at the simplified form:

$$\phi(W) = \tfrac{1}{2} \|W - \Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}^2 + c \,.$$

Appendix G. Convergence with Unbalanced Initialization

In Section 5 we translated an analysis of gradient flow over deep linear neural networks — Proposition 14 — into a convergence guarantee for gradient descent — Theorem 15. In order to leverage known results concerning gradient flow over deep linear neural networks, Proposition 14 assumed that initialization is balanced (*i.e.* meets Equation (19)), which in turn led Theorem 15 to assume the same. We noted (Remark 16), however, that the generic tool used for the translation — Theorem 3 — allows for gradient flow and gradient descent to be initialized differently, thus it is possible to extend Theorem 15 so that it accounts for unbalanced initialization (*i.e.* for initialization which satisfies Equation (19) only approximately). The current appendix presents such an extension.

Consider the setting of Section 5 — depth n fully connected neural network as defined in Equation (8) (and surrounding text), with linear activation ($\sigma(z) = z$) and output dimension $d_n = 1$, learned via minimization of square loss over whitened and normalized data, *i.e.* via minimization of the training loss $f(\cdot)$ presented in Equation (20) (and surrounding text). For simplicity, we assume that the network's hidden widths are all equal to its input dimension, *i.e.* $d_0 = d_1 = \cdots = d_{n-1}$.[31] Deviation from balancedness (Equation (19)) will be quantified per the following definition.

Definition 30 *The* unbalancedness magnitude *of a weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined to be:*

$$\max_{j\in\{1,2,\ldots,n-1\}} \|W_{j+1}^\top W_{j+1} - W_j W_j^\top\|_{nuclear}\,, \tag{33}$$

where $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ denote the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

By Lemma 31 below, small unbalancedness magnitude implies proximity to perfect balancedness.

Lemma 31 *For any weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with unbalancedness magnitude (Definition 30) equal to $\hat{\epsilon} \geq 0$, there exists a weight setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which is balanced (has unbalancedness magnitude zero) and meets $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_2 \leq n^{1.5}\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}$.*

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.19) By Lemma 1 in Razin and Cohen (2020), an analogous result holds in the case where all weight matrices are square (*i.e.* $d_0 = d_1 = \cdots = d_n$). The proof is based on a reduction to this case, attained by replacing W_n with $\sqrt{W_n^\top W_n}$. ■

Including Lemma 31 in the translation of Proposition 14 via Theorem 3 yields Theorem 32 below — an extension of Theorem 15 that allows for unbalanced initialization.

Theorem 32 *Consider minimization of the training loss $f(\cdot)$ in Equation (20) via gradient descent (Equation (6)). Denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \ldots$ the iterates of gradient descent, and by $W_{n:1,0}$ the end-to-end matrix (Equation (10)) of the initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Assume that $\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \in (0, 0.1]$ (initialization is small but non-zero), and that $W_{n:1,0}$ is not antiparallel to Λ_{yx}, meaning:*

$$\nu := \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_{yx}^\top W_{n:1,0}) \big/ \big(\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_{Frobenius}\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}\big) \neq -1\,.$$

Let $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$. Then, if the unbalancedness magnitude (Definition 30) of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is no greater than:

$$\hat{\epsilon} := \frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^8 \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}^2\}}{n^{15} e^{12n+6} \left(\max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{9n-5}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{23n \max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}}\right)\right)^{-2} \in \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^8 \tilde{\epsilon}^2}{n^{15}\left(poly\left(\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right)\right)^n}\right), \tag{34}$$

31. Lemma 31 is the only part of the analysis henceforth which relies on this assumption — generalizing the lemma to account for arbitrary hidden widths will accordingly generalize the entire analysis.

and if the step size η meets:

$$\eta \leq \frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^{5} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}}{n^{17/2} e^{7n+10} \left(\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(11n-5)/2}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{23n \max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}} \right) \right)^{-2} \in \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}^{5} \tilde{\epsilon}}{n^{17/2} \left(poly\left(\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right)\right)^{n}} \right), \quad (35)$$

it holds that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:[32]

$$k \leq \frac{3n\left(\frac{3}{2}\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{n}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}\eta} \ln\left(\frac{23n \max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius} \min\{1,\tilde{\epsilon}\}} \right) + 1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{n\left(poly\left(\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right)\right)^{n} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_{Frobenius}\eta} \right). \quad (36)$$

Proof sketch (for complete proof see Subappendix I.20) The proof begins by invoking Lemma 31 for obtaining a weight setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ which is balanced and meets $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0\|_2 \leq n^{1.5}\sqrt{\tilde{\epsilon}}$. It is then shown that as an initial point for gradient flow, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 14 (namely, in addition to being balanced, its end-to-end matrix has Frobenius norm in $(0, 0.2]$ and is not antiparallel to Λ_{yx}). From this point on, the proof is similar to that of Theorem 15 — it confirms that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$ by invoking Theorem 3 to establish that gradient descent approximates gradient flow sufficiently well until gradient flow is sufficiently close to global minimum. Throughout this process, the only deviation from the proof of Theorem 15 is that gradient descent and gradient flow are initialized differently — the former starts at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, whereas the latter sets off from the nearby point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$. Such discrepancy between initializations is permitted by Theorem 3. ■

Appendix H. Further Experiments and Implementation Details

H.1. Further Experiments

Figure 3 supplements Figure 1 from Section 6 by reporting results obtained on convolutional neural networks.

H.2. Implementation Details

Below are implementation details omitted from our experimental reports (Section 6 and Subappendix H.1). Source code for reproducing the results, based on the PyTorch framework (Paszke et al. (2017)), can be found in `https://github.com/elkabzo/cont_disc_opt_dnn`.

As customary, MNIST images were normalized before being used — we computed mean and standard deviation across all pixels in the dataset, and used those to shift and scale each pixel so as to ensure zero mean and unit standard deviation. To reduce run-time, rather than applying gradient descent to the full MNIST training set (60,000 labeled images), a subset of 1,000 labeled images (chosen once, uniformly at random) was used (altering the size of this subset did not yield a noticeable change in terms of final results). The Xavier distribution employed for initializing neural network weights was of type "uniform" (implemented by calling PyTorch `torch.nn.init.xavier_uniform_()` method with default parameters). Experiments ran on an internal Intel Xeon server with eight NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti graphical processing units.

32. In addition to an upper bound (Equation (36)), the theorem's proof (Subappendix I.20) also establishes an exact expression for k (Equation (92)). This expression includes terms that depend on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ — balanced weight setting near $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 31. Means for computing $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ based on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ are not provided by the lemma's statement, but are brought forth by its proof (Subappendix I.19) — a constructive reduction to Lemma 1 in Razin and Cohen (2020), which itself is proven constructively.




Figure 3: Over deep convolutional neural networks, trajectories of gradient descent with conventional step size barely change when step size is reduced, suggesting they are close to the continuous limit, *i.e.* to trajectories of gradient flow. This figure is identical to Figure 1, except that the results it reports were obtained on convolutional (rather than fully connected) neural networks. Specifically, left pair of plots reports results obtained on a network taken from the online tutorial "Deep Learning with PyTorch: A 60 Minute Blitz" (it comprises two convolutional layers followed by three linear layers, with rectified linear activation in each hidden layer, and max pooling in each convolutional layer),[33] while right pair corresponds to the same network slightly adapted (namely, with no biases in convolutional and linear layers, and with max pooling replaced by regular subsampling, *i.e.* by summarizing each pooling window through its top-left entry) so that it is captured by our theory (*cf.* Subsection 4.2). For further details see caption of Figure 1, as well as Subappendix H.2.

Appendix I. Deferred Proofs

I.1. Notations

We introduce notations to be used throughout the appendix. Beginning with matrix norms, we use $\|\cdot\|_F$ for Frobenius norm, $\|\cdot\|_n$ for nuclear norm and $\|\cdot\|_s$ for spectral norm. We extend the notation established in Lemma 5 by regarding Hessians not only as matrices and quadratic forms, but also as bilinear forms. Namely, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we regard $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ not only as a (symmetric) matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d,d}$ and a quadratic form $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\,\cdot\,] : \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}} \to \mathbb{R}$, but also as a bilinear form $\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\,\cdot\,,\cdot\,]$ that intakes two tuples $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, \ldots, \Delta W_n), (\Delta W'_1, \Delta W'_2, \ldots, \Delta W'_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ as its first and second arguments (respectively), arranges them as (respective) vectors $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}, \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (in correspondence with how weight matrices $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ are arranged to create $\boldsymbol{\theta}$), and returns $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}$. Additionally, for any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$, we extend the view of $\nabla^2\phi(W)$ as a quadratic form, and also see it as a bilinear form $\nabla^2\phi(W)[\,\cdot\,,\cdot\,]$ that intakes two matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$ and returns a scalar. We similarly extend the notation of Lemma 9, regarding the matrix $\nabla^2\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_n}$, for any $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$, as a bilinear form (in addition to its view as a quadratic form) $\nabla^2\ell_i[\,\cdot\,,\cdot\,] : \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\nabla^2\ell_i[\mathbf{v},\mathbf{u}] = \mathbf{v}^\top\nabla^2\ell_i\mathbf{u}$. Finally, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $[j] := \{1, 2, \ldots, j\}$.

33. For exact specification of network see https://pytorch.org/tutorials/beginner/blitz/neural_networks_tutorial.html#sphx-glr-beginner-blitz-neural-networks-tutorial-py. Note that zero padding (two pixels wide, on each side) was applied to MNIST images for compliance with specified input size (32-by-32).

I.2. Proof of Theorem 3

Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ be the continuous polygonal curve corresponding to the iterates of gradient descent:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d \quad , \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) = -\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) \;\; \text{for } t \in (k\eta,(k+1)\eta)\,,\, k = 0,1,2,\ldots .$$

If $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $t \in [0,\tilde{t}\,]$ then we are done. Assume by contradiction that this is not the case, and define $t_\epsilon := \inf\{t \in [0,\tilde{t}\,] : \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 > \epsilon\}$. It necessarily holds that $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2 < \epsilon$ (otherwise the expression on the right-hand side of Equation (7) becomes negative as $t \searrow 0$, in contradiction to it being greater than $\eta > 0$ for all $t \in (0,\tilde{t}\,]$). By continuity, this implies $t_\epsilon > 0$ and $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t_\epsilon) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_\epsilon)\|_2 = \epsilon$. The trajectory of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ between times 0 and t_ϵ, *i.e.* $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}([0,t_\epsilon]) := \{\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) : t \in [0,t_\epsilon]\}$, is contained in $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}$. For any $t \in [0,t_\epsilon]$, the line segment (in $\mathbb{R}^d$) between $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lfloor t/\eta \rfloor \eta)$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)$ is a subset of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}([0,t_\epsilon])$, thus is contained in $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}$ as well. We therefore have, for any $t \in [0,t_\epsilon]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tfrac{d}{dt}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t^+) - (-\nabla f(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)))\|_2 &= \|-\nabla f(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lfloor t/\eta \rfloor \eta)) - (-\nabla f(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)))\|_2 \\
&\leq \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lfloor t/\eta \rfloor \eta)\|_2 \\
&= \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\|\nabla f(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\lfloor t/\eta \rfloor \eta))\|_2 (t - \lfloor t/\eta \rfloor \eta) \\
&\leq \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\eta\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t^+)$ represents the right derivative of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ at time t. The Fundamental Theorem (Theorem 2) may thus be applied with $\delta(t) = \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\eta$ for all $t \in [0,t_\epsilon]$, yielding:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_\epsilon) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t_\epsilon)\|_2 \leq e^{\int_0^{t_\epsilon} m(t')dt'}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2 + \beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\eta \int_0^{t_\epsilon} e^{\int_{t'}^{t_\epsilon} m(t'')dt''}dt' \,.$$

By our assumption on the step size (Equation (7)):

$$\eta < \frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{t_\epsilon} m(t')dt'}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon}\int_0^{t_\epsilon} e^{\int_{t'}^{t_\epsilon} m(t'')dt''}dt'} \,.$$

Combining the latter two inequalities, we obtain $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_\epsilon) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t_\epsilon)\|_2 < \epsilon$. Since it was previously noted that $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t_\epsilon) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t_\epsilon)\|_2 = \epsilon$, our proof by contradiction is complete. ■

I.3. Proof of Corollary 4

Non-negativity and β-smoothness of $f(\cdot)$ imply $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{q})\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2\beta f(\mathbf{q})}$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Using this inequality, along with the fact that $f(\cdot)$ is non-increasing during gradient flow, we have:

$$\sup_{t\in[0,t_e)}\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\|_2 \leq \sup_{t\in[0,t_e)}\sqrt{2\beta f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))} \leq \sqrt{2\beta f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0))}\,.$$

If $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ lies no more than ϵ-away from $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$, *i.e.* $\exists t \in [0,t_e) : \|\mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, then β-smoothness implies $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{q})\|_2 \leq \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\|_2 + \beta\epsilon$, which in turn means $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{q})\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2\beta f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0))} + \beta\epsilon$. We may therefore call Theorem 3 with $\gamma_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} = \sqrt{2\beta f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0))} + \beta\epsilon$, alongside $\beta_{\tilde{t},\epsilon} = \beta$ and $m(\cdot) \equiv m$. Simplifying the resulting bound on the step size (Equation (7)) then completes the proof. ■

I.4. Proof of Lemma 5

Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arrangement of $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, ..., \Delta W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its arrangement as a vector in corresponding order. Denote:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta^{(1)} := \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}, \\
&\Delta^{(2)} := \textstyle\sum_{1\le j<j'\le n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}, \\
&\Delta^{(3:n)} := (W_n + \Delta W_n)\cdots(W_1 + \Delta W_1) - W_{n:1} - \Delta^{(1)} - \Delta^{(2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

We now develop a second-order Taylor expansion of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Since the matrix tuple corresponding to $(\boldsymbol{\theta}+\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is $\big((W_1+\Delta W_1), ..., (W_n+\Delta W_n)\big)$, and $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi(W_{n:1})$ (see beginning of Subsubsection 4.1.1) on an open region containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, for sufficiently small $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}$ we obtain:

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi\Big((W_n + \Delta W_n)...(W_1 + \Delta W_1)\Big) = \phi\Big(W_{n:1} + \Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\Big). \tag{38}$$

Let $\Delta W \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$, the second-order Taylor expansion of the twice continuously differentiable $\phi(\cdot)$ at the point $W_{n:1}$ is given by:

$$\phi(W_{n:1} + \Delta W) = \phi(W_{n:1}) + \big\langle \nabla\phi(W_{n:1}), \Delta W\big\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi(W_{n:1})\,[\Delta W] + \mathcal{o}(\|\Delta W\|_F^2), \tag{39}$$

where the $\mathcal{o}(\cdot)$ notation refers to some expression satisfying $\lim_{a\to 0}\big(\mathcal{o}(a)/a\big) = 0$. We continue to develop Equation (38) using Equation (39):

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \phi\left(W_{n:1} + (\Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)})\right) \\
&= \phi\left(W_{n:1}\right) + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\rangle + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right] + \mathcal{o}(\left\|\Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\|_F^2) \\
&= \phi\left(W_{n:1}\right) + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(1)}\right\rangle + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(2)}\right\rangle + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\rangle + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right] + \\
&\quad 2\cdot\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}, \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right] + \mathcal{o}(\left\|\Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\|_F^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last transition we view $\nabla^2\phi$ as both a quadratic and a bilinear form (see Subappendix I.1). Notice that the following terms $\left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\rangle$, $\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right]$, $\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}, \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right]$ and $\mathcal{o}(\left\|\Delta^{(1)} + \Delta^{(2)} + \Delta^{(3:n)}\right\|_F^2)$ are all $\mathcal{o}(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F^2)$, thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \phi\left(W_{n:1}\right) + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(1)}\right\rangle + \left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(2)}\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}\right] + o\big(\,\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F^2\,\big).
\end{aligned}$$

This is a Taylor expansion of $f(\cdot)$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with a constant term $\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)$, a linear term $\left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(1)}\right\rangle$, a quadtratic term $\left\langle \nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(2)}\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}\right]$, and a remainder term of $\mathcal{o}(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_F^2)$.

From uniqueness of the Taylor expansion it follows that the quadratic term is equal to $\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right]$. This implies:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] &= \nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\Delta^{(1)}\right] + 2\left\langle\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \Delta^{(2)}\right\rangle \\ &= \nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] + \\ &\quad 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the last transition follows from plugging in the definitions of $\Delta^{(1)}$ and $\Delta^{(2)}$ (see Equation (37)). ■

I.5. Proof of Proposition 6

Since $\nabla\phi(0) \neq 0$, there exists $(\Delta W_1', \Delta W_2') \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}$ and $(W_3', ..., W_n') \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3,d_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ such that $\left\langle\nabla\phi(0), W_n' \cdots W_3'\Delta W_2'\Delta W_1'\right\rangle > 0$. Notice that none of the following matrices $\Delta W_1', \Delta W_2', W_3', ..., W_n'$ are equal to zero. Define (while recalling the assumption of $n \geq 3$):

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta W_1 &:= \Delta W_1' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\,,\\ \Delta W_2 &:= \Delta W_2' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\,,\\ \Delta W_3 &:= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3,d_2}\,,\\ \Delta W_j &:= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}} \text{ for } j \in \{1,2,...,n\}/\{1,2,3\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

For some arbitrary $c > 0$, we define:

$$\begin{aligned}W_1 &:= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\,,\\ W_2 &:= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\,,\\ W_3 &:= W_3' \frac{-c \cdot \sum_{1\leq j\leq n}\left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2}{2\left\langle\nabla\phi\left(0\right), W_n' \cdots W_3'\Delta W_2'\Delta W_1'\right\rangle} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3,d_2}\,,\\ W_j &:= W_j' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}} \text{ for } j \in \{1,2,...,n\}/\{1,2,3\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the arrangement of $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n)$ as a vector. As shown in Lemma 5:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] &= \nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] \\ &\quad + 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Notice the first summand in the right-hand side of Equation (40) is equal to zero:

$$\nabla^2\phi(W_{n:1})\left[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] = \nabla^2\phi(W_{n:1})\left[\Sigma_{j=1}^{n} 0\right] = 0\,. \tag{41}$$

We develop the expression of the second summand in the right-hand side of Equation (40):

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big) \\ &= 2\left\langle\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right), \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right\rangle \\ &= 2\left\langle\nabla\phi\left(0\right), W_n \cdots W_3\Delta W_2\Delta W_1\right\rangle \\ &= -c \cdot \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j\leq n}\left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2\,,\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where the last transition follows by plugging in the definitions of ΔW_1, ΔW_2 and W_j for $j \in [n]/\{1,2\}$. Plugging in Equations (41) and (42) in Equation (40), we obtain:

$$\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] = -c \cdot \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j\leq n} \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2 . \tag{43}$$

Noticing that $\sum_{1\leq j\leq n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \neq 0$, Equation (43) implies $\lambda_{\min}\left(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \leq -c$. This bound holds for every $c > 0$, thus yielding the desired result (*i.e.* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{\min}\left(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) = -\infty$). ■

I.6. Proof of Lemma 7

Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arrangement of $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, ..., \Delta W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its arrangement as a vector in corresponding order. As shown in Lemma 5:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] &= \nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\left[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] \\ &+ 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big) .\end{aligned}$$

Convexity of $\phi(\cdot)$ implies that $\nabla^2\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)$ is positive semi-definite, thus:

$$\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n] \geq 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big).$$

Using a simple corollary of Von-Neumann's trace inequality (see Mirsky (1975)):

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\ &\geq -2\left\|\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\right\|_n \cdot \Big\|\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big\|_s .\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Upper bound the nuclear norm:

$$\left\|\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\right\|_n \leq \sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\left\|\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\right\|_F . \tag{45}$$

The following bound holds:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big\|_s \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\left\|W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right\|_s \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\left\|\Delta W_{j'}\right\|_s\left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_s \cdot \prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}}\left\|W_k\right\|_s \\ &\leq \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\left\|W_j\right\|_s \cdot \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\left\|\Delta W_{j'}\right\|_s\left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_s ,\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where the first transition follows from triangle inequalities, the second inequality follows from sub-multiplicativity of the spectral norm, and the last inequality follows from maximizing the term $\prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}}\left\|W_k\right\|_s$ over j, j'. Plugging Equations (45) and (46) into Equation (44), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\ &\geq -2\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\left\|\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\right\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_s \cdot \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\|\Delta W_{j'}\|_s\|\Delta W_j\|_s .\end{aligned}$$

It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\|\Delta W_{j'}\|_s\|\Delta W_j\|_s \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}\|\Delta W_{j'}\|_F\|\Delta W_j\|_F \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F\right)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \tfrac{n}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \\
&= \tfrac{n-1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the one-norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is never greater than $\sqrt{n}$ times its euclidean-norm. This leads us to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\
&\geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\left\|\nabla\phi\left(W_{n:1}\right)\right\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_s \cdot \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result readily follows:

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0, d_n\}}\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_s .$$

■

I.7. Proof of Proposition 8

Denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)$ the time dependent gradient flow trajectory starting at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ (*i.e.* $\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_s$) and by $W_1(t), ..., W_n(t)$ the corresponding time dependent curves of weight matrices induced by the flow. From the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ we can infer $\|W_j(0)\|_F \leq \epsilon$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$. For $j \in \{1, 2, ..., n-1\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|W_{j+1}^\top(0)W_{j+1}(0) - W_j(0)W_j^\top(0)\|_s \\
&\leq \|W_{j+1}^\top(0)W_{j+1}(0)\|_s + \|W_j(0)W_j^\top(0)\|_s \\
&= \|W_{j+1}(0)\|_s^2 + \|W_j(0)\|_s^2 \\
&\leq \|W_{j+1}(0)\|_F^2 + \|W_j(0)\|_F^2 \leq 2\epsilon^2 \leq (2\epsilon)^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.2 from Du et al. (2018) states that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(W_j(t)W_j^\top(t) - W_{j+1}^\top(t)W_{j+1}(t)\right) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, ..., n-1\}$ and $t \geq 0$, thus:

$$\|W_{j+1}^\top(t)W_{j+1}(t) - W_j(t)W_j^\top(t)\|_s = \|W_{j+1}^\top(0)W_{j+1}(0) - W_j(0)W_j^\top(0)\|_s \leq (2\epsilon)^2 .$$

We can rely on this condition in order to apply Lemma 33 below and get that for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\max_{j\in\{1,...,n\}}\|W_j(t)\|^n \leq \|W_{n:1}(t)\|_s + 4n\epsilon \cdot \max\left(1, \{\|W_j(t)\|_s\}_{j\in[n]}\right)^{2n} .$$

Combining the latter inequality together with the result of Lemma 7 (Equation (13)), we get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))) \\
&\geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j(t)\|_s \\
&\geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \max_{j\in[n]}\|W_j(t)\|_s^{n-2} \\
&= -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \left(\max_{j\in[n]}\|W_j(t)\|_s^{n}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}} \\
&\geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \left(\|W_{n:1}(t)\|_s + 4n\epsilon\,\max\left(1,\{\|W_j(t)\|_s\}_{j\in[n]}\right)^{2n}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}} \\
&\geq -(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \,\|W_{n:1}(t)\|_s^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \\
&\qquad - (n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1}(t))\|_F \left(4n\epsilon\,\max\left(1,\{\|W_j(t)\|_s\}_{j\in[n]}\right)^{2n}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality follows from sub-additivity of any power between zero and one. Rewriting the inequality such that we remove the time notation as to be consistent with the proposition statement, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq\; &-(n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_F \,\|W_{n:1}\|_s^{1-2/n} \\
&- (n-1)\sqrt{\min\{d_0,d_n\}}\,\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_F \,(4n)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\,\max\left(1,\{\|W_j(t)\|_s\}_{j\in[n]}\right)^{2(n-2)}\epsilon^{\frac{n-2}{n}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

■

Lemma 33 *Let $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i,d_{i-1}}$ for $i \in [n]$. Denote $\Delta_i := A_{i+1}^\top A_{i+1} - A_i A_i^\top$ for $i \in [n-1]$. Assume that $\|\Delta_i\|_s \leq \frac{1}{2n}$ for $i \in [n-1]$. It holds that:*

$$
max_{i\in[n]}\|A_i\|_s^n \leq \|A_{n:1}\|_s + 2n\sqrt{\max_{i\in[n-1]}\|\Delta_i\|_s}\cdot\max_{A\in\{I,A_1,\ldots,A_n\}}\|A\|_s^{2n},
$$

where we denote $A_{j:i}$ as $A_j\cdots A_{i+1}A_i$ for $1\leq i<j\leq n$ and as an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise.

Proof Define $A_{\max} := \max_{A\in\{I,A_1,\ldots,A_n\}}\|A\|_s$ and $\Delta_{\max} := \max_{i\in[n-1]}\|\Delta_i\|_s$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|=1}\|A_1\boldsymbol{u}\|_2$. Define $a_i := \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-(i-1)}^\top A_{n-(i-1)})^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v}$ for $i\in[n]$. For $i\in[n-1]$ we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&a_i - a_{i+1} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-(i-1)}^\top A_{n-(i-1)})^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-(i+1):1}^\top (A_{n-i}^\top A_{n-i})^{i+1} A_{n-(i+1):1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-(i-1)}^\top A_{n-(i-1)})^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-(i+1):1}^\top A_{n-i}^\top (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top)^i A_{n-i}A_{n-(i+1):1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-(i-1)}^\top A_{n-(i-1)})^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top)^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + \Delta_{n-i})^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top)^i A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top \left((A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + \Delta_{n-i})^i - (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top)^i\right) A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top \left(\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i}\prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}}\left(bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i}\right) - (A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top)^i\right) A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top \left(\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)}\prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}}\left(bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i}\right)\right) A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the fourth transition follows from the definition of Δ_{n-i} and the second to last transition follows from unrolling $(A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + \Delta_{n-i})^i$. Taking absolute value on $a_i - a_{i+1}$ we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|a_i - a_{i+1}| \\
&= \left| \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top \left(\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} \prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left(bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i} \right) \right) A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \right| \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} \left| \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-i:1}^\top \left(\prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left(bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i} \right) \right) A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v} \right| \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} \|A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \left\| \prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left(bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i} \right) \right\|_s \|A_{n-i:1}\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} \|A_{n-i:1}\|_s \left(\prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left\| bA_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top + (1-b)\Delta_{n-i} \right\|_s \right) \|A_{n-i:1}\|_s \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} \|A_{n-i:1}\|_s^2 \prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left(b\left\|A_{n-i}A_{n-i}^\top\right\|_s + (1-b)\|\Delta_{n-i}\|_s \right) \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,\ldots,b_i)\in\{0,1\}^i\setminus(1,\ldots,1)} A_{\max}^{2n} \prod_{b\in\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}} \left(bA_{\max}^2 + (1-b)\Delta_{\max} \right) A_{\max}^n \\
&= A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \left(\left(A_{\max}^2 + \Delta_{\max} \right)^i - A_{\max}^{2i} \right) ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second transition follows from the triangle inequality, the third from Cauchy–Schwarz and the definition of the spectral norm, the fourth from sub-multiplicativity of the spectral norm, the fifth from sub-additivity of the spectral norm and the sixth from the definitions of $A_{\max}$ and $\Delta_{\max}$. We continue by unrolling $\left(A_{\max}^2 + \Delta_{\max} \right)^i$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|a_i - a_{i+1}| \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{i} \binom{i}{k} A_{\max}^{2(i-k)} \Delta_{\max}^k - A_{\max}^{2i} \right) \\
&= A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{i} \binom{i}{k} A_{\max}^{2(i-k)} \Delta_{\max}^k \right) \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{i} n^k A_{\max}^{2n} \Delta_{\max}^k \right) \\
&= A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{i} \left(n\Delta_{\max} \right)^k \right) \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(n\Delta_{\max} \right)^k \right) \\
&= A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \tfrac{n\Delta_{\max}}{1-n\Delta_{\max}} \\
&\leq A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot 2n\Delta_{\max} ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the two last transitions follow from geometric series formula and the assumption $\Delta_{\max} \leq \frac{1}{2n}$. Overall we have that for $i \in [n-1]$:

$$
|a_i - a_{i+1}| \leq 2nA_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} . \tag{47}
$$

The following bound holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_{n:1}\|_s^2 &\geq \|A_{n:1}\boldsymbol{v}\|_2^2 \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n:1}^\top A_{n:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top A_{n-1:1}^\top (A_n^\top A_n)^1 A_{n-1:1}\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= a_1 \\
&\geq a_2 - |a_2 - a_1| \\
&\geq a_3 - |a_3 - a_2| - |a_2 - a_1| \\
&\vdots \\
&\geq a_n - \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_{i+1} - a_i| \\
&\geq a_n - \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} 2nA_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \\
&\geq a_n - 2n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \\
&= \boldsymbol{v}^\top (A_1^\top A_1)^n \boldsymbol{v} - 2n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \\
&= \|A_1\|_s^{2n} - 2n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from Equation (47). Overall we have:

$$\|A_1\|_s^{2n} \leq \|A_{n:1}\|_s^2 + 2n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}\,. \tag{48}$$

For all $i \in [n-1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_i\|_s^2 &= \|A_i A_i^\top\|_s \\
&= \|A_{i+1}^\top A_{i+1} - \Delta_i\|_s \\
&\geq \|A_{i+1}^\top A_{i+1}\|_s - \|\Delta_i\|_s \\
&\geq \|A_{i+1}\|_s^2 - \Delta_{\max}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $i \in [n-1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_{i+1}\|_s^{2n} &\leq \left(\|A_i\|_s^2 + \Delta_{\max}\right)^n \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \|A_i\|^{2(n-k)} \Delta_{\max}^k \\
&= \|A_i\|_s^{2n} + \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \|A_i\|^{2(n-k)} \Delta_{\max}^k \\
&\leq \|A_i\|_s^{2n} + A_{\max}^{2n} \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(n\Delta_{\max}\right)^k \\
&= \|A_i\|_s^{2n} + A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \tfrac{n\Delta_{\max}}{1 - n\Delta_{\max}} \\
&\leq \|A_i\|_s^{2n} + 2nA_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the two last transitions follow from geometric series formula and the assumption $\Delta_{\max} \leq \frac{1}{2n}$. Using the above result repeatedly, we get that for $i \in [n-1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_{i+1}\|_s^{2n} &\leq \|A_i\|_s^{2n} + 2nA_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \\
&\vdots \\
&\leq \|A_1\|_s^{2n} + i \cdot 2nA_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \\
&\leq \|A_1\|_s^{2n} + 2n^2 A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Overall we have that for $i \in [n]$:

$$\|A_i\|_s^{2n} \leq \|A_1\|_s^{2n} + 2n^2 A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \,. \tag{49}$$

Combining Equations (49) and (48) we get for $i \in [n]$:

$$\|A_i\|_s^{2n} \leq \|A_1\|_s^{2n} + 2n^2 A_{\max}^{2n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \leq \|A_{n:1}\|_s^2 + 4n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max} \,.$$

This leads us to:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i\in[n]} \|A_i\|_s^n &\leq \sqrt{\|A_{n:1}\|_s^2 + 4n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\|A_{n:1}\|_s^2} + \sqrt{4n^2 A_{\max}^{4n} \cdot \Delta_{\max}} \\
&= \|A_{n:1}\|_s + 2n\sqrt{\max_{i\in[n-1]} \|\Delta_i\|_s} \cdot \max_{A\in\{I,A_1,\ldots,A_n\}} \|A\|_s^{2n} \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from sub-additivity of square root and the last transition follows from the definitions of $A_{\max}$ and $\Delta_{\max}$. ■

I.8. Proof of Lemma 9

This proof is very similar to that of Lemma 5 (see Subappendix I.4). We repeat all details for completeness. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arrangement of $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, ..., \Delta W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its arrangement as a vector in corresponding order. Denote the following for $i \in \{1, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$:

$$\Delta_i^{(1)} := \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}, \tag{50}$$

$$\Delta_i^{(2)} := \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'} (\Delta W_{j'}) (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}, \tag{51}$$

$$\Delta_i^{(3:n)} := D'_{i,n}(W_n + \Delta W_n) \cdots D'_{i,1}(W_1 + \Delta W_1) - (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1} - \Delta_i^{(1)} - \Delta_i^{(2)}. \tag{52}$$

We now develop a second-order Taylor expansion of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Since the matrix tuple corresponding to $(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is $\big((W_1 + \Delta W_1), ..., (W_n + \Delta W_n)\big)$, and the function $f(\cdot)$ coincides with the function given in Equation (15) on an open region containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, for sufficiently small $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\left(D'_{i,n}(W_n + \Delta W_n) ... D'_{i,1}(W_1 + \Delta W_1)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\left(\left((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1} + \Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\right)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\left((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i + \left(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\right)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\right) \,,
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where the second transition follows from the definition of $\Delta_i^{(3:n)}$ (Equation (52)). Let $\Delta \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$. For every $i \in \{1, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$, the second-order Taylor expansion of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument at the point $\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ is given by:

$$\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\boldsymbol{v}, y_i\big) = \ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta \boldsymbol{v} \big\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i[\Delta \boldsymbol{v}] + \mathcal{O}\big(\|\Delta \boldsymbol{v}\|_2^2\big), \quad (54)$$

where the $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ notation refers to some expression satisfying $\lim_{a \to 0} \big(\mathcal{O}(a)/a\big) = 0$. We continue to develop Equation (53) using Equation (54):

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \Big(\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \\
&\qquad\qquad \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big] + \mathcal{O}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big) \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big] + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big] + 2 \cdot \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i, \big(\Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big] + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \mathcal{O}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last transition we view $\nabla^2 \ell_i$ as both a quadratic and a bilinear form (see Subappendix I.1). Notice that $\big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle$, $\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]$, $\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i, \big(\Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]$ and $\mathcal{O}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big)$ are all $\mathcal{O}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big)$, thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big] + \mathcal{O}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big).
\end{aligned}$$

This is a Taylor expansion of $f(\cdot)$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with a constant term $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$, a linear term $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle$, a quadtratic term of two summands $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i \big\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big]$, and a remainder term of $\mathcal{O}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big)$. From uniqueness of the Taylor expansion,

the quadratic term must be equal to $\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right]$. This implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\Big(\nabla^2 \ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big] + 2\big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle\Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\Bigg(\nabla^2 \ell_i\Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j+1}D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big] + \\
&\quad 2\Big\langle \nabla \ell_i, \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j'+1}D'_{i,j'}(\Delta W_{j'})(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1}D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big\rangle\Bigg),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last transition follows from plugging in the definitions of $\Delta^{(1)}$ and $\Delta^{(2)}$ (see Equations (50) and (51)). ■

I.9. Proof of Proposition 10

From assumption *(ii)* there exists some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$. Define $\big(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n\big) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\times\mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ to be the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. We may assume $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$ without loss of generality, as we can negate the vectors $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$ by flipping the signs of the entries in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ corresponding to the last weight matrix W_n (see Equation (8)). From continuity, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ such that for all $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathcal{N}$ it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$. Moreover, as discussed in Subsubsection 4.1.2, for almost all $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, which is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices and across which $f(\cdot)$ coincides with a function as given in Equation (15). There must exist some $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ in the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ for which a region of the type $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ exists. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Notice that none of the matrices $W_1, W_2, ..., W_n$ are equal to zero (as that would lead to $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$). Define the following weight matrices parameterized by $a > 0$ (while recalling that $n \geq 3$ by assumption *(i)*):

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(a) &:= W_1 \cdot a^{-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\,, \\
W_2(a) &:= W_2 \cdot a^{-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\,, \\
W_3(a) &:= W_3 \cdot a \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3,d_2}\,, \\
W_j(a) &:= W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}} \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}/\{1, 2, 3\}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ their corresponding weight setting. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices, it holds that $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) : a > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Define:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta W_1 &:= W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\,, \\
\Delta W_2 &:= W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\,, \\
\Delta W_j &:= 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j,d_{j-1}} \text{ for } j \in [n]/\{1, 2\}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

For $a > 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $j, j' \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, define $(D'_{i,*}W_*(a))_{j':j}$ to be the matrix $D'_{i,j'}W_{j'}(a)D'_{i,j'-1}W_{j'-1}(a)\cdots D'_{i,j}W_j(a)$ (where by convention $D'_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_n}$ stands for identity) if $j \leq j'$, and an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. For

$i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $a > 0$ let $\nabla \ell_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_n}$ be the gradient and Hessian (respectively) of the loss $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ with respect to its first argument. For every $a > 0$, since $\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ we may apply Lemma 9, obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] = \\
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} (D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{j\text{-}1:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big] + \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(a)^\top \sum_{1 \leq j < j' \leq n} (D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'} (\Delta W_{j'}) (D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j} (\Delta W_j) (D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{j\text{-}1:1} \mathbf{x}_i ,
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where we regard Hessians as quadratic forms (see Subappendix I.1). Plugging in the definitions of $W_j(a)$ and ΔW_j for $j \in [n]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \Big[2a^{-1} (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big] + \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(a)^\top a (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i \\
&= \frac{4}{a^2} \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \Big[(D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big] + a \cdot \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \,,
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where the second transition follows from pulling $2/a$ out of the quadratic operator and the fact that $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i$. Note that $\lim_{a\to\infty} (D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} = 0$. Since $\ell(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable in its first argument, it holds that $\lim_{a\to\infty} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) = \lim_{a\to\infty} \nabla^2 \ell\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) = \nabla^2 \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)$, and similarly $\lim_{a\to\infty} \nabla \ell_i(a) = \lim_{a\to\infty} \nabla \ell\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(a))_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) = \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)$. Therefore, in the limit $a \to \infty$, Equation (56) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right]\Big) \\
&= \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(\frac{4}{a^2} \cdot \frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \Big[(D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big) + \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(a \cdot \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big) \\
&= \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(\frac{4}{a^2}\Big) \cdot \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(\frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \Big[(D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big) + \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(a \cdot \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big)\Big) \\
&= 0 \cdot \Big(\frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i) \Big[(D'_{i,*} W_*)_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big) + \lim_{a\to\infty} \Big(a \cdot \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big) \\
&= -\infty \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition is valid since the multiplied limits are finite and the limit inside a limit is non-zero, and the last transition follows from $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$. Notice that the matrices $\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, ..., \Delta W_n$ are independent of a, thus it must hold that $\lim_{a\to\infty} \lambda_{\min}\big(\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\big) = -\infty$. This in particular implies the desired result:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ exists}} \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = -\infty \,.$$

■

I.10. Proof of Lemma 11

This proof is very similar to that of Lemma 7 (see Subappendix I.6). We repeat all details for completeness. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arrangement of $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta W_1, \Delta W_2, ..., \Delta W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its arrangement as a vector in corresponding order. As shown in Lemma 9:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] = \\
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i \Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big] + \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(\Delta W_{j'})(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where we regard Hessians as quadratic forms (see Subappendix I.1). Convexity of $\ell(\cdot)$ in its first argument implies that for $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$, $\nabla^2 \ell_i$ is positive semi-definite, thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \geq \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} (D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(\Delta W_{j'})(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz and triangle inequalities, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla \ell_i\big\|_2 \cdot \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(\Delta W_{j'})(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} D'_{i,j}(\Delta W_j)(D'_{i,*}W_*)_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla \ell_i\big\|_2 \cdot \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|\Delta W_j\big\|_s \big\|\Delta W_{j'}\big\|_s \prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \big\|W_k\big\|_s \prod_{k=1}^{n} \big\|D'_{i,k}\big\|_s \cdot \big\|\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla \ell_i\big\|_2 \cdot \Bigg(\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big\|W_j\big\|_s\Bigg) \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \big\|\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|\Delta W_j\big\|_s \big\|\Delta W_{j'}\big\|_s\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from the definition and sub-multiplicativity of spectral norm, and the last transition follows from maximizing $\prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \big\|W_k\big\|_s$ over j, j', upper bounding $\|D'_{i,j}\|_s \leq \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}$ for $j \in [n-1]$ and recalling that $D'_{i,n}$ is an identity matrix, meaning $\|D'_{i,n}\|_s = 1$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \|\Delta W_{j'}\|_s \|\Delta W_j\|_s \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \|\Delta W_{j'}\|_F \|\Delta W_j\|_F \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F\Big)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \tfrac{n}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \\
&= \tfrac{n-1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the one-norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is never greater than $\sqrt{n}$ times its euclidean-norm. This leads us to the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n\right] \\ &\geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1}\Big(\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}}\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_s\Big)\frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\Delta W_j\|_F^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

The desired result readily follows:

$$\lambda_{\min}\big(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\big) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1}\cdot\Big(\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}}\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_F\Big)\frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\|\nabla\ell_i\|_2\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2\,.$$

■

I.11. Proof of Proposition 12

Recall that $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\times\mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ are the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and denote by $\big(W_{1,s}, W_{2,s}, ..., W_{n,s}\big) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}\times\mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ those that constitute $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$. For $j, j' \in [n]$:

$$\big|\|W_{j,s}\|_F^2 - \|W_{j',s}\|_F^2\big| \leq \max\big\{\|W_{j,s}\|_F^2, \|W_{j',s}\|_F^2\big\} \leq \max_{j\in[n]}\|W_{j,s}\|_F^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon^2\,.$$

Corollary 2.1 from Du et al. (2018) implies that throughout a gradient flow trajectory differences between squared Frobenius norms of weight matrices are constant. Therefore, for $j, j' \in [n]$:

$$\big|\|W_j\|_F^2 - \|W_{j'}\|_F^2\big| = \big|\|W_{j,s}\|_F^2 - \|W_{j',s}\|_F^2\big| \leq \epsilon^2\,. \tag{57}$$

If the network is shallow (*i.e.* $n = 2$), then Equation (18) coincides with Equation (17), thus the desired result follows trivially from Lemma 11. Hereafter we assume that the network is deep (*i.e.* $n \geq 3$). It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n],|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|W_j\|_F &\leq \max_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^{n-2} \\ &= \Big(\min_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^2 + \max_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^2 - \min_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^2\Big)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \\ &\leq \Big(\min_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^2 + \epsilon^2\Big)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \\ &= \Big(\sqrt{\min_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F^2 + \epsilon^2}\Big)^{n-2} \\ &\leq \Big(\min_{j\in[n]}\|W_j\|_F + \epsilon\Big)^{n-2}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the third transition follows from Equation (57) and the last transition follows from sub-additivity of square root. Combining the latter inequality together with the result of Lemma 11

(Equation (17)), we obtain the desired result:

$$\lambda_{\min}\big(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\big) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla \ell_i\big\|_2 \big\|\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \Big(\min_{j\in[n]} \|W_j\|_F + \epsilon\Big)^{n-2} .$$

■

I.12. Proof of Proposition 14

The proof is organized as follows. Subsubappendix I.12.1 establishes preliminaries. Subsubappendix I.12.2 proves that the trajectory of gradient flow is defined over infinite time. Subsubappendix I.12.3 defines a reparameterization of the gradient flow trajectory, to be used as a technical tool. Subsubappendix I.12.4 lower bounds the minimal distance of the reparameterized trajectory from the origin. Subsubappendix I.12.5 confirms that the reparameterized trajectory escapes the origin. Subsubappendix I.12.6 establishes subsequent convergence, during which the reparameterized trajectory approaches global minimum exponentially fast. Subsubappendix I.12.7 shows that at time $\bar{t}$ (defined in Equation (21)) the (original) gradient flow trajectory reaches $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimality. Subsubappendix I.12.8 analyzes the geometry of the optimization landscape around the gradient flow trajectory, namely, it confirms validity of the smoothness and Lipschitz constants $\beta_{t,\epsilon}$ and $\gamma_{t,\epsilon}$ (given in statement of Proposition 14) respectively, and bounds the integral of the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian in accordance with Equation (22). Finally, Subsubappendix I.12.9 concludes.

I.12.1. PRELIMINARIES

We assume $\bar{\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ without loss of generality (a proof that is valid for $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}$ automatically accounts for $\bar{\epsilon} > \frac{1}{2}$ as well). Throughout the proof we identify matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$ with vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{d_0}$. For example, we identify the end-to-end matrix $W_{n:1} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$ (Equation (10)) with the vector $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$, and the empirical (uncentered) cross-covariance matrix between training labels and inputs, $\Lambda_{yx} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$, with the vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$. Accordingly, we overload notation by regarding the function $\phi(\cdot)$ (defined in Equation (11)) not only as a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, but also as one from $\mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Under the latter view, $\phi(\cdot)$ is defined by $\phi(\boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2^2 + \min_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q})$. For $t \geq 0$, we denote by $W_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}, W_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}, \ldots, W_{n-1}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{n-1},d_{n-2}}, W_n(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_{n-1}}$ the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (gradient flow trajectory at time t), and by $W_{n:1}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_0}$ (or $\mathbf{w}_{n:1}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$) the corresponding end-to-end matrix (*i.e.* $W_{n:1}(t) := W_n(t)W_{n-1}(t)\cdots W_1(t)$).

Definition 34 *Define $\boldsymbol{h} : \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ by:*

$$\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{w}) := \Big(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^{2-\frac{2}{n}} I_{d_0} + (n-1)\big[\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{w}^\top\big]^{1-\frac{1}{n}}\Big)\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}) ,$$

where $I_{d_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ represents identity, and $[\cdot]^c$, $c \geq 0$, stands for a power operator defined over positive semi-definite matrices (with $c = 0$ yielding identity by definition).

The importance of the vector field $\boldsymbol{h}(\cdot)$ lies in the fact that it characterizes the dynamics of the end-to-end matrix — a result proven in Arora et al. (2018), stated hereafter for completeness.

Lemma 35 *$\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)$ is a solution to the following initial value problem:*

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,s} \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t) = -\boldsymbol{h}\big(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)\big) .$$

Proof The lemma follows directly from Theorem 1 in Arora et al. (2018). ■

The following lemma will be used throughout the proof.

Lemma 36 *Let $t \in [0,\infty) \cup \{\infty\}$. Let $q, \bar{q} : [0,t) \to \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable functions, and let $g : [0,t) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be some locally Lipschitz function. Assume that:*

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) && q(0) \leq \bar{q}(0)\,; \\ &(ii) && \tfrac{d}{dt} q(t') \leq g\big(t', q(t')\big) \ \textit{for all } t' \in [0,t)\,; \textit{and} \\ &(iii) && \tfrac{d}{dt} \bar{q}(t') \geq g\big(t', \bar{q}(t')\big) \ \textit{for all } t' \in [0,t)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then $q(t') \leq \bar{q}(t')$ for all $t' \in [0,t)$.

Proof The lemma is a direct consequence of Theorem 10.3 in Hairer et al. (1993). ■

I.12.2. INFINITE TIME

One of the assertions of Proposition 14 is that the gradient flow trajectory is defined over infinite time. This is confirmed by the following lemma.

Lemma 37 *The trajectory of gradient flow is defined over infinite time.*

Proof by Theorem 1 we may denote the gradient flow trajectory by $\boldsymbol{\theta} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, where either: *(i)* $t_e = \infty$; or *(ii)* $t_e < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2 = \infty$. Our objective is to show that $t_e = \infty$, thus it suffices to establish that $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ is bounded, *i.e.* there exists a constant larger than $||\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)||$ for all $t \in [0, t_e)$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ meets the balancedness condition (Equation (19)). Theorem 2.2 in Du et al. (2018) implies that the balancedness condition is preserved along the gradient flow trajectory, *i.e.* for any $j \in [n-1]$ and $t \in [0, t_e)$, it holds that:

$$W_{j+1}^\top(t) W_{j+1}(t) = W_j(t) W_j^\top(t). \tag{58}$$

Using this relation repeatedly, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)\|_2^2 &= \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}^\top(t) \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t) \\ &= W_{n:1}(t) W_{n:1}^\top(t) \\ &= W_{n:2}(t) W_1(t) W_1^\top(t) W_{n:2}^\top(t) \\ &= W_{n:2}(t) W_2^\top(t) W_2(t) W_{n:2}^\top(t) \\ &= W_{n:3}(t) W_2(t) W_2^\top(t) W_2(t) W_2^\top(t) W_{n:3}^\top(t) \\ &= W_{n:3}(t) W_3^\top(t) W_3(t) W_3^\top(t) W_3(t) W_{n:3}^\top(t) \\ &\vdots \\ &= \big(W_n(t) W_n^\top(t)\big)^n \\ &= \|W_n(t)\|_F^{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the balancedness condition implies that $\|W_j(t)\|_F = \|W_{j+1}(t)\|_F$ for any $t \in [0, t_e)$ and $j \in [n-1]$ (to see this, simply apply trace to both sides of Equation (58)), we may conclude $\|W_j(t)\|_F^2 =$

$\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)\|_2^{2/n}$ for any $j \in [n]$. Gradient flow monotonically non-increases the objective it optimizes, *i.e.* $f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\big)$ is non-increasing. In particular it holds that $f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\big) \leq f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\big)$ for all $t \in [0, t_e)$. Relying on Equation (20), we obtain $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2$ for all $t \in [0, t_e)$. By the triangle inequality we have that $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2$. Thus, for all $t \in [0, t_e)$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|W_j(t)\|_F^2 = n\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t)\|_2^{2/n} \leq n\big(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2\big)^{2/n}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

I.12.3. REPARAMETERIZATION

Consider the initial value problem:

$$\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0) \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t) = -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(n\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) + (n-1)\,\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\,. \tag{59}$$

Lemma 38 below establishes existence of a unique solution to this problem.

Lemma 38 *The initial value problem in Equation (59) admits a solution $\boldsymbol{u} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$, where either:* (i) $t_e = \infty$*; or* (ii) $t_e < \infty$ *and* $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \in \{0, \infty\}$*. Moreover, the solution is unique in the sense that any other solution $\boldsymbol{u}' : [0, t_e') \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ must satisfy $t_e' \leq t_e$ and $\forall t \in [0, t_e') : \boldsymbol{u}'(t) = \boldsymbol{u}(t)$.*

Proof Define $\boldsymbol{g} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ by:

$$\boldsymbol{g}(t, \boldsymbol{w}) := -\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2\big(n\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) + (n-1)\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{w}^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\,.$$

The dynamics in Equation (59) can be written as $\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t) = \boldsymbol{g}\big(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t)\big)$. Since $g(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, the lemma follows directly from the results in Section 1.5 of Grant (2014).[4] ■

Hereafter, we denote by $\boldsymbol{u} : [0, t_e) \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$ the (unique) solution to Equation (59). In the remainder of the current subsubappendix we will show that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is a reparameterization of the gradient flow trajectory, or more precisely, of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$.

The following definition overloads notation by extending the scalar ν (defined in the statement of Proposition 14) to a function.

Definition 39 *Define $\nu : [0, t_e) \to [-1, 1]$ by $\nu(t) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}^\top \boldsymbol{u}(t)}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}$.*

Notice that $\nu(0)$ coincides with the original (scalar) definition of ν. Lemma 40 below makes use of $\nu(\cdot)$ for characterizing the dynamics of the norm of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 40 *For all $t \in [0, t_e)$:*

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 = n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\Big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\Big)\,.$$

Proof Recall that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\| = 1$. For all $t \in [0, t_e)$, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 &= \tfrac{\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right) \\
&= \tfrac{\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\Big(-\|\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right)\|_2\big(n\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) + (n-1)\left\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\Big) \\
&= -n\|\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right)\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right)\|_2\nu(t) + (n-1)\left\|\boldsymbol{u}\left(t\right)\right\|_2\nu(t) \\
&= n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\Big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\Big)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from the chain rule and derivative of a (non-zero) vector norm, and the second transition follows from $u(\cdot)$ being a solution to Equation (59). ■

Relying on Lemma 40, Lemma 41 below derives upper and lower bounds for the norm of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 41 *For all $t \in [0, t_e)$:*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{nt}\,.$$

Proof We start by proving the upper bound. Recall that by Lemma 40 we have that $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 = n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)$. It holds that $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, as $\nu(t) \leq 1$ (by Definition 39). Integrating over time:

$$\ln\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\right) - \ln\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2\right) = \int_0^t \tfrac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2}\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2 dt' \leq \int_0^t n dt' = nt.$$

It follows that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2\, e^{nt}$.

Moving on to the lower bound, define $g : [0, t_e) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by:

$$g(t, z) := \begin{cases} -nz\big(1+z\big) & z \geq 1 \\ -2nz & z < 1 \end{cases}.$$

Note that $g(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. For all $t \in [0, t_e)$, it holds that:

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 < 1\,,$$

where the equality follows from $u(\cdot)$ being a solution to Equation (59), and the last inequality follows from an assumption made in Proposition 14. Using this fact, the following holds for all $t \in [0, t_e)$:

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\big(\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt}\big) = -2n\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt} = g\big(t, \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt}\big)\,.$$

On the other hand, recalling that $\nu(t) \geq -1$ (by Definition 39) for all $t \in [0, t_e)$, it holds (for both cases $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\| < 1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\| \geq 1$) that:

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 = n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big) \geq g\big(t, \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)\,.$$

We may now use Lemma 36 to conclude $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2\, e^{-2nt} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ for all $t \in [0, t_e)$. ■

Taken together, Lemmas 38 and 41 imply that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is defined over infinite time. We formalize this in Lemma 42 below.

Lemma 42 *It holds that $t_e = \infty$, i.e. we may write $\boldsymbol{u} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.*

Proof Assume by contradiction that $t_e < \infty$. Lemma 38 implies $\lim_{t \nearrow t_e} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \in \{0, \infty\}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 41 we have that $\liminf_{t \nearrow t_e} \geq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 e^{-2nt_e}$ and $\limsup_{t \nearrow t_e} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\| e^{nt_e}$, which is a contradiction. Hence it must be that $t_e = \infty$. ■

Finally, we are in a position to prove that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is indeed a (monotonic) reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 43 *For all $t \geq 0$:*

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t)\big) = \boldsymbol{u}(t)\,,$$

where $\xi : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined by $\xi(t) := \int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2^{-(1-2/n)}\, dt'$.

Proof Define $\boldsymbol{g} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_0}/\{\mathbf{0}\} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ by $\boldsymbol{g}(t, \boldsymbol{w}) := -\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{w}) \big/ \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{1-2/n}$. Note that $\boldsymbol{g}(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Define the following initial value problem:

$$\boldsymbol{q}(0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0) \quad , \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{q}(t) = \boldsymbol{g}\big(t, \boldsymbol{q}(t)\big). \tag{60}$$

We will show both $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(\cdot))$ are solutions to Equation (60), which by uniqueness implies $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(\cdot))$ for all $t \geq 0$, as required. By the definition of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ (solution to Equation (59)) it holds that $\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0) = \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(0))$. With the help of Lemma 35 we establish the following for $t \geq 0$:

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\big(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(t))\big) = \tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t)\big) \cdot \tfrac{d\xi}{dt}(t) = -\boldsymbol{h}\big(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(t))\big) \big/ \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{1-2/n} = \boldsymbol{g}\big(t, \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(t))\big).$$

Recall that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is a solution to Equation (59). For all $t \geq 0$, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t) &= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(n\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) + (n-1)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) - (n-1)\,\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\boldsymbol{u}(t) + (n-1)\,\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) - (n-1)\,\big[\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{u}(t) + (n-1)\,\big[\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) - (n-1)\,\big[\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) - (n-1)\,\big[\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t)\big) \\
&= -\Big(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{2-2/n}\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big) + (n-1)\,\big[\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\big]^{1-1/n}\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t)\big)\Big) \Big/ \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{1-2/n} \\
&= -\boldsymbol{h}\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t)\big) \big/ \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{1-2/n} \\
&= \boldsymbol{g}\big(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

The above confirms that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(\cdot))$ are both solutions to Equation (60), thereby completing the proof. ■

I.12.4. MINIMAL DISTANCE FROM ORIGIN

In this subsubappendix we derive a lower bound on the minimal distance of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ — solution to Equation (59), which by Lemma 43 is a reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$ — from the origin. We denote this minimal distance by $u_{\min}$, *i.e.* we let $u_{\min} := \inf_{t \geq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$.

Recall the function $\nu(\cdot)$ from Definition 39. Lemma 44 below establishes several properties of this function.

Lemma 44 *For all $t \geq 0$, the following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(i) \quad \nu(t) \in (-1, 1]\,; \\
&(ii) \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\nu(t) = 1 - \nu(t)^2; \\
&(iii) \quad \nu(t) = 1 - 2 \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)} \Big/ \left(\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)} + e^{2t}\right)\,; \text{ and} \\
&(iv) \quad \lim_{t \nearrow \infty} \nu(t) = 1\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof Recall $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 = 1$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\nu(t) &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}^\top \tfrac{d}{dt}\left(\tfrac{\boldsymbol{u}(t)}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\right) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}^\top \frac{\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2} \\
&= \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2} \frac{\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the expression for $\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{u}(t)$ from Equation (59) and the one of $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ from Lemma 40 (while dividing by $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$) affirms property *(ii)*:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\nu(t) &= \tfrac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\left(\left((n-1)\,\tfrac{\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(n\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big)\right) - \Big(\boldsymbol{u}(t)n\big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)\Big)\right) \\
&= \Big(\,(n-1)\,\nu(t)^2 - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(n\nu(t) - 1/\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)\Big) - \Big(\nu(t)n\big(\nu(t) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)\Big) \\
&= (n-1)\,\nu(t)^2 - n\nu(t)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 + 1 - n\nu(t)^2 + n\nu(t)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \\
&= 1 - \nu(t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1, the initial value problem which $\nu(t)$ solves (*i.e.* $\nu(0) = 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt}\nu(t) = 1 - \nu(t)^2$) admits a unique solution. Since $t \mapsto 1 - 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right)\Big/\left(\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)} + e^{2t}\right)$ is a solution to this problem, it must be that $\nu(t) = 1 - 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right)\Big/\left(\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)} + e^{2t}\right)$. This confirms property *(iii)*. Properties *(i)* and *(iv)* immediately follow. ■

Below we define a point in time that will turn out to be one at which the distance of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ from the origin is minimal (*i.e.* is equal to $u_{\min}$).

Definition 45 *Let $t_m := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \nu(t) \geq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\}$, where by convention $t_m = \infty$ if $\nu(t) < \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Lemma 46 below establishes that t_m is finite, that the norm of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is monotonically decreasing until t_m and monotonically non-decreasing thereafter, and that this norm remains smaller than one.

Lemma 46 *It holds that:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(i) \quad t_m < \infty\,; \\
&(ii) \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 < 0 \text{ for all } t \in [0, t_m)\,; \\
&(iii) \quad \tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \geq 0 \text{ for all } t \in [t_m, \infty)\,; \text{ and} \\
&(iv) \quad \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 < 1 \text{ for all } t \geq 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof We start by treating the special case where $\nu(0) = 1$. Recall that by assumption $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\| < 1$. Together with Equation (59) this implies $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 < 1 = \nu(0)$. Thus, by definition $t_m = 0$. We trivially obtain properties *(i)* and *(ii)*. By Lemma 40 together with property *(iii)* from Lemma 44 it holds that $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 = n\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big(1 - \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)$. These dynamics, along with the initial value $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2$, induce an initial value problem whose unique solution is $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 = e^{nt}\big/\big(e^{nt} + \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|^{-1} - 1\big)$. This confirms properties *(iii)* and *(iv)*. From this point onward we assume $\nu(0) \neq 1$.

By definition of t_m, it holds that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 > \nu(t)$ for $t \in [0, t_m)$. Together with Lemma 40 this implies property *(ii)*.

Relying on property *(ii)*, we have $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 < 1$ for $t \in [0, t_m)$, where we used the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 < 1$. Assume by contradiction that property *(i)* does not hold, *i.e.* $t_m = \infty$. This means that $\nu(t) < \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 44, $\lim_{t\nearrow\infty} \nu(t) = 1$ — a contradiction. Thus, property *(i)* must hold.

From the definition of t_m, together with continuity of $\nu(t)$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, it must be that $\nu(t_m) \geq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2$. Define $\bar{t}_m := \inf\{t \geq t_m : \nu(t) < \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\}$, where by convention the infimum of the empty set is equal to infinity. Property *(iii)* of Lemma 44 together with $\nu(0) < 1$ imply that $\nu(t) < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$ (recall that we are treating the case $\nu(0) \neq 1$). We have previously shown (in the proof of this lemma) that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\| < 1$ for $t \in [0, t_m)$. By definition of $\bar{t}_m$, it holds that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq \nu(t) < 1$ for all $t \in [t_m, \bar{t}_m)$. Relying on this inequality together with Lemma 40, we have that $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\| \geq 0$ for $t \in [t_m, \bar{t}_m)$. If $\bar{t}_m = \infty$, then we obtain properties *(iii)* and *(iv)*, thereby finishing the proof. Assume by contradiction that this is not the case, *i.e.* $\bar{t}_m < \infty$. From continuity $\|\boldsymbol{u}(\bar{t}_m)\| = \nu(\bar{t}_m)$. By Lemmas 40 and 44:

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\nu(t)\big|_{t=\bar{t}_m} = 1 - \nu(\bar{t}_m)^2 > 0 = n\|\boldsymbol{u}(\bar{t}_m)\|_2\Big(\nu(\bar{t}_m) - \|\boldsymbol{u}(\bar{t}_m)\|_2\Big) = \tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big|_{t=\bar{t}_m},$$

implying existence of a right neighborhood of $\bar{t}_m$ which contradicts its definition. ■

As a direct consequence of Lemma 46, we obtain that the distance of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ from the origin is indeed minimal at time t_m. This is formalized in Lemma 47 below.

Lemma 47 *It holds that* $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 = u_{\min}$. *Moreover, if* $\nu(0) \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2$ *then* $\nu(t_m) = u_{\min}$.

Proof $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 = u_{\min}$ directly follows from properties *(ii)* and *(iii)* of Lemma 46. In the case where $\nu(0) \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2$, from continuity of $\nu(t)$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, and from the definition of t_m, it must be that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 = \nu(t_m)$. Together with $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 = u_{\min}$, this concludes the proof. ■

Finally, we are ready to establish a lower bound for $u_{\min}$.

Lemma 48 *It holds that:*

$$u_{\min} \geq \big\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\big\|_2 \min\left\{1, \left(\tfrac{2}{3}\cdot\tfrac{1+\nu(0)}{1-\nu(0)}\right)^n\right\},$$

where in the case $\nu(0) = 1$ *the fraction* $(1 + \nu(0))/(1 - \nu(0))$ *is to be interpreted as equal to infinity, leading to* $u_{\min} \geq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2$.

Proof We split the proof into two possible cases: *(i)* $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \leq \nu(0)$; and *(ii)* $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 > \nu(0)$.

In case *(i)*, by definition $t_m = 0$. By taking Lemma 47 together with Equation (59), we obtain $u_{\min} = \|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2$.

Moving on to case *(ii)*, recall that by assumption $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 \leq 0.2$ and $\nu(0) \neq -1$. By Equation (59), we have that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2$. Define $t_b := \frac{1}{2}\ln\big(\frac{1+\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2}{1-\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\big)$, which we will show upper bounds t_m. Plugging $t = t_b$ into the explicit expression for $\nu(t)$ given in property *(iii)* of Lemma 44, we have that $\nu(t_b) = \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2$. Taking this together with Lemma 47, we obtain $\nu(t_b) = \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \geq u_{\min} = \nu(t_m)$. Note that $\nu(0) < \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 < 1$, and property *(iii)* of Lemma 44, together imply that $\nu(t)$ is (strictly) monotonically increasing. Thus, it must be that $t_b \geq t_m$. Combining this observation with Lemma 41 yields:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\min} &= \|\boldsymbol{u}(t_m)\|_2 \\ &\geq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \exp\big(-2nt_m\big) \\ &\geq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \exp\big(-2nt_b\big) \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \big(\tfrac{1+\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2}{1-\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2} \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\big)^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 \leq 0.2$ enables us to conclude the proof for this case. ■

I.12.5. ESCAPE FROM ORIGIN

Recall that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is the (unique) solution to Equation (59), which by Lemma 43 is a reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$. Recall also the function $\nu(\cdot)$ from Definition 39, which quantifies the alignment between $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}$. The current subsubappendix defines a certain point in time (Definition 49), establishes that after this point $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}$ are highly aligned (Lemma 50), and shows that this alignment is accompanied by an escape of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ from the origin (Lemma 51).

Definition 49 *Define* $t_a := \frac{1}{2}\ln\big(\max\big\{5 \cdot \frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big)$.

Lemma 50 *For all* $t \geq t_a$*:* $\nu(t) \geq \frac{2}{3}$.

Proof We split the proof into two possible cases: *(i)* $\nu(0) \geq \frac{2}{3}$; and *(ii)* $\nu(0) < \frac{2}{3}$.

For case *(i)*, it holds that $t_a = 0$. We conclude the proof for this case by relying on Lemma 44, which implies that $\nu(t)$ is monotonically non-decreasing.

Moving on to case *(ii)*, it holds that $t_a = \frac{1}{2}\ln\big(5 \cdot \frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\big)$. Plugging $t = t_a$ into the explicit expression for $\nu(t)$ given in Lemma 44, we obtain $\nu(t_a) = \frac{2}{3}$. We conclude the proof for this case by once again relying on the fact that $\nu(t)$ is monotonically non-decreasing. ■

Lemma 51 *For all* $t \geq 0$*:*

$$\big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t)\big\|_2 \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{\exp(\frac{2}{3}nt)}{\exp(\frac{2}{3}nt) + \frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1} - 1},$$

where (as defined in Subsubappendix I.12.4) $u_{\min} := \inf_{t \geq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$.

Proof Define $g : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $g(z) := nz(\frac{2}{3} - z)$. Notice that $g(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Define $\bar{u} : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\bar{u}(t) := \frac{2}{3}\exp\big(\frac{2}{3}nt\big)\big/\big(\exp\big(\frac{2}{3}nt\big) + \frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1} - 1\big)$. It holds that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a)\|_2 \geq u_{\min} = \bar{u}(0)$. By Lemmas 40 and 50, $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \geq g\big(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\big)$ for all $t \geq t_a$. Furthermore, notice that $\frac{d}{dt}\bar{u}\big(t\big) = g\big(\bar{u}(t)\big)$. We may now use Lemma 36 to obtain $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t)\|_2 \geq \bar{u}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. ■

I.12.6. CONVERGENCE

Recall that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is the (unique) solution to Equation (59), and (by Lemma 43) a reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$. Recall also the (alignment guaranteeing) time t_a from Definition 49, the notation $u_{\min} := \inf_{t\geq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, and the fact that (by Lemma 48) $u_{min} > 0$. In this subsubappendix we define a certain time duration (Definition 52), and show that after it elapses from t_a: *(i)* the norm of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is on the order of one, which is the norm of the target solution $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}$ (Lemma 53); and *(ii)* $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}$ exponentially fast (Lemma 54).

Definition 52 *Define* $t_c := \frac{3}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\right)$.[34]

Lemma 53 *For all* $t \geq 0$*:* $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t_c + t)\|_2 \geq \frac{2n}{3(n+1)}$.

Proof Let $t \geq 0$. From Lemma 51:

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a+t_c+t)\|_2 \geq \frac{2}{3}\cdot\frac{\exp\left(\frac{2}{3}n(t_c+t)\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{2}{3}n(t_c+t)\right)+\frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1}-1} \geq \frac{2}{3}\cdot\frac{\exp\left(\frac{2}{3}nt_c\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{2}{3}nt_c\right)+\frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1}} = \frac{2}{3}\cdot\frac{n\left(\frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1}\right)}{n\left(\frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1}\right)+\left(\frac{2}{3}u_{\min}^{-1}\right)} = \frac{2n}{3(n+1)}.$$

■

Lemma 54 *For all* $t \geq 0$*:* $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t_c + t)\|_2 \leq \frac{6}{5}\exp\left(-\frac{2n}{3(n+1)}t\right)$.

Proof Property *(iv)* from Lemma 46 together with $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 = 1$ imply that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \neq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Relying on Equation (59), while recalling the function $\nu(\cdot)$ from Definition 39, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 &= \tfrac{\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\tfrac{d}{dt}\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\right) \\
&= \tfrac{\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\left(n\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\right) - (n-1)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)^\top\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\right) \\
&= \tfrac{\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\left(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\right) + (n-1)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\boldsymbol{u}(t) - (n-1)\nu(t)\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right) \\
&= \tfrac{\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right)^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\left(\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\right) + (n-1)\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \nu(t)\right)\boldsymbol{u}(t)\right) \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 + (n-1)\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \nu(t)\right)\tfrac{\nu(t)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2-\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2} \\
&= -\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \tfrac{(n-1)\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}-\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2}\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 - \nu(t)\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. By Lemma 53, we may bound $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 \leq -\frac{2n}{3(n+1)}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ for all $t \geq t_a + t_c$. Let $t' \geq 0$. We integrate $\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2/\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ from $t = t_a + t_c$ to $t = t_a + t_c + t'$ in order to obtain $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t_c + t')\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t_c)\|_2 \exp\left(-\frac{2n}{3(n+1)}t'\right)$. Recall that by assumption $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\| \leq 0.2$. By Equation (59) we have that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2$. We conclude the proof by noting that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} - \boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 \leq \frac{6}{5}$. ■

34. Note that, since $n \geq 2$ and $u_{\min} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(0)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 \leq 0.2$, the time duration t_c is necessarily positive.

I.12.7. TIME TO CONVERGENCE

Recall that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is the (unique) solution to Equation (59), and that Lemma 43 presents a monotonically increasing function $\xi(\cdot)$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t)\big) = \boldsymbol{u}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Recall also the function $\nu(\cdot)$ from Definition 39, quantifying the alignment between $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}$. Finally, recall the times t_a and t_c from Definitions 49 and 52, which guarantee alignment and initiation of exponential convergence, respectively. The current subsubappendix makes use of the above to establish that at the time $\bar{t}$ defined in Equation (21), $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$ is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal, *i.e.* $\frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\bar{t}\,) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2^2 \leq \bar{\epsilon}$.

We begin by defining a certain time duration (Definition 55), and showing that it elapsing from $t_a + t_c$ ensures that $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal (Lemma 56).

Definition 55 *Define* $t_{\bar{\epsilon}} := \frac{3(n+1)}{2n} \ln\left(\frac{6}{5\sqrt{2\bar{\epsilon}}}\right)$.[35]

Lemma 56 *It holds that* $\frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2^2 \leq \bar{\epsilon}$.

Proof The proof follows from plugging $t = t_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ into the result of Lemma 54. ■

Moving from the reparameterized to the original gradient flow trajectory, *i.e.* from $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ to $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$, we immediately obtain $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimality of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$ at time $\xi(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}})$.

Lemma 57 *It holds that* $\frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}})) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2^2 \leq \bar{\epsilon}$.

Proof The proof immediately follows from Lemmas 43 and 56. ■

Lemma 58 below shows that the time $\bar{t}$ defined in Equation (21) (recall that the scalar ν there, defined in the preceding text, coincides with the value taken by the function $\nu(\cdot)$ at zero) is greater than or equal to $\xi(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}})$.

Lemma 58 *It holds that* $\bar{t} \geq \xi(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}})$.

Proof By Lemma 46 we have that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2 < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Recall the notation $u_{\min} := \inf_{t \geq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, and the fact that (by Lemma 48) $u_{\min} \geq \big\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\big\|_2 \min\left\{1, \left(\frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1+\nu(0)}{1-\nu(0)}\right)^n\right\}$. For all $t \geq 0$:

$$\xi(t) = \int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2^{-(1-2/n)}\, dt' \leq \int_0^t u_{\min}^{-1}\, dt' = t u_{\min}^{-1}. \tag{61}$$

Recall from Subsubappendix I.12.1 that we assume (without loss of generality) $\bar{\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}} &= \tfrac{1}{2} \ln\left(\max\left\{5 \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\right\}\right) + \tfrac{3}{2n} \ln\left(\tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\right) + \tfrac{3(n+1)}{2n} \ln\left(\tfrac{6}{5\sqrt{2\bar{\epsilon}}}\right) \\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{2} \ln\left(5 \max\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\right\}\right) + \ln\left(\tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\right) + 4 \ln\left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{\epsilon}}}\right) \\ &\leq \ln\left(\sqrt{5} \max\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\right\} \cdot \tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}} \cdot (1/\bar{\epsilon})^2\right) \\ &\leq \ln\left(5n \max\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\right\} \cdot (1/\bar{\epsilon})^2 \cdot u_{\min}^{-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

35. Note that $t_{\bar{\epsilon}} > 0$, since we assume $\bar{\epsilon} \leq 1/2$ without loss of generality (*cf.* Subsubappendix I.12.1).

Using Equations (61) and (62), we conclude the proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\xi(t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}}) \\
&\leq (t_a + t_c + t_{\bar{\epsilon}}) u_{\min}^{-1} \\
&\leq \ln\left(5n \max\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\right\} \cdot (1/\bar{\epsilon})^2 \cdot u_{\min}^{-1}\right) \cdot u_{\min}^{-1} \\
&\leq \ln\left(5n(1/\bar{\epsilon})^2 \left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\right\|_2^{-1} \max\left\{1, \left(\tfrac{3}{2} \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right)^{n+1}\right\}\right) \cdot \left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\right\|_2^{-1} \max\left\{1, \left(\tfrac{3}{2} \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right)^{n}\right\} \\
&\leq \ln\left(15n(1/2\bar{\epsilon}) \left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\right\|_2^{-1} \max\left\{1, \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right\}\right) \cdot 2n \left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\right\|_2^{-1} \max\left\{1, \left(\tfrac{3}{2} \cdot \tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}\right)^{n}\right\} \\
&= \bar{t}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Combining Lemmas 57 and 58 with the fact that, in general, gradient flow monotonically non-increases the objective it optimizes, we obtain the result which the current subsubappendix set out to prove — $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimality of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$ at time $\bar{t}$.

Lemma 59 *It holds that* $f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\bar{t})\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\bar{t}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2^2 \leq \bar{\epsilon}$.

Proof The proof follows directly from Equation (20), Lemmas 57 and 58, and the fact that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot))$ is monotonically non-increasing. ■

I.12.8. GEOMETRIC ANALYSIS

The current subsubappendix analyzes the geometry of the optimization landscape around the gradient flow trajectory. Namely, under the notations of Theorem 3, for $t > 0$, $\epsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2n}\right]$ and corresponding $\mathcal{D}_{t,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time t), it establishes a smoothness constant $\beta_{t,\epsilon} = 16n$, a Lipschitz constant $\gamma_{t,\epsilon} = 6\sqrt{n}$, and the (upper) bound on the integral of (minus) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian given in Equation (22) (with the function $m(\cdot)$ there being non-negative).

Recall (from Lemma 46) that the (Euclidean) norm of $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ — the (unique) solution to Equation (59) — is upper bounded by one. Since (by Lemma 43) $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is a reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$, the norm of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$ is upper bounded by one as well. This allows proving the following result.

Lemma 60 *For all* $t' \geq 0$*:*

$$\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^n \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\,.$$

Proof For all $t' \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^n &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n} \binom{n}{j} \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{(n-j)/n} \epsilon^j \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^{n} n^j \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{(n-j)/n} \epsilon^j \\
&= \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} n^j \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{(n-j)/n} \epsilon^j .
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 43 we have that $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t')\big) = \boldsymbol{u}(t')$, where $\xi(t') := \int_0^{t'} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t'')\|_2^{-(1-2/n)}\, dt''$. $\xi(\cdot)$ is unbounded since $\|\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)\|_2$ is bounded by property *(iv)* of Lemma 46. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\big)^n &\leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \big(n\epsilon\big)^j \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + \frac{n\epsilon}{1-n\epsilon} \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from the formula for geometric sum (notice that $n\epsilon < 1$ since by assumption $\epsilon \leq 1/2n$), and the last transition follows from the assumption $\epsilon \leq 1/2n$. ■

Building on Lemma 60, and the fact that (by assumption) the gradient flow trajectory $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$ emanates from a balanced initialization (*i.e.* an initialization whose weight matrices satisfy the condition in Equation (19)) — which by Du et al. (2018) implies that $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')$ is balanced for any $t' \geq 0$ — the lemma below establishes different properties for weight settings lying ϵ-away from the trajectory.

Lemma 61 *Let $t' \geq 0$ and let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a weight setting satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Denote by $W_{1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}, W_{2,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}, \ldots, W_{n-1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{n-1},d_{n-2}}, W_{n,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_{n-1}}$ the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon$, and by $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ the corresponding end-to-end matrix $W_{n,\epsilon} W_{n-1,\epsilon} \cdots W_{1,\epsilon}$ (in vectorized form). Then, the following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}&(i) \qquad \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 \leq \big(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\big)^n - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2\,; \\ &(ii) \qquad \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon})\|_2 \leq \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t'))\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\,; \text{ and} \\ &(iii) \qquad \text{for any } \mathcal{J} \subseteq [n]\backslash\emptyset,\ \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_{j,\epsilon}\|_F \leq \big(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\big)^{\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof For brevity, throughout this proof we omit the time t' from our notation, *i.e.* we denote $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')$, $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')$, $W_{n:1}(t')$ and $W_1(t'), ..., W_n(t')$ by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}$, $W_{n:1}$ and $W_1, ..., W_n$ respectively.

Starting with property *(i)*, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big\|_2 \\ &= \big\|W_{n:1,\epsilon} - W_{n:1}\big\|_F \\ &= \big\|(W_n + W_{n,\epsilon} - W_n)\cdots(W_1 + W_{1,\epsilon} - W_1) - W_{n:1}\big\|_F \\ &= \Big\|\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n} \big(b_n W_n + (1-b_n)(W_{n,\epsilon} - W_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1 W_1 + (1-b_1)(W_{1,\epsilon} - W_1)\big) - W_{n:1}\Big\|_F \\ &= \Big\|\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\backslash\{1\}^n} \big(b_n W_n + (1-b_n)(W_{\epsilon,n} - W_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1 W_1 + (1-b_1)(W_{\epsilon,1} - W_1)\big)\Big\|_F \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\backslash\{1\}^n} \big\|\big(b_n W_n + (1-b_n)(W_{\epsilon,n} - W_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1 W_1 + (1-b_1)(W_{\epsilon,1} - W_1)\big)\big\|_F \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\backslash\{1\}^n} \big\|b_n W_n + (1-b_n)(W_{\epsilon,n} - W_n)\big\|_F \cdots \big\|b_1 W_1 + (1-b_1)(W_{\epsilon,1} - W_1)\big)\big\|_F \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\backslash\{1\}^n} \big(b_n\|W_n\|_F + (1-b_n)\|W_{n,\epsilon} - W_n\|_F\big)\cdots\big(b_1\|W_1\|_F + (1-b_1)\|W_{1,\epsilon} - W_1\|_F\big) \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\backslash\{1\}^n} \big(b_n\|W_n\|_F + (1-b_n)\epsilon\big)\cdots\big(b_1\|W_1\|_F + (1-b_1)\epsilon\big),\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where the inequalities follow from sub-multiplicativity and sub-additivity of Frobenius norm, as well as the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$ meets the balancedness condition (Equation (19)). Theorem 2.2 from Du et al. (2018) implies that the balancedness condition holds

along the gradient flow trajectory. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is balanced, *i.e.* for any $j \in [n-1]$ it holds that $W_{j+1}^\top W_{j+1} = W_j W_j^\top$. Using this relation repeatedly, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^2 &= \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1} \\
&= W_{n:1} W_{n:1}^\top \\
&= W_{n:2} W_1 W_1^\top W_{n:2}^\top \\
&= W_{n:2} W_2^\top W_2 W_{n:2}^\top \\
&= W_{n:3} W_2 W_2^\top W_2 W_2^\top W_{n:3}^\top \\
&= W_{n:3} W_3^\top W_3 W_3^\top W_3 W_{n:3}^\top \\
&\vdots \\
&= \left(W_n W_n^\top\right)^n \\
&= \|W_n\|_F^{2n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Since the balancedness condition implies that $\|W_j\|_F = \|W_{j+1}\|_F$ for any $j \in [n-1]$, we may conclude $\|W_j\|_F = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n}$ for any $j \in [n]$. This, along with Equation (63), establishes property *(i)*:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n} \left(b_n\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + (1-b_n)\epsilon\right)\cdots\left(b_1\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + (1-b_1)\epsilon\right) \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n} \left(b_n\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + (1-b_n)\epsilon\right)\cdots\left(b_1\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + (1-b_1)\epsilon\right) - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2 \\
&= \left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^n - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Moving to property *(ii)*, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon})\|_2 &= \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 \\
&= \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx} + \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2 \\
&= \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1})\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} - \boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

applying property *(i)*, together with Lemma 60, we obtain property *(ii)*:

$$\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon})\|_2 \leq \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1})\|_2 + \left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^n - \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2 \leq \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1})\|_2 + 2n\epsilon.$$

Regarding property *(iii)*, for any $\mathcal{J} \subseteq [n]$ we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_{j,\epsilon}\|_F &= \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j + W_{j,\epsilon} - W_j\|_F \\
&\leq \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\|W_j\|_F + \|W_{j,\epsilon} - W_j\|_F\right) \\
&\leq \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\|W_j\|_F + \epsilon\right) \\
&= \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right) \\
&= \left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^{|\mathcal{J}|} \\
&= \left(\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\|_2^{1/n} + \epsilon\right)^n\right)^{\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{n}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third transition follows from the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, and the fourth from Equation (64). Applying Lemma 60 concludes the proof of property *(iii)*, and the entire lemma. ■

The following lemma analyzes the Hessian and gradient of the training loss $f(\cdot)$, bounding their spectral and Euclidean norms respectively.

Lemma 62 *For any weight setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with corresponding weight matrices $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}, W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}, \ldots, W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{n-1},d_{n-2}}, W_n \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_{n-1}}$, the following hold:*[12]

$$(i) \quad \|\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_s \leq n \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-1}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F^2 + 2n \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1})\|_2 \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F \text{ ; and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}\, \|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1})\|_2 \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-1}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F .$$

Proof Let $\Delta W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}, \Delta W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}, \ldots, \Delta W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{n-1},d_{n-2}}, \Delta W_n \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_{n-1}}$.

We begin with property *(i)*. By Lemma 5 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta W_1, ..., \Delta W_n] &= \nabla^2\phi\,(W_{n:1})\left[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\right] \\ &+ 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi\,(W_{n:1})^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $W_{j':j}$, for any $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, is defined as $W_{j'}W_{j'-1}\cdots W_j$ if $j \leq j'$, and as an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. We will upper bound each of the two summands on the right-hand side of Equation (65). We bound the first summand as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla^2\phi(W_{n:1})\Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big] \\ &= \Big\|\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\big\|_F\Big)^2 \\ &\leq n\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|W_{n:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\big\|_F^2 \\ &\leq n\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \|W_n\|_F^2 \cdots \|W_{j+1}\|_F^2 \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 \|W_{j-1}\|_F^2 \cdots \|W_1\|_F^2 \\ &\leq n \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n]\\|\mathcal{J}|=n-1}} \textstyle\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \|\Delta W_j\|_F^2 ,\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

where the first transition follows from the fact that the Hessian of $\phi(\cdot)$ is an identity (since $\phi(W) = \frac{1}{2}\|W - \Lambda_{yx}\|_F^2 + c$), the second trasition follows from the triangle inequality, the third trasition follows from the one-norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ being no greater than $\sqrt{n}$ times its Euclidean norm, and the fourth transition follows from sub-multiplicativity of Frobenius norm. Moving on to bounding

the second summand on the right-hand side of Equation (65):

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\text{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big) \\
&\leq 2\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \Big\|\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big\|_F \\
&\leq 2\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\big\|_F \\
&\leq 2\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|\Delta W_{j'}\big\|_F \big\|\Delta W_j\big\|_F \cdot \prod_{j''\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \big\|W_{j''}\big\|_F \\
&\leq 2\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big\|W_j\big\|_F \cdot \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|\Delta W_{j'}\big\|_F \big\|\Delta W_j\big\|_F ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the second and third from sub-additivity and sub-multiplicativity of Frobenius norm respectively. It holds that:

$$\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \big\|\Delta W_{j'}\big\|_F \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F \leq \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F\Big)^2 \leq n\sum_{j=1}^n \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2 ,$$

where the last transition follows from the fact that the one-norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is never greater than $\sqrt{n}$ times its Euclidean norm. This leads us to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\text{Tr}\Big(\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})^\top \textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} W_{n:j'+1}(\Delta W_{j'})W_{j'-1:j+1}(\Delta W_j)W_{j-1:1}\Big) \\
&\leq 2n\left\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\right\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big\|W_j\big\|_F \cdot \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Plugging Equations (66) and (67) into Equation (65), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta W_1, .., \Delta W_n\right] \leq \\
&\left(n \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-1}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F^2 + 2n\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\|_F \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F\right) \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \left\|\Delta W_j\right\|_F^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

This proves property *(i)*.

Moving on to property *(ii)*, we overload notation by allowing the function $f(\cdot)$ to intake the tuple $(W_1, W_2, ..., W_n)$ (in which case $W_1, ..., W_n$ are arranged as $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and the value $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is returned). In Appendix A of Arora et al. (2018) it is shown that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla f(W_1, ..., W_n) = \\
&\Big((W_{n:2})^\top \nabla\phi(W_{n:1}), .., (W_{n:j+1})^\top \nabla\phi(W_{n:1})(W_{j-1:1})^\top, .., \nabla\phi(W_{n:1})(W_{n-1:1})^\top\Big) .
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\|_2^2 &= \left\|\nabla f(W_1, ..., W_n)\right\|_{Frobenius}^2 \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|(W_{n:j+1})^\top \nabla\phi(W_{n:1})(W_{j-1:1})^\top\big\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\big\|_F^2 \prod_{i\in[n]/\{j\}} \|W_j\|_F^2 \\
&\leq n\big\|\nabla\phi(W_{n:1})\big\|_F^2 \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-1}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_j\|_F^2 ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from sub-multiplicativity of Frobenius norm. Taking square root of both sides of the inequality concludes the proof of property *(ii)*, and the entire lemma. ■

Combining Lemmas 61 and 62, Lemma 63 below establishes the smoothness and Lipschitz constants $\beta_{t,\epsilon} = 16n$ and $\gamma_{t,\epsilon} = 6\sqrt{n}$ respectively.

Lemma 63 *It holds that* $\sup_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathcal{D}_{t,\epsilon}} \|\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{q})\|_s \leq 16n$ *and* $\sup_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathcal{D}_{t,\epsilon}} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{q})\|_2 \leq 6\sqrt{n}$.

Proof Under the conditions and notations of Lemma 61, for any $\mathcal{J} \subseteq [n]$:

$$\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_{j,\epsilon}\|_F \leq \left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\right)^{\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{n}}. \tag{68}$$

By Lemma 43 we have that $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t')\big) = \boldsymbol{u}(t')$, where $\xi(t') := \int_0^{t'} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t'')\|_2^{-(1-2/n)}\, dt''$. $\xi(\cdot)$ is unbounded since $\|\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)\|_2 < 1$ by property *(iv)* of Lemma 46. This implies $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 < 1$, which together with the fact that by definition $\epsilon \leq 1/2n$, means:

$$\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_{j,\epsilon}\|_F \leq \big(1+1\big)^{\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{n}} \leq 2. \tag{69}$$

It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon})\|_2 \leq \\ &\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t'))\|_2 + 2n\epsilon = \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t') - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 + 2n\epsilon \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 + 2n\epsilon \leq 3, \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where the first transition follows from Lemma 61, and the last from $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 < 1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 = 1$ and $\epsilon \leq 1/2n$. We conclude the proof by plugging Equations (69) and (70) into the results of Lemma 62, while noticing that arbitrary $t' \geq 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon$ account for all $\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathcal{D}_{t,\epsilon}$. ■

Lemma 64 below employs Lemma 7 from our analysis in Section 4, along with Lemma 61 above, for deriving a lower bound on the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian (of the training loss $f(\cdot)$) in the vicinity of a point along the gradient flow trajectory.

Lemma 64 *For all* $t' \geq 0$*:*

$$\inf_{\substack{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d \\ \|\mathbf{q}-\boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2\leq\epsilon}} \lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})) \;\geq\; -(n-1)\left(\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t'))\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\right)\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\right)^{1-\frac{2}{n}},$$

where $\lambda_{min}(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q}))$ *stands for the minimal eigenvalue of* $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{q})$.

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a weight setting satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon - \boldsymbol{\theta}(t')\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Denote by $W_{1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0}, W_{2,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1}, \ldots, W_{n-1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{n-1},d_{n-2}}, W_{n,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d_{n-1}}$ the weight matrices constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon$, and by $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ the corresponding end-to-end matrix $W_{n,\epsilon}W_{n-1,\epsilon}\cdots W_{1,\epsilon}$ (in vectorized form). Lemma 7 ensures:

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_\epsilon)) \geq -(n-1)\,\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1,\epsilon})\|_2 \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|W_{j,\epsilon}\|_s\,.$$

We conclude the proof by bounding spectral norms with Frobenius norms, and applying properties *(ii)* and *(iii)* from Lemma 61. ■

Lemma 64 implies that, under the notations of Theorem 3, we may choose the function $m(\cdot)$ to be as follows:

$$m : [0,t] \to \mathbb{R} \;\;,\;\; m(t') = (n-1)(\|\nabla\phi(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t'))\|_2 + 2n\epsilon)(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(t')\|_2 + 2n\epsilon)^{1-\frac{2}{n}} \,. \tag{71}$$

Lemma 65 below bounds the integral of this choice of $m(\cdot)$ in accordance with Equation (22) (recall that the scalar ν there, defined in the preceding text, coincides with the value taken by the function $\nu(\cdot)$ from Definition 39 at zero). For doing so, it makes use of the reparameterized trajectory $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$, and splits the reparameterized integral into two parts corresponding to two time intervals: before exponentially fast convergence is guaranteed to have commenced (*i.e.* until time $t_a + t_c$ — see Subsubappendix I.12.6), and afterwards.

Lemma 65 *With the function $m(\cdot)$ defined by Equation (71), Equation (22) is satisfied.*

Proof We apply a change of variable using the (continuously differentiable and strictly increasing) function $\xi(\cdot)$ defined in Lemma 43:

$$\int_0^t m(t')dt' = \int_{\xi^{-1}(0)}^{\xi^{-1}(t)} m\big(\xi(t')\big)\tfrac{d}{dt'}\xi(t')dt'.$$

Notice that $\xi(0) = 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt'}\xi(t') = \|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|^{-(1-2/n)}$. Plugging this and the definition of m(.) (Equation (71)) into the above leads to:

$$\int_0^t m(t')dt' = \int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)} (n-1)\Big(\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t')\big)\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)\Big(\big\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}\big(\xi(t')\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)^{1-\frac{2}{n}}\big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big\|^{\frac{2}{n}-1}dt'.$$

Since (by Lemma 43) $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\xi(t)) = \boldsymbol{u}(t)$, we have that:

$$\int_0^t m(t')dt' = \int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)} (n-1)\Big(\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)\Big(\big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)^{1-\frac{2}{n}}\big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big\|^{\frac{2}{n}-1}dt'.$$

Recall the notation $u_{\min} := \inf_{t\geq 0}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ and that, by Lemma 48, $u_{\min} > 0$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t m(t')dt' &= \int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)} (n-1)\Big(\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)\Big(1 + 2n\epsilon\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|^{-1}\Big)^{1-\frac{2}{n}}dt' \\
&\leq \int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)} (n-1)\Big(\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)\Big(1 + 2n\epsilon\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|^{-1}\Big)dt' \\
&\leq \int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)} (n-1)\Big(\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 + 2n\epsilon\Big)\Big(1 + 2n\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\Big)dt' \\
&= (n-1)\Big(1 + 2n\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\Big)\Big(\textstyle\int_0^{\xi^{-1}(t)}\big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 2n\epsilon\xi^{-1}(t)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Per Lemma 46 we know that $\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2 < 1$ for all $t' \geq 0$. Thus, by the definition of $\xi(\cdot)$, for all $t' \geq 0$ it holds that $\xi(t') \geq t'$, which (since $\xi(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing) implies $\xi^{-1}(t) \leq t$. This leads

to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t m(t')dt' \\
&\leq (n-1)\Big(1+2n\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\Big)\Big(\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 2n\epsilon t\Big) \\
&= (n-1)\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + (n-1)2n\epsilon t + (n-1)2n\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\Big(\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 2n\epsilon t\Big) \\
&\leq (n-1)\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 2n^2\epsilon t + 4n^3\epsilon^2 u_{\min}^{-1} t + 2n^2\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt'.
\end{aligned}$$

It holds that $\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{u}(t') - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 \leq 2$ for all $t' \geq 0$ (recall that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 = 1$ by assumption). Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t m(t')dt' &\leq (n-1)\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 2n^2\epsilon t + 4n^3\epsilon^2 u_{\min}^{-1} t + 2n^2\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}\cdot 2t \\
&\leq (n-1)\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 3\cdot\max\Big\{2n^2\epsilon t, 4n^3\epsilon^2 u_{\min}^{-1} t, 4n^2\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1} t\Big\} \\
&\leq (n-1)\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + 3\cdot 4n^3\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1} t.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

We may bound the latter integral as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' &\leq \textstyle\int_0^\infty \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' \\
&= \textstyle\int_0^{t_a+t_c} \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' + \int_{t_a+t_c}^\infty \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' \\
&= \textstyle\int_0^{t_a+t_c} \big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t') - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big\|_2 dt' + \int_0^\infty \big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t_a+t_c+t') - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big\|_2 dt',
\end{aligned}$$

where t_a and t_c are given by Definitions 49 and 52 respectively. Notice that $\big\|\boldsymbol{u}(t') - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big\|_2$ is monotonically non-increasing (since $\boldsymbol{u}(\cdot)$ is a monotonic reparameterization of $\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(\cdot)$, and gradient flow monotonically non-increases the objective it optimizes). Applying this fact, as well as Lemma 54, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' &\leq \textstyle\int_0^{t_a+t_c} \big\|\boldsymbol{u}(0) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big\|_2 dt' + \frac{6}{5}\int_0^\infty \exp\big(-\tfrac{2n}{3(n+1)}t'\big)dt' \\
&= \big\|\boldsymbol{u}(0) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\big\|_2\big(t_a+t_c\big) + \tfrac{6}{5}\cdot\tfrac{3(n+1)}{2n} \\
&\leq \tfrac{6}{5}\big(t_a+t_c\big) + 3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last transition follows from the assumptions $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2 \leq 0.2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{yx}\|_2 = 1$. Plug in the definitions of t_a and t_c (Definitions 49 and 52 respectively):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\int_0^t \big\|\nabla\phi\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t')\big)\big\|_2 dt' \\
&\leq \tfrac{6}{5}\Big(\tfrac{1}{2}\ln\big(\max\big\{5\cdot\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big) + \tfrac{3}{2n}\ln\big(\tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\big)\Big) + 3 \\
&= \tfrac{3}{5}\ln\big(\max\big\{5\cdot\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big) + \tfrac{9}{5n}\ln\big(\tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\big) + 3 \\
&= \tfrac{3}{5n}\ln\Big(\max\big(\big\{5\cdot\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big)^n\cdot\big(\tfrac{2n}{3u_{\min}}\big)^3\cdot e^{5n}\Big) \\
&\leq \tfrac{3}{5n}\ln\Big(5^n\max\big(\big\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big)^n\cdot\big(\tfrac{2n}{3}\big)^3\max\big(\big\{\tfrac{3}{2}\cdot\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big)^{3n}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2^{-3}\cdot e^{5n}\Big) \\
&\leq \tfrac{3}{5n}\ln\Big(n^3\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2^{-3}e^{8n}\max\big(\big\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)}, 1\big\}\big)^{4n}\Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the fourth transition follows from Lemma 48. Plug Equation (73) into Equation (72):

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t m(t')dt' \\ &\leq \tfrac{3(n-1)}{5n}\ln\left(n^3\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2^{-3}e^{8n}\max\left(\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)},1\right\}\right)^{4n}\right)+12n^3\epsilon u_{\min}^{-1}t \\ &\leq \ln\left(n^2\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2^{-2}e^{5(n-1)}\max\left(\left\{\tfrac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)},1\right\}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}(n-1)}\right)+15n^3u_{\min}^{-1}\epsilon t.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof with the help of Lemma 48:

$$\int_0^t m(t')dt' \leq \frac{15n^3\max\left(\left\{\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)},1\right\}\right)^n t\epsilon}{\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2}+\ln\left(\frac{n^2e^{5(n-1)}\max\left(\left\{\frac{1-\nu(0)}{1+\nu(0)},1\right\}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}(n-1)}}{\|\boldsymbol{w}_{n:1}(0)\|_2^2}\right).$$

■

I.12.9. CONCLUSION

Lemmas 37, 59, 63 and 65, along with the fact that by the definition of $m(\cdot)$ (Equation (71)) it is non-negative, together form a complete proof for Proposition 14. ■

I.13. Proof of Theorem 15

Let $\tilde{\epsilon}>0$, and consider $\eta>0$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ adhering to Equations (23) and (24) respectively. We would like to show that with step size η, iterate k of gradient descent is $\tilde{\epsilon}$-optimal, *i.e.* $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)-\min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d}f(\mathbf{q})\leq\tilde{\epsilon}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\epsilon}\leq 1$ (a proof that is valid for $\tilde{\epsilon}=1$ automatically accounts for $\tilde{\epsilon}>1$ as well). Define:

$$\bar{\epsilon}:=\tilde{\epsilon}/2\ \ ,\ \ \epsilon:=\frac{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^n k\eta}\,. \tag{74}$$

Invoking Proposition 14 with initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, time $t=k\eta$ and $\bar{\epsilon}$, ϵ as defined above (note that $\epsilon\in(0,1/(2n)]$), we obtain that the gradient flow trajectory emanating from $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is defined over infinite time, and with $\boldsymbol{\theta}:[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}^d$ representing this trajectory, the following time $\bar{t}$ satisfies $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\bar{t}))-\min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d}f(\mathbf{q})\leq\bar{\epsilon}$:

$$\bar{t}=\frac{2n\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^n}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F}\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F\min\{1,2\bar{\epsilon}\}}\right). \tag{75}$$

Moreover, we obtain that under the notations of Theorem 3, in correspondence with $\mathcal{D}_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$) are the smoothness and Lipschitz constants $\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}=16n$ and $\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}=6\sqrt{n}$ respectively, and the following (upper) bound on the integral of (minus) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian:

$$\int_0^{k\eta}m(t')dt'\leq\frac{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^n k\eta\epsilon}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F}+\ln\left(\frac{n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right), \tag{76}$$

where the function $m:[0,k\eta]\to\mathbb{R}$ is non-negative.

Notice that $k = \lfloor \bar{t}/\eta + 1 \rfloor$ and therefore $k\eta \geq \bar{t}$. Combining this with the fact that the gradient flow trajectory is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal at time $\bar{t}$, and that in general gradient flow monotonically non-increases the objective it optimizes, we infer $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimality of the gradient flow trajectory at time $k\eta$, *i.e.* $\boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$. We will invoke Theorem 3 for showing that, in addition to being $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal, the gradient flow trajectory at time $k\eta$ is also ϵ-approximated by iterate k of gradient descent, *i.e.* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. This, along with $f(\cdot)$ being $6\sqrt{n}$-Lipschitz across $\mathcal{D}_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$), yields the desired result — $\tilde{\epsilon}$-optimality for iterate k of gradient descent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \\
& \quad = \Big(f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\big) - f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\big) \Big) + \Big(f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \Big) \\
& \quad \leq \Big(6\sqrt{n} \big\| \boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta) \big\|_2 \Big) + \Big(f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \Big) \\
& \quad \leq 6\sqrt{n} \cdot \epsilon + \bar{\epsilon} \\
& \quad \leq \tilde{\epsilon} \,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last transition follows from the definitions of ϵ and $\bar{\epsilon}$ (Equation (74)).

We conclude the proof by showing that indeed $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Equation (76), the definition of ϵ (Equation (74)) and the condition $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq 1$ together imply:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt' \quad &\leq \quad \frac{15n^3 \Big(\max\Big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^n k\eta\epsilon}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F} + \ln\left(\frac{n^2 \Big(e^2 \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \right) \qquad (77) \\
&= \quad \tilde{\epsilon} + \ln\left(\frac{n^2 \Big(e^2 \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \right) \\
&\leq \quad 1 + \ln\left(\frac{n^2 \Big(e^2 \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \right) \\
&< \quad \ln\left(\frac{3n^2 \Big(e^2 \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Recalling the fact that $k = \lfloor \bar{t}/\eta + 1 \rfloor$, the expression for $\bar{t}$ (Equation (75)), and the definition of $\bar{\epsilon}$ (Equation (74)), we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
k\eta = \lfloor \bar{t}/\eta + 1 \rfloor \eta \leq \bar{t} + \eta &= \frac{2n \Big(\max\Big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^n}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F} \ln\left(\frac{15n \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}} \right) + \eta \qquad (78) \\
&< \frac{3n \Big(\max\Big\{1, \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\} \Big)^n}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F} \ln\left(\frac{15n \max\Big\{1, \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\Big\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}} \right) ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last transition makes use of the upper bound on η given in Equation (23). It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon^{-1}\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}k\eta e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} \\
&\quad< \frac{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^n k\eta}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\cdot 16n\cdot 6\sqrt{n}\cdot k\eta\cdot\frac{3n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \\
&\quad< \frac{4500n^{13/2}e^{6n-5}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(7n-5)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^3\tilde{\epsilon}}(k\eta)^2 \\
&\quad< \frac{4500n^{13/2}e^{6n-5}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(7n-5)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^3\tilde{\epsilon}}\cdot\frac{9n^2\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{2n}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\quad< \frac{n^{17/2}e^{7n+6}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(11n-5)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^5\tilde{\epsilon}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\quad\leq 1/\eta\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from Equation (77) and the definition of ϵ (Equation (74)); the third makes use of Equation (78); and the last is due to the upper bound on η given in Equation (23). Rearrange the derived inequality:

$$\eta < \frac{\epsilon}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}k\eta\, e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'}}\,.$$

Since $m(\cdot)$ is non-negative, it holds that:

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}k\eta\, e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'}} \leq \inf_{t\in(0,k\eta]}\frac{\epsilon}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}\int_0^t e^{\int_{t'}^t m(t'')\,dt''}\,dt'}\,,$$

and therefore:

$$\eta < \inf_{t\in(0,k\eta]}\frac{\epsilon}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}\int_0^t e^{\int_{t'}^t m(t'')\,dt''}\,dt'}\,. \tag{79}$$

We now invoke Theorem 3 with ϵ as we have defined (Equation (74)), time $\tilde{t} = k\eta$, and $\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}$, $\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ and $m(\cdot)$ as produced by Proposition 14. Recalling that in our context gradient flow and gradient descent are initialized identically, *i.e.* $\boldsymbol{\theta}(0) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we conclude from Equation (79) that the first $\lfloor k\eta/\eta\rfloor = k$ iterates of gradient descent ϵ-approximate the gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$, *i.e.* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k'} - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k'\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $k' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. In particular $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, as required. ■

I.14. Proof of Proposition 20

The proof is organized as follows. Subsubappendix I.14.1 establishes preliminaries. Subsubappendixes I.14.2, I.14.3 and I.14.4 respectively analyze the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent in three different regions of the objective function: *(i)* "anisotropic" region where curvatures in first and second coordinates differ; *(ii)* transition region between the previous and the next; and *(iii)* "isotropic" region where curvatures in first and second coordinates are identical. Subsubappendix I.14.5 shows that the location of gradient flow at time $\tilde{t}$ is not ϵ-approximated by different portions of the gradient descent trajectory. Finally, Subsubappendix I.14.6 concludes.

I.14.1. PRELIMINARIES

Consider an arbitrary time

$$\tilde{t} \in \left[\tfrac{2}{a}\ln\left(\tfrac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\theta_{s,2}-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\right)+\tfrac{1}{a}\ln\left(\tfrac{2}{1-\bar{\rho}}\right),\ \tfrac{2}{a}\ln\left(\tfrac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\theta_{s,2}-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\right)+\tfrac{1}{a}\ln\left(\tfrac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\right)+\tfrac{1}{a}\ln(b)\right],$$

and suppose the step size η is greater than or equal to $\frac{10^{14}}{a}e^{-a\tilde{t}}\epsilon$. We aim to prove $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k-\boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2>\epsilon$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$.

Since the objective function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in Equation (27)) is additively separable (can be expressed as a sum of terms, each depending on a single input variable), the dynamics in $\mathbb{R}^d$ induced by gradient flow and gradient descent can be analyzed separately for different coordinates. Lemma 66 below analyzes the dynamics in the third coordinate, establishing the sought after result for the case where η is greater than $\frac{1}{6a}$.

Lemma 66 *Assume $\eta>\frac{1}{6a}$. Then $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k-\boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2>\epsilon$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$.*

Proof Denote by $\hat{\theta}(\cdot)$ the third coordinate of the gradient flow trajectory $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$. Similarly, for any $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, denote by $\hat{\theta}_k$ the third coordinate of the gradient descent iterate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$. For any $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, it holds that:

$$|\hat{\theta}_{k+1}|=|\hat{\theta}_k-\eta\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial q_3}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)|=|\hat{\theta}_k-12a\eta\hat{\theta}_k|=|\hat{\theta}_k|\cdot|1-12a\eta|>|\hat{\theta}_k|.$$

Thus, we may conclude $|\hat{\theta}_k|>|\hat{\theta}_0|$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. The solution to the gradient flow equation of the third coordinate (*i.e.* $\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\theta}(t)=-12a\hat{\theta}(t)$) is $\hat{\theta}(t)=\hat{\theta}(0)e^{-12at}$. Recall that $\hat{\theta}(0)=\hat{\theta}_0>2$ and notice that $\tilde{t}\geq\frac{\ln(2)}{12a}$. For any $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ we have:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})-\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\|_2\geq|\hat{\theta}(\tilde{t})-\hat{\theta}_k|\geq|\hat{\theta}_k|-|\hat{\theta}(\tilde{t})|\geq|\hat{\theta}_0|-\left|\hat{\theta}\left(\tfrac{\ln(2)}{12a}\right)\right|=|\hat{\theta}_0|-\tfrac{1}{2}|\hat{\theta}_0|>1>\epsilon.$$

■

It remains to treat the case where η is no greater than $\frac{1}{6a}$. In the remainder of the proof we restrict our attention to this case, *i.e.* we assume $\eta\in\left[\frac{10^{14}}{a}e^{-a\tilde{t}}\epsilon,\frac{1}{6a}\right]$. Special focus will be devoted to the dynamics in the first two coordinates. Denote by $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ the first and second coordinates, respectively, of the gradient flow trajectory $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\cdot)$. Similarly, for $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, denote by θ_k and $\bar{\theta}_k$ the first and second coordinates, respectively, of the gradient descent iterate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$. The following lemma shows that in the first two coordinates, the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent are monotonically non-decreasing.

Lemma 67 *The functions $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$, and the series $(\theta_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$, are all monotonically non-decreasing.*

Proof The results follows from the fact that the derivative of $\varphi(\cdot)$ over $[0,\infty)$, and that of $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ over $[\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1,\infty)$, are both non-positive. ■

With Lemma 67 at hand, we consider three regions (in $\mathbb{R}^d$) which may be traversed by the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent: *(i) "anisotropic" region* $[0\,,z_c)\times[\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})\times\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$, where the curvatures of $f(\cdot)$ in the first and second coordinates differ (namely, they equal $-a$ and $-a/2$ respectively); *(ii) transition region* $[0\,,z_c)\times[1-\bar{\rho}\,,1)\times\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$; and *(iii) "isotropic" region* $[0\,,z_c)\times[1\,,\bar{z}_c)\times\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$, where the curvatures of $f(\cdot)$ in the first and second coordinates are identical (namely, they both equal $-a$). As we now show, throughout the above regions, the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent admit simple characterizations for their first coordinate.

Lemma 68 *It holds that* $\theta(t) = \theta(0)e^{at}$ *for all* $t \in \left[0\,,a^{-1}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)\right]$*, and* $\theta_k = \theta_0(1+a\eta)^k$ *for all* $k \in \left\{0,1,\ldots,\left\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil\right\}$.

Proof Notice that $\theta(0) \in (0, z_c)$. For any $t \in [0,\infty)$ such that $\theta(t) \in (0, z_c)$, we obtain:

$$\tfrac{d\theta}{dt}(t) = -\tfrac{d\varphi}{dz}\big(\theta(t)\big) = a\theta(t).$$

The function $t \mapsto \theta(0)e^{at}$ is a solution to this initial value problem valid through $t \in \big(0, \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta_0})/a\big)$, and from uniqueness of the solution together with continuity of $\theta(\cdot)$, we conclude that $\theta(t) = \theta(0)e^{at}$ for $t \in \big[0, \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta_0})/a\big]$.

Moving on to gradient descent. Notice that $\theta_0 \in (0, z_c)$, and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta_{k-1} \in (0, z_c)$ we have:

$$\theta_k = \theta_{k-1} - \eta\tfrac{d\varphi}{dz}(\theta_{k-1}) = \theta_{k-1} + a\eta\theta_{k-1} = \theta_{k-1}(1+a\eta).$$

It follows that $\theta_k = \theta_0(1+a\eta)^k$ for any $k \in \left\{0,1,..,\left\lceil \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta_0})/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil\right\}$, where by plugging in $k = \left\lceil \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta_0})/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil$ we obtain $\theta_{k-1} < z_c$. ■

Compared to the first coordinate, in the second coordinate the trajectories of gradient flow and gradient descent are more involved — analyses for the anisotropic, transition and isotropic regions are conducted in Subsubappendixes I.14.2, I.14.3 and I.14.4 respectively.

I.14.2. ANISOTROPIC REGION

The current subsubappendix analyzes the second coordinate of the gradient flow and gradient descent trajectories throughout the anisotropic region, or more specifically, when the second coordinate is in the range $[\bar\rho/2 - 1\,, 1-\bar\rho)$. Beginning with gradient flow, we recall that (by Lemma 67) the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing, and consider the time at which it exits the range $[\bar\rho/2 - 1\,, 1-\bar\rho)$.

Definition 69 *Define* $t_{1-\bar\rho} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar\theta(t) \geq 1-\bar\rho\}$.[36]

Lemma 70 below provides an explicit expression for $t_{1-\bar\rho}$, and for the second coordinate of the gradient flow trajectory until this time.

Lemma 70 *The following hold:*

$$(i) \qquad t_{1-\bar\rho} = \tfrac{2}{a}\ln\left((4-3\bar\rho)/(2\bar\theta(0)+2-\bar\rho)\right)\text{; and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar\theta(t) = \big(\bar\theta(0) - (\bar\rho/2-1)\big)e^{at/2} + (\bar\rho/2-1) \text{ for all } t \in [0\,, t_{1-\bar\rho}]\,.$$

Proof Notice that $\bar\theta(0) \in (\frac{\bar\rho}{2}-1, 1-\bar\rho)$. For any $t \in [0,\infty)$ such that $\bar\theta(t) \in (\frac{\bar\rho}{2}-1, 1-\bar\rho)$, we obtain:

$$\tfrac{d\bar\theta}{dt}(t) = -\tfrac{d\bar\varphi}{dz}\big(\bar\theta(t)\big) = \tfrac{a}{2}\big(\bar\theta(t) - (\tfrac{\bar\rho}{2}-1)\big).$$

The function $t \mapsto \big(\bar\theta(0) - (\frac{1}{2}\bar\rho - 1)\big)e^{at/2} + \big(\frac{1}{2}\bar\rho - 1\big)$ is a solution to this initial value problem valid through $t \in \big(0, \frac{2}{a}\ln((4-3\bar\rho)/(2\bar\theta(0)+2-\bar\rho))\big)$, and from uniqueness of the solution together with continuity of $\bar\theta(\cdot)$, we conclude that $\bar\theta(t) = \big(\bar\theta(0) - (\frac{1}{2}\bar\rho - 1)\big)e^{at/2} + \big(\frac{1}{2}\bar\rho - 1\big)$ for $t \in$

36. Note that by convention, the infimum of the empty set is equal to infinity.

$\left[0, \frac{2}{a}\ln((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho}))\right]$. This, along with the definition of $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$, implies that $t_{1-\bar{\rho}} = \frac{2}{a}\ln((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho}))$. ■

Moving on to gradient descent, we provide a treatment analogous to that of gradient flow. Namely, we recall that (by Lemma 67) the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing, consider the iteration at which it exits the range $[\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})$, and present an explicit expression for the index of this iteration as well as the second coordinate of the gradient descent trajectory until the iteration is reached.

Definition 71 *Define* $k_{1-\bar{\rho}} := \inf\left\{k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\} : \bar{\theta}_k \geq 1-\bar{\rho}\right\}$.[36]

Lemma 72 *The following hold:*

$$(i) \qquad k_{1-\bar{\rho}} = \left\lceil \left(\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2) - \ln(\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2)\right)/\ln(1+a\eta/2)\right\rceil \text{; and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar{\theta}_k = \left(\bar{\theta}_0-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)\right)(1+a\eta/2)^k + (\bar{\rho}/2-1) \text{ for all } k \in \{0,1,\ldots,k_{1-\bar{\rho}}\}.$$

Proof Notice that $\bar{\theta}_0 \in (\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1, 1-\bar{\rho})$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{\theta}_{k-1} \in (\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1, 1-\bar{\rho})$, we obtain:

$$\bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} - \eta\frac{d\bar{\varphi}}{dz}(\bar{\theta}_{k-1}) = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} + \tfrac{a}{2}\eta\big(\bar{\theta}_{k-1} - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big).$$

Subtract $(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)$ from both sides of the equation:

$$\big(\bar{\theta}_k - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big) = \big(\bar{\theta}_{k-1} - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big) + \tfrac{a}{2}\eta\big(\bar{\theta}_{k-1} - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big).$$

This leads us to:

$$\big(\bar{\theta}_k - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big) = \big(\bar{\theta}_{k-1} - (\tfrac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big)(1+\tfrac{a}{2}\eta).$$

It follows that $\big(\bar{\theta}_k - (\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big) = \big(\bar{\theta}_0 - (\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2}-1)\big)(1+\frac{a}{2}\eta)^k$ for any $k \in \{0,1,\ldots,k_{1-\bar{\rho}}\}$. From the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ it must be equal to $\left\lceil \left(\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2) - \ln(\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2)\right)/\ln(1+a\eta/2)\right\rceil$, as if it is smaller we get $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}} < 1-\bar{\rho}$, and if it is larger we get $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}-1}} \geq 1-\bar{\rho}$, both contradicting the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$. ■

We conclude this subsubappendix by combining its results with Lemma 68, thereby showing that the gradient flow trajectory between initialization and time $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$, and the gradient descent trajectory between initialization and iteration $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$, both lie in the anisotropic region.

Lemma 73 *It holds that* $\big(\theta(t),\bar{\theta}(t)\big) \in [0\,,z_c)\times[\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})$ *for all* $t \in [0\,,t_{1-\bar{\rho}})$, *and* $(\theta_k,\bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,,z_c)\times[\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})$ *for all* $k \in \{0,1,\ldots,k_{1-\bar{\rho}}-1\}$.

Proof We start by proving the result for gradient flow. By assumption it holds that $\bar{\theta}(0) \in [\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})$. From monotonicity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ (Lemma 67) together with the definition of $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$, we have that $\bar{\theta}(t) \in \left[\bar{\rho}/2-1, 1-\bar{\rho}\right)$ for all $t \in \left[0, t_{1-\bar{\rho}}\right)$. Recall that we assume $\theta(0) \in (0.5,1)$. By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta(t) \in \left[\theta(0), z_c\right)$ for all $t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{a}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)\right)$. By Lemma 70 $t_{1-\bar{\rho}} = \frac{2}{a}\ln\left((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho})\right)$. Since $\frac{2}{a}\ln\left((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho})\right) \leq \frac{1}{a}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)$ (can be verified by recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$), it follows that $\theta(t) \in \left[0, z_c\right)$ for all $t \in \left[0, t_{1-\bar{\rho}}\right)$. In conclusion, we have shown that $\big(\theta(t),\bar{\theta}(t)\big) \in [0\,,z_c)\times[\bar{\rho}/2-1\,,1-\bar{\rho})$ for all $t \in [0\,,t_{1-\bar{\rho}})$.

Moving on to gradient descent, by assumption it holds that $\bar{\theta}_0 \in [\bar{\rho}/2 - 1\,, 1 - \bar{\rho})$. From monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ (Lemma 67) together with the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$, we have that $\bar{\theta}_k \in \big[\bar{\rho}/2 - 1, 1 - \bar{\rho}\big)$ for all $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_{1-\bar{\rho}} - 1\}$. Recall that we assume $\theta_0 \in (0.5, 1)$. By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta_k \in \big[\theta(0), z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \big\{0, 1, \ldots, \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)\big/ \ln(1 + a\eta)\big\rceil - 1\big\}$. By Lemma 72 $k_{1-\bar{\rho}} = \big\lceil \big(\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2) - \ln(\bar{\theta}_0 + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)\big)\big/ \ln(1+a\eta/2)\big\rceil$. Since $k_{1-\bar{\rho}} \leq \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)\big/ \ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$ (can be verified by recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, θ_0 and $\bar{\theta}_0$), it follows that $\theta_k \in \big[0, z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_{1-\bar{\rho}} - 1\}$. In conclusion, we have shown that $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [\bar{\rho}/2 - 1\,, 1 - \bar{\rho})$ for all $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_{1-\bar{\rho}} - 1\}$. ■

I.14.3. TRANSITION REGION

The current subsubappendix analyzes the second coordinate of the gradient flow and gradient descent trajectories throughout the transition region, or more specifically, when the second coordinate is in the range $[1 - \bar{\rho}\,, 1)$. Beginning with gradient flow, we recall that (by Lemma 67) the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing, and consider the time at which it exits the range $[1 - \bar{\rho}\,, 1)$.

Definition 74 *Define* $t_1 := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{\theta}(t) \geq 1\}$.[36]

Using $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Definition 69, Lemma 75 below provides lower and upper bounds for t_1, and an upper bound for the ratio between the second coordinate of the gradient flow trajectory at time t_1, and its first coordinate at the same time.

Lemma 75 *The following hold:*

$$(i) \qquad t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1} \ln\big((4 + \bar{\rho})/(4 - 3\bar{\rho})\big) \;\leq\; t_1 \;\leq\; t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1} \ln\big(1/(1 - \bar{\rho})\big)\,; \textit{ and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar{\theta}(t_1)/\theta(t_1) \;\leq\; \big((\bar{\theta}(0) + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)\big/(2 - 3\bar{\rho}/2)\big)^2/\theta(0)\,.$$

Proof We start by proving property *(i)*. Lemma 70 implies $\bar{\theta}(t_{1-\bar{\rho}}) = 1 - \bar{\rho}$. Recall that by Lemma 67, $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ is monotonically non-decreasing. For any $t \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\bar{\theta}(t) \in [1 - \bar{\rho}, 1]$, we have:

$$\tfrac{d\bar{\theta}}{dt}(t) = -\tfrac{d\bar{\varphi}}{dz}\big(\bar{\theta}(t)\big) = a\bar{\theta}(t) + \tfrac{a}{4\bar{\rho}}\big(\bar{\theta}(t) - 1\big)^2. \tag{80}$$

By lower bounding Equation (80) we get $\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{dt}(t) \geq a\bar{\theta}(t)$ (which implies $t_1 < \infty$). Dividing both sides of this inequality by $\bar{\theta}(t)$ and integrating over time from $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ until t_1 we have that $\bar{\theta}(t_1) \geq (1-\bar{\rho})e^{a(t_1 - t_{1-\bar{\rho}})}$. From continuity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$, the definition of t_1 and the fact that $t_1 < \infty$, we have that $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_1) = 1$. This implies $(1 - \bar{\rho})e^{a(t_1 - t_{1-\bar{\rho}})} \leq 1$. We may conclude $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1} \ln\big(1/(1 - \bar{\rho})\big)$. We now turn to upper bound Equation (80). For any $t \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\bar{\theta}(t) \in [1 - \bar{\rho}, 1]$:

$$\tfrac{d\bar{\theta}}{dt}(t) \leq a\bar{\theta}(t) + \tfrac{a}{4\bar{\rho}}\big(\bar{\rho}\big)^2 = a\bar{\theta}(t) + \tfrac{a\bar{\rho}}{4}.$$

Dividing both sides of this inequality by $\bar{\theta}(t)$ and integrating over time from $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ until t_1, we have that $\bar{\theta}(t_1) \leq \big(1 - \frac{3}{4}\bar{\rho}\big)e^{a(t_1 - t_{1-\bar{\rho}})} - \frac{\bar{\rho}}{4}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}(t_1) = 1$, this implies $\big(1 - \frac{3}{4}\bar{\rho}\big)e^{a(t_1 - t_{1-\bar{\rho}})} - \frac{\bar{\rho}}{4} \geq 1$. We may conclude $t_1 \geq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1} \ln\big((4 + \bar{\rho})/(4 - 3\bar{\rho})\big)$.

Moving on to property *(ii)*, by property *(i)* we know that $t_1 < \infty$. Recall that $\bar{\theta}(t_1) = 1$. Lemma 70 showed that $t_{1-\bar{\rho}} = \frac{2}{a} \ln\big((4 - 3\bar{\rho})\big/(2\bar{\theta}(0) + 2 - \bar{\rho})\big)$. Lemma 68 ensures $\theta(t) = \theta_0 e^{at}$

for $t \in \left[0, \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta(0)})/a\right]$. Notice that $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\left(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\right) \leq \ln(\frac{z_c}{\theta(0)})/a$, where the first inequality follows from property *(i)*. It holds that:

$$\bar{\theta}(t_1)/\theta(t_1) = 1/\left(\theta(0)e^{at_1}\right) \leq 1/\left(\theta(0)e^{at_{1-\bar{\rho}}}\right) \leq \left(\tfrac{2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho}}{4-3\bar{\rho}}\right)^2/\theta(0).$$

■

Moving on to gradient descent, we recall that here too the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing (see Lemma 67), and consider the iteration at which this second coordinate exits the range $[1-\bar{\rho}\,, 1)$.

Definition 76 *Define* $k_1 := \inf\left\{k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\} : \bar{\theta}_k \geq 1\right\}$.[36]

Using $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Definition 71, Lemma 77 below provides an upper bound for k_1, and a lower bound for the ratio between the second coordinate of the gradient descent trajectory at iteration k_1, and its first coordinate at the same iteration.

Lemma 77 *The following hold:*

$$(i) \qquad k_1 \;\leq\; k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \left\lceil \max\left\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\}\right\rceil \text{; and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar{\theta}_{k_1}/\theta_{k_1} \;\geq\; \left((\bar{\theta}_0 + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)/(2-3\bar{\rho}/2)\right)^2/\left(\theta_0(1-a\eta/10)\right).$$

Proof We start by proving property *(i)*. By the definition of $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}}$ (and from the fact that it is finite from Lemma 72), we know that $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}} \geq 1-\bar{\rho}$. Recall that by Lemma 67 $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is monotonically non-decreasing. Notice that it is possible for k_1 to be equal to $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$; this will be the case if $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}} \geq 1$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{\theta}_{k-1} \in [1-\bar{\rho}, 1]$, we obtain:

$$\bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} - \eta\tfrac{d\bar{\varphi}}{dz}(\bar{\theta}_{k-1}) = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} + \eta\left(a\bar{\theta}_{k-1} + \tfrac{a}{4\bar{\rho}}(\bar{\theta}_{k-1}-1)^2\right) \geq \bar{\theta}_{k-1} + a\eta\bar{\theta}_{k-1} = \bar{\theta}_{k-1}(1+a\eta).$$

It follows that $\bar{\theta}_k \geq \bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_{1-\bar{\rho}}}$ for any $k \in \{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}, k_{1-\bar{\rho}}+1, ..., k_1\}$. Plugging $k = k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \left\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\right\rceil$ yields $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_{1-\bar{\rho}}} \geq 1$. From monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$, we may conclude that $k_1 \leq k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \left\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\right\rceil$, thereby finishing the proof of property *(i)*.

Moving on to property *(ii)*, with the help of Lemma 68, Lemma 72 and property *(i)*, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{\theta_{k_1}}{\bar{\theta}_{k_1}} &\leq \theta_{k_1} \\
&= \theta_0(1+a\eta)^{k_1} \\
&= \theta_0 \exp\left(\ln(1+a\eta)k_1\right) \\
&\leq \theta_0 \exp\left(\ln(1+a\eta)\left(\left\lceil \tfrac{\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2)-\ln(\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2)}{\ln(1+a\eta/2)}\right\rceil + \left\lceil \tfrac{-\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})}{\ln(1+a\eta)}\right\rceil\right)\right) \\
&\leq \theta_0 \exp\left(\ln(1+a\eta)\left(2 + \tfrac{\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2)-\ln(\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2)}{\ln(1+a\eta/2)} - \tfrac{\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})}{\ln(1+a\eta)}\right)\right) \\
&= \theta_0\left(\tfrac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1+a\eta)}{\ln(1+a\eta/2)}} \tfrac{1}{\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}}}(1+a\eta)^2 \\
&\leq \tfrac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}}\left(\tfrac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{\frac{\ln(1+a\eta)}{\ln(1+a\eta/2)}}(1+a\eta)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (3) in Topsøe (2004) states that $\frac{2z}{2+z} \leq \ln(1+z) \leq \frac{z}{2} \cdot \frac{2+z}{1+z}$ for all $z \geq 0$. This, along with the fact that $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6a}$ (see Subsubappendix I.14.1), leads us to $\frac{\ln(1+a\eta)}{\ln(1+a\eta/2)} \leq \left(\frac{a\eta}{2} \cdot \frac{2+a\eta}{1+a\eta}\right) \big/ \left(\frac{a\eta}{2+a\eta/2}\right) = \frac{4+3a\eta+(a\eta)^2/2}{2+2a\eta} = 2 + \frac{(a\eta)^2/2-a\eta}{2+2a\eta} \leq 2 - a\eta/3$. Thus:

$$\frac{\theta_{k_1}}{\bar{\theta}_{k_1}} \leq \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2-a\eta/3} (1+a\eta)^2 = \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{a\eta/3} (1+a\eta)^2.$$

By assumption on $\bar{\theta}_0$ and $\bar{\rho}$, namely $\bar{\theta}_0 \leq e^{-12} - 1$ and $\bar{\rho} \in [0, e^{-12}/2]$, we may bound as follows:

$$\frac{\theta_{k_1}}{\bar{\theta}_{k_1}} \leq \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} \left(e^{-12}\right)^{a\eta/3} (1+a\eta)^2 = \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} e^{-4a\eta} (1+a\eta)^2.$$

Since $1 + z \leq e^z$ for all $z \geq 0$, we have that:

$$\frac{\theta_{k_1}}{\bar{\theta}_{k_1}} \leq \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{1+4a\eta} (1+a\eta)^2 = \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} \left(1 - \frac{4}{1+4a\eta} a\eta\right) \left(1 + 2a\eta + (a\eta)^2\right).$$

Once again relying on the fact that $\eta \leq \frac{1}{6a}$, we obtain:

$$\frac{\theta_{k_1}}{\bar{\theta}_{k_1}} \leq \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} \left(1 - \frac{12}{5} a\eta\right) \left(1 + \frac{11}{5} a\eta\right) \leq \frac{\theta_0}{1-\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2}\right)^{2} (1 - a\eta/5).$$

We will show that $(1 - a\eta/5)/(1 - \bar{\rho}) \leq 1 - a\eta/10$, thereby finishing the proof, as this leads to $\bar{\theta}_{k_1}/\theta_{k_1} \geq \left((\bar{\theta}_0 + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)/(2 - 3\bar{\rho}/2)\right)^2 / \left(\theta_0(1 - a\eta/10)\right)$. It holds that:

$$a\tilde{t} \leq 2\ln\left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}_0-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\right) + \ln(b) \leq 2\ln\left(\frac{2}{e^{-12}/4}\right) + \ln\left(e\right) + \ln(b) \leq 30 + \ln(b), \quad (81)$$

where the first transition follows from the upper bound for $\tilde{t}$; and the second follows from the definition $\bar{\rho} := \min\{e^{-12}/2, \epsilon/2b\}$ together with the assumption $\bar{\theta}_0 \in (e^{-12}/2 - 1, e^{-12} - 1)$. The following holds:

$$\bar{\rho} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2b} = 10^{13}\epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{10^{13} \cdot 2b} \leq 10^{13}\epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{e^{30}b} = 10^{13}\epsilon \cdot e^{-(30+\ln(b))} \leq 10^{13}\epsilon \cdot e^{-a\tilde{t}} \leq a\eta/10,$$

where the first transition follows from the definition of $\bar{\rho}$; the fifth from Equation (81); and the last from the assumption $\eta \geq e^{-a\tilde{t}} \cdot 10^{14}\epsilon/a$. It follows that:

$$\frac{1-a\eta/5}{1-\bar{\rho}} \leq \frac{1-a\eta/5}{1-a\eta/10} = 1 - \frac{a\eta/10}{1-a\eta/10} \leq 1 - a\eta/10.$$

■

We conclude this subsubappendix by combining its results with Lemma 68, thereby showing that the gradient flow trajectory between times $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and t_1, and the gradient descent trajectory between iterations $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and k_1, both lie in the transition region.

Lemma 78 *It holds that* $\left(\theta(t), \bar{\theta}(t)\right) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1 - \bar{\rho}\,, 1)$ *for all* $t \in [t_{1-\bar{\rho}}\,, t_1)$, *and* $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1 - \bar{\rho}\,, 1)$ *for all* $k \in \{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}, k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + 1, \ldots, k_1 - 1\}$.

Proof We start by proving the result for gradient flow. Lemma 70 implies $t_{1-\bar{\rho}} < \infty$, and similarly Lemma 75 implies $t_1 < \infty$. From continuity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ together with the definitions of $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and t_1, we have that $\bar{\theta}(t_{1-\bar{\rho}}) = 1 - \bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\theta}(t_1) = 1$. By monotonicity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ (Lemma 67) we conclude $\theta(t) \in \big[1-\bar{\rho}, 1\big)$ for all $t \in [t_{1-\bar{\rho}}, t_1)$. Recall that we assume $\theta(0) \in (0.5, 1)$. Lemma 68 implies $\theta(t) \in \big[\theta(0), z_c\big)$ for all $t \in \big[0, a^{-1}\ln\big(z_c/\theta(0)\big)\big)$. By Lemma 75 $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\big(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\big)$. By recalling the explicit expression for $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Lemma 70, and all the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$, it can be seen that $t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\big(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\big) \leq a^{-1}\ln\big(z_c/\theta(0)\big)$, which implies $t_1 \leq a^{-1}\ln\big(z_c/\theta(0)\big)$. It follows that $\theta(t) \in \big[0, z_c\big)$ for all $t \in \big[t_{1-\bar{\rho}}, t_1\big)$. Overall we proved that $\big(\theta(t), \bar{\theta}(t)\big) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1-\bar{\rho}\,, 1)$ for all $t \in [t_{1-\bar{\rho}}\,, t_1)$, as required.

Moving on to gradient descent, Lemma 72 implies $k_{1-\bar{\rho}} < \infty$, and similarly Lemma 77 implies $k_1 < \infty$. By definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ we have that $\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}} \geq 1-\bar{\rho}$, and by definition of k_1 it holds that $\bar{\theta}_{k_1-1} < 1$. From monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ (Lemma 67) and the definitions of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and k_1 (from Definitions 71 and 76 respectively), we know that $\bar{\theta}_k \in \big[1-\bar{\rho}, 1\big)$ for all $k \in \{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}, k_{1-\bar{\rho}}+1, \ldots, k_1-1\}$. Recall that we assume $\theta_0 \in (0.5, 1)$. Lemma 68 implies $\theta_k \in \big[\theta_0, z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \big\{0, 1, \ldots, \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil - 1\big\}$. By Lemma 77, $k_1 \leq k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil$. By recalling the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ (Definition 71) and also its explicit expression from Lemma 72, while also recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, θ_0 and $\bar{\theta}_0$, it can be seen that $k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil \leq \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$, which implies $k_1 \leq \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. It follows that $\theta_k \in \big[0, z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}, k_{1-\bar{\rho}}+1, \ldots, k_1-1\}$. Overall we proved that $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1-\bar{\rho}\,, 1)$ for all $k \in \{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}, k_{1-\bar{\rho}}+1, \ldots, k_1-1\}$. ■

I.14.4. ISOTROPIC REGION

The current subsubappendix analyzes the second coordinate of the gradient flow and gradient descent trajectories throughout the isotropic region, or more specifically, when the second coordinate is in the range $[1\,, \bar{z}_c)$. Beginning with gradient flow, we recall that (by Lemma 67) the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing, and consider the time at which it exits the range $[1\,, \bar{z}_c)$.

Definition 79 *Define* $t_{\bar{z}_c} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{\theta}(t) \geq \bar{z}_c\}$.[36]

Using t_1 from Definition 74, Lemma 80 below provides an expression for $t_{\bar{z}_c}$, and for the second coordinate of the gradient flow trajectory between times t_1 and $t_{\bar{z}_c}$, *i.e.* between the time it enters the range $[1\,, \bar{z}_c)$ and that at which it exits.

Lemma 80 *The following hold:*

$$(i) \qquad t_{\bar{z}_c} = t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)\,; \textit{ and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar{\theta}(t) = e^{a(t-t_1)} \textit{ for all } t \in [t_1\,, t_{\bar{z}_c}]\,.$$

Proof For any $t \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\bar{\theta}(t) \in [1, \bar{z}_c)$, we obtain:

$$\tfrac{d\bar{\theta}}{dt}(t) = -\tfrac{d\bar{\varphi}}{dz}\big(\bar{\theta}(t)\big) = a\bar{\theta}(t).$$

Lemma 75, the definition of t_1 and continuity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ together imply that $\bar{\theta}(t_1) = 1$. The function $t \mapsto e^{a(t-t_1)}$ is a solution to this initial value problem (starting at t_1), valid through $t \in [t_1, t_1 +$

$a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$), and from uniqueness of the solution together with continuity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$, we conclude that $\bar{\theta}(t) = e^{a(t-t_1)}$ for $t \in [t_1, t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)]$. This, along with the definition of $t_{\bar{z}_c}$, implies that $t_{\bar{z}_c} = t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. ■

Moving on to gradient descent, we recall that here too the second coordinate of the trajectory is monotonically non-decreasing (see Lemma 67), and consider the iteration at which this second coordinate exits the range $[1\,,\bar{z}_c)$.

Definition 81 *Define* $k_{\bar{z}_c} := \inf\left\{k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\} : \bar{\theta}_k \geq \bar{z}_c\right\}$.[36]

Using k_1 from Definition 76, Lemma 82 below provides an expression for $k_{\bar{z}_c}$, and for the second coordinate of the gradient descent trajectory between iterations k_1 and $k_{\bar{z}_c}$, *i.e.* between the iteration where it enters the range $[1\,,\bar{z}_c)$ and that at which it exits.

Lemma 82 *It holds that:*

$$(i) \qquad k_{\bar{z}_c} = k_1 + \left\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})\big/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil \text{ ; and}$$

$$(ii) \qquad \bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k_1}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_1} \text{ for all } k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}\}.$$

Proof Lemma 77 and the definition of k_1 imply that $\bar{\theta}_{k_1} \geq 1$. Recall that by Lemma 67 $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is monotonically non-decreasing. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{\theta}_{k-1} \in [1, \bar{z}_c)$, we obtain:

$$\bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} - \eta\tfrac{d\bar{\varphi}}{dz}(\bar{\theta}_{k-1}) = \bar{\theta}_{k-1} + a\eta\bar{\theta}_{k-1}.$$

The solution of this recursive equation is $\bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k_1}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_1}$ for all $k \geq k_1$ such that $\bar{\theta}_{k-1} \in [1, \bar{z}_c)$ *i.e.* for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_1 + \left\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})\big/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil\}$. From the definition of $k_{\bar{z}_c}$ it must be equal to $k_1 + \left\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})\big/\ln(1+a\eta)\right\rceil$, as if it is smaller we get $\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c}} < \bar{z}_c$, and if it is larger we get $\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c-1}} \geq \bar{z}_c$, both contradicting the definition of $k_{\bar{z}_c}$. ■

We conclude this subsubappendix by combining its results with Lemma 68, thereby showing that the gradient flow trajectory between times t_1 and $t_{\bar{z}_c}$, and the gradient descent trajectory between iterations k_1 and $k_{\bar{z}_c}$, both lie in the isotropic region.

Lemma 83 *It holds that* $\left(\theta(t), \bar{\theta}(t)\right) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1\,, \bar{z}_c)$ *for all* $t \in [t_1\,, t_{\bar{z}_c})$, *and* $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1\,, \bar{z}_c)$ *for all* $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c} - 1\}$.

Proof We start by proving the result for gradient flow. Lemma 75 implies $t_1 < \infty$, and similarly Lemma 80 implies $t_{\bar{z}_c} < \infty$. From continuity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ and the definition of t_1 we have that $\bar{\theta}(t_1) = 1$, and similarly by definition of $t_{\bar{z}_c}$ we have $\bar{\theta}(t_{\bar{z}_c}) = \bar{z}_c$. By monotonicity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ (Lemma 67) we conclude $\theta(t) \in \left[1, \bar{z}_c\right)$ for all $t \in [t_1, t_{\bar{z}_c})$. Recall that we assume $\theta(0) \in (0.5, 1)$. By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta(t) \in \left[\theta(0), z_c\right)$ for all $t \in \left[0, a^{-1}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)\right)$. Recall the explicit expression for $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Lemma 70. By Lemma 75 $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\left(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\right)$, and by Lemma 80 we have that $t_{\bar{z}_c} = t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. Overall, we obtain $t_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \frac{2}{a}\ln\left((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho})\right) + a^{-1}\ln\left(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\right) + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. By recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$, it can be shown that $t_{\bar{z}_c} \leq a^{-1}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)$. It follows that $\theta(t) \in \left[\theta(0), z_c\right)$ for all $t \in \left[t_1, t_{\bar{z}_c}\right)$. Overall we proved that $\left(\theta(t), \bar{\theta}(t)\right) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1\,, \bar{z}_c)$ for all $t \in [t_1\,, t_{\bar{z}_c})$, as required.

Moving on to gradient descent, Lemma 77 implies $k_1 < \infty$, and similarly Lemma 82 implies $k_{\bar{z}_c} < \infty$. By definition of k_1 we have that $\bar{\theta}_{k_1} \geq 1$, and by definition of $k_{\bar{z}_c}$ we have $\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c-1}} <$

$\bar{z}_c$. From monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ (Lemma 67) we conclude $\bar{\theta}_k \in \big[1, \bar{z}_c\big)$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$. Recall that we assume $\theta_0 \in (0.5, 1)$. By Lemma 68 $\theta_k \in \big[\theta_0, z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \big\{0, 1, \ldots, \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil - 1\big\}$. Recall the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and also its explicit expression from Lemma 72. By Lemma 77 we have that $k_1 \leq k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil$. By Lemma 82 $k_{\bar{z}_c} = k_1 + \big\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. Overall, we obtain $k_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \big\lceil \big(\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2) - \ln(\bar{\theta}_0 + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)\big)/\ln(1+a\eta/2)\big\rceil + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil + \big\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. By recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, θ_0 and $\bar{\theta}_0$, it can be shown that $k_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. It follows that $\theta_k \in \big[\theta_0, z_c\big)$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$. Overall we proved that $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in [0\,, z_c) \times [1\,, \bar{z}_c)$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$, as required. ■

I.14.5. INAPPROXIMATION

The current subsubappendix shows that the location of gradient flow at time $\tilde{t}$ is not ϵ-approximated by different portions of the gradient descent trajectory. Key to the derived results is the following lemma, which establishes that in the isotropic region, for both gradient flow and gradient descent trajectories, the first two coordinates proceed in a straight line at an exponential pace.

Lemma 84 *It holds that* $\big(\theta(t), \bar{\theta}(t)\big) = \big(\theta(t_1), \bar{\theta}(t_1)\big) \cdot e^{a(t-t_1)}$ *for all* $t \in [t_1, t_{\bar{z}_c})$, *and* $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) = (\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}) \cdot (1+a\eta)^{k-k_1}$ *for all* $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$, *where* t_1, $t_{\bar{z}_c}$, k_1 *and* $k_{\bar{z}_c}$ *are given by Definitions 74, 79, 76 and 81 respectively.*

Proof We start by proving the result for gradient flow. Lemma 80 implies $\bar{\theta}(t) = \bar{\theta}(t_1)e^{a(t-t_1)}$ for all $t \in [t_1\,, t_{\bar{z}_c}]$. By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta(t) = \theta(0)e^{at}$ for all $t \in \big[0, a^{-1}\ln\big(z_c/\theta(0)\big)\big)$. Recall the explicit expression for $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Lemma 70. By Lemma 75 $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\big(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\big)$, and by Lemma 80 we have that $t_{\bar{z}_c} = t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. Overall, we obtain $t_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \frac{2}{a}\ln\big((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0) + 2 - \bar{\rho})\big) + a^{-1}\ln\big(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\big) + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. By recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$, it can be shown that $t_{\bar{z}_c} \leq a^{-1}\ln\big(z_c/\theta(0)\big)$. It follows that $\theta(t) = \theta(0)e^{at} = \theta(t_1)e^{a(t-t_1)}$ for all $t \in \big[t_1, t_{\bar{z}_c}\big)$.

Moving on to gradient descent, Lemma 82 implies $\bar{\theta}_k = \bar{\theta}_{k_1}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_1}$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$. By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta_k = \theta_0(1+a\eta)^k$ for all $k \in \big\{0, 1, \ldots, \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil\big\}$. Recall the definition of $k_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ and its explicit expression from Lemma 72. Lemma 77 ensures $k_1 \leq k_{1-\bar{\rho}} + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil$. By Lemma 82 $k_{\bar{z}_c} = k_1 + \big\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. Putting it all together, we obtain $k_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \big\lceil \big(\ln(2-3\bar{\rho}/2) - \ln(\bar{\theta}_0 + 1 - \bar{\rho}/2)\big)/\ln(1+a\eta/2)\big\rceil + \big\lceil \max\{0, -\ln(\bar{\theta}_{k_{1-\bar{\rho}}})/\ln(1+a\eta)\}\big\rceil + \big\lceil \ln(\bar{z}_c/\bar{\theta}_{k_1})/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. By recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, θ_0 and $\bar{\theta}_0$, it can be shown that $k_{\bar{z}_c} \leq \big\lceil \ln(z_c/\theta_0)/\ln(1+a\eta)\big\rceil$. It follows that $\theta_k = \theta_0(1+a\eta)^k = \theta_{k_1}(1+a\eta)^{k-k_1}$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$. ■

Lemma 85 *It holds that* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t}\,)\| > \epsilon$ *for all* $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k_1 - 1\}$, *where* k_1 *is given by Definition 76.*

Proof Recall that $\tilde{t} \in \big[\frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2}{1-\bar{\rho}}\big), \frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\big) + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b)\big]$ and $\epsilon < 1$. Lemmas 70 and 75 imply $\tilde{t} \in [t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(2), t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b)]$. Notice that $t_1 \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(2) \leq \tilde{t} \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b) \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b+1) = t_{\bar{z}_c}$. Thus, by Lemma 83, gradient flow is in the isotropic region at time $\tilde{t}$. We may use Lemma 80 together with monotonicity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ (Lemma 67) to obtain $\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}\,) \geq \bar{\theta}\big(t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(2)\big) = e^{a\ln(2)/a} = 2$. From the definition of k_1 (and from the fact that it is finite

from Lemma 77) we know that $|\bar{\theta}_{k_1-1}| \leq 1$. For all $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_1 - 1\}$, using monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ (Lemma 67), we may conclude:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq |\bar{\theta}_k - \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| \geq |\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| - |\bar{\theta}_k| \geq |\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| - |\bar{\theta}_{k_1-1}| \geq 2 - 1 = 1 > \epsilon.$$

■

Lemma 86 *It holds that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\| > \epsilon$ for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1 + 1, \dots, k_{\bar{z}_c} - 1\}$, where k_1 and $k_{\bar{z}_c}$ are given by Definitions 76 and 81 respectively.*

Proof Recall that $\tilde{t} \in \left[\frac{2}{a}\ln\left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\right)+\frac{1}{a}\ln\left(\frac{2}{1-\bar{\rho}}\right), \frac{2}{a}\ln\left(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\right)+\frac{1}{a}\ln\left(\frac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\right)+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b)\right]$ and $\epsilon < 1$. Lemmas 70 and 75 imply $\tilde{t} \in [t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(2), t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b)]$. Notice that $t_1 \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(2) \leq \tilde{t} \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b) \leq t_1 + \frac{1}{a}\ln(b+1) = t_{\bar{z}_c}$. Thus, by Lemma 83, gradient flow is in the isotropic region at time $\tilde{t}$. By Lemma 77 we know that $k_1 < \infty$, and by Lemma 83 it holds that $\bar{\theta}_{k_1} \geq 1$. By monotonicity of $(\theta_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ (Lemma 67) and since $\theta_0 > 0$, we know that $\theta_k > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For all $k \in \{k_1, k_1 + 1, ..., k_{\bar{z}_c} - 1\}$, Lemma 84 ensures $\theta_k/\bar{\theta}_k = \theta_{k_1}/\bar{\theta}_{k_1}$, thus $(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k) \in \left\{(q, \bar{q}) : q, \bar{q} \in (0, \infty) \text{ s.t. } q/\bar{q} = \theta_{k_1}/\bar{\theta}_{k_1}\right\} = \left\{c(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}) : c > 0\right\}$. This leads us to:

$$\left\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right\|_2 \geq \left\|\left(\theta_k, \bar{\theta}_k\right) - \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right)\right\|_2 \geq \inf_{c>0} \left\|c\left(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}\right) - \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right)\right\|_2.$$

Minimizing over $c > 0$ yields $c_{\min} = \left\langle \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right), \left(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}\right)\right\rangle / \|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2^2$. Note that since gradient flow is in the isotropic region at time $\tilde{t}$, then $\|(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))\|_2 \neq 0$. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 &\geq \left\| \left(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}\right) \left\langle \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right), \left(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1}\right)\right\rangle / \|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2^2 - \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right) \right\|_2 \\
&= \sqrt{\left\|\left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right)\right\|_2^2 - \left\langle \left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right), \frac{(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})}{\|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2} \right\rangle^2} \\
&= \left\|\left(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})\right)\right\|_2 \sqrt{1 - \left\langle \frac{(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))}{\|(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))\|_2}, \frac{(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})}{\|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2} \right\rangle^2} \\
&\geq \left|\theta(\tilde{t})\right| \sqrt{1 - \left\langle \frac{(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))}{\|(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))\|_2}, \frac{(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})}{\|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2} \right\rangle^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 68 we have that $\theta(t) = \theta(0)e^{at}$ for all $t \in \left[0, a^{-1}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)\right)$. Recall the explicit expression for $t_{1-\bar{\rho}}$ from Lemma 70. By Lemma 75 $t_1 \leq t_{1-\bar{\rho}} + a^{-1}\ln\left(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\right)$, and by Lemma 80 we have that $t_{\bar{z}_c} = t_1 + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. Since $\tilde{t} \leq t_{\bar{z}_c}$, overall we obtain $\tilde{t} \leq \frac{2}{a}\ln\left((4 - 3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0) + 2 - \bar{\rho})\right) + a^{-1}\ln\left(1/(1-\bar{\rho})\right) + a^{-1}\ln(\bar{z}_c)$. By recalling the assumptions on a, z_c, $\bar{\rho}$, $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$, it can be shown that $\tilde{t} \leq a^{-1}\ln\left(z_c/\theta(0)\right)$. It follows that:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}} \sqrt{1 - \left\langle \frac{(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))}{\|(\theta(\tilde{t}), \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}))\|_2}, \frac{(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})}{\|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2} \right\rangle^2}.$$

Recall that $\tilde{t} \in [t_1, t_{\bar{z}_c}]$. Lemma 83 implies that both $\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})$ and $\bar{\theta}(t_1)$ are greater or equal to one. Since Lemma 84 implies $\theta(\tilde{t})/\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}) = \theta(t_1)/\bar{\theta}(t_1)$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 &\geq \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}} \sqrt{1 - \left\langle \frac{(\theta(t_1), \bar{\theta}(t_1))}{\|(\theta(t_1), \bar{\theta}(t_1))\|_2}, \frac{(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})}{\|(\theta_{k_1}, \bar{\theta}_{k_1})\|_2} \right\rangle^2} \\
&= \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}} \sqrt{1 - \left\langle \frac{(\theta(t_1)/\bar{\theta}(t_1), 1)}{\|(\theta(t_1)/\bar{\theta}(t_1), 1)\|_2}, \frac{(\theta_{k_1}/\bar{\theta}_{k_1}, 1)}{\|(\theta_{k_1}/\bar{\theta}_{k_1}, 1)\|_2} \right\rangle^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the latter inner product is between positively correlated unit vectors, and that it is squared. We use Lemmas 75 and 77, ensuring that $\bar{\theta}(t_1)/\theta(t_1) \leq \big((\bar{\theta}(0)+1-\bar{\rho}/2)/(2-3\bar{\rho}/2)\big)^2/\theta(0)$, and $\bar{\theta}_{k_1}/\theta_{k_1} \geq \big((\bar{\theta}_0+1-\bar{\rho}/2)/(2-3\bar{\rho}/2)\big)^2/\big(\theta_0(1-a\eta/10)\big)$ respectively. For brevity, denote $\alpha := \theta(0)\big((4-3\bar{\rho})/(2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho})\big)^2$ and $\beta := (1-a\eta/10)$. Notice that $\beta \in (0,1)$. Recall that by definition $\theta(0)=\theta_0$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)=\bar{\theta}_0$. Thus, $\theta_{t_1}/\bar{\theta}_{t_1} \leq \alpha\beta < \alpha \leq \theta(t_1)/\bar{\theta}(t_1)$. Replacing $\theta(t_1)/\bar{\theta}(t_1)$ with α, and $\theta_{k_1}/\bar{\theta}_{k_1}$ with $\alpha\beta$, decreases the angle between the unit vectors, thereby increasing their inner product. We thus have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 &\geq \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\sqrt{1-\left\langle \tfrac{(\alpha,1)}{\|(\alpha,1)\|_2}, \tfrac{(\alpha\beta,1)}{\|(\alpha\beta,1)\|_2}\right\rangle^2} \\
&= \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\sqrt{1-\left(\tfrac{\alpha^2\beta+1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}\cdot\sqrt{\alpha^2\beta^2+1}}\right)^2} \\
&= \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\sqrt{\tfrac{\alpha^4\beta^2+\alpha^2\beta^2+\alpha^2+1}{\alpha^4\beta^2+\alpha^2\beta^2+\alpha^2+1} - \left(\tfrac{\alpha^4\beta^2+2\alpha^2\beta+1}{\alpha^4\beta^2+\alpha^2\beta^2+\alpha^2+1}\right)} \\
&= \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\sqrt{\tfrac{\alpha^2(1-\beta)^2}{\alpha^4\beta^2+\alpha^2\beta^2+\alpha^2+1}}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha \geq 1$ (can be verified by recalling the assumptions on $a, \eta, \bar{\rho}, \theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$), we obtain:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\big(\tfrac{1-\beta}{2\alpha}\big).$$

Plugging in α and β, we obtain:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq \theta(0)e^{a\tilde{t}}\cdot\tfrac{a\eta}{10}\cdot\tfrac{1}{2\theta(0)}\big(\tfrac{2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho}}{4-3\bar{\rho}}\big)^2 = \tfrac{1}{20}\big(\tfrac{2\bar{\theta}(0)+2-\bar{\rho}}{4-3\bar{\rho}}\big)^2 a\eta e^{a\tilde{t}}.$$

The definition of $\bar{\rho}$, and the assumptions on $\theta(0)$ and $\bar{\theta}(0)$ lead us to:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq \tfrac{1}{20}\big(\tfrac{0.5e^{-12}}{4}\big)^2 a\eta e^{a\tilde{t}} > 10^{-14}a\eta e^{a\tilde{t}}.$$

Since $\eta \geq \epsilon 10^{14}e^{-a\tilde{t}}/a$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 > \epsilon$, and this holds for all $k \in \{k_1, k_1+1, \ldots, k_{\bar{z}_c}-1\}$. ■

Lemma 87 *It holds that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\| > \epsilon$ for all $k \in \{k_{\bar{z}_c}, k_{\bar{z}_c}+1, k_{\bar{z}_c}+2, \ldots\}$, where $k_{\bar{z}_c}$ is given by Definition 81.*

Proof Recall that $\tilde{t} \in \big[\frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big)+\frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2}{1-\bar{\rho}}\big), \frac{2}{a}\ln\big(\frac{2-3\bar{\rho}/2}{\bar{\theta}(0)-(\bar{\rho}/2-1)}\big)+\frac{1}{a}\ln\big(\frac{1+\bar{\rho}/4}{1-3\bar{\rho}/4}\big)+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b)\big]$ and $\epsilon < 1$. Lemmas 70 and 75 imply $\tilde{t} \in [t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(2), t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b)]$. Notice that $t_1 \leq t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(2) \leq \tilde{t} \leq t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b) \leq t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b+1) = t_{\bar{z}_c}$. Thus, by Lemma 83, gradient flow is in the isotropic region at time $\tilde{t}$. We may use Lemma 80 together with monotonicity of $\bar{\theta}(\cdot)$ (Lemma 67) to obtain $\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t}) \leq \bar{\theta}\big(t_1+\frac{1}{a}\ln(b)\big) = e^{a\ln(b)/a} = b$. Lemma 67 further ensures monotonicity of $(\bar{\theta}_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$. By the definition of $\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c}}$ (and from the fact that it is finite from Lemma 82) we know that $\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c}} \geq \bar{z}_c = b+1$. This implies, for all $k \in \{k_{\bar{z}_c}, k_{\bar{z}_c}+1, k_{\bar{z}_c}+2, \ldots\}$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \boldsymbol{\theta}(\tilde{t})\|_2 \geq |\bar{\theta}_k - \bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| \geq |\bar{\theta}_k| - |\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| \geq |\bar{\theta}_{k_{\bar{z}_c}}| - |\bar{\theta}(\tilde{t})| \geq (b+1) - b = 1 > \epsilon.$$

■

I.14.6. CONCLUSION

Taken together, Lemmas 85, 86 and 87 form a proof for Proposition 20 in the case where the step size η is no greater than $\frac{1}{6a}$. The complementary case $\eta > \frac{1}{6a}$ is accounted for by Lemma 66.

I.15. Proof of Lemma 21

This proof is very similar to that of Lemmas 5 and 9 (see Subappendixes I.4 and I.8 respectively). We repeat all details for completeness. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a concatenation of $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its concatenation as a vector in corresponding order. Denote the following for $i \in \{1, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_i^{(1)} &:= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j} (W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j)) (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}, \\
\Delta_i^{(2)} &:= \textstyle\sum_{1 \le j < j' \le n} (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'} (W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'})) (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} \\
&\qquad\qquad D'_{i,j} (W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j)) (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}, \qquad (82) \\
\Delta_i^{(3:n)} &:= D'_{i,n}(W_n(\mathbf{w}_n) + W_n(\Delta\mathbf{w}_n)) \cdots D'_{i,1}(W_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)) \\
&\qquad\qquad - (D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1} - \Delta_i^{(1)} - \Delta_i^{(2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now develop a second-order Taylor expansion of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Since the vector tuple corresponding to $(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is $\big((\mathbf{w}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{w}_1), ..., (\mathbf{w}_n + \Delta\mathbf{w}_n)\big)$, and the function $f(\cdot)$ coincides with the function given in Equation (29) on an open region containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, for sufficiently small $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\Big(D'_{i,n}\big(W_n(\mathbf{w}_n + \Delta\mathbf{w}_n)\big) \cdots D'_{i,1}\big(W_1(\mathbf{w}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\big)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\Big(D'_{i,n}\big(W_n(\mathbf{w}_n) + W_n(\Delta\mathbf{w}_n)\big) \cdots D'_{i,1}\big(W_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + W_1(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1)\big)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i \Big) \qquad (83) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\Big(\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1} + \Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \ell\Big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i + \big(\Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(2)} + \Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i, y_i \Big),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from linearity of $W_j(\cdot)$ for $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and the third transition follows from the definition of $\Delta_i^{(3:n)}$ (Equation (82)). Let $\Delta\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$. For every $i \in \{1, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$, the second-order Taylor expansion of $\ell(\cdot)$ with respect to its first argument at $\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ell\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\boldsymbol{v}, y_i\big) = \\
&\quad \ell\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big) + \big\langle \nabla\ell_i, \Delta\boldsymbol{v} \big\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i[\Delta\boldsymbol{v}] + \mathcal{O}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{v}\|_2^2\big),
\end{aligned} \qquad (84)$$

where the $\mathcal{o}(\cdot)$ notation refers to some expression satisfying $\lim_{a\to 0}\big(\mathcal{o}(a)/a\big)=0$. We continue to develop Equation (83) using Equation (84):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta}+\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta})\\
&=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\Big(\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)+\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\big(\Delta_i^{(1)}+\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\\
&\qquad\qquad\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(1)}+\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]+\mathcal{o}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)}+\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big)\Big)\\
&=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)+\\
&\quad\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\\
&\quad\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big]+\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]+2\cdot\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i,\big(\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]+\\
&\quad\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\mathcal{o}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)}+\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big),
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last transition we view $\nabla^2\ell_i$ as both a quadratic and a bilinear form (see Subappendix I.1). Notice that $\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle$, $\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\big(\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]$, $\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i,\big(\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big]$ and $\mathcal{o}\big(\big\|\big(\Delta_i^{(1)}+\Delta_i^{(2)}+\Delta_i^{(3:n)}\big)\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2^2\big)$ are all $\mathcal{o}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big)$, thus:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f(\boldsymbol{\theta}+\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta})=\\
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)+\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big]+\mathcal{o}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

This is in fact a Taylor expansion of the function $f(\cdot)$ evaluated at the point $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with a constant term $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)$, a linear term $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle$, a quadtratic term $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big]$, and a remainder term of $\mathcal{o}\big(\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2\big)$. From uniqueness of the Taylor expansion, the quadratic term must be equal to $\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n]$. This implies:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n]\\
&=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\Big(\nabla^2\ell_i\big[\Delta_i^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_i\big]+2\big\langle\nabla\ell_i,\Delta_i^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_i\big\rangle\Big)\\
&=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i\Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j+1}D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]+\\
&\quad\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i^\top\sum_{1\le j<j'\le n}(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j'+1}D'_{i,j'}(W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1}\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last transition follows from plugging in the definitions of $\Delta^{(1)}$ and $\Delta^{(2)}$ (see Equation (82). ■

I.16. Proof of Proposition 22

This proof is very similar to that of Proposition 10 (see Subappendix I.9). We repeat all details for completeness. From assumption *(ii)* there exists some $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$. Define $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ to be the weight vectors constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. We may assume $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$ without loss of generality, as we can negate the vectors $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$ by flipping the signs of the entries in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ corresponding to the last vector $\mathbf{w}_n$ (see Equation (28)). From continuity, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ such that for all $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathcal{N}$ it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0$. Moreover, as discussed in Appendix C, for almost all $\boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists an open region $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$, which is closed under positive rescaling of weight matrices and across which $f(\cdot)$ coincides with a function as given in Equation (29). There must exist some $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ in the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ for which a region of the type $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ exists. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Notice that none of the weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n$ are equal to zero (as that would lead to $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell(\mathbf{0}, y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$). Define the following weight vectors parameterized by $a > 0$ (while recalling that $n \geq 3$ by assumption *(i)*):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{w}_1(a) := \mathbf{w}_1 \cdot a^{-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \,, \\
&\mathbf{w}_2(a) := \mathbf{w}_2 \cdot a^{-2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \,, \\
&\mathbf{w}_3(a) := \mathbf{w}_3 \cdot a \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_3} \,, \\
&\mathbf{w}_j(a) := \mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_j} \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2, ..., n\} / \{1, 2, 3\} \,,
\end{aligned}$$

and denote by $\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ their corresponding weight setting. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is closed under positive rescaling of weight vectors, it holds that $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) \,:\, a > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$. Define:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta \mathbf{w}_1 := \mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \,, \\
&\Delta \mathbf{w}_2 := \mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \,, \\
&\Delta \mathbf{w}_j := \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_j} \text{ for } j \in [n] / \{1, 2\} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

For $a > 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $j, j' \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, define $(D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{j':j}$ to be the matrix $D'_{i,j'} W_{j'}(\mathbf{w}_{j'}(a)) D'_{i,j'-1} W_{j'-1}(\mathbf{w}_{j'-1}(a)) \cdots D'_{i,j} W_j(\mathbf{w}_j(a))$ (where by convention $D'_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_n}$ stands for identity) if $j \leq j'$, and an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. For $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$ and $a > 0$ let $\nabla \ell_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ and $\nabla^2 \ell_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n, d_n}$ be the gradient and Hessian (respectively) of the loss $\ell(\cdot)$ at the point $\big((D'_{i,*} W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{n:1} \mathbf{x}_i, y_i\big)$ with respect to its first argument. For every $a > 0$, since $\boldsymbol{\theta}(a) \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$, we may apply Lemma 21,

obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] = \\
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)\Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{n:j+1}D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]+ \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(a)^\top\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n}(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{n:j'+1}D'_{i,j'}(W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} \\
&\qquad\qquad D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where we regard Hessians as quadratic forms (see Subappendix I.1). Plugging in the definitions of $\mathbf{w}_j(a)$ and $\Delta\mathbf{w}_j$ for $j\in[n]$ and relying on linearity of $W_j(\cdot)$ for $j\in[n]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)\Big[2a^{-1}(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]+\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(a)^\top a(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i \\
&= \frac{4}{a^2}\cdot\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)\Big[(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]+a\cdot\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

where the second transition follows from pulling $2/a$ out of the quadratic operator and the fact that $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)=(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i$. Note that $\lim_{a\to\infty}\big(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a))\big)_{n:1}=0$. Since the function $\ell(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable in its first argument, it holds that $\lim_{a\to\infty}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)=\lim_{a\to\infty}\nabla^2\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)=\nabla^2\ell(\mathbf{0},y_i)$, and similarly we have that $\lim_{a\to\infty}\nabla\ell_i(a)=\lim_{a\to\infty}\nabla\ell\big((D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*(a)))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i,y_i\big)=\nabla\ell(\mathbf{0},y_i)$. Therefore, in the limit $a\to\infty$, Equation (86) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right]\Big) \\
&= \lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(\frac{4}{a^2}\cdot\frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)\Big[(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big)+\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(a\cdot\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big) \\
&= \lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(\frac{4}{a^2}\Big)\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(\frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell_i(a)\Big[(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big)+\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(a\cdot\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(a)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big)\Big) \\
&= 0\cdot\Big(\frac{4}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla^2\ell(\mathbf{0},y_i)\Big[(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big]\Big)+\lim_{a\to\infty}\Big(a\cdot\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell_i(\mathbf{0},y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big) \\
&= -\infty\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition is valid since the multiplied limits are finite and the limit inside a limit is non-zero, and the last transition follows from $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|}\nabla\ell(\mathbf{0},y_i)^\top h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)<0$. Notice that the vectors $\Delta\mathbf{w}_1,\Delta\mathbf{w}_2,...,\Delta\mathbf{w}_n$ are independent of a, thus it must hold that $\lim_{a\to\infty}\lambda_{\min}\big(\nabla^2 f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}(a)\big)\big)=-\infty$. This in particular implies the desired result:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^d\ s.t.\ \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\ exists}\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta}))=-\infty\,.$$

■

I.17. Proof of Lemma 23

This proof is very similar to that of Lemmas 7 and 11 (see Subappendixes I.6 and I.10 respectively). We repeat all details for completeness. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a concatenation of $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ as a vector. Let $(\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, \Delta\mathbf{w}_2, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$, and denote by $\Delta\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its concatenation as a vector in corresponding order. As shown in Lemma 21:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] = \\
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla^2 \ell_i \Big[\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} (D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j+1} D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\Big] + \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} (D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where we regard Hessians as quadratic forms (see Subappendix I.1). Convexity of $\ell(\cdot)$ in its first argument implies that for $i \in \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{S}|\}$, $\nabla^2\ell_i$ is positive semi-definite, thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] \geq \\
&\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \nabla \ell_i^\top \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} (D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz and triangle inequalities, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\|\nabla\ell_i\right\|_2 \cdot \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \left\|(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{n:j'+1} D'_{i,j'}(W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j'\text{-}1:j+1} \cdot \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. D'_{i,j}(W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j))(D'_{i,*}W_*(\mathbf{w}_*))_{j\text{-}1:1}\mathbf{x}_i\right\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\|\nabla\ell_i\right\|_2 \cdot \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \left\|W_j(\Delta\mathbf{w}_j)\right\|_s \left\|W_{j'}(\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'})\right\|_s \prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \left\|W_k(\mathbf{w}_k)\right\|_s \prod_{k\in[n]} \left\|D'_{i,k}\right\|_s \cdot \left\|\mathbf{x}_i\right\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\|\nabla\ell_i\right\|_2 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \left\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\right\|_2 \left\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}\right\|_2 \prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \left\|\mathbf{w}_k\right\|_2 \prod_{k=1}^{n} \left\|D'_{i,k}\right\|_s \cdot \left\|\mathbf{x}_i\right\|_2 \\
&\geq -\frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\|\nabla\ell_i\right\|_2 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \left\|\mathbf{w}_j\right\|_2 \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \left\|\mathbf{x}_i\right\|_2 \sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \left\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\right\|_2 \left\|\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}\right\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from the definition and sub-multiplicativity of spectral norm, the third transition follows from bounding spectral norms with Frobenius norms and the definition of $\|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op}$, and the last transition follows from maximizing $\prod_{k\in[n]/\{j,j'\}} \|\mathbf{w}_k\|_2$ over j, j', upper

bounding $\|D'_{i,j}\|_s \leq \max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}$ for $j \in [n-1]$ and recalling that $D'_{i,n}$ is an identity matrix, meaning $\|D'_{i,n}\|_s = 1$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{1\leq j<j'\leq n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_{j'}\|_2 \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2 \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2\Big)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \tfrac{n}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 \\
&= \tfrac{n-1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the one-norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is never greater than $\sqrt{n}$ times its euclidean-norm. This leads us to the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left[\Delta\mathbf{w}_1, ..., \Delta\mathbf{w}_n\right] \geq \\
&-\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big\|\mathbf{w}_j\big\|_2 \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla\ell_i\big\|_2 \big\|\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\Delta\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result readily follows:

$$\lambda_{\min}\big(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\big) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \big\|\nabla\ell_i\big\|_2 \big\|\mathbf{x}_i\big\|_2 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n] \\ |\mathcal{J}|=n-2}} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big\|\mathbf{w}_j\big\|_2 .$$

■

I.18. Proof of Proposition 24

This proof is very similar to that of Proposition 12 (see Subappendix I.11). Recall that $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, ..., \mathbf{w}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ are the weight vectors constituting $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and denote by $(\mathbf{w}_{1,s}, \mathbf{w}_{2,s}, ..., \mathbf{w}_{n,s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d'_n}$ those that constitute $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s$. For $j, j' \in [n]$:

$$\big|\|\mathbf{w}_{j,s}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_{j',s}\|_2^2\big| \leq \max\big\{\|\mathbf{w}_{j,s}\|_2^2, \|\mathbf{w}_{j',s}\|_2^2\big\} \leq \max_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_{j,s}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon^2 .$$

Theorem 2.3 from Du et al. (2018) implies that throughout a gradient flow trajectory differences between squared Euclidean norms of weight vectors are constant. Therefore, for $j, j' \in [n]$:

$$\big|\|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_{j'}\|_2^2\big| = \big|\|\mathbf{w}_{j,s}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_{j',s}\|_2^2\big| \leq \epsilon^2 . \tag{87}$$

If the network is shallow (*i.e.* $n = 2$), then Equation (32) coincides with Equation (31), thus the desired result follows trivially from Lemma 23. Hereafter we assume that the network is deep

(*i.e.* $n \geq 3$). It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\mathcal{J}\subseteq[n],|\mathcal{J}|=n-2} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2 &\leq \max_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^{n-2} \\
&= \left(\min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 + \max_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 - \min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \\
&\leq \left(\min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 + \epsilon^2\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \\
&= \left(\sqrt{\min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2^2 + \epsilon^2}\right)^{n-2} \\
&\leq \left(\min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2 + \epsilon\right)^{n-2} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third transition follows from Equation (87) and the last transition follows from sub-additivity of square root. Combining the latter inequality together with the result of Lemma 23 (Equation (31)), we obtain the desired result:

$$\lambda_{\min}\left(\nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \geq -\max\{|\alpha|, |\bar{\alpha}|\}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\|\nabla \ell_i\right\|_2 \left\|\mathbf{x}_i\right\|_2 \prod_{j\in[n]} \|W_j(\cdot)\|_{op} \left(\min_{j\in[n]} \|\mathbf{w}_j\|_2 + \epsilon\right)^{n-2} .$$

■

I.19. Proof of Lemma 31

In this proof we overload the definition of unbalancedness magnitude (Definition 30) to account for arbitrary matrix dimensions, namely, for any matrices $A_1, ..., A_n$ such that the product $A_n \cdots A_1$ is defined, we refer to $\max_{j\in[n-1]} \|A_{j+1}^\top A_{j+1} - A_j A_j^\top\|_n$ as their unbalancedness magnitude. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the arrangement of $W_1, W_2, ..., W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ and $W_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$ as a vector. Define the matrices $B_1, B_2, ..., B_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ as follows: $B_j := W_j$ for $j \in [n-1]$ and $B_n := \sqrt{W_n^\top W_n}$. Notice that:

$$B_n^\top B_n = \sqrt{W_n^\top W_n} \sqrt{W_n^\top W_n} = W_n^\top W_n ,$$

thus the unbalancedness magnitude of $B_1, ..., B_n$ is equal to that of $W_1, ..., W_n$, *i.e.* to $\hat{\epsilon}$. Define the matrices $C_1, C_2, ..., C_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ by transposing and reversing the order of $B_1, ..., B_n$, formally: $C_j := B_{n-j+1}^\top$ for $j \in [n]$. Notice that transposition and order reversal do not change the unbalancedness magnitude. Namely, since for $j \in [n-1]$ we have that $\|C_{j+1}^\top C_{j+1} - C_j C_j^\top\|_n = \|B_{n-j} B_{n-j}^\top - B_{n-j+1}^\top B_{n-j+1}\|_n$, the unbalancedness magnitude of $C_1, ..., C_n$ is equal to that of $B_1, ..., B_n$, *i.e.* to $\hat{\epsilon}$. Applying Lemma 1 from Razin and Cohen (2020) to $C_1, ..., C_n$, we conclude that there exists $\hat{C}_1, ..., \hat{C}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ which are balanced (*i.e.* have unbalancedness magnitude zero), such that $\|C_j - \hat{C}_j\|_F \leq (j-1)\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}$ for $j \in [n]$. Pay special notice to the fact that $\hat{C}_1 = C_1$ (as the Frobenius norm of the discrepancy is zero). Define the matrices $\hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2, ..., \hat{B}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ by transposing and reversing the order of $\hat{C}_1, ..., \hat{C}_n$, formally: $\hat{B}_j := \hat{C}_{n-j+1}^\top$ for $j \in [n]$. Relying again on the fact that transposition and order reversal do not change unbalancedness magnitude, we have that $\hat{B}_1, ..., \hat{B}_n$, similarly to $\hat{C}_1, ..., \hat{C}_n$, are balanced. Define the matrices $\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2, ..., \hat{W}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0,d_0}$ and $\hat{W}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$ as follows: $\hat{W}_j := \hat{B}_j$ for $j \in [n-1]$ and $\hat{W}_n := W_n$. Notice that the dimensions

of $\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2, ..., \hat{W}_n$ correspond to those of $W_1, W_2, ..., W_n$, and in particular that these are valid weight matrices. We denote their corresponding weight setting by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Notice that:

$$\hat{W}_n^\top \hat{W}_n = W_n^\top W_n = \sqrt{W_n^\top W_n}\sqrt{W_n^\top W_n} = B_n B_n = C_1 C_1 = \hat{C}_1 \hat{C}_1 = \hat{B}_n \hat{B}_n \,,$$

which means that $\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2, ..., \hat{W}_n$ are balanced, as they have the same unbalancedness magnitude of $\hat{B}_1, ..., \hat{B}_n$, *i.e.* zero. Furthermore we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 &= \|(\hat{W}_n, \hat{W}_{n-1}..., \hat{W}_1) - (W_n, W_{n-1}, ..., W_1)\|_F \\
&= \|(W_n, \hat{B}_{n-1}..., \hat{B}_1) - (W_n, B_{n-1}, ..., B_1)\|_F \\
&= \sqrt{\|W_n - W_n\|_F^2 + \|\hat{B}_{n-1} - B_{n-1}\|_F^2 + ... + \|\hat{B}_1 - B_1\|_F^2} \\
&= \sqrt{0 + \|\hat{C}_2^\top - C_2^\top\|_F^2 + ... + \|\hat{C}_n^\top - C_n^\top\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(n-1)\cdot(n-1)^2\hat{\epsilon}} \\
&\leq n^{1.5}\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}} \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second transition follows from the definitions of $\hat{W}_1, ..., \hat{W}_{n-1}$ and $B_1, ..., B_{n-1}$, the third from the definition of Frobenius norm, the forth from the definitions of $\hat{B}_1, ..., \hat{B}_{n-1}$ and $C_1, ..., C_{n-1}$ and the fifth transition follows from the conclusion of Lemma 1 from Razin and Cohen (2020) applied to $C_1, ..., C_n$. ■

I.20. Proof of Theorem 32

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq 1$ (a proof that is valid for $\tilde{\epsilon} = 1$ automatically accounts for $\tilde{\epsilon} > 1$ as well). Given that the unbalancedness magnitude (Definition 30) of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is no greater than $\hat{\epsilon}$ (defined in Equation (34)), by Lemma 31, there exists a weight setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which is balanced (has unbalancedness magnitude zero) and meets $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0\|_2 \leq n^{1.5}\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}$. Denote by $(\hat{W}_{1,0}, \hat{W}_{2,0}, ..., \hat{W}_{n,0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1,d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2,d_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_{n-1}}$ the weight matrices corresponding to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$, and by $\hat{W}_{n:1,0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n,d_0}$ its end-to-end matrix (*i.e.* $\hat{W}_{n:1,0} := \hat{W}_{n,0}\hat{W}_{n-1,0}\cdots\hat{W}_{1,0}$). Define $\hat{\nu}$ as $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_{yx}^\top \hat{W}_{n:1,0}) \big/ \big(\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F \|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F\big)$ if $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \neq 0$, and as 0 otherwise. The following lemma establishes several bounds relating $\hat{W}_{n:1,0}$ and $\hat{\nu}$ to $W_{n:1,0}$ and ν respectively.

Lemma 88 *The following hold:*

$$\|W_{n:1,0} - \hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \leq \tfrac{1}{3}\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F \,; \tag{88}$$

$$\hat{\nu} \geq \min\left\{-\tfrac{1}{2}\,,\, \textit{sign}(\nu)\tfrac{|\nu|+1}{2}\right\} \,; \tag{89}$$

$$\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^{-1} \leq \tfrac{3}{2}\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^{-1} \,; \textit{ and} \tag{90}$$

$$\max\{1, \tfrac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\} \leq \max\{3, \tfrac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\} \,. \tag{91}$$

Proof for Lemma 88 is provided in Subsubappendix I.20.1.

Given $\eta > 0$ adhering to Equation (35), define:

$$k := \left\lfloor \frac{2n\left(\max\left\{1, \frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \eta} \ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}\right) + 1 \right\rfloor \,. \tag{92}$$

Taken together, Equations (90) and (91) imply that k adheres to the upper bound in Equation (36). It thus suffices to show that with step size η, iterate k of gradient descent is $\tilde{\epsilon}$-optimal, *i.e.* $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$.

Equations (88) and (89) respectively imply that $\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \leq 0.2$ and $\hat{\nu} \neq -1$. Therefore, as an initial point for gradient flow, the (balanced) weight setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 14. Define:

$$\bar{\epsilon} := \tilde{\epsilon}/2 \;\;,\;\; \epsilon := \frac{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n k\eta}\,, \tag{93}$$

and invoke Proposition 14 with initial point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$, time $t = k\eta$ and $\bar{\epsilon}$, ϵ as above (note that $\epsilon \in (0, 1/(2n)]$). From the proposition we obtain that the gradient flow trajectory emanating from $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ is defined over infinite time, and with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ representing this trajectory, the following time $\bar{t}$ satisfies $f(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\bar{t})) - \min_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{q}) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$:

$$\bar{t} = \frac{2n\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F} \ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \min\{1,2\bar{\epsilon}\}}\right). \tag{94}$$

Moreover, we obtain that under the notations of Theorem 3, in correspondence with $\mathcal{D}_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$) are the smoothness and Lipschitz constants $\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon} = 16n$ and $\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} = 6\sqrt{n}$ respectively, and the following (upper) bound on the integral of (minus) the minimal eigenvalue of the Hessian:

$$\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt' \leq \frac{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n k\eta\epsilon}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F} + \ln\left(\frac{n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right), \tag{95}$$

where the function $m : [0, k\eta] \to \mathbb{R}$ is non-negative.

Notice that $k = \lfloor \bar{t}/\eta + 1 \rfloor$ and therefore $k\eta \geq \bar{t}$. Combining this with the fact that the gradient flow trajectory $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$ is $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal at time $\bar{t}$, and that in general gradient flow monotonically non-increases the objective it optimizes, we infer $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimality of the gradient flow trajectory at time $k\eta$, *i.e.* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \leq \bar{\epsilon}$. We will invoke Theorem 3 for showing that, in addition to being $\bar{\epsilon}$-optimal, the gradient flow trajectory at time $k\eta$ is also ϵ-approximated by iterate k of gradient descent, *i.e.* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. This, along with $f(\cdot)$ being $6\sqrt{n}$-Lipschitz across $\mathcal{D}_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ (ϵ-neighborhood of gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$), yields the desired result — $\tilde{\epsilon}$-optimality for iterate k of gradient descent:

$$\begin{aligned}
&f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q}) \\
&= \Big(f\big(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\big) - f\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\big)\Big) + \Big(f\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q})\Big) \\
&\leq \Big(6\sqrt{n}\big\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\big\|_2\Big) + \Big(f\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\big) - \min_{\boldsymbol{q}\in\mathbb{R}^d} f(\boldsymbol{q})\Big) \\
&\leq 6\sqrt{n}\cdot\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon} \\
&\leq \tilde{\epsilon}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last transition follows from the definitions of ϵ and $\bar{\epsilon}$ (Equation (93)).

We conclude the proof by showing that indeed $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Equation (95), the definition of ϵ (Equation (93)) and the condition $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq 1$ together imply:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt' &\leq \frac{15n^3\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n k\eta\epsilon}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F} + \ln\left(\frac{n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right) \qquad (96)\\
&= \tilde{\epsilon} + \ln\left(\frac{n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right)\\
&\leq 1 + \ln\left(\frac{n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right)\\
&< \ln\left(\frac{3n^2\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the expressions for k and $\bar{t}$ (Equations (92) and (94) respectively), and the definition of $\bar{\epsilon}$ (Equation (93)), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
k\eta = \lfloor \bar{t}/\eta + 1\rfloor\eta \leq \bar{t} + \eta &= \frac{2n\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F}\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right) + \eta \qquad (97)\\
&< \frac{3n\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F}\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last transition makes use of the upper bound on η given in Equation (35). It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&4n^3\epsilon^{-2}e^2\textstyle\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'\\
&< 4n^3\frac{225n^6\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{2n}(k\eta)^2}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^2\tilde{\epsilon}^2}\cdot\frac{9n^4\left(e^2\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^4}\\
&< \frac{8100n^{13}e^{11n-10}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{7n-5}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^6\tilde{\epsilon}^2}(k\eta)^2\\
&< \frac{8100n^{13}e^{11n-10}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{7n-5}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^6\tilde{\epsilon}^2}\cdot\frac{9n^2\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{2n}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2\\
&< \frac{n^{15}e^{12n+2}\left(\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{9n-5}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F^8\tilde{\epsilon}^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{1,\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}(0)\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2\\
&\leq \frac{n^{15}e^{12n+2}\left(\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{9n-5}}{(\frac{2}{3})^8\|W_{n:1}(0)\|_F^8\tilde{\epsilon}^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{15n\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\frac{2}{3}\|W_{n:1}(0)\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2\\
&\leq \frac{n^{15}e^{12n+6}\left(\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{9n-5}}{\|W_{n:1}(0)\|_F^8\tilde{\epsilon}^2}\left(\ln\left(\frac{23n\max\left\{3,\frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1}(0)\|_F\tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2\\
&= 1/\hat{\epsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition follows from Equation (96) and the definition of ϵ (Equation (93)); the third makes use of Equation (97); the fifth relies on Equations (90) and (91); and the last is based on

the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}$ (Equation (34)) and the condition $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq 1$. Rearranging the derived inequality gives $\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}} < \frac{1}{2} n^{-1.5} \epsilon e^{-\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'}$. Combining this with the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2 \leq n^{1.5}\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}$, we obtain:

$$\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2 \geq \epsilon - e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} n^{1.5}\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}} > \epsilon - \tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon = \tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon. \tag{98}$$

We now have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} k\eta e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} \Big/ \left(\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')d'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2\right) \\
&< \beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} k\eta e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} 2\epsilon^{-1} \\
&< (16n)(6\sqrt{n})\, k\eta \cdot \frac{3n^2 \left(e^2 \max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{5(n-1)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \cdot 2\frac{15n^3 \left(\max\left\{1, \frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^n k\eta}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}} \\
&< \frac{9000 n^{13/2} e^{6n-5} \left(\max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{(7n-5)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^3 \tilde{\epsilon}} (k\eta)^2 \\
&< \frac{9000 n^{13/2} e^{6n-5} \left(\max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{(7n-5)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^3 \tilde{\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{9n^2 \left(\max\left\{1, \frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{2n}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^2} \left(\ln\left(\frac{15n \max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&< \frac{n^{17/2} e^{7n+7} \left(\max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}\right)^{(11n-5)/2}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F^5 \tilde{\epsilon}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{15n \max\left\{1, \frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}}\right\}}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{n^{17/2} e^{7n+7} \left(\max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(11n-5)/2}}{(\frac{2}{3})^5 \|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^5 \tilde{\epsilon}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{15n \max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\frac{2}{3}\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{n^{17/2} e^{7n+10} \left(\max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}\right)^{(11n-5)/2}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F^5 \tilde{\epsilon}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{23n \max\left\{3, \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}\right\}}{\|W_{n:1,0}\|_F \tilde{\epsilon}}\right)\right)^2 \\
&\leq 1/\eta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition is due to Equation (98); the second makes use of $\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon} = 16n$, $\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} = 6\sqrt{n}$, Equation (96) and the definition of ϵ (Equation (93)); the fourth relies on Equation (97); the sixth is an outcome of Equations (90) and (91); and the last follows from the upper bound on η given in Equation (35), as well as the condition $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq 1$. Rearrange the inequality above:

$$\eta < \frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} k\eta\, e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'}}.$$

Since $m(\cdot)$ is non-negative, it holds that:

$$\frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} k\eta\, e^{\int_0^{k\eta} m(t')dt'}} \leq \inf_{t \in (0, k\eta]} \frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{t} m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} \int_0^t e^{\int_{t'}^t m(t'')\, dt''}\, dt'},$$

and therefore:

$$\eta < \inf_{t \in (0, k\eta]} \frac{\epsilon - e^{\int_0^{t} m(t')dt'} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(0)\|_2}{\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon} \int_0^t e^{\int_{t'}^t m(t'')\, dt''}\, dt'}. \tag{99}$$

We now invoke Theorem 3 with ϵ as we have defined (Equation (93)), time $\tilde{t} = k\eta$, and $\beta_{k\eta,\epsilon}$, $\gamma_{k\eta,\epsilon}$ and $m(\cdot)$ as produced by Proposition 14. The theorem implies that, by Equation (99), the first $\lfloor k\eta/\eta \rfloor = k$ iterates of gradient descent ϵ-approximate the gradient flow trajectory up to time $k\eta$, *i.e.* $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k'} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k'\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $k' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. In particular $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(k\eta)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, as required. ■

I.20.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 88

For conciseness, in the current proof we omit a second subscript "0" from our notation. Namely, we use $W_{n:1}$ and $\hat{W}_{n:1}$ as shorthand for $W_{n:1,0}$ and $\hat{W}_{n:1,0}$ respectively, and for any $j \in [n]$, W_j and $\hat{W}_j$ serve as shorthand for $W_{j,0}$ and $\hat{W}_{j,0}$ respectively.

We start by proving Equation (88). The following matrix $\hat{W}_{j':j}$, for any $j, j' \in [n]$, is defined as $\hat{W}_{j'}\hat{W}_{j'-1}\cdots\hat{W}_j$ if $j \leq j'$, and as an identity matrix (with size to be inferred by context) otherwise. Recall that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ meets the balancedness condition, *i.e.* $\hat{W}_{j+1}^\top \hat{W}_{j+1} = \hat{W}_j \hat{W}_j^\top$ for all $j \in [n-1]$. Using this relation repeatedly (while recalling that $d_n = 1$), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^2 &= \hat{W}_{n:1}\hat{W}_{n:1}^\top \\
&= \hat{W}_{n:2}\hat{W}_1\hat{W}_1^\top\hat{W}_{n:2}^\top \\
&= \hat{W}_{n:2}\hat{W}_2^\top\hat{W}_2\hat{W}_{n:2}^\top \\
&= \hat{W}_{n:3}\hat{W}_2\hat{W}_2^\top\hat{W}_2\hat{W}_2^\top\hat{W}_{n:3}^\top \\
&= \hat{W}_{n:3}\hat{W}_3^\top\hat{W}_3\hat{W}_3^\top\hat{W}_3\hat{W}_{n:3}^\top \\
&\vdots \\
&= \left(\hat{W}_n\hat{W}_n^\top\right)^n \\
&= \|\hat{W}_n\|_F^{2n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the balancedness condition implies that $\|\hat{W}_j\|_F = \|\hat{W}_{j+1}\|_F$ for any $j \in [n-1]$, we may conclude $\|\hat{W}_j\|_F = \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{1/n}$ for any $j \in [n]$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|W_{n:1} - \hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \\
&= \left\|(\hat{W}_n + W_n - \hat{W}_n)\cdots(\hat{W}_1 + W_1 - \hat{W}_1) - \hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \\
&= \left\|\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n}\big(b_n\hat{W}_n + (1-b_n)(W_n - \hat{W}_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1\hat{W}_1 + (1-b_1)(W_1 - \hat{W}_1)\big) - \hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \\
&= \left\|\textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n}\big(b_n\hat{W}_n + (1-b_n)(W_n - \hat{W}_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1\hat{W}_1 + (1-b_1)(W_1 - \hat{W}_1)\big)\right\|_F \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n}\left\|\big(b_n\hat{W}_n + (1-b_n)(W_n - \hat{W}_n)\big)\cdots\big(b_1\hat{W}_1 + (1-b_1)(W_1 - \hat{W}_1)\big)\right\|_F \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n}\left\|b_n\hat{W}_n + (1-b_n)(W_n - \hat{W}_n)\right\|_F\cdots\left\|b_1\hat{W}_1 + (1-b_1)(W_1 - \hat{W}_1)\big)\right\|_F \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n}\big(b_n\|\hat{W}_n\|_F + (1-b_n)\|W_n - \hat{W}_n\|_F\big)\cdots\big(b_1\|\hat{W}_1\|_F + (1-b_1)\|W_1 - \hat{W}_1\|_F\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities follow from sub-multiplicativity and sub-additivity of Frobenius norm. Since $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n^3\hat{\epsilon}}$ and $\|\hat{W}_j\|_F = \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{1/n}$ for any $j \in [n]$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|W_{n:1} - \hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{(b_1,..,b_n)\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus\{1\}^n} \left(b_n\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{1/n} + (1-b_n)\sqrt{n^3\hat{\epsilon}}\right)\cdots\left(b_1\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{1/n} + (1-b_1)\sqrt{n^3\hat{\epsilon}}\right) \\
&= \left(\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{1/n} + \sqrt{n^3\hat{\epsilon}}\right)^n - \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j}\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{(n-j)/n}\left(n^3\hat{\epsilon}\right)^{j/2} - \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n}{j}\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F^{(n-j)/n}\left(n^3\hat{\epsilon}\right)^{j/2} \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n n^j \max\left\{1, \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\right\}\left(n^3\hat{\epsilon}\right)^{j/2} \\
&= \max\left\{1, \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\right\}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \left(n^5\hat{\epsilon}\right)^{j/2} \\
&\leq \max\left\{1, \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\right\}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^\infty \left(n^5\hat{\epsilon}\right)^{j/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}} < 1$ (relying on the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}$ in Equation (34)), we obtain:

$$\left\|W_{n:1} - \hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \leq \max\left\{1, \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\right\}\frac{\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}{1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}. \tag{100}$$

By the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}$ (Equation (34)), it follows that $\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}/\left(1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{3}\|W_{n:1}\|_F$, thus:

$$\|W_{n:1} - \hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \leq \tfrac{1}{3}\max\left\{1, \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\right\}\|W_{n:1}\|_F.$$

We conclude the proof of Equation (88) by showing that $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \leq 1$. Indeed, assuming that this is not the case, *i.e.* $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F > 1$, while recalling that $\|W_{n:1}\|_F \leq 0.1$, leads us to a contradiction:

$$\left\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F \leq \left\|W_{n:1}\right\|_F + \left\|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\right\|_F \leq 0.1\left\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F + \tfrac{1}{3}\left\|W_{n:1}\right\|_F\left\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F < \left\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\right\|_F.$$

Note that in addition to Equation (88), from Equation (100) and the fact that $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \leq 1$, we may also establish the following:

$$\|W_{n:1} - \hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \leq \|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F\frac{\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}{1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}. \tag{101}$$

Moving on to the proof of Equation (89), we split the analysis into the following two cases: *(i)* $\nu \in [0,1]$; and *(ii)* $\nu \in (-1,0)$. We start by analyzing case *(i)*. Note that Equation (88) together with the fact that $\|W_{n:1}\|_F \neq 0$ imply $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \neq 0$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\nu} &= \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, \hat{W}_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, W_{n:1} + \hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, W_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} + \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, \hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= \nu\cdot\frac{\|W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} + \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, \hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\geq 0 + \frac{\langle\Lambda_{yx}, \hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\rangle}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F = 1$. We may finish the proof for case *(i)* by using Cauchy-Schwartz and triangle inequalities together with Equation (88):

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\nu} &\geq -\frac{1\cdot\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{1\cdot\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= -\frac{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}+\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\geq -\frac{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\geq -\frac{\|W_{n:1}\|_F/3}{2\|W_{n:1}\|_F/3} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Regarding case *(ii)* (*i.e.* $\nu \in (-1, 0)$), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\nu}| &= \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},\hat{W}_{n:1}\rangle|}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}+\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\rangle|}{1\cdot\|W_{n:1}+\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle+\langle\Lambda_{yx},\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\rangle|}{\|W_{n:1}+\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\leq \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+|\langle\Lambda_{yx},\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\rangle|}{(\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F)} \\
&\leq \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+1\cdot\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= |\nu| - |\nu| + \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= |\nu| - \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|}{\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F\|W_{n:1}\|_F} + \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= |\nu| - \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|}{1\cdot\|W_{n:1}\|_F} + \frac{|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= |\nu| + \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F \cdot \frac{\|W_{n:1}\|_F^{-1}|\langle\Lambda_{yx},W_{n:1}\rangle|+1}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&= |\nu| + \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F \cdot \frac{|\nu|+1}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F-\|\hat{W}_{n:1}-W_{n:1}\|_F},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition relies on $\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \neq 0$; the second uses $\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F = 1$; the fourth uses triangle inequality, and relies on Equation (88) ensuring positive denominator; the fifth uses Cauchy-

Schwartz and $\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F = 1$; and both the eighth and the last follow from $\|\Lambda_{yx}\|_F = 1$. It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\nu}| &\leq |\nu| + \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F \cdot \tfrac{3}{2} \tfrac{|\nu|+1}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\leq |\nu| + \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F \cdot \tfrac{3}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\leq |\nu| + 3\tfrac{\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}{1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}} \cdot \tfrac{\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\leq |\nu| + 3\tfrac{\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}{1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}} \cdot \tfrac{\|W_{n:1}\|_F + \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F}{\|W_{n:1}\|_F} \\
&\leq |\nu| + 4\tfrac{\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}}{1-\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}}} \\
&\leq |\nu| + 4\tfrac{(1+\nu)/16}{1-1/2} \\
&= |\nu| + \tfrac{1-|\nu|}{2} \\
&= \tfrac{|\nu|+1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first transition uses Equation (88); the second relies on $|\nu| \leq 1$; the third uses Equation (101); the fourth follows from triange inequality; the fifth uses Equation (88); the sixth follows from the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}$ (Equation (34)), namely that $\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}} \leq (1+\nu)/16$ and $\sqrt{n^5\hat{\epsilon}} \leq 1/2$; and the seventh relies on the assumption of case *(ii)* (*i.e.* $\nu < 0$). After proving both cases *(i)* and *(ii)*, we may conclude Equation (89).

Equation (90) follows from triangle inequality and Equation (88):

$$\|\hat{W}_{n:1}\|_F \geq \|W_{n:1}\|_F - \|\hat{W}_{n:1} - W_{n:1}\|_F \geq \|W_{n:1}\|_F - \tfrac{1}{3}\|W_{n:1}\|_F = \tfrac{2}{3}\|W_{n:1}\|_F.$$

To prove Equation (91), it suffices to show that $\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}} \leq 3$ or $\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}} \leq \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}$. We prove this separately for the following two cases: $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \text{sign}(\nu)\frac{|\nu|+1}{2}$ and $-\frac{1}{2} > \text{sign}(\nu)\frac{|\nu|+1}{2}$. In the case of $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \text{sign}(\nu)\frac{|\nu|+1}{2}$, Equation (89) implies $\hat{\nu} \geq -\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we have that $\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}} \leq \frac{1-(-0.5)}{1-0.5} = 3$, thereby proving that Equation (91) holds for this case. For the other case (*i.e.* $-0.5 > \text{sign}(\nu)(|\nu|+1)/2$), we have that $\nu < 0$, and Equation (89) implies $\hat{\nu} \geq -\frac{1-\nu}{2}$. Thus, we have that $\frac{1-\hat{\nu}}{1+\hat{\nu}} \leq \frac{1-(-(1-\nu)/2)}{1-(1-\nu)/2} = \frac{1.5-\nu/2}{0.5+\nu/2} = \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}$, thereby proving that Equation (91) holds for the second (and last) case. ■