arXiv:2108.04620v1 [math.OC] 10 Aug 2021

A proof of convergence for the gradient descent optimization method with random initializations in the training of neural networks with ReLU activation for piecewise linear target functions

Arnulf Jentzen[1,2] and Adrian Riekert[3]

[1] Applied Mathematics: Institute for Analysis and Numerics, University of Münster, Germany, e-mail: ajentzen@uni-muenster.de

[2] School of Data Science and Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China, e-mail: ajentzen@cuhk.edu.cn

[3] Applied Mathematics: Institute for Analysis and Numerics, University of Münster, Germany, e-mail: ariekert@uni-muenster.de

August 11, 2021

Abstract

Gradient descent (GD) type optimization methods are the standard instrument to train artificial neural networks (ANNs) with rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation. Despite the great success of GD type optimization methods in numerical simulations for the training of ANNs with ReLU activation, it remains – even in the simplest situation of the plain vanilla GD optimization method with random initializations and ANNs with one hidden layer – an open problem to prove (or disprove) the conjecture that the risk of the GD optimization method converges in the training of such ANNs to zero as the width of the ANNs, the number of independent random initializations, and the number of GD steps increase to infinity. In this article we prove this conjecture in the situation where the probability distribution of the input data is equivalent to the continuous uniform distribution on a compact interval, where the probability distributions for the random initializations of the ANN parameters are standard normal distributions, and where the target function under consideration is continuous and piecewise affine linear. Roughly speaking, the key ingredients in our mathematical convergence analysis are (i) to prove that suitable sets of global minima of the risk functions are *twice continuously differentiable submanifolds of the ANN parameter spaces*, (ii) to prove that the Hessians of the risk functions on these sets of global minima satisfy an appropriate *maximal rank condition*, and, thereafter, (iii) to apply the machinery in [Fehrman, B., Gess, B., Jentzen, A., Convergence rates for the stochastic gradient descent method for non-convex objective functions. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 21(136): 1–48, 2020] to establish convergence of the GD optimization method with random initializations.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Second order differentiability properties of the risk function **6**

2.1 Mathematical description of artificial neural networks (ANNs) 7

2.2 Regularity properties for parametric integrals of Lipschitz continuous functions . 8

2.3 Local Lipschitz continuity for active neuron regions 10

2.4 Explicit representations for the Hessian matrix of the risk function 13

2.5 Upper bounds for the entries of the Hessian matrix of the risk function 17

3 Regularity properties for the set of global minima of the risk function 18
3.1 Submanifolds of the ANN parameter space 19
3.2 Determinants of submatrices of the Hessian matrix of the risk function 21
3.3 Regularity properties for the set of global minima of the risk function 23

4 Local convergence to the set of global minima for gradient flow (GF) 28
4.1 Differential geometric preliminaries 29
4.2 Abstract convergence result for GF to a submanifold of global minima 32
4.3 Convergence rates for GF in the training of ANNs 33
4.4 Convergence rates for GF with random initializations in the training of ANNs . . 34

5 Local convergence to the set of global minima for gradient descent (GD) 34
5.1 Abstract convergence result for GD to a submanifold of global minima 35
5.2 Convergence rates for GD in the training of ANNs 37
5.3 Convergence results for GD with random initializations in the training of ANNs . 38

1 Introduction

Gradient descent (GD) type optimization methods are the standard schemes to train artificial neural networks (ANNs) with rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation; cf., e.g., Goodfellow et al. [23, Chapter 5]. Even though GD type optimization methods seem to perform very effectively in numerical simulations, until today in general there is no mathematical convergence analysis in the literature which explains the success of GD optimization methods in the training of ANNs with ReLU activation.

There are, however, several promising mathematical analysis approaches for GD optimization methods in the scientific literature. In the case of convex objective functions, the convergence of GD type optimizations methods to the global minimum in different settings was shown, e.g., in [7, 25, 37, 38, 39, 43, 47].

Typically, the objective functions occurring in the training of ANNs with ReLU activation are non-convex and, instead, admit infinitely many non-global local minima and saddle points. In view of this, it becomes important to study the landscapes of the risk functions in the training of ANNs and to develop an understanding of the appearance of critical points (such as non-global local extrema and saddle points) of the risk functions. Recently, in the article Cheridito et al. [13] a characterization of the saddle points and non-global local minima of the risk function was obtained for the case of affine target functions. Sufficient conditions which ensure that the convergence of GD type optimization methods to saddle points can be excluded have been revealed, e.g., in [21, 31, 32, 40, 41].

Another promising direction of research is to study the convergence of GD type optimization methods for the training of ANNs in the so-called overparametrized regime, where the number of ANN parameters has to be sufficiently large when compared to the number of used input-output data pairs. In this situation the risks of GD type optimization methods can be shown to converge to zero with high probability; see, e.g., [5, 17, 19, 24, 34, 44, 52] for the case of ANNs with one hidden layer and see, e.g., [3, 4, 16, 46, 53] for the case of ANNs with more than one hidden layer. The results in these articles apply to the empirical risk, which is measured with respect to a finite set of input-output data pairs.

For convergence results for GD type optimization schemes without convexity but under Łojasiewicz type assumptions we point, e.g., to [1, 6, 14, 29, 33, 50, 51]. Further abstract convergence results for GD type optimization schemes in the non-convex setting can be found, e.g., in [2, 9, 15, 20, 35, 42] and the references mentioned therein. In particular, the article Fehrman et al. [20] shows convergence towards the global minimum value of some GD type optimization algorithms with random initilizations, provided that the set of global minima of

the objective function is locally a suitable submanifold of the parameter space and provided that the Hessian of the objective function satisfies a certain maximal rank condition at these global minima. A key contribution of this work is to demonstrate that these regularity assumptions are satisfied in the training of ANNs with one hidden layer and ReLU activation provided that the target function is piecewise affine linear.

We also refer, e.g., to [12, 28, 36, 48] for lower bounds and divergence results for GD type optimization methods. For more detailed overviews and further literature on GD type optimization schemes we point, e.g., to [8], [10], [18], [20, Section 1.1], [25, Section 1], and [45].

There are different variants of GD type optimization methods in the scientific literature, such as the plain vanilla GD optimization method, GD optimization methods with momentum, and adaptive GD optimization methods (cf., e.g., Ruder [45]), and the plain vanilla GD optimization method with independent random initializations is maybe the GD based ANN training scheme which is most accessible for a mathematical convergence analysis. Despite the above mentioned promising mathematical analysis approaches in the literature, it remains – even in the simple situation of the plain vanilla GD optimization method with independent random initializations and ANNs with one hidden layer and ReLU activation – an open problem to prove (or disprove) the conjecture that the risk of the GD optimization method converges to the risk of the global minima of the risk function in the training of such ANNs. It is one of the key contributions of this article to prove this conjecture for the plain vanilla GD optimization method with independent random initializations and ANNs with one hidden layer and ReLU activation in the situation where the probability distribution of the input data is equivalent to the continuous uniform distribution on a compact interval with a Lipschitz continuous density, where the probability distributions for the random initializations of the ANN parameters are standard normal distributions, and where the target function under consideration is continuous and piecewise affine linear. The precise formulation of this statement is given in Theorem 1.1 below within this introductory section.

In Theorem 1.1 the target function (the function which describes the relationship between the input and the output data in the considered supervised learning problem) is described through the function $f\colon [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ from the compact interval $[a,b]$ to the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ are real numbers with $a < b$. In Theorem 1.1 this target function $f \in C([a,b],\mathbb{R})$ is assumed to be an element of the set $C([a,b],\mathbb{R})$ of continuous functions from $[a,b]$ to $\mathbb{R}$. In addition, in Theorem 1.1 the target function $f\colon [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be piecewise affine linear in the sense that there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_N = b \tag{1.1}$$

so that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ we have that the target function $[x_{i-1}, x_i] \ni x \mapsto f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ restricted to the subinterval $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$ is affine linear; see above (1.2) in Theorem 1.1 below.

The risk functions associated to ANNs with ReLU activation fail to be continuously differentiable due to the lack of differentiability of the ReLU activation function $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \max\{x, 0\} \in \mathbb{R}$ and, in view of this, one needs to introduce appropriate generalized gradients of the risk function which mathematically describe the behave of GD steps in implementations in numerical simulations to mathematically formulate the GD optimization method for the training of ANNs with ReLU activation. To accomplish this, we approximate as in [27, (7) in Setting 2.1] and [11, Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 2.3] the ReLU activation function $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \max\{x, 0\} \in \mathbb{R}$ through appropriate continuously differentiable activation functions and then specify the generalized gradients as the limits of the usual gradients of the approximated risk functions; see (2.6) in Proposition 2.2 in Subsection 2.1 below. Specifically, in Theorem 1.1 below the continuously differentiable functions $\mathfrak{R}_r\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, serve as approximations for the ReLU activation function $\mathfrak{R}_\infty\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ in the sense that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\mathfrak{R}_\infty(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$ and $\limsup_{r\to\infty}(|\mathfrak{R}_r(x) - \max\{x, 0\}| + |(\mathfrak{R}_r)'(x) - \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x)|) = 0$; see (1.2) in Theorem 1.1 below.

In Theorem 1.1 we also assume that the probability distribution of the input data in the

supervised learning problem considered in Theorem 1.1 below is equivalent to the standard uniform distribution on $[a, b]$ with a Lipschitz continuous density. More specifically, the Lipschitz continuous function $\mathfrak{p}\colon [a, b] \to (0, \infty)$ in Theorem 1.1 is assumed to be an unnormalized density of the probability distribution of the input data with respect to the Lebesgue measure restricted to $[a, b]$.

In (1.3) in Theorem 1.1 we consider fully connected feedforward ANNs with ReLU activation and three layers: one input layer with 1 neuron on the input layer (1-dimensional input), one hidden layer with $H \in \mathbb{N}$ neurons on the hidden layer (H-dimensional hidden layer), and one output layer with 1 neuron on the output layer (1-dimensional output). In particular, for every number $H \in \mathbb{N}$ of neurons on the hidden layer and every approximation parameter $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ (see (1.2) below) we describe in (1.3) below the risk function $\mathcal{L}_r^H\colon \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ associated to the supervised learning problem considered in Theorem 1.1. The functions $\mathcal{G}^H\colon \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $H \in \mathbb{N}$, in Theorem 1.1 specify generalized gradient functions of the risk functions $\mathcal{L}_\infty^H\colon \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \to \mathbb{R}$, $H \in \mathbb{N}$, in (1.3).

For every number $H \in \mathbb{N}$ of neurons on the hidden layer, every natural number $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and every learning rate $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that the random variables $\Theta_n^{H,k,\gamma}\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, in (1.4) describe the GD process with learning rate γ. Observe that the assumption in Theorem 1.1 that for all $H \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\Theta_0^{H,k,\gamma}\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. random variables ensures that for all $H \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that the random variables $\Theta_n^{H,k,\gamma}\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. random variables. Loosely speaking, for every number $H \in \mathbb{N}$ of neurons on the hidden layer, every natural number $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every learning rate $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and every number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of GD steps we have that the random variable $\mathbf{k}_n^{H,k,\gamma}\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{N}$ in (1.5) selects an independent random initialization with the smallest risk.

Roughly speaking, in (1.6) in Theorem 1.1 we prove that there exists a sufficiently small strictly positive real number $\mathfrak{g} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every learning rate $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ which is smaller or equal than the strictly positive real number $\mathfrak{g}$ we have as the number $K \in \mathbb{N}$ of independent random realizations and the number $H \in \mathbb{N}$ of neurons on the hidden layer increase to infinity convergence to one of the probability that the risk of the GD optimization method with independent standard normal random initializations converges to zero. We now present the precise statement of Theorem 1.1 in a self-contained style and, thereafter, we outline how we prove Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a, \infty)$, $f \in C([a,b], \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that $f|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]}$ is affine linear, let $\mathfrak{R}_r \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that $(\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \{\mathfrak{R}_r\}) \subseteq C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathfrak{R}_\infty(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$, $\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{y \in [-|x|, |x|]} |(\mathfrak{R}_r)'(y)| < \infty$, and*

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \big(|\mathfrak{R}_r(x) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(x)| + |(\mathfrak{R}_r)'(x) - \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x)| \big) = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

let $\mathfrak{p} \colon [a,b] \to (0, \infty)$ be Lipschitz continuous, let $\mathcal{L}_r^H \colon \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \to \mathbb{R}$, $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, $H \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, $H \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{3H+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$ that

$$\mathcal{L}_r^H(\theta) = \int_a^b \big(f(x) - \theta_{\mathfrak{d}} - \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^H \theta_{2H+j} [\mathfrak{R}_r(\theta_j x + \theta_{H+j})] \big)^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x, \tag{1.3}$$

let $\mathcal{G}^H \colon \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $H \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $H \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{3H+1} \colon ((\nabla \mathcal{L}_r^H)(\vartheta))_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ is convergent$\}$ that $\mathcal{G}^H(\theta) = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\nabla \mathcal{L}_r^H)(\theta)$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let $\Theta_n^{H,k,\gamma} \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$, $H, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\mathbf{k}_n^{H,k,\gamma} \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{N}$, $H, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be random variables, assume for all $H \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\Theta_0^{H,k,\gamma}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent standard normal random vectors, and assume for all $H, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ that

$$\Theta_{n+1}^{H,k,\gamma}(\omega) = \Theta_n^{H,k,\gamma}(\omega) - \gamma \mathcal{G}^H(\Theta_n^{H,k,\gamma}(\omega)) \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}_n^{H,k,\gamma}(\omega) \in \arg\min_{\ell \in \{1,2,\ldots,k\}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^H(\Theta_n^{H,\ell,\gamma}(\omega)). \tag{1.5}$$

Then there exists $\mathfrak{g} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that

$$\liminf_{H \to \infty} \liminf_{K \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}_\infty^H\big(\Theta_n^{H, \mathbf{k}_n^{H,K,\gamma}, \gamma}\big) = 0 \Big) = 1. \tag{1.6}$$

Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of Corollary 5.5 below. Corollary 5.5, in turn, follows from Theorem 5.3 in Subsection 5.2 below, which is the main result of this article. Loosely speaking, Theorem 5.3 establishes in the case of ANNs with three layers (1-dimensional input layer, H-dimensional hidden layer, and 1-dimensional output layer) and in the case of a continuous and piecewise affine linear target function $f \colon [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$ grid points that there exists an appropriate open subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ of the ANN parameter space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} = \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$ such that for every sufficiently small learning rate $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and every initial value $\theta \in U$ it holds that the risk of the plain vanilla deterministic GD optimization method with initial value θ and learning rate γ (see (5.23) in Theorem 5.3 in Subsection 5.2) converges in the training of the considered ANNs exponentially quick to zero.

To make the statement of Theorem 5.3 more accessible to the reader within this introductory section, we illustrate Theorem 5.3 by means of another consequence of Theorem 5.3 which is also of independent interest. Specifically, in Theorem 1.2 below in this introductory section we prove in the case of ANNs with three layers (1-dimensional input layer, H-dimensional hidden layer, and 1-dimensional output layer) and in the case of a continuous and piecewise affine linear target function $f \colon [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$ grid points that for every sufficiently small learning rate γ we have that the risk of the plain vanilla GD optimization method with learning rate γ and one standard normal random initialization (see (1.9) in Theorem 1.2) converges exponentially to zero with strictly positive probability (see (1.10) in Theorem 1.2). We now present the precise statement of Theorem 1.2 and, thereafter, we briefly sketch how we prove Theorem 5.3 in Subsection 5.2 and Theorem 1.2, respectively.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $H, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a, \infty)$, $f \in C([a,b], \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\mathfrak{d} = 3H + 1$ and $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that $f|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]}$ is affine linear, let $\mathfrak{R}_r \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that $(\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \{\mathfrak{R}_r\}) \subseteq C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathfrak{R}_\infty(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$, $\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{y \in [-|x|, |x|]} |(\mathfrak{R}_r)'(y)| < \infty$, and*

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \big(|\mathfrak{R}_r(x) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(x)| + |(\mathfrak{R}_r)'(x) - \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x)| \big) = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

let $\mathfrak{p} \colon [a,b] \to (0, \infty)$ be Lipschitz continuous, let $\mathcal{L}_r \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}$, $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, satisfy for all $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ that

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\theta) = \int_a^b \big(f(x) - \theta_{\mathfrak{d}} - \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{H} \theta_{2H+j} [\mathfrak{R}_r(\theta_j x + \theta_{H+j})] \big)^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, dx, \tag{1.8}$$

let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let $\Theta_n^\gamma \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be random variables, assume for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that Θ_0^γ is standard normally distributed, let $\mathcal{G} \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon ((\nabla \mathcal{L}_r)(\vartheta))_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is convergent}\}$ that $\mathcal{G}(\theta) = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\nabla \mathcal{L}_r)(\theta)$, and assume for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ that

$$\Theta_{n+1}^\gamma(\omega) = \Theta_n^\gamma(\omega) - \gamma \mathcal{G}(\Theta_n^\gamma(\omega)). \tag{1.9}$$

Then there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{c}]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\Theta_n^\gamma) = 0 \big) \geq \mathbb{P}\big(\forall \, n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \colon \mathcal{L}_\infty(\Theta_n^\gamma) \leq \mathfrak{C} \exp(-\mathfrak{c} \gamma n) \big) \geq \mathfrak{c} > 0. \tag{1.10}$$

Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Corollary 5.4 below (applied with $\rho \curvearrowleft 0$ in the notation of Corollary 5.4). Corollary 5.4, in turn, is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.3 (see Subsection 5.3 below for details). Roughly speaking, we prove Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 5.3, respectively, (i) by showing that for every number $H \in \mathbb{N} \cap [N, \infty)$ of neurons on the hidden layer there exists a natural number $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, \mathfrak{d})$ such that a suitable subset of the set of global minima of the risk function $\mathcal{L}_\infty \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}$ in (1.8) is a twice continuously differentiable k-dimensional submanifold of the ANN parameter space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} = \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$ (cf. Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.10 in Section 3 below), (ii) by proving that the ranks of the Hessian matrices of the risk function on this suitable set of global minima of the risk function $\mathcal{L}_\infty \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}$ in (1.8) are equal to $\mathfrak{d} - k$, and, thereafter, (iii) by applying the machinery in Fehrman et al. [20] to establish convergence of the GD optimization method.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish several regularity properties for the Hessian matrix of the risk function of the considered supervised learning problem. In Section 3 we employ the findings from Section 2 to establish that a suitable subset of the set of global minima of the risk function constitutes a C^∞-submanifold of the ANN parameter space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} = \mathbb{R}^{3H+1}$ on which the Hessian matrix of the risk function has maximal rank. In Section 4 we engage the findings from Section 3 to establish that the risk of certain solutions of GF differential equations converges exponentially quick to zero. Finally, in Section 5 we establish that the risk of certain GD processes converges exponentially quick to zero and, thereby, we also prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 above.

2 Second order differentiability properties of the risk function

In this section we establish in Lemma 2.15 in Subsection 2.4 below an explicit representation result for the Hessian matrix of the risk function of the considered supervised learning problem. In particular, in Lemma 2.15 we identify a suitable open subset of the ANN parameter space with full Lebesgue measure on which the risk function is twice continuously differentiable (see (2.5) below for details). This is nontrivial due to the fact that the ReLU activation function $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \max\{x, 0\} \in \mathbb{R}$ is not everywhere differentiable. Results related to Lemma 2.15 have been shown in [13, Lemma 3.8].

Corollary 2.17 in Subsection 2.4 specializes Lemma 2.15 to the specific situation where the ANN parameter represents a global minima of the risk function. In Lemma 2.16 in Subsection 2.4 we employ Lemma 2.15 to conclude under the assumption that the target function is locally Lipschitz continuous that the second derivative of the risk function is locally Lipschitz continuous. In Lemma 2.18, Lemma 2.19, and Corollary 2.20 in Subsection 2.5 below we use Lemma 2.15 to derive suitable upper bounds for the absolute values of the second order partial derivatives of the risk function. Lemma 2.16, Corollary 2.17, and Corollary 2.20 are all employed in Section 3 below.

Our proof of Lemma 2.15 employs the well-known Leibniz integral rule type result in Lemma 2.14 in Subsection 2.4, the known representation and regularity results for the first derivative of the risk function in Proposition 2.2 in Subsection 2.1 below and Proposition 2.12 in Subsection 2.4, the elementary continuity result in Lemma 2.13 in Subsection 2.4, the elementary and well-known differentiability results for certain parameter integrals in Lemma 2.3 and Corollary 2.4 in Subsection 2.2 below, and the elementary continuity result for certain parameter integrals involving indicator functions in Lemma 2.6 in Subsection 2.2 and Corollary 2.10 in Subsection 2.3 below. Proposition 2.12 is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.11 in [26] and Proposition 2.2 follows directly from, e.g., item (iv) in Proposition 2.2 in [26]. Our proof of Lemma 2.16 also uses the local Lipschitz continuity results for certain parameter integrals involving indicator functions in Corollary 2.11 in Subsection 2.3. Our proofs of Corollaries 2.10 and 2.11, in turn, employ the elementary Lipschitz continuity result for certain parameter integrals involving indicator functions in Lemma 2.7 in Subsection 2.2 as well as the local Lipschitz continuity results for active neuron regions in Lemma 2.8 and Corollary 2.9 in Subsection 2.3.

2.1 Mathematical description of artificial neural networks (ANNs)

Setting 2.1. *Let $H, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a, \infty)$, $f \in C([a,b], \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\mathfrak{d} = 3H + 1$, let $\mathfrak{w} = ((\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{w}_H^\theta))_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}^H$, $\mathfrak{b} = ((\mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{b}_H^\theta))_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}^H$, $\mathfrak{v} = ((\mathfrak{v}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{v}_H^\theta))_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}^H$, $\mathfrak{c} = (\mathfrak{c}^\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathfrak{q} = ((\mathfrak{q}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}_H^\theta)) \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to (-\infty, \infty]^H$ satisfy for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_\mathfrak{d}) \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that $\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta = \theta_j$, $\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta = \theta_{H+j}$, $\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \theta_{2H+j}$, $\mathfrak{c}^\theta = \theta_\mathfrak{d}$, and*

$$\mathfrak{q}_j^\theta = \begin{cases} -\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta / \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta & : \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \neq 0 \\ \infty & : \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

let $\mathfrak{p} \colon [a,b] \to (0, \infty)$ be Lipschitz continuous, let $\mathfrak{R} \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{N} = (\mathscr{N}^\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, and $\mathcal{L} \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\mathfrak{R}(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$, $\mathscr{N}^\theta(x) = \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \sum_{j=1}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta [\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)]$, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \int_a^b (\mathscr{N}^\theta(y) - f(y))^2 \mathfrak{p}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y, \tag{2.2}$$

let $\chi_r \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{y \in [-|x|, |x|]} |(\chi_r)'(y)| < \infty$ and

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \big(|\chi_r(x) - \mathfrak{R}(x)| + |(\chi_r)'(x) - \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x)| \big) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

let $\mathfrak{L}_r \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$ that

$$\mathfrak{L}_r(\theta) = \int_a^b \big(f(y) - \mathfrak{c}^\theta - \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta [\chi_r(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta y + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)] \big)^2 \mathfrak{p}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y, \tag{2.4}$$

let $I_j^\theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that $I_j^\theta = \{x \in [a,b] \colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta > 0\}$, let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\mathfrak{d}) \colon \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \to \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$ satisfy for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \colon ((\nabla \mathfrak{L}_r)(\vartheta))_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ is convergent$\}$ that $\mathcal{G}(\theta) = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\nabla \mathfrak{L}_r)(\theta)$, and let $\mathfrak{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d}$ satisfy

$$\mathfrak{V} = \big\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^\mathfrak{d} \colon \big(\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^H \prod_{v \in \{a,b\}} (\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta v + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta) \neq 0 \big) \big\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proposition 2.2. *Assume Setting 2.1. Then it holds for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_i(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \int_{I_i^\theta} x(\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \mathcal{G}_{H+i}(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \int_{I_i^\theta} (\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \mathcal{G}_{2H+i}(\theta) &= 2\int_a^b \left[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)\right](\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{d}}(\theta) &= 2\int_a^b (\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Observe that, e.g., [26, Item (iv) in Proposition 2.2] establishes (2.6). The proof of Proposition 2.2 is thus complete. □

2.2 Regularity properties for parametric integrals of Lipschitz continuous functions

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathfrak{u} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{v} \in (\mathfrak{u}, \infty)$, let $\phi\colon \mathbb{R} \times [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally bounded and measurable, let $\mu\colon \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]) \to [0, \infty]$ be a finite measure, let $\Phi\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that*

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{\mathfrak{u}}^{\mathfrak{v}} \phi(x, s)\,\mu(\mathrm{d}s), \tag{2.7}$$

let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta, c \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy for all $h \in (-\delta, \delta)$, $s \in [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ that $|\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)| \leq c|h|$, let $E \subseteq [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ be measurable, assume $\mu([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]\backslash E) = 0$, and assume for all $s \in E$ that $\mathbb{R} \ni v \mapsto \phi(v, s) \in \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x. Then

(i) it holds that Φ is differentiable at x and

(ii) it holds that

$$\Phi'(x) = \int_E \left(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\phi\right)(x, s)\,\mu(\mathrm{d}s). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Note that the assumption that $\mu([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]\backslash E) = 0$ shows for all $h \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-1}[\Phi(x + h) - \Phi(x)] &= \int_{\mathfrak{u}}^{\mathfrak{v}} h^{-1}[\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)]\,\mu(\mathrm{d}s) \\ &= \int_E h^{-1}[\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)]\,\mu(\mathrm{d}s). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Next observe that the assumption that for all $s \in E$ it holds that $\mathbb{R} \ni v \mapsto \phi(v, s) \in \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x ensures that for all $s \in E$ it holds that

$$\lim_{\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\} \ni h \to 0}\left(h^{-1}[\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)]\right) = \left(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\phi\right)(x, s). \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, note that the assumption that for all $h \in (-\delta, \delta)$, $s \in [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ it holds that $|\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)| \leq c|h|$ implies that for all $h \in (-\delta, \delta)\backslash\{0\}$, $s \in [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ we have that $|h^{-1}[\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)]| \leq c$. Combining this with (2.9), (2.10), and the dominated convergence theorem demonstrates that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\} \ni h \to 0}\left(h^{-1}[\Phi(x + h) - \Phi(x)]\right) \\ &= \int_E \left[\lim_{\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\} \ni h \to 0}\left(h^{-1}[\phi(x + h, s) - \phi(x, s)]\right)\right]\mu(\mathrm{d}s) = \int_E \left(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\phi\right)(x, s)\,\mu(\mathrm{d}s). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.3. □

Corollary 2.4. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $\mathfrak{u} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{v} \in (\mathfrak{u}, \infty)$, let $\phi \colon \mathbb{R}^n \times [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally bounded and measurable, let $\mu \colon \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]) \to [0, \infty]$ be a finite measure, let $\Phi \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that*

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{\mathfrak{u}}^{\mathfrak{v}} \phi(x, s)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s), \tag{2.12}$$

let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\delta, c \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy for all $s \in [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$, $h \in (-\delta, \delta)$ that

$$|\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_j + h, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_n, s) - \phi(x, s)| \leq c|h|, \tag{2.13}$$

let $E \subseteq [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ be measurable, assume $\mu([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}] \backslash E) = 0$, and assume for all $s \in E$ that $\mathbb{R} \ni v \mapsto \phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, v, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_n, s) \in \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x_j. Then

(i) it holds that $\mathbb{R} \ni v \mapsto \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, v, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x_j and

(ii) it holds that

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\Phi\big)(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \int_E \big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\phi\big)(x_1, \ldots, x_n, s)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s). \tag{2.14}$$

Proof of Corollary 2.4. Observe that Lemma 2.3 establishes items (i) and (ii). The proof of Corollary 2.4 is thus complete. □

Definition 2.5. We denote by $\|\cdot\| \colon \big(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^n\big) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \colon \big(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)\big) \to \mathbb{R}$ the functions which satisfy for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that $\|x\| = \big[\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2\big]^{1/2}$ and $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{u} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{v} \in (\mathfrak{u}, \infty)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}], \mathbb{R})$, let $\mu \colon \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]) \to [0, \infty]$ be a finite measure, let $I^y \in \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}])$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfy for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ that $\mu(I^y \Delta I^z) \leq c\|y - z\|$, and let $\Phi \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that*

$$\Phi(y) = \int_{I^y} \phi(y, s)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \tag{2.15}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5). Then it holds that $\{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\} \ni y \mapsto \Phi(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.

Proof of Lemma 2.6. Throughout this proof let $y \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ and let $z = (z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \colon \mathbb{N} \to \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ satisfy $\limsup_{k \to \infty} \|z_k - y\| = 0$. Note that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(y) - \Phi(z_k)| \leq{}& \int_{I^y \cap I^{z_k}} |\phi(y, s) - \phi(z_k, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) + \int_{I^y \backslash I^{z_k}} |\phi(y, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \\ &+ \int_{I^{z_k} \backslash I^y} |\phi(z_k, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s). \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Next observe that the assumption that ϕ is continuous and the dominated convergence theorem demonstrate that

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \left[\int_{I^y \cap I^{z_k}} |\phi(y, s) - \phi(z_k, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \right] = 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Moreover, note that the fact that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\mu(I^y \Delta I^{z_k}) \leq c\|y - z_k\|$ and the assumption that ϕ is continuous prove that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \left[\int_{I^y \backslash I^{z_k}} |\phi(y, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) + \int_{I^{z_k} \backslash I^y} |\phi(z_k, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \right] = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Combining this with (2.16) and (2.17) establishes that $\limsup_{k \to \infty} |\Phi(y) - \Phi(z_k)| = 0$. The proof of Lemma 2.6 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{u} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{v} \in (\mathfrak{u}, \infty)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $\phi \colon \mathbb{R}^n \times [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz continuous, let $\mu \colon \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]) \to [0, \infty]$ be a finite measure, let $I^y \in \mathcal{B}([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}])$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfy for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ that $\mu(I^y \Delta I^z) \leq c\|y - z\|$, and let $\Phi \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that*

$$\Phi(y) = \int_{I^y} \phi(y, s)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \tag{2.19}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5). Then there exists $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ it holds that $|\Phi(y) - \Phi(z)| \leq \mathfrak{C}\|y - z\|$.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Observe that the assumption that ϕ is locally Lipschitz continuous ensures that there exists $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$, $s \in [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]$ with $y \neq z$ that

$$\tfrac{|\phi(y,s) - \phi(z,s)|}{\|y - z\|} + |\phi(y, s)| + |\phi(z, s)| \leq \mathfrak{C}. \tag{2.20}$$

Furthermore, note that (2.19) ensures for all $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$|\Phi(y) - \Phi(z)| \leq \int_{I^y \cap I^z} |\phi(y, s) - \phi(z, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) + \int_{I^y \setminus I^z} |\phi(y, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) + \int_{I^z \setminus I^y} |\phi(z, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s). \tag{2.21}$$

In addition, observe that (2.20) shows for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ that

$$\int_{I^y \cap I^z} |\phi(y, s) - \phi(z, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \leq \mathfrak{C}\|y - z\| \mu([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]). \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, note that (2.20) and the assumption that for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ it holds that $\mu(I^y \Delta I^z) \leq c\|y - z\|$ prove that for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ we have that

$$\int_{I^y \setminus I^z} |\phi(y, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) + \int_{I^z \setminus I^y} |\phi(z, s)|\, \mu(\mathrm{d}s) \leq c\mathfrak{C}\|y - z\|. \tag{2.23}$$

Combining this with (2.21) and (2.22) establishes for all $y, z \in \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon \|x - v\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ that

$$|\Phi(y) - \Phi(z)| \leq \mathfrak{C}(c + \mu([\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}]))\|y - z\|. \tag{2.24}$$

The proof of Lemma 2.7 is thus complete. □

2.3 Local Lipschitz continuity for active neuron regions

Lemma 2.8. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a, \infty)$, $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \backslash \{0\}$, let $\mathfrak{p} \colon [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and measurable, and let $I^v \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$, satisfy for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that $I^v = \{x \in [a, b] \colon v_1 x + v_2 > 0\}$. Then there exist $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\max\{\|u - v\|, \|u - w\|\} \leq \varepsilon$ it holds that*

$$\left| \int_{I^v \Delta I^w} \mathfrak{p}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| \leq c\|v - w\| \tag{2.25}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5).

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Throughout this proof let $M \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $M = \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\mathfrak{p}(x)|$. In the following we distinguish between the case $u_1 = 0$ and the case $u_1 \neq 0$.

We first prove (2.25) in the case

$$u_1 = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Observe that (2.26) and the assumption that $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \backslash \{0\}$ imply that $u_2 \neq 0$. Moreover, note that (2.26) shows for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $x \in I^u \Delta I^v$ that

$$|(u_1 x + u_2) - (v_1 x + v_2)| = |u_1 x + u_2| + |v_1 x + v_2| \geq |u_1 x + u_2| = |u_2|. \tag{2.27}$$

In addition, observe that for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $x \in [a, b]$ we have that

$$|(u_1 x + u_2) - (v_1 x + v_2)| \leq |u_1 - v_1||x| + |u_2 - v_2| \leq (1 + \max\{|a|, |b|\})\|u - v\|. \tag{2.28}$$

Combining this with (2.27) demonstrates for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|u - v\| < \frac{|u_2|}{1+\max\{|a|,|b|\}}$ that $I^u \Delta I^v = \varnothing$ and, therefore, $I^u = I^v$. Hence, we obtain for all $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\max\{\|u - v\|, \|u - w\|\} \leq \frac{|u_2|}{2+\max\{|a|,|b|\}}$ that $I^v = I^u = I^w$ and, therefore, $\int_{I^v \Delta I^w} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,dx = 0$. This establishes (2.25) in the case $u_1 = 0$.

In the next step we prove (2.25) in the case $u_1 \neq 0$. Note that for all $v = (v_1, v_2)$, $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathfrak{s} \in \{-1, 1\}$ with $\min\{\mathfrak{s}v_1, \mathfrak{s}w_1\} > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I^v \backslash I^w &= \{y \in [a, b] \colon v_1 y + v_2 > 0 \geq w_1 y + w_2\} = \left\{y \in [a, b] \colon -\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}v_2}{v_1} < \mathfrak{s}y \leq -\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}w_2}{w_1}\right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{y \in \mathbb{R} \colon -\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}v_2}{v_1} < \mathfrak{s}y \leq -\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}w_2}{w_1}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Hence, we obtain for all $v = (v_1, v_2)$, $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathfrak{s} \in \{-1, 1\}$ with $\min\{\mathfrak{s}v_1, \mathfrak{s}w_1\} > 0$ that

$$\int_{I^v \backslash I^w} 1\,dx \leq \left|\left(-\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}w_2}{w_1}\right) - \left(-\tfrac{\mathfrak{s}v_2}{v_1}\right)\right| = \left|\tfrac{v_2}{v_1} - \tfrac{w_2}{w_1}\right|. \tag{2.30}$$

Furthermore, observe that the fact that for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $y \geq -|y|$ implies that for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|u - v\| < |u_1|$ it holds that

$$u_1 v_1 = (u_1)^2 + (v_1 - u_1)u_1 \geq |u_1|^2 - |u_1 - v_1||u_1| \geq |u_1|^2 - \|u - v\||u_1| > 0. \tag{2.31}$$

This ensures that for all $v = (v_1, v_2)$, $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\max\{\|u - v\|, \|u - w\|\} < |u_1|$ there exists $\mathfrak{s} \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that $\min\{\mathfrak{s}v_1, \mathfrak{s}w_1\} > 0$. Combining this with (2.30) demonstrates for all $v = (v_1, v_2)$, $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\max\{\|u - v\|, \|u - w\|\} \leq \frac{|u_1|}{2}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_{I^v \Delta I^w} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,dx\right| \leq M\left[\int_{I^v \Delta I^w} 1\,dx\right] \leq 2M\left|\tfrac{v_2}{v_1} - \tfrac{w_2}{w_1}\right| = 2M\left|\frac{v_2(w_1 - v_1) - v_1(w_2 - v_2)}{v_1 w_1}\right| \\ &\leq 2M\left[\left|\frac{v_2(w_1 - v_1)}{v_1 w_1}\right| + \left|\frac{v_1(w_2 - v_2)}{v_1 w_1}\right|\right] \leq 2M\left[\frac{|v_2|\|v - w\|}{|v_1 w_1|} + \frac{|v_1|\|v - w\|}{|v_1 w_1|}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{4M\|v\|\|v - w\|}{|v_1 w_1|} \leq \left[\frac{16M\|v\|}{|u_1|^2}\right]\|v - w\| \leq \left[\frac{32M\|u\|}{|u_1|^2}\right]\|v - w\|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

This establishes (2.25) in the case $u_1 \neq 0$. The proof of Lemma 2.8 is thus complete. □

Corollary 2.9. *Assume Setting 2.1 and let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$. Then there exist $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\max\{\|\vartheta_1 - \theta\|, \|\vartheta_2 - \theta\|\} \leq \varepsilon$ it holds that*

$$\int_{\cup_{i,j=1}^{H}((I_i^{\vartheta_1} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_1}) \Delta (I_i^{\vartheta_2} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_2}))} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,dx \leq \int_{\cup_{i=1}^{H}(I_i^{\vartheta_1} \Delta I_i^{\vartheta_2})} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,dx \leq c\|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2\| \tag{2.33}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5).

Proof of Corollary 2.9. Note that (2.5) ensures that $\min_{k \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}}(|\mathfrak{w}_k^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_k^\theta|) > 0$. Combining this with Lemma 2.8 shows that there exist $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\max\{\|\theta - \vartheta_1\|, \|\theta - \vartheta_2\|\} \leq \varepsilon$ we have that

$$\int_{I_k^{\vartheta_1} \Delta I_k^{\vartheta_2}} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,dx \leq c\|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2\|. \tag{2.34}$$

Next observe that the fact that for all sets $A, \mathbb{A}, B, \mathbb{B}$ it holds that

$$(A \cap \mathbb{A}) \backslash (B \cap \mathbb{B}) \subseteq (A \backslash B) \cup (\mathbb{A} \backslash \mathbb{B}) \subseteq (A \Delta B) \cup (\mathbb{A} \Delta \mathbb{B}) \tag{2.35}$$

implies that for all sets $A, \mathbb{A}, B, \mathbb{B}$ we have that

$$(A \cap \mathbb{A})\Delta(B \cap \mathbb{B}) \subseteq (A\Delta B) \cup (\mathbb{A}\Delta\mathbb{B}). \tag{2.36}$$

Hence, we obtain for all $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that $(I_i^{\vartheta_1} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_1})\Delta(I_i^{\vartheta_2} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_2}) \subseteq (I_i^{\vartheta_1}\Delta I_i^{\vartheta_2}) \cup (I_j^{\vartheta_2}\Delta I_j^{\vartheta_2})$. Combining this with (2.34) proves for all $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\max\{\|\theta - \vartheta_1\|, \|\theta - \vartheta_2\|\} \leq \varepsilon$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\cup_{i,j=1}^{H}((I_i^{\vartheta_1}\cap I_j^{\vartheta_1})\Delta(I_i^{\vartheta_2}\cap I_j^{\vartheta_2}))} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x &\leq \int_{\cup_{k=1}^{H}(I_k^{\vartheta_1}\Delta I_k^{\vartheta_2})} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{H}\left[\int_{I_k^{\vartheta_1}\Delta I_k^{\vartheta_2}} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right] \leq cH\|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2\|.\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

The proof of Corollary 2.9 is thus complete. □

Corollary 2.10. *Assume Setting 2.1 and let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \times [a, b], \mathbb{R})$. Then*

(i) it holds that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\theta}} \phi(\theta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.38}$$

is continuous and

(ii) it holds that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\theta}\cap I_j^{\theta}} \phi(\theta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.39}$$

is continuous.

Proof of Corollary 2.10. Throughout this proof let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$. Note that Corollary 2.9 and Lemma 2.6 (applied with $n \curvearrowleft \mathfrak{d}$, $\mathfrak{u} \curvearrowleft a$, $\mathfrak{v} \curvearrowleft b$, $x \curvearrowleft \theta$, $\mu \curvearrowleft (\mathcal{B}([a, b]) \ni A \mapsto \int_A \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in [0, \infty])$ in the notation of Lemma 2.6) assure that there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\{\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \|\theta - \psi\| \leq \varepsilon\} \ni \vartheta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\vartheta}} \phi(\vartheta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$\{\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \|\theta - \psi\| \leq \varepsilon\} \ni \vartheta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\vartheta}\cap I_j^{\vartheta}} \phi(\vartheta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.41}$$

are continuous. This shows items (i) and (ii). The proof of Corollary 2.10 is thus complete. □

Corollary 2.11. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, and let $\phi \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \times [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz continuous. Then*

(i) it holds that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\theta}} \phi(\theta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.42}$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous and

(ii) it holds that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \int_{I_i^{\theta}\cap I_j^{\theta}} \phi(\theta, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.43}$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous.

Proof of Corollary 2.11. Throughout this proof let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$. Observe that Corollary 2.9 and Lemma 2.7 (applied with $n \curvearrowleft \mathfrak{d}$, $\mathfrak{u} \curvearrowleft a$, $\mathfrak{v} \curvearrowleft b$, $x \curvearrowleft \theta$, $\mu \curvearrowleft (\mathcal{B}([a,b]) \ni A \mapsto \int_A \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \in [0,\infty])$ in the notation of Lemma 2.7) demonstrate that there exist $\varepsilon, \mathfrak{C} \in (0,\infty)$ such that for all $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\max\{\|\theta - \vartheta_1\|, \|\theta - \vartheta_2\|\} \leq \varepsilon$ it holds that

$$\left| \int_{I_i^{\vartheta_1}} \phi(\vartheta_1, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{I_i^{\vartheta_2}} \phi(\vartheta_2, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right| \leq \mathfrak{C}\|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2\| \tag{2.44}$$

and

$$\left| \int_{I_i^{\vartheta_1} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_1}} \phi(\vartheta_1, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{I_i^{\vartheta_2} \cap I_j^{\vartheta_2}} \phi(\vartheta_2, x)\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right| \leq \mathfrak{C}\|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2\|. \tag{2.45}$$

This establishes items (i) and (ii). The proof of Corollary 2.11 is thus complete. □

2.4 Explicit representations for the Hessian matrix of the risk function

Proposition 2.12. *Assume Setting 2.1 and let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$. Then*

(i) it holds that $\mathcal{L}$ is differentiable at θ and

(ii) it holds that $(\nabla\mathcal{L})(\theta) = \mathcal{G}(\theta)$.

Proof of Proposition 2.12. Note that the assumption that $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ implies that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ it holds that $|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta| > 0$. Hence, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta)\big(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{H} |\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta| \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}\big(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|\big)\big) = 0. \tag{2.46}$$

Combining this with [26, Proposition 2.11] establishes items (i) and (ii). The proof of Proposition 2.12 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.13. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, $r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\psi \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ that $\psi(x) = x^{-1}$, and let $\mathbf{c} \colon (-\infty, \infty] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ that $\mathbf{c}(x) = \max\{\min\{x, b\}, a\}$. Then*

(i) it holds for all continuous $\phi \colon \mathfrak{V} \times [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \big[\psi([\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta]^r |\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|^s)\big]\big[\phi(\theta, \mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\big]\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.47}$$

is continuous and

(ii) it holds for all locally Lipschitz continuous $\phi \colon \mathfrak{V} \times [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto \big[\psi([\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta]^r |\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|^s)\big]\big[\phi(\theta, \mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\big]\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.48}$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous.

Proof of Lemma 2.13. Observe that (2.5) shows for all $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ that $|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta| > 0$. Hence, we obtain for all $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ with $\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta = 0$ that $\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta \neq 0$. This implies that for all $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ with $\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta = 0$ there exists $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$ such that for all $\vartheta \in \{\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \|\psi - \theta\| < \varepsilon\}$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}_i^\vartheta \notin [a,b]$. Combining this with (2.1) and the fact that for all $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta \notin \{a, b\}$ establishes items (i) and (ii). The proof of Lemma 2.13 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.14. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a,\infty)$, let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be open, let $\phi = (\phi_x(t))_{(x,t)\in[a,b]\times U} \in C([a,b] \times U, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy for all $x \in [a,b]$ that $\phi_x \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R})$, assume that $[a,b] \times U \ni (x,t) \mapsto (\phi_x)'(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, let $\psi_0, \psi_1 \in C^1(U, [a,b])$, and let $\Phi \colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $t \in U$ that*

$$\Phi(t) = \int_{\psi_0(t)}^{\psi_1(t)} \phi_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.49}$$

Then

(i) it holds that $\Phi \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R})$ *and*

(ii) it holds for all $t \in U$ *that*

$$\Phi'(t) = \big[\phi_{\psi_1(t)}(t)\big]\big[(\psi_1)'(t)\big] - \big[\phi_{\psi_0(t)}(t)\big]\big[(\psi_0)'(t)\big] + \int_{\psi_0(t)}^{\psi_1(t)} (\phi_x)'(t)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.50}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.14. Throughout this proof let $\Psi\colon [a,b] \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in [a,b]$, $t \in U$ that

$$\Psi(x,t) = \int_a^x \phi_y(t)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{2.51}$$

Note that (2.49) and (2.51) imply for all $t \in U$ that

$$\Phi(t) = \int_a^{\psi_1(t)} \phi_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_a^{\psi_0(t)} \phi_x(t)\,\mathrm{d}x = \Psi(\psi_1(t), t) - \Psi(\psi_0(t), t). \tag{2.52}$$

Next observe that the fundamental theorem of calculus ensures for all $x \in [a,b]$, $t \in U$ that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Psi(x,t) = \phi_x(t)$. In addition, note that Lemma 2.3 assures for all $x \in [a,b]$, $t \in U$ that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi(x,t) = \int_a^x (\phi_y)'(t)\,\mathrm{d}y$. Furthermore, observe that the assumption that $[a,b] \times U \ni (x,t) \mapsto \phi_x(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, the assumption that $[a,b] \times U \ni (x,t) \mapsto (\phi_x)'(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, and the dominated convergence theorem demonstrate that $[a,b] \times U \ni (x,t) \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Psi(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $[a,b] \times U \ni (x,t) \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}$ are continuous. Hence, we obtain that $\Psi \in C^1([a,b] \times U, \mathbb{R})$. Combining this with (2.52) and the chain rule shows for all $t \in U$ that $\Phi \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi'(t) &= (\psi_1)'(t)\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\Psi\big)(\psi_1(t), t) + \big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi\big)(\psi_1(t), t) \\
&\quad - (\psi_0)'(t)\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\Psi\big)(\psi_0(t), t) - \big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi\big)(\psi_0(t), t) \\
&= \big[(\psi_1)'(t)\big]\big[\phi_{\psi_1(t)}(t)\big] + \int_a^{\psi_1(t)} (\phi_x)'(t)\,\mathrm{d}x - \big[(\psi_0)'(t)\big]\big[\phi_{\psi_0(t)}(t)\big] - \int_a^{\psi_0(t)} (\phi_x)'(t)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \big[(\psi_1)'(t)\big]\big[\phi_{\psi_1(t)}(t)\big] - \big[(\psi_0)'(t)\big]\big[\phi_{\psi_0(t)}(t)\big] + \int_{\psi_0(t)}^{\psi_1(t)} (\phi_x)'(t)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

The proof of Lemma 2.14 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.15. *Assume Setting 2.1, let* $\psi\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfy for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ *that* $\psi(x) = x^{-1}$, *and let* $\mathbf{c}\colon (-\infty, \infty] \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfy for all* $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ *that* $\mathbf{c}(x) = \max\{\min\{x, b\}, a\}$. *Then*

(i) it holds that $\mathfrak{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ *is open,*

(ii) it holds that $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathfrak{V}} \in C^2(\mathfrak{V}, \mathbb{R})$, *and*

(iii) it holds for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \mathfrak{V}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ *that*

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_j \partial\theta_{\mathfrak{d}}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.54}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+j} \partial\theta_{\mathfrak{d}}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.55}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+j} \partial\theta_{\mathfrak{d}}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\textstyle\int_a^b \big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)\big]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.56}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{\mathfrak{d}}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\textstyle\int_a^b \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_j \partial\theta_{2H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} x\big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)\big]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{1}_{\{i\}}(j) \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x(\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+j}\partial\theta_{2H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta}\big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)\big]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + 2\mathbb{1}_{\{i\}}(j)\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta}(\mathcal{N}^\theta(x)-f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.59}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+j}\partial\theta_{2H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\textstyle\int_a^b\big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)\big]\big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x+\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)\big]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.60}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_j\partial\theta_i}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta}x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta\mathbb{1}_{\{i\}}(j)\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)[\psi(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|)][\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))-f(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)), \tag{2.61}$$

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_j\partial\theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta}x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathbb{1}_{\{i\}}(j)\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)[\psi(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|)][\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))-f(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)), \tag{2.62}$$

and

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+j}\partial\theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta}\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathbb{1}_{\{i\}}(j)\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)[\psi(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))-f(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)). \tag{2.63}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.15. Note that (2.5) establishes item (i). Next observe that Proposition 2.12 ensures that $\mathfrak{V}\ni\theta\mapsto\mathcal{L}(\theta)\in\mathbb{R}$ is differentiable and satisfies $\nabla(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathfrak{V}})=\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. In addition, note that (2.6) and Corollary 2.10 prove that $\mathcal{G}|_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is continuous. Hence, we obtain that $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathfrak{V}}\in C^1(\mathfrak{V},\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\nabla(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathfrak{V}}) = \mathcal{G}|_{\mathfrak{V}}. \tag{2.64}$$

Combining this with (2.6), Corollary 2.4, and the product rule establishes (2.54)–(2.60). In the next step we prove (2.61)–(2.63) and for this let $\theta=(\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_{\mathfrak{d}})\in\mathfrak{V}$, $i,j\in\{1,2,\ldots,H\}$. In our proof of (2.61)–(2.63) we distinguish between the case $(i\neq j)$, the case $((i=j)\wedge(\max\{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta,\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta\}<0))$, the case $((i=j)\wedge(\min\{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta,\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta\}>0))$, the case $((i=j)\wedge(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta<0<\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta))$, and the case $((i=j)\wedge(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta>0>\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta))$. We first establish (2.61)–(2.63) in the case $(i\neq j)$. Observe that for all $k\in\{0,1\}$ and almost all $x\in[a,b]$ it holds that

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\theta_{kH+j}}\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\theta_{kH+j}}\big(\theta_{2H+j}[\mathfrak{R}(\theta_j x+\theta_{H+j})]\big) = \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta x^{1-k}\mathbb{1}_{I_j^\theta}(x). \tag{2.65}$$

Combining this with (2.6), (2.64), and Corollary 2.4 (applied for every $k,\ell\in\{0,1\}$ with $n\curvearrowleft\mathfrak{d}$, $j\curvearrowleft kH+j$, $\phi\curvearrowleft(\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}\times[a,b]\ni(\vartheta,x)\mapsto x^{1-\ell}(\mathcal{N}^\vartheta(x)-f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\mathbb{1}_{I_i^\vartheta}(x)\in\mathbb{R})$ in the notation of Corollary 2.4) demonstrates for all $k,\ell\in\{0,1\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{kH+j}\partial\theta_{\ell H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= \big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\theta_{kH+j}}\mathcal{G}_{\ell H+i}\big)(\theta)\\ &= \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\theta_{kH+j}}\left(2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\int_a^b x^{1-\ell}(\mathcal{N}^\theta(x)-f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\mathbb{1}_{I_i^\theta}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right) = 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta}x^{2-k-\ell}\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

This establishes (2.61)–(2.63) in the case $(i\neq j)$.

We next prove (2.61)–(2.63) in the case

$$(i=j)\wedge(\max\{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta,\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b+\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta\}<0). \tag{2.67}$$

Note that (2.67) implies that there exists $\delta\in(0,\infty)$ such that for all $h\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\|h\|<\delta$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}_i^{\theta+h}\notin[a,b]$ and $I_i^{\theta+h}=\varnothing$ (cf. Definition 2.5). Combining this with (2.6) and (2.64) ensures that $\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)=\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)=\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+i}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)=0$, as desired.

In the next step we prove (2.61)–(2.63) in the case

$$(i = j) \wedge (\min\{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta\} > 0). \tag{2.68}$$

Observe that (2.68) implies that there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\|h\| < \delta$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}_i^{\theta+h} \notin [a, b]$ and $I_i^{\theta+h} = [a, b]$. Combining (2.6), (2.64), and Corollary 2.4 hence shows that $\big(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \int_a^b x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $\big(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \int_a^b x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, and $\big(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_{H+i}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \int_a^b \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, as claimed.

In the remaining cases we employ Lemma 2.14 since the interval I_i^θ depends on $\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta$ and $\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta$ in these cases. We first consider the case

$$(i = j) \wedge (\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta < 0 < \mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta). \tag{2.69}$$

Note that (2.69) ensures that there exists an open neighborhood $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ of θ which satisfies for all $\vartheta \in U$ that $\mathfrak{w}_i^\vartheta > 0$, $\mathfrak{q}_i^\vartheta \in (a, b)$, and $I_i^\vartheta = (\mathfrak{q}_i^\vartheta, b]$. Furthermore, observe that $U \ni \vartheta \mapsto \mathfrak{q}_i^\vartheta = -\frac{\mathfrak{b}_i^\vartheta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and satisfies $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta = \frac{\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta}{(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta)^2} = -\frac{\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{H+i}}\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta = -\frac{1}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}$. Combining Lemma 2.14, (2.6), and (2.64) hence shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta}{(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta)^2}\right] \mathfrak{q}_i^\theta (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta), \\
\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}\right] \mathfrak{q}_i^\theta (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta), \\
\text{and} \qquad \big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_{H+i}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}\right] (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.70}$$

This establishes (2.61)–(2.63) in the case $((i = j) \wedge (\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta < 0 < \mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta))$. It remains to consider the case

$$(i = j) \wedge (\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta > 0 > \mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta) \tag{2.71}$$

Note that (2.71) assures that $\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta < 0$, $\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta \in (a, b)$, and $I_i^\theta = [a, \mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)$. Combining Lemma 2.14, (2.6), and (2.64) therefore demonstrates that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta}{(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta)^2}\right] \mathfrak{q}_i^\theta (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta), \\
\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_{H+i}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}\right] \mathfrak{q}_i^\theta (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta), \\
\text{and} \qquad \big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_{H+i}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2(\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta)^2 \textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \left[\frac{2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta}{\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta}\right] (\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta) - f(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.72}$$

This establishes (2.61)–(2.63) in the case $((i = j) \wedge (\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta > 0 > \mathfrak{w}_i^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)$.

Finally, observe that Corollary 2.10 and item (i) in Lemma 2.13 imply that the partial derivatives in (2.54)–(2.63) are continuous on $\mathfrak{V}$. The proof of Lemma 2.15 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.16. *Assume Setting 2.1 and assume that f is Lipschitz continuous. Then*

(i) it holds that $\mathfrak{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is open,

(ii) it holds that $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathfrak{V}} \in C^2(\mathfrak{V}, \mathbb{R})$, and

(iii) it holds that $\mathfrak{V} \ni \theta \mapsto (\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}\times\mathfrak{d}}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.

Proof of Lemma 2.16. Note that Lemma 2.15 establishes items (i) and (ii). Moreover, observe that Lemma 2.15, Corollary 2.11, item (ii) in Lemma 2.13, the assumption that f is Lipschitz continuous, and the assumption that $\mathfrak{p}$ is Lipschitz continuous establish item (iii). The proof of Lemma 2.16 is thus complete. □

Corollary 2.17. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, and assume for all $x \in [a, b]$ that $\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = f(x)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \int_{I_i^\theta \cap I_j^\theta} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \int_{I_i^\theta \cap I_j^\theta} x \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \text{and} \qquad \big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+i} \partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) &= 2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \int_{I_i^\theta \cap I_j^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{2.73}$$

Proof of Corollary 2.17. Note that the assumption that for all $x \in [a, b]$ it holds that $\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = f(x)$ and Lemma 2.15 establish (2.73). The proof of Corollary 2.17 is thus complete. □

2.5 Upper bounds for the entries of the Hessian matrix of the risk function

Lemma 2.18. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $\mathfrak{D} \in [1, \infty)$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $A = \max\{1, |a|, |b|, b - a\}$, and let $\theta \in \mathfrak{V}$ satisfy $\max_{i \in \{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}} |\theta_i| \leq \mathfrak{D}$ and $\min_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} \big((\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta - \frac{1}{2}) \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_j^\theta)\big) \geq 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{i,j \in \{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| \\ &\leq \big(8A^3\mathfrak{D}^2 + 8A^2\mathfrak{D}^2\big[\sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\big]\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.74}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.18. Throughout this proof let $\psi \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \backslash \{0\}$ that $\psi(x) = x^{-1}$ and let $\mathbf{c} \colon (-\infty, \infty] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ that $\mathbf{c}(x) = \max\{\min\{x, b\}, a\}$. Observe that Lemma 2.15 implies for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that

$$\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_\mathfrak{d}^2}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| = 2\big|\textstyle\int_a^b \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \leq 2A\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{2.75}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+j} \partial\theta_\mathfrak{d}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| &= 2\big|\textstyle\int_a^b [\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \leq 2\textstyle\int_a^b |\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)|\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2A(|\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta|)\textstyle\int_a^b \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq 4A^2\mathfrak{D}\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.76}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+i} \partial\theta_{2H+j}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| = 2\big|\textstyle\int_a^b [\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)][\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \\ &\leq 2\textstyle\int_a^b |\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)|\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2A^2(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|)(|\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta|)\textstyle\int_a^b \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq 8A^3\mathfrak{D}^2\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.77}$$

$$\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_\mathfrak{d} \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| = 2|\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\big|\textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \leq 2A^2\mathfrak{D}\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{2.78}$$

$$\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_\mathfrak{d} \partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| = 2|\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta| \textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq 2A\mathfrak{D}\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{2.79}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+i} \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\big|\textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} x[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| + 2\big|\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} x(\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \\ &\leq \big(4A^3\mathfrak{D}^2 + 2A^2\big[\sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\big]\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.80}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{2H+i} \partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\big|\textstyle\int_{I_j^\theta} [\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)]\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| + 2\big|\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta} (\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x))\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \\ &\leq \big(4A^2\mathfrak{D}^2 + 2A\big[\sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\big]\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.81}$$

In addition, note that Lemma 2.15 and the fact that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ with $\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta \in [a, b]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ show that for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\big|\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta \cap I_j^\theta} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\big| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)\big|2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta[\psi(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta|^2)][\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)) - f(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\big| \\ &\leq \big(2A^3\mathfrak{D}^2 + 8A\mathfrak{D}^2\big[\sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\big]\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.82}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\right)(\theta)\right| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\left|\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)\left|2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta[\psi(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta)][\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)) - f(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\right| \\ &\leq \left(2A^2\mathfrak{D}^2 + 4A\mathfrak{D}\left[\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\right]\right)\left(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.83}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_{H+i}\partial\theta_{H+j}}\mathcal{L}\right)(\theta)\right| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta|\left|\textstyle\int_{I_i^\theta\cap I_j^\theta} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)\left|2\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta[\psi(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta)](\mathcal{N}^\theta(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)) - f(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta)))\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{q}_i^\theta))\right| \\ &\leq \left(2A\mathfrak{D}^2 + 4\mathfrak{D}\left[\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)|\right]\right)\left(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.84}$$

Combining this with the fact that $\{A,\mathfrak{D}\}\subseteq[1,\infty)$ establishes (2.74). The proof of Lemma 2.18 is thus complete. □

Lemma 2.19. *Assume Setting 2.1 and let $\theta\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $A\in\mathbb{R}$ satisfy $A=\max\{1,|a|,|b|\}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|\mathcal{N}^\theta(x)| &\leq |\mathfrak{c}^\theta| + A\left[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{H}|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta|(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|)\right] \\ &\leq \left[\max_{i\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}|\theta_i|\right] + 2AH\left[\max_{i\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}|\theta_i|^2\right].\end{aligned} \tag{2.85}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.19. Observe that for all $i\in\{1,2,\ldots,H\}$, $x\in[a,b]$ it holds that

$$|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)| \leq |\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta|(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|) \leq |\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta|(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|)A. \tag{2.86}$$

This and the triangle inequality demonstrate that for all $x\in[a,b]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{N}^\theta(x)| &\leq |\mathfrak{c}^\theta| + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{H}|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta)| \leq |\mathfrak{c}^\theta| + A\left[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{H}|\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta|(|\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta| + |\mathfrak{b}_i^\theta|)\right] \\ &\leq \left[\max_{i\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}|\theta_i|\right] + 2AH\left[\max_{i\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}|\theta_i|^2\right].\end{aligned} \tag{2.87}$$

The proof of Lemma 2.19 is thus complete. □

Corollary 2.20. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $\mathfrak{D}\in[1,\infty)$, $A\in\mathbb{R}$ satisfy $A=\max\{1,|a|,|b|,b-a\}$, and let $\theta\in\mathfrak{V}$ satisfy $\max_{i\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}|\theta_i|\leq\mathfrak{D}$ and $\min_{j\in\{1,2,\ldots,H\}}\left((\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta - \frac{1}{2})\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(\mathfrak{q}_j^\theta)\right)\geq 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{i,j\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}\left|\left(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\right)(\theta)\right| \\ &\leq \left[8A^3\mathfrak{D}^2 + 8A^2\mathfrak{D}^2\left(\mathfrak{D} + 2AH\mathfrak{D}^2 + \sup_{x\in[a,b]}|f(x)|\right)\right]\left(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\right) \\ &= \left[8A^3\mathfrak{D}^2 + 8A^2\mathfrak{D}^3 + 16A^3H\mathfrak{D}^4 + 8A^2\mathfrak{D}^2\left(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|f(x)|\right)\right]\left(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.88}$$

Proof of Corollary 2.20. Note that Lemma 2.19 and the triangle inequality prove that for all $x\in[a,b]$ it holds that

$$|\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x)| \leq \mathfrak{D} + 2AH\mathfrak{D}^2 + |f(x)| \leq \mathfrak{D} + 2AH\mathfrak{D}^2 + \sup_{y\in[a,b]}|f(y)|. \tag{2.89}$$

This and Lemma 2.18 establish (2.88). The proof of Corollary 2.20 is thus complete. □

3 Regularity properties for the set of global minima of the risk function

In this section we establish in Corollary 3.10 in Subsection 3.3 below under the assumption that the target function is piecewise affine linear that there exists a natural number $k\in\{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}$ such that a suitable subset of the set of global minima of the considered risk function constitutes a k-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of the ANN parameter space on which the Hessian matrix of the risk function has the maximal rank $\mathfrak{d}-k$.

Our proof of Corollary 3.10 employs Proposition 3.7 in Subsection 3.3 as well as the elementary and well-known eigenvalue estimate in Lemma 3.9 in Subsection 3.3. In Proposition 3.7 we establish under the assumption that the target function is piecewise affine linear with varying slopes in consecutive subintervals that a suitable subset of the set of global minima of the risk function represents an $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of the ANN parameter space on which the Hessian matrix of the risk function has the maximal rank $\mathfrak{d} - (H+1) = (3H+1) - (H+1) = H$ where $H \in \mathbb{N}$ represents the number of neurons on the hidden layer (see Setting 2.1 for details).

Our proof of Proposition 3.7 uses Lemma 3.2 in Subsection 3.1, Proposition 3.4 in Subsection 3.2, and the elementary and well-known properties for tangent spaces of submanifolds in Lemma 3.6 in Subsection 3.3. The notion of tanget spaces is recalled in Definition 3.5 in Subsection 3.3. Our proof of Proposition 3.4, in turn, is based on an application of the auxiliary result in Lemma 3.3 in Subsection 3.2 and in Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 we show that certain matrices involving appropriate subintegrals of the unnormalized density function have a strictly positive determinant.

In Lemma 3.2 in Subsection 3.1 we verify that a suitable subset of the ANN parameter space is a non-empty $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of the ANN parameter space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$. Our proof of Lemma 3.2 is based on an application of the regular level set theorem which we recall in Proposition 3.1 below. In the scientific literature Proposition 3.1 is sometimes also referred to as submersion level set theorem, regular value theorem, or preimage theorem. Proposition 3.1 is, e.g., proved as Theorem 9.9 in Tu [49]. Only for the sake of completeness we include in this section the detailed proofs for Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.9. In the scientific literature Lemma 3.9 is, e.g., proved in Golub & Van Loan [22, Section 2.3.2].

3.1 Submanifolds of the ANN parameter space

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be open, let $g \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and assume for all $x \in g^{-1}(\{0\})$ that $\operatorname{rank}(g'(x)) = n$. Then it holds that $g^{-1}(\{0\}) \subseteq U$ is a $(\mathfrak{d}-n)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$.*

Lemma 3.2. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_H, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_H = b$ and*

$$\mathfrak{D} \geq 1 + |\mathfrak{y}| + (1 + 2\max_{j\in\{1,2,\ldots,H\}}|\alpha_j|)(1 + |a| + |b|), \tag{3.1}$$

and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M} = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \big(\big[\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta\} > 0\big],\ [\mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = \mathfrak{y}],\\ [\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta = \alpha_1],\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 1/2,\ \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta = x_{j-1},\ \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}\big]\big)\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Then

(i) it holds that $\mathcal{M} \neq \varnothing$ and

(ii) it holds that $\mathcal{M}$ is a $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Throughout this proof let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy

$$U = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \big(\big[\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta\} > 0\big],\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 1/2\big]\big)\big\}, \tag{3.3}$$

let $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_{2H}) \colon U \to \mathbb{R}^{2H}$ satisfy for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ that

$$g_j(\theta) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta - \alpha_1 & : j = 1 \\ \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta - (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}) & : j > 1 \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$g_{H+j}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta - \mathscr{y} & : j = 1 \\ \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta - x_{j-1} & : j > 1, \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

and let $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \big([\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta = \alpha_1],\, [\forall\, i \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{w}_i^\vartheta = 1],\, [\mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta = |\alpha_1|(|a| + |b|) + 1],\, [\forall\, i \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{b}_i^\vartheta = -x_{i-1}], \\ [\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta = 1],\, [\forall\, i \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{v}_i^\vartheta = \alpha_i - \alpha_{i-1}],\, [\mathfrak{c}^\vartheta = \mathscr{y} - \mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta)]\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Observe that (3.6) ensures that $\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta > 0$, $\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta \mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta = \alpha_1$, and $\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta) + \mathfrak{c}^\vartheta = \mathscr{y}$. Moreover, note that $\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta\} = \min\{\alpha_1 a, \alpha_1 b\} + |\alpha_1|(|a| + |b|) + 1 \geq 1 > 0$. In addition, observe that for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ we have that $\mathfrak{w}_j^\vartheta = 1 > 1/2$, $\mathfrak{q}_j^\vartheta = -\mathfrak{b}_j^\vartheta / \mathfrak{w}_j^\vartheta = x_{j-1}$, and $\mathfrak{w}_j^\vartheta \mathfrak{v}_j^\vartheta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}$. Furthermore, note that for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ it holds that $|\mathfrak{w}_i^\vartheta| = 1 < \mathfrak{D}$, $|\mathfrak{v}_i^\vartheta| \leq 2 \max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} |\alpha_j| < \mathfrak{D}$, and $|\mathfrak{b}_i^\vartheta| \leq 1 + |a| + |b| < \mathfrak{D}$. Moreover, observe that $|\mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta| = |\alpha_1| < \mathfrak{D}$, $|\mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta| \leq (1 + \max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} |\alpha_j|)(1 + |a| + |b|) < \mathfrak{D}$, $|\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta| = 1 < \mathfrak{D}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{c}^\vartheta| &\leq |\mathscr{y}| + |\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta \mathfrak{w}_1^\vartheta a| + |\mathfrak{v}_1^\vartheta \mathfrak{b}_1^\vartheta| = |\mathscr{y}| + |\alpha_1||a| + |\alpha_1|(|a| + |b|) + 1 \\ &\leq |\mathscr{y}| + \big(1 + 2 \max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} |\alpha_j|\big)(1 + |a| + |b|) < \mathfrak{D}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

This implies that $\vartheta \in (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$. Hence, we obtain that $\vartheta \in \mathcal{M}$. This establishes item (i). In the next step we prove item (ii) through an application of the regular value theorem in Proposition 3.1. Note that (3.3) assures that $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is open. In addition, observe that the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 0$ ensures that $g \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{R}^{2H})$. Moreover, note that

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\{0\}) = \big\{\theta \in U \colon \big([\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta = \alpha_1],\, [\mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = \mathscr{y}], \\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta = x_{j-1},\, \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}\big]\big)\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\{0\}) = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \big(\big[\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta\} > 0\big], \\ [\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 1/2],\, [\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta = \alpha_1],\, [\mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = \mathscr{y}], \\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H] \colon \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta = x_{j-1},\, \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}\big]\big)\big\} = \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Next observe that (3.4), (3.5), and the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta = \theta_j$, $\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta = \theta_{H+j}$, and $\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \theta_{2H+j}$ ensure that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, 2H]$ it holds that

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{2H+j}} g_\ell\big)(\theta) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \neq 0 & : \ell = j \\ 0 & : \ell \neq j \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{H+j}} g_\ell\big)(\theta) = \begin{cases} -(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta)^{-1} \neq 0 & : \ell = H + j \\ 0 & : \ell \neq H + j. \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

In addition, note that (3.4) and (3.5) show that for all $\theta \in U$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, 2H]$ it holds that

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1} g_\ell\big)(\theta) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \neq 0 & : \ell = 1 \\ \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta a & : \ell = H + 1 \\ 0 & : \ell \notin \{1, H + 1\} \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{H+1}} g_\ell\big)(\theta) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \neq 0 & : \ell = H + 1 \\ 0 & : \ell \neq H + 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

This demonstrates that for all $\theta \in U$ it holds that the $((2H) \times (2H))$-matrix with entries $\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} g_\ell\big)(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$, $(i, \ell) \in (\{1\} \cup \{H+j \colon j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]\} \cup \{2H+j \colon j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]\}) \times \{1, 2, \ldots, 2H\}$, is invertible. Hence, we obtain for all $\theta \in U$ that $\operatorname{rank}(g'(\theta)) = 2H$. Combining this with Proposition 3.1 establishes item (ii). The proof of Lemma 3.2 is thus complete. □

3.2 Determinants of submatrices of the Hessian matrix of the risk function

Lemma 3.3. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (a, \infty)$, let $\mathfrak{p} \colon [a, b] \to (0, \infty)$ be bounded and measurable, let $\mathcal{Q}_N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\mathcal{Q}_N = \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \colon a \leq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{N+1} \leq b\}$, and let $A^{N,x} = (A^{N,x}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \{1,2,\ldots,2N\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N) \times (2N)}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that*

$$A^{N,x}_{i,j} = \int_{x_{\max\{i,j\}}}^{x_{N+1}} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x, \qquad A^{N,x}_{N+i,j} = A^{N,x}_{i,N+j} = \int_{x_{\max\{i,j\}}}^{x_{N+1}} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x,$$
$$\text{and} \qquad A^{N,x}_{N+i,N+j} = \int_{x_{\max\{i,j\}}}^{x_{N+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.14}$$

Then it holds for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$ that

$$\det(A^{N,x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right] \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right] - \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right]^2 \right) > 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Throughout this proof let $E^{N,x}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that

$$E^{N,x}_i = \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right] \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right] - \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right]^2. \tag{3.16}$$

Observe that the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that for all $x \in [a, b]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{p}(x) > 0$ ensure that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right| &= \left| \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} \left[x \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}(x)} \right] \left[\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}(x)} \right] \mathrm{d}x \right| \\ &< \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Hence, we obtain for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that $E^{N,x}_i > 0$. Next we claim that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{Q}_N$ it holds that

$$\det(A^{N,x}) = \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{N} E^{N,x}_i > 0. \tag{3.18}$$

We now prove (3.18) by induction on $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For the base case $N = 1$ note that for all $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{Q}_1$ it holds that

$$\det(A^{1,x}) = \det\begin{pmatrix} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x & \int_{x_1}^{x_2} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \\ \int_{x_1}^{x_2} x \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x & \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mathfrak{p}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \end{pmatrix} = E^{1,x}_1 > 0. \tag{3.19}$$

This establishes (3.18) in the base case $N = 1$. For the induction step let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [2, \infty)$ and assume for all $x \in \mathcal{Q}_{N-1}$ that

$$\det(A^{N-1,x}) = \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} E^{N-1,x}_i > 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Next let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}_N$ and let $B = (B_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \{1,2,\ldots,2N\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N) \times (2N)}$ satisfy for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2N\}$ that

$$B_{i,j} = \begin{cases} A^{N,x}_{i,j} & : i \notin \{1, N+1\} \\ A^{N,x}_{1,j} - A^{N,x}_{2,j} & : i = 1 \\ A^{N,x}_{N+1,j} - A^{N,x}_{N+2,j} & : i = N+1. \end{cases} \tag{3.21}$$

Observe that B is the matrix that is obtained from $A^{N,x}$ by subtracting the 2nd row from the 1st row and the $(N+2)$-th row from the $(N+1)$-th row. In particular, note that (3.21) implies that $\det(B) = \det(A^{N,x})$. Next observe that the fact that for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, N]$ it holds that $A^{N,x}_{1,j} = A^{N,x}_{2,j}$, $A^{N,x}_{1,N+j} = A^{N,x}_{2,N+j}$, $A^{N,x}_{N+1,j} = A^{N,x}_{N+2,j}$, and $A^{N,x}_{N+1,N+j} = A^{N,x}_{N+2,N+j}$ demonstrates that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, N]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{1,1} &= A^{N,x}_{1,1} - A^{N,x}_{2,1} = \textstyle\int_{x_1}^{x_{N+1}} x^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{x_2}^{x_{N+1}} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
B_{N+1,1} &= B_{1,N+1} = \textstyle\int_{x_1}^{x_{N+1}} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{x_2}^{x_{N+1}} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
B_{N+1,N+1} &= \textstyle\int_{x_1}^{x_{N+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{x_2}^{x_{N+1}} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
B_{1,j} &= B_{N+1,j} = B_{1,N+j} = B_{N+1,N+j} = 0, \quad B_{i,j} = A^{N,x}_{i,j}, \quad B_{N+i,j} = A^{N,x}_{N+i,j},\\
B_{i,N+j} &= A^{N,x}_{i,N+j}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad B_{N+i,N+j} = A^{N,x}_{N+i,N+j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(B) &= (B_{1,1}B_{N+1,N+1} - B_{N+1,1}B_{1,N+1}) \det\big((B_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in(\{1,2,\ldots,2N\}\setminus\{1,N+1\})^2}\big)\\
&= E^{N,x}_1 \det\big((B_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in(\{1,2,\ldots,2N\}\setminus\{1,N+1\})^2}\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

In addition, note that (3.20) proves that

$$\begin{aligned}
\det\big((B_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in(\{1,\ldots,2N\}\setminus\{1,N+1\})^2}\big) &= \det(A^{N-1,(x_2,x_3,\ldots,x_{N+1})})\\
&= \textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} E_i^{N-1,(x_2,x_3,\ldots,x_{N+1})} = \prod_{i=2}^{N} E_i^{N,x} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Hence, we obtain that $\det(A^{N,x}) = \det(B) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} E_i^{N,x}$. Induction thus proves (3.18). Furthermore, observe that (3.18) establishes (3.15). The proof of Lemma 3.3 is thus complete. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N$, let $I_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, satisfy for all $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that $I_j = [x_{j-1}, x_N]$, let $\mathfrak{p}\colon [x_0, x_N] \to (0, \infty)$ be bounded and measurable, and let $A = (A_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in\{1,2,\ldots,2N\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N)\times(2N)}$ satisfy for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{i,j} = 2v_iv_j \textstyle\int_{I_i\cap I_j} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \qquad A_{N+i,j} = A_{i,N+j} = 2v_iv_j \int_{I_i\cap I_j} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{and} \qquad A_{N+i,N+j} = 2v_iv_j \textstyle\int_{I_i\cap I_j} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Then $\det(A) > 0$.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Throughout this proof let $B = (B_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in\{1,2,\ldots,2N\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N)\times(2N)}$ satisfy for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ that $B_{i,j} = \int_{I_i\cap I_j} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $B_{N+i,j} = B_{i,N+j} = \int_{I_i\cap I_j} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, and $B_{N+i,N+j} = \int_{I_i\cap I_j} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$. Note that for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_{i,j} = \textstyle\int_{x_{\max\{i-1,j-1\}}}^{x_N} x^2\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \qquad B_{N+i,j} = B_{i,N+j} = \int_{x_{\max\{i-1,j-1\}}}^{x_N} x\mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{and} \qquad B_{N+i,N+j} = \textstyle\int_{x_{\max\{i-1,j-1\}}}^{x_N} \mathfrak{p}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Furthermore, observe that (3.25) and the fact that the determinant is linear in each row and each column show that

$$\det(A) = 4^N \big(\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{N} |v_i|^4\big) \det(B). \tag{3.27}$$

In addition, note that (3.26) and Lemma 3.3 (applied with $a \curvearrowleft x_0$, $b \curvearrowleft x_N$, $\mathfrak{p} \curvearrowleft \mathfrak{p}$, $N \curvearrowleft N$, $x \curvearrowleft (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ in the notation of Lemma 3.3) demonstrate that $\det(B) > 0$. Combining this with (3.27) ensures that $\det(A) > 0$. The proof of Proposition 3.4 is thus complete. □

3.3 Regularity properties for the set of global minima of the risk function

Definition 3.5 (Tangent space)**.** Let $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a set, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Then we denote by $\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ the set given by

$$\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}} = \big\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \big[\exists\, \gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}) \colon \big([\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}],\, [\gamma(0) = x],\, [\gamma'(0) = v]\big)\big]\big\}. \tag{3.28}$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be open, let $f \in C^2(U, \mathbb{R})$ have locally Lipschitz continuous derivatives, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq U$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} = \{x \in U \colon f(x) = \inf_{y \in U} f(y)\}$, assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Then*

(i) it holds for all $v \in \mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}}$ that $\big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)v = 0$,

(ii) it holds that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)) \leq \mathfrak{d} - k$, and

(iii) it holds for all $v \in (\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp}$ that $\big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)v \in (\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp}$

(cf. Definition 3.5).

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Observe that the assumption that $\mathcal{M} = \{y \in U \colon f(y) = \inf_{z \in U} f(z)\}$ ensures for all $y \in \mathcal{M}$ that $(\nabla f)(y) = 0$. This implies for all $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ that $(\nabla f)(\gamma(t)) = 0$. Hence, we obtain for all $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ that

$$0 = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big((\nabla f)(\gamma(t))\big) = \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\gamma(t))\big)\gamma'(t). \tag{3.29}$$

This shows for all $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$ with $\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $\gamma(0) = x$ that $((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))\gamma'(0) = 0$. This establishes item (i).

Next note that the assumption that $\mathcal{M}$ is a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ proves that $\dim(\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}}) = k$. Combining this with item (i) establishes item (ii).

Moreover, observe that item (i) and the fact that $(\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)$ is symmetric demonstrate for all $v \in \mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}}$, $w \in (\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp}$ that

$$\big\langle v, \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)w\big\rangle = \big\langle \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)v, w\big\rangle = \langle 0, w\rangle = 0. \tag{3.30}$$

This establishes item (iii). The proof of Lemma 3.6 is thus complete. □

Proposition 3.7. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_H, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_H \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_H = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, assume $\prod_{i=1}^{H-1}(\alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_i) \neq 0$, and let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{D} = 1 + |f(a)| + (1 + 2\max\nolimits_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}}|\alpha_j|)(1 + |a| + |b|). \tag{3.31}$$

Then there exists an open $U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that

(i) it holds that $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$,

(ii) it holds that $\mathcal{L}|_U \in C^2(U, \mathbb{R})$,

(iii) it holds that $U \ni \theta \mapsto (\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d} \times \mathfrak{d}}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous,

(iv) it holds for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in U$ that

$$\max\nolimits_{i,j \in \{1,2,\ldots,\mathfrak{d}\}}\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| \leq \big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16H\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup\nolimits_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{3.32}$$

(v) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\} \neq \varnothing$,

(vi) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ is a $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and

(vii) it holds for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ *that* $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta)) = 2H = \mathfrak{d} - (H+1)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. Throughout this proof let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} U = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}\colon \big(\big[\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta\} > 0\big],\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N}\cap(1,H]\colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 1/2\big],\\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N}\cap(1,H]\colon \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta \in (a,b)\big],\big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N}\cap(1,H)\colon \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta < \mathfrak{q}_{j+1}^\theta\big]\big)\big\} \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}\colon \big(\big[\min\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta\} > 0\big],\ \big[\mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = f(a)\big],\\ \big[\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta = \alpha_1\big],\ \big[\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N}\cap(1,H]\colon \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > 1/2,\ \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta = x_{j-1},\ \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}\big]\big)\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Note that (3.33) ensures that U is open. Furthermore, observe that (2.5) and (3.33) assure that $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$. This proves item (i). In addition, note that item (i), Lemma 2.16, and the fact that U is open establish items (ii) and (iii).

Next observe that Corollary 2.20, the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \{1,2,\dots,H\}$ with $\mathfrak{q}_j^\theta \in [a,b]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta > \frac{1}{2}$, and the fact that $\mathfrak{D} \geq \max\{|a|,|b|,b-a,\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|f(x)|,1\} \geq 1$ prove that for all $\theta \in U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,j\in\{1,2,\dots,\mathfrak{d}\}} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| &\leq \big(16\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16H\mathfrak{D}^7 + 8\mathfrak{D}^4\big(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}|f(x)|\big)\big)\big(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\big)\\ &\leq \big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16H\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup_{x\in[a,b]}\mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

This establishes item (iv).

Next note that (3.34) and Lemma 3.2 imply that $\mathcal{M}$ is a non-empty $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$. Furthermore, observe that (3.33), (3.34), and the fact that $a < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_H = b$ show that $\mathcal{M} \subseteq U$. In the next step we intend to prove that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0$. Note that (3.33) and the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in [a,b]$ it holds that

$$\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta = \left[\tfrac{b-x}{b-a}\right](\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \left[\tfrac{x-a}{b-a}\right](\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) > 0 \tag{3.36}$$

ensure that for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in [a,b]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{N}^\theta(x) &= \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \max\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, 0\} + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \max\{\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta, 0\}\\ &= \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta, 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Combining this with (3.34) demonstrates that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, $x \in [a,b]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{N}^\theta(x) &= \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta + \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - x_{j-1}, 0\}\\ &= \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + f(a) - \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^H \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - x_{j-1}, 0\}\\ &= f(a) + \alpha_1(x-a) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^H (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}) \max\{x - x_{j-1}, 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

In addition, observe that the assumption that for all $i \in \{1,2,\dots H\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ it holds that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$ proves that for all $j \in \{0,1,\dots,H-1\}$, $x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]$ it

holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= f(x_0) + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j}[f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})]\right] + [f(x) - f(x_j)] \\
&= f(a) + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} \alpha_k(x_k - x_{k-1})\right] + \alpha_{j+1}(x - x_j) \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_{j+1}x + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} \alpha_k(x_k - x_{k-1})\right] - \alpha_{j+1}x_j \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_{j+1}x + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} \alpha_k x_k\right] - \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} \alpha_k x_{k-1}\right] - \alpha_{j+1}x_j \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_{j+1}x - \left(\left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j+1} \alpha_k x_{k-1}\right] - \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} \alpha_k x_k\right]\right) \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_{j+1}x - \left(\alpha_1 x_0 + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{j+1} \alpha_k x_{k-1}\right] - \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{j+1} \alpha_{k-1} x_{k-1}\right]\right) \\
&= f(a) + \left(\alpha_1 x + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{j+1} (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1})x\right]\right) - \left(\alpha_1 x_0 + \left[\textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{j+1} (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1})x_{k-1}\right]\right) \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_1(x - a) + \textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{j+1} (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1})(x - x_{k-1}) \\
&= f(a) + \alpha_1(x - a) + \textstyle\sum_{k=2}^{H} (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}) \max\{x - x_{k-1}, 0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

This implies that for all $x \in [a, b]$ we have that

$$f(x) = f(a) + \alpha_1(x - a) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}) \max\{x - x_{j-1}, 0\}. \tag{3.40}$$

Combining this with (3.38) demonstrates that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, $x \in [a, b]$ it holds that $\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = f(x)$. Hence, we obtain that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0$. Next we intend to prove that for all $\theta \in U$ with $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0$ it holds that $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$. Note that (2.2) and the fact that for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ it holds that $[a, b] \ni x \mapsto \mathcal{N}^\theta(x) - f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous show that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $x \in [a, b]$ we have that

$$\mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = f(x). \tag{3.41}$$

Combining this with (3.33), (3.34), (3.37), and the fact that $\mathcal{M} \subseteq U$ demonstrates that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$, $x \in [x_0, x_1 + \min\{0, (\mathfrak{q}^\theta_{\min\{2,H\}} - x_1)\mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(H)\}]$ it holds that

$$f(a) + \alpha_1(x - a) = f(x) = \mathcal{N}^\theta(x) = \mathfrak{v}^\theta_1(\mathfrak{w}^\theta_1 x + \mathfrak{b}^\theta_1) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = \mathfrak{v}^\theta_1\mathfrak{w}^\theta_1(x - a) + \mathfrak{v}^\theta_1(\mathfrak{w}^\theta_1 a + \mathfrak{b}^\theta_1) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta. \tag{3.42}$$

The fact that for all $\theta \in U$ it holds that $x_1 + \min\{0, (\mathfrak{q}^\theta_{\min\{2,H\}} - x_1)\mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(H)\} > x_0$ hence ensures that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ we have that

$$\mathfrak{w}^\theta_1\mathfrak{v}^\theta_1 = \alpha_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathfrak{v}^\theta_1(\mathfrak{w}^\theta_1 a + \mathfrak{b}^\theta_1) + \mathfrak{c}^\theta = f(a). \tag{3.43}$$

Next observe that the fact that for all $\theta \in U$ it holds that $(a, b)\backslash\{\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_2, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_H\}$ is an open set shows that there exists $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_{\theta,x})_{(\theta,x)\in U\times\mathbb{R}} \colon U \times \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$ which satisfies for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in (a, b)\backslash\{\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_2, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_H\}$ that $(x - \varepsilon_{\theta,x}, x + \varepsilon_{\theta,x}) \subseteq (a, b)\backslash\{\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_2, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_H\}$. Combining this with (3.33) and (3.37) demonstrates for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in (a, b)\backslash\{\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_2, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_H\}$ that $(x - \varepsilon_{\theta,x}, x + \varepsilon_{\theta,x}) \ni y \mapsto \mathcal{N}^\theta(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is affine linear. This, (3.40), (3.41), and the fact that for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H)$ it holds that $\alpha_{i+1} \neq \alpha_i$ prove that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$, $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H)$ it holds that $x_i \in \{\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_2, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^\theta_H\}$. Combining this with the fact that for all $\theta \in U$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}^\theta_1 \notin [a, b]$, the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}^\theta_j \in (a, b)$, the fact that for all $\theta \in U$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H)$ it holds that $\mathfrak{q}^\theta_j < \mathfrak{q}^\theta_{j+1}$, and the fact that $a < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_H = b$ shows that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ we have that $\mathfrak{q}^\theta_j = x_{j-1}$. This, (3.36), (3.40),

(3.41), and (3.43) assure that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$, $x \in [a,b]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(a) + \alpha_1(x-a) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H}(\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1})\max\{x - \mathfrak{x}_{j-1}, 0\} = f(x)\\
&= \mathscr{N}^\theta(x) = \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \max\{\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta, 0\}\\
&= \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \max\{\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, 0\} + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x + (\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta)^{-1}\mathfrak{b}_j^\theta, 0\}\\
&= \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta(\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - \mathfrak{q}_j^\theta, 0\}\\
&= \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta (x-a) + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - \mathfrak{x}_{j-1}, 0\}\\
&= (\mathfrak{c}^\theta + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{w}_1^\theta a + \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta) + \alpha_1(x-a) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - \mathfrak{x}_{j-1}, 0\}\\
&= f(a) + \alpha_1(x-a) + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta \max\{x - \mathfrak{x}_{j-1}, 0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

Hence, we obtain for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ that $\mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta = \alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}$. Combining this with (3.43) proves that for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ it holds that $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence, we obtain that $\mathcal{M} = \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$. This and the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ is a non-empty $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ establish items (v) and (vi).

In the next step note that (3.36) ensures that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that $I_1^\theta = [a,b]$. In addition, observe that (3.34) shows that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ it holds that $I_j^\theta = (\mathfrak{x}_{j-1}, b]$. Furthermore, note that (3.34) and the fact that for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (1, H]$ it holds that $\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1} \neq 0$ demonstrate that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{v}_i^\theta \neq 0$. This, Corollary 2.17, and Proposition 3.4 assure that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that $\det\big(\big(\big(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big)_{(i,j)\in\{1,2,\ldots,2H\}^2}\big) \neq 0$. Hence, we obtain for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ that

$$\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta)) \geq 2H. \tag{3.45}$$

Moreover, observe that the fact that $\mathcal{M} = \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ is a $(H+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ and Lemma 3.6 imply that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta)) \leq \mathfrak{d} - (H+1) = 2H$. This and (3.45) establish item (vii). The proof of Proposition 3.7 is thus complete. □

Definition 3.8. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\backslash\{0\}$ be symmetric. Then we denote by $\sigma(A) \in (0,\infty)$ the real number given by

$$\sigma(A) = \min\{\ell \in (0,\infty)\colon [\exists\, \lambda \in \{-\ell, \ell\}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}\colon Av = \lambda v]\} \tag{3.46}$$

and we denote by $\Lambda(A) \in (0,\infty)$ the real number given by

$$\Lambda(A) = \max\{\ell \in (0,\infty)\colon [\exists\, \lambda \in \{-\ell, \ell\}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}\colon Av = \lambda v]\} \tag{3.47}$$

Lemma 3.9. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A = (a_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in\{1,2,\ldots,n\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\backslash\{0\}$ be symmetric. Then $\Lambda(A) \leq \big[\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}|a_{i,j}|^2\big]^{1/2}$ (cf. Definition 3.8).*

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Throughout this proof let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}$ satisfy

$$Av = \lambda v. \tag{3.48}$$

Note that (3.48) ensures that

$$\tfrac{\|Av\|^2}{\|v\|^2} = \tfrac{\|\lambda v\|^2}{\|v\|^2} = |\lambda|^2 \tag{3.49}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5). Moreover, observe that the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality demonstrates for all $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Aw\|^2 &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}w_j\Big|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{n}|a_{i,j}w_j|\Big]^2\\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big[\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|a_{i,j}|^2\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|w_j|^2\Big)\Big] = \|w\|^2\Big[\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}|a_{i,j}|^2\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

Combining this with (3.49) shows that $|\lambda|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n}|a_{i,j}|^2$. The proof of Lemma 3.9 is thus complete. □

Corollary 3.10. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, and let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{D} = 1 + |f(a)| + (1 + 2\max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}} |\alpha_j|)(1 + |a| + |b|). \tag{3.51}$$

Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, \mathfrak{d})$ and an open $U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that

(i) it holds that $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$,

(ii) it holds that $\mathcal{L}|_U \in C^2(U, \mathbb{R})$,

(iii) it holds that $U \ni \theta \mapsto (\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d} \times \mathfrak{d}}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous,

(iv) it holds for all $\theta \in U$ that

$$\Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta)) \leq (3N + 1)\big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{3.52}$$

(v) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\} \neq \varnothing$,

(vi) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ is a k-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$,

(vii) it holds for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U \colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$, and

(viii) it holds that $k = \mathfrak{d} - 2[\#\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N\}]$

(cf. Definition 3.8).

Proof of Corollary 3.10. Throughout this proof assume without loss of generality that $\prod_{i=1}^{N-1}(\alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_i) \neq 0$ (otherwise we can simply remove the points x_i which satisfy $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i$ and thereby reduce the number N), let $P \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}^{3N+1}$ satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ that $P(\theta) = (\mathfrak{w}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{w}_N^\theta, \mathfrak{b}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{b}_N^\theta, \mathfrak{v}_1^\theta, \ldots, \mathfrak{v}_N^\theta, \mathfrak{c}^\theta)$, and let $\mathscr{L} \colon \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{3N+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+1}$ that

$$\mathscr{L}(\theta) = \textstyle\int_a^b \big(f(x) - \theta_{3N+1} - \sum_{j=1}^N \theta_{2N+j}[\mathfrak{R}(\theta_j x + \theta_{N+j})]\big)^2 \mathfrak{p}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.53}$$

Note that Proposition 3.7 (applied with $H \curvearrowleft N$, $\mathcal{L} \curvearrowleft \mathscr{L}$ in the notation of Proposition 3.7) demonstrates that there exists an open $V \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{3N+1}$ which satisfies that

(I) it holds that

$$V \subseteq \big\{\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{3N+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} \colon \big(\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^N \prod_{v \in \{a,b\}} (\theta_j v + \theta_{N+j}) \neq 0\big)\big\}, \tag{3.54}$$

(II) it holds that $\mathscr{L}|_V \in C^2(V, \mathbb{R})$,

(III) it holds for all $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{3N+1}) \in V$ that

$$\max_{i,j \in \{1,2,\ldots,3N+1\}} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \mathscr{L}\big)(\theta)\big| \leq \big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big), \tag{3.55}$$

(IV) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in V \colon \mathscr{L}(\vartheta) = 0\} \neq \varnothing$,

(V) it holds that $\{\vartheta \in V \colon \mathscr{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ is an $(N+1)$-dimensional C^∞-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{3N+1}$, and

(VI) it holds for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in V \colon \mathscr{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} \mathscr{L})(\theta)) = 2N = (3N+1) - (N+1)$.

In the following let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy

$$U = \big\{\theta \in (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}} \cap (P^{-1}(V))\colon \big(\forall\, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N, H]\colon \max\big\{\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta a + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta, \mathfrak{w}_j^\theta b + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta\big\} < 0\big)\big\}. \tag{3.56}$$

Observe that (3.56) assures that $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is open. In addition, note that (2.5), (3.56), and item (I) imply that $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$. This establishes item (i). Next observe that item (i) and Lemma 2.16 prove items (ii) and (iii). Furthermore, note that for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in [a, b]$, $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N, H]$ it holds that $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_i^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_i^\theta) = 0$. Therefore, we obtain for all $\theta \in U$, $x \in [a, b]$ that

$$\mathscr{N}^\theta(x) = \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{H} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)\big] = \mathfrak{c}^\theta + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathfrak{v}_j^\theta \big[\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{w}_j^\theta x + \mathfrak{b}_j^\theta)\big]. \tag{3.57}$$

This implies for all $\theta \in U$ that

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathscr{L}(P(\theta)). \tag{3.58}$$

Combining this with (3.55) ensures for all $\theta \in U$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \cap ((0, N] \cup (H, H + N] \cup (2H, 2H + N] \cup \{3H + 1\})$ that

$$\big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta)\big| \leq \big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup\nolimits_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \tag{3.59}$$

Moreover, observe that (3.58) shows that for all $\theta \in U$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}\} \backslash ((0, N] \cup (H, H + N] \cup (2H, 2H + N] \cup \{3H + 1\})$, $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}\}$ we have that

$$\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathcal{L}\big)(\theta) = 0. \tag{3.60}$$

Combining this with Lemma 3.9 and (3.59) assures for all $\theta \in U$ that

$$\Lambda((\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta)) \leq \sqrt{\textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{H} \big|\big(\tfrac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\mathscr{L}\big)(\theta)\big|^2} \leq (3N+1)\big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup\nolimits_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \tag{3.61}$$

This establishes item (iv). Furthermore, note that items (IV) and (V), (3.56), and (3.58) establish items (v), (vi), and (viii). In addition, observe that (3.58), (3.60), and item (VI) demonstrate for all $\theta \in \{\vartheta \in U\colon \mathcal{L}(\vartheta) = 0\}$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess}\mathcal{L})(\theta)) = 2N$. Combining this with item (viii) establishes item (vii). The proof of Corollary 3.10 is thus complete. □

4 Local convergence to the set of global minima for gradient flow (GF)

In this section we employ Corollary 3.10 from Section 3 to establish in Proposition 4.16 in Subsection 4.3 below and Corollary 4.17 in Subsection 4.4 below that the risk of certain solutions of GF differential equations converges under the assumption that the target function is piecewise constant exponentially quick to zero. Our proof of Proposition 4.16 employs the abstract local convergence result for GF trajectories in Proposition 4.14 in Subsection 4.2. Proposition 4.14 and its proof are strongly inspired by Fehrman et al. [20, Proposition 16]. Our proofs of Propositions 4.14 and 4.16 also use the several well-known concepts and results from differential geometry which we recall in Subsection 4.1 below.

In particular, Lemma 4.4 is a direct consequence of, e.g., [20, Proposition 7], Lemma 4.6 is proved as, e.g., [20, Lemma 10], Lemma 4.7 is proved as, e.g., [20, Lemma 11], Definition 4.8 is a slight reformulation of, e.g., [20, Definition 12], Proposition 4.10 is a slight extension of, e.g., [20, Proposition 13], Proposition 4.12 is a reformulation of [20, Lemma 15], and Lemma 4.13 is a slight generalization of [20, Lemma 14].

4.1 Differential geometric preliminaries

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} \neq \varnothing$. Then we denote by $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}$ the function which satisfies for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ that $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{M}} \|x - y\|$ (cf. Definition 2.5).

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} \neq \varnothing$. Then we denote by $\mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ the set given by

$$\mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}} = \big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon (\exists_1 \, y \in \mathcal{M} \colon \|x - y\| = \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)) \big\} \tag{4.1}$$

and we denote by $\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ the function which satisfies for all $x \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ that $\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \in \mathcal{M}$ and

$$\|x - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\| = \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \tag{4.2}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.1).

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} \neq \varnothing$. Then we denote by $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ the set given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} = \bigcup_{\substack{U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \text{ is open}, \, U \subseteq \mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}}, \\ \text{and } \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}|_U \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})}} U \tag{4.3}$$

(cf. Definition 4.2).

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exists an open $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that*

(i) it holds that $x \in V \subseteq \mathscr{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and

(ii) it holds that $\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}|_V \in C^1(V, \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$.

(cf. Definitions 2.5, 4.1, and 4.2).

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a non-empty k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$. Then $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (cf. Definition 4.3).*

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Note that Lemma 4.4 assures that $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$. The proof of Proposition 4.5 is thus complete. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a non-empty k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and let $x \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (cf. Definition 4.3). Then $x - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \in (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(x)})^{\perp}$ (cf. Definitions 3.5 and 4.2).*

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a non-empty k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$. Then*

(i) it holds that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \backslash \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is open,

(ii) it holds that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \backslash \mathcal{M} \ni y \mapsto \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable, and

(iii) it holds for all $y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \backslash \mathcal{M}$ that

$$(\nabla \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}})(y) = \tfrac{y - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)}{\|y - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\|} \tag{4.4}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.1–4.3).

Definition 4.8. Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $r, s \in (0, \infty)$. Then we denote by $V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ the set given by

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} = \Big\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \exists \, \mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M} \colon \exists \, v \in (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathfrak{m}})^{\perp} \colon \big[(\|\mathfrak{m} - x\| \leq r), \, (\|v\| < s), \, (y = \mathfrak{m} + v) \big] \Big\} \tag{4.5}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 3.5).

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $r, s \in (0, \infty)$. Then*

(i) it holds that

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \exists\, \mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M} \colon \left[(\|\mathfrak{m} - x\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathfrak{m}\| < s), (y - \mathfrak{m} \in (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathfrak{m}})^{\perp}) \right] \right\}, \tag{4.6}$$

(ii) it holds that

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} \supseteq \left\{ y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \left[(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s) \right] \right\}, \tag{4.7}$$

and

(iii) it holds that $x \in (V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s})^{\circ}$ (cf. Definitions 2.5, 3.5, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.8).

Proof of Lemma 4.9. Observe that (4.5) establishes item (i). Next note that (4.5) and Lemma 4.6 establish item (ii). Furthermore, observe that item (ii) implies that

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} \supseteq \left\{ y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \left[(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s) \right] \right\}. \tag{4.8}$$

Furthermore, note that the fact that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \ni y \mapsto \mathfrak{p}(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is continuous shows that $\{ y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon [(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s)] \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is open. Combining this with (4.8) and the fact that $x \in \{ y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon [(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s)] \}$ establishes item (iii). The proof of Lemma 4.9 is thus complete. □

Proposition 4.10. *Let $\mathfrak{d}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, let $U \subseteq \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ be open, and let $x \in \mathcal{M} \cap U$ (cf. Definition 4.3). Then there exist $R, S \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

(i) it holds for all $r \in (0, R]$, $s \in (0, S]$ that $\overline{V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \subseteq U$,

(ii) it holds for all $r \in (0, R]$, $s \in (0, S]$ that

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) = \mathscr{d}_{\{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M} \colon \|x - \mathfrak{m}\| \leq r\}}(y) < s \right\}, \tag{4.9}$$

(iii) it holds for all $r \in (0, R]$, $s \in (0, S]$, $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M}$, $v \in (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathfrak{m}})^{\perp}$ with $\|\mathfrak{m} - x\| \leq r$ and $\|v\| < s$ that $\mathfrak{m} + v \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{m} + v) = \mathfrak{m}$, and

(iv) it holds for all $r \in (0, R]$, $s \in (0, S]$ that

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} = \left\{ y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \left[(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s) \right] \right\} \tag{4.10}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.8).

Proof of Proposition 4.10. Observe that [20, Proposition 13] establishes items (i)–(iii). In addition, note that items (ii) and (iii) and (4.5) establish item (iv). The proof of Proposition 4.10 is thus complete. □

Setting 4.11. *Let $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \mathfrak{d})$, let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be open, let $f \in C^2(U, \mathbb{R})$ have locally Lipschitz continuous derivatives, let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq U$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} = \{ x \in U \colon f(x) = \inf_{y \in U} f(y) \}$, and assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$.*

Proposition 4.12. *Assume Setting 4.11 and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$. Then*

(i) it holds for all $v \in ((\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}}^{x})^{\perp}) \backslash \{0\}$ that $\langle ((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))v, v \rangle \geq [\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))] \|v\|^2 > 0$ and

(ii) *it holds for all* $v \in ((\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp})\backslash\{0\}$, $r \in [0, (\Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)))^{-1}]$ *that* $\|v - r((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))v\| \leq [1 - r\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))]\|v\|$.

(cf. Definitions 2.5, 3.5, and 3.8).

Proof of Proposition 4.12. Throughout this proof let $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{\mathfrak{d}-k}\} \subseteq ((\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp})\backslash\{0\}$ be an orthogonal basis of $(\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp}$ with respect to which $(\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)$ is diagonal and let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}-k} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}-k\}$ that $((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))v_i = \lambda_i v_i$. Observe that the fact that x is a local minimum of f shows for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}-k\}$ that $\lambda_i \geq 0$. This and the assumption that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$ imply for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}-k\}$ that $\lambda_i > 0$. Hence, we obtain for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}-k\}$ that $\lambda_i \in [\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)), \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))]$. Next let $\mathbf{v} \in ((\mathcal{T}^x_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp})\backslash\{0\}$ and let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{\mathfrak{d}-k} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{d}-k} u_i v_i$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \big\langle \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}\big\rangle &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{d}-k} \big(\lambda_i |u_i|^2 \|v_i\|^2\big) \geq \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))\big]\big[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{d}-k} |u_i|^2\|v_i\|^2\big] \\ &= \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))\big]\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

This establishes item (i). Furthermore, observe that the fact that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mathfrak{d}-k\}$ it holds that $\lambda_i \in [\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)), \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))]$ ensures that for all $r \in [0, (\Lambda(\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))^{-1}]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \big\|\mathbf{v} - r\big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)\big)\mathbf{v}\big\|^2 &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{d}-k} \big(|u_i|^2\|v_i\|^2(1 - r\lambda_i)^2\big) \\ &\leq \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{d}-k} \big(|u_i|^2\|v_i\|^2\big(1 - r\big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))\big]\big)^2\big) \\ &= \big(1 - r\big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x))\big]\big)^2\|\mathbf{v}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

This establishes item (ii). The proof of Proposition 4.12 is thus complete. □

Lemma 4.13. *Assume Setting 4.11 and let* $x \in \mathcal{M}$. *Then there exist* $c, r, s \in (0, \infty)$ *such that for all* $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$ *it holds that* $\overline{V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}} \subseteq (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \cap U)$ *and*

$$\big\|(\nabla f)(y) - \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big)(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big\| \leq c(\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))^2 \tag{4.13}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5, 4.1–4.3, and 4.8).

Proof of Lemma 4.13. Note that Proposition 4.10 ensures that there exist $r, s \in (0, \infty)$ which satisfy $\overline{V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}} \subseteq U$, which satisfy

$$V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x} = \big\{y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \big[(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s)\big]\big\}, \tag{4.14}$$

and which satisfy for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M}$, $v \in (\mathcal{T}^{\mathfrak{m}}_{\mathcal{M}})^{\perp}$ with $\|\mathfrak{m} - x\| \leq r$ and $\|v\| < s$ that $\mathfrak{m} + v \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$ and

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{m} + v) = \mathfrak{m} \tag{4.15}$$

(cf. Definition 3.5). Observe that (4.14), (4.15), and Lemma 4.6 imply for all $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$, $t \in [0, 1]$ that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) + t(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$. In addition, note that the fact that $\overline{V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}}$ is compact and the assumption that $U \ni y \mapsto (\operatorname{Hess} f)(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}\times\mathfrak{d}}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous prove that there exists $c \in (0, \infty)$ which satisfies for all $y, z \in \overline{V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ that $\|((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(z))v\| \leq c\|y - z\|\|v\|$. Furthermore, observe that the fact that for all $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$ it holds that $(\nabla f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) = 0$ and the assumption that f is twice continuously differentiable demonstrate that for all $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla f)(y) &= \int_0^1 \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) + t(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)))\big)(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big)(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \Big((\operatorname{Hess} f)\big(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) + t(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\Big)(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Combining this with the fact that for all $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$, $t \in [0,1]$ it holds that

$$\big\|\big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) + t(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big)(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\big\| \leq ct\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\|^2 \tag{4.17}$$

implies that for all $y \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$ we have that

$$\|(\nabla f)(y) - ((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)))(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\| \leq c\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\|^2 \Big[\textstyle\int_0^1 t \, \mathrm{d}t\Big] = \frac{c}{2}(\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))^2. \tag{4.18}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.13 is thus complete. □

4.2 Abstract convergence result for GF to a submanifold of global minima

Proposition 4.14. *Assume Setting 4.11, assume for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$, let $\mathcal{G} \colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be locally bounded and measurable, assume for all $x \in U$ that $\mathcal{G}(x) = (\nabla f)(x)$, let $\Theta^\theta \in C([0,\infty), \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ that $\Theta^\theta_t = \theta - \int_0^t \mathcal{G}(\Theta^\theta_s)\,\mathrm{d}s$, and let $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist $r, s \in (0,\infty)$ such that*

(i) it holds for all $\theta \in V^{r/2,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ that $\Theta^\theta_t \in V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$,

(ii) it holds that $\inf_{y \in \mathcal{M} \cap V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}} [\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))] > 0$, and

(iii) it holds for all $\theta \in V^{r/2,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ that

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta^\theta_t) \leq \exp\big(-\tfrac{t}{2}\big[\inf_{y \in \mathcal{M} \cap V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}} \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))\big]\big]\big)\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta) \tag{4.19}$$

(cf. Definitions 3.8, 4.1, and 4.8).

Proof of Proposition 4.14. Note that Proposition 4.10 and Lemma 4.13 prove that there exist $r, \varepsilon, \mathfrak{c} \in (0,\infty)$ which satisfy $\overline{V^{r,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{M},x}} \subseteq U$, which satisfy

$$V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x} = \big\{y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \big[(\|x - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s)\big]\big\}, \tag{4.20}$$

and which satisfy for all $y \in \overline{V^{r,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{M},x}}$ that

$$\|(\nabla f)(y) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))(y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\| \leq \mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))^2 \tag{4.21}$$

(cf. Definition 4.3). In the following let $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}\inf_{y \in \mathcal{M} \cap V^{r,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{M},x}} \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))\big]$. Observe that the fact that Hess f is locally Lipschitz continuous and the fact that the eigenvalues are continuous functions of a matrix (cf., e.g., Kato [30, Section 2.5.1]) prove that $\kappa > 0$. Next note that the fact that $\overline{V^{r,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{M},x}}$ is compact, the fact that for all $y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ it holds that $(\nabla f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) = 0$, the fact that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \ni y \mapsto \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is continuously differentiable, and the assumption that $f \in C^2(U, \mathbb{R})$ prove that there exists $c \in (0,\infty)$ which satisfies for all $y \in \overline{V^{r,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{M},x}}$ that

$$\|(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}})'(y)[(\nabla f)(y)]\| = \|(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}})'(y)[(\nabla f)(y) - (\nabla f)(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))]\| \leq c\|y - \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| = c\mathfrak{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) \tag{4.22}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.2). In the following let $s \in (0,\infty)$ satisfy

$$s = \min\Big\{\frac{\kappa}{\mathfrak{c}}, \frac{\kappa r}{2c}, \varepsilon\Big\}, \tag{4.23}$$

let $\theta \in V^{r/2,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}$, and let $\tau \in (0,\infty]$ satisfy $\tau = \inf(\{t \in [0,\infty) \colon \Theta^\theta_t \notin V^{r,s}_{\mathcal{M},x}\} \cup \{\infty\})$. Observe that the assumption that for all $y \in U$ it holds that $\mathcal{G}(y) = (\nabla f)(y)$ and the fact that $U \ni y \mapsto (\nabla f)(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is continuous assure that $[0,\tau) \ni t \mapsto \Theta^\theta_t \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is continuously differentiable and

that for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ it holds that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\Theta_t^\theta = -(\nabla f)(\Theta_t^\theta)$. This, Lemma 4.7, and the chain rule show for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) = -\Big\langle (\nabla f)(\Theta_t^\theta), (\nabla \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}})(\Theta_t^\theta)\Big\rangle = -\left\langle (\nabla f)(\Theta_t^\theta), \frac{\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)}{\|\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)\|}\right\rangle \tag{4.24}$$

(cf. Definition 2.5). Next note that (4.21), (4.23), (4.24), and Proposition 4.12 demonstrate for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) &= -\left\langle (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta))(\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)), \frac{\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)}{\|\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)\|}\right\rangle \\
&\quad - \left\langle (\nabla f)(\Theta_t^\theta) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta))(\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)), \frac{\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)}{\|\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)\|}\right\rangle \\
&\leq -2\kappa\|\Theta_t^\theta - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)\| + \mathfrak{c}(\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta))^2 \\
&= -2\kappa\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) + \mathfrak{c}(\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta))^2 \leq -\kappa\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Hence, we obtain for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) \leq e^{-\kappa t}\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_0^\theta) = e^{-\kappa t}\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta). \tag{4.26}$$

It remains to prove that $\tau = \infty$. To this end, observe that the chain rule and Lemma 4.4 imply for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) = -(D\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}})(\Theta_t^\theta)(\nabla f(\Theta_t^\theta)). \tag{4.27}$$

Combining this, (4.22), and (4.26) ensures for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\left\|\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta)\right\| \leq c\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) \leq ce^{-\kappa t}\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta) \leq cse^{-\kappa t}. \tag{4.28}$$

This and (4.23) show for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that

$$\|\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_t^\theta) - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta)\| \leq cs\int_0^t e^{-\kappa u}\,\mathrm{d}u \leq \frac{\kappa r}{2}\int_0^\infty e^{-\kappa u}\,\mathrm{d}u = \frac{r}{2}. \tag{4.29}$$

Furthermore, note that the assumption that $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2,s}$ assures that there exists $\delta \in (0,\infty)$ which satisfies that $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2-\delta,s}$. Combining this with (4.29) establishes for all $t \in [0,\tau)$ that $\Theta_t^\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r-\delta,s}$. Consequently, we must have that $\tau = \infty$. The proof of Proposition 4.14 is thus complete. □

4.3 Convergence rates for GF in the training of ANNs

Lemma 4.15. *Assume Setting 2.1. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is locally bounded and measurable.*

Proof of Lemma 4.15. Observe that, e.g., [26, Corollary 2.4] demonstrates that $\mathcal{G}$ is locally bounded and measurable. The proof of Lemma 4.15 is thus complete. □

Proposition 4.16. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N}\cap[1,H]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, and let $\Theta^\theta \in C([0,\infty),\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}})$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ that*

$$\Theta_t^\theta = \theta - \int_0^t \mathcal{G}(\Theta_s^\theta)\,\mathrm{d}s \tag{4.30}$$

(cf. Lemma 4.15). Then there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0,\infty)$ and a non-empty open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that for all $\theta \in U$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\Theta_t^\theta) \leq \mathfrak{C}e^{-\mathfrak{c}t}$.

Proof of Proposition 4.16. Throughout this proof let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0\}$. Note that Corollary 3.10 proves that there exist $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, \mathfrak{d})$ and an open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ which satisfy $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$, which satisfy that $\mathcal{L}|_U$ is twice continuously differentiable, which satisfy that $(\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})|_U$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, which satisfy that $\mathcal{M} \cap U$ is a non-empty k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and which satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M} \cap U$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$. Combining this, Lemma 4.15, Proposition 2.12, Lemma 4.9, and Proposition 4.10 with Proposition 4.14 ensures that there exist $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M} \cap U$, $\mathfrak{c} \in (0, \infty)$, $V, \mathcal{V} \in \{A \subseteq U \colon A \text{ is compact}\}$ which satisfy that

(i) it holds that $\mathfrak{m} \in V^\circ \subseteq V \subseteq \mathcal{V}$,

(ii) it holds for all $\theta \in \mathcal{V}$ that $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U}(\theta) = \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U \cap \mathcal{V}}$,

(iii) it holds for all $\theta \in V$, $t \in [0, \infty)$ that $\Theta^\theta_t \in \mathcal{V}$, and

(iv) it holds for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U}(\Theta^\theta_t) \leq e^{-\mathfrak{c} t} \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U}(\theta)$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.1). Furthermore, observe that the fact that $\mathcal{L}|_U$ is twice continuously differentiable proves that there exists $\mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ which satisfies for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathcal{V}$ that $|\mathcal{L}(\theta) - \mathcal{L}(\vartheta)| \leq \mathfrak{C} \|\theta - \vartheta\|$. This assures that for all $\theta \in V^\circ$, $t \in [0, \infty)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\Theta^\theta_t) &= \inf\nolimits_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{M} \cap U \cap \mathcal{V}} |\mathcal{L}(\Theta^\theta_t) - \mathcal{L}(\vartheta)| \leq \mathfrak{C} \big[\inf\nolimits_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{M} \cap U \cap \mathcal{V}} \|\Theta^\theta_t - \vartheta\|\big] \\ &= \mathfrak{C} \big[\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U}(\Theta^\theta_t)\big] \leq \mathfrak{C} e^{-\mathfrak{c} t} \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M} \cap U}(\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

The proof of Proposition 4.16 is thus complete. □

4.4 Convergence rates for GF with random initializations in the training of ANNs

Corollary 4.17. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i (x - x_{i-1})$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let $\Theta \colon [0, \infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ be a stochastic process with continuous sample paths, assume that Θ_0 is standard normally distributed, and assume for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\omega \in \Omega$ that*

$$\Theta_t(\omega) = \Theta_0(\omega) - \int_0^t \mathcal{G}(\Theta_s(\omega)) \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{4.32}$$

(cf. Lemma 4.15). Then there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\forall\, t \in [0, \infty) \colon \mathcal{L}(\Theta_t) \leq \mathfrak{C} e^{-\mathfrak{c} t}) > 0$.

Proof of Corollary 4.17. Note that Proposition 4.16 ensures that there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ and a non-empty open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ which satisfy for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\omega \in \Omega$ with $\Theta_0(\omega) \in U$ that $\mathcal{L}(\Theta_t(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{C} e^{-\mathfrak{c} t}$. Observe that the fact that U is a non-empty open set and the assumption that Θ_0 is standard normally distributed imply that $\mathbb{P}(\Theta_0 \in U) > 0$. This completes the proof of Corollary 4.17. □

5 Local convergence to the set of global minima for gradient descent (GD)

In this section we employ Corollary 3.10 from Section 3 to establish in Theorem 5.3 in Subsection 5.2, Corollary 5.4 in Subsection 5.3, and Corollary 5.5 in Subsection 5.3 under the assumption that the target function is piecewise affine linear that the risk of certain GD processes converges to zero. Our proofs of Corollaries 5.4 and 5.5 are based on an application of Theorem 5.3 and our proof of Theorem 5.3 uses the abstract local convergence result for GD

processes in Proposition 5.2 in Subsection 5.1 below. Proposition 5.2 and its proof are strongly inspired by Fehrman et al. [20, Proposition 17]. Our proof of Proposition 5.2 employs the elementary uniform estimate for certain exponential sums in Lemma 5.1 in Subsection 5.1. For completeness we include in this section also a detailed proof for Lemma 5.1.

5.1 Abstract convergence result for GD to a submanifold of global minima

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\rho \in [0,1)$, $c, \mathfrak{g} \in (0,\infty)$. Then there exists $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0,\mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma(k-1)^{1-\rho}\big) \leq \mathfrak{C}. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. First note that for all $\gamma \in (0,\mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma(k-1)^{1-\rho}\big) &\leq \gamma + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \gamma (k-1)^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma(k-1)^{1-\rho}\big) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{g} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma n^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma n^{1-\rho}\big) \\ &\leq 2\mathfrak{g} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \gamma n^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma n^{1-\rho}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Next observe that the fact that for all $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$ it holds that $[1,\infty) \ni x \mapsto x^{-\rho}\exp(-c\gamma x^{1-\rho}) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and non-increasing assures that for all $\gamma \in (0,\mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \gamma n^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma n^{1-\rho}\big) &\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \bigg[\int_{n-1}^{n} \gamma x^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma x^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\bigg] \\ &= \int_{1}^{\infty} \gamma x^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma x^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Moreover, note that the integral transformation theorem proves for all $\gamma \in (0,\mathfrak{g}]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{1}^{\infty} \gamma x^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma x^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\gamma^{1/(1-\rho)}}^{\infty} \gamma^{1+\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} x^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-cx^{1-\rho}\big)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{1-\rho}}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-cx^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{0}^{1} x^{-\rho}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{1}^{\infty} \exp\!\big(-cx^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\rho} + \int_{1}^{\infty} \exp\!\big(-cx^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Furthermore, observe that the assumption that $c \in (0,\infty)$ and the assumption that $\rho \in [0,1)$ ensure that $\int_1^\infty \exp(-cx^{1-\rho})\,\mathrm{d}x < \infty$. Combining this, (5.2), (5.3), and (5.4) establishes for all $\gamma \in (0,\mathfrak{g}]$ that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\!\big(-c\gamma(k-1)^{1-\rho}\big) \leq 2\mathfrak{g} + \frac{1}{1-\rho} + \int_{1}^{\infty} \exp\!\big(-cx^{1-\rho}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x < \infty. \tag{5.5}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.1 is thus complete. □

Proposition 5.2. *Assume Setting 4.11, assume for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} f)(x)) = \mathfrak{d} - n$, let $\mathcal{G}\colon \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy for all $x \in U$ that $\mathcal{G}(x) = (\nabla f)(x)$, let $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\rho \in [0,1)$, and let $\Theta^{\theta,\gamma}\colon \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\Theta_0^{\theta,\gamma} = \theta$ and*

$$\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} = \Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho}\mathcal{G}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}). \tag{5.6}$$

Then there exist $r, s \in (0,\infty)$ such that

(i) it holds for all $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2,s}$, $\gamma \in (0, \min\{[\sup_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))]^{-1}, 1\}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *that* $\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}$,

(ii) it holds that $\inf_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))\big] > 0$, *and*

(iii) it holds for all $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2,s}$, $\gamma \in (0, \min\{[\sup_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))]^{-1}, 1\}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *that*

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \exp\Big(-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\rho)}\Big[\inf_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))\big]\Big] n^{1-\rho}\Big) \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta) \tag{5.7}$$

(cf. Definitions 3.8 and 4.8).

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Note that Proposition 4.10 and Lemma 4.13 prove that there exist $r, \varepsilon, \mathfrak{c} \in (0,\infty)$ which satisfy $\overline{V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,\varepsilon}} \subseteq U$, which satisfy

$$V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s} = \big\{y \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \big[(\|x - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| \leq r), (\|y - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| < s)\big]\big\}, \tag{5.8}$$

and which satisfy for all $y \in \overline{V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,\varepsilon}}$ that

$$\|(\nabla f)(y) - (\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))(y - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\| \leq \mathfrak{c}(\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))^2 \tag{5.9}$$

(cf. Definition 4.3). In the following let $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\kappa = \inf_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,\varepsilon}} \big[\sigma((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))\big]$. Observe that the fact that $U \ni y \mapsto (\operatorname{Hess} f)(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}\times\mathfrak{d}}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and the fact that the eigenvalues are continuous functions of a matrix (cf., e.g., Kato [30, Section 2.5.1]) prove that $\kappa > 0$. Next note that the fact that $\overline{V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,\varepsilon}}$ is compact and the fact that $U \ni y \mapsto (\nabla f)(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is continuously differentiable demonstrate that there exists $c \in (0,\infty)$ which satisfies for all $y \in \overline{V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,\varepsilon}}$ that

$$\|(\nabla f)(y)\| = \|(\nabla f)(y) - (\nabla f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y))\| \leq c\|y - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\| = c\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(y) \tag{5.10}$$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.2). In the following let $\mathfrak{C} \in (0,\infty)$ satisfy for all $\gamma \in (0,1]$ that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\Big(-\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2(1-\rho)}(k-1)^{1-\rho}\Big) \leq \mathfrak{C} \tag{5.11}$$

(cf. Lemma 5.1), let $s \in (0,\infty)$ satisfy

$$s = \min\Big\{\frac{\kappa}{2\mathfrak{c}}, \frac{r}{2(2+c\mathfrak{C})}, \varepsilon\Big\}, \tag{5.12}$$

let $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2,s}$ and $\gamma \in (0, \min\{[\sup_{y\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))]^{-1}, 1\}]$ be arbitrary, and let $\tau \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$ satisfy $\tau = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \colon \Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} \notin V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}\}$. Observe that the fact that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}\cap(0,\tau]$ it holds that $\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}$ proves that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}\cap(0,\tau]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) &\leq \|\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma})\| \\
&= \Big\|\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}) - \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho}(\nabla f)(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma})\Big\| \\
&\leq \Big\|\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}) - \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho}(\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}))(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}))\Big\| \\
&\quad + \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho}\Big\|\big((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}))\big)(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma})) - (\nabla f)(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma})\Big\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Combining this, Proposition 4.12, and (5.9) demonstrates for all $n \in \mathbb{N}\cap(0,\tau]$ that

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \big(1 - \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{n^\rho}\big)\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}) + \tfrac{\mathfrak{c}\gamma}{n^\rho}(\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}))^2. \tag{5.14}$$

This, the fact that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ it holds that $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq s \leq \frac{\kappa}{2\mathfrak{c}}$, and (5.12) imply that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ it holds that

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \left(1 - \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2n^\rho}\right) \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}). \tag{5.15}$$

By induction, we therefore obtain for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \left[\textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(1 - \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2k^\rho}\right)\right] \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta). \tag{5.16}$$

Next note that the assumption that $\gamma \leq [\sup_{y \in \mathcal{M} \cap V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r,s}} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(y))]^{-1} \leq \kappa^{-1}$ shows for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\frac{\kappa\gamma}{2k^\rho} \in (0, 1)$. This and the fact that for all $u \in (0, 1)$ it holds that $\ln(1 - u) \leq -u$ prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$\ln\left[\textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(1 - \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2k^\rho}\right)\right] = \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{n} \ln\left(1 - \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2k^\rho}\right) \leq -\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2} \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{n} k^{-\rho} \leq -\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2} \int_0^n u^{-\rho} \, \mathrm{d}u = \tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2(1-\rho)} n^{1-\rho}. \tag{5.17}$$

Combining this with (5.16) demonstrates for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that

$$\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2(1-\rho)} n^{1-\rho}\right) \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta). \tag{5.18}$$

It only remains to show that $\tau = \infty$. Observe that (5.10) assures for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that

$$\|\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} - \Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}\| = \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho} \|(\nabla f)(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma})\| \leq \tfrac{c\gamma}{n^\rho} \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}) \tag{5.19}$$

This, (5.18), the fact that $\gamma \leq 1$, (5.11), and the triangle inequality establish for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} - \theta\| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} c\gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\left(-\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2(1-\rho)} (k-1)^{1-\rho}\right) \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta) \\ &\leq cs \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma k^{-\rho} \exp\left(-\tfrac{\kappa\gamma}{2(1-\rho)} (k-1)^{1-\rho}\right) \leq cs\mathfrak{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Combining this with (5.18), (5.12), and the triangle inequality proves for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) - \mathscr{p}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta)\| &\leq \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) + \|\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} - \theta\| + \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta) \\ &\leq s(2 + c\mathfrak{C}) \leq \tfrac{r}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Furthermore, note that the assumption that $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2,s}$ assures that there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ which satisfies that $\theta \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r/2-\delta,s}$. Hence, we obtain for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, \tau]$ that $\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} \in V_{\mathcal{M},x}^{r-\delta,s}$. This implies that $\tau = \infty$. The proof of Proposition 5.2 is thus complete. □

5.2 Convergence rates for GD in the training of ANNs

Theorem 5.3. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $\rho \in [0, 1)$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{D} = 1 + |f(a)| + (1 + 2\max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} |\alpha_j|)(|a| + |b| + 1), \tag{5.22}$$

and let $\Theta^{\theta,\gamma} \colon \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\Theta_0^{\theta,\gamma} = \theta$ and

$$\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} = \Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma} - \tfrac{\gamma}{n^\rho} \mathcal{G}(\Theta_{n-1}^{\theta,\gamma}). \tag{5.23}$$

Then there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ and a non-empty open $U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that for all $\theta \in U$, $\gamma \in (0, ((3N + 1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \mathfrak{C} \exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n^{1-\rho})$.

Proof of Theorem 5.3. Throughout this proof let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \colon \mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0\}$. Observe that Corollary 3.10 proves that there exist $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, \mathfrak{d})$ and an open $U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ which satisfy $U \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$, which satisfy that $\mathcal{L}|_U$ is twice continuously differentiable, which satisfiy for all $\theta \in U$ that $\Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta)) \leq (3N+1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x))$, which satisfy that $(\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})|_U$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, which satisfy that $\mathcal{M} \cap U$ is a non-empty k-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, and which satisfy for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M} \cap U$ that $\operatorname{rank}((\operatorname{Hess} \mathcal{L})(\theta)) = \mathfrak{d} - k$. Combining this, Lemma 4.15, Proposition 2.12, Lemma 4.9, and Proposition 4.10 with Proposition 5.2 shows that there exist $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M} \cap U$, $\mathfrak{c} \in (0, \infty)$, $V, \mathcal{V} \in \{A \subseteq U \colon A \text{ is compact}\}$ such that

(i) it holds that $\mathfrak{m} \in V^\circ \subseteq V \subseteq \mathcal{V}$,

(ii) it holds for all $\theta \in \mathcal{V}$ that $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U}(\theta) = \mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U\cap\mathcal{V}}(\theta)$, and

(iii) it holds for all $\theta \in V$, $\gamma \in (0, \min\{(\sup_{\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}\cap V_2} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\vartheta)))^{-1}, 1\}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that $\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) \leq \exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n^{1-\rho})\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U}(\theta)$

(cf. Definitions 2.5 and 4.1). In addition, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}\cap\mathcal{V}} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\vartheta)) &\leq \sup_{\vartheta\in U} \Lambda((\operatorname{Hess} f)(\vartheta)) \\ &\leq (3N+1)\big(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7\big)\big(\sup_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Furthermore, observe that the fact that $\mathcal{L}|_U$ is twice continuously differentiable implies that there exists $\mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ which satisfies for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathcal{V}$ that $|\mathcal{L}(\theta) - \mathcal{L}(\vartheta)| \leq \mathfrak{C}\|\theta - \vartheta\|$. This ensures that for all $\theta \in V^\circ$, $\gamma \in (0, ((3N+1)(16\mathfrak{D}^5 + 8N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) &= \inf_{\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}\cap U\cap\mathcal{V}} |\mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma}) - \mathcal{L}(\vartheta)| \leq \mathfrak{C}\big[\inf_{\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}\cap U\cap\mathcal{V}} \|\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma} - \vartheta\|\big] \\ &= \mathfrak{C}\big[\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U}(\Theta_n^{\theta,\gamma})\big] \leq \mathfrak{C}\exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n^{1-\rho})\mathscr{d}_{\mathcal{M}\cap U}(\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

The proof of Theorem 5.3 is thus complete. □

5.3 Convergence results for GD with random initializations in the training of ANNs

Corollary 5.4. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $\rho \in [0, 1)$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{D} = 1 + |f(a)| + (1 + 2\max_{j\in\{1,2,\ldots,H\}}|\alpha_j|)(|a| + |b| + 1), \tag{5.26}$$

let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let $\Theta_n^\gamma \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be random variables, assume for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that Θ_0^γ is standard normally distributed, and assume for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ that

$$\Theta_n^\gamma(\omega) = \Theta_{n-1}^\gamma(\omega) - \gamma n^{-\rho}\mathcal{G}(\Theta_{n-1}^\gamma(\omega)). \tag{5.27}$$

Then there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, ((3N+1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5+16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}]$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \colon \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^\gamma) \leq \mathfrak{C}\exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n^{1-\rho})) \geq \mathfrak{c}$.

Proof of Corollary 5.4. Note that Theorem 5.3 ensures that there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ and a non-empty open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, ((3N+1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5+16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x\in[a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}]$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\Theta_0^\gamma(\omega) \in U$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^\gamma(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{C}\exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n^{1-\rho}). \tag{5.28}$$

Observe that the fact that U is a non-empty open set and the assumption that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that Θ_0^γ is standard normally distributed imply that there exists $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $\mathbb{P}(\Theta_0^\gamma \in U) \geq \delta$. This completes the proof of Corollary 5.4. □

Corollary 5.5. *Assume Setting 2.1, let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, H]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = b$, assume for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ that $f(x) = f(x_{i-1}) + \alpha_i(x - x_{i-1})$, let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{D} = 1 + |f(a)| + (1 + 2\max_{j \in \{1,2,\ldots,H\}} |\alpha_j|)(|a| + |b| + 1), \tag{5.29}$$

let $\Theta_n^{k,\gamma} \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}}$, $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbf{k}_n^{k,\gamma} \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{N}$, $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, be random variables, assume for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\Theta_0^{k,\gamma}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent standard normal random variables, and assume for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ that

$$\Theta_{n+1}^{k,\gamma}(\omega) = \Theta_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega) - \gamma \mathcal{G}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega)) \tag{5.30}$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega) \in \arg\min_{\ell \in \{1,2,\ldots,k\}} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{\ell,\gamma}(\omega)). \tag{5.31}$$

Then it holds for all $\gamma \in (0, ((3N+1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}]$ that

$$\liminf_{K \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}\big(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}_n^{K,\gamma},\gamma}\big) = 0\Big) = 1. \tag{5.32}$$

Proof of Corollary 5.5. Throughout this proof let $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\mathfrak{g} = ((3N+1)(24\mathfrak{D}^5 + 16N\mathfrak{D}^7)(\sup_{x \in [a,b]} \mathfrak{p}(x)))^{-1}$. Note that Theorem 5.3 assures that there exist $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{C} \in (0, \infty)$ and an open $U \subseteq (-\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D})^{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\Theta_0^{k,\gamma}(\omega) \in U$ it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{C}\exp(-\mathfrak{c}\gamma n)$. Hence, we obtain for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ with $\Theta_0^{k,\gamma}(\omega) \in U$ that $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega)) = 0$. Next observe that (5.31) ensures for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}\big(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}_n^{K,\gamma},\gamma}\big) = 0\Big) \geq \mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \big[\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}) = 0\big]\Big). \tag{5.33}$$

Furthermore, note that the fact that for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ with $\Theta_0^{k,\gamma}(\omega) \in U$ it holds that $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}(\omega)) = 0$ shows that for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \big[\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}(\Theta_n^{k,\gamma}) = 0\big]\Big) \geq \mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \Theta_0^{k,\gamma} \in U\Big). \tag{5.34}$$

In addition, observe that the fact that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\Theta_0^{k,\gamma}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. implies that for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \Theta_0^{k,\gamma} \in U\Big) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}\Big(\forall\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \Theta_0^{k,\gamma} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \backslash U)\Big) \\ &= 1 - \big[\mathbb{P}\big(\Theta_0^{1,\gamma} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \backslash U)\big)\big]^K. \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Moreover, note that the fact that U is open and the fact that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\Theta_0^{1,\gamma}$ is standard normally distributed prove that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}\big(\Theta_0^{1,\gamma} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}} \backslash U)\big) < 1$. This and (5.35) demonstrate for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ that

$$\liminf_{K \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\exists\, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \colon \Theta_0^{k,\gamma} \in U\Big) = 1. \tag{5.36}$$

Combining this with (5.33) and (5.34) shows for all $\gamma \in (0, \mathfrak{g}]$ that

$$\liminf_{K \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{L}\big(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}_n^{K,\gamma},\gamma}\big) = 0\Big) = 1. \tag{5.37}$$

The proof of Corollary 5.5 is thus complete. □

Acknowledgements

This work has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics-Geometry-Structure.

References

[1] P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and B. Andrews. Convergence of the iterates of descent methods for analytic cost functions. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 16(2):531–547, 2005. doi:10.1137/040605266.

[2] Ömer Deniz Akyildiz and Sotirios Sabanis. Nonasymptotic analysis of Stochastic Gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo under local conditions for nonconvex optimization, 2021. arXiv:2002.05465.

[3] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Yingyu Liang. Learning and generalization in overparameterized neural networks, going beyond two layers. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 6158–6169. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/62dad6e273d32235ae02b7d321578ee8-Paper.pdf.

[4] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. URL: http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/allen-zhu19a.html.

[5] Sanjeev Arora, Simon Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Ruosong Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 322–332, Long Beach, California, USA, 6 2019. PMLR. URL: http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/arora19a.html.

[6] Hedy Attouch and Jérôme Bolte. On the convergence of the proximal algorithm for nonsmooth functions involving analytic features. *Math. Program.*, 116(1-2, Ser. B):5–16, 2009. doi:10.1007/s10107-007-0133-5.

[7] Francis Bach and Eric Moulines. Non-strongly-convex smooth stochastic approximation with convergence rate $O(1/n)$. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26, pages 773–781. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013. URL: http://papers.nips.cc/paper/4900-non-strongly-convex-smooth-stochastic-approximation-with-convergence-rate-o1n.pdf.

[8] Bernard Bercu and Jean-Claude Fort. *Generic Stochastic Gradient Methods*, pages 1–8. American Cancer Society, 2013. URL: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470400531.eorms1068.

[9] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. Gradient convergence in gradient methods with errors. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 10(3):627–642, 2000. doi:10.1137/S1052623497331063.

[10] Léon Bottou, Frank E. Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning, 2018. arXiv:1606.04838.

[11] Patrick Cheridito, Arnulf Jentzen, Adrian Riekert, and Florian Rossmannek. A proof of convergence for gradient descent in the training of artificial neural networks for constant target functions, 2021. arXiv:2102.09924.

[12] Patrick Cheridito, Arnulf Jentzen, and Florian Rossmannek. Non-convergence of stochastic gradient descent in the training of deep neural networks. *Journal of Complexity*, page 101540, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jco.2020.101540.

[13] Patrick Cheridito, Arnulf Jentzen, and Florian Rossmannek. Landscape analysis for shallow ReLU neural networks: complete classification of critical points for affine target functions, 2021. arXiv:2103.10922.

[14] Steffen Dereich and Sebastian Kassing. Convergence of stochastic gradient descent schemes for Lojasiewicz-landscapes, 2021. arXiv:2102.09385.

[15] Steffen Dereich and Thomas Müller-Gronbach. General multilevel adaptations for stochastic approximation algorithms of Robbins-Monro and Polyak-Ruppert type. *Numer. Math.*, 142(2):279–328, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00211-019-01024-y.

[16] Simon Du, Jason Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1675–1685, Long Beach, California, USA, 6 2019. PMLR. URL: http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/du19c.html.

[17] Simon S. Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL: https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1eK3i09YQ.

[18] Weinan E, Chao Ma, Stephan Wojtowytsch, and Lei Wu. Towards a mathematical understanding of neural network-based machine learning: what we know and what we don't, 2020. arXiv:2009.10713.

[19] Weinan E, Chao Ma, and Lei Wu. A comparative analysis of optimization and generalization properties of two-layer neural network and random feature models under gradient descent dynamics. *Sci. China Math.*, 63(7):1235–1258, 2020. doi:10.1007/s11425-019-1628-5.

[20] Benjamin Fehrman, Benjamin Gess, and Arnulf Jentzen. Convergence rates for the stochastic gradient descent method for non-convex objective functions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:Paper No. 136, 48, 2020.

[21] Rong Ge, Furong Huang, Chi Jin, and Yang Yuan. Escaping from saddle points — online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In Peter Grünwald, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale, editors, *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 40 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 797–842, Paris, France, 03–06 Jul 2015. PMLR.

[22] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, fourth edition, 2013.

[23] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016.

[24] Arnulf Jentzen and Timo Kröger. Convergence rates for gradient descent in the training of overparameterized artificial neural networks with biases, 2021. arXiv:2102.11840.

[25] Arnulf Jentzen, Benno Kuckuck, Ariel Neufeld, and Philippe von Wurstemberger. Strong error analysis for stochastic gradient descent optimization algorithms. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(1):455–492, 2021. doi:10.1093/imanum/drz055.

[26] Arnulf Jentzen and Adrian Riekert. Convergence analysis for gradient flows in the training of artificial neural networks with ReLU activation, 2021. arXiv:2107.04479.

[27] Arnulf Jentzen and Adrian Riekert. A proof of convergence for stochastic gradient descent in the training of artificial neural networks with ReLU activation for constant target functions, 2021. arXiv:2104.00277.

[28] Arnulf Jentzen and Philippe von Wurstemberger. Lower error bounds for the stochastic gradient descent optimization algorithm: Sharp convergence rates for slowly and fast decaying learning rates. *Journal of Complexity*, 57:101438, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jco.2019.101438.

[29] Hamed Karimi, Julie Nutini, and Mark Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition, 2020. arXiv:1608.04636.

[30] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.

[31] Jason D. Lee, Ioannis Panageas, Georgios Piliouras, Max Simchowitz, Michael I. Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. First-order methods almost always avoid strict saddle points. *Math. Program.*, 176(1–2):311–337, July 2019. doi:10.1007/s10107-019-01374-3.

[32] Jason D. Lee, Max Simchowitz, Michael I. Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers. In Vitaly Feldman, Alexander Rakhlin, and Ohad Shamir, editors, *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 49 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1246–1257, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA, 23–26 Jun 2016. PMLR. URL: http://proceedings.mlr.press/v49/lee16.html.

[33] Y. Lei, T. Hu, G. Li, and K. Tang. Stochastic gradient descent for nonconvex learning without bounded gradient assumptions. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(10):4394–4400, 2020. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2019.2952219.

[34] Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, pages 8157–8166. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/file/54fe976ba170c19ebae453679b362263-Paper.pdf.

[35] Attila Lovas, Iosif Lytras, Miklós Rásonyi, and Sotirios Sabanis. Taming neural networks with TUSLA: Non-convex learning via adaptive stochastic gradient Langevin algorithms, 2020. arXiv:2006.14514.

[36] Lu Lu, Yeonjong Shin, Yanhui Su, and George Em Karniadakis. Dying ReLU and initialization: Theory and numerical examples. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 28(5):1671–1706, 2020. doi:10.4208/cicp.OA-2020-0165.

[37] Eric Moulines and Francis Bach. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24,

pages 451–459. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2011/file/40008b9a5380fcacce3976bf7c08af5b-Paper.pdf.

[38] Yu Nesterov. Universal gradient methods for convex optimization problems. *Math. Program.*, 152(1-2, Ser. A):381–404, 2015. doi:10.1007/s10107-014-0790-0.

[39] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization*, volume 87 of *Applied Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 2004. A basic course. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-8853-9.

[40] Ioannis Panageas and Georgios Piliouras. Gradient Descent Only Converges to Minimizers: Non-Isolated Critical Points and Invariant Regions. In Christos H. Papadimitriou, editor, *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*, volume 67 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:12, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2017. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2017.2.

[41] Ioannis Panageas, Georgios Piliouras, and Xiao Wang. First-order methods almost always avoid saddle points: the case of vanishing step-sizes, 2019. arXiv:1906.07772.

[42] Vivak Patel. Stopping criteria for, and strong convergence of, stochastic gradient descent on Bottou-Curtis-Nocedal functions, 2021. arXiv:2004.00475.

[43] Alexander Rakhlin, Ohad Shamir, and Karthik Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning*, page 1571–1578, Madison, WI, USA, 2012. Omnipress.

[44] Grant Rotskoff and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Parameters as interacting particles: long time convergence and asymptotic error scaling of neural networks. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/file/196f5641aa9dc87067da4ff90fd81e7b-Paper.pdf.

[45] Sebastian Ruder. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms, 2017. arXiv:1609.04747.

[46] Karthik A. Sankararaman, Soham De, Zheng Xu, W. Ronny Huang, and Tom Goldstein. The impact of neural network overparameterization on gradient confusion and stochastic gradient descent, 2020. arXiv:1904.06963.

[47] Mark Schmidt and Nicolas Le Roux. Fast convergence of stochastic gradient descent under a strong growth condition, 2013. arXiv:1308.6370.

[48] Ohad Shamir. Exponential convergence time of gradient descent for one-dimensional deep linear neural networks. In Alina Beygelzimer and Daniel Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2691–2713, Phoenix, USA, 6 2019. PMLR. URL: http://proceedings.mlr.press/v99/shamir19a.html.

[49] Loring W. Tu. *An introduction to manifolds*. Universitext. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7400-6.

[50] Stephan Wojtowytsch. Stochastic gradient descent with noise of machine learning type. Part I: Discrete time analysis, 2021. arXiv:2105.01650.

[51] Yangyang Xu and Wotao Yin. A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 6(3):1758–1789, 2013. doi:10.1137/120887795.

[52] Guodong Zhang, James Martens, and Roger B Grosse. Fast convergence of natural gradient descent for over-parameterized neural networks. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8082–8093. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL: http://papers.nips.cc/paper/9020-fast-convergence-of-natural-gradient-descent-for-over-parameterized-neural-networks.pdf.

[53] Difan Zou, Yuan Cao, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Gradient descent optimizes over-parameterized deep ReLU networks. *Machine Learning*, 109:467–492, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10994-019-05839-6.