arXiv:2302.01002v1 [stat.ML] 2 Feb 2023

Over-parameterised Shallow Neural Networks with Asymmetrical Node Scaling: Global Convergence Guarantees and Feature Learning

François Caron[1], Fadhel Ayed[2], Paul Jung[3], Hoil Lee[4], Juho Lee[5], and Hongseok Yang[6,5,7]

[1]Dept of Statistics, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
[2]Huawei Technologies, Paris, France
[3]Dept of Mathematics and Statistics, Sam Houston State University, Texas, USA
[4]Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea
[5]Kim Jaechul Graduate School of AI, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea
[6]School of Computing, KAIST, South Korea
[7]Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, South Korea

February 3, 2023

Abstract

We consider the optimisation of large and shallow neural networks via gradient flow, where the output of each hidden node is scaled by some positive parameter. We focus on the case where the node scalings are non-identical, differing from the classical Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) parameterisation. We prove that, for large neural networks, with high probability, gradient flow converges to a global minimum AND can learn features, unlike in the NTK regime. We also provide experiments on synthetic and real-world datasets illustrating our theoretical results and showing the benefit of such scaling in terms of pruning and transfer learning.

1 Introduction

The training of neural networks typically involves the minimisation of a non-convex objective function. However, first-order optimisation methods, such as gradient descent (GD) and its variants, often find solutions with low training error. To gain a better understanding of this phenomenon, one fruitful direction of research has been to analyse the properties of GD training of over-parameterised (or large-width) neural networks; that is, neural networks where the number m of hidden nodes is very large. In particular, under a "$\sqrt{1/m}$" scaling of the hidden nodes, Jacot et al. (2018) have shown that, as the number of nodes m tends to infinity, the solution obtained by GD coincides with that of kernel regression under a so-called limiting *Neural Tangent Kernel* (NTK). Under the same node scaling, called *NTK scaling*, theoretical guarantees for the global convergence and generalisation properties have then been obtained for large (but finite) width neural networks (Du et al., 2019b,a; Oymak and Soltanolkotabi, 2020; Arora et al., 2019a; Bartlett et al., 2021).

However, it has been noted in a number of articles (Chizat et al., 2019; Yang, 2019; Arora et al., 2019a) that in this large-width regime, feature learning does not occur; consequently, for large-width neural networks under the NTK scaling, GD training is performed in a *lazy training* regime, in contrast with the typical feature-learning regime exhibited in deep neural networks.

1.1 Summary of the main contributions

In this work, we investigate global convergence properties and feature learning in gradient-type training of neural networks under a more general asymmetrical node scaling. In particular, we consider that each node $j = 1, \ldots, m$ has a fixed node-specific scaling $\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}$, where

$$\lambda_{m,j} = \gamma \cdot \frac{1}{m} + (1-\gamma) \cdot \frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m \widetilde{\lambda}_k} \tag{1}$$

where $\gamma \in [0,1]$ and $1 \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_1 \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_2 \geq \ldots \geq 0$ are nonnegative fixed scalars with $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j = 1$. Note that $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the NTK scaling $\sqrt{1/m}$. If $\gamma < 1$, the node scaling is necessarily asymmetrical for large-width networks.[1] For $(\widetilde{\lambda}_j)_{j \geq 1}$, one can take for instance $\widetilde{\lambda}_j = 6\pi^{-2} j^{-2}$ for all $j \geq 1$; another example is $\widetilde{\lambda}_1 = 1$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_j = 0$ for $j \geq 2$.

We consider a shallow neural network with a ReLU or smooth activation function and without bias, where the first layer weights are trained via gradient flow and empirical risk minimisation under the ℓ_2 loss. We show that, under similar assumptions as in (Du et al., 2019b,a) on the data, activation function, and initialisation, when the number of nodes m is sufficiently large:

- if $\gamma > 0$, then the training error goes to 0 at a linear rate with high probability; and
- feature learning arises if and only if $\gamma < 1$.

We also provide numerical experiments illustrating the theoretical results, and demonstrating empirically that such node-scaling is also useful for network pruning and transfer learning.

1.2 Organisation of the paper

Section 2 introduces the neural network model with asymmetrical node scaling, the gradient flow updates, and the main assumptions on the data, activation function, and initialisation. Section 3 discusses the properties of the NTK at initialisation, and its infinite-width limit. Section 4 derives our main results on the convergence to a global minimum of gradient flow and sketches their proofs. Section 5 gives the main results regarding feature learning. Section 6 describes our experiments on simulated and real datasets, whose results illustrate our theoretical results and their potential applications. Missing detailed proofs can be found in the Appendix.

1.3 Related work

Large-width neural networks. The analysis of large-width neural networks dates back to the work of Neal (1996) who showed the connection between Gaussian processes and neural network models in the infinite-width limit. Recent work has further explored this connection under different assumptions (Matthews et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Yang, 2019; Favaro et al., 2020; Bracale et al., 2021; Jung et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2022).

Large-width neural networks under the NTK scaling. Following the seminal work of Jacot et al. (2018), a number of articles have investigated the benefits of over-parameterisation for gradient descent training, with the "$1/\sqrt{m}$" NTK scaling (Arora et al., 2019b; Du et al., 2019b,a; Lee et al., 2019; Zou and Gu, 2019; Oymak and Soltanolkotabi, 2020; Zou et al., 2020). Crucially, when the size of the network is large enough with respect to the size of the training set, the training loss converges to a global minimum at a linear rate under gradient descent. However, under the NTK scaling, the hidden-layer features do not move significantly when the width is large, and the NTK scaling has been coined lazy training regime for this reason (Chizat et al., 2019; Woodworth et al., 2020).

Large-width neural networks under the mean-field scaling. An alternative scaling is the "$1/m$" mean field scaling (Rotskoff and Vanden-Eijnden, 2018; Mei et al., 2018, 2019; Sirignano and Spiliopoulos, 2020; Chen et al., 2021). The mean field scaling is also equivalent, up to symmetry, to the μP parameterisation of Yang and Hu (2021) in the case of shallow networks. While there is feature learning under the mean-field and μP scalings, the relative contribution of each individual activation to the network output becomes infinitesimal in the large-width limit. In contrast, under asymmetrical scaling, individual activations retain a nontrivial contribution even in the large-width limit.

Asymmetrical scaling in neural networks. The idea of using asymmetrical scaling parameters in the context of (stochastic) gradient descent optimisation of deep neural networks has been previously introduced by Wolinski et al. (2020). The focus of the work of Wolinski et al. (2020) was on the (empirical) usefulness in terms of pruning. Indeed, our experiments in Section 6 are also in line with their findings. Wolinski et al. (2020), however, only consider asymmetrical scaling with $\gamma = 0$ (no fixed part), and did not investigate the global convergence properties under such scaling. The property of random neural networks under (random) asymmetrical node scaling in the large-width limit has also been considered by Lee et al. (2022); but this paper did not investigate the training properties under gradient descent or gradient flow.

1.4 Notations

For an integer $n \geq 1$, let $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. For a multivariate real-valued function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, the gradient $\nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v})$ is the n-dimensional column vector of partial derivatives $\nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v}) = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial v_1}(\mathbf{v}), \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_n}(\mathbf{v}))^\top$ where $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)^\top$. For a square matrix B, we denote its minimum and maximum eigenvalues by $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(B)$

[1] That is, for m large enough, there exists j and k such that $\lambda_{m,j} \neq \lambda_{m,k}$.

and $\mathrm{eig}_{\max}(B)$, respectively. For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $B = \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{v})$ the n-by-n diagonal matrix with $B_{ii} = v_i$ for $i \in [n]$.

2 Problem setup

2.1 Statistical model

We consider a shallow feedforward neural network (FFNN) with one hidden layer of $m \geq 1$ hidden nodes and a scalar output. To simplify the analysis, we assume that there is no bias term. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be some input vector, where $d \geq 1$ is the input dimension. The model is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{for } j \in [m] \\ f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} a_j \sigma(Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})$ is the scalar output of the neural network, $Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})$ is the pre-activation of the j-th hidden node, $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the activation function, $\mathbf{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the column vector of weights between node j at the hidden layer and the input nodes, and $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ is the weight between the hidden node j and the output node. The $\lambda_{m,j}$'s for $j \in [m]$ are nonnegative scaling parameters for hidden nodes. Let $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1^\top, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_m^\top)^\top$ be a column vector of dimension md corresponding to the parameters to be optimised. We assume that σ admits a (weak) derivative σ'. For $n \geq 1$, let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\sigma}' : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$) be the vector-valued multivariate function that applies the real-valued function σ (resp. σ') element-wise on each of the n input variables.

To simplify the analysis, we will assume throughout this article that the output weights a_j are randomly initialised and fixed afterwards: for all $j \geq 1$,

$$a_j \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathrm{Uniform}(\{-1, 1\}). \tag{3}$$

This simplifying assumption is often made when analysing large shallow networks (see e.g. (Du et al., 2019b; Bartlett et al., 2021)), and the analysis can also be extended to the case where both layers are trained.

The scaling parameters $\lambda_{m,j}$ are fixed and parameterised as in Equation (1). By construction, we have $\lambda_{m,1} > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} = 1$ for all $m \geq 1$.

Recall that the case $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the NTK scaling. The case that $\gamma = 0$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_j = \frac{1}{K}$ for $j \in [K]$ for some $K \leq m$ and 0 otherwise corresponds to a finite neural network with width K. In the experiments, we will consider that $(\widetilde{\lambda}_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is the probability mass of a Zipf law:

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_j = \frac{1}{\zeta(1/\alpha)} \frac{1}{j^{1/\alpha}}, \quad j \geq 1 \tag{4}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, where ζ is the Riemann zeta function. The parameter α tunes how quickly $\widetilde{\lambda}_j$ decreases with j, smaller values corresponding to a more rapid decrease and a more asymmetrical node scaling.

2.2 Training with gradient flow

Let $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$ be the training dataset, where $n \geq 1$ is the number of observations. Let $\mathbf{X}$ denote the n-by-d matrix whose ith row is $\mathbf{x}_i^\top$. We want to minimise the empirical risk under the ℓ_2 loss. Consider the objective function

$$L_m(\mathbf{W}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}))^2 \tag{5}$$

which is non-convex in general. For a given dataset $\mathcal{D}_n$, width $m \geq 1$, output weights a_j, and scaling parameters $(\lambda_{m,j})_{j \in [m]}$, we aim to estimate the trainable parameters $\mathbf{W}$ by minimising $L_m(\mathbf{W})$ using continuous-time gradient descent (a.k.a. gradient flow). Let $\mathbf{W}_0$ be some initialisation and $(\mathbf{W}_t)_{t > 0}$ be the solution to the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\frac{d\mathbf{W}_t}{dt} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} L_m(\mathbf{W}_t)$$

with $\lim_{t\to 0} \mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{W}_0$. Let $\mathbf{w}_{tj}$ be the value of the parameter $\mathbf{w}_j$ at time t, and define $Z_{tj}(\mathbf{x}) = Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}_t)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}) &= \frac{\partial f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})}{\partial Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}) \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} a_j \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathbf{x}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, under gradient flow, for $j \in [m]$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathbf{w}_{tj}}{dt} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}_t) \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t)) \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \frac{a_j}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{tj}(\mathbf{x}_i)) \mathbf{x}_i \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t)), \\ \frac{dZ_{tj}(\mathbf{x})}{dt} &= (\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}_t))^\top \frac{d\mathbf{w}_{tj}}{dt} \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \frac{a_j}{d} \mathbf{x}^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{tj}(\mathbf{x}_i)) \mathbf{x}_i \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t)).\end{aligned}$$

Note that the derivatives associated with each hidden node j are scaled by $\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}$. We may view this per-node scaling as using different learning rates for different hidden nodes.

For an input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the output of the neural network therefore satisfies the ODE

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{df_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}_t)}{dt} &= \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}_t)^\top \frac{d\mathbf{W}_t}{dt} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t) \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Theta_m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is the neural tangent kernel, defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{W}) &= \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m(\mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{W}) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}' \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j} \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W})) \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{W})).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The associated neural tangent Gram (NTG) matrix $\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W})$ is the n-by-n symmetric positive semi-definite matrix whose (i, j)-th entry is $\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j; \mathbf{W})$. It takes the form

$$\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j} \operatorname{diag}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_j}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right) \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \operatorname{diag}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_j}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right). \tag{7}$$

2.3 Main assumptions

In this section, we give the main assumptions used in this article. The first set of assumptions is on the training dataset $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$. The assumptions are rather mild, and similar to other assumptions used in the literature.

Assumption 2.1 (Dataset)**.**

(a) All inputs are non-zero and their norms are at most 1: $0 < \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$.
(b) For all $i \neq i'$ and all $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{x}_i \neq c\mathbf{x}_{i'}$.
(c) There exists $C > 0$ such that $|y_i| \leq C$ for all $i \geq 1$.

The next assumption concerns the activation function σ. Standard activation functions ((leaky) ReLU, softplus, tanh, sigmoid, linear) satisfy this assumption.

Assumption 2.2 (Activation function)**.** The activation function is either

(a) the ReLU function $\sigma(x) = \max(0, x)$, with weak derivative $\sigma'(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{x>0\}}$; or
(b) analytic, with $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$ and $|\sigma''(x)| \leq M$ for some $M > 0$, and not a polynomial.

The last assumption, which is standard, is on the initialisation of the weights.

Assumption 2.3 (Initialisation)**.** For $j \in [m]$,

$$\mathbf{w}_{0j} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathrm{I}_d) \tag{8}$$

where I_d is the d-by-d identity matrix.

3 Neural Tangent Kernel at initialisation and its limit

3.1 Mean NTG at initialisation and its minimum eigenvalue

Let $\mathbf{W}_0$ be a random initialisation from Equation (8). Consider the mean NTK at initialisation

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') &= \mathbb{E}\left[\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{W}_0)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{d}\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}' \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma'\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_{01}^\top \mathbf{x}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_{01}^\top \mathbf{x}'\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that this mean NTK, which is also, by the law of large numbers, the limiting NTK under the $1/\sqrt{m}$ scaling (Jacot et al., 2018), does not depend on $(\lambda_{m,j})_{j\geq 1}$ nor m. Let $\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\right]$ be the associated n-by-n mean NTG matrix at initialisation, whose (i, i')-th entry is $\Theta^*(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i'})$. Let

$$\kappa_n = \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})) \tag{10}$$

be the minimum eigenvalue of the mean NTG matrix at initialisation. This minimum eigenvalue plays an important role in the analysis of the global convergence properties in the symmetrical NTK regime. Many authors (see e.g. (El Karoui, 2010; Nguyen et al., 2021)) have shown that, under some assumptions on the data, activation function, and initialisation, κ_n is strictly positive or bounded away from zero. We now state such a result, under the Assumptions of Section 2.3.

Proposition 3.1 ((Du et al., 2019b, Theorem 3.1) and (Du et al., 2019a, Proposition F.1))**.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 to 2.3, $\kappa_n > 0$.*

Remark 3.2. Du et al. (2019b,a) make the assumption that the $\mathbf{x}_i$ have unit norm. But their proof holds under the less strict Assumption 2.1(a).

3.2 Limiting NTG

To give some intuition, we now describe the limiting behaviour of the NTG, for a fixed sample size n, as the width m goes to infinity. The proof, given in Appendix B, follows from the triangle inequality and the law of large numbers, together with the facts that $|\sigma'(z)| \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j\geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j = 1$.

Proposition 3.3. *Consider a sequence $(\mathbf{w}_{0j})_{j\geq 1}$ of iid random vectors distributed as in Assumption 2.3. Assume Assumption 2.2 holds. Then,*

$$\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \to \widehat{\Theta}_\infty(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \tag{11}$$

almost surely as $m \to \infty$, where

$$\widehat{\Theta}_\infty(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) = \gamma\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X}) + (1-\gamma)\widehat{\Theta}_\infty^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)$$

with $\widehat{\Theta}_\infty^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)$ a random positive semi-definite matrix:

$$\widehat{\Theta}_\infty^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j \,\mathrm{diag}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_{0j}}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \,\mathrm{diag}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_{0j}}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right).$$

Also, $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Theta}_\infty(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)] = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Theta}_\infty^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)] = \widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\widehat{\Theta}_\infty(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) - \widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})\|_F^2\right] = C_0(\mathbf{X})(1-\gamma)^2 \sum_{j\geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2 \tag{12}$$

where $||\cdot||_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm, and $C_0(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0$ is some positive constant equal to

$$\sum_{1\leq i,i'\leq n}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'}}{d}\right)^2 \mathrm{Var}\left(\sigma'\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_{01}^\top \mathbf{x}_i\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_{01}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'}\right)\right).$$

When $\gamma = 1$ (symmetric NTK scaling), the NTG converges to a constant matrix, and solutions obtained by GD coincide with that of kernel regression. Whenever $\gamma < 1$, Proposition 3.3 shows that the NTG is random at initialisation, even in the infinite-width limit, suggesting that we are not operating in the kernel regime asymptotically. As shown in Equation (12), the departure from the kernel regime, as measured by the total variance of the limiting random NTG, can be quantified by the nonnegative constant

$$(1-\gamma)^2 \left(\sum_{j \geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2 \right) \in [0, 1].$$

When this constant is close to 0, we approach the kernel regime; increasing this value leads to a departure from the kernel regime, and increases the amount of feature learning (see Section 5). The quantity $\sum_{j \geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2 \in (0, 1]$ is always strictly positive. More rapid decrease of the $\widetilde{\lambda}_j$ as j increases will lead to higher values of $\sum_{j \geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2$. For example, when using the Zipf weights in Equation (4), we have $\sum_{j \geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2 = \frac{\zeta(2/\alpha)}{\zeta(1/\alpha)^2}$, which decreases with α, as shown in Figure 5 in the Appendix.

In this section, we described the behaviour of the NTG at initialisation in the infinite-width limit, and provided some intuition on the node scaling parameters. In the next two sections, we state results on the global convergence and feature learning properties of large, but finite, neural networks under such asymmetrical scaling.

4 Global convergence analysis

4.1 Main results

ReLU case. Our main theorem for ReLU activation functions, which is given below, explains what happens during training via gradient flow. It says that with high probability, the loss decays exponentially fast with respect to κ_n and the training time t, and the weights $\mathbf{w}_{tj}$ and the NTG matrix change by $O\left(\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}^{1/2}}{\kappa_n d^{1/2}}\right)$ and $O\left(\frac{n^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}{\kappa_n d^{3/2}} + \frac{n^{3/2}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}}{\kappa_n^{1/2} d^{5/4}}\right)$, respectively.

Theorem 4.1 (Global convergence, ReLU)**.** *Consider $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $D_0 = \sqrt{2C^2 + (2/d)}$. Assume Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2(a), and Assumption 2.3. Assume $\gamma > 0$ and*

$$m \geq \max\left(\frac{2^3 n \log \frac{4n}{\delta}}{\kappa_n d}, \frac{2^{25} n^4 D_0^2}{\kappa_n^4 d^3 \gamma^2 \delta^5}, \frac{2^{35} n^6 D_0^2}{\kappa_n^6 d^5 \gamma^2 \delta^5} \right).$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following properties hold for all $t \geq 0$:

(a) $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)) \geq \frac{\gamma \kappa_n}{4}$;

(b) $L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \leq e^{-(\gamma \kappa_n t)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$;

(c) $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \frac{2^3 n D_0}{\kappa_n d^{1/2} \gamma \delta^{1/2}} \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}$ *for all* $j \in [m]$;

(d) $\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{2^9 n^2 D_0}{\kappa_n d^{3/2} \gamma \delta^{5/2}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2} \right) + \left(\frac{2^6 n^{3/2} D_0^{1/2}}{\kappa_n^{1/2} d^{5/4} \gamma^{1/2} \delta^{5/4}} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}} \right)$.

The above theorem implies that, whenever $\gamma > 0$, the training error converges to 0 exponentially fast. Additionally, the weight change is bounded by a factor $\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}$ and the NTG change is bounded by a factor $\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}$. We have (see Appendix A.2), as $m \to \infty$, $\lambda_{m,j} \to (1-\gamma)\widetilde{\lambda}_j$, $j \geq 1$, and $\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{3/2} \to (1-\gamma)^{3/2} \sum_{j=1}^\infty \widetilde{\lambda}_j^{3/2}$. If $\widetilde{\lambda}_j > 0$ (note that we necessarily have $\widetilde{\lambda}_1 > 0$) the upper bound in (c) is therefore vanishing in the infinite-width limit if and only if $\gamma = 1$ (NTK regime); similarly, the upper bound in (d) is vanishing if and only if $\gamma = 1$. Although we were not able to obtain matching lower bounds, we show in Section 5 that indeed feature learning arises whenever $\gamma < 1$.

Smooth activation case. We now state a similar result in the smooth activation case. First define

$$C_1 = \sup_{c \in (0,1]} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\sigma\left(\frac{cz}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^2 \right]. \tag{13}$$

Theorem 4.2. *(Global convergence, smooth activation) Consider $\delta \in (0,1)$. Assume Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2(b), and Assumption 2.3. Assume $\gamma > 0$ and*

$$m \geq \max\left(\frac{2^3 n \log\frac{2n}{\delta}}{\kappa_n d}, \frac{2^{10} n^3 M^2 (C^2+C_1)}{\kappa_n^3 d^3 \gamma^2 \delta}, \frac{2^{15} n^4 M^2 (C^2+C_1)}{\kappa_n^4 d^4 \gamma^2 \delta}\right).$$

Then, with probability at least $1-\delta$, the following properties hold for all $t \geq 0$:

(a) $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)) \geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}$;

(b) $L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \leq e^{-(\gamma\kappa_n t)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$;

(c) $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \times \frac{n}{\kappa_n d^{1/2}} \sqrt{\frac{2^7(C^2+C_1)}{\gamma^2\delta}}$ *for all* $j \in [m]$;

(d) $\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{2^7 n^3 M^2 (C^2+C_1)}{\kappa_n^2 d^3 \gamma^2 \delta} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^2\right) + \left(\frac{2^5 n^2 M (C^2+C_1)^{1/2}}{\kappa_n d^2 \gamma \delta^{1/2}} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^2}\right)$.

The same comments as in the previous section apply here. The proof is slightly different than in the ReLU case, and leads to a different factor $\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^2}$ for the change of the NTG in (d).

4.2 Sketch of the proofs

We give here a sketch of the proofs of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. The detailed proofs are given in Appendices E and F, with secondary lemmas and propositions given in Appendices C and D.

The structures of the proofs of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 are similar to that of (Du et al., 2019b, Theorem 3.2), which showed analogous results on the global convergence under the NTK scaling. There are some key differences however which we highlight below.

Gradient flow converges to a global minimum of the objective function if the minimum eigenvalue of the NTG matrix $\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)$ is bounded away from zero by some positive constant for all $t \geq 0$. In the NTK scaling case, Du et al. (2019b) showed that it is satisfied as, for m sufficiently large, with high probability:

(i) the NTG matrix at initialisation is close to its mean, and the minimum eigenvalue is close to that of the mean NTG,
(ii) the weights $\mathbf{w}_{tj}$ are almost constant over time, which implies
(iii) the NTG matrix is almost constant over time, hence
(iv) the minimum eigenvalue of the NTG matrix at time t is close to that at initialisation, which is bounded away from zero.

However, in the case of asymmetrical node scaling ($\gamma < 1$), none of the points (i-iv) holds. At initialisation, the random NTG matrix may be significantly different from its mean. Additionally, as we will discuss in Section 5, both the weights and the NTG matrix substantially change over time. This therefore requires a somewhat different approach that we now describe.

Let $\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)} = \frac{\gamma}{m}$ and $\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)} = (1-\gamma)\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m \widetilde{\lambda}_k}$, and note that $\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)} + \lambda_{m,j}^{(2)} = \lambda_{m,j}$. For $k \in \{1,2\}$, let $\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}$ be the n-by-n symmetric positive semi-definite matrices defined by Equation (7), with $\lambda_{m,j}$ replaced by either $\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}$. Note that

$$\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) = \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) + \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) \tag{14}$$

with $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)] = \gamma\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})$.

The key idea of the proof is to use the above decomposition of the NTG matrix as a sum of two terms, and to show that, while the second term may change over time, the first term is close to its mean at initialisation, and does not change over time. The important points of the proof are as follows. For large m, with high probability,

(i) $\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)$ is close to its mean $\gamma\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})$ and its minimum eigenvalue is therefore lower bounded by $\frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2}$;
(ii) while the weights $\mathbf{W}_t$ may change significantly over time, $\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)$ remains almost constant over time;
(iii) as a result, the minimum eigenvalue of $\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)$ can be lower bounded by $\frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}$;
(iv) this implies that the minimum eigenvalue of the overall NTG matrix $\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)$ is lower bounded by $\frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}$.

5 Feature learning analysis

In this section we provide some results about feature learning when $\gamma < 1$.

5.1 Weight change by the first gradient update

We first show that on average, each individual weight in the network changes on the order of $\lambda_{m,j}$ by the first gradient-update step. To state this formally, for $j \in [m]$ and $k \in [d]$, let w_{0jk} be the k-th component of the weight vector $\mathbf{w}_{0j}$ at initialisation, and define a function $g_1 : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)}\left[\sigma\left(\frac{z\|\mathbf{x}\|}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{z\|\mathbf{x}\|}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right].$$

In the ReLU case, we have $g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|/\sqrt{2\pi d}$. The next theorem describes our result on weight change, and its proof appears in Appendix G.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume Assumption 2.2 holds. For all $j \in [m]$ and $k \in [d]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{dw_{tjk}}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\right] = -\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ik}g_1(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

In particular, if σ is the ReLU function, this expectation is $-\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ik}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|$.

Recall that $\lambda_{m,j} \to (1-\gamma)\widetilde{\lambda}_j$ as $m \to \infty$. Hence, if $\gamma < 1$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_j > 0$, the expected change of the weight vector $\mathbf{w}_j$ at the first GD update is non-vanishing in the infinite-width limit.

5.2 NTK change by the first gradient update in the smooth activation case

We now consider a smooth activation function σ satisfying Assumption 2.2(b). The next result characterises how much the NTK kernel at time 0 changes on average, using the neural tangent hierarchy (Huang and Yau, 2020). Let g_2 be a function of type $(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$g_2(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbb{E}_{(z_1,z_2,z_3)}\left[\sigma''(z_1)\sigma'(z_2)\sigma'(z_3)\sigma(z_3)\right],$$

where $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is distributed as a multivariate zero-mean Gaussian with the following covariance matrix:

$$\Sigma = \frac{1}{d}\begin{pmatrix} \|\mathbf{x}_k\|^2 & \mathbf{x}_k^\top\mathbf{x}_\ell & \mathbf{x}_k^\top\mathbf{x}_i \\ \mathbf{x}_\ell^\top\mathbf{x}_k & \|\mathbf{x}_\ell\|^2 & \mathbf{x}_\ell^\top\mathbf{x}_i \\ \mathbf{x}_i^\top\mathbf{x}_k & \mathbf{x}_i^\top\mathbf{x}_\ell & \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The evolution equation for $\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell; \mathbf{W}_t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell; \mathbf{W}_t)}{dt} &= \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell; \mathbf{W}_t)\right)^\top \frac{d\mathbf{W}_t}{dt} \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}(f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t) - y_i) \times \left\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{W}}\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell; \mathbf{W}_t),\, \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_t)\right\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.2. *Assume Assumption 2.2(b) holds. For all $\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell \in (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{d\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell; \mathbf{W}_t)}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\right] = -\frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top\mathbf{x}_\ell}{d^{3/2}} \times \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^2\right) \times \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left((\mathbf{x}_k^\top\mathbf{x}_i)g_2(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{x}_i) + (\mathbf{x}_\ell^\top\mathbf{x}_i)g_2(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_i)\right)\right].$$

The above theorem shows that the expected change to the NTK at initialisation is scaled by the factor $\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^2$, which converges to $(1-\gamma)^2\sum_j \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2$ as $m \to \infty$. The expected change in the NTK at the first GD iteration is therefore bounded away from zero when $\gamma < 1$.

6 Experiments

The code to reproduce the experiments in this section can be found in this repository.




Figure 1: Results on simulated data. From left to right, 1) training risks, 2) differences in weight norms $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\|$ with the j's being those neurons which have maximal differences at the end of the training, 3) differences in NTG matrices, and 4) minimum eigenvalues of NTG matrices.




Figure 2: A subset of results for the regression experiments. From left to right, 1) the differences in weight norms $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\|$ with js being the neurons having the maximum difference at the end of the training for `concrete` dataset, 2) the differences in NTG matrices for `energy` dataset, 3) training risks of pruned models for `airfoil` dataset, and 4) test risks of transferred models for `plant` dataset.




Figure 3: A subset of results for MNIST dataset. (Left) test accuracies of the pruned models, and (right) test accuracies of transferred models.




Figure 4: Results for Cifar10 data. From left to right, 1) test risk through training, 2) the differences in weight norms $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\|$ with js being the neurons having the maximum difference at the end of the training, 3) the test risks of the pruned models, and 4) test accuracies of the pruned models.

6.1 Simulated data

We first illustrate our theory on simulated data. We generate a dataset with $n = 100$ observations where, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\mathbf{x}_i$ is $d = 50$ dimensional and sampled uniformly on the unit sphere and $y_i = \frac{5}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d} \sin(\pi x_{i,j}) + \varepsilon_i$ where $\varepsilon_i \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. We use a wide shallow neural network as described in Section 2.1, with $m = 2000$ hidden nodes and scaling parameters $\lambda_{m,j}$ defined as in Equation (1), where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ and $(\widetilde{\lambda}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ is the probability mass of a Zipf law with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, see Equation (4). We consider four values for the pair of parameters (γ, α): $\gamma = 1$, $(\gamma, \alpha) = (0.5, 0.7)$, $(\gamma, \alpha) = (0.5, 0.5)$, and $(\gamma, \alpha) = (0, 0.4)$. For each setting, we run gradient descent with a learning rate of 1.0 for 50 000 steps, which is repeated five times to get average results.

We summarise the results in Figure 1, which shows the training error and the evolution of the weights, NTG, and minimum eigenvalue of the NTG as a function of the GD iterations. We see a clear correspondence between the theory and the empirical results. For $\gamma > 0$, GD achieves near-zero training error. The minimum eigenvalue and the training rates increase with the value of γ. For $\gamma = 1$, we have the highest minimum eigenvalue and the fastest training rate; however, there is no/very little feature learning: the weights and the NTG do not change significantly over the GD iterations. When $\gamma < 1$, there is clear evidence of feature learning: both the weights and the NTG change significantly over time; the smaller γ and α, the more feature learning arises.

6.2 Regression

We also validate our model on four real-world regression datasets from the UCI repository[2]: `concrete` (concrete compressive strength, $(n, d) = (1030, 9)$), `energy` (energy efficiency, $(n, d) = (768, 8)$), `airfoil` (airfoil self-noise, $(n, d) = (1503, 6)$), and `plant` (combined cycle power plant, $(n, d) = (9568, 4)$). We split each dataset into training (40%) , test (20%), and validation sets (40%), and the validation set is used to test transfer learning. We use the same parameters as in Section 6.1, and we now train our neural networks for 100 000 steps in each run.

In addition, to further highlight the presence of feature learning in our model, we conduct two experiments. Firstly, we test the prunability of the networks. We gradually prune those hidden nodes which have small feature importance and measure risks after pruning. Here, feature importance is measured as $(\lambda_{m,j}\|\mathbf{w}_{t,j}\|^2)_{j\in[m]}$, and our theory suggests that a model with smaller γ and/or α values is likely to be more robust with respect to pruning, as long as $\gamma < 1$. Similar empirical findings were made by Wolinski et al. (2020) about the benefits of asymmetrical scaling for neural network pruning, in the case $\gamma = 0$. Secondly, we test the transferability of the features learnt from our networks as follows. We first split the validation set into a held-out training set (50%) and a test set (50%), and extract features of the held-out training set using the neural networks trained with the original training set. The features are taken to be the output of the hidden layers, so each data point in the validation set is represented with a $m = 2000$ dimensional vector. Then, we sort the feature dimensions with respect to feature importance as above and use the top-k of these to train an external model. The chosen external model is a FFNN with a single hidden layer having 64 neurons and a ReLU activation function, and it is trained for 5,000 steps of gradient descent with a learning rate of 1.0. Again, our theory suggests that a model with smaller γ and α values is likely to exhibit better transfer learning.

We summarise a subset of our results in Figure 2; additional results can be found in Appendix I. In line with the simulated data experiments, we observe a stronger presence of feature learning, in terms of weight-norm changes and NTG changes, for smaller values of γ and α. Also, we observe that models with smaller γ values are more robust to pruning, allowing them to retain relatively low training risks for larger numbers of pruned nodes. A similar phenomenon is seen in transfer learning, where models with smaller values of γ have lower risks when a small number of features are used for the transfer. The interpretation is that those models are able to learn a sufficient number of representative features using a relatively small number of neurons.

6.3 Classification

Finally, we apply our model on image classification tasks. We conduct two experiments, 1) a small-scale experiment under the same setting assumed in our theory, and 2) a larger-scale experiment under a more realistic setting.

MNIST. We take a subset of size 5,000 from the MNIST dataset and train the same models used in the previous experiments. We also test pruning and transfer learning, where we use an additional subset of size 5,000 to train an external FFNN having a single hidden layer with 128 nodes. To match our theory, instead of using cross-entropy loss, we use the MSE loss by treating one-hot class labels as continuous-valued targets. The outputs of the models are 10 dimensional, so we compute the NTG matrices using only the first dimension of the outputs. In general, we get similar results in line with our previous experiments. The pruning and transfer learning results are displayed in Figure 3. Other results can be found in Figure 10 in the Appendix.

[2] `https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets.php`

CIFAR10. We consider a more challenging image classification task, CIFAR10. The dataset is composed of 60 000 images, among which 50 000 are used for training and the rest for testing. There are ten different classes. We illustrate the described benefits of asymmetrical node scaling and show they hold for this more challenging problem. In many applications, one uses a large model pre-trained on a general task and then performs fine-tuning or transfer learning to adapt it to the task at hand. This is the approach we implement here. We consider a Resnet-18 model, pre-trained on the ImageNet dataset. Using this model, we transform each one of the original images to a vector of dimension 512. We then train wide shallow neural networks as described in Section 2.1, with $m = 2000$, and output dimensions respectively 10. The experimental setup differs from previous results as 1) we use stochastic gradient descent with a mini-batch size of 64 instead of full batch gradient descent, here a step is a mini-batch step; 2) we use the cross-entropy loss instead of the MSE. All experiments are run five times, the learning rate is set to 5.0. In Figure 4, we report the results for the same four values of (γ, α) pairs. We can see that the main conclusions of the previous experiments hold in this setting as well, even though the theory does not apply directly. Additional results, investigating the effect of γ, are given in Figure 11 in the Appendix.

References

S. Arora, S. Du, W. Hu, Z. Li, and R. Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 322–332. PMLR, 2019a.

S. Arora, S. S. Du, W. Hu, Z. Li, R. Salakhutdinov, and R. Wang. On exact computation with an infinitely wide neural net. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019b.

P. Bartlett, A. Montanari, and A. Rakhlin. Deep learning: a statistical viewpoint. *Acta numerica*, 30:87–201, 2021.

D. Bracale, S. Favaro, S. Fortini, and S. Peluchetti. Large-width functional asymptotics for deep gaussian neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Z. Chen, E. Vanden-Eijnden, and J. Bruna. On feature learning in neural networks with global convergence guarantees. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

L. Chizat, E. Oyallon, and F. Bach. On lazy training in differentiable programming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

S. Du, J. Lee, H. Li, L. Wang, and X. Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1675–1685. PMLR, 2019a.

S. Du, X. Zhai, B. Poczos, and A. Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019b.

N. El Karoui. The spectrum of kernel random matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(1):1–50, 2010.

S. Favaro, S. Fortini, and S. Peluchetti. Stable behaviour of infinitely wide deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS'20)*, pages 1137–1146, 2020.

J. Huang and H.-T. Yau. Dynamics of deep neural networks and neural tangent hierarchy. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4542–4551. PMLR, 2020.

A. Jacot, F. Gabriel, and C. Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS'18)*, pages 8571–8580, 2018.

P. Jung, H. Lee, J. Lee, and H. Yang. α-stable convergence of heavy-tailed infinitely-wide neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11064*, 2021.

H. Lee, F. Ayed, P. Jung, J. Lee, and F. Yang, H.and Caron. Deep neural networks with dependent weights: Gaussian process mixture limit, heavy tails, sparsity and compressibility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08187*, 2022.

J. Lee, Y. Bahri, R. Novak, S. S. Schoenholz, J. Pennington, and J. Sohl-Dickstein. Deep neural networks as Gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR'18)*, 2018.

J. Lee, L. Xiao, S. Schoenholz, Y. Bahri, R. Novak, J. Sohl-Dickstein, and J. Pennington. Wide neural networks of any depth evolve as linear models under gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.

A. G. d. G. Matthews, J. Hron, M. Rowland, R. E. Turner, and Z. Ghahramani. Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR'18)*, 2018.

S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P.-M. Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33):E7665–E7671, 2018.

S. Mei, T. Misiakiewicz, and A. Montanari. Mean-field theory of two-layers neural networks: dimension-free bounds and kernel limit. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2388–2464. PMLR, 2019.

R. M. Neal. Priors for infinite networks. In *Bayesian Learning for Neural Networks*, pages 29–53. Springer New York, 1996.

Q. Nguyen, M. Mondelli, and G. F. Montufar. Tight bounds on the smallest eigenvalue of the neural tangent kernel for deep ReLU networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8119–8129. PMLR, 2021.

S. Oymak and M. Soltanolkotabi. Toward moderate overparameterization: Global convergence guarantees for training shallow neural networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 1(1):84–105, 2020.

G. Rotskoff and E. Vanden-Eijnden. Parameters as interacting particles: long time convergence and asymptotic error scaling of neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.

J. Sirignano and K. Spiliopoulos. Mean field analysis of neural networks: A law of large numbers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80(2):725–752, 2020.

J. A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12 (4):389–434, 2012.

P. Wolinski, G. Charpiat, and Y. Ollivier. Asymmetrical scaling layers for stable network pruning. *OpenReview Archive*, 2020.

B. Woodworth, S. Gunasekar, J. D. Lee, E. Moroshko, P. Savarese, I. Golan, D. Soudry, and N. Srebro. Kernel and rich regimes in overparametrized models. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3635–3673. PMLR, 2020.

G. Yang. Wide feedforward or recurrent neural networks of any architecture are Gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS'19)*, pages 9947–9960, 2019.

G. Yang and E. Hu. Tensor programs iv: Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11727–11737. PMLR, 2021.

D. Zou and Q. Gu. An improved analysis of training over-parameterized deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.

D. Zou, Y. Cao, D. Zhou, and Q. Gu. Gradient descent optimizes over-parameterized deep ReLU networks. *Machine learning*, 109(3):467–492, 2020.

A Useful bounds and identities

A.1 Matrix Chernoff inequalities

The following matrix bounds can be found in (Tropp, 2012).

Proposition A.1. *Consider a finite sequence $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_p)$ of independent, random, positive semi-definite $n \times n$ matrices with $\mathrm{eig}_{\max}(X_j) \leq R$ almost surely for all $j \in [p]$, for some $R > 0$. Define*

$$\mu_{\min} = \mathrm{eig}_{\min}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}[X_j]\right) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mu_{\max} = \mathrm{eig}_{\max}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}[X_j]\right).$$

Then

$$\Pr\left(\mathrm{eig}_{\min}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} X_j\right) \leq (1-\delta)\mu_{\min}\right) \leq n\left[\frac{e^{-\delta}}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}}\right]^{\mu_{\min}/R} \leq ne^{-\delta^2\mu_{\min}/(2R)} \textit{ for } \delta \in [0,1)$$

$$\Pr\left(\mathrm{eig}_{\max}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} X_j\right) \geq (1+\delta)\mu_{\max}\right) \leq n\left[\frac{e^{\delta}}{(1+\delta)^{1+\delta}}\right]^{\mu_{\max}/R} \leq ne^{-\delta^2\mu_{\max}/((2+\delta)R)} \textit{ for } \delta \geq 0.$$

A.2 Some identities on $(\lambda_{m,j})_{j\in[m]}$

The following proposition summarised a number of useful properties on the scaling parameters.

Proposition A.2. *For all $m \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} = 1, \tag{15}$$

$$\sqrt{\gamma m} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \leq \sqrt{m}. \tag{16}$$

For every $r > 1$, as $m \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^r \sim \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)}\right)^r \to (1-\gamma)^r \sum_{j\geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^r. \tag{17}$$

Proof. Equation (15) follows from the definition of $\lambda_{m,j}$ as shown below:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\gamma}{m} + (1-\gamma)\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^{m}\widetilde{\lambda}_k}\right) = \gamma + (1-\gamma)\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^{m}\widetilde{\lambda}_k} = \gamma + (1-\gamma) = 1.$$

In Equation (16), the upper bound follows from Cauchy-Schwarz and Equation (15), and the lower bound from the definition of $\lambda_{m,j}$:

$$\sqrt{\gamma m} = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{m}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} 1} = 1 \cdot \sqrt{m}.$$

For Equation (17), we note the following bounds on the sum of the $\lambda_{m,j}^r$ for all $r > 1$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)}\right)^r \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m}(\lambda_{m,j})^r \leq \left(\left[\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)}\right)^r\right]^{1/r} + \left[\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)}\right)^r\right]^{1/r}\right)^r$$

where the second inequality uses Minkowski inequality. But as $m \to \infty$, the term $\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)})^r = \gamma^r m^{-(r-1)} \to 0$. Furthermore, as $m \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)}\right)^r = \frac{(1-\gamma)^r}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m}\tilde{\lambda}_k\right)^r}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\tilde{\lambda}_j^r \to (1-\gamma)^r\sum_{j\geq 1}\tilde{\lambda}_j^r$$

because $(\sum_{k\geq 1}\tilde{\lambda}_k)^r = 1$. □




Figure 5: Value of $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2$ as a function of α, where $(\widetilde{\lambda}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ are defined as in Equation (4), As $\alpha \to 1$, it converges to 0, which corresponds to the kernel regime.

Figure 5 shows the value of $\sum_{j\geq 1} \widetilde{\lambda}_j^2 = \frac{\zeta(2/\alpha)}{\zeta(1/\alpha)^2}$ as a function of α, when using the Zipf weights Equation (4).

B Proof of Proposition 3.3 on the limiting NTG

It is sufficient to look at the convergence of individual entries of the NTG matrix; that is, to show that, for each pair $1 \leq i, i' \leq n$,

$$\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0) = \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'}}{d}\right) \times \left(\frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0)) + \frac{(1-\gamma)}{\sum_{k=1}^{m} \widetilde{\lambda}_k} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \widetilde{\lambda}_j \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0))\right) \tag{18}$$

tends to

$$\gamma\Theta^*(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i'}) + \frac{(1-\gamma)}{d}\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0)) \tag{19}$$

almost surely as $m \to \infty$. Using the fact that $|\sigma'(z)| \leq 1$ and the triangle inequality, the modulus of the difference between the RHS of Equation (18) and Equation (19) is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'}}{d}\right| \left(\gamma \cdot \left|\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0))\right) - \mathbb{E}[\sigma'(Z_1(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_1(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0))]\right| \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + (1-\gamma) \cdot \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \widetilde{\lambda}_j} - 1\right) \sum_{j=1}^{m} \widetilde{\lambda}_j + \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j\right]\right) \\
&= \left|\frac{\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{x}_{i'}}{d}\right| \left(\gamma \cdot \left|\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0))\right) - \mathbb{E}[\sigma'(Z_1(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))\sigma'(Z_1(\mathbf{x}_{i'}; \mathbf{W}_0))]\right| \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + (1-\gamma) \cdot 2 \cdot \left[1 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \widetilde{\lambda}_j\right]\right)
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 almost surely as m tends to infinity using the law of large numbers and the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j = 1$.

C Secondary Proposition - NTG at initialisation

The following proposition is a corollary of Lemma 4 in (Oymak and Soltanolkotabi, 2020). It holds under both the ReLU and smooth activation cases. A proof is included for completeness.

Proposition C.1. *Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. Assume Assumptions 2.1 to 2.3 hold. Assume that $\gamma > 0$ and $m \geq \frac{2^3 n \log \frac{n}{\delta}}{\kappa_n d}$. Then, with probability at least $1-\delta$,*

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) > \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2} > 0.$$

Proof. We follow here the proof of Lemma 4 in (Oymak and Soltanolkotabi, 2020).

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}A_j \\ &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)}A_j + \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(2)}A_j\end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_j = \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_j/\sqrt{d}))\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_j/\sqrt{d})).$$

Let $\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(1)}A_j = \frac{\gamma}{md}\sum_{j=1}^{m}A_j$. Note that $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}))$ a.s., and

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)] = \gamma\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})$$

where $\widehat{\Theta}^*(\mathbf{X})$ is defined in Equation (9). We have, for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_j\|_2 = \mathrm{eig}_{\max}(A_j) &\leq \mathrm{eig}_{\max}(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}_j/\sqrt{d}))^2)\,\mathrm{eig}_{\max}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) \leq \mathrm{eig}_{\max}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) \\ &\leq \mathrm{trace}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top) \leq n.\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

At initialisation, $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ are independent random matrices. Using matrix Chernoff inequalities (see Proposition A.1), we obtain, for any $\epsilon \in [0,1)$,

$$\Pr\left(\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) \leq (1-\epsilon)\gamma\kappa_n\right) \leq n e^{-\epsilon^2 m\kappa_n d/(2n)}.$$

Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. Taking $\epsilon = 1/2$, we have that, if $\frac{m\kappa_n d}{2^3 n} \geq \log\frac{n}{\delta}$, then

$$\Pr\left(\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) \leq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2}\right) \leq \delta.$$

□

D Secondary Lemmas on gradient flow dynamics

The proof technique used to prove Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 is similar to that of (Du et al., 2019b) (NTK scaling). In particular, we provide in this section Lemmas similar to Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 in (Du et al., 2019b), but adapted to our setting. Lemma D.1 is an adaptation of Lemma 3.3. Lemmas D.2 and D.4 are adaptations of Lemma 3.2, respectively for the ReLU and smooth activation cases. Lemmas D.3 and D.5 are adaptations of Lemma 3.4, respectively for the ReLU and smooth activation cases.

D.1 Lemma on the exponential decay of the empirical risk and scaling of the weight changes

The following lemma is an adaptation of Lemma 3.3, and applies to both the ReLU and smooth activation cases. It shows that, if the minimum eigenvalue of the NTG matrix is bounded away from 0, gradient flow converges to a global minimum at a linear rate. Recall that $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma D.1. *Let $t > 0$ and $\zeta > 0$. Assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Also, assume that $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s)) \geq \frac{\zeta}{2}$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t$. Then,*

$$L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \leq e^{-\zeta t}L_m(\mathbf{W}_0),$$

and for all $j \in [m]$,

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\,\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\|\,\frac{2}{\zeta}, \tag{21}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_0 = (f_m(\mathbf{x}_1;\mathbf{W}_0), \ldots, f_m(\mathbf{x}_n;\mathbf{W}_0))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. For $0 \le s \le t$, write $\mathbf{u}_s = (f_m(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{W}_s), \ldots, f_m(\mathbf{x}_n; \mathbf{W}_s))^\top$. We have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathbf{u}_s = \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s)(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{dL_m(\mathbf{W}_s)}{ds} = -(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s)^\top \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s)(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s) \le -\frac{\zeta}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s)^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s) = -\zeta L_m(\mathbf{W}_s).$$

Using Grönwall's inequality, we obtain

$$L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \le e^{-\zeta t} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0).$$

For $0 \le s \le t$, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{d\mathbf{w}_{sj}}{ds} \right\|^2 &= \left\| \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \frac{a_j}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{sj}(\mathbf{x}_i)) \mathbf{x}_i \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_s)) \right\|^2 \\
&= \frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{sj}(\mathbf{x}_i)) x_{ik} \cdot (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_s)) \right)^2 \\
&\le \frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ik}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{sj}(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_s))^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma'(Z_{sj}(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_s))^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ik}^2 \right) \\
&\le \frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_s))^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d x_{ik}^2 \right) \\
&\le \frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_s\|^2 \\
&\le \frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\|^2 e^{-\zeta s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating and using Minkowski's integral inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| = \left\| \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{w}_{sj} ds \right\| &\le \int_0^t \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{w}_{sj} \right\| ds \\
&\le \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\| \int_0^t e^{-\zeta s/2} ds \\
&\le \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\| \frac{2}{\zeta}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

From now on, the proofs for the ReLU and smooth-activation cases slightly differ.

D.2 Lemma on the bound of the NTK change and minimum eigenvalue - ReLU case

The next lemma and its proof are similar to Lemma 3.2 in (Du et al., 2019b) and its proof. Recall that $0 < \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \le 1$ for every $i \in [n]$, and the $\mathbf{w}_{0j}$ are iid $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathrm{I}_d)$.

Lemma D.2. *Let $\delta \in (0,1)$, and $c_{m,j} > 0$ for every $j \in [m]$. Assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 and Assumption 2.2(a) hold. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds. For every $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1^\top, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_m^\top)^\top$, if it satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{0j} - \mathbf{w}_j\| \le \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{4} \quad \textit{for all } j \in [m],$$

we have

$$\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \right\|_2 \le \frac{n}{d} \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n}{d} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}} \qquad \textit{for all } k \in [2]$$

and

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{n\gamma}{dm}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n\gamma}{dm^{1/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}}\right). \tag{22}$$

Proof. For $k \in [2]$, let

$$f_m^{(k)}(-;\mathbf{W}) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{W}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}} a_j \sigma(Z_j(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{W})).$$

Define $\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})$ to be the n-by-(md) matrix whose i-th row is the md-dimensional row vector $(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}))^\top$.

Note that for all $k \in [2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 &= \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})^\top - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)^\top\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

The justification of the inequality from above is given below (which is an expanded version of the three equations (364-366) in (Bartlett et al., 2021)): for all n-by-(pd) matrices A and B,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|AA^\top - BB^\top\right\|_2 &= \left\|\frac{1}{2}(A-B)(A+B)^\top + \frac{1}{2}(A+B)(A-B)^\top\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\left\|(A-B)(A+B)^\top\right\|_2 + \left\|(A+B)(A-B)^\top\right\|_2\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|A-B\|_2 \times \left\|(A+B)^\top\right\|_2 + \|A+B\|_2 \times \left\|(A-B)^\top\right\|_2\right) \\
&= \|A-B\|_2 \times \|A+B\|_2 \\
&\leq \|A-B\|_2 \times (\|A-B+B\|_2 + \|B\|_2) \\
&\leq \|A-B\|_2 \times (\|A-B\|_2 + 2\|B\|_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Coming back to the inequality in Equation (23), we next bound the two terms $\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2$ and $\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2$ there.

We bound the first term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 \leq \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \left|\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right|^2 \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{d} \\
&\leq \frac{n}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \leq \frac{n}{d}\gamma_k
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $\gamma_1 = \gamma$ and $\gamma_2 = 1-\gamma$. The second inequality uses the assumption that $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$. The third inequality follows from the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} = 1$.

For the second term, we recall that $Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i$. Using this fact, we derive an upper bound for the

second term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 &\le \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left\|\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}}a_j\frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\left[\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right]\right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\,\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\left|\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right|^2. \quad (25)\end{aligned}$$

In the rest of the proof, we will derive a probabilistic bound on the upper bound just obtained, and show the conclusions claimed in the lemma.

For any $\epsilon > 0$, $i \in [n]$, and $j \in [m]$, we define the event

$$A_{i,j}(\epsilon) = \left\{\exists \mathbf{w}_j \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{w}_{0j} - \mathbf{w}_j\| \le \epsilon \text{ and } \sigma'(\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i) \ne \sigma'(\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i)\right\}.$$

If this event happens, we have $|\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i| \le \epsilon$. To see this, assume that $A_{i,j}(\epsilon)$ holds with $\mathbf{w}_j$ as a witness of the existential quantification, and note that since the norm of $\mathbf{x}_i$ is at most 1,

$$\left|\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i\right| \le \|\mathbf{w}_{0j} - \mathbf{w}_j\|\,\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \le \epsilon.$$

If $\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i > 0$, then $\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i \le 0$ and thus

$$\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \le \epsilon + \mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i < \epsilon.$$

Alternatively, if $\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \le 0$, then $\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i > 0$ and thus

$$-\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \le \epsilon - \mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i \le \epsilon.$$

In both cases, we have the desired $|\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i| \le \epsilon$.

Using the observation that we have just explained and the fact that $\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2)$, we obtain, for a random variable $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(A_{i,j}(\epsilon)) \le \Pr\left(|N| \le \frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|}\right) &= \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|\sqrt{2}}\right) \\ &\le \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\left(4\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\right)/\pi\right)} \\ &\le \sqrt{\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\pi}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|}, \quad (26)\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses $\operatorname{erf}(x) \le \sqrt{1 - \exp(-(4x^2)/\pi)}$. Let $\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)$ be the constraint on $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1^\top, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_m^\top)^\top$ defined by

$$\mathbf{W} \in \Psi(\mathbf{W}_0) \iff \|\mathbf{w}_{0j'} - \mathbf{w}_{j'}\| \le \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j'}}{4} \text{ for all } j' \in [m].$$

Then, for all $k = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2\right] \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left|\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right|^2\right] \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\Pr\left(\exists\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)\text{ s.t. }\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}))\neq\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right) \\
&\quad= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\Pr\left(\exists\mathbf{w}_j\text{ s.t. }\|\mathbf{w}_{0j}-\mathbf{w}_j\|\le\frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{4}\text{ and }\sigma'(\mathbf{w}_j^\top\mathbf{x}_i)\neq\sigma'(\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i)\right) \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\Pr\left(A_{i,j}(\delta^2 c_{m,j}/4)\right) \\
&\quad\le \frac{(\delta^2/4)}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j} \\
&\quad\le \frac{n(\delta^2/4)}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses the bound in Equation (25), and the fourth inequality uses the inequality derived in Equation (26).

We bring together the bound on the expectation just shown and also the bounds proved in Equations (23) and (24). Recalling that $\gamma_1 = \gamma$ and $\gamma_2 = 1-\gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2\right] \\
&\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2\right] \\
&\qquad + 2\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2\right] \\
&\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2\right] \\
&\qquad + 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{d}\gamma_k}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2\right] \\
&\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2\right] \\
&\qquad + 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{d}\gamma_k}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2\right]} \\
&\le \frac{n(\delta^2/4)}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j} + 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{d}\gamma_k}\sqrt{\frac{n(\delta^2/4)}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j}} \\
&\le \frac{\delta}{2}\left(\frac{n}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j} + \frac{2n}{d}\sqrt{\gamma_k\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality uses Jensen's inequality, and the last uses the fact that $\delta/2 \ge (\delta/2)^2$. Hence, for each $k = 1, 2$, by Markov inequality, we have, with probability at least $1-(\delta/2)$,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{W}\in\Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)}\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 \le \frac{n}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j} + \frac{2n}{d}\sqrt{\gamma_k}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}c_{m,j}}.$$

By union bound, the conjunction of the above inequalities for the $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ cases holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We prove the last remaining claim using the following lemma.

If A and B are real symmetric matrices, then

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(A) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(B) - \|A - B\|_2,$$

which holds because

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(A) = \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(B - (A - B)) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(B) - \mathrm{eig}_{\max}(A - B) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(B) - \|A - B\|_2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{\mathbf{W} \in \Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)} \left(\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W})) \right) \\
&\quad \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)) - \sup_{\mathbf{W} \in \Psi(\mathbf{W}_0)} \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \right\|_2 \\
&\quad \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{n}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(1)} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n}{d} \sqrt{\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(1)} c_{m,j}} \right) \\
&\quad = \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{n\gamma}{dm} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n\gamma}{dm^{1/2}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Equation (22) then follows from the fact that for all $\mathbf{W}$, $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W})) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}))$. □

D.3 Lemma on a sufficient condition for Theorem 4.1 - ReLU case

We now bring together the results from Proposition C.1 and Lemmas D.1 and D.2, and identify a sufficient condition for Theorem 4.1, which corresponds to the condition in Lemma 3.4 in (Du et al., 2019b).

Lemma D.3. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 and Assumption 2.2(a) hold. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $c_{m,j} > 0$ for all $j \in [m]$. Assume that $\gamma > 0$ and*

$$m \geq \max \left(\left(\frac{8n \log \frac{4n}{\delta}}{d\kappa_n} \right), \left(\frac{8n}{d\kappa_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} \right), \left(\frac{16^2 n^2}{d^2 \kappa_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} \right) \right).$$

Define

$$R'_{m,j} = \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\| \frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} \quad \textit{and} \quad R_{m,j} = \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{64}.$$

If $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ for all $j \in [m]$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, then on an event with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have that for all $j \in [m]$, $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ and the following properties also hold for all $t \geq 0$:

(a) $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t)) \geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}$;

(b) $L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \leq e^{-(\gamma\kappa_n t)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$;

(c) $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j}$ *for all* $j \in [m]$; *and*

(d) $\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 \leq \frac{n}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j} + \frac{2\sqrt{2} \cdot n}{d} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j}}$.

Proof. Suppose $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ for all $j \in [m]$ on some event A' having probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. Also, we would like to instantiate Proposition C.1 and Lemma D.2 with $\delta/4$, so that each of their claims holds with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{4}$. Let A be the intersection of A' with the event that the conjunction of the two claims in Proposition C.1 and Lemma D.2 hold with $\delta/4$. By the union bound, A has probability at least $1 - \delta$. We will show that on the event A, the four claimed properties of the lemma hold.

It will be sufficient to show that

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{sj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m] \text{ and } s \geq 0. \tag{27}$$

To see why doing so is sufficient, pick an arbitrary $t_0 \geq 0$, and assume the above inequality for all $s \geq 0$. Then, by event A and Lemma D.2, for all $0 \leq s \leq t_0$, we have the following upper bound on the change of the Gram matrix from time 0 to s, and the following lower bound on the smallest eigenvalue of $\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \right\|_2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left(\frac{n}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n}{d} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j} + \frac{2\sqrt{2} \cdot n}{d} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_s)) &\geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{n\gamma}{dm} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} + \frac{2n\gamma}{dm^{1/2}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2} - \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{4n}{d\kappa_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j} + \frac{1}{m^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{8n}{d\kappa_n} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2} - \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4} = \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Lemma D.1 with ζ being set to $\frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2}$, which gives

$$L_m(\mathbf{W}_{t_0}) \leq e^{-(\gamma\kappa_n t_0)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_0 j} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\| \frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} = R'_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m].$$

We have just shown that all the four properties in the lemma hold for t_0.

It remains to prove Equation (27) under the event A and the assumption that $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ for all $j \in [m]$ holds on this event. Suppose that Equation (27) fails for some $j \in [m]$. Let

$$t_1 = \inf \{ t \mid \|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| > R_{m,j} \text{ for some } j \in [m] \}.$$

Then, by the continuity of $\mathbf{w}_{tj}$ on t, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{sj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m] \text{ and } 0 \leq s \leq t_1$$

and for some $j_0 \in [m]$,

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j_0} - \mathbf{w}_{0 j_0}\| = R_{m,j_0}. \tag{28}$$

Thus, by the argument that we gave in the previous paragraph, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m].$$

In particular, $\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j_0} - \mathbf{w}_{0 j_0}\| \leq R'_{m,j_0}$. But this contradicts our assumption $R'_{m,j_0} < R_{m,j_0}$. □

D.4 Lemma on the bound of the NTK change and minimum eigenvalue - Smooth activation case

We now give a version of Lemma D.2 under Assumption 2.2(b) (smooth activation function). The proof of this version is similar to the one for Lemma 5 in (Oymak and Soltanolkotabi, 2020), and uses the three equations (364-366) in (Bartlett et al., 2021).

Lemma D.4. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 and Assumption 2.2(b) hold. Let $c_{m,j} > 0$ for every $j \in [m]$. Then, for any fixed $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^\top)^\top$, if it satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{0j} - \mathbf{w}_j\| \leq \frac{c_{m,j}}{2} \quad \textit{for all } j \in [m],$$

we have

$$\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 \leq \frac{nM^2}{4d^2}\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM}{d^{3/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2} \qquad \textit{for all } k \in [2]$$

and

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{nM^2\gamma}{4d^2 m}\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\gamma}{d^{3/2}m^{1/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2}\right). \tag{29}$$

Note that this lemma has a deterministic conclusion, although its original counterpart (Lemma D.2) has a probabilistic one.

Proof. The beginning part of the proof is essentially an abbreviated version of the beginning part of the proof of Lemma D.2. This repetition is intended to help the reader by not forcing her or him to look at the proof of Lemma D.2 beforehand.

For $k \in [2]$, let

$$f_m^{(k)}(-;\mathbf{W}) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad\qquad f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{W}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}} a_j \sigma(Z_j(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{W})),$$

and define $\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})$ to be the n-by-(pd) matrix whose i-th row is the pd-dimensional row vector $(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}))^\top$.

For all $k \in [2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 &= \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})^\top - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)^\top\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

To see why this inequality holds, see the proof of Lemma D.2. We bound the two terms $\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2$ and $\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2$ in Equation (30). We bound the first term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 \leq \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^m \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \left|\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right|^2 \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{d} \\
&\leq \frac{n}{d}\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \leq \frac{n}{d}\gamma_k
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_1 = \gamma$ and $\gamma_2 = 1 - \gamma$. The second inequality uses the assumption that $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$. The third inequality holds because $\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j} = 1$. For the second term, we recall that $|\sigma''(x)| \leq M$ and so σ' is M-Lipschitz, and also that $Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_i$. Using these facts, we

derive an upper bound for the second term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2^2 &\leq \left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left\|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_j} f_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left\|\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}} a_j \frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\left[\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right]\right\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\left[\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\left[\sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W})) - \sigma'(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{M^2}{d^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\left(\left(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\right)^\top \mathbf{x}_i\right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{nM^2}{d^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)}\left\|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\right\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{nM^2}{4d^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The second to last step uses the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and the last step uses our assumption that $\|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \frac{c_{m,j}}{2}$ for all $j \in [m]$. From the derived bounds on the first and second terms in the last line of Equation (30), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 &\leq \frac{nM^2}{4d^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{d}\gamma_k}\sqrt{\frac{nM^2}{4d^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2} \\
&= \frac{nM^2}{4d^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM}{d^{3/2}}\sqrt{\gamma_k \sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{(k)} c_{m,j}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, as noted in the proof of Lemma D.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) &\geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) \\
&\geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) - \left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W})) \geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{nM^2\gamma}{4d^2 m}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\gamma}{d^{3/2}m^{1/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2}\right).$$

□

D.5 Lemma on a sufficient condition for Theorem 4.2 - Smooth activation case

We now give a version of Lemma D.3 under Assumption 2.2(b) (smooth activation function). It brings together the results from Proposition C.1 and Lemmas D.1 and D.4, and identifies a sufficient condition for Theorem 4.1, which corresponds to the condition in Lemma 3.4 in (Du et al., 2019b).

Lemma D.5. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 and Assumption 2.2(b) hold. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$, and $c_{m,j} > 0$ for all $j \in [m]$. Assume that $\gamma > 0$ and*

$$m \geq \max\left(\frac{8n\log\frac{2n}{\delta}}{d\kappa_n},\ \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8d^2\kappa_n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2,\ \frac{4n^2M^2\delta^2}{d^3\kappa_n^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2\right).$$

For each $j \in [m]$, define

$$R'_{m,j} = \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\,\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u}_0\|\,\frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} \quad \textit{and} \quad R_{m,j} = \frac{\delta c_{m,j}}{8}.$$

If $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ for all $j \in [m]$ with probability at least $1-\frac{\delta}{2}$, then on an event with probability at least $1-\delta$, we have that for all $j \in [m]$, $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ and the following properties also hold for all $t \geq 0$:

(a) $\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_t)) \geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}$*;*

(b) $L_m(\mathbf{W}_t) \leq e^{-(\gamma\kappa_n t)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$*;*

(c) $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj}-\mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j}$ *for all $j \in [m]$; and*

(d) $\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 \leq \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8^2d^2}\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\delta}{2^{3/2}d^{3/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j}^2}$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Lemma D.3, although the concrete bounds in these proofs differ due to the differences between Lemma D.2 and Lemma D.4.

Suppose $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$ for all $j \in [m]$ on some event A' having probability at least $1-\frac{\delta}{2}$. Also, we would like to instantiate Proposition C.1 with $\delta/2$, so that its claim holds with probability at least $1-\frac{\delta}{2}$. Let A be the intersection of A' with the event that claim in Proposition C.1 holds with $\delta/2$. By the union bound, A has probability at least $1-\delta$. We will show that on the event A, the four claimed properties of the lemma hold.

It will be sufficient to show that

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{sj}-\mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } s \geq 0. \tag{31}$$

To see why doing so is sufficient, pick an arbitrary $t_0 \geq 0$, and assume the above inequality for all $s \geq 0$. Then, by the event A and Lemma D.4, for all $0 \leq s \leq t_0$, we have the following upper bound on the change of the Gram matrix from time 0 to s, and the following lower bound on the smallest eigenvalue of $\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 &\leq \left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 + \left\|\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(2)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s) - \widehat{\Theta}_m^{(2)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{64d^2}\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\delta}{2^{3/2}d^{3/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j}^2}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_s)) &\geq \mathrm{eig}_{\min}(\widehat{\Theta}_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)) - \left(\frac{nM^2\delta^2\gamma}{64d^2m}\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\delta\gamma}{4d^{3/2}m^{1/2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2}\right) \\ &> \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2} - \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}\left(\frac{1}{m}\cdot\frac{nM^2\delta^2}{16d^2\kappa_n}\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{1}{m^{1/2}}\cdot\frac{nM\delta}{d^{3/2}\kappa_n}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}^2}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2} - \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{4}.\end{aligned}$$

We now apply the version of Lemma D.1 for the analytic activation σ, with ζ being set to $\frac{\gamma\kappa_n}{2}$. This application gives

$$L_m(\mathbf{W}_{t_0}) \leq e^{-(\gamma\kappa_n t_0)/2} L_m(\mathbf{W}_0)$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_0 j}-\mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\,\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u}_0\|\,\frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} = R'_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m].$$

We have just shown that all the four properties in the lemma hold for t_0.

It remains to prove Equation (31) under the event A. Suppose that Equation (31) fails for some $j \in [m]$. Let

$$t_1 = \inf\left\{t \mid \|\mathbf{w}_{tj}-\mathbf{w}_{0j}\| > R_{m,j} \text{ for some } j \in [m]\right\}.$$

Then, by the continuity of $\mathbf{w}_{tj}$ on t, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{sj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m] \text{ and } 0 \leq s \leq t_1$$

and for some $j_0 \in [m]$,

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j_0} - \mathbf{w}_{0 j_0}\| = R_{m,j_0}. \tag{32}$$

Thus, by the argument that we gave in the previous paragraph, we have

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in [m].$$

In particular, $\|\mathbf{w}_{t_1 j_0} - \mathbf{w}_{0 j_0}\| \leq R'_{m,j_0}$. But this contradicts our assumption $R'_{m,j_0} < R_{m,j_0}$. □

E Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof of Theorem 4.1 essentially follows Lemma D.3, which itself follows from the secondary Proposition C.1 and Lemmas D.1 and D.2, derived in Appendices C and D. Pick $\delta \in (0,1)$. Let

$$D = \sqrt{n^2 \left(C^2 + \frac{1}{d}\right) \frac{2 \cdot 512^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^5 \kappa_n^2 d}}$$

where C is the assumed upper bound on the $|y_i|$'s. Assume $\gamma > 0$ and

$$m \geq \max\left(\left(\frac{8n \log \frac{4n}{\delta}}{\kappa_n d}\right), \left(\frac{8nD}{d\kappa_n}\right)^2, \left(\frac{16^2 n^2 D}{d^2 \kappa_n^2}\right)^2\right)$$

and set $c_{m,j}$ as follows:

$$c_{m,j} = \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot \sqrt{n^2 \left(C^2 + \frac{1}{d}\right) \frac{2 \cdot 512^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^5 \kappa_n^2 d}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot D.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{8n}{d\kappa_n} \sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{8nD}{d\kappa_n}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}\right)^2 &\leq \left(\frac{8nD}{d\kappa_n}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}\right) \cdot m \\ &= \left(\frac{8nD}{d\kappa_n}\right)^2 \cdot m \leq m^2,\end{aligned}$$

and also that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{16^2 n^2}{d^2 \kappa_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{16^2 n^2 D}{d^2 \kappa_n^2}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}\right)^2 &\leq \left(\frac{16^2 n^2 D}{d^2 \kappa_n^2}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{m,j}\right) \cdot m \\ &= \left(\frac{16^2 n^2 D}{d^2 \kappa_n^2}\right)^2 \cdot m \leq m^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$m \geq \max\left(\left(\frac{8n \log \frac{4n}{\delta}}{d\kappa_n}\right), \left(\frac{8n}{d\kappa_n} \sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}\right), \left(\frac{16^2 n^2}{d^2 \kappa_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^m c_{m,j}\right)\right).$$

As a result, we can now employ Lemma D.3. Thus, if we find an event A' such that the probability of A' is at least $1 - (\delta/2)$ and under A', we have $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$, then the conclusion of Lemma D.3 holds. In particular, we may further calculate conclusions (c) and (d) of Lemma D.3 as

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j} = \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{64} &= \frac{\delta^2}{64} \cdot \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot \sqrt{n^2 \left(C^2 + \frac{1}{d}\right) \frac{2 \cdot 512^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^5 \kappa_n^2 d}} \\ &= \frac{8n}{\kappa_n d^{1/2}} \cdot \sqrt{\left(C^2 + \frac{1}{d}\right) \frac{2}{\gamma^2 \delta}} \cdot \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X};\mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 &\le \frac{n}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\cdot n}{d}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}c_{m,j}} \\
&= \frac{n}{d}\cdot D\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\cdot n}{d}\cdot\sqrt{D}\cdot\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}} \\
&= \frac{n}{d}\cdot\sqrt{n^2\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2\cdot 512^2}{\gamma^2\delta^5\kappa_n^2 d}}\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\cdot n}{d}\cdot\left(n^2\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2\cdot 512^2}{\gamma^2\delta^5\kappa_n^2 d}\right)^{1/4}\cdot\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}} \\
&= \frac{512n^2}{\kappa_n d^{3/2}}\cdot\sqrt{\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2}{\gamma^2\delta^5}}\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2} \\
&\quad + \frac{64n^{3/2}}{\kappa_n^{1/2}d^{5/4}}\cdot\left(\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2}{\gamma^2\delta^5}\right)^{1/4}\cdot\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to find such an event A'. Start by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u}_0\|^2] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i^2 - 2y_i\mathbb{E}[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)] + \mathbb{E}[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)^2]\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i^2 - 2y_i\cdot 0 + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}(\mathbf{w}_j^\top\mathbf{x}_i)^2\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{w}_j^\top\mathbf{x}_i\ge 0\}}\right]\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i^2 + \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}\mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{w}_j^\top\mathbf{x}_i)^2\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{w}_j^\top\mathbf{x}_i\ge 0\}}\right]\right) \\
&\le n\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Markov inequality, with probability at least $1-(\delta/2)$,

$$\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u}_0\|^2 < n\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2}{\delta}.$$

Let A' be the corresponding event for the above inequality. Then, under A', we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R'_{m,j} &= \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\,\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u}_0\|\,\frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} \\
&< \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\cdot\sqrt{n\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2}{\delta}}\cdot\frac{4}{\gamma\kappa_n} \\
&= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}\cdot\sqrt{n^2\left(C^2+\frac{1}{d}\right)\frac{2\cdot 4^2}{\gamma^2\delta\kappa_n^2 d}} \\
&= \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{128} < \frac{\delta^2 c_{m,j}}{64} = R_{m,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, A' is the desired event.

F Proof of Theorem 4.2

The proof of the theorem is similar to that of Theorem 4.1. It derives from Lemma D.5, which itself follows from the secondary Proposition C.1 and Lemmas D.1 and D.4, derived in Appendices C and D. Recall that

$$C_1 = \sup_{c\in(0,1]} \mathbb{E}[\sigma(cz)^2]$$

where the expectation is taken over the real-valued random variable z with the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/d)$. To see that C_1 is finite, note that since $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$|\sigma(cz) - \sigma(0)| \leq |cz| \text{ for all } c \in (0, 1].$$

Thus, for every $c \in (0, 1]$,

$$\sigma(0) - |cz| \leq \sigma(cz) \leq \sigma(0) + |cz|,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\sigma(cz)^2] &\leq \sigma(0)^2 + 2|\sigma(0)| \cdot |c| \cdot \mathbb{E}[|z|] + c^2\mathbb{E}[z^2] \\ &\leq \sigma(0)^2 + 2|\sigma(0)| \cdot \mathbb{E}[|z|] + \mathbb{E}[z^2].\end{aligned}$$

As a result, $\mathbb{E}[\sigma(cz)^2]$ is bounded, so C_1 is finite.

Pick $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Assume $\gamma > 0$ and

$$m \geq \max\left(\left(\frac{8n}{\kappa_n d} \cdot \log\frac{2n}{\delta}\right), \left(\frac{2^{10}n^3M^2}{\kappa_n^3 d^3} \cdot \frac{C^2 + C_1}{\gamma^2\delta}\right), \left(\frac{2^{15}n^4M^2}{\kappa_n^4 d^4} \cdot \frac{C^2 + C_1}{\gamma^2\delta}\right)\right)$$

and instantiate Lemma D.5 using the below $c_{m,j}$:

$$c_{m,j} = \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot \sqrt{n^2\left(C^2 + C_1\right)\frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2\delta^3\kappa_n^2 d}}$$

where C is the assumed upper bound on the $|y_i|$'s. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8d^2\kappa_n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2 &= \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8d^2\kappa_n}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j} \cdot n^2\left(C^2 + C_1\right)\frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2\delta^3\kappa_n^2 d}\right) \\ &= \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8d^2\kappa_n} \cdot n^2\left(C^2 + C_1\right)\frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2\delta^3\kappa_n^2 d} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j} \\ &= \frac{2^{10}n^3M^2}{\kappa_n^3 d^3} \times \frac{C^2 + C_1}{\gamma^2\delta}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4n^2M^2\delta^2}{d^3\kappa_n^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2 &= \frac{4n^2M^2\delta^2}{d^3\kappa_n^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\lambda_{m,j} \cdot n^2\left(C^2 + C_1\right)\frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2\delta^3\kappa_n^2 d}\right) \\ &= \frac{4n^2M^2\delta^2}{d^3\kappa_n^2} \cdot n^2\left(C^2 + C_1\right)\frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2\delta^3\kappa_n^2 d} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j} \\ &= \frac{2^{15}n^4M^2}{\kappa_n^4 d^4} \times \frac{C^2 + C_1}{\gamma^2\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$m \geq \max\left(\frac{8n\log\frac{2n}{\delta}}{d\kappa_n}, \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8d^2\kappa_n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2, \frac{4n^2M^2\delta^2}{d^3\kappa_n^2}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{m,j}^2\right).$$

This allows us to employ Lemma D.5. Hence, it is sufficient to find an event A' such that the probability of A' is at least $1 - (\delta/2)$ and under A', we have $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$.

The desired conclusion then follows from the conclusion of Lemma D.5, and the below calculations: if $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| \leq R'_{m,j}$ and $R'_{m,j} < R_{m,j}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\| < R_{m,j} &= \frac{\delta c_{m,j}}{8} \\ &= \frac{\delta}{8} \cdot \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot \sqrt{n^2 \left(C^2 + C_1\right) \frac{2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^3 \kappa_n^2 d}} \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \times \frac{n}{\kappa_n d^{1/2}} \sqrt{\frac{128(C^2 + C_1)}{\gamma^2 \delta}},\end{aligned}$$

and the upper bound on $\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\|_2$ in the conclusion of Lemma D.5 can be rewritten to

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_t) - \widehat{\Theta}_m(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}_0)\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{8^2 d^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j}^2 + \frac{nM\delta}{2^{3/2} d^{3/2}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} c_{m,j}^2} \\ &= \frac{nM^2\delta^2}{4^3 d^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} \left(\lambda_{m,j} n^2 \frac{(C^2 + C_1) 2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^3 \kappa_n^2 d}\right) + \frac{nM\delta}{2^{3/2} d^{3/2}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} \left(\lambda_{m,j} n^2 \frac{(C^2 + C_1) 2 \cdot 64^2}{\gamma^2 \delta^3 \kappa_n^2 d}\right)} \\ &= \left(\frac{n^3 M^2}{\kappa_n^2 d^3} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^2 \frac{2^7 (C^2 + C_1)}{\gamma^2 \delta}\right) + \frac{n^2 M}{\kappa_n d^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j}^2 \frac{2^{10} (C^2 + C_1)}{\gamma^2 \delta}}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\|^2] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(y_i^2 - 2y_i \mathbb{E}[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0)] + \mathbb{E}[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0)^2]\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(y_i^2 - 2y_i \cdot 0 + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} \sigma(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))^2\right]\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(y_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m,j} \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma(Z_j(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{W}_0))^2\right]\right) \\ &\leq n\left(C^2 + C_1\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Markov inequality, with probability at least $1 - (\delta/2)$,

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\|^2 < n\left(C^2 + C_1\right) \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

Let A' be the corresponding event for the above inequality. Then, under A', we have

$$\begin{aligned}R'_{m,j} &= \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}_0\| \frac{4}{\gamma \kappa_n} \\ &< \sqrt{\frac{n\lambda_{m,j}}{d}} \cdot \sqrt{n\left(C^2 + C_1\right) \frac{2}{\delta}} \cdot \frac{4}{\gamma \kappa_n} \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}} \cdot \sqrt{n^2 \left(C^2 + C_1\right) \frac{2 \cdot 4^2}{\gamma^2 \delta \kappa_n^2 d}} \\ &= \frac{\delta c_{m,j}}{16} < \frac{\delta c_{m,j}}{8} = R_{m,j}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, A' is the desired event.

G Proof of Theorem 5.1

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{dw_{sjk}}{ds}\right|_{s=0}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\cdot\left(\left.\frac{df_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t)}{dw_{tjk}}\right)\right|_{t=0}\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[(y_i - f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0))\cdot\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\frac{x_{ik}}{\sqrt{d}}\right] \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[y_i a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)x_{ik}\right] - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)x_{ik}\right]\right) \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)x_{ik}\right] \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{j'=1}^{m}\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j'}}a_{j'}\sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)x_{ik}\right] \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j}}a_j\sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)a_j\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)x_{ik}\right] \\
&= -\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_{ik}\mathbb{E}\left[\sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right] \\
&= -\frac{\lambda_{m,j}}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_{ik}g_1(\mathbf{x}_i)
\end{aligned}$$

H Proof of Theorem 5.2

We can write

$$\frac{d\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t)}{dt} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n}(f_m\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t) - y_i)\Theta_m^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t)$$

where

$$\Theta_m^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t) = \Big\langle\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t),\,\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big\rangle. \tag{33}$$

We have

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t) = \Big(\nabla^2_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t) + \Big(\nabla^2_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha;\mathbf{W}_t).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Theta_m^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t) \\
&= \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)^\top\Big(\nabla^2_{\mathbf{W}}f(\mathbf{x}_\alpha;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big) + \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)^\top\Big(\nabla^2_{\mathbf{W}}f(\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big)\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{W}}f_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha;\mathbf{W}_t)\Big) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m}a_j\frac{\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}{d^{3/2}}\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{tj}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta \\
&\qquad\times\left(\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{tj}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{tj}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right) + \mathbf{x}_\beta^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{tj}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{tj}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left.\frac{d\Theta_m(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta;\mathbf{W}_t)}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[-\sum_{i=1}^{n}(f_m(\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)-y_i)\Theta_m^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_i;\mathbf{W}_0)\right] \\
&= -\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\lambda_{m,j}^{3/2}}{d^{3/2}}\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Bigg[a_j\left(\sum_{j'=1}^{m}\sqrt{\lambda_{m,j'}}a_{j'}\sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j'}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times\left(\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left.+\mathbf{x}_\beta^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)\Bigg] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\lambda_{m,j}^{2}}{d^{3/2}}\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left.+\mathbf{x}_\beta^\top\mathbf{x}_i\sigma''\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\sigma'\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{0j}^\top\mathbf{x}_i}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)\Bigg] \\
&= -\frac{\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\mathbf{x}_\beta}{d^{3/2}}\left[\mathbf{x}_\alpha^\top\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{x}_i g_2(\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_i)\right)+\mathbf{x}_\beta^\top\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{x}_i g_2(\mathbf{x}_\beta,\mathbf{x}_\alpha,\mathbf{x}_i)\right)\right]\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{m,j}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

I Additional experimental results

We provide here additional results for the experiments described in Section 6.

I.1 Regression

In Figures 6, 7, 8 and 9 we respectively provide the detailed results for the datasets `concrete`, `energy`, `airfoil` and `plant`.

I.2 Classification

We provide in Figure 10 detailed results for the MNIST experiment.

In Figure 11, we study the impact of the γ parameter on CIFAR10. We recall that this parameter controls the weight of the symmetric part of the lambdas. We can see that these results corroborates the theory, a smaller value of γ leads to improved pruned models, as the asymmetrical part, responsible for feature learning becomes more prevalent.




Figure 6: Results for the `concrete` dataset. From left to right and top to bottom, training risks, test risks, difference in weight norms, difference in NTG matrices, minimum NTG eigenvalues, training risks for pruning, test risks for pruning, training risks for transfer learning, and test risks for transfer learning.




Figure 7: Results for the `energy` dataset. From left to right and top to bottom, training risks, test risks, difference in weight norms, difference in NTG matrices, minimum NTG eigenvalues, training risks for pruning, test risks for pruning, training risks for transfer learning, and test risks for transfer learning.




Figure 8: Results for the `airfoil` dataset. From left to right and top to bottom, training risks, test risks, difference in weight norms, difference in NTG matrices, minimum NTG eigenvalues, training risks for pruning, test risks for pruning, training risks for transfer learning, and test risks for transfer learning.




Figure 9: Results for the `plant` dataset. From left to right and top to bottom, training risks, test risks, difference in weight norms, difference in NTG matrices, minimum NTG eigenvalues, training risks for pruning, test risks for pruning, training risks for transfer learning, and test risks for transfer learning.




Figure 10: Results for the `mnist` dataset. From left to right and top to bottom, training risks, test risks, difference in weight norms, difference in NTG matrices, minimum NTG eigenvalues, training risks for pruning, test risks for pruning, training risks for transfer learning, and test risks for transfer learning.




Figure 11: Results for the `CIFAR10 dataset`. Impact of the γ parameter. From left to right and top to bottom, 1) test risk through training, 2) the differences in weight norms $\|\mathbf{w}_{tj} - \mathbf{w}_{0j}\|$ with js being the neurons having the maximum difference at the end of the training, 3) the test risks of the pruned models, and 4) test accuracies of the pruned models.