
Spectral Analysis of the Neural Tangent Kernel for Deep Residual Networks

Yuval Belfer Amnon Geifman Meirav Galun Ronen Basri

Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot, Israel

Abstract

Deep residual network architectures have been shown to achieve superior accuracy over classical feed-forward networks, yet their success is still not fully understood. Focusing on massively over-parameterized, fully connected residual networks with ReLU activation through their respective neural tangent kernels (ResNTK), we provide here a spectral analysis of these kernels. Specifically, we show that, much like NTK for fully connected networks (FC-NTK), for input distributed uniformly on the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , the eigenfunctions of ResNTK are the spherical harmonics and the eigenvalues decay polynomially with frequency k as k^{-d} . These in turn imply that the set of functions in their Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space are identical to those of FC-NTK, and consequently also to those of the Laplace kernel. We further show, by drawing on the analogy to the Laplace kernel, that depending on the choice of a hyper-parameter that balances between the skip and residual connections ResNTK can either become spiky with depth, as with FC-NTK, or maintain a stable shape.

1. Introduction

Deep residual networks (ResNets), first introduced in (He et al., 2016a), are to date amongst the most effective network architectures for image understanding (Howard et al., 2019; Radosavovic et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2019) as well as for other tasks (Greenfeld et al., 2019; Siravenha et al., 2019). These networks use blocks of two or three layers with skip connections such that the input to each block is added to its output (called the *residual*) and the sum is passed to the next block. These architectural changes allowed researchers to train networks with hundreds, and even thousands of layers and to achieve unprecedentedly accurate classification results on the competitive ImageNet dataset (He et al., 2016a;b).

The reasons for the advantage of residual over classical feed-forward architectures are not yet fully understood.

Several papers argue that skip connections alleviate the problem of *vanishing gradients*, which is prevalent in classical deep architectures (Balduzzi et al., 2017; Veit et al., 2016). Subsequent work showed that ResNets can avoid spurious local minima (Liu et al., 2019), while (Li et al., 2018) showed, by empirically visualizing the loss landscape, that skip connections make the loss smoother.

In this work we examine residual networks from the perspective of the neural tangent kernels. As with many existing network models, residual network applications are typically over-parameterized. (He et al., 2016a)'s implementation, for example, trains a network with roughly 60M trainable parameters on the 1.2M images of ImageNet. Recent work (Jacot et al., 2018) suggested that massively overparameterized neural networks behave similarly to kernel regressors with a family of kernels called *Neural Tangent Kernels* (NTKs). (Huang et al., 2020; Tirer et al., 2020) proved that fully connected residual networks of infinite width converge to such kernel, which we here call *ResNTK*, and provided a closed form derivation.

Kernel regression is characterized by the set of functions in the corresponding Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) and by the norm induced in this space. These in turn are determined by the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the respective kernel under the uniform measure, with the decay rate of the eigenvalues playing a particularly important role. In this paper we prove that the eigenfunctions of ResNTK on the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} are the spherical harmonics and that with ReLU activations the eigenvalues decay polynomially with frequency k at the rate of k^{-d} , thus characterizing the set of functions in the corresponding RKHS. We conclude that this set of functions is identical to the functions in the RKHS of NTK of classical, fully connected networks (denoted *FC-NTK*) (Basri et al., 2020; Bietti & Bach, 2020), and, as is implied by previous work (Geifman et al., 2020; Bietti & Bach, 2020; Chen & Xu, 2020), also to those of the Laplace kernel, restricted to \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . We further discuss how this characterization extends outside of the hypersphere to \mathbb{R}^d .

Various properties of ResNTK appear to critically depend on a choice of hyperparameter α , which balances between

the residual and skip connections. In particular, we examine these properties when α is either constant or decaying with the depth of the corresponding network and make the following additional contributions:

1. With no bias and a decaying α ($\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ and $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$ where L denotes the number of hidden layers in the corresponding network), deep ResNTK is significantly biased toward the even frequencies. Specifically, with deep ResNTK the leading eigenfunctions beyond frequencies 0, 1, and 2 are the even frequencies, and eigenfunctions of odd frequency have significantly lower eigenvalues. Ultimately when the depth $L \rightarrow \infty$ ResNTK converges to a two-layer FC-NTK, for which with no bias all the eigenvalues corresponding to odd frequency eigenfunction (except frequency 1) vanish. Such a parity difference is not observed if bias is used, if $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{L}$, or if α is constant.
2. Through the analogy to the Laplace kernel we can show the condition for which ResNTK become spiky. Specifically, we show that, with a decaying $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ with $0.5 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ ResNTK maintains a roughly stable shape, but becomes spiky with deep architectures if α is constant independent of depth. With this choice ResNTK exhibits the same behavior as FC-NTK. Our experiments indeed indicate that with real datasets (UCI, CIFAR-10 and SVHN) a spiky kernel achieves inferior classification results compared to less steep kernels, implying that with FC-NTK and ResNTK with a constant α deep architectures are in fact inferior to shallow ones.

2. Previous work

Existing neural network models are typically applied with many more learnable parameters than training data items, yet somewhat counter-intuitively they successfully generalize to unseen data. Attempting to explain this phenomenon (Jacot et al., 2018) showed that infinite width networks whose parameters do not change much from their initial values behave like kernel regression with novel kernels called the Neural Tangent Kernels. Specifically, for an input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and learnable parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, denote the network by $f(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$, then the corresponding NTK is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{P}} \left\langle \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta)}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x}_j, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\rangle,$$

where \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j is a training pair, and the expectation is over the distribution \mathcal{P} with which θ is initialized (typically the standard normal distribution). We note that the relevance of these models, referred to as *lazy training*, to realistic neural networks is the subject of an ongoing debate (see, e.g., (Chizat et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020)).

Subsequent work showed that very wide networks of finite width converge to a global minimum (Du et al., 2019; Allen-Zhu et al., 2019; Chizat et al., 2019) and further characterized the speed of convergence as a function of the data distribution and the frequency of the target function (Arora et al., 2019; Basri et al., 2019; 2020). In particular, for data distributed uniformly in the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , it was shown that the eigenfunctions of FC-NTK are the spherical harmonics and the eigenvalues decay at the rate of k^{-d} , where k denotes frequency (Bietti & Mairal, 2019; Bietti & Bach, 2020). This completely characterizes the set of functions in the RKHS of FC-NTK. Subsequent work showed that this set of functions is identical to the functions in the RKHS of the classical Laplace kernel (Geifman et al., 2020; Bietti & Bach, 2020; Chen & Xu, 2020). Our paper extends these results to NTK of residual networks of any depth.

Several recent studies examined the behavior of over-parameterized residual networks. (Du et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019b) showed that very wide ResNets of finite size converge to their global minima. (Huang et al., 2020; Tirer et al., 2020) derived a formula for ResNTK. (Tirer et al., 2020)’s analysis further suggested that ResNTK gives rise to a class of smoother function than FC-NTK. (Huang et al., 2020) showed that FC-NTK becomes spiky for deep networks, indicating that learning with these kernels becomes degenerate, while ResNTK remains stable with depth. Our work shows that the functions in the RKHS of both ResNTK and FC-NTK have the same smoothness properties. Moreover, we show that the specific choice of α , the hyper-parameter that balances between the skip and residual connections, has a significant effect on the shape of ResNTK for deep architecture, so, for example, with constant α ResNTK too becomes spiky with depth.

Understanding the spectrum of a kernel is useful for a number of objectives. It indicates whether a kernel exhibits a frequency bias (Cao et al., 2019; Rahaman et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2019), it provides an estimate of the number of gradient descent iterations needed to learn certain target functions (Basri et al., 2019), and it can be used to estimate the generalization error obtained by using the kernel as a minimum interpolant regressor (ridge-less kernel regression). For example, (Liang et al., 2020; 2019; Pagliana et al., 2020) analyzed the bias-variance interplay of minimum norm interpolation with a growing number of samples when the dimension is either fixed or growing at the same rate.

3. Preliminaries

We consider positive definite kernels $\mathbf{k} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over inputs $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. \mathbf{k} is called zonal if when \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} are restricted to the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \mathbf{k} can be expressed as a

function of $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}$. In such case we overload our definition of \mathbf{k} defining also $\tilde{\mathbf{k}} : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by letting $u = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}$ and writing $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \tilde{\mathbf{k}}(u)$. To avoid unnecessary scalings, a good practice is to normalize the kernel such that $\mathbf{k}(1) = 1$. The eigenfunctions and eigenvalues derived in this paper are with respect to the uniform measure on the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , or with respect to radial distributions in \mathbb{R}^d . Note however that the resulting RKHS definition is independent of data distribution. The kernels we use in this paper are ResNTK and FC-NTK, denoted respectively by \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{k} , as well as the Laplace kernel (denoted \mathbf{k}_{Lap}), with superscripts denoting the number of hidden layers, e.g. $\mathbf{k}^{(L)}$, i.e., $L = 1$ corresponds to a network with one hidden layer (i.e., a two-layer network). Except when noted our kernels will correspond to networks with no bias. All proofs are the deferred to the supplementary material.

3.1. NTK for FC Networks

A fully-connected neural network (also called multilayer perceptron, MLP) with L hidden layers and m units in each hidden layer is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta, \mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}_L \\ \mathbf{x}_\ell &= \sqrt{\frac{c_\sigma}{m}} \sigma \left(W^{(\ell)} \mathbf{x}_{\ell-1} \right), \quad \ell \in [L] \\ \mathbf{x}_0 &= \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The network parameters θ include $W^{(1)}, W^{(2)}, \dots, W^{(L)}$, where $W^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, $W^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ($2 \leq \ell \leq L$), and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We denote by σ the ReLU activation function and by $c_\sigma = 1 / (\mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} [\sigma(z)^2]) = 2$. The network parameters are initialized randomly with $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$.

(Jacot et al., 2018) showed that when the width $m \rightarrow \infty$ the network behaves like kernel regression with the neural tangent kernel. (Bietti & Mairal, 2019) showed that this kernel, denoted for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, is homogeneous of degree 1 and zonal, so that $\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(L)}(u)$, where $u = \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|} \in [-1, 1]$. The (normalized) kernel is defined by

$$\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(u) = \frac{1}{L+1} \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(L)}(u)$$

with the recursive formula

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell)}(u) &= \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell-1)}(u) \kappa_0(\Sigma^{(\ell-1)}(u)) + \Sigma^{(\ell)}(u) \quad (1) \\ \Sigma^{(\ell)}(u) &= \kappa_1(\Sigma^{(\ell-1)}(u)), \quad \ell \in [L]. \end{aligned}$$

The functions κ_1, κ_0 are the arc-cosine kernels (Cho & Saul, 2009), defined as

$$\kappa_0(u) = \frac{1}{\pi} (\pi - \arccos(u)) \quad (2)$$

$$\kappa_1(u) = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(u \cdot (\pi - \arccos(u)) + \sqrt{1-u^2} \right), \quad (3)$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}(u) = \Sigma^{(0)}(u) = u.$$

3.2. NTK for residual networks

For the definition of a fully connected residual network we follow the formulation of (Huang et al., 2020; Tիրer et al., 2020). Below we include bias, but except when noted we will work with a bias-free formulation (i.e., $\tau = 0$).

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{x}, \theta) &= \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}_L \\ \mathbf{x}_\ell &= \mathbf{x}_{\ell-1} + \alpha \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}} V_\ell \sigma \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} W_\ell \mathbf{x}_{\ell-1} + \tau \mathbf{b}_\ell \right) \\ \mathbf{x}_0 &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}} A \mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\ell \in [L]$ with parameters $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $V_\ell, W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU function. α is a constant hyper-parameter. (Huang et al., 2020; Du et al., 2019) suggested to set this constant according to $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ with $0.5 \leq \gamma \leq 1$. In contrast, (He et al., 2016a)'s implementation uses $\alpha = 1$ (and an additional ReLU function applied to $V_\ell \sigma(\cdot)$). Recent work argued that setting α to decay with depth is enforced in practice through suitable small initialization of the residual parameters or by applying normalization blocks (Zhang et al., 2019a).

Adopting (Huang et al., 2020)'s derivation, we assume that both A and \mathbf{v} are fixed at their initial values and that V_ℓ, W_ℓ and \mathbf{b} are learned, with all parameters initialized with the standard normal distribution except for the bias terms \mathbf{b}_ℓ , which are initialized at 0. Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The respective NTK, denoted $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= C \sum_{\ell=1}^L B_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) [v_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \kappa_1(u_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})) \\ &\quad + (K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \tau^2) \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))], \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where for $\ell \in [L]$ we let

$$\begin{aligned} v_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \sqrt{K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) K_\ell(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z})} \\ u_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \frac{K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{v_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \\ K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \alpha^2 v_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \kappa_1(u_{\ell-1}) \\ B_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= B_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) [1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1})] \\ K_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z} \\ B_{L+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= 1 \\ C &= \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and κ_0 and κ_1 are defined in (2)-(3).

We note that with this model with $L = 1$ ResNTK is equal to FC-NTK, i.e., $\mathbf{r}^{(1)} = \mathbf{k}^{(1)}$.

4. Spectral Analysis of ResNTK

In this section we characterize the RKHS of ResNTK. In particular, we prove that the eigenfunctions of ResNTK are (scaled) spherical harmonics and that its eigenvalues decay with frequency k at the rate of k^{-d} .

4.1. Eigenfunctions of ResNTK

Theorem 4.1. *Bias-free ResNTK is homogeneous of degree 1 and zonal, i.e., $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\mathbf{z}\|\mathbf{r}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|\|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)$. Its eigenfunctions under the uniform measure in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} are the spherical harmonics.*

The proof of this theorem, given in the supplementary material, relies on propagating these properties through the recursive definition of ResNTK. Finally, the spherical harmonics are eigenfunctions for any zonal kernel (see, e.g., (Gallier, 2009)).

The following Theorem extends the eigen-decomposition of ResNTK to \mathbb{R}^d .

Theorem 4.2. *Let $p(r)$ be a decaying density on $[0, \infty)$ such that $0 < \int_0^\infty p(r)r^2 dr < \infty$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the eigenfunctions of the bias-free ResNTK $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ with respect to $p(\|\mathbf{x}\|)$ are given by $\Psi_{k,j} = a\|\mathbf{x}\|Y_{k,j}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}\right)$ where $Y_{k,j}$ are the spherical harmonics in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and the normalizing constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ depends on $p(r)$.*

The proof of this theorem relies on the homogeneity of ResNTK and is immediate from (Geifman et al., 2020)(Theorem 5 therein).

The consequence of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 is that the bias-free ResNTK admits the following Mercer decomposition:

$$\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = a^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda_k \sum_{j=1}^{N(d,k)} \|\mathbf{x}\| Y_{k,j} \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \right) \|\mathbf{z}\| Y_{k,j} \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|} \right),$$

where $N(d, k)$ denotes the number of spherical harmonics of frequency k in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Note that this decomposition also ensures that the eigenvalues for the bias-free ResNTK in \mathbb{R}^d are identical to those on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .

4.2. Eigenvalue decay for ResNTK

We next turn to characterizing the asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of ResNTK. This is our main theorem, and it is given below.

Theorem 4.3. *The eigenvalues λ_k of ResNTK, $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, decay at the rate of k^{-d} where k denotes frequency.*

The proof of this theorem uses a theorem proved recently by (Bietti & Bach, 2020), which for certain zonal kernels relates the decay rate of the eigenvalues of a kernel to its infinitesimal tendency near ± 1 . (Bietti & Bach, 2020) used

this theorem to derive the eigenvalue decay of FC-NTK for deep networks. Below we review the theorem and provide additional lemmas, which together allow us to prove Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.4 ((Bietti & Bach, 2020)). *Let $\kappa : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ function on $(-1, 1)$ that has the following asymptotic expansions around ± 1*

$$\kappa(1-t) = p_1(t) + c_1 t^\nu + o(t^\nu) \quad (5)$$

$$\kappa(-1+t) = p_{-1}(t) + c_{-1} t^\nu + o(t^\nu) \quad (6)$$

for $t \geq 0$, where p_1, p_{-1} are polynomials and $\nu > 0$ is not an integer. Let μ_k denote an eigenvalue of κ corresponding to a spherical harmonic eigenfunction of frequency k . Then, there is an absolute constant $C(d, \nu)$ depending on d and ν such that

- For k even, if $c_1 \neq -c_{-1}$:
 $\mu_k \sim (c_1 + c_{-1})C(d, \nu)k^{-d-2\nu-1}$.
- For k odd, if $c_1 \neq c_{-1}$:
 $\mu_k \sim (c_1 - c_{-1})C(d, \nu)k^{-d-2\nu-1}$.

In the case $|c_1| = |c_{-1}|$, we have $\mu_k = o(k^{-d-2\nu+1})$ for one of the two parities (or both if $c_1 = c_{-1} = 0$). If κ is infinitely differentiable on $[-1, 1]$ so that no such ν exists, then μ_k decays faster than any polynomial.

The following lemmas enable us to compute the expansions of ResNTK around ± 1 . They are proved in the supplementary material.

Lemma 4.5. *For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near +1, if $\alpha > 0$ and $L \geq 1$*

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(1-t) = 1 + c_1 t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})$$

where

$$c_1 = -\frac{1 + \alpha^2 L}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1 + \alpha^2)}.$$

Lemma 4.6. *For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near -1, if $\alpha > 0$ and $L \geq 2$ then*

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1+t) = p_{-1}(t) + c_{-1} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}),$$

with

$$|c_{-1}| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1 + \alpha^2)L}.$$

Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 establish that for $L \geq 2$ (recall that with $L = 1$ $\mathbf{r}^{(1)} = \mathbf{k}^{(1)}$) ResNTK takes the form of (5) and (6) near ± 1 with $\nu = 1/2$, satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.4. Moreover, clearly from these lemmas

$$|c_{-1}| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1 + \alpha^2)L} < \frac{1 + \alpha^2 L}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1 + \alpha^2)} = |c_1|.$$

The eigenvalues of ResNTK, therefore, decay at the rate of k^{-d} both for the odd and even frequencies, proving Theorem 4.3.

While the rate of decay for all frequencies is $O(k^{-d})$, the constants for the even and odd frequencies differ. In fact, if the hyperparameter α , which relates between the residual and the skip connections, decays sufficiently fast with network depth, then the eigenvalues for the odd frequencies become extremely small compared to those for the even frequencies. This in fact happens when α is chosen according to (Huang et al., 2020; Du et al., 2019), i.e., when $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ with $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, see Figure 1(left). We summarize this in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *With $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ and $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, the eigenvalues of the bias-free \mathbf{r} of odd frequencies $k \geq 3$ vanish.*

For the proof we use the following theorem, which states that for $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ and $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, ResNTK of infinite depth converges to FC-NTK with $L = 1$ hidden layer, i.e., NTK for a bias-free two-layer MLP, for which it was shown in (Basri et al., 2019) that the eigenvalues for odd frequencies with $k \geq 3$ are zero. We note that this theorem, proved in the supplementary material, extends a similar theorem by (Huang et al., 2020), who proved this only for $\gamma = 1$.

Theorem 4.8. *For ResNTK, as $L \rightarrow \infty$, with $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$, $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, for any two inputs $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, such that $1 - |\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}| \geq \delta > 0$ it holds that*

$$|\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{k}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})| = O(L^{1-2\gamma}).$$

Indeed, the convergence of ResNTK to FC-NTK with $L = 1$ is also reflected in its expansion near ± 1 , as can be seen from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near -1 , if $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$ then*

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1 + t) = c_{-1} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})$$

with

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$

implying that when $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$ with $L \rightarrow \infty$ we have from Lemma 4.5 that

$$c_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = c_{-1}.$$

Note that this common value of c_1 and c_{-1} in the limit when $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$ is identical to the value of the coefficients in the expansion of $\mathbf{k}^{(1)}$ near ± 1 for $L = 1$.

As a consequence of Theorem 4.8, for a training set of n samples using the Wielandt-Hoffman inequality (Golub & Van Loan, 1996), the eigenvalues associated with the odd frequencies are at most $O(n/L^{1-2\gamma})$. Note




Figure 1. The eigenvalues of ResNTK without ($\tau = 0$, left) and with bias ($\tau = 1$, right) as a function of frequency for different network depths and with $\gamma = 1$, i.e., $\alpha = 1/L$. With deep networks the eigenvalues of the bias-free ResNTK associated with odd frequencies ($k \geq 3$) become small, approaching 0 at $L \rightarrow \infty$. In contrast, with bias the eigenvalues decrease monotonically with frequency.

that in this ResNTK differs from FC-NTK, for which in all depths except $L = 1$ the eigenvalues of odd and even frequencies have similar values. Figure 1(left) shows the eigenvalues of ResNTK for various depth values as a function of frequency. It can be seen that as depth increases the eigenvalues of odd frequencies considerably decrease compared to those of the even frequencies. We note finally that the difference between the odd and even frequencies disappears if we chose $\gamma = 0.5$, i.e., $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{L}$, or if we include bias ($\tau > 0$), as can be seen in Figure 1(right).

5. Comparison of ResNTK and FC-NTK

Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 provide a full characterization of the set of functions in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space of ResNTK, denoted \mathcal{H}_r , defined in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} as

$$\mathcal{H}_r = \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ \lambda_k \neq 0}} \sum_{j=1}^{N(d,k)} a_{kj} Y_{kj}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ s.t. } \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_r} < \infty \right\},$$

where λ_k are the eigenvalues of \mathbf{r} and

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_r} = \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ \lambda_k \neq 0}} \sum_{j=1}^{N(d,k)} \frac{a_{kj}^2}{\lambda_k}. \quad (7)$$

Our characterization of the RKHS structure of ResNTK yields similar results to those shown for FC-NTK and for the Laplace kernel (Bietti & Bach, 2020; Chen & Xu, 2020; Geifman et al., 2020), yielding the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Denote by \mathcal{H}_k (resp. $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k$) the space of functions in the RKHS of a kernel \mathbf{k} in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} (resp. in \mathbb{R}^d). Then,*

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{H}_r = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k}_{L\alpha p}},$$

Moreover, in \mathbb{R}^d , with a radial measure (as in Thm. 4.2)

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathbf{k}} = \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathbf{r}} = \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathbf{k}_{HLap}}.$$

where for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, \mathbf{k}_{Lap} denotes the standard Laplace kernel defined by

$$\mathbf{k}_{Lap}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = e^{-c\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\|} = e^{-c\sqrt{2(1-\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{z})}}, \quad (8)$$

and for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ \mathbf{k}_{HLap} is the homogenized version of the Laplace kernel, defined in (Geifman et al., 2020) as

$$\mathbf{k}_{HLap} = \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\mathbf{z}\|e^{-c\sqrt{2\left(1-\frac{\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|\|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}}.$$

A consequence of Theorem 5.1 is that the three kernels, ResNTK, FC-NTK, and the (homogenized) Laplace kernel generate functions of the same smoothness properties, i.e., all three RKHSs include functions that have weak derivatives up to order $d/2$ (Narcowich et al., 2007). However, the structure of the RKHSs is not identical, since every kernel is associated with a unique RKHS. Consequently, while the eigenvalues decay at the same rate, they are not identical across kernels, or even across different depths for the same kernel, producing different RKHS norms (7). This, in turn, implies that when applied to the same regression problem, the kernels may produce somewhat different outcomes. For example, with deep architectures the bias-free ResNTK will be biased to interpolate functions with even frequencies, while with bias it will be agnostic to parity. Also, (Tirer et al., 2020) showed that under a suitable measure, with low values of α ResNTK tends to produce smoother interpolations. A close examination of their experiments however reveals that also with small values of α their interpolations are only piecewise smooth, consistent with the structure of the respective RKHS derived here.

Our analysis also allows to determine how sharp ResNTK is. In particular, the expansion of the Laplace kernel (8) near 1, derived by (Bietti & Bach, 2020), is given by

$$\mathbf{k}_{Lap}(1-t) = 1 - c\sqrt{2t} + O(t).$$

Therefore, the coefficient of $t^{1/2}$ indicates how steep a kernel is near 1. With ResNTK, its steepness depends on the choice of hyper-parameter α , which balances between the residual and skip connections. Using Lemma 4.5 we obtain that with $c = \frac{(1+\alpha^2 L)}{2\pi(1+\alpha^2)}$

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(1-t) - \mathbf{k}_{Lap}(1-t) = o(t^{1/2}).$$

Therefore, if α is set according to $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ with $0.5 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ then ResNTK is stable and its steepness is bounded, i.e.,

$$c^{\text{RES}}(L) = \frac{(1+\alpha^2 L)}{2\pi(1+\alpha^2)} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi}, & \gamma = 0.5 \\ \frac{1}{2\pi}, & 0.5 < \gamma \leq 1. \end{cases}$$




Figure 2. FC-NTK (left) and ResNTK (center $\alpha = 1$, right $\alpha = 1/L$) for networks of different depths, $L = 5, 20, 100$. For FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha = 1$, the kernel becomes spiky with depth. With $\alpha = 1/L$ ResNTK remains stable for all depths.

If however α is independent of depth ResNTK becomes steeper with depth. This is similar to FC-NTK, as is implied by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *With small $t > 0^1$*

$$\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(1-t) = 1 - \frac{L}{\pi\sqrt{2}}t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}). \quad (9)$$

Therefore, with $c = \frac{L}{2\pi}$, $\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(1-t) - \mathbf{k}_{Lap}(1-t) = o(t^{1/2})$.

Clearly therefore with deep networks FC-NTK becomes steeper near 1. This is consistent with (Huang et al., 2020) who proved that, except near $u = \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{z} = 1$, as the depth L tends to infinity FC-NTK approaches the constant 0.25. Therefore with deep architectures FC-NTK forms a spike.

Figure 2 shows the shape of both FC-NTK and ResNTK for three choices of network depths. Our experiments (Section 6) indeed show that for FC-NTK and ResNTK with constant value of α learning accuracy degrades with depth, while with a decaying α learning accuracy is stable across depth.

6. Experiments

We performed a number of experiments to show the effect of depth on ResNTK and to compare it to FC-NTK.

UCI Dataset We applied ResNTK and FC-NTK to 90 datasets of the UCI collection (< 5000 items) using the protocol of (Arora et al., 2020). We applied ridge regression with smoothness constant $\lambda = 1e^{-3}$ and normalized each data item to unit norm. To solve a classification problem, for each test item we regress each kernel to a one-hot vector and select the class that maximizes the regression result. For ResNTK we used a decaying balancing parameter ($\alpha = 1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}$) as well as constant $\alpha = 1$. (Due to condition number problems, in the case of constant α we only report results for 63 datasets.) We report average

¹Note that here we fix a slight miscalculation in (Bietti & Bach, 2020)(Corollary 3) which implied that the coefficient of $t^{1/2}$ is constant with depth.

Table 1. Classification accuracies on the UCI dataset obtained by applying FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha \in \{1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}, 1\}$.

NUMBER OF LAYERS	FC-NTK	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{L}$	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$	RESNTK, $\alpha = 1$
5	85.54 \pm 10.70	85.59 \pm 10.61	85.52 \pm 10.95	86.02 \pm 9.660
25	84.28 \pm 11.18	85.51 \pm 10.82	85.46 \pm 10.69	85.21 \pm 10.10
50	82.97 \pm 11.44	85.45 \pm 10.80	85.25 \pm 10.86	79.94 \pm 16.55
100	80.87 \pm 12.08	85.38 \pm 10.75	84.86 \pm 10.93	79.91 \pm 16.10

Table 2. Classification accuracies on the CIFAR-10 dataset obtained by applying FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha \in \{1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}\}$.

NUMBER OF LAYERS	FC-NTK	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{L}$	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$
5	58.29	58.23	58.32
25	54.33	57.72	58.33
50	51.42	57.58	58.34
100	48.27	57.53	58.34

Table 3. Classification accuracies on the SVHN dataset obtained by applying FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha \in \{1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}\}$.

NUMBER OF LAYERS	FC-NTK	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{L}$	RESNTK, $\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$
5	74.44	73.62	78.36
25	48.75	74.73	78.17
50	33.69	74.89	78.14
100	21.12	74.91	78.13

classification accuracy. Table 1 shows average accuracy for different depth values. It can be seen that while FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha = 1$ degrade with depth, from roughly 86% with 5 hidden layers to 80-81% with 100 layers, ResNTK with $\alpha = 1/L$ and $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{L}$ remain stable around 85-85.5%. Interestingly, in the latter cases also the standard deviations remain stable across different depths. We note that these results, peaked for FC-NTK at 85.54%, are comparable to those shown in (Arora et al., 2020), who reported an average accuracy of 81.95% on 90 datasets with hyper-parameter search, including depth and testing also with a Gaussian Process kernel.

CIFAR-10 We next applied both kernels to the CIFAR-10 dataset. Note that the kernels we applied correspond to classical and residual fully connected architectures and are not convolutional. We normalized the pixels in each image to zero mean and unit variance and used kernel regression with $\lambda = 0$. Table 2 shows classification accuracies with FC-NTK and ResNTK with $\alpha \in \{1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}\}$. As with the UCI experiments, test accuracies for FC-NTK degrade from 58.28% for 5 layers to 48.27% for 100 layers. In contrast, ResNTK with $\alpha \in \{1/L, 1/\sqrt{L}\}$ maintains an accuracy of 57.5%-58.3% across depth.

SVHN We repeated the same experiments on the SVHN dataset, see Table 3. Here too we normalized the pixels in each image to zero mean and unit variance but used regres-

sion with $\lambda = 1e^{-5}$. The differences between FC-NTK and ResNTK are even more extreme in this experiment. FC-NTK degrades from an accuracy of 74.44% with 5 layers to 21.12% with 100 layers, while ResNTK with $\alpha = 1/L$ and $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{L}$ maintains respectively a 74-75% and 78% accuracy for all tested depths.

7. Conclusion

We have provided derivations to determine the RKHS structure of NTK for residual networks. Our analysis indicates that, similar to NTK for classical, fully connected networks, the eigenfunctions of ResNTK are the (scaled) spherical harmonics and its eigenvalues decay polynomially with frequency k at the rate of k^{-d} . These in turn imply that the set of functions in its RKHS are identical to those of both FC-NTK and the Laplace kernel restricted to the hypersphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Our results imply that all three kernels produce functions of similar smoothness properties. We however showed that depending on the choice of α , which balances between the residual and skip connections, ResNTK can be controlled to become spiky with depth, as is the case with FC-NTK, or maintain a stable shape. In addition, we showed that deep bias-free ResNTK is significantly biased toward the even frequencies.

Our results suggest that NTK provides only a partial explanation to the success of residual networks. Indeed it appears that classification with FC-NTK degrades with depth, while classification with ResNTK can be made stable with a proper choice of a balancing hyper-parameter. However, our experiments suggest that with an optimal choice of depth classification results with FC-NTK and ResNTK are similar, most likely due to their similar RKHS structures. This is somewhat in contrast to actual implementations in which residual networks seem to significantly outperform classical feed-forward networks. This difference may be attributed to optimization issues, or to the possible invalidity of the assumptions of NTK to real networks of finite width. It is also possible that differences between residual and classical kernels are more significant in convolutional architectures.

References

- Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., and Song, Z. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 242–252. PMLR, 2019.
- Arora, S., Du, S., Hu, W., Li, Z., and Wang, R. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 322–332. PMLR, 2019.
- Arora, S., Du, S. S., Li, Z., Salakhutdinov, R., Wang, R., and Yu, D. Harnessing the power of infinitely wide deep nets on small-data tasks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Balduzzi, D., Frean, M., Leary, L., Lewis, J., Ma, K. W.-D., and McWilliams, B. The shattered gradients problem: If resnets are the answer, then what is the question? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08591*, 2017.
- Basri, R., Jacobs, D. W., Kasten, Y., and Kritchman, S. The convergence rate of neural networks for learned functions of different frequencies. In Wallach, H. M., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d’Alché Buc, F., Fox, E. A., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4763–4772, 2019.
- Basri, R., Galun, M., Geifman, A., Jacobs, D., Kasten, Y., and Kritchman, S. Frequency bias in neural networks for input of non-uniform density. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 685–694. PMLR, 2020.
- Bietti, A. and Bach, F. Deep equals shallow for relu networks in kernel regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14397*, 2020.
- Bietti, A. and Mairal, J. On the inductive bias of neural tangent kernels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 12893–12904, 2019.
- Cao, Y., Fang, Z., Wu, Y., Zhou, D.-X., and Gu, Q. Towards understanding the spectral bias of deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01198*, 2019.
- Chen, L. and Xu, S. Deep neural tangent kernel and laplace kernel have the same rkhs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10683*, 2020.
- Chizat, L., Oyallon, E., and Bach, F. On lazy training in differentiable programming. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2937–2947, 2019.
- Cho, Y. and Saul, L. Kernel methods for deep learning. In Bengio, Y., Schuurmans, D., Lafferty, J., Williams, C., and Culotta, A. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 22, pp. 342–350. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- Du, S., Lee, J., Li, H., Wang, L., and Zhai, X. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1675–1685. PMLR, 2019.
- Gallier, J. Notes on spherical harmonics and linear representations of lie groups. 2009.
- Geifman, A., Yadav, A., Kasten, Y., Galun, M., Jacobs, D., and Basri, R. On the similarity between the laplace and neural tangent kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01580*, 2020.
- Golub, G. H. and Van Loan, C. F. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, third edition, 1996.
- Greenfeld, D., Galun, M., Basri, R., Yavneh, I., and Kimmel, R. Learning to optimize multigrid PDE solvers. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97, pp. 2415–2423, 2019.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016a.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In Leibe, B., Matas, J., Sebe, N., and Welling, M. (eds.), *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016*. Springer International Publishing, 2016b.
- Howard, A., Sandler, M., Chu, G., Chen, L.-C., Chen, B., Tan, M., Wang, W., Zhu, Y., Pang, R., Vasudevan, V., et al. Searching for mobilenetv3. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1314–1324, 2019.
- Huang, K., Wang, Y., Tao, M., and Zhao, T. Why do deep residual networks generalize better than deep feed forward networks? - a neural tangent kernel perspective. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.06262, 2020.
- Jacot, A., Gabriel, F., and Hongler, C. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pp. 8571–8580. 2018.
- Lee, J., Schoenholz, S. S., Pennington, J., Adlam, B., Xiao, L., Novak, R., and Sohl-Dickstein, J. Finite versus infinite neural networks: an empirical study. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020.

- Li, H., Xu, Z., Taylor, G., Studer, C., and Goldstein, T. Visualizing the loss landscape of neural nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 6389–6399, 2018.
- Liang, T., Rakhlin, A., and Zhai, X. On the risk of minimum-norm interpolants and restricted lower isometry of kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10292*, 2019.
- Liang, T., Rakhlin, A., et al. Just interpolate: Kernel “ridgeless” regression can generalize. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1329–1347, 2020.
- Liu, T., Chen, M., Zhou, M., Du, S. S., Zhou, E., and Zhao, T. Towards understanding the importance of shortcut connections in residual networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 7892–7902, 2019.
- Narcowich, F. J., Sun, X., and Ward, J. D. Approximation power of rbfs and their associated sbfs: a connection. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 27(1):107–124, 2007.
- Pagliana, N., Rudi, A., De Vito, E., and Rosasco, L. Interpolation and learning with scale dependent kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09984*, 2020.
- Radosavovic, I., Kosaraju, R. P., Girshick, R., He, K., and Dollár, P. Designing network design spaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 10428–10436, 2020.
- Rahaman, N., Baratin, A., Arpit, D., Draxler, F., Lin, M., Hamprecht, F., Bengio, Y., and Courville, A. On the spectral bias of neural networks. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5301–5310. PMLR, 2019.
- Siravenha, A. C. Q., Reis, M. N. F., Cordeiro, I., Tourinho, R. A., Gomes, B. D., and Carvalho, S. R. Residual mlp network for mental fatigue classification in mining workers from brain data. In *2019 8th Brazilian Conference on Intelligent Systems (BRACIS)*, pp. 407–412, 2019. doi: 10.1109/BRACIS.2019.00078.
- Tan, M., Chen, B., Pang, R., Vasudevan, V., Sandler, M., Howard, A., and Le, Q. V. Mnasnet: Platform-aware neural architecture search for mobile. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 2820–2828, 2019.
- Tirer, T., Bruna, J., and Giryes, R. Kernel-based smoothness analysis of residual networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10008*, 2020.
- Veit, A., Wilber, M. J., and Belongie, S. Residual networks behave like ensembles of relatively shallow networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29: 550–558, 2016.
- Xu, Z. J., Zhang, Y., Luo, T., Xiao, Y., and Ma, Z. Frequency principle: Fourier analysis sheds light on deep neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1901.06523, 2019.
- Zhang, H., Dauphin, Y. N., and Ma, T. Residual learning without normalization via better initialization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019a.
- Zhang, H., Yu, D., Yi, M., Chen, W., and Liu, T.-y. Stability and convergence theory for learning resnet: A full characterization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.07120*, 2019b.

Appendix

A. Eigenfunctions of ResNTK

We next prove Theorem 4.1 from the paper.

Theorem A.1. *Bias-free ResNTK is homogeneous of degree 1 and zonal, i.e., $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| \mathbf{r}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)$. Its eigenfunctions under the uniform measure in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} are the spherical harmonics.*

Proof. We use the notation for $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ defined in Section 3.2 in the paper, without bias, i.e., $\tau = 0$. We first show that for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, L-1\}$ K_ℓ is homogeneous of degree 1 and zonal (abbreviated H1Z), i.e., for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right). \quad (10)$$

First, clearly $K_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}$ is H1Z. Next, suppose K_ℓ is H1Z, then

$$\begin{aligned} v_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \sqrt{K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})K_\ell(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z})} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| K_\ell(1) \\ u_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= \frac{K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{v_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}{K_\ell(1)} \\ K_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \alpha^2 v_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \kappa_1(u_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})) \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| \left(K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right) + \alpha^2 K_\ell(1) \kappa_1\left(\frac{K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}{K_\ell(1)}\right) \right) = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| K_{\ell+1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right), \end{aligned}$$

implying that $K_{\ell+1}$ is H1Z.

Next, we show that B_ℓ is homogeneous of degree 0 and zonal (abbreviated H0Z), i.e.,

$$B_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = B_{\ell+1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right). \quad (11)$$

$B_{L+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = 1$ is trivially H0Z. Suppose $B_{\ell+1}$ is H0Z, then

$$B_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = B_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) [1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1})] = B_{\ell+1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right) \left[1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0\left(\frac{K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}{K_\ell(1)}\right) \right] = B_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right).$$

Finally, using (10) and (11)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) &= C \sum_{\ell=1}^L B_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) [v_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \kappa_1(u_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})) + K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))] \\ &= C \sum_{\ell=1}^L B_{\ell+1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right) \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| \left[K_{\ell-1}(1) \kappa_1\left(\frac{K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}{K_\ell(1)}\right) + K_{\ell-1}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right) \kappa_0\left(\frac{K_\ell\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)}{K_\ell(1)}\right) \right] \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\| \mathbf{r}^{(L)}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}$ is homogeneous of degree 1 and zonal, and therefore, with the uniform measure in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} the eigenfunctions of $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}$ are the spherical harmonics. \square

B. Decay rate of ResNTK

In this section, we prove Lemmas 4.5, 4.6 and 4.9. We start with supporting Lemmas and notations that we use in this section.

Lemma B.1. (Huang et al., 2020) For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^\ell$.

Proof. With $\ell = 0$, $K_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^0$. Using the recursive definition of K_ℓ ,

$$K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + \alpha^2 K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}} \right) = K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) (1 + \alpha^2) \kappa_1(1)$$

Noting that $\kappa_1(1) = 1$ and assuming the induction holds for $K_{\ell-1}$, then

$$K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = K_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) (1 + \alpha^2) = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2) = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^\ell.$$

□

Corollary B.2. For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , $K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = (1 + \alpha^2)^\ell$.

B.1. Notation: ResNTK in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}

We next assume that $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and let $u = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}$. Then, using the corollary above, ResNTK can be expressed as follows

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(u) = \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L B_{\ell+1}(u) \left[(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(u)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + K_{\ell-1}(u) \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(u)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \right] \quad (12)$$

where $K_0(u) = u$, $B_{L+1}(u) = 1$, and

$$K_\ell(u) = K_{\ell-1}(u) + \alpha^2 (1 - \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(u)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L-1 \quad (13)$$

$$B_\ell(u) = B_{\ell+1}(u) \left[1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(u)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \right], \quad \ell = L, \dots, 2 \quad (14)$$

and κ_0 and κ_1 are defined as

$$\kappa_0(u) = \frac{1}{\pi} (\pi - \arccos(u)) \quad (15)$$

$$\kappa_1(u) = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(u \cdot (\pi - \arccos(u)) + \sqrt{1 - u^2} \right). \quad (16)$$

We further define the following for the expansion near -1 (small $t > 0$):

$$\nu_\ell = \frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \quad (17)$$

$$\beta_\ell = \kappa_1(\nu_\ell) \quad (18)$$

$$\eta_\ell = \kappa_0(\nu_\ell) \quad (19)$$

for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, and $\beta_0 = \eta_L = 0$. Note that $\beta_\ell, \eta_\ell \in [0, 1]$ due to the image of the arc-cosine kernels.

B.2. Expansion near 1

Lemma B.3. (Bietti & Bach, 2020) The arc-cosine kernels near 1 satisfy

$$\kappa_0(1-t) = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \quad (20)$$

$$\kappa_1(1-t) = 1 - t + \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} t^{3/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{5/2}). \quad (21)$$

Lemma B.4. For small $t > 0$, $K_\ell(1-t) = (1+\alpha^2)^\ell(1-t) + o(t)$, where K_ℓ is defined in (13).

Proof. We prove this by induction. For $\ell = 0$, $K_0(1-t) = 1-t$, trivially satisfying the lemma. Suppose the lemma holds for $K_{\ell-1}(1-t)$, using (13)

$$\begin{aligned} K_\ell(1-t) &= K_{\ell-1}(1-t) + \alpha^2(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t) + \alpha^2(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\kappa_1 \left(\frac{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t) + \alpha^2(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\kappa_1(1-t + o(t)) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + \alpha^2(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t) = (1+\alpha^2)^\ell(1-t) + o(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the leftmost equality in the last line is due to (21). □

Lemma B.5. With small $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) &= 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}t^{1/2} + o(t) \\ \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) &= 1 - t + o(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using Lemma B.4, for small $t > 0$,

$$\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} = \frac{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} = 1 - t + o(t).$$

Next, using (20)

$$\kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = \kappa_0(1-t + o(t)) = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}t^{1/2} + o(t),$$

and using (21)

$$\kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = \kappa_1(1-t + o(t)) = 1 - t + o(t). \quad \square$$

Lemma B.6. With small $t > 0$,

$$B_{\ell+1}(1-t) = (1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell} - \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi}(1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell-1}(L-\ell)t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t),$$

where B_ℓ is defined in (14).

Proof. With small $t > 0$, we use Lemma B.5 to simplify (14) as follows:

$$B_\ell(1-t) = B_{\ell+1}(1-t) \left[1 + \alpha^2 \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}t^{1/2} + o(t) \right) \right].$$

Since $B_{L+1} = 1$, resolving the recursion yields

$$B_{\ell+1}(1-t) = \left(1 + \alpha^2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi}t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \right)^{L-\ell}.$$

This can be simplified as follows

$$B_{\ell+1}(1-t) = \sum_{i=0}^{L-\ell} \binom{L-\ell}{i} \left(1 + \alpha^2 + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \right)^{L-\ell-i} \left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi}t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \right)^i.$$

Grouping together all $\mathcal{O}(t)$ terms, we finally obtain

$$B_{\ell+1}(1-t) = (1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell} - \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi}(1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell-1}(L-\ell)t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

□

We next prove Lemma 4.5 from the paper.

Lemma B.7. *For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near +1, if $\alpha > 0$ and $L \geq 1$*

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(1-t) = 1 + c_1 t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})$$

where

$$c_1 = -\frac{1+\alpha^2 L}{\sqrt{2}\pi(1+\alpha^2)}.$$

Proof. Rewrite (12) as $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(1-t) = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{1}{2L(1+\alpha^2)^{L-1}} \\ X_\ell &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + K_{\ell-1}(1-t) \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(1-t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \\ Y_\ell &= B_{\ell+1}(1-t). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas B.4 and B.5, for small $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_\ell &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t + o(t)) + ((1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + o(t)) \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + o(t) \right) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) + (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(1-t) \left(2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \left(2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) + o(t^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma B.6 each term in the sum can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} X_\ell Y_\ell &= \left[(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \left(2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) \right] \left[(1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell} - \frac{\alpha^2 \sqrt{2}}{\pi} (1+\alpha^2)^{L-\ell-1} (L-\ell) t^{1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(t) \\ &= \left[2(1+\alpha^2)^{L-1} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} (2\alpha^2(1+\alpha^2)^{L-2}(L-\ell) + (1+\alpha^2)^{L-1}) t^{1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(t) \\ &= (1+\alpha^2)^{L-1} \left[2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \left(\frac{2\alpha^2(L-\ell)}{1+\alpha^2} + 1 \right) t^{1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $C = \frac{1}{2L(1+\alpha^2)^{L-1}}$

$$C X_\ell Y_\ell = \frac{1}{2L} \left[2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \left(\frac{2\alpha^2(L-\ell)}{1+\alpha^2} + 1 \right) t^{1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(t)$$

Summing over the layers

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(1-t) = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi L} \left[\frac{\alpha^2 L(L-1)}{1+\alpha^2} + L \right] t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) = 1 - \frac{1+\alpha^2 L}{\sqrt{2}\pi(1+\alpha^2)} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}).$$

□

B.3. Expansion near -1

Here we investigate the expansion of ResNTK near -1. We consider two cases. First, with $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha^2 L$ does not vanish as L grows, and secondly, with $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$.

B.3.1. $\alpha > 0$ SUCH THAT $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$

Lemma B.8. (Bietti & Bach, 2020) *The arc-cosine kernels near -1 satisfy*

$$\kappa_0(-1+t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \quad (22)$$

$$\kappa_1(-1+t) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} t^{3/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{5/2}). \quad (23)$$

Lemma B.9. *With small $t > 0$,*

$$K_\ell(-1+t) = -1+t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}),$$

where β_ℓ as defined in (18).

Proof. With $\ell = 0$, $K_0(-1+t) = -1+t$, trivially satisfying the lemma. Suppose the lemma holds for $K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)$. Then, using (13) and (18)

$$\begin{aligned} K_\ell(-1+t) &= K_{\ell-1}(-1+t) + \alpha^2 (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) \\ &= K_{\ell-1}(-1+t) + \alpha^2 (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \beta_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction assumption

$$\begin{aligned} K_\ell(-1+t) &= -1+t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j + \alpha^2 (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \beta_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \\ &= -1+t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

The next Lemma ensures that β_ℓ is well defined (since κ_1 takes input in $[-1, 1]$).

Lemma B.10. *Let ν_ℓ as defined in (17). Then, $\forall \ell \geq 1$, $|\nu_\ell| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Using (17) and Lemma B.9 we have

$$\nu_\ell = \frac{-1+t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \quad (24)$$

Since $\beta_0 = 0$, with $\ell = 1$ $|\nu_1| = |-1+t| \leq 1$. With $\ell > 1$ using triangle inequality,

$$|\nu_\ell| \leq \left| \frac{-1+t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-2} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right| + \left| \frac{\alpha^2 (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-2} \beta_{\ell-1}}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right|.$$

Noting that the first term is $\left| \frac{\nu_{\ell-1}}{1+\alpha^2} \right|$, and assuming by induction that the lemma is satisfied for $\nu_{\ell-1}$, then

$$|\nu_\ell| \leq \frac{1}{1+\alpha^2} + \frac{\alpha^2 \beta_{\ell-1}}{1+\alpha^2} \leq \frac{1}{1+\alpha^2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} = 1,$$

where the rightmost inequality is because by definition $\beta_\ell \in [0, 1]$.

□

Lemma B.11. Let $\delta_\ell = \frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}}$. Then, $\forall \ell \geq 2$, $|\delta_\ell| < 1$.

Proof. For $\ell = 2$ we have $|\delta_2| = \left| \frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \beta_1}{1 + \alpha^2} \right| \leq \max\left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \alpha^2}, \frac{\alpha^2 - 1}{1 + \alpha^2} \right\} < 1$. Assume the lemma holds for $\ell - 1$. We prove for ℓ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta_\ell| &= \left| \frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right| = \left| \frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-2} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j + \alpha^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-2} \beta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-2} (1 + \alpha^2)} \right| = \\ &= \left| \frac{\delta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)} + \frac{\alpha^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-2} \beta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-2} (1 + \alpha^2)} \right| = \left| \frac{\delta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)} + \frac{\alpha^2 \beta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)} \right| \stackrel{\leq 1}{\leq} \left| \frac{\delta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)} \right| + \left| \frac{\alpha^2 \beta_{\ell-1}}{(1 + \alpha^2)} \right| <^2 \\ &\frac{1}{(1 + \alpha^2)} + \frac{\alpha^2}{(1 + \alpha^2)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where \leq^1 uses the triangle inequality, and $<^2$ is due to the induction hypothesis and the fact that $\forall \ell, \beta_\ell \in [0, 1]$. \square

Lemma B.12. With small $t > 0$, $\forall \ell \in [L - 1]$

$$\beta_\ell = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Proof. First, note that for $\ell = 1$ we get this directly from Lemma 23. For $\ell \geq 2$, using Lemma B.9 and the definition in (18):

$$\beta_\ell = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_1 (\delta_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t)),$$

where δ_ℓ is defined in Lemma B.11. Note that from this lemma, $-1 < \delta_\ell < 1$. In this domain, κ_1 is infinitely differentiable, hence we get:

$$\beta_\ell = \kappa_1 (\delta_\ell) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

\square

Lemma B.13. With small $t > 0$, $\forall \ell \in [L - 1]$

$$\beta_\ell = \tilde{c}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t),$$

where $\tilde{c}_\ell \in [0, 1]$ does not depend on t .

Proof. The proof is by induction. For $\ell = 1$ we have from Lemma B.12

$$\beta_1 = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1}{(1 + \alpha^2)} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \tilde{c}_1 + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Suppose the lemma holds for $\beta_{\ell-1}$ and show for β_ℓ

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\ell &= \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} (\tilde{c}_j + \mathcal{O}(t))}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \\ &\kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_1 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \tilde{c}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the leftmost equality in the second line is from Lemma B.12. The definition of \tilde{c}_ℓ directly implies that $\tilde{c}_\ell \in [0, 1]$. \square

Lemma B.14. *With small $t > 0$, and for $\ell = 1$,*

$$\eta_1 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}).$$

For $\ell \geq 2$,

$$\eta_\ell = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

where η_ℓ is defined in (19).

Proof. First, note that for $\ell = 1$ we get this directly from Lemma 22. For $\ell \geq 2$, using Lemma B.9 and the definition (19):

$$\eta_\ell = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_0 (\delta_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t)).$$

where δ_ℓ is defined in Lemma B.11. Note that from this lemma, $-1 < \delta_\ell < 1$. In this domain, κ_0 is infinitely differentiable, hence we get:

$$\eta_\ell = \kappa_0 (\delta_\ell) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t)$$

□

Lemma B.15. *With small $t > 0$, $\forall \ell \geq 2$*

$$\eta_\ell = \tilde{d}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t),$$

where $\tilde{d}_\ell \in [0, 1]$ does not depend on t .

Proof. The proof is by induction. For $\ell = 2$ we have from Lemma B.14

$$\eta_2 = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1}{(1 + \alpha^2)} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \tilde{d}_2 + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Suppose the lemma holds for $\eta_{\ell-1}$ and show for η_ℓ

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\ell &= \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} (\tilde{c}_j + \mathcal{O}(t))}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \\ &= \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \tilde{d}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the leftmost equality in the second line is from Lemma B.14. The definition of \tilde{d}_ℓ directly implies that $\tilde{d}_\ell \in [0, 1]$. □

Lemma B.16. *With small $t > 0$,*

$$B_{\ell+1}(-1 + t) = \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \eta_i)$$

where η_ℓ is defined in (19).

Proof. Since $B_{L+1} = 1$ and using (14)

$$B_{\ell+1}(-1 + t) = \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L \left[1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{i-1}(-1 + t)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{i-1}} \right) \right] = \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L [1 + \alpha^2 \eta_\ell]$$

□

We next prove Lemma 4.6 from the paper.

Lemma B.17. For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near -1, if $\alpha > 0$ and $L \geq 2$ then

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1+t) = p_{-1}(t) + c_{-1}t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}),$$

with

$$|c_{-1}| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi(1+\alpha^2)L}.$$

Proof. Rewrite (12) as $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1+t) = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{1}{2L(1+\alpha^2)^{L-1}} \\ X_\ell &= (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)\kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)}{(1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\beta_\ell + K_{\ell-1}(-1+t)\eta_\ell \\ Y_\ell &= B_{\ell+1}(-1+t). \end{aligned}$$

By plugging Lemma B.9 into the definition of X_ℓ we have

$$X_\ell = (1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\beta_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}\beta_j \right) \eta_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Using Lemma B.16 the sum can be written as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left((1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\beta_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}\beta_j \right) \eta_\ell \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1+\alpha^2\eta_i) + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

From Lemma B.14, there is a difference between $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$. For $\ell = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 Y_1 &= \left((1+\alpha^2)^0\beta_1 + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^0 (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}\beta_j \right) \eta_1 \right) \prod_{i=1+1}^L (1+\alpha^2\eta_i) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \\ &= -\eta_1 \prod_{i=2}^L (1+\alpha^2\eta_i) + \mathcal{O}(t) = - \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1+\alpha^2\eta_i) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma B.15 this simplifies to

$$X_1 Y_1 = - \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1+\alpha^2(\tilde{d}_i + \mathcal{O}(t))) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) = - \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1+\alpha^2\tilde{d}_i) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t)$$

For $\ell \geq 2$, using Lemmas B.13, B.15

$$\begin{aligned} X_\ell Y_\ell &= \left((1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\beta_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}\beta_j \right) \eta_\ell \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1+\alpha^2\eta_i) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \\ &= \left((1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}(\tilde{c}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t)) + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}(\tilde{c}_j + \mathcal{O}(t)) \right) (\tilde{d}_\ell + \mathcal{O}(t)) \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1+\alpha^2(\tilde{d}_i + \mathcal{O}(t))) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \\ &= \left((1+\alpha^2)^{\ell-1}\tilde{c}_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1+\alpha^2)^{j-1}\tilde{c}_j \right) \tilde{d}_\ell \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1+\alpha^2\tilde{d}_i) + \mathcal{O}(t) \end{aligned}$$

The sum can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = \left(\sum_{\ell=2}^L \left((1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \tilde{c}_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j \right) \tilde{d}_\ell \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right) - \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Multiplying this by the normalization factor C we have

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1 + t) = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = p_{-1}(t) + c_{-1} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}),$$

where

$$p_{-1}(t) = \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \left(\sum_{\ell=2}^L \left((1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \tilde{c}_\ell + \left(-1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \tilde{c}_j \right) \tilde{d}_\ell \right) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right)$$

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}.$$

From Lemma B.15,

$$|c_{-1}| = \left| \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \left(\prod_{i=2}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \tilde{d}_i) \right) \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-2}}{2\pi L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi(1 + \alpha^2)L}.$$

□

B.3.2. VANISHING REGIME $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$

For the case where $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$ with $L \rightarrow \infty$ (which implies $(1 + \alpha^2)^j \approx 1, \forall j \in [L]$), the analysis takes the following form. The next Lemma is analogous to Lemma B.9.

Lemma B.18. *With small $t > 0$ and $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$,*

$$K_\ell(-1 + t) = -1 + t + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}).$$

Proof. With $\ell = 0$, $K_0(-1 + t) = -1 + t$, trivially satisfying the lemma. Suppose the lemma holds for $K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t)$. Then, using (13) and (18)

$$K_\ell(-1 + t) = K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t) + \alpha^2 (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right)$$

$$= K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t) + \alpha^2 \kappa_1 (K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t)).$$

Where the last equality is from $\alpha^2 \ll 1$. By the induction assumption

$$K_\ell(-1 + t) = (-1 + t + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2})) + \alpha^2 \kappa_1 \left(-1 + t + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \right) = -1 + t + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}),$$

where the last equality is directly from Lemma B.8. □

The next Lemma is analogous to Lemma B.10.

Lemma B.19. *Let ν_ℓ as defined in (17). Then, for $\alpha^2 L \ll 1, \forall \ell \geq 1$, $\nu_\ell = -1 + \mathcal{O}(t)$.*

Proof. Using (24), with $\ell = 1, \nu_1 = -1 + t$. Assume the lemma is satisfied for $\nu_{\ell-1}$. Then, for $1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$,

$$\beta_j = \kappa_1(\nu_j) = \kappa_1(-1 + \mathcal{O}(t)) = \mathcal{O}(t),$$

where the rightmost equality is due to (23). Therefore, using (24) and $(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \approx 1$ we obtain

$$\nu_\ell = \frac{-1 + t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (1 + \alpha^2)^{j-1} \beta_j}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} = -1 + t + \alpha^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \mathcal{O}(t) = -1 + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

□

Combining this lemma with lemma B.8 we get the following lemmas (analogous to B.12, B.14):

Lemma B.20. *With $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$, $\forall \ell \in [L-1]$, $\beta_\ell = \kappa_1(\nu_\ell) = \kappa_1(-1 + t) = \mathcal{O}(t)$.*

Lemma B.21. *With $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$, $\forall \ell \in [L-1]$, $\eta_\ell = \kappa_0(\nu_\ell) = \kappa_0(-1 + t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t)$.*

Lemma B.22. *With $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$, $\forall \ell \in [L-1]$,*

$$B_{\ell+1}(-1 + t) = 1 + (L - \ell) \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Proof. Using lemma B.16, the expansion of \mathbf{B} around -1 can be written in this regime as:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\ell+1}(-1 + t) &= \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L (1 + \alpha^2 \eta_i) = \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right)^{L-\ell} + \mathcal{O}(t) \\ &= 1 + (L - \ell) \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t). \end{aligned}$$

□

We next prove Lemma 4.9 from the paper.

Lemma B.23. *For inputs in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and near -1, if $\alpha^2 L \ll 1$ then*

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1 + t) = c_{-1} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})$$

with

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi}$$

Proof. Rewrite (12) $\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1 + t) = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{1}{2L(1 + \alpha^2)^{L-1}} \approx \frac{1}{2L} \\ X_\ell &= (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \kappa_1 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) + K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t) \kappa_0 \left(\frac{K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t)}{(1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1}} \right) = (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \beta_\ell + K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t) \eta_\ell \\ Y_\ell &= B_{\ell+1}(-1 + t). \end{aligned}$$

Using $(1 + \alpha^2) \approx 1$ and Lemmas B.18, B.20 and B.21

$$X_\ell = (1 + \alpha^2)^{\ell-1} \beta_\ell + K_{\ell-1}(-1 + t) \eta_\ell = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Using the above and Lemma B.22, we have

$$X_\ell Y_\ell = \left(\left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) \left(1 + (L - \ell) \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha^2}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) \right) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^{(L)}(-1+t) &= C \sum_{\ell=1}^L X_\ell Y_\ell = C \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2L} \left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}L}{\pi} t^{1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(t) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that with the conditions of $\alpha^2 L \rightarrow 0$ with $L \rightarrow \infty$, using Lemma B.7,

$$c_1 = -\frac{1 + \alpha^2 L}{\sqrt{2}\pi(1 + \alpha^2)} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi}.$$

This is indeed the case when $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ with $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$. In this case we have from Lemma B.23 that $c_1 = c_{-1}$, implying that the odd frequencies decay faster than $\mathcal{O}(k^{-d})$. If however $\alpha = L^{-1/2}$ then for all L , $\alpha^2 L = 1$ and c_1 approaches $-\sqrt{2}/\pi$ and all the frequencies decay exactly at the rate of $\mathcal{O}(k^{-d})$.

C. Steepness of FC-NTK

Lemma C.1. (Bietti & Bach, 2020) With small $t > 0$,

$$\mathbf{k}_{Lap}(1-t) = e^{-c\sqrt{2}t} = 1 - c\sqrt{2}t + \mathcal{O}(t),$$

where \mathbf{k}_{Lap} is defined in equation (8) in the paper.

We next prove Lemma 5.2 from the paper.

Lemma C.2. With small $t > 0$,

$$\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(1-t) = 1 - \frac{L}{\pi\sqrt{2}} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}).$$

Therefore, with $c = \frac{L}{2\pi}$, $\mathbf{k}^{(L)}(1-t) - \mathbf{k}_{Lap}(1-t) = o(t^{1/2})$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the unnormalized kernel $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell)} = (\ell+1)\mathbf{k}^{(\ell)}$. With $\ell = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(1)}(1-t) &= (1-t)\kappa_0(1-t) + \kappa_1(1-t) = (1-t) \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(t^{3/2}) \right) + 1 + \mathcal{O}(t) \\ &= 2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell)}$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell)}(u) = \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell-1)}(u)\kappa_0(\Sigma^{(\ell-1)}(u)) + \Sigma^{(\ell)}(u).$$

Using

$$\Sigma^{(\ell)}(1-t) = 1-t + o(t),$$

that was proved in (Bietti & Bach, 2020). Additionally, using the equation above and Lemma B.8

$$\kappa_0(\Sigma^{(\ell-1)}(1-t)) = \kappa_0(1-t + o(t)) = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} (t + o(t))^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}) = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}).$$

Suppose the lemma holds for $j \leq \ell - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell)}(1-t) &= \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(\ell-1)}(1-t)\kappa_0(\Sigma^{(\ell-1)}(1-t)) + \Sigma^{(\ell)}(1-t) \\ &= \ell \left(1 - \frac{\ell-1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})\right) \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2})\right) + 1-t + o(t) \\ &= \ell + 1 - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{\pi\sqrt{2}}t^{1/2} + o(t^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\mathbf{k}^{(L)} = \frac{1}{L+1}\tilde{\mathbf{k}}^{(L)}$, the first part of the lemma is proven. Finally, using Lemma C.1, the relation to the Laplace kernel is immediate. \square

D. Proof of Theorem 4.8 from the paper

Theorem D.1. For ResNTK, as $L \rightarrow \infty$, with $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$, $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, for any two inputs $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, such that $1 - |\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}| \geq \delta > 0$ it holds that

$$|\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{k}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})| = O(L^{1-2\gamma}).$$

Proof. We follow the ResNTK notations in Sec. B.1. We include an additional subscript L to emphasize the dependence of α on L . Let

$$u_{\ell,L} = \frac{K_{\ell,L}}{(1+\alpha^2)^\ell}, \quad u_0 = K_0 = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{z}$$

and assume that $-1 + \delta < u_0 < 1 - \delta$. Following these notations, and using Corollary B.2, we obtain the following relation

$$u_{\ell,L} = \frac{u_{\ell-1,L} + \alpha^2 \kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L})}{1 + \alpha^2}, \quad (25)$$

which implies that

$$u_{\ell,L} - u_{\ell-1,L} = \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2}(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) - u_{\ell-1,L}). \quad (26)$$

We note that $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\kappa_1'(s) = \kappa_0(s)$, and therefore, the derivative of the function $\kappa_1(s) - s$ is non-positive, implying that $\kappa_1(s) - s$ is non-increasing. Therefore, the minimal value is attained at $s = 1$ and the maximal value at $s = -1$. Since $\kappa_1(1) - 1 = 0$ and $\kappa_1(-1) + 1 = 1$ this means that $0 \leq \kappa_1(s) - s \leq 1$. Now, by the relation (26), it is easy to see that $u_{\ell,L} \geq u_{\ell-1,L}$, which means that

$$u_0 \leq u_{1,L} \leq \dots \leq u_{L-1,L}. \quad (27)$$

In addition, we obtain the following upper bound for $u_{\ell,L} - u_0$

$$u_{\ell,L} - u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (u_{i,L} - u_{i-1,L}) = \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (\kappa_1(u_{i-1,L}) - u_{i-1,L}) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)\ell,$$

where the last inequality uses the observation $u_0 \leq u_{i,L}$ and that $\kappa_1(s) - s$ is decreasing. The last inequality is equivalent to

$$u_{\ell,L} \leq u_0 + \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)\ell. \quad (28)$$

For $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$, we have $\frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} = \frac{1}{1 + L^{2\gamma}}$, and since $0 \leq \kappa_1(s) - s \leq 1$ this inequality implies that

$$u_{L-1,L} \leq u_0 + \frac{L}{1 + L^{2\gamma}} \leq 1 - \delta + L^{1-2\gamma}. \quad (29)$$

Therefore, for $\gamma > 0.5$ and L sufficiently large, this yields a maximal bound $1 - \delta'$ over the series (27), with $\delta > \delta' > 0$.

Denote by

$$P_{\ell+1,L} = B_{\ell+1,L}(1 + \alpha^2)^{-(L-\ell)} = \prod_{i=\ell}^{L-1} \frac{1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0(u_{i,L})}{1 + \alpha^2},$$

and note that $P_{\ell+1,L} \in (0, 1]$. Since $1 - \frac{1 + \alpha^2 \kappa_0(u_{i,L})}{1 + \alpha^2} = \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \kappa_0(u_{i,L}))}{1 + \alpha^2}$ and for $a_k \in [0, 1]$, $1 - \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - a_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$ (see Lemma D.2), we obtain

$$1 - P_{\ell+1,L} = 1 - \prod_{i=\ell}^{L-1} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \kappa_0(u_{i,L}))}{1 + \alpha^2} \right) \leq \sum_{i=\ell}^{L-1} \frac{\alpha^2(1 - \kappa_0(u_{i,L}))}{1 + \alpha^2} = \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \left(L - \ell - \sum_{i=\ell}^{L-1} \kappa_0(u_{i,L}) \right). \quad (30)$$

Using these notations, ResNTK on the sphere (12) can be written as

$$\mathbf{r}^{(L)} = \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L P_{\ell+1,L} (\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L} \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})). \quad (31)$$

We next bound the distance of each layer from $\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0)$ from above. In the derivation below we apply several times the mean value theorem, i.e., $\exists c \in [a, b]$, such that $\kappa_1(b) - \kappa_1(a) = \kappa_0(c)(b - a) \leq \kappa_0(b)(b - a)$. This is valid since the derivative of κ_1 is κ_0 . In addition, κ_0 is monotonic increasing, so any $c \in [a, b]$ can be replaced by b .

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_{\ell+1,L}(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L} \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})) - (\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \\ & \leq |P_{\ell+1,L}| \cdot |(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L} \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})) - (\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot |1 - P_{\ell+1,L}| \\ & \leq |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0)| + |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_{\ell-1,L} - \kappa_0(u_0)u_0| + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot |1 - P_{\ell+1,L}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because $0 < P_{\ell-1,L} \leq 1$ and due to the mean value theorem. We next focus on the first two terms

$$\begin{aligned} & |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0)| + |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_{\ell-1,L} - \kappa_0(u_0)u_0| \\ & \leq |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0)| + |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_{\ell-1,L} - \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_0 + \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_0 - \kappa_0(u_0)u_0| \\ & \leq |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0)| + |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_{\ell-1,L} - \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_0| + |\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})u_0 - \kappa_0(u_0)u_0| \\ & = 2|\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0)| + |u_0(\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L}) - \kappa_0(u_0))| \\ & \leq^1 2\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L}) \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1) + |u_0|(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0) \kappa_0'(c_{\ell-1,L}) \\ & = 2\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L}) \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1) + |u_0|(u_{\ell-1,L} - u_0) \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{1 - c_{\ell-1,L}^2}} \\ & \leq^2 2\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L}) \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1)}{\pi \sqrt{1 - c_{\ell-1,L}^2}} \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \end{aligned}$$

where \leq^1 is obtained by applying (28) and the mean value theorem for κ_0 with $c_{\ell-1,L} \in [u_0, u_{\ell-1,L}]$, and \leq^2 too is obtained by applying (28).

Third term (30) and the monotonicity of κ_0 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot |1 - P_{\ell+1,L}| \leq |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \left(L - \ell - \sum_{i=\ell}^{L-1} \kappa_0(u_{i,L}) \right) \\ & \leq |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (L - \ell)(1 - \kappa_0(u_0)) \end{aligned}$$

To recap, the upper bound for each layer is

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_{\ell+1,L}(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L} \kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})) - (\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \\ & \leq 2\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L}) \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell - 1)}{\pi \sqrt{1 - c_{\ell-1,L}^2}} \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \\ & \quad + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0 \kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} (L - \ell)(1 - \kappa_0(u_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We would like next to derive a bound for the entire kernel, i.e., to bound from above the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(u_0) - \mathbf{k}^{(1)}(u_0)| &= \left| \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ P_{\ell+1,L}(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L}\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})) \right\} - \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0)) \right| \\
 &= \left| \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ P_{\ell+1,L}(\kappa_1(u_{\ell-1,L}) + u_{\ell-1,L}\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})) - (\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0)) \right\} \right| \\
 &\leq^3 \frac{1}{2L} \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ 2\kappa_0(u_{\ell-1,L})(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell-1) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell-1)}{\pi\sqrt{1-c_{\ell-1,L}^2}} + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))|(L-\ell)(1-\kappa_0(u_0)) \right\} \\
 &\leq^4 \frac{1}{2L} \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left(2(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell-1) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)(\ell-1)}{\pi\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}} \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2L} \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))|(1-\kappa_0(u_0)) \frac{L(L-1)}{2} \\
 &= \frac{L(L-1)}{2} \frac{1}{2L} \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} \left[2(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)}{\pi\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}} + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))|(1-\kappa_0(u_0)) \right] \\
 &= \frac{L-1}{4} \frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} \left[2(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)}{\pi\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}} + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))|(1-\kappa_0(u_0)) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

where \leq^3 is directly by applying (32), and \leq^4 relies on the fact that $0 \leq \kappa_0(s) \leq 1$ and the following argument. We would like to bound from above the term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-c_{\ell-1,L}^2}}$ for $c_{\ell-1,L} \in [u_0, u_{\ell-1,L}]$. Since we have

$$-1 + \delta' \leq -1 + \delta \leq u_0 \leq \dots \leq u_{L-1,L} \leq 1 - \delta \leq 1 - \delta',$$

it follows that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-c_{\ell-1,L}^2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}}$.

Since for $\alpha = L^{-\gamma}$ we have $\frac{\alpha^2}{1+\alpha^2} = \frac{1}{1+L^{2\gamma}}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathbf{r}^{(L)}(u_0) - \mathbf{k}^{(1)}(u_0)| &\leq \\
 &\frac{L-1}{4} \frac{1}{1+L^{2\gamma}} \left[2(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)}{\pi\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}} + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot (1 + \kappa_0(u_0)) \right] \leq \\
 &L^{1-2\gamma} \left[2(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0) + \frac{|u_0|(\kappa_1(u_0) - u_0)}{\pi\sqrt{1-(1-\delta')^2}} + |(\kappa_1(u_0) + u_0\kappa_0(u_0))| \cdot (1 + \kappa_0(u_0)) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence the bound is $O(L^{1-2\gamma})$, which means that for any $0.5 < \gamma \leq 1$, ResNTK converges as $L \rightarrow \infty$ to FC-NTK for 2-Layer MLP. \square

Lemma D.2. For $a_k \in [0, 1]$, it holds that $1 - \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - a_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$

Proof. By induction. The lemma holds trivially for $k = 1$. Assume the lemma holds for $k \leq n-1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 - \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - a_k) &= 1 - (1 - a_n) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - a_k) \right) = 1 - \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - a_k) + a_n \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - a_k) \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k + a_n \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - a_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n a_k.
 \end{aligned}$$

\square