

How Fine-Tuning Allows for Effective Meta-Learning

Kurtland Chua* Qi Lei* Jason D. Lee*

May 6, 2021

Abstract

Representation learning has been widely studied in the context of meta-learning, enabling rapid learning of new tasks through shared representations. Recent works such as MAML have explored using fine-tuning-based metrics, which measure the ease by which fine-tuning can achieve good performance, as proxies for obtaining representations. We present a theoretical framework for analyzing representations derived from a MAML-like algorithm, assuming the available tasks use *approximately* the same underlying representation. We then provide risk bounds on the best predictor found by fine-tuning via gradient descent, demonstrating that the algorithm can provably leverage the shared structure. The upper bound applies to general function classes, which we demonstrate by instantiating the guarantees of our framework in the logistic regression and neural network settings. In contrast, we establish the existence of settings where *any algorithm*, using a representation trained with no consideration for task-specific fine-tuning, performs as well as a learner with no access to source tasks in the worst case. This separation result underscores the benefit of fine-tuning-based methods, such as MAML, over methods with “frozen representation” objectives in few-shot learning.

1 Introduction

Meta-learning (Thrun & Pratt, 2012) has emerged as an essential tool for quickly adapting prior knowledge to a new task with limited data and computational power. In this context, a meta-learner has access to some different but related source tasks from a shared environment. The learner aims to uncover some inductive bias from the source tasks to reduce sample and computational complexity for learning a new task from the same environment. One of the most promising methods is representation learning (Bengio et al., 2013), *i.e.*, learning a feature extractor (or a common representation) from the source tasks.

*Princeton University. Correspondence to: Kurtland Chua <kchua@princeton.edu>

At test time, a learner quickly adapts to the new task by fine-tuning the representation and retraining the final layer(s) (see, *e.g.*, prototype networks (Snell et al., 2017)). Substantial improvement over directly learning from a single task is expected in few-shot learning (Antoniou et al., 2018), a setting that naturally arises in many applications including reinforcement learning (Mendonca et al., 2019; Finn et al., 2017), computer vision (Nichol et al., 2018), federated learning (McMahan et al., 2017) and robotics (Al-Shedivat et al., 2017).

The empirical success of representation learning has led to an increased interest in theoretical analyses of underlying phenomena. Recent work assumes an explicitly shared representation across tasks (Du et al., 2020; Tripuraneni et al., 2020b,a; Saunshi et al., 2020; Balcan et al., 2015). For instance, Du et al. (2020) shows a generalization risk bound consisting of an *irreducible* representation error and estimation error. Without fine-tuning the whole network, the representation error accumulates to the target task and is irreducible even with infinite target labeled samples. Due to the lack of (representation) fine-tuning during training, we refer to these methods as making use of “frozen representation” objectives. This result is consistent with empirical findings, which suggest substantial performance gains associated with fine-tuning the whole network, compared to just learning the final linear layer (Chen et al., 2020; Salman et al., 2020).

Requiring tasks to be linearly separable on the same features is also unrealistic for transferring knowledge to other domains (*e.g.*, from ImageNet to medical images (Raghu et al., 2019)). Therefore, we consider a more realistic setting, where the available tasks only approximately share the same representation. We propose a theoretical framework for analyzing the sample complexity of fine-tuning using a representation derived from a MAML-like algorithm. We show that fine-tuning quickly adapts to new tasks, requiring fewer samples in certain cases compared to methods using “frozen representation” objectives (as studied in Du et al. (2020), and will be formalized in Section 2.2). To the best of our knowledge, no prior studies exist beyond fine-tuning a linear model (Denevi et al., 2018; Konobeev et al., 2020; Collins et al., 2020a; Lee et al., 2020) or only the task-specific layers (Du et al., 2020; Tripuraneni et al., 2020b,a; Mu et al., 2020). In particular, our work can be viewed as a continuation of the work presented in Tripuraneni et al. (2020b), where the authors have acknowledged that the framework does not incorporate representation fine-tuning, and thus is a promising line of future work.

The following outlines this paper and its contributions:

- In Section 2, we outline the general setting and overall assumptions.
- In Section 3, we provide an in-depth analysis of the (d -dimensional) linear representation setting. First, we show that our MAML-like algorithm achieves a rate of $r_{source} = O(\frac{kd}{n_S T} + \frac{k}{n_S} + \delta_0 \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr} \Sigma}{n_S}})$ on the source tasks and $O(\frac{k}{n_T} + \delta_0 \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr} \Sigma}{n_T}} + r_{source})$ on the target when the norm of the representation change is bounded by δ_0 , showing that fine-tuning can handle the approximately-shared representation setting. In contrast, “frozen representation” methods have a minimax rate of $\Omega(d/n_T)$ on the target task under certain task distributions, demonstrating that prior methods can fail.

- In Section 4, we extend the analysis to general function classes. Our result provides bounds of the form

$$\varepsilon_{\text{OPT}} + \varepsilon_{\text{EST}} + \varepsilon_{\text{REPR}},$$

where ε_{OPT} is the optimization error, ε_{EST} is the estimation error, and $\varepsilon_{\text{REPR}}$ stands for representation error.

The **optimization error** naturally arises when the output of optimization procedure reaches an ε_{OPT} -approximate minimum. To control ε_{OPT} , our analysis accounts for nonconvexity introduced by representation fine-tuning, which is presented as a self-contained result in Section F.

The **estimation error** ε_{EST} stems from fine-tuning the target parameters with finite n_T samples. It therefore scales with $1/\sqrt{n_T}$ and is controlled by the (Rademacher) complexity of the target fine-tuning set.

Finally, the **representation error** $\varepsilon_{\text{REPR}}$ is the error associated with learning the centered representation while adapting to the task-specific deviations. Therefore it naturally consists of two terms: one term scales with $1/\sqrt{n_S T}$ on learning the centered representation jointly with all T source tasks; and the other term scales with $1/\sqrt{n_S}$ on the small adaptation to each source task.

- In Section 5, we instantiate our guarantees in the logistic regression and two-layer neural network settings.
- In Section 6, we extend the separation result presented in Section 3 to a non-linear setting.
- In Section 7, we experimentally verify the separation result in the linear setting from Section 3.

1.1 Related Work

The empirical success of MAML (Finn et al., 2017) or, more generally, meta-learning, invokes further theoretical analysis from both statistical and optimization perspectives. A flurry of work engages in developing more efficient and theoretically-sound optimization algorithms (Antoniou et al., 2018; Nichol et al., 2018; Li et al., 2017) or showing convergence analysis (Fallah et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2019; Rajeswaran et al., 2019; Collins et al., 2020b). Inspired by MAML, a line of gradient-based meta-learning algorithms have been widely used in practice Nichol et al. (2018); Al-Shedivat et al. (2017); Jerfel et al. (2018). Much follow-up work focused on online-setting with regret bounds (Denevi et al., 2018; Finn et al., 2019; Khodak et al., 2019; Balcan et al., 2015; Alquier et al., 2017; Bullins et al., 2019; Pentina & Lampert, 2014).

The statistical analysis of meta-learning can be traced back to Baxter (2000); Maurer & Jaakkola (2005), with a principle of inductive bias learning. Following the same setting, Amit & Meir (2018); Konobeev et al. (2020); Maurer et al. (2016); Pentina & Lampert

(2014) assume a shared meta distribution for sampling the source tasks and measure generalization error/gap averaged over the meta distribution. Another line of work connects the target performance to source data with some distance measure between distributions (Ben-David & Borbely, 2008; Ben-David et al., 2010; Mohri & Medina, 2012). Finally, another series of works studied the benefits of using additional “side information” provided with a task for specializing the parameters of an inner algorithm (Denevi et al., 2020, 2021).

The hardness of meta-learning also attracts some investigation under various settings. Some recent work studies the meta-learning performance in worst-case setting (Collins et al., 2020b; Hanneke & Kpotufe, 2020a,b; Kpotufe & Martinet, 2018; Lucas et al., 2020). Hanneke & Kpotufe (2020a) provides a no-free-lunch result with problem-independent minimax lower bound, and Konobeev et al. (2020) also provide problem-dependent lower bound on a simple linear setting.

2 General Setting

2.1 Notation

Let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. We denote the vector L_2 -norm as $\|\cdot\|_2$, and the matrix Frobenius norm as $\|\cdot\|_F$. Additionally, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ can denote either the Euclidean inner product or the Frobenius inner product between matrices.

For a matrix A , we let $\sigma_i(A)$ denote its i^{th} largest singular value. Additionally, for positive semidefinite A , we write $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ for its largest and smallest eigenvalues, and $A^{1/2}$ for its principal square root. We write P_A for the projection onto the column span of A , denoted $\text{Col } A$, and $P_A^\perp := I - P_A$ for the projection onto its complement.

We use standard O , Θ , and Ω notation to denote orders of growth. We also use $a \lesssim b$ or $a \ll b$ to indicate that $a = O(b)$. Finally, we write $a \asymp b$ for $a = \Theta(b)$.

2.2 Problem Setting

We assume that the learner has access to T source tasks. Every task $t \in [T]$ is associated with a distribution μ_t over the set $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ of input-label pairs. We consider $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ throughout. For every task, the learner observes n_S i.i.d. samples $\{(x_{i,t}, y_{i,t})\}_{i \in [n_S]}$ from μ_t . We collect these inputs into matrices $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_S \times d}$ and labels into vectors $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_S}$ for convenience. Finally, we measure learner performance using the loss function $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We aim to find a common structure across the source tasks that could be leveraged for learning future tasks. As done by Du et al. (2020), we study the case where the common structure is given by a *representation*, a mapping $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ from the input space to a latent space $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. We assume that these representations lie in a function class \mathcal{F} parameterized by some normed space. In contrast to prior work however, we *do not* assume the existence of a common representation – instead, each source task has an associated

representation ϕ_{θ_t} close to a fixed representation ϕ_{θ_0} , *i.e.* $\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|$ is small. As before, we apply a task-specific linear transformation to the representation to obtain the final prediction. Formally, the predictor for task $t \in [T]$ is given by $x \mapsto \langle w_t, \phi_t(x) \rangle$. We then consider the following optimization problem for some $\delta_0 > 0$:

$$\min_{\theta_0} \min_{\substack{\theta_t, w_t \\ \|\theta_t - \theta_0\| \leq \delta_0}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ell(\langle w_t, \phi_{\theta_t}(x_{i,t}) \rangle, y_{i,t}). \quad (1)$$

We will refer to the procedure above as ADAPTREP, as it can be intuitively described as finding an initialization ϕ in representation space such that there exists a good representation nearby for every task (and thus a learner simply needs a small *adaptation/fine-tuning* step to achieve good performance). We note that the objective can be viewed as a constrained form of algorithms found in the literature such as iMAML (Rajeswaran et al., 2019) and Meta-MinibatchProx (Zhou et al., 2019). However, we do not have a train-validation split, as is widespread in practice. This setup is motivated by results in Bai et al. (2020), which show that data splitting may not be preferable performance-wise, assuming realizability. Furthermore, empirical evaluations have demonstrated successes despite the lack of such a split (Zhou et al., 2019).

Let θ_0 be the initialization obtained from (1), which we will now use to learn future tasks. More concretely, let μ_{T+1} be a distribution over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ from which we have n_T i.i.d. samples $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n_T]}$. As before, we collect these samples into a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T \times d}$ and a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T}$. We then adapt to the target task by solving

$$\min_{\substack{\theta, w \\ \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta_0}} \frac{1}{2n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \ell(\langle w, \phi_{\theta}(x_i) \rangle, y_i). \quad (2)$$

In the following sections, we will analyze the performance of the learned predictor for the population loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{T+1}}(\theta, w) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mu_{T+1}} [\ell(\langle w, \phi_{\theta}(x) \rangle, y)].$$

We focus on the few-shot learning setting for the target task, where we assume limited access to target data, and a learner needs to effectively use the source tasks to learn the target task quickly.

For ADAPTREP to be sensible, we need to ensure the existence of a desirable initialization. We do so by assuming that there exists an initialization θ_0^* such that for any $t \in [T]$, there exists a representation θ_t^* with $\|\theta_t^* - \theta_0^*\| \leq \delta_0$ and a predictor w_t^* so that μ_t is given by

$$x \sim p_t, \quad y | x \sim q(\cdot | \langle w_t^*, \phi_{\theta_t^*}(x) \rangle)$$

with distribution q to model some additive noise. Specifically, in regression, we set $\mathbb{E}[y_t | x] = \langle w_t^*, \phi_{\theta_t^*}(x) \rangle$. With an appropriate choice of loss function ℓ , we can guarantee that the optimal predictor under the population loss is $x \mapsto \langle w_t^*, \phi_{\theta_t^*}(x) \rangle$.

Throughout the paper, we assume the existence of an oracle during source training time for solving (1), as in Du et al. (2020); Tripuraneni et al. (2020b). For detailed analyses of source training optimization, we refer the reader to Ji et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2020). Nevertheless, representation fine-tuning introduces nonconvexity during target time not present in prior work, where one only needed to solve the convex problem of optimizing a final linear layer. Thus, our bounds explicitly take into account optimization performance on (2). To this end, we analyze the use of projected gradient descent (PGD), which applies to a wide variety of settings, under certain loss landscape assumptions. These standalone results are also provided in Section F.

As a point of comparison with ADAPTRREP, we will also be analyzing the “frozen representation” objective used in Du et al. (2020); Tripuraneni et al. (2020b). In particular, using the notation introduced above, such objectives consider the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\theta_0} \min_{w_t} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ell(\langle w_t, \phi_{\theta_0}(x_{i,t}) \rangle, y_{i,t}). \quad (3)$$

Due to the fact that the representation, once chosen, is fixed/frozen for all source tasks, we refer to the representation learning method above as FROZENREP throughout the rest of the paper. In Sections 3.4 and 6, we will demonstrate that unlike with ADAPTRREP, there exists cases where FROZENREP is unable to take advantage of the fact that the tasks approximately share representations.

3 ADAPTRREP in the Linear Setting

To illustrate the theory, we first examine ADAPTRREP in the linear setting. That is, we consider the set of linear transformations $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ for $d > k$, equipped with the Frobenius norm, so that $\phi_B(x) = B^\top x$. In this setting, we provide a performance bound for ADAPTRREP, and then exhibit a specific construction for which the baseline method in Du et al. (2020) fails to find useful representations.

3.1 Statistical Assumptions

We proceed to instantiate the data assumptions outlined in Section 2.2. First, we assume that the inputs for all tasks come from a common zero-mean distribution p , with covariance $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} [xx^\top] = \Sigma$. Let $\kappa = \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)/\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma)$ be the condition number of this covariance matrix. As done by Du et al. (2020), we impose the following tail condition:

Assumption 3.1 (Sub-Gaussian input). *There exists $\rho > 0$ such that if $x \sim p$, then $\Sigma^{-1/2}x$ is ρ^2 -sub-Gaussian¹.*

¹Recall that a zero-mean random vector v is ρ^2 -sub-Gaussian if for any fixed unit vector u , $\mathbb{E} [\exp(\lambda v^\top u)] \leq \lambda^2 \rho^2 / 2$.

This assumption is used in the proofs to guarantee probabilistic tail bounds, and can be replaced with other conditions with appropriate modifications to the analysis. Finally, we define $q(\cdot | \mu) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for a fixed $\sigma > 0$.

We proceed to parametrize the tasks. Let B^* be the ground truth initialization point, and Δ_t^* be the task-specific fine-tuning for task t , where $\|\Delta_t^*\|_F \leq \delta_0$. Furthermore, let $w_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be the task-specific predictor weights, which we combine into a matrix $W^* = [w_1^*, \dots, w_T^*] \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times T}$.

Assumption 3.2 (Source task diversity). *For any $t \in [T]$, $\|w_t^*\|_2 = \Theta(1)$, and $\sigma_k^2(W^*) = \Omega(T/k)$.*

Since the predictor weights all have $\Theta(1)$ norm, and thus $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i(W^*)^2 = \|W^*\|_F^2 = \Theta(T)$, the assumption on $\sigma_k(W^*)^2$ implies that the weights covers directions in \mathbb{R}^k roughly evenly. This condition is satisfied with high probability when the w_t^* are sampled from a sub-Gaussian distribution with well-conditioned covariance.

Finally, we evaluate the performance of the learner on a target task $\theta^* := B^*w^* + \delta^*$ for some w^* and $\|\delta^*\|_2 \leq \delta_0$.

To gain an intuition for the parameters, note that $(B^* + \Delta_t^*)w_t^* = B^*w_t^* + \delta_t^*$, where $\|\delta_t^*\|_2 \lesssim \delta_0$ by the norm conditions in Assumption 3.2. Thus, we can think of the assumptions on the source predictor weights as ensuring their proximity to a rank- k space.

Finally, as a convention since the parameterization is not unique, we define the optimal parameters so that $(B^*)^\top \Sigma \delta_t^* = 0$ for any $t \in [T]$. This results in no loss of generality, as we can always redefine w_t^* and δ_t^* as such.

3.2 Training Procedure

(Source training) We can write the objective (1) in this setting as

$$\min_B \min_{\substack{\Delta_t, w_t \\ \|\Delta_t\|_F \leq \delta_0}} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|y_t - X_t(B + \Delta_t)w_t\|_2^2.$$

However, note that the objective does not impose any constraint on the predictor, as we can offload the norm of Δ_t onto w_t . Therefore, we instead consider the regularized source training objective

$$\min_B \min_{\Delta_t, w_t} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|y_t - X_t(B + \Delta_t)w_t\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_t\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|w_t\|_2^2. \quad (4)$$

As will be shown in Section A, the regularization is equivalent to regularizing $\sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \|\Delta_t w_t\|_2$, which is consistent with the intuition that δ_t^* has small norm.

(Target training) Letting B_0 be the obtained representation after orthonormalization, we adapt to the target task by optimizing

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(\Delta, w) = \frac{1}{2n} \|y - \beta X (A_{B_0} + \Delta) (w_0 + w)\|_2^2, \quad (5)$$

where $A_{B_0} := [B_0 \ B_0] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$ and $w_0 = [u, -u]$ for some unit-norm vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$. To optimize the objective, we perform PGD on (5) with

$$\mathcal{C}_\beta := \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F \leq c_1/\beta, \|w\|_2 \leq c_2/\beta\}$$

as the feasible set, where we explicitly define c_1 and c_2 in Section A.

To understand the choice of training objective above, observe that the predictor can be written as

$$x \mapsto \beta(x^\top A_{B_0} w + x^\top \Delta w_0 + x^\top \Delta w),$$

where the ‘‘antisymmetric’’ initialization scheme ensures that $A_{B_0} w_0 = 0$. Due to the choice of \mathcal{C}_β , the first two terms are of norm $O(1)$, while the last term is of norm $O(1/\beta)$. Therefore, for large enough β , we can treat the cross term Δw as a negligible perturbation, and the predictor is approximately linear in the parameters. Indeed, one can show that \mathcal{L}_β is thus approximately convex, guaranteeing that the best solution found by PGD is nearly optimal.

3.3 Performance Bound

Now, we provide a performance bound on the performance of the algorithm proposed in the previous section, which we prove in Section A. We define the following rates² of interest:

$$\begin{aligned} r_S(n_S, T) &:= \frac{\sigma^2 kd}{n_S T} + \sigma \delta_0 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{kd}{n_S T}} + \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_S} + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} \\ r_T^{(1)}(n_T) &:= k r_S(n_S, T) + \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_T} + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} \\ r_T^{(2)}(n_T) &:= \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_T} + \left[1 + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{\lambda_{\min}} k r_S(n_S, T)} \right] \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1 (Performance guarantee, linear representations). *Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Assume that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, and that $n_S \gg \rho^4(d + \log(T/\delta))$ and $n_T \gg \rho^4(d + \log(1/\delta))$. Then there are $(\lambda, \gamma, \beta, T_{\text{PGD}}, \eta, c_1, c_2)$ (specified in Section A) such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of all samples, the training procedure in Section 3.2 can find a parameter θ such that the excess risk on the target task is bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E} [(x^\top \theta^* - x^\top \theta)^2] \lesssim \min \left(r_T^{(1)}(n_T), r_T^{(2)}(n_T), \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T} \right).$$

We briefly remark on the three available rates, which corresponds to three different subalgorithms depending on the amount of target data. Firstly, as will be proven in Section A, r_S is a performance bound on the learner during source training. Then:

²Log factors and non-dominant terms have been suppressed for clarity. Full rates are presented in the appendix.

1. In the most data-starved regime, we restrict the learner so that it can only adapt to learn δ^* for the target task to obtain the first rate. Notably, $r_T^{(1)}$ incorporates the resulting irreducible source error in the form of $kr_S(n_S, T)^3$.
2. The second rate $r_T^{(2)}$ results when we allow the learner to adapt more (requiring more target samples) to reduce the irreducible error due to finite n_S . Observe that this additional complexity in the fine-tuning step is captured by the multiplicative factor that shrinks to 1 in the limit of infinite source samples.
3. Finally, we can obtain the trivial $\sigma^2 d/n_T$ rate by ignoring B_0 , which matches the minimax lower bound for standard linear regression (see e.g., Duchi (2016)).

3.4 A Hard Case for FROZENREP

In what follows, we demonstrate the existence of a family of task distributions satisfying the assumptions outlined in Section 3.1 that is difficult for the method in Du et al. (2020), which we will refer to as FROZENREP⁴. More explicitly, we prove an $\Omega(d/n)$ minimax rate on the target task when using an FROZENREP-derived representation, *even with access to infinite source tasks and data*. Since this rate is achievable via training on the target task directly, this demonstrates that FROZENREP fails to capture the shared information between the tasks. In contrast, by specializing Theorem 3.1 to the proposed family of tasks, we will show that ADAPTRREP can indeed achieve a strictly faster statistical rate.

We proceed to explicitly define the objects in Section 3.1. Let p be a Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{R}^d with covariance

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon I_{d-k} & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}$$

for a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We define $E^*, E_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the eigenspaces corresponding to the first and second block of Σ , respectively, *i.e.*

$$E^* = \text{Col} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon I_{d-k} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad E_k = \text{Col} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, for an orthogonal matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, define a corresponding task distribution given by

$$\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}} Bw + \delta, \tag{6}$$

where w and δ are sampled uniformly at random from the unit spheres in \mathbb{R}^k and E_k , respectively. The family of interest is the set of task distributions induced by any B^* such that $\text{Col } B^* \subset E^*$.

³When measuring average target performance, $kr_S(n_S, T)$ can be replaced by $r_S(n_S, T)$; see Section 5.1; Du et al. (2020).

⁴This is in reference to the fact that the representation is frozen during source training, *i.e.* no task-specific fine-tuning.

In this setting, we can write the FROZENREP objective in (3) as

$$\hat{B} = \operatorname{argmin}_B \min_{w_t} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|y_t - X_t B w_t\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

First, we characterize the span of \hat{B} in the limit of infinite source tasks and data. Intuitively, since both $B^* w$ and δ both lie in (distinct) rank- k spaces, but $(1/\sqrt{2\varepsilon}) \|\Sigma^{1/2} B^* w\|_2 \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2} \delta\|_2$ for any (w, δ) from the task distribution (and thus the error along δ is larger), FROZENREP learns E_k rather than B^* .

Lemma 3.1 (FROZENREP learns incorrect space). *Fix an orthogonal matrix $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ with $\operatorname{Col} B^* \subseteq E^*$, and assume that we sample task weights from the distribution in (6). Then, with infinitely many tasks and per-task samples ($n_S, T \rightarrow \infty$), $\operatorname{Col} \hat{B} = E_k$.*

The claim is proven in Section B. Although “incorrect”, it is unclear *a priori* that this choice of \hat{B} is undesirable performance-wise – we now show that this indeed the case. In fact, *any algorithm* making use of \hat{B} , in the worst case, cannot perform any better than a learner that is constrained to only use target data.

Theorem 3.2 (FROZENREP minimax bound). *For an orthogonal matrix $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ whose column space lies in E^* , let S_{B^*} be the set*

$$S_{B^*} := \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}} B^* w + \delta \mid \|w\|_2 \leq 1, \|\delta\|_2 \leq 1, \delta \in E_k \right\}.$$

Then, with high probability over the draw of $n_T \gg d$ samples during target training, we have that

$$\min_{\substack{\bar{B}, \hat{w}, \hat{\delta} \\ \operatorname{Col} \bar{B} = \operatorname{Col} \hat{B}}} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{B^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \bar{B} \hat{w} - \hat{\delta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T},$$

where \hat{B} is the output of FROZENREP in the setting of Lemma 3.1, with the task distribution determined by B^* . The expectation is over the randomness in the labels $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_{n_T})$. Furthermore, \bar{B} , \hat{w} , and $\hat{\delta}$ are measurable functions of (X, y) to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, \mathbb{R}^k , and \mathbb{R}^d , respectively.

The previous result, which we prove in Section B, shows that *any procedure* making use of target samples to learn a predictor of the form $\hat{B} \hat{w} + \hat{\delta}$ has a minimax rate of $\Omega(d/n)$. This includes target-time fine-tuning procedures used by methods in practice such as iMAML, MetaOptNet (Lee et al., 2019), and R2D2 (Bertinetto et al., 2019). Notably, this rate is achievable by performing linear regression solely on the target samples, reflecting that the FROZENREP learner failed to capture the shared task structure. In contrast, by specializing the guarantee of Theorem 3.1 to this setting, we have the following result:

Corollary 3.1. Fix $k = \Theta(1)$ and $d \gg k$, and set $\varepsilon = k/d$. Furthermore, assume that $n_S T \gtrsim d^2$, and $n_S \geq n_T \asymp d$. Then, for a fixed target task in S_{B^*} as defined in Theorem 3.2, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of samples, the procedure outlined in Section 3.2 achieves excess risk bounded as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(x^\top \theta^* - x^\top \hat{\theta})^2 \right] \lesssim \min \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}}, \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T} \right).$$

In contrast to the rate above, the minimax rate in Theorem 3.2 remains bounded away from 0 when $n_T \asymp d$. Therefore, in addition to performing at least as well as the minimax rate for FROZENREP for *any* $n_T \gtrsim d$, there exists a strict separation between the methods that widens as $n_T \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, the guarantee can be achieved with finite source samples. Thus, we have established a setting where incorporating a notion of representation fine-tuning into meta-training is *provably necessary* for the meta-learner to succeed.

4 ADAPTREP in the Nonlinear Setting

We now describe a general framework for analyzing fine-tuning in general function classes. To simplify the notation, we modify the setting described in Section 2.2 so that both the representation ϕ and task-specific weight vector w are captured by one parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, with corresponding predictor g_θ .

Throughout this section, we denote the population loss induced by a predictor g as

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty^g(h) := \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mu_g} [\ell(h(x), y)],$$

where μ_g samples $x \sim p$ and $y \mid x \sim q(\cdot \mid g(x))$. Additionally, we let $\mathcal{L}^g(h)$ denote the corresponding finite-sample quantity⁵.

Furthermore, for a fixed parameter θ and a set \mathcal{C} , we define the set $\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}}$ to be

$$\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}} := \{g_{\theta'} \mid \theta' - \theta \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Intuitively, we can think of \mathcal{C} as the possible ways a learner could adapt, and $\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the resulting set of possible predictors given an initialization θ . For convenience, we define $(\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}})^{\otimes T}$ to be the set of functions mapping $\mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^T$ defined as

$$(\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}})^{\otimes T} := \{(x_i)_{i \in [T]} \mapsto (f_i(x_i))_{i \in [T]} \mid f_1, \dots, f_T \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}}\}.$$

That is, $(\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}})^{\otimes T}$ can be interpreted as the set of possible choices of T predictors for T source tasks that are all close to some initialization θ .

⁵Note that we have omitted the samples from the notation for brevity.

4.1 Training Procedure

The training procedure is defined by a set of possible initializations $\Theta_0 \subseteq \Theta$, and fine-tuning sets $\mathcal{C}_S, \mathcal{C}_T \subseteq \Theta$. We then rewrite the objective defined in (1) in terms of θ as

$$\theta_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \min_{g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S}} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ell(g_t(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t}). \quad (8)$$

Note that \mathcal{C}_S is the feasible set of task-specific fine-tuning options for source training. Then, given samples from a target task g^* , we perform T_{PGD} steps of PGD with step size η on the objective $\delta \mapsto \mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g_{\theta_0+\delta})$, with feasible fine-tuning set \mathcal{C}_T .

4.2 Assumptions

We now outline the assumptions we make in this setting.

Assumption 4.1. *For any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\ell(\cdot, y)$ is 1-Lipschitz⁶ and convex, and that $|\ell(0, y)| \leq B$.*

To ensure transfer from source to target, we impose the following condition, a specific instance of which was proposed by Du et al. (2020) in the linear setting, and proposed by Tripuraneni et al. (2020b) for general settings:

Assumption 4.2 (Source tasks are (ν, ε) -diverse). *There exists constants (ν, ε) such that if ρ is the distribution of target tasks, then for any $\theta \in \Theta_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\inf_{g \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_T}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g^*) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \inf_{g \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \right] + \varepsilon.$$

That is, the average best-case performance on the set of target tasks is controlled by the task-averaged best-case performance on the source tasks.

The (ν, ε) -diversity assumption ensures that optimizing θ for the average source task performance results in controlled average target task performance. Note that we weakened the condition in Tripuraneni et al. (2020b) to bound the average rather than worst-case target performance, as is more suitable for higher-dimensional settings.

Finally, we make several assumptions to ensure that PGD finds a solution close in performance to the optimal fine-tuning parameter in \mathcal{C}_T . We remark that these assumptions are specific to the choice of fine-tuning algorithm.

Assumption 4.3 (Approximate linearity in fine-tuning). *Let x_1, \dots, x_{n_T} be the set of target inputs. Then, there exists β, L such that*

$$\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_{\theta+\delta}(x_i)\|_2^2 \leq \beta^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \|\nabla_\theta g_\theta(x)\|_2^2 \leq L^2.$$

Assumption 4.4. $\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T} \|\delta\|_2 \leq R$ for some R .

⁶Observe that this is not restrictive as one can simply rescale the loss, and is assumed for simplicity of presentation.

4.3 Performance Bound

Before we present the performance bound, recall that for a set \mathcal{H} of functions $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ on n samples, its Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H})$ on n samples is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, X} \left[\frac{1}{n} \left| \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{ij} h_j(x_i) \right| \right],$$

where (ε_{ij}) are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables and (x_i) are i.i.d. samples from some (preset) distribution.

Theorem 4.1 (General Performance Bound). *Assume that Assumptions 4.1 to 4.4 all hold. Consider a learner following the training procedure outlined in Section 4.1, and let (θ_t) be the set of iterates generated by PGD with appropriately chosen step size η (specified in Section C). Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of samples,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(\theta_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(\theta^* + \delta^*) \right] &\lesssim \underbrace{\beta R^2 + R \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{OPT}}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{EST}}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{\nu} \left\{ \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}} \right\}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{REPR}}} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the \mathcal{R}_{n_T} complexity term samples from p , while the \mathcal{R}_{n_S} complexity term samples from $p^{\otimes T}$, i.e. each draw is T i.i.d. draws from p , concatenated.

Note that the Rademacher complexity terms above decays in most settings as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) &\asymp O\left(\frac{\text{diam } \mathcal{C}_T}{\sqrt{n_T}}\right) \\ \frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] &\asymp O\left(\frac{C(\Theta_0)}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + \frac{\text{diam } \mathcal{C}_S}{\sqrt{n_S}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\Theta_0)$ represents some complexity measure of Θ_0 , and $\text{diam } \mathcal{C}_S$ and $\text{diam } \mathcal{C}_T$ represents a measure of the size of the fine-tuning sets \mathcal{C}_S and \mathcal{C}_T . A full proof is provided in Section C. Nevertheless, we provide a brief intuition on the result, as well as how the assumptions contribute to the final bound. Let θ_{opt} denote the best-performing solution found by PGD, θ_{ERM} and $\bar{\theta}$ the ERM and population-level optimal solution in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$ respectively, and θ^* the ground truth predictor.

Optimization error (ε_{OPT}). The difference in performance between θ_{opt} and θ_{ERM} , i.e. the error due to the optimization procedure, is bounded by approximate linearity.

Estimation error (ε_{EST}). By uniform convergence, θ_{ERM} (and thus θ_{opt}) performs similarly to $\bar{\theta}$.

Representation/approximation error ($\varepsilon_{\text{REPR}}$). Via the (ν, ε) -diversity condition, $\bar{\theta}$ is connected to θ^* explicitly (that is, the performance on the target task is controlled by the performance on the source tasks). Furthermore, the performance over source tasks can be bounded via uniform convergence.

5 Case Studies

5.1 Multitask Logistic Regression

To illustrate our framework, we analyze the performance of ADAPTRER on logistic regression, as done by Tripuraneni et al. (2020b). In this setting, we let $\theta = (B, w)$ for $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and define the predictor corresponding to θ to be $g_\theta(x) = x^\top Bw$.

5.1.1 Statistical Assumptions

As in the linear setting, we consider an input distribution p with covariance Σ . We restrict the set of labels \mathcal{Y} to $\{0, 1\}$, and consider the conditional distribution

$$q(y \mid g_\theta(x)) = \text{Ber}(\sigma(g_\theta(x))),$$

where $\sigma(y) = 1/(1 + e^{-y})$ is the sigmoid function.

We define the optimal parameters for tasks $t \in [T]$ to be $(B^* + \Delta_t^*, w_t^*)$, where B^* is orthogonal and $\|\Delta_t^*\|_F \leq \delta_0$. As before, we define $\delta_t^* := \Delta_t^* w_t^*$ for any $t \in [T]$ and $W^* = [w_1, \dots, w_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times T}$. Having defined the prior quantities, we make use of the statistical assumptions presented in Section 3.1, reproduced below for convenience:

Assumption 5.1 (Sub-Gaussian input). *There exists $\rho > 0$ such that if $x \sim p_t$, then $\Sigma^{-1/2}x$ is ρ^2 -sub-Gaussian.*

Assumption 5.2 (Source task diversity). *For any $t \in [T]$, $\|w_t^*\|_2 = \Theta(1) \leq r$, and $\sigma_k^2(W^*) = \Omega(r^2 T/k)$.*

Finally, we define the target task distribution ρ by sampling w^*, δ^* uniformly from the r - and δ_0 -balls of \mathbb{R}^k respectively, and letting $\theta^* = B^* w^* + \delta^*$.

5.1.2 Training Procedure

We train on the standard logistic loss:

$$\ell(\hat{y}, y) = -y \log[\sigma(\hat{y})] - (1 - y) \log[1 - \sigma(\hat{y})].$$

During source training, we optimize the representation over the set of orthogonal matrices while fixing $w_0 = 0$, i.e. $\Theta_0 := \{(B, 0) \mid B \text{ is orthogonal}\}$. Let $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$

be the obtained representation. To adapt to the target task, we initialize the learner at $\theta_0 = ([B_0, B_0], [w_0, -w_0])$ for some unit-norm vector w_0 , and scale the predictor by a fixed parameter β to be chosen later. Finally, we set the feasible sets for optimization to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_S &:= \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F \leq \delta_0, \|w\|_2 \leq r\} \\ \mathcal{C}_T^\beta &:= \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F \leq \delta_0/\beta, \|w\|_2 \leq r\kappa^{1/2}/\beta\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa := \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)/\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma)$. Note that this training procedure is quite similar to that of the linear setting. In particular, since the nonconvexity disappears in the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, we can set β appropriately as a function n_T so that the irreducible term arising from nonconvexity is negligible.

5.1.3 Performance Guarantee

Having described the statistical assumptions and the training procedure, we now specialize the guarantee of Theorem 4.1 to this setting. Details are provided in Section D.

Theorem 5.1 (Performance Guarantee for Logistic Regression). *Assume that Assumption 5.1 and Assumption 5.2 both hold, and that $n_S \geq n_T \gtrsim \rho^4 d$. Then, there exists a setting of the training parameters (see Section D) so that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of samples, the iterates (θ_t) generated by PGD satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g_{\theta_t}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g^*) \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} \left[r\sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} + r\sqrt{\frac{kd}{n_S T}} \right].$$

5.2 Two-Layer Neural Networks

To further illustrate the framework, we instantiate the result in the two-layer neural network setting. Throughout this section, we fix an activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Assumption 5.3. *For any $t \in [-2, 2]$, $|\sigma'(t)| \leq L$ and $|\sigma''(t)| \leq \mu$. Furthermore, $\sigma(0) = 0$.*

Then, for a constant β and $\theta = (B, w)$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we define the neural network $f_\theta^\beta(x) = \beta w^\top \sigma(B^\top x)$, where σ is applied elementwise.

Before we outline the statistical assumptions we make for this setting, we first illustrate a property of the function class. Consider any matrix $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$ that can be expressed as $[A, A]$ for some $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$. Furthermore, fix $w_0 \in \{-1, 1\}^{2k}$ such that the last k coordinates are a negation of the first k coordinates. We will refer to parameters satisfying the previous conditions as being *antisymmetric*. Note that for any antisymmetric parameter θ , $f_\theta^\beta \equiv 0$. We can then define the following feature vectors:

Definition 5.1 (Feature vectors ϕ, ψ, ρ). Let $\theta_0 = (B_0, w_0)$ be an antisymmetric parameter. Then, for every x , there exists feature vectors $\phi_{B_0}(x)$ and $\psi_{B_0, w_0}(x)$ such that

$$f_{\theta_0 + (\Delta, w)}^\beta(x) = \beta w^\top \phi_{B_0}(x) + \beta \Delta^\top \psi_{B_0, w_0}(x) + \beta \zeta_{B_0, w_0}^{\Delta, w}(x).$$

We interpret the features $\phi_{B_0}(x)$ and $\psi_{B_0, w_0}(x)$ to be the gradients of $(B, w) \mapsto f_{(B, w)}^\beta(x)$ evaluated at θ_0^7 . Additionally, $\zeta_{B_0, w_0}^{\Delta, w}(x)$ is the Taylor error. Finally, we define $\rho_{B_0, w_0}(x)$ to be the concatenation of $\phi_{B_0}(x)$ and $\psi_{B_0, w_0}(x)$. \diamond

We will show that if $\|\Delta\|_F$ and $\|w\|_F$ are both $O(1/\beta)$, then the remainder term $\zeta_{B_0, w_0}^{\Delta, w}(x)$ is $O(1/\beta)$, and thus the function class is approximately linear in (Δ, w) with feature functions $\phi_{B_0}(\cdot)$ and $\psi_{B_0, w_0}(\cdot)$. Note that these features correspond to the ‘‘activation’’ and ‘‘gradient’’ features, respectively, that are empirically evaluated by Mu et al. (2020).

5.2.1 Statistical Assumptions

We now outline the statistical assumptions for this setting. For all tasks, the inputs are assumed to be sampled from a 1-norm-bounded distribution p . Furthermore, we let $q(\cdot | \mu)$ be generated as $\mu + \eta$ for some $O(1)$ -bounded additive noise η , similar to Tripuraneni et al. (2020b).

To define the source tasks, we fix a representation matrix B^* and a linear predictor w_0^* so that $\theta_0^* = (B^*, w_0^*)$ is antisymmetric, as motivated by the previous discussion.

Assumption 5.4 (Initialization Assumptions). *The columns of B^* are norm-bounded by 1. Furthermore, $c_1 I \preceq \mathbb{E} [\rho_{\theta_0^*}(x) \rho_{\theta_0^*}(x)^\top] \preceq c_2 I$ for $c_1 > 0$.*

The assumption on the representation covariance ensures that that representation is well-conditioned; we define the condition number $\kappa = c_2/c_1$. We then define task-specific fine-tuning options by fixing unit-norm vectors $w_1^*, \dots, w_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ and $\delta_1^*, \dots, \delta_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^k$, as well as an orthonormal set of matrices $\Delta_1^*, \dots, \Delta_k^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$. Then, the optimal parameter for task t is given by

$$\theta_t^* = \left(B^* + \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i \in [k]} \delta_{t,i}^* \Delta_i^*, w_0^* + \frac{1}{\beta} w_t^* \right).$$

We note that the fine-tuning step for $t \in [T]$ can be parametrized by $\omega_t^* = [w_t^*, \delta_t^*]/\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{3k}$ via a linear transformation. We assume that this parametrization has a matrix representation Γ , so that $\theta_t^* = \theta_0^* + \Gamma \omega_t^*$.

Assumption 5.5. *Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2k \times T}$ be the matrix $[\omega_1^*, \dots, \omega_T^*]$. Then, $\sigma_{2k}(\Omega) \gtrsim T/k$.*

The assumption above is analogous to the diversity conditions assumed in the previous sections.

Finally, to define the target task distribution, let $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be i.i.d. samples from a uniform distribution over the unit sphere, and define $\theta^* = \theta_0^* + \Gamma[u, v]/\beta$.

⁷Closed-form expressions for these quantities are provided in Section D.

5.2.2 Training Procedure

Finally, we describe the training procedure. Using squared-error loss, we train on the objective $\delta \mapsto \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\gamma)$, where we set $\gamma = \beta$ during source training, while γ is set as a function of n_T during target training time. Furthermore, we let Θ_0 be the set of antisymmetric initializations satisfying Assumption 5.4. Finally, we set the constraint sets

$$\mathcal{C}_S = \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F, \|w\|_2 \leq 1/\beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_T^\gamma = \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F^2 + \|w\|_2^2 \leq \kappa/\gamma^2\}.$$

5.2.3 Performance Guarantee

Having described the statistical assumptions and the training procedure, we proceed with the performance guarantee.

Theorem 5.2 (Neural net performance bound). *Assume that Assumptions 5.3 to 5.5 hold. Then, if $n_S \geq n_T$, there exists a training parameter setting (see Section D) such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the iterates (θ_t) satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}_{f^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(f_{\theta_t}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(f_{\theta^*}) \right] \lesssim \kappa L^2 \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_T}} + L(L + \mu) \frac{k^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + \left(\frac{\mu + L}{\beta} \right) L \sqrt{k}.$$

6 A FROZENREP Hard Case for the Nonlinear Setting

In what follows, we establish the existence of a nonlinear setting where there exists a sample complexity separation between ADAPTRREP and FROZENREP, as in Section 3.4. As before, fix $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2k < d$. The construction relies on the observation that linear predictors lying in a rank- k space are representable as linear functions of $2k$ appropriately chosen ReLU neurons.

Following the discussion in Section 5.2, note that when we take $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, the resulting function class can be expressed as

$$f_{(B+\Delta, w)} = w^\top \sigma(B^\top x) + \langle x \sigma'(x^\top B), \Delta \rangle,$$

where $B, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}$. We further constrain B so that the first k columns are equal to the negation of the last k columns. Finally, we choose $\sigma(x) = \max(x, 0)$, which we will also write as x_+ for convenience⁸. For convenience, we follow the convention in Section 5.2 of writing ϕ_B, ψ_B and ρ_B for the activation, gradient, and concatenated features corresponding to B , respectively, as defined in Definition 5.1.

We briefly review the construction in Section 3.4. Let the input distribution p be a Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{R}^d with covariance

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon I_{d-k} & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}$$

⁸Note that $\sigma'(x) = \mathbb{1}[x > 0]$.

for a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Define $E^*, E_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the eigenspaces corresponding to the first and second block of Σ , respectively. For an orthogonal matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, define a distribution over θ given by

$$\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}}Av + \delta, \quad (9)$$

where v and δ are sampled uniformly at random from the unit spheres in \mathbb{R}^k and E_k , respectively. As before, the family of interest is the set of distributions induced by any A^* with $\text{Col } A^* \subseteq E^*$.

Now, we lift the linear task distribution setting into the ReLU setting. In particular, we sample the source tasks by fixing orthogonal $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, sampling v and δ as before, and letting the optimal predictor be $f_{(B+\Delta, w)}$, where

$$B := [A, -A], \quad w := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}}[v, -v], \quad \Delta := \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{1}\delta^\top. \quad (10)$$

One can easily verify algebraically that

$$f_{(B+\Delta, w)}(x) = x^\top \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}}Av + \delta \right),$$

as desired. As before, we consider the family of task distributions induced by any A^* with $\text{Col } A^* \subseteq E^*$.

With the above task distribution, we can then prove the following hardness result on FROZENREP:

Theorem 6.1 (FROZENREP Minimax Bound, ReLU). *For an orthogonal matrix $A^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ such that $\text{Col } A^* \subset E^*$, let $B^* = [A^*, -A^*]$, and define S_{A^*} to be the set*

$$S_{A^*} = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}}A^*v + \delta \mid \|v\|_2 \leq 1, \|\delta\|_2 \leq 1, \delta \in E_k \right\}.$$

Furthermore, let \hat{B} be the output of FROZENREP with access to infinite per-task samples and tasks, with the task distribution determined by B^* . Then, with high probability over the draw of $n_T \gg d$ samples during target training, we have that

$$\min_{\bar{B}, \hat{w}, \hat{\Delta}} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{A^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X\theta^* - f_{(\bar{B}+\hat{\Delta}, \hat{w})}(X) \right\|_2^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T},$$

where \bar{B} , \hat{w} , and $\hat{\Delta}$ are all measurable functions of (X, y) to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$, \mathbb{R}^{2k} , and $\mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$, respectively, and $\text{Col } \bar{B} = \text{Col } \hat{B}$. Furthermore, the expectation is over the randomness in the labels $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_{n_T})$.

In contrast, we have the following upper bound on the performance of ADAPTREP:

Lemma 6.1 (Adaptation target performance, ReLU). *Let $B_0 = [A_0, -A_0]$, and fix a $\theta^* \in S_{A^*}$. Consider a learner which solves*

$$\min_B \min_{\substack{(w_t, \Delta_t) \\ \|\Delta_t\|_F \leq 1}} \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\rho_B(X)[w, \Delta] - y\|_2^2.$$

during source training, and

$$\min_{\substack{w, \Delta \\ \|\Delta\|_F \leq 1}} \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - y\|_2^2$$

during target training, where B_0 is the representation obtained from source training. Finally, we set $k = \Theta(1)$ and $\varepsilon = k/d$. Then, with access to infinite per-task samples and tasks during source training, the learner achieves target loss bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X\theta^*\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of target samples.

Proofs of the above results are provided in Section E. As before, we compare the two methods when $n_T = \Theta(d)$. Then, from the results above, the lower bound on the loss of FROZENREP is $\Omega(1)$, while the upper bound on the loss of ADAPTREP is $O(1/\sqrt{n_T})$. Therefore, we also see a strict separation between the two methods within this setting as well, which grows with $n_T \rightarrow \infty$.

7 Simulations

In this section, we experimentally verify the hard case for the linear setting presented in Section 3.4. Since the empirical success of MAML or its variants in general has already been demonstrated extensively in practice and in existing work, it is not the focus of this section.

Recall that in the hard case, we vary the amount of data n_T available to the learner during target time, and we set $d \asymp n_T$. We fix $k = 2$ throughout the experiment. The matrix B^* spans the first k coordinates, while the residuals δ_t^* lie in the span of the last k coordinates. Finally, we set the $\sigma = 2$ for the Gaussian noise.

During source training, both FROZENREP and ADAPTREP are provided with 1000 tasks and $10d$ samples per task from the task distribution in Section 3.4. During target time, we evaluate the learned representation on the worst-case regression task from the same family.

Before we detail our results, we briefly comment on the nonconvexity in the source training procedure. Rather than optimizing (4) or (7) during source training, we use an




Figure 1: Sine distances of the representations learned by each method from the correct space B^* .




Figure 2: The average worst-case excess risk for several settings of n_T , plotted on a logarithmic y -axis.

additional Frobenius-norm regularizer on $B^\top B - WW^\top$ to ensure that the two terms are balanced. In the case of FROZENREP, this regularized objective was shown to have a favorable optimization landscape in Tripuraneni et al. (2020a). We then used L-BFGS to optimize these regularized objectives. To further mitigate any possible optimization issues, we evaluated both methods with 10 random restarts, and report the best of the 10 restarts (as measured by the worst-case performance on the target task) for both methods.

(Subspace Alignment). First, we plot the alignment of the learned representation (using the best of the 10 restarts described above) with the correct space B^* . We measure this via the sine of the largest principal angle between the two spaces, i.e.

$$\sin \Theta_1(\hat{B}, B^*) = \sqrt{1 - \lambda_1^2(\hat{B}^\top B^*)}.$$

We plot the results in Figure 1. As predicted by Lemma 3.1, FROZENREP does not learn B^* , in contrast to ADAPTRP.

(Target Task Performance). We proceeded to evaluate how the methods fare on their corresponding worst-case target tasks. We do so by training with the representation over 1000 i.i.d. draws of the target dataset, and averaging the excess risk over all obtained representations. We provide the results in Figure 2, and include a comparison with standard linear regression as a baseline. As predicted, ADAPTREP performs much better than FROZENREP, with a gap that grows with n_T .

8 Conclusion

We have presented, to the best of our knowledge, the first statistical analysis of fine-tuning-based meta-learning. We demonstrate the success of such algorithms under the assumption of approximately shared representation between available tasks. In contrast, we show that methods analyzed by prior work that do not incorporate task-specific fine-tuning fail under this weaker assumption.

An interesting line of future work is to determine ways to formulate useful shared structure among MDPs, *i.e.* formulate settings for which meta-reinforcement learning succeeds and results in improved regret bounds for downstream tasks.

Acknowledgements

KC is supported by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship, Grant DGE-2039656. QL is supported by NSF #2030859 and the Computing Research Association for the CIFellows Project. JDL acknowledges support of the ARO under MURI Award W911NF-11-1-0303, the Sloan Research Fellowship, and NSF CCF 2002272.

References

- Al-Shedivat, M., Bansal, T., Burda, Y., Sutskever, I., Mordatch, I., and Abbeel, P. Continuous adaptation via meta-learning in nonstationary and competitive environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.03641*, 2017.
- Alquier, P., Pontil, M., et al. Regret bounds for lifelong learning. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 261–269. PMLR, 2017.
- Amit, R. and Meir, R. Meta-learning by adjusting priors based on extended pac-bayes theory. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 205–214. PMLR, 2018.
- Antoniou, A., Edwards, H., and Storkey, A. How to train your maml. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09502*, 2018.

- Bai, Y., Chen, M., Zhou, P., Zhao, T., Lee, J. D., Kakade, S., Wang, H., and Xiong, C. How important is the train-validation split in meta-learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05843*, 2020.
- Balcan, M.-F., Blum, A., and Vempala, S. Efficient representations for lifelong learning and autoencoding. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 191–210. PMLR, 2015.
- Baxter, J. A model of inductive bias learning. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 12:149–198, 2000.
- Ben-David, S. and Borbely, R. S. A notion of task relatedness yielding provable multiple-task learning guarantees. *Machine learning*, 73(3):273–287, 2008.
- Ben-David, S., Blitzer, J., Crammer, K., Kulesza, A., Pereira, F., and Vaughan, J. W. A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine learning*, 79(1):151–175, 2010.
- Bengio, Y., Courville, A., and Vincent, P. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828, 2013.
- Bertinetto, L., Henriques, J. F., Torr, P. H. S., and Vedaldi, A. Meta-learning with differentiable closed-form solvers, 2019.
- Bullins, B., Hazan, E., Kalai, A., and Livni, R. Generalize across tasks: Efficient algorithms for linear representation learning. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 235–246. PMLR, 2019.
- Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M., and Hinton, G. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.
- Collins, L., Mokhtari, A., and Shakkottai, S. Why does maml outperform erm? an optimization perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14672*, 2020a.
- Collins, L., Mokhtari, A., and Shakkottai, S. Task-robust model-agnostic meta-learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020b.
- Denevi, G., Ciliberto, C., Stamos, D., and Pontil, M. Incremental learning-to-learn with statistical guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08089*, 2018.
- Denevi, G., Pontil, M., and Ciliberto, C. The advantage of conditional meta-learning for biased regularization and fine tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Denevi, G., Pontil, M., and Ciliberto, C. Conditional meta-learning of linear representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16277*, 2021.

- Du, S. S., Hu, W., Kakade, S. M., Lee, J. D., and Lei, Q. Few-shot learning via learning the representation, provably. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09434*, 2020.
- Duchi, J. Lecture notes for statistics 311/electrical engineering 377. URL: https://stanford.edu/class/stats311/Lectures/full_notes.pdf. Last visited on, 2:23, 2016.
- Fallah, A., Mokhtari, A., and Ozdaglar, A. On the convergence theory of gradient-based model-agnostic meta-learning algorithms. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1082–1092. PMLR, 2020.
- Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- Finn, C., Rajeswaran, A., Kakade, S., and Levine, S. Online meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08438*, 2019.
- Hanneke, S. and Kpotufe, S. A no-free-lunch theorem for multitask learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15785*, 2020a.
- Hanneke, S. and Kpotufe, S. On the value of target data in transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04747*, 2020b.
- Jerfel, G., Grant, E., Griffiths, T. L., and Heller, K. Online gradient-based mixtures for transfer modulation in meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.06080*, 2018.
- Ji, K., Lee, J. D., Liang, Y., and Poor, H. V. Convergence of meta-learning with task-specific adaptation over partial parameters, 2020.
- Khodak, M., Balcan, M.-F. F., and Talwalkar, A. S. Adaptive gradient-based meta-learning methods. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 5917–5928, 2019.
- Konobeev, M., Kuzborskij, I., and Szepesvári, C. On optimality of meta-learning in fixed-design regression with weighted biased regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00344*, 2020.
- Kpotufe, S. and Martinet, G. Marginal singularity, and the benefits of labels in covariate-shift. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pp. 1882–1886. PMLR, 2018.
- Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. Probability in banach spaces: isoperimetry and processes. 1991.
- Lee, J. D., Lei, Q., Saunshi, N., and Zhuo, J. Predicting what you already know helps: Provable self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01064*, 2020.
- Lee, K., Maji, S., Ravichandran, A., and Soatto, S. Meta-learning with differentiable convex optimization, 2019.

- Li, Z., Zhou, F., Chen, F., and Li, H. Meta-sgd: Learning to learn quickly for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09835*, 2017.
- Lucas, J., Ren, M., Kameni, I., Pitassi, T., and Zemel, R. Theoretical bounds on estimation error for meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07140*, 2020.
- Maurer, A. and Jaakkola, T. Algorithmic stability and meta-learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6(6), 2005.
- Maurer, A., Pontil, M., and Romera-Paredes, B. The benefit of multitask representation learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(81):1–32, 2016.
- McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., and y Arcas, B. A. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Mendonca, R., Gupta, A., Kravev, R., Abbeel, P., Levine, S., and Finn, C. Guided meta-policy search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 9656–9667, 2019.
- Mohri, M. and Medina, A. M. New analysis and algorithm for learning with drifting distributions. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 124–138. Springer, 2012.
- Mu, F., Liang, Y., and Li, Y. Gradients as features for deep representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05529*, 2020.
- Nichol, A., Achiam, J., and Schulman, J. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2018.
- Pentina, A. and Lampert, C. A pac-bayesian bound for lifelong learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 991–999. PMLR, 2014.
- Raghu, M., Zhang, C., Kleinberg, J., and Bengio, S. Transfusion: Understanding transfer learning for medical imaging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07208*, 2019.
- Rajeswaran, A., Finn, C., Kakade, S. M., and Levine, S. Meta-learning with implicit gradients. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 113–124, 2019.
- Salman, H., Ilyas, A., Engstrom, L., Kapoor, A., and Madry, A. Do adversarially robust imagenet models transfer better? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08489*, 2020.
- Saunshi, N., Zhang, Y., Khodak, M., and Arora, S. A sample complexity separation between non-convex and convex meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8512–8521. PMLR, 2020.

- Snell, J., Swersky, K., and Zemel, R. S. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.05175*, 2017.
- Thrun, S. and Pratt, L. *Learning to learn*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Tripuraneni, N., Jin, C., and Jordan, M. I. Provable meta-learning of linear representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11684*, 2020a.
- Tripuraneni, N., Jordan, M., and Jin, C. On the theory of transfer learning: The importance of task diversity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020b.
- Vershynin, R. Four lectures on probabilistic methods for data science. 2017.
- Wang, H., Sun, R., and Li, B. Global convergence and generalization bound of gradient-based meta-learning with deep neural nets, 2020.
- Zhou, P., Yuan, X., Xu, H., Yan, S., and Feng, J. Efficient meta learning via minibatch proximal update. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1534–1544, 2019.

A Proof of Theorem 3.1

In this section, we will prove the performance guarantee in the linear representation setting presented in Theorem 3.1. We first compute a bound on the difference in the spans of the true underlying representation B^* and the representation B_0 obtained from training on the source tasks. Having done so, we then analyze the performance of the best predictor found by projected gradient descent.

For clarity of presentation, we will write $\theta_t^* = B_t^* w_t^* + \delta_t^*$ and $\hat{\theta}_t = (B + \Delta_t) w_t$ throughout this section. Furthermore, let $\hat{\delta}_t = \Delta_t w_t$. Finally, we will be making use of the following covariance concentration results throughout this section, allowing us to connect empirical averages to population averages and vice versa:

Lemma A.1 (Source covariance concentration, Du et al. (2020), Claim A.1). *If $n_S \gg \rho^4[d + \log(T/\delta)]$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$ over the random draw of $n_S T$ source inputs,*

$$0.9\Sigma \preceq \frac{1}{n_S} X_t^\top X_t \preceq 1.1\Sigma$$

for any $t \in [T]$.

Lemma A.2 (Target covariance concentration). *If $n_T \gg \rho^4[d + \log(T/\delta)]$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$ over the random draw of n_T target inputs,*

$$0.9\Sigma \preceq \frac{1}{n_T} X^\top X \preceq 1.1\Sigma$$

for any $t \in [T]$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma A.1, and is omitted for brevity. \square

A.1 Source Guarantees for the Linear Setting

We proceed to analyze the representation B_0 obtained from the source training procedure outlined in (4). Key to the analysis is a bound on the average population loss over the source tasks that the global minimizer of (4) can achieve as a function of n_S :

Lemma A.3 (Source training bound). *Let B_0 be a minimizer of (4), and $\{(\Delta_t, w_t)\}_{t \in [T]}$ be minimizers for the inner optimization problem given B_0 . If the regularizer coefficients are chosen such that*

$$\lambda \asymp \frac{1}{T\delta_0} \left[\frac{\sigma \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right)} \right],$$

and $\gamma = \delta_0^2 \lambda$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2}{n_S T} \left(kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \\ & \quad + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, we instantiate the high-probability event in Lemma A.1, which occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$.

Note that we can express δ_t^* as $[\delta_t^*(w_t^*)^\top / \|w_t^*\|_2^2] w_t^* = \Delta_t^* w_t^*$. Thus, via the optimality of B_0 and $\{(\Delta_t, w_t)\}_{t \in [T]}$, we can form the basic inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| y_t - X_t \hat{\theta}_t \right\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_t\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|w_t\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \|z_t\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_t^*\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|w_t^*\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \|z_t\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{\|\delta_t^*\|_2^2}{\|w_t^*\|_2^2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|w_t^*\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \|z_t\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda \delta_0^2 + \gamma}{2} \right) T \\ & \leq \underbrace{\frac{\sigma \delta_0 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)}}_{=: C_{n_S, T}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \|z_t\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the simplification of the regularizer on the optimum holds since $\|w_t^*\|_2 = \Theta(1)$ by Assumption 3.2. Equivalently, by rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_t\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|w_t\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\langle z_t, X_t (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\rangle + C_{n_S, T}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Proposition G.4, the regularizer on Δ_t and w_t can be rewritten as a regularizer

on $\hat{\delta}_t$, i.e.

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 + \sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \left\| \hat{\delta}_t \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\langle z_t, X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\rangle + C_{n_S, T}. \quad (11)$$

To proceed, define the set S as

$$\left\{ [\alpha_t + \beta_t]_{t \in [T]} \mid \text{rank}[\alpha_t] \leq 2k, \|\beta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0 + \left\| \hat{\delta}_t \right\|_2, \|X_t(\alpha_t + \beta_t)\|_2 \leq \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2 \right\},$$

and observe that $[\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t]_{t \in [T]} \in S$, by letting $\alpha_t = B^* w_t^* - B_0 w_t$ and $\beta_t = \delta_t^* - \hat{\delta}_t$. We bound the right-hand side of (11) via bounding the supremum of the inner product over S , i.e.

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \left\langle z_t, X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\rangle \leq \sup_{[\alpha_t + \beta_t] \in S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\langle z_t, X_t(\alpha_t + \beta_t) \right\rangle.$$

Now, we decompose the Gaussian width as

$$\sup_{[\alpha_t + \beta_t] \in S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\langle z_t, X_t(\alpha_t + \beta_t) \right\rangle \leq \underbrace{\sup_{[\alpha_t] \in S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\langle z_t, X_t \alpha_t \right\rangle}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\sup_{[\beta_t] \in S_2} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\langle z_t, X_t \beta_t \right\rangle}_{\text{(II)}},$$

where $S_2 = \left\{ [\beta_t]_{t \in [T]} \mid \|\beta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0 + \left\| \hat{\delta}_t \right\|_2 \right\}$. Note the abuse of notation in (I), where we say $[\alpha_t]_{t \in [T]} \in S$ if there exists $[\beta_t]_{t \in [T]}$ so that $[\alpha_t + \beta_t]_{t \in [T]} \in S$. This decomposes the Gaussian width into the sum of the Gaussian widths of a low-rank set (I) and a small norm set (II). We proceed to bound both terms accordingly to these two properties.

Bounding the Gaussian width of the low-rank set (I).

To bound the Gaussian width, we first enlarge S to remove β_t from the definition of the feasible set. Fix any (α_t, β_t) pair satisfying the conditions in S , and note that

$$\|X_t \beta_t\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{n_S} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \left(\delta_0 + \left\| \hat{\delta}_t \right\|_2 \right).$$

Therefore, by the reverse triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2 - \|X_t \beta_t\|_2 \right| &\leq \|X_t(\alpha_t + \beta_t)\|_2 \\ \implies \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2 &\leq \underbrace{\left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2}_{=:\rho_t} + \sqrt{n_S} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \left(\delta_0 + \left\| \hat{\delta}_t \right\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can enlarge the feasible set to

$$S_1 := \{[\alpha_t] \mid \text{rank}[\alpha_t] \leq 2k, \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2 \leq \rho_t\}.$$

Having relaxed the constraints, we now proceed to the main argument.

Since $\text{rank}[\alpha_t] \leq 2k$, there exists an orthogonal matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$ (dependent on α_t) and vectors $r_t \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ such that $\alpha_t = Vr_t$. Therefore, the inner product in the Gaussian width would be unchanged if we project z_t onto X_tV , i.e.

$$\sup_{[\alpha_t] \in S_1} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \alpha_t \rangle = \sup_{[\alpha_t] \in S_1} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle P_{X_t V} z_t, X_t V r_t \rangle.$$

The key idea we will leverage is that if V were chosen independently of z_t , then $P_{X_t V} z_t$ is Gaussian in a $2k$ -dimensional space, and thus norm bounded by $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{2k})$ with high probability. However, due to the supremum over α_t , this independence assumption is not satisfied. Nevertheless, we can obtain a *fixed* finite covering of the set of all rank- $2k$ matrices, and ensure that the aforementioned norm bound on $P_{X_t V} z_t$ holds for every V in the covering via a union-bound. By choosing the discretization level of the covering appropriately, we can control the error resulting from approximating the supremum by some element of the covering.

Formally, let $\mathcal{O}^{d \times 2k}$ be the set of orthogonal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times 2k}$. By Proposition G.1, there exists an ε -covering of $\mathcal{O}^{d \times 2k}$ in the Frobenius norm with at most $(6\sqrt{2k}/\varepsilon)^{2kd}$ elements. Let \bar{V} be an element of the covering such that $\|V - \bar{V}\|_F \leq \varepsilon$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_t, X_t \alpha_t \rangle &= \langle z_t, X_t \bar{V} r_t \rangle + \langle z_t, X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t \rangle \\ &\leq \|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 \|X_t \bar{V} r_t\|_2 + \|z_t\|_2 \|X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t\|_2 \\ &\leq \|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 \|X_t V r_t\|_2 + (\|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 + \|z_t\|_2) \|X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t\|_2 \\ &\leq \|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 \|X_t V r_t\|_2 + (\|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 + \|z_t\|_2) \|X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2 \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2 + \|z_t\|_2 \|X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t V r_t \rangle &\leq \underbrace{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{X_t \bar{V}} z_t\|_2^2 \right) \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2^2 \right)}}_{(A)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|z_t\|_2^2 \right) \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t (V - \bar{V}) r_t\|_2^2 \right)}}_{(B) \quad (C)}. \end{aligned}$$

We will bound (A), (B), and (C) individually.

- (A) For a fixed \bar{V} , (A) is a chi-squared random variable with kT degrees of freedom scaled by σ^2 . However, since \bar{V} depends on V , we need to have a high probability bound for any element of the covering. By using known concentration bounds for

chi-squared random variables together with the union-bound, we find that uniformly over the covering,

$$(A) \leq \sigma^2 \left(kT + \log \frac{1}{\delta'} \right) \quad \text{w.p.} \geq 1 - \delta' \left(\frac{6\sqrt{2k}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{2kd}.$$

(B) Note that (B) is a chi-squared random variable with $n_S T$ degrees of freedom scaled by σ^2 , and thus

$$(B) \lesssim \sigma^2 \left(n_S T + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{w.p.} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{18}.$$

(C) Since $(1/n_S)X^\top X$ is concentrated about Σ via Lemma A.1,

$$\|X_t(V - \bar{V})r_t\|_2^2 \lesssim n_S \|\Sigma\|_2 \varepsilon^2 \|r_t\|_2^2 = n_S \|\Sigma\|_2 \varepsilon^2 \|Vr_t\|_2^2 \lesssim \kappa \varepsilon^2 \|X_t V r_t\|_2^2.$$

Putting these bounds together, and setting $\varepsilon = \sqrt{k/\kappa n_S}$ and $\delta' = \delta/[18(6\sqrt{2k}/\varepsilon)^{2kd}]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \alpha_t \rangle &\lesssim \left(\sigma \sqrt{kT + \log \frac{1}{\delta'}} + \varepsilon \sigma \sqrt{\kappa n_S T + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t V r_t\|_2^2 \right)} \\ &\lesssim \left(\sigma \sqrt{kT + \log \frac{1}{\delta'}} \right) \sqrt{\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t V r_t\|_2^2 \right)} \quad (k < n_S, \delta' < \delta) \\ &\lesssim \sigma \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t \alpha_t\|_2^2 \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over S_1 , we thus obtain the following bound on the Gaussian width:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{[\alpha_t] \in S_1} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \alpha_t \rangle \\ &\lesssim \sigma \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left[\sqrt{\sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2} + \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_2 n_S T} \left(\delta_0 + \|\hat{\delta}_t\|_2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the events for this sub-argument occur with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$.

Bounding the Gaussian width of the low-norm set (II).

Recall that we want to bound

$$\sup_{[\beta_t] \in \mathcal{S}_2} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \beta_t \rangle, \quad \mathcal{S}_2 := \left\{ [\beta_t] \mid \|\beta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0 + \|\hat{\delta}_t\|_2 \right\}.$$

For any $t \in [T]$,

$$\langle z_t, X_t \beta_t \rangle = \langle X_t^\top z_t, \beta_t \rangle \leq \left(\delta_0 + \|\hat{\delta}_t\|_2 \right) \|X_t^\top z_t\|_2.$$

Furthermore, by the Hanson-Wright inequality, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta/9T$,

$$\|X_t^\top z_t\|_2 \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{n_S \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)}.$$

Putting everything together, we thus find that with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$,

$$\sup_{[\beta_t] \in \mathcal{S}_2} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \beta_t \rangle \leq \sigma \left(T \delta_0 + \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\hat{\delta}_t\|_2 \right) \sqrt{n_S \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)}.$$

Combining the bounds and concluding.

Having bounded both Gaussian widths, we can thus bound the right-hand side of (11) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 + \left(\sqrt{\lambda \gamma} - \frac{1}{\delta_0 T} C_{n_S, T} \right) \|\hat{\delta}_t\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} + C_{n_S, T}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as $\sqrt{\lambda \gamma} \geq (1/\delta_0 T) C_{n_S, T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} + C_{n_S, T}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by solving the quadratic inequality using Proposition G.2, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in [T]} \frac{1}{2n_S T} \left\| X_t(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2}{n_S T} \left(kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \\ & \quad + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the desired performance bound follows due to the concentration of the empirical covariance from Lemma A.1. Since the concentration of the source covariance matrices and each of the sub-arguments all hold with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$, it follows that the main claim holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$. \square

The prior bound is central to the analysis, as the performance of the learner can be tied to how well B_0 spans the correct space. To see why this is the case, note that for large n_S , the effect of the noise on the optimization in (4) is negligible. In this regime, no matter which representation B_0 the learner has chosen, the optimal predictor would satisfy $P_{X_t B_0} X_t \hat{\theta}_t \approx P_{X_t B_0} X_t \theta_t^*$ and $P_{X_t B_0}^\perp X_t \hat{\theta}_t \approx P_{X_t B_0}^\perp X_t \theta_t^*$. Consequently, the performance of the predictors chosen by the learner can be tied to the chosen representation B_0 . We formalize this intuition in the following result:

Lemma A.4 (Transfer Lemma). *Under Assumption 3.2, we have that*

$$\|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0} \Sigma^{1/2} B^*\|_F^2 \lesssim k \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \Sigma^{1/2}(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 \right].$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, we will write $P := P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}$ and $P^\perp := P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp$ for readability. To proceed, note that we intuitively expect that for a learner that has learned the correct spaces, $P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \approx \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*$ as it is the low-rank component of the estimator, and consequently, $P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \approx \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^*$. Then, decomposing into the corresponding errors, we have that for any $t \in [T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Sigma^{1/2}(\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \right\|_2^2 & \gtrsim \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \right\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + 2 \left\langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \right\rangle \\ & \geq \left\| P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \right\|_2^2 \\ & \quad - 2 \left| \left\langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed to bound the inner product above. We do so by observing that if we were to replace $\hat{\theta}_t$ by θ_t^* , then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* \rangle \\
&= \langle P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^*, P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* \rangle \\
&= (w_t^*)^\top (B^*)^\top \Sigma \delta_t^* \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To translate this result into a bound on the original inner product, we note that as $n_S \rightarrow \infty$, and the impact of the noise and the regularizer on the optimization is diminished, we expect $\hat{\theta}_t$ to learn the projections of $X_t \theta_t^*$ onto $X_t B_0$ and its complement. With these two insights in mind, we decompose the inner product as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \left| \langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*, P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \rangle \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \langle P \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t), \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \right| \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left| \langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^* \rangle \right|}_{=0} \\
&= \left| \langle P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*, P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \rangle \right| + \left| \langle P \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t), \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left| \langle \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^* - P \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t, \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left| \langle P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*, P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t) \rangle \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left| \langle P \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t), \Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*\|_2^2} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \delta_t^* - P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\theta}_t\|_2^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is a quadratic inequality in the two terms on the left-hand side, and so by applying Proposition G.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*\|_2^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P \Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by orthogonality. Finally, by Proposition G.3,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w_t^*\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{T} \|P^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* W^*\|_F^2 \geq \frac{\sigma_k(W^*)^2}{T} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^*\|_F^2,$$

which together with the diversity assumption in Assumption 3.2 yields the final bound

$$\|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^*\|_F^2 \lesssim k \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\theta_t^* - \hat{\theta}_t)\|_2^2 \right]. \quad \square$$

A.2 Target Guarantees for the Linear Setting

Having established a connection between the performance on the source tasks and the difference in the spans of B^* and B_0 , we can now analyze the performance of the target training procedure. First, we bound the performance of nearly optimal points in \mathcal{C}_β for several possible choices of c_1, c_2 .

Lemma A.5 (Statistical Rates for \mathcal{L}_β). *Assume that (Δ, w) is ζ -suboptimal for \mathcal{L}_β with the constraint set $\mathcal{C}_\beta = \{(\Delta, w) \mid \|\Delta\|_F \leq c_1/\beta, \|w\|_2 \leq c_2/\beta\}$, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(\Delta, w) \leq \min_{(\Delta', w') \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \mathcal{L}_\beta(\Delta', w') + \zeta.$$

We write $\hat{\theta}$ for the predictor corresponding to (Δ, w) , i.e. $\hat{\theta} = \beta(A_{B_0} + \Delta)(w_0 + w)$. Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w} &= (B_0 X^\top X B_0)^\dagger B_0^\top X^\top X \theta^* \\ \bar{\delta} &= \theta^* - B_0 \bar{w} \\ \tilde{w} &= (B_0^\top X^\top X B_0)^\dagger B_0^\top X^\top X B^* w^*. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $XB_0\bar{w} = P_{XB_0}X\theta^*$, $X\bar{\delta} = P_{XB_0}^\perp X\theta^*$, and $XB\tilde{w} = P_{XB_0}XB^*w^*$. Then, assuming $\beta > \max(\|\bar{w}\|_2, \|\tilde{w}\|_2)$,

$$\frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \zeta + \begin{cases} \left\| P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w^* \right\|_2^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} & c_1 = \delta_0, c_2 = \|\tilde{w}\|_2 \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \|\bar{\delta}\|_2}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} & c_1 = \|\bar{\delta}\|_2, c_2 = \|\bar{w}\|_2 \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(d + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) & c_1 = \|\theta^*\|_2, c_2 = 0 \end{cases}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$.

Proof. We proceed by proving the three cases separately. Throughout the proof, we instantiate the high-probability event in Lemma A.2, which guarantees that

$$0.9\Sigma \preceq \frac{1}{n_T} X^\top X \preceq 1.1\Sigma.$$

Recall that this event occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$.

$$c_1 = \delta_0, c_2 = \|\tilde{w}\|_2$$

Due to the choice of c_1 and c_2 , there exists a parameter in \mathcal{C}_β corresponding to the prediction vector $P_{XB_0}X\theta^* + X\delta^*$. Writing the corresponding basic inequality, we thus have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| y - X\hat{\theta} \right\|_2^2 - \zeta &\leq \frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| P_{XB_0}^\perp XB^*w^* \right\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp XB^*w^* \rangle + \frac{1}{2n_T} \|z\|_2^2 \\ \implies \frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 &\leq \zeta + \frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| P_{XB_0}^\perp XB^*w^* \right\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp XB^*w^* \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp XB^*w^* \rangle - \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{XB_0}X(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \rangle - \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp X(\delta^* - \beta\Delta(w_0 + w)) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by the Hanson-Wright inequality, we can bound the last term as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{n_T} \langle X^\top P_{X B_0}^\perp z, \delta^* - \beta \Delta(w_0 + w) \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{n_T} \|X^\top P_{X B_0}^\perp z\|_2 \|\delta^* + \beta \Delta(w_0 + w)\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$. Therefore, we can rewrite the prior basic inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2n_T} \|X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2^2 &\lesssim \underbrace{\frac{1}{2n_T} \|P_{X B_0}^\perp X B^* w^*\|_2^2 + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)}}_{=C} + \zeta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{X B_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that we can form the quadratic inequality

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \|P_{X B_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n_T} \|P_{X B_0} z\|_2 \|P_{X B_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2 + C,$$

and thus by applying Proposition G.2 to solve the inequality and noting that $P_{X B_0} z / \sigma$ is distributed as a chi-squared random variable with k degrees of freedom,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \|X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2^2 &\lesssim \zeta + \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w^*\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$, which is the bound that we wanted to show.

$$c_1 = \|\bar{\delta}\|_2, c_2 = \|\bar{w}\|_2$$

Due to the choice of c_1 and c_2 , there exists a parameter in \mathcal{C}_β corresponding to a predictor that agrees with θ^* on the target samples. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2n_T} \|X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2^2 &\leq \zeta + \frac{1}{2n_T} \|z\|_2^2 \\ \implies \frac{1}{2n_T} \|X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})\|_2^2 &\leq \zeta + \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{X B_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \rangle + \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, P_{X B_0}^\perp X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We proceed with an argument similar to that used in the source guarantee, albeit simpler since the representation B_0 is fixed (and thus no covering argument is required). Along

these lines, we bound the first term using the low-rank of B_0 . Via projections,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n_T} \left\| P_{XB_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \zeta + \frac{1}{n_T} \|P_{XB_0} z\|_2 \left\| P_{XB_0} X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2 + \frac{1}{n_T} \left\langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying Proposition G.2 to solve the quadratic inequality, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$,

$$\frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \leq \zeta + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{1}{n_T} \left\langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\rangle.$$

To bound the second term, we simply make use of the norm constraints defining the feasible set \mathcal{C}_β , which we note is analogous to the low-norm sub-argument of the source guarantee. Formally, the Hanson-Wright inequality implies that with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \left\langle z, P_{XB_0}^\perp X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} X^\top P_{XB_0}^\perp z \right\|_2 \left\| \bar{\delta} + \beta \Delta w_0 + \beta \Delta w \right\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sigma \|\bar{\delta}\|_2}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we thus have that

$$\frac{1}{2n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \zeta + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \|\bar{\delta}\|_2}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)}.$$

$$\underline{c_1 = \|\theta^*\|_2, c_2 = 0}$$

Due to the choice of c_1 and c_2 , there exists a parameter in \mathcal{C}_β corresponding to a predictor that agrees with θ^* on the target samples. Therefore, we can write the basic inequality

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| y - X\hat{\theta} \right\|_2^2 \leq \zeta + \frac{1}{n_T} \|z\|_2^2 \implies \frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \leq \zeta + \frac{1}{n_T} \left\langle z, X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\rangle.$$

Now, noting that $P_X z / \sigma$ is a chi-squared random variable with d degrees of freedom, we have that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta/9$,

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \left\langle z, X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\rangle \leq \frac{1}{n_T} \|P_X z\|_2 \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{n_T} \sqrt{d + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2.$$

Therefore, by solving the resulting quadratic inequality via Proposition G.2, we obtain the bound

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \leq \zeta + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(d + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

Observe that all relevant high-probability events for each case occur simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$, as desired. \square

A.3 Optimization Landscape during Target Time Training

Having derived statistical rates on nearly-optimal points for several choices of \mathcal{C}_β in the prior section, all that remains to be shown is that projected gradient descent can indeed find such points. In particular, we will demonstrate that for large enough β , the optimization landscape induced by \mathcal{L}_β is approximately convex. We do so by demonstrating that the objective satisfies the assumptions outlined in Section F, and thus the accompanying guarantees for projected gradient descent hold.

Lemma A.6 (Approximate linearity of function class). *Let $g_\theta(x) = \beta x^\top (A_{B_0} + \Delta)(w_0 + w)$ for $\theta = (\Delta, w) \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$, where \mathcal{C}_β is considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^{dk+k} . Then, assuming the high-probability event in Lemma A.2 holds, then*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \lesssim \beta^2 \text{tr } \Sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_\theta g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \lesssim \beta^2 \text{tr } \Sigma.$$

Proof. To bound the average squared Hessian operator norm, note that $\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)[\Delta, w] = \beta x_i^\top \Delta w$, which is independent of θ . Then, by the variational characterization of the operator norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)\|_2 &= \sup_{\|\Delta\|_F + \|w\|_2 \leq 1} |\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)[\Delta, w]| = \sup_{\|\Delta\|_F + \|w\|_2 \leq 1} \beta |x_i^\top \Delta w| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|\Delta\|_F + \|w\|_2 \leq 1} \beta \|x_i\|_2 \|\Delta\|_F \|w\|_2 \\ &\leq \beta \|x_i\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\|\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \lesssim \beta^2 \|x_i\|_2^2$. Consequently,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\beta^2}{n_T} \text{tr } X X^\top \lesssim \beta^2 \text{tr } \Sigma.$$

We now proceed to bound the squared norm of the gradient. Observe that the gradient is given by $\nabla_\theta g_\theta(x_i) = \beta [A_{B_0}^\top x_i, \text{vec}(x_i w_0^\top)]$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_\theta g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 &= \frac{\beta^2}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|A_{B_0}^\top x_i\|_2^2 + \|x_i w_0^\top\|_F^2 \lesssim \frac{\beta^2}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|x_i\|_2^2 = \frac{\beta^2}{n_T} \text{tr } X X^\top \\ &\lesssim \beta^2 \text{tr } \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $\|A_{B_0}^\top x_i\|_2^2 = 2 \|B_0^\top x_i\|_2^2 = 2 \|P_{B_0} x_i\|_2^2 \lesssim \|x_i\|_2^2$, by the definition of A_{B_0} and assumed orthogonality of B_0 . \square

Lemma A.7 (\mathcal{L}_β is Lipschitz). *Let $g_\theta(x) = \beta x^\top (A_{B_0} + \Delta)(w_0 + w)$ for $\theta = (\Delta, w) \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$, where \mathcal{C}_β is considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^{dk+k} . Furthermore, assume that the high-probability event in Lemma A.2 holds. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$ over the draw of n_T labels, we have that for any $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\beta^2 > c_1^2 + c_2^2$,*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}_\beta(g_\theta(X))\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n_T} \left[\|\Sigma\|_2 (\|\theta^*\|_2^2 + c_1^2 + c_2^2) + \sigma^2 \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right].$$

Proof. We assume that $\|z\|_2^2/n_T \lesssim \sigma^2[1 + \log(1/\delta)]$, which occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta/3$ via standard tail bounds on chi-squared random variables. Then, the gradient of the loss with respect to the predictions is given by

$$\nabla_g \mathcal{L}_\beta(g_\theta(X)) = \frac{1}{n_T} (y - g_\theta(X)) = \frac{1}{n_T} [X(\theta^* - \beta A_{B_0} w_0 - \beta \Delta w_0 - \beta \Delta w) + z].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}_\beta(g_\theta(X))\|_2^2 &\lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \frac{1}{n_T^2} \|X(\theta^* - \beta A_{B_0} w_0 - \beta \Delta w_0 - \beta \Delta w)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n_T^2} \|z\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n_T} \left[\|\Sigma\|_2 (\|\theta^*\|_2^2 + c_1^2 + c_2^2) + \sigma^2 \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.8. *Let \tilde{w} , \bar{w} , and $\bar{\delta}$ be defined as in Lemma A.5. Then, assuming that the high-probability event in Lemma A.2 holds, the three quantities above are norm-bounded by $\kappa^{1/2}(\|B^* w^*\|_2 + \delta_0)$, up to constant factors. Furthermore, we can also bound $\|\bar{\delta}\|_2$ as*

$$\|\bar{\delta}\|_2 \leq \delta_0 + \left(\frac{\|w^*\|_2 + \delta_0 \kappa^{1/2}}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \right) \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^*\|_F.$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, we will write λ_{\max} and λ_{\min} as shorthand for $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma)$, respectively. By definition, since B_0 is assumed to be orthonormal, the concentration of the sample covariance in Lemma A.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{w}\|_2^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{n_T \lambda_{\min}} \|X B_0 \bar{w}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_T \lambda_{\min}} \|P_{X B_0} X \theta^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \theta^*\|_2^2 \leq \kappa \|\theta^*\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \kappa (\|B^* w^*\|_2 + \delta_0)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Following similar arguments for \tilde{w} and $\bar{\delta}$, we obtain the same bounds. Thus, we have demonstrated that all three quantities are indeed norm-bounded by $\kappa^{1/2}(\|B^* w^*\|_2 + \delta_0)$, up to constant factors.

Finally, we proceed to derive the final bound on $\bar{\delta}$. Note that $X\bar{\delta} = X\delta^* - P_{XB_0}X\delta^* + P_{\bar{X}B_0}^\perp XB^*w^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\delta}\|_2 &\lesssim \delta_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T\lambda_{\min}}} [\|P_{XB_0}X\delta^*\|_2 + \|P_{\bar{X}B_0}^\perp XB^*w^*\|_2] \\ &\lesssim \delta_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \left[\|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}\Sigma^{1/2}\delta^*\|_2 + \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2}B^*w^*\|_2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \delta_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \left[\|\Sigma^{1/2}\delta^*\|_2 \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}^\perp\|_F + \|w^*\|_2 \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2}B^*\|_F \right]\end{aligned}$$

Now, by applying the properties of the trace operator and Proposition G.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}^\perp\|_F^2 &= \text{tr } P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}^\perp P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0} = \text{tr } (I - P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*})P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0} \\ &= \text{tr } P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0} - P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0} \\ &\leq \text{tr } P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*} - P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0} = \text{tr } P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}(I - P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}) \\ &= \text{tr } P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*} = \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B^*}\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2}B^*\|_F^2,\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\delta}\|_2 &\lesssim \delta_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \|\Sigma^{1/2}\delta^*\|_2 + \|w^*\|_2 \right] \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2}B^*\|_F \\ &\leq \delta_0 + \left(\frac{\|w^*\|_2 + \delta_0\kappa^{1/2}}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}} \right) \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2}B^*\|_F.\end{aligned}\quad \square$$

A.4 Deducing Theorem 3.1

Having proven all the previous results, we can now assemble the main claim in Theorem 3.1. Recall that we have defined the rates

$$\begin{aligned}
r_S(n_S, T) &:= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_S T} \left(kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0 \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log \kappa n_S + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right)} \\
r_T^{(1)}(n_T) &:= k r_S(n_S, T) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{\sigma \delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \\
r_T^{(2)}(n_T) &:= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(k + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \left[\delta_0 + \left(\frac{\|w^*\|_2 + \delta_0 \kappa^{1/2}}{\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(\Sigma)} \right) \sqrt{k r_S(n_S, T)} \right] \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \\
r_T^{(3)}(n_T) &:= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(d + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1 (Performance guarantee, linear representations). *Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Assume that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, and that $n_S \gg \rho^4(d + \log(T/\delta))$ and $n_T \gg \rho^4(d + \log(1/\delta))$. Then there are $(\lambda, \gamma, \beta, T_{\text{PGD}}, \eta, c_1, c_2)$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of all samples, the training procedure in Section 3.2 can find a parameter θ such that the excess risk on the target task is bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E} [(x^\top \theta^* - x^\top \theta)^2] \lesssim \min(r_T^{(1)}(n_T), r_T^{(2)}(n_T), r_T^{(3)}(n_T)).$$

Proof. Assume that during source training, the regularization parameters (λ, γ) are chosen according to Lemma A.3. We instantiate the high-probability events in Lemmas A.3, A.5 and A.7. These events occur altogether with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Throughout the proof, we define $r(n) = \min(r_T^{(1)}(n), r_T^{(2)}(n), r_T^{(3)}(n))$.

Given all the events above, we know that the optimization landscape induced by \mathcal{L}_β is well-behaved. That is, the function class is approximately linear in the parameters by Lemma A.6 and the loss is Lipschitz by Lemma A.7. Furthermore, for any of the proposed feasible sets in Lemma A.5, the bounds on relevant quantities provided by Lemma A.8 imply that

$$c_1^2 + c_2^2 \lesssim \underbrace{\kappa(\|B^* w^*\|_2^2 + \delta_0^2)}_{=: R^2} \implies \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} \|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}_\beta(g_\theta(X))\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n_T} \underbrace{\left[\|\Sigma\|_2 R^2 + \sigma^2 \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right]}_{=: \alpha^2}.$$

Therefore, we have demonstrated that \mathcal{L}_β satisfies the assumptions in Section F for any

$\beta > R^2$. Consequently, by running projected gradient descent with parameters

$$\beta = \max \left(R^2, \frac{\alpha R^2 \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}}{r(n_{\text{T}})} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\text{PGD}} = \frac{\alpha^2 R^2 \text{tr} \Sigma}{r(n_{\text{T}})^2},$$

and setting η as in Theorem F.1, we can guarantee that projected gradient descent finds an $r(n_{\text{T}})$ -suboptimal point. Therefore, by choosing (c_1, c_2) in order to achieve the minimal rate $r(n_{\text{T}})$ in Lemma A.5, we can guarantee that

$$\min_t \frac{1}{n_{\text{T}}} \|X(\theta_t - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \lesssim r(n_{\text{T}}).$$

Finally, due to target covariance concentration as guaranteed by the event in Lemma A.2, we thus have that the excess risk of the best predictor found by the algorithm on the target task is bounded as

$$\min_t \mathbb{E} [(x^\top \theta_t - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2] = \min_t \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\theta_t - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \lesssim \min(r_{\text{T}}^{(1)}(n), r_{\text{T}}^{(2)}(n), r_{\text{T}}^{(3)}(n)). \quad \square$$

B Proofs for Section 3.4

Lemma 3.1 (FROZENREP learns incorrect space). *Fix an orthogonal matrix $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ with $\text{Col } B^* \subseteq E^*$, and assume that we sample task weights from the distribution in (6). Then, with infinitely many tasks and per-task samples ($n_S, T \rightarrow \infty$), $\text{Col } \hat{B} = E_k$.*

Proof. Fix a B . For any $t \in [T]$, as $n_S \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w_t} \frac{1}{n_S} \|y_t - X_t B w_t\|_2^2 &= \min_{w_t} \frac{1}{n_S} \|X_t(\theta_t^* - B w_t) + z_t\|_2^2 \\ &= \min_{w_t} \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\theta_t^* - B w_t)\|_2^2 + \sigma^2 \\ &= \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*\|_2^2 + \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can rewrite the objective defining \hat{B} as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B} &= \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \operatorname{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \theta_t^* (\theta_t^*)^\top \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \\ &= \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \operatorname{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp \left[\frac{1}{2} P_{B^*} + P_{E_k} \right] \\ &= \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{B^*}\|_F^2 + \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{E_k}\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses the definition of the task distribution in (6). Now, let S be the space defined as $E_k + \text{Col } B^*$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_S\|_F^2 &= \operatorname{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_S \\ &= \operatorname{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{B^*} + \operatorname{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{E_k} \\ &= \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{B^*}\|_F^2 + \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{E_k}\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

By putting everything together, we thus see that

$$\hat{B} = \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_S\|_F^2 + \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}B}^\perp P_{E_k}\|_F^2.$$

This objective is minimized if and only if the span of $\Sigma^{1/2}B$ is exactly E_k . By inverting, this is only possible if $\text{Col } \hat{B} = E_k$. \square

Theorem 3.2 (FROZENREP minimax bound). *For an orthogonal matrix $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ whose column space lies in E^* , let S_{B^*} be the set*

$$S_{B^*} := \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}} B^* w + \delta \mid \|w\|_2 \leq 1, \|\delta\|_2 \leq 1, \delta \in E_k \right\}.$$

We consider the following procedure:

1. We draw n_T samples for target time training, which are collected into a matrix X .
2. Player chooses a target-time estimator $\hat{\theta} = \bar{B}\hat{w} + \hat{\delta}$, where \bar{B} , \hat{w} , and $\hat{\delta}$ are measurable function of (X, y) , and $\text{Col } \bar{B} = \text{Col } \hat{B}$.
3. Player chooses target-time estimator $\hat{\theta} = \hat{B}\hat{w} + \hat{\delta}$, where \hat{w} and $\hat{\delta}$ are measurable functions of (\hat{B}, X, y) .
4. Adversary chooses an orthogonal matrix $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ satisfying $\text{Col } B^* \subset E_k$, and a target time predictor $\theta^* \in S_{B^*}$.
5. FROZENREP returns a representation \hat{B} under the setting of Lemma 3.1 with the task distribution determined by B^* .
6. Target time samples are generated using $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_n)$, and the player estimator is evaluated.

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of X , we have that

$$\min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\delta}} \max_{\substack{B^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{B}\hat{w} - \hat{\delta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T},$$

where the expectation is over the randomness in the labels $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_{n_T})$. Note that the minimization over \hat{w} and $\hat{\delta}$ is performed over the set of measurable functions from (X, y) to \mathbb{R}^k and \mathbb{R}^d , respectively.

Proof. We instantiate the event guaranteed by Lemma A.2 over the draw of target samples, which guarantees that

$$0.9\Sigma \lesssim \frac{1}{n_T} X^\top X \lesssim 1.1\Sigma,$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Recall that by Lemma 3.1, FROZENREP will always find an orthogonal matrix whose column space is E_k , no matter how B^* is chosen. Therefore, we can rewrite the minimax expression as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\delta}} \max_{\substack{B^*, \theta^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{B}\hat{w} - \hat{\delta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] &= \min_{\hat{\theta}} \max_{\substack{B^*, \theta^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\gtrsim \min_{\hat{\theta}} \max_{\substack{B^*, \theta^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \theta^* - \hat{\theta} \right\|_\Sigma^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is simply a measurable function of (X, y) to \mathbb{R}^d . To further simplify the problem, observe that if we define the set

$$T = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \left\| P_{E^*} \theta \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}, \left\| P_{E_k} \theta \right\|_2^2 \leq 1 \right\} \subseteq S_{B^*}$$

then since the estimator only depends on B^* through θ^* ,

$$\min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\delta}} \max_{\substack{B^*, \theta^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{B}\hat{w} - \hat{\delta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] \gtrsim \min_{\hat{\theta}} \max_{\theta^* \in T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

To lower bound the right-hand side of (13), we use local coverings in the Σ -norm and apply the Fano bound for minimax risk. Let $B := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \varepsilon \|P_{E^*}\theta\|_2^2 + \|P_{E_k}\theta\|_2^2 \leq 1\}$ be the unit ball in the Σ -norm, so that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}B \subseteq T$. Using a known volumetric argument, there exists a $(1/2)$ -packing of B in the Σ -norm with at least 2^d elements. Equivalently, there exists a 2δ -packing of $4\delta B$ with at least 2^d elements – let this packing be S . Then, for any $\theta, \theta' \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(X\theta, \sigma^2 I_{n_T}) \parallel \mathcal{N}(X\theta', \sigma^2 I_{n_T})) &= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|X(\theta - \theta')\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{n_T}{2\sigma^2} \|\theta - \theta'\|_{\Sigma}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{32n_T}{\sigma^2} \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Fano's inequality, for any $\delta^2 \leq 1/32$ (which ensures that $S \subseteq 4\delta B \subseteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}B \subseteq T$),

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{\theta}} \max_{\theta^* \in T} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \left\| (\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] &\geq \delta^2 \left(1 - \frac{32n}{\sigma^2 d \log 2} \delta^2 - \frac{1}{d} \right) \\ &\geq \delta^2 \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{32n}{\sigma^2 d \log 2} \delta^2 \right). \quad (d \geq 4) \end{aligned}$$

As long as $n_T \geq \frac{\log 2}{2} \sigma^2 d$, we can set $\delta^2 = \left(\frac{\log 2}{64}\right) \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T}$, and thus putting everything together, we have that

$$\min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\delta}} \max_{\substack{B^*, \theta^* \\ \theta^* \in S_{B^*}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \left\| X(\theta^* - \hat{B}\hat{w} - \hat{\delta}) \right\|_2^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T}. \quad \square$$

C Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this section, we will prove the guarantee provided in Theorem 4.1, along with all related intermediate results. Along these lines, we proceed as we did for Section A. More explicitly, the overall outline of the proof follows the four major steps below. We have placed in parenthesis the corresponding intermediate steps in the linear representation case (Section A) as an additional illustration of the procedure:

- (1) Provide a statistical rate for source training (Lemma A.3).
- (2) Bound the difference in performance between the solution found by the optimization algorithm and the ERM solution (Lemma A.6+Theorem F.1).
- (3) Bound the difference between the ERM solution and the best solution in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$ as a function of target sample size (Lemma A.5).
- (4) Connect the best-case performance in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$ to the performance of the learner on the source tasks (Lemmas A.4, A.5 and A.8).

Note that step (4) is provided by the (ν, ε) -diversity condition. We will now proceed to demonstrate the remaining steps.

C.1 Bounding Average Source Task Performance (1)

The (ν, ε) -diversity condition implies that we can bound the best-case performance during target time training via control over the average source task performance. We proceed to provide such a bound using a standard uniform convergence argument. Recall that for a set of vector-valued functions \mathcal{H} mapping from $\mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, the Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{H} on n_S samples, denoted $\mathcal{R}_{n_S}(\mathcal{H})$, is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{n_S}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{j \in [n]} \varepsilon_{ij} h(x_i)_j \right],$$

where the expectation is over the samples (x_i) and i.i.d. Rademacher random variables ε_{ij} .

Lemma C.1 (Source Training Bound). *Let $\theta \in \Theta_0$ be a minimizer of the training objective in (8). Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of inputs and labels,*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{g_t \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{C}_S}} \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}}.$$

Proof. For any $t \in [T]$, we define the empirical risk minimizer $\bar{g}_t := \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}} \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g)$. Then, since θ minimizes the training objective in (8),

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \leq 0.$$

Following the canonical risk decomposition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) &\leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) + \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We give a high-probability bound on the right-hand side by first bounding its expectation, and then applying Markov's inequality to obtain the desired result. To bound the expectation, note that via symmetrization,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t) \right| \right] \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \varepsilon_{ij} \ell(g_t(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t}) \right| \right]$$

Recentering about $\ell(0, y_{i,t})$ and using the constant-shift property of the Rademacher complexity,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \varepsilon_{ij} \ell(g_t(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t}) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \varepsilon_{ij} [\ell(g_t(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t}) - \ell(0, y_{i,t})] \right| \right] + B \sqrt{\frac{T}{n_S}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since the loss is 1-Lipschitz, we can apply the Rademacher contraction principle,

from which we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \varepsilon_{ij} [\ell(g_t(x_{i,t}), y_{i,t}) - \ell(0, y_{i,t})] \right| \right] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \varepsilon_{ij} g_t(x_{i,t}) \right| \right] = \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S})^{\otimes T} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we can thus bound the expectation of the maximum deviation as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t) \right| \right] \lesssim \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + B \sqrt{\frac{T}{n_S}}.$$

Therefore, by applying Markov's inequality, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(\bar{g}_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) & \lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta_0 \\ g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S}}} \left| \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g_t^*}(g_t) \right| \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

C.2 Bounding Optimization Performance (2)

Having provided a bound on source task performance, we now proceed to analyze the objective being optimized during target time training. We first note that the approximate linearity assumption in Assumption 4.3 and the norm-boundedness of \mathcal{C}_T via Assumption 4.4 ensure that the results from Section F apply, as long as we can show that the empirical loss satisfies an $(\alpha/\sqrt{n_T})$ -Lipschitz condition. We proceed to show that this is indeed a simple consequence of the 1-Lipschitz assumption on the loss given by Assumption 4.1.

Lemma C.2. *Define the function $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^{n_T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as*

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}) := \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \ell(\hat{y}_i, y_i).$$

for fixed $y_1, \dots, y_{n_T} \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, for any \hat{y} , $\|\nabla_{\hat{y}} \mathcal{L}(\hat{y})\|_2^2 \leq 1/n_T$.

Proof. By direct computation,

$$\|\nabla_{\hat{y}} \mathcal{L}(\hat{y})\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_T^2} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} |\nabla_{\hat{y}_i} \ell(\hat{y}_i, y_i)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n_T},$$

where we have used the fact that $\ell(\cdot, y)$ is 1-Lipschitz for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ by Assumption 4.1. \square

Having verified that the assumptions in Section F hold, it follows that we have the following performance bound on projected gradient descent during target time training:

Lemma C.3. *Assume that we run projected gradient descent during target training time for T_{PGD} iterations with step size η given by*

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_{\text{PGD}}}} \left(\frac{R}{\sqrt{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}} \right).$$

Let $g_0, \dots, g_{T_{\text{PGD}}}$ denote the sequence of predictors obtained, where $g_0 = g_{\theta_0}$. Then, for any $g \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$,

$$\min_t \mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g) \leq \beta R^2 + R \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}.$$

C.3 Bounding the Performance of ERM during Target Training (3)

We now proceed to bound the performance of the ERM solution during target time training. Via following the canonical risk decomposition as in Lemma C.1, we can prove such a bound simply by bounding the maximum deviation between empirical and population losses over $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$.

Lemma C.4. *Let \mathcal{S} be the support of ρ . With probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of inputs and noise,*

$$\sup_{\substack{g^* \in \mathcal{S} \\ g \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}}} |\mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(g)| \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}}.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds similarly to that of Lemma C.1. Note that the supremum over g^* does not affect the bound, since g^* only enters into the expression through the labels y_i , and no matter what choice of g^* is made, $|\ell(0, y_i)| \leq B$ for all i . \square

C.4 Concluding: Proving Theorem 4.1

Having completed all the steps for the outline, we now proceed to compile the main result. Intuitively, since the diversity condition allows us to bound the performance of the best predictor, and projected gradient descent can perform as well as any predictor in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$ (and thus, as well as the best predictor), we can obtain performance bounds on the iterates found while training on the target task.

Theorem 4.1 (General Performance Bound). *Assume that Assumptions 4.1 to 4.4 all hold. Consider a learner following the training procedure outlined in Section 4.1, and let (θ_t) be the set of iterates generated by PGD with appropriately chosen step size η . Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of samples,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(\theta_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(\theta^* + \delta^*) \right] &\lesssim \underbrace{\beta R^2 + R \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{OPT}}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{EST}}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\nu} \left\{ \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}} \right\}}_{\varepsilon_{\text{REPR}}} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the \mathcal{R}_{n_T} complexity term samples from p , while the \mathcal{R}_{n_S} complexity term samples from $p^{\otimes T}$, i.e. each draw is T i.i.d. draws from p , concatenated.

Proof. We instantiate the high-probability events in Lemmas C.1 and C.4 both with failure probability $\delta/2$, which simultaneously occur with probability at least $1 - \delta$ via a union-bound. Consequently, we have the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{g_t \in \mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g_t^*}(g^*) &\lesssim \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_\theta^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}} \\ \sup_{\substack{g^* \in \mathcal{S} \\ g \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}}} |\mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g)| &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}} \end{aligned}$$

Given g^* , let \bar{g} be the population risk minimizer in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}$. Throughtout this proof, we omit g^* when writing \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_∞ whenever it is understood. Then, by Lemma C.3, projected gradient descent always finds an iterate \tilde{g} such that

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{g}) - \mathcal{L}(\bar{g}) \lesssim \beta R^2 + R \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}, \quad (14)$$

independent of g^* . Furthermore, note that $\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty(g_t) - \mathcal{L}_\infty(g^*) \leq \mathcal{L}_\infty(\tilde{g}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty(g^*)$. We thus proceed to decompose the risk as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\tilde{g}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty(g^*) &\lesssim \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_\infty(\tilde{g}) - \mathcal{L}(\tilde{g})}_{=:T_1} + \underbrace{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{g}) - \mathcal{L}(\bar{g})}_{=:T_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathcal{L}(\bar{g}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty(\bar{g})}_{=:T_3} + \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_\infty(\bar{g}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty(g^*)}_{=:T_4}. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound the terms T_1, \dots, T_4 individually. As a result of uniform convergence as guaranteed by Lemma C.4,

$$T_1, T_3 \leq \sup_{\substack{g^* \in \mathcal{S} \\ g \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}}} |\mathcal{L}^{g^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(g)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}},$$

where \mathcal{S} is the support of the target task distribution ρ . Furthermore, we have demonstrated a bound on T_2 in (14). Finally, by applying the (ν, ε) -diversity condition as guaranteed by Assumption 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} [T_4] &= \mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\inf_{g \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}} \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(g) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(g^*) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{g_t \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{C}_S}} \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g_t^*}(g_t) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g_t^*}(g_t^*) \right] + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} \left\{ \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}} \right\} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation with respect to $g^* \sim \rho$ and putting all of these bounds together, we thus have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} [\mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(\theta_t) - \mathcal{L}_{\infty}^{g^*}(\theta^* + \delta^*)] \\ &\lesssim \beta R^2 + R \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 R^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_T}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\nu} \left\{ \frac{1}{\delta T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} (\mathcal{A}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{C}_S})^{\otimes T} \right] + \frac{B}{\delta \sqrt{n_S T}} \right\} + \varepsilon. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

D Proofs for Case Studies

D.1 Logistic Regression

In this section, we verify that the logistic regression setting, as described in Section 5.1, satisfies the assumptions required by the general framework in Section 4.2. Subsequently, we then compute the necessary quantities for instantiating the guarantees provided by Theorem 4.1 in this setting.

D.1.1 Verifying Assumptions of Section 4.2

It is easily verified that the logistic loss is 1-Lipschitz, convex, and that $|\ell(0, y)| \leq 1$ for $y \in \{0, 1\} = \mathcal{Y}$. Furthermore, as we have already characterized the approximate linearity of the function class in Lemma A.6, the approximate linearity assumption in Assumption 4.3 holds with high probability. Finally, \mathcal{C}_T is norm-bounded by $(\kappa r^2 + \delta_0^2)/\beta^2$.

Therefore, all that remains is verifying that a (ν, ε) -diversity condition holds in this setting. In what follows, we will do so by connecting the logistic loss to squared error loss via leveraging smoothness and local strong convexity, as was done by Tripuraneni et al. (2020b). Consequently, we can utilize the same argument as in the linear setting to obtain the desired diversity condition.

Lemma D.1 (Diversity condition, logistic regression). *Under the assumptions above, the source tasks satisfy a $(\Omega(\exp[-\rho^3(r + \delta_0) \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}]), 0)$ -diversity condition.*

Proof. We remark that under the choice of q and the logistic loss, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(g_\theta(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta'}(x), y)] = \mathbb{E}_x [\text{KL}(\text{Ber}(\sigma(g_\theta(x))) \parallel \text{Ber}(\sigma(g_{\theta'}(x))))]$$

Using the results in Tripuraneni et al. (2020b, Lemmas 2 and 3),

$$\frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_x [\exp(-\max(|g_\theta(x)|, |g_{\theta'}(x)|))(g_\theta(x) - g_{\theta'}(x))^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(g_\theta(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta'}(x), y)] \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(g_\theta(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta'}(x), y)] \leq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_x [(g_\theta(x) - g_{\theta'}(x))^2]. \quad (16)$$

In what follows, we will make use of (15) to lower bound the task-averaged best-case performance, and (16) to upper bound the expected best-case target performance. Note that this results in bounds in terms of best-case mean squared error – we can then proceed to use arguments similar to that of the linear case to connect the two inequalities.

Upper bounding the expected best-case target performance.

Assume that the optimal predictor is given by $\theta^* = B^* w^* + \delta^*$. Then, defining

$$\hat{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\beta} \delta^* w_0^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w} = \frac{1}{\beta} (B_0^\top \Sigma B_0)^\dagger B_0^\top \Sigma B^* w^*,$$

we note that $\hat{\delta} := ([\hat{\Delta}, 0], [0, \bar{w}^\top]^\top) \in \mathcal{C}_T^\beta$, following the argument in Lemma A.8, and achieves a squared-error excess risk of

$$\mathbb{E} [(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \hat{\delta}}(x) - g_{\theta^*}(x))^2] = \|\Sigma^{1/2}[(B_0 \bar{w} + \delta^*) - (B^* w^* - \delta^*)]\|_2^2 = \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w^*\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, by taking the infimum of the excess risk over feasible δ and applying the excess risk upper bound in (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\beta} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \delta}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta^*}(x), y)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \hat{\delta}}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta^*}(x), y)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} [(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \hat{\delta}}(x) - g_{\theta^*}(x))^2] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* w^*\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall that $\mathbb{E}_{\theta^* \sim \rho} [(w^*)(w^*)^\top] = (r^2/k)I$. Therefore, by taking expectations with respect to ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^* \sim \rho} \left[\inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\beta} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \delta}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta^*}(x), y)] \right] \\ \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\theta^* \sim \rho} \left[\text{tr} P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* (w^*)(w^*)^\top (P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^*)^\top \right] \\ = \frac{r^2}{k} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^*\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Lower bounding the task-averaged best-case performance.

We proceed to lower bound the task-averaged best-case performance. To proof proceeds similarly to that of Tripuraneni et al. (2020b), lower bounding the excess risk by a constant multiple of the squared-error excess risk. Then, the result follows by an application of the transfer lemma in Lemma A.4.

Fix a task $t \in [T]$. Define $Z_1 := x^\top (B^* w_t^* + \delta_t^*)$ and $Z_2 := x^\top (B_0 w_t + \delta_t)$. We see that Z_1 is sub-Gaussian with parameter $\rho^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} (B^* w_t^* + \delta_t^*)\|_2^2 \leq \rho^2 (r^2 + \delta_0^2) \|\Sigma\|_2 =: \sigma^2$. Note that Z_2 is also sub-Gaussian with proxy σ^2 . Then, by applying the lower bound in (17),

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta_t^*}(x), y)] \geq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_x [e^{-\max(|Z_1|, |Z_2|)} (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2]. \quad (17)$$

We will now show that the right-hand side is lower bounded by a constant multiple of the squared error excess risk. Intuitively, since Z_1 and Z_2 concentrate around 0, $e^{-\max(|Z_1|, |Z_2|)}$ concentrates around 1.

Formally, consider the event $E_\alpha := \{\max(|Z_1|, |Z_2|) \leq \alpha\sigma\}$ for any α . Since the quantity inside the expectation of (17) is non-negative,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\max(|Z_1|, |Z_2|)} (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}[E_\alpha] e^{-\alpha\sigma} (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] \\ & \geq \frac{e^{-\alpha\sigma}}{8} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}[E_\alpha^C] (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we upper bound the last term. By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}[E_\alpha^C] (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] \leq \sqrt{P(E_\alpha^C)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^4 \right]},$$

where we have used the fact that $\text{Var}[X] \leq \sigma^2$ for a σ^2 -sub-Gaussian random variable. We use properties of sub-Gaussian random variables to bound both factors. First, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$P(E_\alpha^C) \leq 2P(|Z_1| \geq \alpha\sigma) \leq \frac{2\text{Var}[Z_1]}{\alpha^2\sigma^2} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha^2}.$$

For the second factor, $g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x)$ is sub-Gaussian with proxy $\rho^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right]$, and so via an equivalent definition of sub-Gaussian random variables,

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^4 \right]} \lesssim \rho^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right].$$

Putting these bounds together, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}[E_\alpha^C] (g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right] \lesssim \frac{\rho^2}{\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x) - g_{\theta_t^*}(x))^2 \right].$$

Therefore, by setting $\alpha \asymp \rho^2$, we can ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\ell(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta_t^*}(x), y) \right] \gtrsim e^{-\rho^3(r+\delta_0)\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}} \mathbb{E} \left[(x^\top \hat{\theta}_t - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2 \right] \\ & \implies \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\ell(g_{\hat{\theta}_t}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta_t^*}(x), y) \right] \\ & \gtrsim \frac{e^{-\rho^3(r+\delta_0)\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} (B_0 w_t + \delta_t - B^* w_t^* + \delta_t^*) \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma A.4, we finally obtain the final lower bound

$$\frac{e^{\rho^3(r+\delta_0)\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{\delta_t \in \mathcal{C}_S} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\ell(g_{\theta_0 + \delta_t}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta_t^*}(x), y) \right] \geq \frac{r^2}{k} \left\| P_{\Sigma^{1/2} B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} B^* \right\|_F^2.$$

Putting everything together, we thus have the desired diversity condition

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\|\delta\| \leq \delta_0} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(\beta g_{\theta_0 + \delta}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta^*}(x), y)] \\ & \lesssim \frac{e^{\rho^3(r+\delta_0)\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{\|\hat{\delta}_t\| \leq \delta_0} \mathbb{E}_{x,y} [\ell(g_{\theta_0 + \hat{\delta}_t}(x), y) - \ell(g_{\theta_t^*}(x), y)]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

D.1.2 Computations

Having demonstrated that the assumptions in Section 4.2 holds, we proceed to calculate the relevant quantities required for establishing a performance bound in this setting. First, we compute the Rademacher complexity for source task training.

Lemma D.2 (Source Rademacher Bound). *Assume that $n_S \gtrsim \rho^4 d$. Then, we can bound the source Rademacher complexity as*

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{C_S} \right] \lesssim \frac{r \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log n_S} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}.$$

Proof. Observe that if $(\Delta_t, w_t) \in \mathcal{C}_S$, then $\delta_t := \Delta_t w_t$ satisfies $\|\delta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{C_S} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\Delta_t, w_t) \in \mathcal{C}_S} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X_t (B + \Delta_t) w_t \rangle \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|w_t\|_2 \leq r} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X_t B w_t \rangle \right]}_{=:(I)} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|\delta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X \delta_t \rangle \right]}_{=:(II)} \end{aligned}$$

We proceed to bound these two quantities separately.

Bounding (I) via discretization.

In this section, we bound the complexity by discretizing the set $\mathcal{O}^{k \times d}$ of $(k \times d)$ orthogonal matrices. We remark that the argument is similar in form to that of Lemma A.3.

Let \mathcal{S} be an ε -covering of $\mathcal{O}^{k \times d}$ in the Frobenius norm with at most $(6\sqrt{k}/\varepsilon)^{dk}$ elements guaranteed by Proposition G.1. Then,

$$(I) \leq \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|w_t\|_2 \leq r} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X_t B w_t \rangle \right]}_{=:(A)} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{B, \bar{B} \in \mathcal{S} \\ \|B - \bar{B}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \\ \|w_t\|_2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X_t (B - \bar{B}) w_t \rangle \right]}_{=:(B)}$$

To bound (A), we bound the corresponding Gaussian complexity and use the fact that $\mathcal{R}(\cdot) \lesssim \mathcal{G}(\cdot)$. Consequently, via multiple applications of Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{S} \\ \|w_t\|_2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle P_{X_t B} z_t, X_t B w_t \rangle \right] \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{X_t B} z_t\|_2^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{S} \\ \|w_t\|_2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t B w_t\|_2^2 \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Conditioned on X_t , $\sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{X_t B} z_t\|_2^2$ is distributed as a chi-squared random variable with kT degrees of freedom, with mean kT . Therefore, using known bounds on expectations of finite maxima of subexponential random variables,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{X_t B} z_t\|_2^2 - kT \right] &\lesssim \sqrt{kT \log |\mathcal{S}|} + \log |\mathcal{S}| \\ \implies \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{X_t B} z_t\|_2^2 \right] &\lesssim kT + \log |\mathcal{S}|. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Furthermore, by applying the expectation bound on the empirical spectral norm in Proposition G.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{S} \\ \|w_t\|_2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|X_t B w_t\|_2^2 \right]} &= r \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{B \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{B^\top X_t^\top X_t B}{n_S} \right) \right]} \tag{19} \\ &\leq r \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{X_t^\top X_t}{n_S} \right) \right]} \\ &\lesssim r \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Therefore, by combining the inequalities from (18) and (20),

$$\text{(A)} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + \log |\mathcal{S}|}.$$

We proceed to bound (B), the error arising from discretization. We have that

$$\text{(B)} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{B, \bar{B} \in \mathcal{S} \\ \|B - \bar{B}\|_F \leq \varepsilon \\ \|w_t\|_2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{n_S T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \varepsilon_t, X_t (B - \bar{B}) w_t \rangle \right] \lesssim r \varepsilon \|\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2.$$

Finally, by setting $\varepsilon = \sqrt{k/n_S}$, we have an overall bound of

$$(I) \leq \frac{r \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log n_S}.$$

Bounding (II).

By bounding by the Gaussian complexity,

$$(II) \leq \frac{1}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|\delta_t\|_2 \leq \delta_0} \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle z_t, X_t \delta_t \rangle \right] \lesssim \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} X_1^\top z \right\|_2 \right] \leq \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}.$$

Putting the bounds on (I) and (II) together, we thus have that

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{C_S} \right] \lesssim \frac{r \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log n_S} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}. \quad \square$$

Lemma D.3 (Target Rademacher Bound). *For $\beta \gtrsim r\kappa^{1/2}$, the Rademacher complexity of the feasible set during target time training is bounded by*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n_T} (\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{C_T}) \lesssim r\kappa^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}.$$

Proof. We can write the Rademacher complexity as

$$\mathcal{R}_{n_T} (\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{C_T}) = \beta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\Delta, w) \in C_T^\beta} \frac{1}{n_T} \langle \varepsilon, X[B_0, B_0]w + X\Delta w_0 + X\Delta w \rangle \right].$$

Firstly, by converting to Gaussian complexity and following standard arguments, we can bound the first term as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|w\|_2 \leq r\kappa^{1/2}/\beta} \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, X[B_0, B_0]w \rangle \right] &\leq \beta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|w\|_2 \leq \kappa/\beta} \frac{1}{n_T} \langle [B_0, B_0]^\top X^\top z, w \rangle \right] \\ &\leq \frac{r\kappa^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_T}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| B_0^\top \frac{X^\top}{\sqrt{n_T}} z \right\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq r\kappa^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, note that we only need to consider the set of rank-1 matrices of the form $\Delta = v[w_0, -w_0]^\top$, where $\|v\|_2 \leq \delta_0/\beta\sqrt{2}$. As such,

$$\beta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|v\|_2 \leq \delta_0/\beta\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{n_T} \langle z, Xv \rangle \right] \leq \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{X}{\sqrt{n_T}} z \right\|_2^2 \right]} \lesssim \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}.$$

Finally, to bound the Hessian term, note that $\|\Delta w\|_2 \leq r\kappa^{1/2}\delta_0/\beta^2$. Therefore, by a similar argument to the previous term,

$$\beta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\Delta, w) \in \mathcal{C}_T} \frac{1}{n_T} \langle \varepsilon, X \Delta w \rangle \right] \leq \frac{\kappa \delta_0}{\beta \sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}.$$

Thus, as long as $\beta \geq r\kappa^{1/2}$, we obtain the overall bound of

$$\mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T}) \lesssim r\kappa^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}. \quad \square$$

D.1.3 Compiling the Bound

Theorem 5.1 (Performance Guarantee for Logistic Regression). *Assume that Assumption 5.1 and Assumption 5.2 both hold. Set the parameters for target time training to be*

$$\beta = (\kappa r^2 + \delta_0^2) \max \left(1, \frac{\sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma}}{1/\delta \sqrt{n_T}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\text{PGD}} = \frac{(\kappa r^2 + \delta_0^2) \text{tr} \Sigma}{1/\delta^2 n_T}.$$

Then, for $n_S, n_T \gtrsim \rho^4 d$, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of samples, the iterates (θ_t) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{g^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g_{\theta_t}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{g^*}(g^*) \right] \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} \left\{ r\kappa^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \exp \left[\rho^3 (r + \delta_0) \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2} \right] \left[\frac{r \|\Sigma\|_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \sqrt{kT + kd \log n_S} + \frac{\delta_0}{\sqrt{n_S}} \sqrt{\text{tr} \Sigma} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. With probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, the approximate linearity property of the function class holds via Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.6. Therefore, by combining all prior calculations and instantiating Theorem 4.1 with failure probability $\delta/2$, projected gradient descent finds a predictor g satisfying the desired bound in the theorem statement. \square

D.2 Two-Layer Neural Networks

Recall the feature vectors $\phi_{B_0}(x)$ and $\psi_{B_0, w_0}(x)$ defined in Definition 5.1, which have the following closed-form expressions:

$$\phi_{B_0}(x) = \sigma(B_0^\top x) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{B_0, w_0}(x) = w_0^{\text{diag}} \sigma'(B_0^\top x) x^\top.$$

Additionally, there exists $\bar{B} = B_0 + \alpha_1 \Delta$ and $\bar{w} = w_0 + \alpha_2 w$ for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0, 1]$ such that the Taylor remainder $\zeta_{(B_0, w_0)}^{\Delta, w}(x)$ can be written as

$$\zeta_{(B_0, w_0)}^{\Delta, w}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2k} \bar{w}_i \sigma''(\bar{B}_i^\top x) (\Delta_i^\top x)^2 + 2w_i \sigma'(\bar{B}_i^\top x) (\Delta_i^\top x).$$

We define the feature vector $\rho_{B, w}(x)$ to be the concatenation of $\phi_B(x)$ and $\psi_{B, w}(x)$. For $\theta_0 = (B_0, w_0)$ and $\delta = (\Delta, w)$, we will frequently abuse notation and let $\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta$ denote the linearization of $f_{\theta_0+\delta}$, *i.e.*

$$\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta = w^\top \phi_{B_0}(x) + \langle \psi_{\theta_0}(x), \Delta \rangle.$$

Before we verify the assumptions in Section 4.2 required to instantiate the bounds, we first provide the following intermediate results on relevant norm bounds:

Lemma D.4 (Hessian Bound). *Fix a matrix $\bar{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{2k \times d}$ and a vector $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}$. Assume that all rows of \bar{B} are 2-norm-bounded, and that $\|\bar{w}\|_2 \leq 2$. Then, for $x \sim p$ almost surely, $\left\| \nabla_{\theta}^2 f_{(\bar{B}, \bar{w})}^\beta(x) \right\|_2 \lesssim \beta(\mu + L)$.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, we will use the fact that $\|x\|_2 \leq 1$ for $x \sim p$ almost surely. By definition,

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta}^2 f_{(\bar{B}, \bar{w})}^\beta(x) \right\|_2 = \sup_{\|\Delta\|_F^2 + \|w\|_2^2 \leq 1} \beta \left| \sum_{i \in [2k]} \bar{w}_i \sigma''(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \langle \Delta_i, x \rangle^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in [2k]} w_i \sigma'(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \langle \Delta_i, x \rangle \right|$$

To bound the first term, observe that by applying Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [2k]} \bar{w}_i \sigma''(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \langle \Delta_i, x \rangle^2 &\leq \left(\sup_{i \in [2k]} \left| w_i \sigma''(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \right| \right) \sum_{i \in [2k]} \langle \Delta_i, x \rangle^2 \\ &= \left(\sup_{i \in [2k]} \left| \bar{w}_i \sigma''(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \right| \right) \|\Delta x\|_2^2 \leq 2\mu. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the second term, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz, from which we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{i \in [2k]} w_i \sigma'(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \langle \Delta_i, x \rangle &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{i \in [2k]} \left[w_i \sigma'(\bar{B}_i^\top x) \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} \|\Delta x\|_2 \\ &\leq 2L \|w\|_2 \|\Delta x\|_2 \leq 2L. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we thus have that almost surely for $x \sim p$,

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta}^2 f_{(\bar{B}, \bar{w})}^\beta(x) \right\|_2 \lesssim \beta(\mu + L). \quad \square$$

As an immediate corollary, since $\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x)$ evaluates the Hessian at a point satisfying the preconditions of Lemma D.4 during both source and target training time, we have the following result:

Corollary D.1. *For any $\theta_0 \in \Theta_0$ and any (Δ, w) with $\|\Delta\|_F \leq c_1/\beta$, $\|w\|_2 \leq c_2/\beta$, we have that $\left| \beta \zeta_{\theta_0}^{(\Delta, w)}(x) \right| \leq c_1 c_2 (\mu + L) / \beta$ for $x \sim p$ almost surely.*

The above result formalizes the intuition outlined in the main text, which claims that the function class is approximately linear in the fine-tuning parameters (Δ, w) for large enough β . Finally, we provide a norm bound on the combined representation vector $\rho_{\theta_0}(x)$.

Lemma D.5 (Representation Norm Bound). *For $x \sim p$, $\|\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\|_2 \leq 2L\sqrt{k}$ almost surely for any $\theta_0 = (B_0, w_0) \in \Theta_0$.*

Proof. Recall from definitions that $\|\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\|_2^2 = \|\phi_{B_0}(x)\|_2^2 + \|\psi_{\theta_0}(x)\|_F^2$. To bound the activation features, since $\sigma(0) = 0$ and $|\sigma'(x)| \leq L$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\|\phi_{B_0}(x)\|_2^2 = 2k \max_{i \in [2k]} |\sigma(B_{0,i}^\top x)|^2 \leq 2k \max_{i \in [2k]} \left| \int_0^{B_{0,i}^\top x} \sigma'(z) dz \right|^2 \leq 2kL^2.$$

To bound the gradient features, we once again use the boundedness of σ' to obtain

$$\|\psi_{\theta_0}(x)\|_F^2 = \left\| w_0^{\text{diag}} \sigma'(B_0^\top x) x^\top \right\|_F^2 = \left\| w_0^{\text{diag}} \sigma'(B_0^\top x) \right\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2 = \|\sigma'(B_0^\top x)\|_2^2 \|x\|_2^2 \leq 2kL^2.$$

Putting the bounds together, we obtain the desired overall bound. \square

D.3 Verifying Assumptions of Section 4.2

Having proved the norm bounds above, we now can proceed to verify the required assumptions. First, we verify the assumptions on the loss function; clearly, the squared error loss is convex, so we simply need to verify that the loss is Lipschitz over the prediction, and that $\ell(0, y)$ is bounded. Note that we have to prove separate bounds for source and target training, due to the change in the function class.

Lemma D.6 (Validating Loss Assumptions). *Assume that $\gamma^2 \geq 2\kappa$. Define the quantities*

$$\alpha_1 := L\sqrt{k} + \frac{\mu + L}{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 := \kappa^{1/2} L\sqrt{k} + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma} (\mu + L).$$

Then, during both source and target training time, $|\ell(0, y)| \leq \alpha_1^2$ for any y , and $\ell(\cdot, y)$ is α_1 -Lipschitz during source training time and α_2 -Lipschitz during target training time for any y , all up to universal constants.

Proof. For the squared error loss, $\ell(0, y) = y^2$ and $\nabla_{\hat{y}}\ell(\hat{y}, y) = 2(\hat{y} - y)$ for any y . Therefore, since the additive noise is $O(1)$ bounded, the claims hold as long as we can prove a bound on the predictions of any feasible predictor.

We first consider bounding the Lipschitz constant during source-time training. That is, we need to provide a uniform bound on $x \mapsto \beta\rho_{\theta_0}(x)^\top\delta + \beta\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x)$ for $\theta_0 \in \Theta_0$, $\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S$, and x in the support of p . To this end, we apply the bounds in Corollary D.1 and Lemma D.5, from which we obtain

$$|\beta\rho_{\theta_0}(x)^\top\delta + \beta\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x)| \lesssim L\sqrt{k} + \frac{\mu + L}{\beta} =: \alpha_1.$$

By applying a similar argument for target-time training, we find that

$$|\gamma\rho_{\theta_0}(x)^\top\delta + \gamma\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x)| \lesssim \kappa^{1/2}L\sqrt{k} + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(\mu + L) =: \alpha_2.$$

We thus can conclude that during both source and target training time, $|\ell(0, y)| \leq \alpha_1^2$ for any y , and that $\ell(\cdot, y)$ is α_1 -Lipschitz during source training time and α_2 -Lipschitz during target training time for any feasible y . \square

Lemma D.7 (Neural network diversity). *Assume that $\gamma > \max(\kappa\beta, \sqrt{2\kappa})$. The source tasks satisfy a $(1, (L + \mu)^2/\beta^2)$ -diversity condition with respect to the target task distribution ρ .*

Proof. Observe that we can write the excess risk as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[[(\gamma\rho_{B_0, w_0}(x)\delta - \beta\rho_{B^*, w_0^*}(x)\delta^*) + (\gamma\zeta_{B_0, w_0}^\delta(x) - \beta\zeta_{B^*, w_0^*}^{\delta^*}(x))]^2 \right].$$

We proceed to upper bound the averaged best-case target performance, and lower bound the best-case performance averaged over source tasks.

Upper bounding the expected best-case target performance.

Fix a δ^* . Then, since $\gamma^2 > 2\kappa$ guarantees that Lemma D.4 holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*+\delta^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(\gamma\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta - \rho_{\theta_0^*}(x)\delta^*)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[(\gamma\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x) - \beta\zeta_{\theta_0^*}^{\delta^*}(x))^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(\gamma\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta - \beta\rho_{\theta_0^*}(x)\delta^*)^2 \right] + \left[\frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu) \right]^2 + \frac{(L + \mu)^2}{\beta^2} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(\gamma\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta - \beta\rho_{\theta_0^*}(x)\delta^*)^2 \right] + \frac{(L + \mu)^2}{\beta^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by taking the infimum over $\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T$ and noting that the unconstrained infimum of the right-hand side is feasible by Proposition G.7 and the conditioning constraint imposed by Θ_0 ,

$$\inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*+\delta^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] \leq \beta^2 \|\Lambda(\rho_{\theta_0}, \rho_{\theta_0^*})^{1/2}\delta^*\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2$$

Now, by the choice of target task distribution, we can write δ^* as $\Gamma\omega^*/\beta$, where we note that $\mathbb{E}[\omega^*(\omega^*)^\top] = (1/k)I_{2k}$. Thus, by taking expectations, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta^* \sim \rho} \left[\inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*+\delta^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] \right] \leq \frac{1}{k} \|\Lambda(\rho_{\theta_0}, \rho_{\theta_0^*})^{1/2} \Gamma\|_F^2 + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2.$$

Lower bounding the source task-averaged best-case target performance.

Fix a source task $t \in [T]$. By Corollary G.1, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(\rho_{\theta_0}(x)\delta - \rho_{\theta_0^*}(x)\delta^*)^2 \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[(\zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(x) - \zeta_{\theta_0^*}^{\delta^*}(x))^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by taking the infimum on both sides and applying Proposition G.7,

$$\|\Lambda(\rho_{\theta_0}, \rho_{\theta_0^*})^{1/2} \Gamma \omega_t^*\|_2^2 \leq \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2.$$

By averaging over the set of source tasks,

$$\frac{1}{T} \|\Lambda(\rho_{\theta_0}, \rho_{\theta_0^*})^{1/2} \Gamma \Omega\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2.$$

Finally, by applying Assumption 5.5 to lower bound the left-hand side, we find that

$$\frac{1}{k} \|\Lambda(\rho_{\theta_0}, \rho_{\theta_0^*})^{1/2} \Gamma\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2.$$

Concluding.

Consequently, by putting the two parts together, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\delta^* \sim \rho} \left[\inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*+\delta^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] \right] \\ \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_S} \mathbb{E} \left[(f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\beta(x) - f_{\theta_0^*}^\beta(x))^2 \right] + \left(\frac{L + \mu}{\beta} \right)^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma D.8 (Neural network approximate linearity). *Assume that $\gamma^2 \geq 2\kappa$. For any $\theta_0 \in \Theta$,*

$$\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_{\theta}^2 f_{\theta_0+\delta}^\gamma(x_i)\|_2^2 \lesssim \gamma^2(L + \mu)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i \in [n_T]} \|\nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta_0}^\gamma(x_i)\|_2^2 \lesssim \gamma^2 k L^2.$$

Proof. The first bound is a trivial consequence of Lemma D.4. Meanwhile, we note that the second inequality, the quantity inside the norm is exactly $\beta\rho_{\theta_0}(x)$, and thus the bound follows by Lemma D.5. \square

D.3.1 Computations

Lemma D.9 (Source Rademacher Bound). *We have the following bound on the Rademacher complexity:*

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{C_S} \right] \lesssim \frac{kL}{(n_S T)^2} + \left[(L + \mu) \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + L \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_S}} \right] \log(n_S T) + \frac{\mu + L}{\beta}$$

Proof. We first consider bounding the empirical Rademacher complexity for a fixed set of inputs $(x_{i,t})$, after which we obtain the desired result by taking expectations over the sampled inputs. Expanding the definition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{C_S} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{nT} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{(B_0, w_0) \in \Theta_0 \\ (\Delta_t, w_t) \in C_S}} \left| \sum_{\substack{i \in [n_S] \\ t \in [T]}} \varepsilon_{i,t} \left[w_t^\top \phi(B^\top x_{i,t}) + \langle \Delta_t, \psi_B(x_{i,t}) \rangle + \zeta_{B, w_0}^{\Delta_t, w_t}(x_{i,t}) \right] \right| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S}(\mathcal{F}_\Phi^{\otimes T} \circ \Phi) + \frac{1}{T} \mathcal{R}_{n_S}(\mathcal{F}_\Psi^{\otimes T} \circ \Psi) + \frac{\mu + L}{\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\Phi &:= \{z \mapsto \beta \langle w, z \rangle \mid \|w\|_2 \leq 1/\beta\} \\ \mathcal{F}_\Psi &:= \{Z \mapsto \beta \langle \Delta, Z \rangle \mid \|\Delta\|_F \leq 1/\beta\} \\ \Phi &:= \{\phi_B \mid (\exists w) (B, w) \in \Theta_0\} \\ \Psi &:= \{\psi_{B,w} \mid (B, w) \in \Theta_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed to bound the two complexity terms by noting that for any function class \mathcal{F} , $\mathcal{R}_{n_S}(\mathcal{F}) \lesssim \mathcal{G}_{n_S}(\mathcal{F})$, and making use of the Gaussian complexity chain rule from Proposition G.6. First, note that for a fixed set of latent vectors z_1, \dots, z_{n_S} ,

$$\mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F}_\Phi) = \frac{1}{n_S} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|w\|_2 \leq 1} |\langle z, Z w \rangle| \right] \leq \frac{1}{n_S} \sqrt{\text{tr} Z Z^\top} = \frac{1}{n_S} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n_S]} \|z_i\|_2^2}.$$

Then, applying the representation norm bound Lemma D.5 to the latents,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F}_\Phi) \right] \leq L \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_S}}.$$

Similarly, for a fixed set of latent matrices Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_S}

$$\mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F}_\Psi) \leq \frac{1}{n_S} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in n_S} \|Z_i\|_F^2} \implies \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F}_\Psi) \right] \leq L \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_S}},$$

where we once again used the representation bound from Lemma D.5.

Finally, we bound the complexity of the classes Φ and Ψ . Firstly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T}\mathcal{G}_{n_S}(\Phi) &= \frac{1}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(B_0, w_0) \in \Theta_0} \left| \sum_{r \in [2k]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{t \in [T]} z_{r,i,t} \sigma(B_r^\top x_{i,t}) \right| \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2k}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{t \in [T]} z_{i,t} \sigma(b^\top x_{i,t}) \right| \right] \\
&\lesssim \frac{kL}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in [n_S T]} z_i x_i \right\|_2 \right] \leq \frac{kL}{n_S T} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n_S T]} \|x_i\|_2^2} \leq \frac{kL}{\sqrt{n_S T}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality makes use of the Gaussian contraction result in Ledoux & Talagrand (1991, Corollary 3.17). Note that we reindex at the third line, which is made possible by the fact that the source tasks have the same input distributions. Secondly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T}\mathcal{G}_{n_S}(\Psi) &= \frac{1}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(B_0, w_0) \in \Theta_0} \left| \sum_{r \in [2k]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sigma'(B_r^\top x_{i,t}) \langle x_{i,t}, z_{r,i,t} \rangle \right| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(B_0, w_0) \in \Theta_0} \left| \sum_{r \in [2k]} \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{t \in [T]} [\sigma'(B_r^\top x_{i,t}) - \sigma'(0)] \langle x_{i,t}, z_{r,i,t} \rangle \right| \right] + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \\
&= \frac{2k}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i \in [n_S]} \sum_{t \in [T]} [\sigma'(b^\top x_{i,t}) - \sigma'(0)] \langle x_{i,t}, z_{r,i,t} \rangle \right| \right] + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{k\mu}{n_S T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in [n_S T]} \langle x_{i,t}, z_{i,t} \rangle x_{i,t} \right\|_2 \right] + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \leq \frac{k\mu}{n_S T} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n_S T]} \|x_i\|_2^4} + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n_S T}} \\
&\leq \frac{k\mu}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n_S T}},
\end{aligned}$$

following the same reasoning as before. Therefore, by applying Proposition G.6, we obtain the bound

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathcal{R}_{n_S} \left[\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{A}_\theta^{c_S} \right] \lesssim \frac{kL}{(n_S T)^2} + \left[(L + \mu) \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + L \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_S}} \right] \log(n_S T) + \frac{\mu + L}{\beta}. \quad \square$$

Lemma D.10 (Target Rademacher bound). *We have the following Rademacher complexity bound:*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{c_T^\gamma}) \lesssim L\sqrt{\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu).$$

Proof. Following definitions, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{n_T}(\mathcal{A}_{\theta_0}^{\mathcal{C}_T^\gamma}) &= \frac{\gamma}{n_T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\gamma} |\langle \varepsilon, \rho(X)\delta + \zeta_{\theta_0}^\delta(X) \rangle| \right] \leq \frac{\gamma}{n_T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{C}_T^\gamma} |\langle \varepsilon, \rho(X)\delta \rangle| \right] + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu) \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{n_T} \mathbb{E} [\|\rho(X)^\top \varepsilon\|_2] + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu) \leq \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{n_T} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [\|\rho(X)^\top \varepsilon\|_2^2]} + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu) \\
&\leq L\sqrt{\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n_T}} + \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}(L + \mu),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality uses the bound on the representation given in Lemma D.5. \square

D.3.2 Compiling the Bound

Theorem 5.2 (Neural net performance bound). *Assume that Assumptions 5.3 to 5.5 hold. Then, if $n_S \geq n_T$, there exists a training parameter setting (see Section D) such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the iterates (θ_t) satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}_{f^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(f_{\theta_t}) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(f_{\theta^*}) \right] \lesssim \kappa L^2 \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_T}} + L(L + \mu) \frac{k^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + \left(\frac{\mu + L}{\beta} \right) L\sqrt{k}.$$

Proof. By incorporating previous bounds and invoking Theorem 4.1, we have that for large enough γ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{f^* \sim \rho} \left[\min_t \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(f_{\theta_t}(x)) - \mathcal{L}_\infty^{f^*}(\theta^*) \right] \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{k\kappa(L + \mu)^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}} + \kappa L^2 \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_T}} + L(L + \mu) \frac{k^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n_S T}} + \left(\frac{\mu + L}{\beta} \right) L\sqrt{k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by running enough projected gradient descent iterations so that the first term matches $kL^2k/\sqrt{n_T}$, we obtain the desired bound. \square

E Proofs for the Nonlinear Hard Case

Throughout this section, we write $\theta_t^* = A^*v_t^* + \delta_t^*$ for the linear predictor parameter for source task $t \in [T]$. Furthermore, we assume that this linear predictor corresponds to ReLU predictor $f_{(B^*+\Delta^*, w^*)}$. First, we prove the following intermediate technical result which will be used throughout this section.

Lemma E.1 (Optimal ReLU Predictor is Linear). *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and assume that $B = [A, -A]$. Then, if we set*

$$w = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^{2k}} \mathbb{E} [(w^\top (B^\top x)_+ - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2],$$

then the predictor $x \mapsto w^\top (B^\top x)$ is in fact a linear function of x , and takes the form of $x^\top Av$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Proof. Write $w = [w_+, w_-]$, and thus the objective defining w can be written as

$$\min_{w_+, w_- \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E} [(w_+^\top (A^\top x)_+ + w_-^\top (-A^\top x)_+ - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2].$$

Now, define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &:= \mathbb{E} [(A^\top x)_+(x^\top A)_+] = \mathbb{E} [(-A^\top x)_+(-x^\top A)_+] \\ \Gamma &:= \mathbb{E} [(-A^\top x)_+(x^\top A)_+] = \mathbb{E} [(A^\top x)_+(-x^\top A)_+], \end{aligned}$$

where the equalities follow from the fact that Ax and $-Ax$ are equal in distribution. Additionally,,

$$\mathbb{E} [(A^\top x)_+x^\top] = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} [(A^\top x)_+x^\top] - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} [(-A^\top x)_+x^\top] = \frac{1}{2}A^\top \mathbb{E} [xx^\top] = \frac{1}{2}A^\top \Sigma,$$

and thus once again since Ax and $-Ax$ are equal in distribution,

$$\mathbb{E} [(-A^\top x)_+x^\top] = -\mathbb{E} [(A^\top x)_+x^\top] = -\frac{1}{2}A^\top \Sigma.$$

Thus, by explicitly solving for the optimum of the convex objective,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} w_+ \\ w_- \end{bmatrix} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega & \Gamma \\ \Gamma & \Omega \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \Sigma \theta_t^* \\ -A^\top \Sigma \theta_t^* \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (\Omega - \Gamma \Omega \Gamma)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (\Omega - \Gamma \Omega \Gamma)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -\Gamma \Omega^{-1} \\ -\Gamma \Omega^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \Sigma \theta_t^* \\ -A^\top \Sigma \theta_t^* \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied blockwise matrix inversion to obtain the second inequality. From this, we see that $w_+ = w_-$, and thus the corresponding optimal predictor is linear, and can be shown to be $x \mapsto x^\top Aw_+$. \square

E.1 Hardness Result for FROZENREP

Lemma E.2 (FROZENREP learns incorrect neurons). *Fix an orthogonal matrix $A^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ with $\text{Col } A^* \subseteq E^*$, and assume that we sample tasks from the distribution in (10). Assume that $\hat{B} = [\hat{A}, -\hat{A}]$ is the representation found by FROZENREP. Then, with infinitely many tasks and per-task samples (i.e. $n_S, T \rightarrow \infty$), $\hat{A} = \text{Col } E_k$.*

Proof. Intuitively, the result follows from the fact that the optimal predictor is equivalent to a linear predictor, and thus the result follows by Lemma 3.1. More formally, by Lemma E.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(B) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \min_w \mathbb{E} [(w^\top (Bx)_+ - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \min_v \mathbb{E} [(x^\top Av - x^\top \theta_t^*)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \min_v \|\Sigma^{1/2}(Av - \theta_t^*)\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \theta_t^*\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

At this point, we recognize that the objective is equivalent to the one analyzed in Lemma 3.1, and thus the same characterization of global optima holds. That is, the solution \hat{B} found by FROZENREP can be expressed as $\hat{B} = [\hat{A}, -\hat{A}]$, where $\text{Col } \hat{A} = E_k$. \square

Theorem 6.1 (FROZENREP Minimax Bound, ReLU). *For an orthogonal matrix $A^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ such that $\text{Col } A^* \subset E^*$, let S_{A^*} be the set*

$$S_{A^*} = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}} A^* v + \delta \mid \|v\|_2 \leq 1, \|\delta\|_2 \leq 1, \delta \in E_k \right\}.$$

We consider the following procedure:

1. *We draw n_T samples for target time training, which are collected into a matrix X .*
2. *Player chooses target-time estimator $x \mapsto \hat{w}^\top (\bar{B}^\top x) + \mathbb{1}[x^\top \bar{B} \geq 0] \hat{\Delta}^\top x$, where \bar{B} , \hat{w} and $\hat{\Delta}$ are measurable functions of (X, y) , and \bar{B} is an orthogonal matrix with $\text{Col } \bar{B} = \text{Col } \hat{B}$.*
3. *Adversary chooses an orthogonal matrix $A^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ satisfying $\text{Col } A^* \subset E_k$, and a target time predictor $\theta^* \in S_{A^*}$.*
4. *Compute the representation \hat{B} returned by FROZENREP under the setting of Lemma E.2 with the task distribution determined by A^* .*
5. *Target time samples are generated using $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_n)$, and the player estimator is evaluated.*

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of X , we have that

$$\min_{\bar{B}, \hat{w}, \hat{\Delta}} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{A^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(x_i^\top \theta^* - \hat{w}^\top (\bar{B}^\top x_i) - \mathbb{1}[x_i^\top \bar{B} > 0] \hat{\Delta}^\top x_i \right)^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T},$$

where the expectation is over the randomness in the labels $y \sim \mathcal{N}(X\theta^, \sigma^2 I_{n_T})$.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, we assume the high-probability event in Lemma A.2, which guarantees that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$0.9\Sigma \preceq \frac{1}{n_T} X^\top X \preceq 1.1\Sigma.$$

Let S denote the intersection of the d -dimensional unit sphere with E_k . For any infinite-dimensional vector f indexed by S and a measure μ on S , we define $\mu^\top f$ to denote integration with respect to μ , i.e.

$$\mu^\top f = \int_S f \, d\mu.$$

We then define the infinite-dimensional vectors η and $\zeta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, both indexed by S , as

$$\eta(x) := (v^\top x)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta^{(i)}(x) := \mathbb{1}[v^\top x > 0] x_i.$$

Recall that by Lemma E.2, $\text{Col } \hat{B} = E_k$. With the preceding discussion in mind, we can equivalently think of the player as choosing $d + 1$ signed measures $\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d$ over S , all with a common support of $2k$ elements in S , as a function of (X, y) . The player then plays the predictor

$$x \mapsto \alpha^\top \eta(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i^\top \zeta^{(i)}(x).$$

Then, if we let $T = \{\theta \mid \|P_{E^*} \theta\|_2^2 \leq 1/2\varepsilon, \|P_{E_k} \theta\|_2^2 \leq 1\} \subseteq S_{A^*}$, then we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\Delta}} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{A^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(x_i^\top \theta^* - \hat{w}^\top (\hat{B}^\top x_i)_+ - \mathbb{1}[x_i^\top \hat{B} > 0] \hat{\Delta}^\top x \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \min_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{A^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(x_i^\top \theta^* - \alpha^\top \eta(x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j^\top \zeta^{(j)}(x) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \min_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d} \max_{\theta^* \in T} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(x_i^\top \theta^* - \alpha^\top \eta(x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j^\top \zeta^{(j)}(x) \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that the expression has no direct dependence on A^* .

The rest of the argument follows makes use of Fano's minimax bound, applied similarly as in the linear setting. First, note that for any $\theta \in T$, there exists $d + 1$ signed measures on S with common support size $2k$, which we denote with α^θ and $\beta_1^\theta, \dots, \beta_d^\theta$, such that $x^\top \theta = (\alpha^\theta)^\top \eta(x) + \sum_j (\beta_j^\theta)^\top \zeta^{(j)}(x)$. Using this construction, we can lift the local packing set from the linear setting into this setting, where the associated seminorm (defined over

vector measures) is given by

$$\|(\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)\|^2 = \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(\alpha^\top \eta(x) + \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j^\top \zeta^{(j)}(x) \right)^2.$$

More formally, let B be the unit ball under the Σ -norm, which we observe satisfies $(1/\sqrt{2})B \subseteq T$. Recall that there exists a $(1/2)$ -packing of the unit Σ -ball in the Σ -norm with at least 2^d elements, via a standard volumetric argument - let this set be P . Equivalently, there exists a $(2\delta/\sqrt{0.9})$ -packing of $(4\delta/\sqrt{0.9})B$ with at least 2^d elements, which we denote as P . Note that for any $\theta, \theta' \in P$,

$$\left\| (\alpha^\theta, \beta_1^\theta, \dots, \beta_d^\theta) - (\alpha^{\theta'}, \beta_1^{\theta'}, \dots, \beta_d^{\theta'}) \right\|^2 = \frac{1}{n_T} \|X(\theta - \theta')\|_2^2 \geq 0.9 \|\theta - \theta'\|_\Sigma^2 > 4\delta^2,$$

which implies that the vector measures corresponding to the elements of P are 2δ -separated in the associated seminorm. Furthermore, for any $\theta, \theta' \in P$,

$$\text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(X\theta, \sigma^2 I_{n_T}) \| \mathcal{N}(X\theta', \sigma^2 I_{n_T})) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|X(\theta - \theta')\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{n_T}{2\sigma^2} \|\theta - \theta'\|_\Sigma^2 \leq \frac{32n_T}{0.9\sigma^2} \delta^2.$$

Therefore, for any $\delta^2 \leq 1/32$, which ensures that $P \subseteq 4\delta B \subseteq (1/\sqrt{2})B \subseteq T$, Fano's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d} \max_{\theta^* \in T} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\alpha^{\theta^*}, \beta_1^{\theta^*}, \dots, \beta_d^{\theta^*}) - (\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \right\|^2 \right] &\geq \delta^2 \left(1 - \frac{32n_T}{0.9\sigma^2 \log 2} \delta^2 - \frac{1}{d} \right) \\ &\geq \delta^2 \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{32n_T}{0.9\sigma^2 d \log 2} \delta^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as $n_T \geq \left(\frac{0.9 \log 2}{2}\right) \sigma^2 d$, we can set $\delta^2 = \left(\frac{0.9 \log 2}{64}\right) \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T}$, which implies that

$$\min_{\hat{w}, \hat{\Delta}} \max_{\theta^* \in S_{A^*}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^{n_T} \left(x_i^\top \theta^* - \hat{w}^\top (\bar{B}^\top x_i) - \mathbb{1}[x_i^\top \bar{B} > 0] \hat{\Delta}^\top x \right)^2 \right] \gtrsim \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n_T}. \quad \square$$

E.2 Adaptation Upper Bound

Having proven the minimax result for FROZENREP, we now proceed to prove a corresponding upper bound on the performance of ADAPTREP. To do so, we need to prove a result analogous to Lemma A.4 for the ReLU setting.

Before we proceed to the proof, we need to find proper generalizations for relevant objects in the proof of Lemma A.4. In particular, we recall the prominent use of the projector $P_{\Sigma B_0}$, which, loosely speaking, can be thought of as representing the ‘‘average’’ component of the signal that can be represented by a parameter in $\text{Col } B_0$.

Recall that the inputs (which are element of \mathbb{R}^d) are sampled from a distribution p . This input distribution induces the $L_2(p)$ -norm⁹ on vector-valued functions of \mathbb{R}^d and its associated inner product via

$$\|\zeta\|_{L_2} = \mathbb{E} [\|\zeta(x)\|_2^2] \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \zeta, \xi \rangle_{L_2} = \mathbb{E} [\zeta(x)^\top \xi(x)].$$

Now, let $\zeta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\xi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ be two representation functions on \mathbb{R}^d . Then, we can define the *linear projector onto ζ* as the linear operator P_ζ taking representations $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ onto itself via

$$[P_\zeta \xi](x) := \mathbb{E} [\xi(x) \zeta(x)^\top] \mathbb{E} [\zeta(x) \zeta(x)^\top]^\dagger \zeta(x).$$

We denote the corresponding orthogonal projection as $P_\zeta^\perp \xi := \xi - P_\zeta \xi$. We note that these operators satisfy the orthogonality property

$$\mathbb{E} [[P_\zeta \xi](x)^\top [P_\zeta^\perp \xi](x)] = 0,$$

which can be easily verified algebraically.

To understand the operator P_ζ , consider the problem of approximating a linear function of ξ via a linear function of ζ , as measured via the input distribution p . More formally, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^q$, we want to find

$$w^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\xi(\cdot)^\top v - \zeta(\cdot)^\top w\|_{L_2}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad f^* = \zeta(\cdot)^\top w^*.$$

As the problem is differentiable and convex in w , we can simply use standard optimality conditions to find that

$$w^* = \mathbb{E} [\zeta(x) \zeta(x)^\top]^\dagger \mathbb{E} [\zeta(x) \xi(x)^\top] v \quad \text{and} \quad f^* = \zeta(\cdot)^\top w^*.$$

That is, $P_\zeta \xi$ is performing exactly the transformation required on ζ such that $[P_\zeta \xi(\cdot)]^\top v$ is the best approximation to $\xi(\cdot)^\top v$ via linear functions of ζ in L_2 -norm. To further connect this construction to the linear setting, observe that if $\zeta(x) = B_0^\top x$ and $\xi(x) = x$, then for any $\theta, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\langle \xi(\cdot)^\top v, [P_\zeta^\perp \xi](\cdot)^\top \theta \rangle_{L_2} = v^\top \Sigma^{1/2} P_{\Sigma B_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} \theta,$$

and thus $P_\zeta \xi$ is indeed the desired generalization of the projection operators used in the proof of Lemma A.4. Having introduced the required mathematical tools, we now prove the corresponding transfer lemma for this setting.

Lemma E.3 (Transfer Lemma, ReLU). *Assume that $B_0 = [A_0, -A_0]$. Then, we have that*

$$\frac{1}{T} \left\| P_{\Sigma^{1/2} A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* W^* \right\|_F^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \min_{w, \Delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(x^\top \theta_t^* - \rho_{B_0}(x) [w, \Delta] \right)^2 \right].$$

⁹we write L_2 throughout as a shorthand for $L_2(p)$.

Proof. This proof follows the outline of Lemma A.4, with all inner products computed with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L_2}$. Throughout the proof, we will write P and P^\perp as shorthand for the operators $P_{\phi_{B_0}}$ and $P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp$, respectively. First, we decompose the task-averaged population risk as for any choices of $(w_t), (\Delta_t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \left\| (\cdot)^\top \theta_t^* - \rho_{B_0}(\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
& \gtrsim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \gtrsim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| P_{\Sigma^{1/2} A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* v_t^* \right\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left\| \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from noting that $\phi_{B^*}(x)^\top w_t^*$ is a linear function of x , and thus by Lemma E.1, the best linear predictor on ϕ is a linear function of x . Since the L_2 -norm on linear functions of x is equivalent to the Σ -norm on the parameters, we obtain the inequality above¹⁰.

Now, we proceed to prove a bound on the inner product above. For any fixed $t \in [T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w, \Delta], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w, \Delta] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*], [P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \left\langle [P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \left\langle \phi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top w_t^* - [P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \left\langle [P^\perp \phi_{B^*}](\cdot)^\top w_t^*, [P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \left\langle [P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] - [P \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t], \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \right\rangle_{L_2} \right|,
\end{aligned}$$

where adding and subtracting $[P \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*]$ and $[P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*]$ in the first and second arguments of the inner product, respectively, results in the first inequality. The

¹⁰This is exactly the argument used in Lemma A.4.

second inequality then uses the orthogonality properties of P and P^\perp in the second term. Furthermore, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle \phi_{B^*}(x)^\top w_t^* - [P\rho_{B^*}](x)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*], \psi_{B^*}(x)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B^*}](x)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] \rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
&= \left| \langle [P^\perp \phi_{B^*}](x)^\top w_t^* - [P\psi_{B^*}](x)^\top \Delta_t^*, [P^\perp \psi_{B^*}](x)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P\phi_{B^*}](x)[w_t^*, \Delta_t^*] \rangle_{L_2} \right| \\
&= \left| \langle \phi_{B^*}(x)^\top w_t^*, \psi_{B^*}(x)^\top \Delta_t^* \rangle_{L_2} \right| = |w_t^* A^* \Sigma \delta_t^*| \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the algebraically-verifiable fact that $[P\rho_{B^*}](\cdot)[w, \Delta] = [P\phi_{B^*}](x)^\top + [P\psi_{B^*}](x)[\Delta]$, and that $[P^\perp \rho_{B^*}][w, \Delta]$ decomposes in a similar fashion. Finally, since $\phi_{B^*}(x)^\top w_t^*$ is linear, we can apply Lemma E.1, and thus

$$\| [P^\perp \phi_{B^*}](x)^\top w_t^* \|_{L_2} = \| P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* v_t^* \|_2.$$

From here, we note that we have an analogous quadratic inequality to that of Lemma A.4 in the terms

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \| P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* v_t^* \|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \| \psi_{B^*}(\cdot)^\top \Delta_t^* - [P^\perp \rho_{B_0}](\cdot)[w_t, \Delta_t] \|_{L_2}^2$$

upon applying Cauchy-Schwarz as before. Furthermore, note that via orthogonality, we have the Pythagorean identity

$$\| P\rho \|_{L_2}^2 + \| P^\perp \rho \|_{L_2}^2 \leq \| \rho \|_{L_2}^2,$$

and thus by following the exact same algebraic argument as in Lemma A.4 of using Proposition G.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \| P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* V^* \|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \| P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* v_t^* \|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} [(x^\top \theta_t^* - \rho_{B_0}(x)[w_t, \Delta_t])^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Since the result holds for any (w_t) and (Δ_t) , it holds for the minimizers. \square

Lemma 6.1 (Adaptation target performance, ReLU). *Let $B_0 = [A_0, -A_0]$, and fix a $\theta^* \in S_{A^*}$. Consider a learner which solves*

$$\min_B \min_{\substack{(w_t, \Delta_t) \\ \|\Delta_t\|_F \leq 1}} \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{t \in [T]} \| \rho_B(X)[w, \Delta] - y \|_2^2.$$

during source training, and

$$\min_{\substack{w, \Delta \\ \|\Delta\|_F \leq 1}} \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - y\|_2^2$$

during target training, where B_0 is the representation obtained from source training. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X\theta^*\|_2^2 &\lesssim \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^*\|_2^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_T} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{k \operatorname{tr} \Sigma} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, with $k = \Theta(1)$ and $\varepsilon = k/d$, and assuming access to infinite per-task samples and tasks during source training, the learner achieves target loss bounded as

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X\theta^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2}{n_T} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of target samples.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we instantiate the high-probability event in Lemma A.2, which guarantees that with probability at least $1 - \delta/9$,

$$0.9\Sigma \preceq \frac{1}{n_T} X^\top X \preceq 1.1\Sigma.$$

By forming the least-squares basic inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X(A^*v^* + \delta^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\frac{1}{n_T} \|P_{X A_0}^\perp X A^* v^*\|_2^2}_{=: \zeta} + \frac{1}{n_T} |\langle z, \rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - P_{X A_0} X A^* v^* - X \delta^* \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $P_{X A_0} X A^* v^*$ is in the span of $\phi_{B_0}(X)$, we can bound the right-hand side of the basic inequality by

$$\begin{aligned} &\zeta + \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, \underbrace{P_{\phi_{B_0}(X)} (\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - P_{X A_0} X A^* v^* - X \delta^*)}_{=: T_{\text{low-rank}}} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, P_{\phi_{B_0}(X)}^\perp (\psi_{B_0}(X)[\Delta] - X \delta^*) \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can lower bound the left-hand side by

$$\frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X(A^*v^* + \delta^*)\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{n_T} \|T_{\text{low-rank}}\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{n_T} \langle P_{X A_0}^\perp X A^* v^*, T_{\text{low-rank}} \rangle.$$

Note that $\phi_{B_0}(X)$ is a matrix with rank $\leq 2k$, and therefore, $P_{\phi_{B_0}}(X)z$ is a chi-squared random variable, with at most $2k$ degrees of freedom. Subsequently, by applying known bounds on chi-squared random variables, we have that with probability at least $1 - (4/9)\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \|T_{\text{low-rank}}\|_2^2 &\leq \zeta + \left(\sqrt{\zeta} + \frac{2\sigma k}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} \|T_{\text{low-rank}}\|_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) (\psi_{B_0}(X)[\Delta] - X\delta^*) \right\rangle \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which thus implies via Proposition G.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X(A^*v^* + \delta^*)\|_2^2 \\ \lesssim \zeta + \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_T} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) (\psi_{B_0}(X)[\Delta] - X\delta^*) \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the final term, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) (\psi_{B_0}(X)[\Delta] - X\delta^*) \right\rangle \right| \\ \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} \psi_{B_0}(X)^\top P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) z \right\|_2 + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_T}} X^\top P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) z \right\|_2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

by applying the norm bounds on Δ and δ^* , and thus by applying the Hanson-Wright inequality, with probability at least $1 - (4/9)\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \left| \left\langle z, P_{\phi_{B_0}}^\perp(X) (\psi_{B_0}(X)[\Delta] - X\delta^*) \right\rangle \right| \\ \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_T} \text{tr} \psi_{B_0}(X)^\top \psi_{B_0}(X)} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_T} \text{tr} X^\top X} \right] \sqrt{1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \\ \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{k \text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\|v^*\|_2 \leq 1$, we have an overall bound of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_T} \|\rho_{B_0}(X)[w, \Delta] - X\theta^*\|_2^2 &\lesssim \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^*\|_2^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 k}{n_T} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_T}} \sqrt{k \text{tr} \Sigma \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the second part of the statement, note that with infinite source tasks and samples, global optimality with respect to the source loss together with Lemma E.3 implies that

$$\frac{1}{T} \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^* V^*\|_F^2 = 0 \implies \|P_{\Sigma^{1/2}A_0}^\perp \Sigma^{1/2} A^*\|_2 = 0,$$

since $(k/T) [V^{*\top} V^*] = I_k$. Furthermore, with the choice of d and ε , $\text{tr } \Sigma = \Theta(1)$. Therefore, we obtain the second claim. \square

F A Performance Bound for Projected Gradient Descent

In this section, we provide a performance bound for projected gradient descent on the objective

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \ell(g_\theta(x_i), y_i)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, where $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$. We assume that Θ is norm-bounded by D , and that Θ is convex and contains 0. Furthermore, we assume that g_θ is twice-differentiable as a function of θ .

Key to the performance bound that we will demonstrate is that g_θ is “approximately linear” in the parameter θ , which we formally define below. Under this assumption, we demonstrate \mathcal{L} is approximately convex over Θ if \mathcal{L} is Lipschitz as a function of the vector of predictions and ℓ is convex in the first argument. Therefore, with slight modifications to the online analysis of projected gradient descent, we obtain the desired performance bound.

Following the discussion above, we make the following assumptions:

Assumption F.1 (Approximate linearity). *There exists β and L such that*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \leq \beta^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_\theta g_\theta(x_i)\|_2^2 \leq L^2.$$

Assumption F.2 (Assumptions on ℓ). *We assume that ℓ is convex in the first argument. Furthermore, if \mathcal{L} is viewed as a function of the vector of predictions $g_\theta(X)$, then we have that*

$$\|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_\theta(X))\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{n}$$

for any $\theta \in \Theta$, i.e. \mathcal{L} is (α/\sqrt{n}) -Lipschitz as a function of the vector of predictions.

Note that we abuse notation in Assumption F.2, using \mathcal{L} to reference both the function of the parameter, and of the vector of predictions. Given these two assumptions, we now proceed to demonstrate that the loss landscape of \mathcal{L} has several desirable properties.

Lemma F.1 (Approximate convexity in Θ). *Let $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$. Then,*

$$\langle \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta_1), \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rangle \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta_2) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) + 4\alpha\beta D^2.$$

Proof. Note that \mathcal{L} is a convex function of the vector of predictions $g_\theta(X)$, as it is a sum of convex functions by Assumption F.2. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_2) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) \geq \langle \nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta_1}(X)), g_{\theta_2}(X) - g_{\theta_1}(X) \rangle.$$

Furthermore, by the chain rule,

$$\langle \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta_1), \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rangle = \langle \nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta_1}(X)), [\nabla_\theta g_{\theta_1}(X)](\theta_2 - \theta_1) \rangle.$$

Putting the two statements together and applying Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}(\theta_2) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) - \langle \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_1), \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rangle \\
& \geq \langle \nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta_1}(X)), g_{\theta_2}(X) - g_{\theta_1}(X) - [\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta_1}(X)](\theta_2 - \theta_1) \rangle \\
& \geq - \|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta_1}(X))\|_2 \|g_{\theta_2}(X) - g_{\theta_1}(X) - [\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta_1}(X)](\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|_2 \\
& \geq - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} \|g_{\theta_2}(X) - g_{\theta_1}(X) - [\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta_1}(X)](\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by Taylor's theorem, there exists $\bar{\theta} = \lambda\theta_1 + (1 - \lambda)\theta_2$ such that

$$g_{\theta_2}(X) - g_{\theta_1}(X) - \nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta_1}(X)(\theta_2 - \theta_1) = [(\theta_2 - \theta_1)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}^2 g_{\bar{\theta}}(x_i)(\theta_2 - \theta_1)]_{i \in [n]}.$$

Consequently, by rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_1), \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rangle & \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta_2) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) + \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} [(\theta_2 - \theta_1)^{\top} \nabla_{\theta}^2 g_{\bar{\theta}}(x_i)(\theta_2 - \theta_1)]^2} \\
& \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta_2) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) + 4\alpha\beta D^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma F.2 (Gradient bound in Θ). *For any $\theta \in \Theta$, we have that*

$$\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha^2(L^2 + \beta^2 D^2)$$

Proof. Using the Lipschitz assumption in Assumption F.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)\|_2^2 & = \|[\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta}(X)]^{\top} \nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta}(X))\|_2^2 \leq \|\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta}(X)\|_F^2 \|\nabla_g \mathcal{L}(g_{\theta}(X))\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta}(x_i)\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by integrating, we have that for any fixed $i \in [n]$,

$$\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta}(x_i) = \nabla_{\theta} g_0(x_i) + \left[\int_0^1 \nabla_{\theta}^2 g_{\alpha\theta}(x_i) \, d\alpha \right] \theta.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)\|_2^2 & \lesssim \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_{\theta} g_0(x_i)\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla_{\theta}^2 g_{\alpha\theta}(x_i) \, d\alpha \right\|_2^2 \|\theta\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_{\theta} g_{\theta_0}(x_i)\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 D^2}{n} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \|\nabla_{\theta}^2 g_{\alpha\theta}(x_i)\|_2^2 \, d\alpha \\
& \leq \alpha^2(L^2 + \beta^2 D^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Having proven the results above, we now proceed to the main claim of this section.

Theorem F.1 (Bound on PGD performance). *Assume we run projected gradient descent on \mathcal{L} with constraint set Θ for T_{PGD} iterations with step size η given by*

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_{\text{PGD}}}} \left(\frac{D}{\alpha \sqrt{L^2 + \beta^2 D^2}} \right).$$

Let $(\theta_t)_{t \in [T_{\text{PGD}}]}$ denote the sequence of PGD iterates obtained, where $\theta_0 = 0$. Then, for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\min_t \mathcal{L}(\theta_t) - \mathcal{L}(\theta) \lesssim \alpha \beta D^2 + \alpha D \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 D^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}.$$

Proof. For any $t \in [T_{\text{PGD}}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{t+1}^2 &= \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\theta_t - \eta \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_t) - \theta\|_2^2 \\ &= r_t^2 + 2\eta \langle \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_t), \theta - \theta_t \rangle + \eta^2 \|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq r_t^2 + 2\eta [\mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta_t) + 4\alpha\beta D^2] + \eta^2 \alpha^2 [L^2 + \beta^2 D^2], \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the nonexpansive property of projections onto convex sets. Furthermore, the last inequality makes use of the approximate convexity property from Lemma F.1 and the gradient bound over Θ from Lemma F.2. Therefore, via telescoping,

$$r_{T_{\text{PGD}}}^2 \leq r_0^2 + 2\eta \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T_{\text{PGD}}-1} \mathcal{L}(\theta) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_t) \right] + 8\eta T_{\text{PGD}} \alpha \beta D^2 + \eta^2 T_{\text{PGD}} \alpha^2 [L^2 + \beta^2 D^2],$$

or by rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r_0^2 - r_{T_{\text{PGD}}}^2}{2\eta T_{\text{PGD}}} + 4\alpha\beta D^2 + \frac{\eta\alpha^2}{2} [L^2 + \beta^2 D^2] &\geq \frac{1}{T_{\text{PGD}}} \sum_{t=0}^{T_{\text{PGD}}-1} \mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta_t) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta) \\ &\geq \min_{t=0, \dots, T_{\text{PGD}}-1} \mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta_t) - \mathcal{L}(\theta_0 + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the choice of step size, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r_0^2 - r_{T_{\text{PGD}}}^2}{2\eta T_{\text{PGD}}} + \frac{\eta}{2} [\alpha^2 L^2 + \beta^2 D^2] &\leq \frac{D^2}{2\eta T_{\text{PGD}}} + \frac{\eta\alpha^2}{2} [L^2 + \beta^2 D^2] \\ &= \alpha D \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + \beta^2 D^2}{T_{\text{PGD}}}}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the desired claim easily follows. \square

G Technical Lemmas

Proposition G.1 (Du et al. (2020), Lemma A.5). *Let $\mathcal{O}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ be the set of matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ with orthonormal columns, $d_1 \geq d_2$. Then, there exists an ε -covering of $\mathcal{O}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ with at most $(6\sqrt{d_2}/\varepsilon)^{d_1 d_2}$ elements.*

Proposition G.2 (Solving quadratic inequalities). *Assume that $ax^2 \leq bx + c$ for $a, b, c > 0$. Then, $bx + c \lesssim (b^2/a) + c$.*

Proof. Since $a > 0$, the solution set to the inequality is given by the interval $[r_1, r_2]$, where r_1 and r_2 are the roots of $ax^2 - bx - c$. By the quadratic formula, the larger root r_2 is given by

$$r_2 = \frac{b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4ac}}{2a} \leq \frac{b}{a} + \sqrt{\frac{c}{a}}.$$

Therefore,

$$x \leq r_2 \leq \frac{b}{a} + \sqrt{\frac{c}{a}} \implies bx + c \leq \frac{b^2}{a} + \left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{a}}\right) \sqrt{c} + c \lesssim \frac{b^2}{a} + c,$$

where the last inequality makes use of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

Corollary G.1. *Let X and Y be random variables.*

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[(X + Y)^2] + \mathbb{E}[Y^2]$$

Proof. We have that

$$\mathbb{E}[(X + Y)^2] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[XY] + \mathbb{E}[Y^2] \geq \mathbb{E}[X^2] - 2\mathbb{E}[|XY|].$$

Therefore, by applying Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X + Y)^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[|XY|] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X + Y)^2] + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X^2]\mathbb{E}[Y^2]}.$$

Finally, by applying Proposition G.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[(X + Y)^2] + \mathbb{E}[Y^2]. \quad \square$$

Proposition G.3. *Let A, B be matrices with compatible dimensions, and assume that $\text{rank } A = r > 0$. Then,*

$$\|P_A B\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_r(A)} \|A^\top B\|_F.$$

Proof. Let (U, Σ, V^\top) be the compact singular value decomposition of A , i.e. we only retain positive singular values in Σ . By rotational invariance,

$$\|A^\top B\|_F^2 = \|V \Sigma U^\top B\|_F^2 = \|\Sigma U^\top B\|_F^2.$$

Furthermore, by definition,

$$\|\Sigma U^\top B\|_F^2 = \sum_i \|\Sigma U^\top B e_i\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_r^2(\Sigma) \sum_i \|U^\top B e_i\|_2^2 = \sigma_r^2(A) \|U^\top B\|_F^2.$$

Finally, by applying rotational invariance once more,

$$\|A^\top B\|_F^2 \geq \sigma_r^2(A) \|UU^\top B\|_F^2 = \sigma_r^2(A) \|P_A B\|_F^2,$$

from which the desired claim follows. \square

Proposition G.4. *Let $\lambda, \gamma > 0$, and fix a vector y . Then,*

$$\min_{\substack{A, x \\ Ax=y}} \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x\|_2^2 = \sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \|y\|_2.$$

Proof. We proceed by cases. If $y = 0$, then the result is trivial.

Otherwise, if $y \neq 0$, note that $x^* \neq 0$. Now, for any fixed $x \neq 0$, the minimizing choice for A is zx^\top for some z . To see this, observe that if A is not rank-1, then we can achieve a lower Frobenius norm by reducing its rank. Consequently, for a given x , the minimizing choice for A is $yx^\top / \|x\|_2^2$ necessarily. Therefore,

$$\min_{\substack{A, x \\ Ax=y}} \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x\|_2^2 = \min_x \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\frac{\|y\|_2^2}{\|x\|_2^2} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x\|_2^2 = \min_{z>0} \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\frac{\|y\|_2^2}{z} \right) + \frac{\gamma z}{2}.$$

This final optimization problem is convex in z – using first-order optimality conditions, we can thus easily see that $z^* = \sqrt{\lambda/\gamma} \|y\|_2$, and therefore

$$\min_{\substack{A, x \\ Ax=y}} \frac{\lambda}{2} \|A\|_F^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|x\|_2^2 = \sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \|y\|_2. \quad \square$$

Proposition G.5 (Expectation bound on empirical spectral norm). *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be a matrix with rows drawn i.i.d. from a zero-mean distribution with covariance Σ . Furthermore, assume that the whitened distribution is ρ^2 -sub-Gaussian. Then, whenever $n \gtrsim \rho^4 d$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{X^\top X}{n} \right) \right] \lesssim \|\Sigma\|_2.$$

Proof. By Weyl's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{X^\top X}{n} \right) \right] \leq \|\Sigma\|_2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{X^\top X}{n} \right) - \Sigma \right| \right] \leq \|\Sigma\|_2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{X^\top X}{n} - \Sigma \right\|_2 \right].$$

Thus, by applying the result in Vershynin (2017, Theorem 4.4.1), we have that as long as $n_S \gtrsim \rho^4 d$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{X^\top X}{n} \right) \right] \lesssim \|\Sigma\|_2. \quad \square$$

Proposition G.6 (Gaussian complexity chain rule, Tripuraneni et al. (2020b), Theorem 7). Assume that \mathcal{F} is a class of functions $\mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that every $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is L -Lipschitz in the L_2 -norm. Furthermore, assume that Φ is a class of functions $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that for any $\phi \in \Phi$, $\phi(x)$ is norm-bounded by D for any x in the support of the input distribution. Then, we have the bound

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{G}_n(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes T} \circ \Phi) \leq \frac{8D}{(nT)^2} + 128 \left(\frac{L}{T} \mathcal{G}_n(\Phi) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F}) \right] \right) \log(nT),$$

where \mathcal{Z} is the random set $\{(\phi(x_{i_1}), \dots, \phi(x_{i_n})) \mid i_1, \dots, i_n \in [nT]\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_Z(\mathcal{F})$ is the empirical Gaussian complexity on samples Z . Note that the inner expectation is over the nT input samples, and that we have assumed that all input samples come from a single distribution.

Proposition G.7 (Tripuraneni et al. (2020b), Lemma 6). Let $h, h^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be representation functions, and define

$$\Lambda(h, h^*) := \mathbb{E} [h^*(x)h^*(x)^\top] - \mathbb{E} [h^*(x)h(x)^\top] (\mathbb{E} [h(x)h(x)^\top])^\dagger \mathbb{E} [h(x)h^*(x)^\top].$$

Then, $\inf_v \mathbb{E} [(h(x)^\top v - h^*(x)^\top v^*)^2] = (v^*)^\top \Lambda(h, h^*) v^*$. Furthermore, if

$$\sigma_{\min}(\mathbb{E} [h(x)h(x)^\top]) \geq c_1 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\max}(\mathbb{E} [h^*(x)h^*(x)^\top]) \leq c_2,$$

then this infimum is achieved within the ball of radius $\|v^*\|_2 \sqrt{c_2/c_1}$.

Proof. The calculation of the infimum is provided in Tripuraneni et al. (2020b), and is thus omitted. However, we prove the sharper radius bound below.

Define $F_{h,h^*} := \mathbb{E} [h(x)h^*(x)^\top]$, so that $\Lambda(h, h^*) = F_{h^*,h^*} - F_{h^*,h} F_{h,h}^\dagger F_{h,h^*}$. Then, since $\Lambda(h, h^*) \succeq 0$, and recalling that the infimum is achieved at $v = F_{h,h}^\dagger F_{h,h^*} v^*$,

$$\left\| F_{h,h}^\dagger F_{h,h^*} v^* \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \left\| F_{h,h}^{1/2} F_{h,h}^\dagger F_{h,h^*} v^* \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \left\| F_{h^*,h^*}^{1/2} v^* \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{c_1}{c_2} \|v^*\|_2^2,$$

as desired. □