

---

# Linear Regularizers Enforce the Strict Saddle Property

---

Matthew Ubl<sup>1</sup> Kasra Yazdani<sup>1</sup> Matthew T. Hale<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Satisfaction of the strict saddle property has become a standard assumption in non-convex optimization, and it ensures that gradient descent will almost always escape saddle points. However, functions exist in machine learning that do not satisfy this property, such as the loss function of a neural network with at least two hidden layers. Gradient descent may converge to non-strict saddle points of such functions, and there do not currently exist any first-order methods that reliably escape non-strict saddle points. To address this need, we demonstrate that regularizing a function with a linear term enforces the strict saddle property, and we provide justification for only regularizing locally, i.e., when the norm of the gradient falls below a certain threshold. We analyze bifurcations that may result from this form of regularization, and then we provide a selection rule for regularizers that depends only on the gradient of an objective function. This rule is shown to guarantee that gradient descent will escape the neighborhoods around a broad class of non-strict saddle points. This behavior is demonstrated on common examples of non-strict saddle points, and numerical results are provided from the training of a neural network.

## 1. Introduction

Interest in non-convex optimization has grown in recent years, driven by applications such as training deep neural networks. Often, one seeks convergence to a local minimizer in such problems because finding global minima is known to be NP complete (Murty & Kabadi, 1987). To ensure convergence to minimizers, one research direction in non-convex optimization has been the identification of problem properties for which particular algorithms escape saddle points. One such property, which has become common in

the non-convex optimization literature since its introduction in (Ge et al., 2015), is the *strict saddle property* (SSP), which states that the Hessian of every saddle point of a function has at least one negative eigenvalue. It was later shown that gradient descent and other first order methods almost always escape saddle points of objective functions that satisfy the SSP (and other mild assumptions) (Lee et al., 2016; Panageas & Piliouras, 2017; Lee et al., 2017).

Because of this behavior, a growing body of non-convex optimization research has either focused on problems for which the SSP is known to hold, or simply assumed the SSP holds for a generic problem and derived convergence guarantees that result from it. However, verification of the SSP for a general, unstructured problem is difficult in practice, and there exist problems in machine learning for which the SSP does not hold, such as training a neural network with at least two hidden layers (Kawaguchi, 2016).

Motivated by these challenges, we develop an algorithmic method that will escape saddle points that are not strict. We still wish to leverage the current body of knowledge on problems with the SSP, rather than developing entirely new convergence analyses, and thus our approach is to *enforce* the SSP by regularizing problems when in the vicinity of a non-strict saddle point, rather than simply assuming that the SSP holds. We show that this can be done with a linear regularizer, motivated by John Milnor’s proof that almost all choices of such a term will render a function Morse (and therefore guarantee that the regularized problem has the SSP) (1965). We are also motivated by the success of regularization techniques in convex optimization, where quadratic perturbations are used to provide strong convexity to objective functions (Facchinei & Pang, 2007), and we believe that the linear regularizers we present are their natural counterparts in the non-convex setting.

### 1.1. Related Work

A large body of work exists on the convergence properties of gradient descent and other first-order methods on problems with the SSP, including algorithms that consider deterministic gradient descent (Dixit & Bajwa, 2020; Schaeffer & McCalla, 2019), and those that incorporate noise into their updates (Xu et al., 2017; Daneshmand et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2017; Ge et al., 2015). These methods are shown to

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA. Correspondence to: Matthew Ubl <m.ubl@ufl.edu>.

escape strict saddles, but have not been shown to escape non-strict saddles, and therefore rely on the SSP.

While these methods are shown to escape strict saddles in the limit, they can get stuck near strict saddles for exponential time, which can cause numerical slowdowns (Du et al., 2017). Some attempts have been made to accelerate the escape near strict saddle points (Jin et al., 2017; Agarwal et al., 2017; Jin et al., 2018). However, when starting near non-strict saddles, first-order methods may actually converge to them, and such accelerated methods do not escape.

Current research into escaping non-strict saddle points requires higher-order information and/or algorithms. Perhaps the best known is (Anandkumar & Ge, 2016), which guarantees convergence to a third-order optimal critical point. That paper replaces the SSP, which is a property of the Hessian, with a condition on the third-order derivative of the problem. Work in (Zhu et al., 2020) expands on these results and includes numerical simulations on a function that does not satisfy the SSP. Subsequent work in (Chen & Toint, 2021) provides a method to converge to  $p^{\text{th}}$ -order critical points using  $p^{\text{th}}$ -order information, while also demonstrating that doing so for  $p \geq 4$  is NP-hard. Recent work in (Truong, 2021) examines the behavior of a second-order method on common toy examples of non-strict saddle points, and (Nguyen & Hein, 2017) develop a weaker form of the SSP that guarantees escape from saddle points for the training of a particular neural network. In contrast, in this paper we require only first-order information and provably escape from non-strict saddles using linear regularizers under weak assumptions.

Previous research has shown that regularizing with quadratic or sums of squares (SOS) terms will make a function Morse, which is sufficient to ensure the SSP is satisfied (Lerario, 2011; Nicolaescu, 2011). However, no convergence or bifurcation analysis was performed on the regularized function, and indeed these results originate outside the non-convex optimization literature. We show in Example 2.6 that quadratic and SOS regularizers can actually convert a non-strict saddle point into a local minimum, and thus we do not use them.

## 1.2. Contributions

The contributions of this paper are the following:

- A local linear regularization method using only first-order information (i.e.,  $\nabla f(x)$ ) that enforces satisfaction of the SSP around critical points
- A proof that this regularization method escapes non-strict saddle points that satisfy a condition much weaker than the SSP, and examples of non-strict saddle points that satisfy this weaker condition
- Conditions under which linearly regularized gradient

descent is guaranteed to converge to a local minimum

- Bounds on the regularization error seen at minima that is induced by linear regularizers

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove that almost all linear regularizers enforce the SSP, and we demonstrate the need to define this regularizer locally rather than globally. In Section 3, we analyze the bifurcations that may occur when regularizing and justify a particular choice of regularizer that avoids problematic bifurcations. In Section 4, we describe the condition weaker than the SSP for which this regularization method escapes saddle points and demonstrate this escape on examples of non-strict saddle points taken from the literature. Then, in Section 5 we give conditions under which we converge to local minima. In Section 6, we present numerical results on a neural network with four hidden layers, and in Section 7 we provide concluding remarks.

## 2. Local Linear Regularization

Throughout this paper,  $f$  denotes a function in  $C^2$ , the space of twice-continuously differentiable functions, with  $L$ -Lipschitz gradient  $\nabla f$ . The symbol  $g$  denotes the gradient descent map  $g(x) = x - \gamma \nabla f(x)$ , with  $\gamma \in (0, 1/L)$ . The following definition regards the *critical points* of  $f$ :

- Definition 2.1.**
1. A point  $x^*$  is a *critical point* of  $f$  if  $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$  or, equivalently,  $g(x^*) = x^*$ .
  2. A critical point  $x^*$  is *isolated* if there is a neighborhood  $U$  around  $x^*$  and  $x^*$  is the only critical point in  $U$ . Otherwise it is called *non-isolated*.
  3. A critical point of  $f$  is a *local minimum* if there is a neighborhood  $U$  around  $x^*$  such that  $f(x^*) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in U$ , and a *local maximum* if  $f(x^*) \geq f(x)$ .
  4. A critical point of  $f$  is a *saddle point* if for all neighborhoods  $U$  around  $x^*$ , there are  $y, z \in U$  such that  $f(y) \leq f(x^*) \leq f(z)$ .
  5. A critical point of  $f$  is a *strict saddle* if  $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x^*)) < 0$ .
  6. The *local stable set*  $W^s(x^*)$  defined on some neighborhood  $U$  of a critical point  $x^*$  is the set of initial conditions of gradient descent in  $U$  that converge to  $x^*$ , i.e.,  $W^s(x^*) = \{x \in U : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g^k(x) = x^*\}$ . The *local unstable set* is given by  $W^u(x^*) = \{x \in U : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g^k(x) \neq x^*\}$ . If  $U = \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $W^s(x^*)$  ( $W^u(x^*)$ ) is the *global stable (unstable) set*.

Here  $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$  denotes the minimum eigenvalue of a square matrix. Lemma 2.2 states that, for almost all initial conditions, gradient descent does not converge to a strict saddle:

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^2$  function with  $L$ -Lipschitz gradient. The set of initial conditions  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $g^k(x)$  converges to a strict saddle point of  $f$  is of (Lebesgue) measure zero.

*Proof:* See Theorem 2 in (Panageas & Piliouras, 2017).  $\square$

The underlying principle is that, for a saddle  $x^*$ , a single negative eigenvalue of  $\nabla^2 f(x^*)$  renders  $W^s(x^*)$  measure zero. This is the motivating principle behind the study of the strict saddle property:

**Definition 2.3.** A function  $f$  satisfies the *strict saddle property (SSP)* if every saddle point of  $f$  is strict.

From Lemma 2.2, gradient descent will almost always avoid every strict saddle point of an objective function  $f$ . Therefore, if  $f$  satisfies the SSP, then gradient descent will almost always avoid *all* saddle points of  $f$ . Provided gradient descent converges (i.e.,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g^k(x)$  exists), it must then almost always converge to a local minimum. We note that  $g^k(x)$  is guaranteed to converge in a variety of settings, including when  $f$  is analytic or coercive, and we will proceed with the assumption that  $f$  satisfies one of these properties. However, verifying that a general, unstructured function satisfies the SSP is difficult in practice, and functions of interest exist that are known not to satisfy the SSP, such as the loss function of a neural network with at least two hidden layers (Kawaguchi, 2016). These functions may have *non-strict saddles*:

**Definition 2.4.** A saddle point  $x^*$  of  $f$  is a *non-strict saddle* if  $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x^*)) = 0$ .

We make a brief point on terminology here. The definition of a degenerate saddle varies between the dynamical systems and computer science literature, so to avoid confusion in this paper a *degenerate saddle* is any saddle point  $x^*$  whose Hessian has at least one zero eigenvalue (i.e.,  $\nabla^2 f(x^*)$  is singular), while a *non-strict saddle* is a saddle whose minimum eigenvalue is zero. Using this terminology, any non-strict saddle is necessarily degenerate. We note that the SSP is *not* a non-degeneracy condition, as strict saddles may be degenerate, as long as they have at least one negative eigenvalue. Example 2.5 illustrates the key problem with non-strict saddle points, which is that their stable sets are not necessarily measure zero.

**Example 2.5.** (Non-Measure Zero  $W^s$  for non-Strict Saddle)

Consider the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + \frac{1}{2}y^2$ , with negative gradient field plotted in Figure 1. Here,  $(0, 0)$  is a non-strict saddle of  $f$ , with  $\nabla^2 f(0, 0)$  having 1 and 0 as eigenvalues. Here, we see  $W^s(0, 0) = \{(x, y) : x > 0\}$ , depicted by the red region. That is, the set of initial conditions for which  $g^k(x)$  converges to  $(0, 0)$  is not measure zero and is in fact a closed halfspace of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .




Figure 1. The negative gradient field of  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + \frac{1}{2}y^2$ . The blue dot at  $(0, 0)$  denotes the non-strict saddle point,  $W^u(0, 0)$  is denoted by the green region, and  $W^s(0, 0)$  by red.

Instead of modifying our gradient descent algorithm to somehow accommodate non-strict saddles, we instead wish to modify the *problem* itself in such a way that the modified function satisfies the SSP, either by making non-strict saddles strict or eliminating them altogether. That is, we wish to find a regularization scheme that enforces satisfaction of the SSP and thus ensures the escape of non-strict saddles. While quadratic and sum of squares regularization terms are popular in convex optimization, they are not advisable in this context as they change the positive semi-definite Hessian of a non-strict saddle into a positive definite one, turning such a saddle into a local minimum of the regularized function.

**Example 2.6.** Consider again the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + \frac{1}{2}y^2$ , which has a non-strict saddle at  $(0, 0)$  with eigenvalues 1 and 0. If a sum of squares regularization term  $\frac{1}{2}\alpha_x x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_y y^2$  is added to  $f$ , then  $(0, 0)$  remains a critical point of the regularized function, but the eigenvalues of the regularized Hessian become  $\alpha_x$  and  $1 + \alpha_y$ , rendering  $(0, 0)$  a local minimum for all  $\alpha_x, \alpha_y > 0$ .

Instead, the following lemma from (Milnor, 1965) provides motivation for using a linear regularization term.

**Lemma 2.7.** If  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^2$  function, then for almost all  $l \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the critical points of the function  $f_l(x) = f(x) + l^T x$  have only non-singular Hessians.

*Proof:* See Appendix A.1.  $\square$

This lemma states that for almost any choice of  $l$ , the regularized function  $f_l$  will have only non-degenerate critical points. This immediately gives us the following result:

**Theorem 2.8.** If  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^2$  function, then for almost all  $l \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the function  $f_l(x) = f(x) + l^T x$  satisfies the SSP.

*Proof:* This follows from Lemma 2.7 and the fact that non-

degenerate saddle points must be strict.  $\square$

This regularization method does not affect the Hessian (i.e.,  $\nabla^2 f(x) = \nabla^2 f_l(x)$ ), avoiding the problems caused by sums of squares and quadratic regularizers and resulting in simpler analysis. However, this regularization method enforces satisfaction of the SSP by creating bifurcations of degenerate critical points of  $f$ , and we must carefully analyze these bifurcations to ensure that we attain the desired convergence properties.

### 3. Bifurcations

Regularization of a function naturally perturbs non-degenerate critical points, which can be limited by a judicious choice of regularizer. However, more seriously, regularization can also cause a *local bifurcation* at a degenerate critical point:

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^2$  function. Let  $(x^*, \mu^*)$  be a point for which  $\nabla_x f(x^*, \mu^*) = 0$  and  $\nabla_x^2 f(x^*, \mu^*)$  is singular. A *local bifurcation* of this gradient system occurs at  $x^*$  when a smooth change in  $\mu$  away from  $\mu^*$  induces a sudden change in the stability properties of the equilibrium at  $x^*$ .

A “sudden change in stability properties” could mean  $W^s(x^*)$  grows or shrinks in dimension, the critical point at  $x^*$  splits into two or more critical points, or the critical point at  $x^*$  is eliminated. A local bifurcation induced by linear regularization is illustrated in Example 3.2:

**Example 3.2.** Consider again the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + \frac{1}{2}y^2$  and consider two regularizations that add terms of the form  $l_x x + l_y y$ . The first sets  $l_x = 1$  and  $l_y = 0$  and the second sets  $l_x = -1$  and  $l_y = 0$ , and we plot the trajectory behavior of gradient descent under these two regularizations in Figure 2.




Figure 2. When we choose  $l_x = -1$  we create a local minimum and a strict saddle, and the escape region actually shifts (left). When we choose  $l_x = 1$ , the critical point is destroyed and gradient descent escapes the saddle from every initial condition (right).

Observe that when  $l_x = -1$ , the original non-strict saddle point bifurcates into a strict saddle at  $(-1, 0)$  and a local

minimum at  $(1, 0)$ . Both of these points are non-degenerate, satisfying the SSP as ensured by Theorem 2.8. However, we can see that the stable set (now defined for both of the resulting critical points) has actually expanded. This is because the resulting bifurcation has created a *false minimum* at  $(1, 0)$ :

**Definition 3.3.** A *false minimum* is a local minimum of  $f_l$  that resulted from a bifurcation of a degenerate saddle point of  $f$  caused by the linear regularizer  $l^T x$ .

In Example 3.2, one can see that for any  $l_x < 0$ , a *saddle-node bifurcation* occurs, which splits a degenerate critical point into two non-degenerate critical points. We also observe that when  $l_x = 1$  (and in fact whenever  $l_x > 0$ ) the critical point at  $(0, 0)$  is destroyed and all trajectories of gradient descent escape the neighborhood of  $(0, 0)$ .

This example demonstrates that while almost all choices of  $l$  will enforce the SSP, only some enforce the trajectory behavior we want. Thus,  $l$  should be chosen deliberately, based on some information from the function being minimized, rather than arbitrarily. However, a choice of  $l$  that enforces desired behavior around one non-strict saddle point may not do so around another, as the following theorem states.

**Theorem 3.4.** There exist  $C^2$  objective functions such that every choice of regularizer  $l \neq 0$  induces a saddle-node bifurcation of a non-strict saddle point which creates a false minimum.

*Proof:* See Appendix A.2.  $\square$




Figure 3. Plots of the function  $(x - 1)^3(x + 1)^3 + lx$  for  $l = 0$ ,  $l > 0$ , and  $l < 0$ . Regardless of the sign of  $l$ , one of the original degenerate critical points is bifurcated into a false minimum and a local maximum, and the other eliminated for every regularizer  $l \neq 0$ .

Theorem 3.4 is illustrated in Figure 3, which shows a function for which any non-zero choice of regularizer  $l$  results in a saddle-node bifurcation of a non-strict saddle point. A natural consequence of Theorem 3.4 is that it is infeasible to use a constant, global linear regularizer. Instead, we should regularize “locally”, changing our choice of  $l$  when approaching different critical points. We take inspiration from (Jin et al., 2017) and define a “small gradient region”, outside of which  $l = 0$  and inside of which  $l$  will be chosen according to some selection rule:

**Definition 3.5.** Fix  $\theta > 0$  and let  $L_\theta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\nabla f(x)\|_2 \leq \theta\}$ . That is, the *small-gradient region*  $L_\theta$

is the subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for which the norm of the gradient of  $f$  is less than or equal to  $\theta$ .

As long as  $\theta$  is chosen small enough, a point in  $L_\theta$  must be near a critical point of  $f$ . Given our knowledge of  $\nabla f$ , we now wish to choose  $l$  such that, if the nearby critical point is a degenerate saddle, we then induce the desired bifurcation, which either eliminates the critical point or ensures the resulting critical points are strict saddles. The following theorem gives us motivation for one particular choice of  $l$ :

**Theorem 3.6.** *Consider the function  $f(x) + \mu l^T x$  with  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $l, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Assume that for  $\mu = 0$  there exists an equilibrium  $x^*$  such that:*

1.  $\nabla^2 f(x^*)$  has  $n - 1$  positive eigenvalues, and a simple eigenvalue 0 with eigenvector  $v$ .
2.  $v^T l \neq 0$ .
3.  $v^T \nabla^3 f(x^*)(v, v) \neq 0$ .

*Then there is a smooth curve of equilibria in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  passing through  $(x^*, 0)$  tangent to the hyperplane  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$  with no equilibrium on one side of the hyperplane for each value  $\mu$  and two equilibria on the other side of the non-degenerate for each  $\mu$ . The two equilibria are hyperbolic and have stable manifolds of dimensions  $n - 1$  and  $n$  respectively.*

*Proof:* This theorem simply restates Theorem 3.4.1 from (Guckenheimer & Holmes, 2013) using the specific notation of our problem.  $\square$

Theorem 3.6 considers a non-strict saddle point  $x^*$  of  $f$  whose Hessian has a single zero eigenvalue (1) and satisfies a mild third-order condition (3). It states that for almost any vector  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , if the choice  $l = r$  induces a saddle-node bifurcation at  $x^*$  that creates a false minimum, then the choice  $l = -r$  will instead eliminate the critical point  $x^*$ . We now combine Theorem 3.6 with a concept that appears trivial at first: for some point  $x_0$ , the choice  $l = -\nabla f(x_0)$  will create a critical point of  $f_l$  at  $x_0$ . Qualitatively, if the degenerate critical point  $x^*$  is the only critical point near  $x_0$ , then the resulting critical point at  $x_0$  must be the result of a bifurcation of  $x^*$ . If this is the case, then Theorem 3.6 implies that instead choosing  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  will eliminate the degenerate critical point.

Theorem 3.6 and the above discussion imply that the choice  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  for some point  $x_0$  near a particular degenerate critical point may be a good candidate for our regularization selection rule. This proposed rule is presented in Algorithm 1, where the update law is  $g(x)$  when the gradient is large. When this algorithm enters the small-gradient region  $L_\theta$  at some point  $x_0$ ,  $l$  is set to be  $\nabla f(x_0)$  and the update law is switched to  $g_l(x) = x - \gamma(\nabla f(x) + l)$  until the

---

**Algorithm 1** Locally Linearly Regularized Gradient Descent

---

**Input:** Step size  $\gamma > 0$ , Small gradient parameter  $\theta > 0$

**for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  **do**

**if**  $\|\nabla f(x_k)\| > \theta$  **then**

$x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k - \gamma \nabla f(x_k)$

**else if**  $\|\nabla f(x_k)\| \leq \theta$  &  $\|\nabla f(x_{k-1})\| > \theta$  **then**

$l \leftarrow \nabla f(x_k)$

$x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k - \gamma(\nabla f(x_k) + l)$

**else**

$x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k - \gamma(\nabla f(x_k) + l)$

**end if**

**end for**

---

algorithm leaves  $L_\theta$ . Note that because linear regularization does not affect the Hessian, and by extension the Lipschitz constant  $L$ ,  $\gamma$  can remain unchanged between  $g$  and  $g_l$ .

We note that, as stated, Theorem 3.6 only guarantees that Algorithm 1 will escape non-strict saddles that satisfy restrictive conditions. To extend to more general saddles, we must determine more general cases for which Algorithm 1 works. One key assumption in our derivation of this proposed algorithm is that  $x^*$  and  $x_0$  are sufficiently separated from other critical points. The definition of  $L_\theta$  and our choice of  $\theta$  provide the means to ensure this assumption is formally satisfied. First, for a point  $x \in L_\theta$ , we define its *local small-gradient neighborhood*:

**Definition 3.7.** For a particular  $x \in L_\theta$ , let  $\Theta(x)$  be the largest connected subset of  $L_\theta$  that contains  $x$ .

Thus,  $\Theta(x)$  is simply the portion of  $L_\theta$  that surrounds  $x$ . Consider a point  $x_0 \in L_\theta$ . If  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$ , then the update law  $x_{k+1} = g_l(x_k)$  will be used at each  $x_k \in \Theta(x_0)$ . Recall from Theorem 3.4 that a choice of  $l$  that destroys one degenerate critical point may induce a saddle-node bifurcation at another. Therefore, to help avoid a saddle node bifurcation within  $\Theta(x_0)$ , we want  $\Theta(x_0)$  to contain only one critical point or connected critical subspace. We formalize this idea with the following definition and assumption:

**Definition 3.8.** Let  $X^* = \{x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n : \nabla f(x^*) = 0\}$ . That is,  $X^*$  is the set of all isolated or non-isolated critical points of  $f$ . For a particular  $x^* \in X^*$ , let  $\Phi(x^*)$  be the largest connected subset of  $X^*$  such that  $x^* \in \Phi(x^*)$ . If  $x^*$  is an isolated critical point, then  $\Phi(x^*) = \{x^*\}$ . If  $x^*$  is non-isolated, then  $\Phi(x^*)$  is the connected critical subset that contains  $x^*$ .

**Assumption 3.9.**  $\theta$  is chosen such that for every  $x^* \in X^*$ ,  $\Theta(x^*) \cap X^* = \Phi(x^*)$ .

Note that, trivially,  $X^* \subset L_\theta$  for any  $\theta > 0$ . Assumption 3.9 simply states that  $\theta$  is chosen small enough that any critical point  $x^*$  is isolated in  $\Theta(x^*)$  from all other critical points it is not connected to. Let  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$  and  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$ .

Recall from Theorem 3.4 that this choice of  $l$  may induce saddle-node bifurcations at degenerate critical points of  $f$  other than  $x^*$  and create false minima at those other points. We want to ensure that these false minima, or indeed any critical points that result from a bifurcation or perturbation of a critical point other than  $x^*$ , do not end up in the set  $\Theta(x^*)$ . This is guaranteed by the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $x^*$  be a critical point of  $f$ , and let  $\|l\|_2 \leq \theta$ . Let  $y_l^*$  be a critical point of the regularized function  $f_l$  that resulted as a bifurcation or a perturbation of  $x^*$ . Then  $x_l^* \in \Theta(x^*)$ .*

*Proof:* See Appendix A.3.  $\square$

Because  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  for some  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$ , this ensures that, even if a particular choice of  $l$  induces a bifurcation at another degenerate critical point  $y^* \in X^*$ , the critical points that result from that bifurcation are contained within  $\Theta(y^*)$ , which, under Assumption 3.9, is disjoint from  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Thus, while the iterates of gradient descent are in  $\Theta(x^*)$ , regularizing can create false minima somewhere, but not in  $\Theta(x^*)$ , and there is no risk of converging to false minima. In fact, Theorem 3.10 implies that the topology of  $\Theta(x^*)$  after regularization depends *only* on the topology of  $\Theta(x^*)$  prior to regularization. In the following section, we identify exactly where any critical points of  $f_l$  will lie and what their convergence properties will be.

#### 4. Exit Condition of $\Theta(x^*)$

By construction, a point  $x_l^* \in \Theta(x^*)$  is a critical point of  $f_l$  if and only if  $\nabla f(x_l^*) = -l$ . Because a linear regularizer does not affect the Hessian,  $\nabla^2 f_l(x_l^*) = \nabla^2 f(x_l^*)$ . That is, if  $x_l^*$  is a critical point of  $f_l$ , its convergence behavior is determined by the Hessian of  $f$  at  $x_l^*$ . In order to analyze this, let us stratify  $\Theta(x^*)$  based on the properties of its Hessian:

**Definition 4.1.** For a  $C^2$  function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

- $\Lambda^+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_{\min} \nabla^2 f(x) > 0\}$
- $\Lambda^0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_{\min} \nabla^2 f(x) = 0\}$
- $\Lambda^- = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_{\min} \nabla^2 f(x) < 0\}$

Note that  $\mathbb{R}^n = \Lambda^+ \cup \Lambda^0 \cup \Lambda^-$ . According to Lemma 2.7,  $\nabla^2 f(x_l^*)$  is non-singular, implying  $x_l^* \notin \Lambda^0$ . If  $x_l^* \in \Lambda^-$ , then it is a strict saddle, and  $g^k(x)$  will not converge to  $x_l^*$ , as shown by the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$  for some  $x^* \in X^*$  and let  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$ . Let  $Y_l^* = \Theta(x^*) \cap \Lambda^- \cap X_l^*$ , where  $X_l^*$  is the critical set of  $f_l$ . Then*

$$\Pr \left( \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_l^k(x_0) \in Y_l^* \right) = 0.$$

*Proof:* All elements of  $Y_l^*$  are strict saddle points of the function  $f_l$ . The update law  $g_l(x)$  is equivalent to gradient descent on the function  $f_l$ . Using this information, Corollary 9 in (Lee et al., 2016) provides the result.  $\square$

Because  $x_l^* \notin \Lambda^0$  and  $g_l(x)$  does not converge to any  $x_l^* \in \Lambda^- \cap \Theta(x^*)$ , then the only way  $g_l(x)$  can fail to escape  $\Theta(x^*)$  is if  $x_l^* \in \Lambda^+ \cap \Theta(x^*)$ , which is precisely when  $x_l^*$  is a local minimum. Recall that if  $x^*$  is not a local minimum of  $f$ , then such a point  $x_l^*$  is a *false minimum*. Therefore, in order to guarantee  $g_l(x)$  escapes  $\Theta(x^*)$  when  $x^*$  is a saddle point, we wish to show that the choice  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  for  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$  almost never creates a false minimum in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . We formalize this notion with the following definition and assumption:

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $\Psi(\Theta(x^*)) = \{x \in \Theta(x^*) : \exists y^* \in \Theta(x^*) \text{ such that } \nabla f(y^*) = -\nabla f(x^*) \text{ and } y^* \notin \Lambda^-\}$ .

**Assumption 4.4.** For the function  $f$ , for all of its saddle points  $x^*$ , the set  $\Psi(\Theta(x^*))$  has Lebesgue measure zero.

If  $x_0 \in \Psi(\Theta(x^*))$ , then the choice  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  creates a false minimum or degenerate point in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Assumption 4.4 therefore implies that for any saddle point  $x^*$  of  $f$  and for almost any point  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$ , the choice  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  will not create a false minimum or degenerate point in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . This leads to the following theorem on the ability of linearly regularized gradient descent to exit the small-gradient neighborhood of non-strict saddle points in finite time:

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $x^* \in X^*$  be a saddle point of  $f$ , and let Assumptions 3.9 and 4.4 hold. Let  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  for some  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*) \setminus \Psi(\Theta(x^*))$  and define the sequence  $\{g_l^k(x_0)\}_k$ . Then there almost always exists a finite integer  $k_p$  such that  $g_l^{k_p}(x_0) \notin \Theta(x^*)$ .*

*Proof:* See Appendix A.4.  $\square$

Theorem 4.5 states that under Assumption 4.4,  $g_l^k(x_0)$  exits  $\Theta(x^*)$  for any saddle point  $x^*$  in finite time. Note that Assumption 4.4 only applies to saddle points, as we do not wish to escape  $\Theta(x^*)$  if  $x^*$  is a local minimum of  $f$ . We now examine two properties non-strict saddles may have that are sufficient to satisfy Assumption 4.4.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $\nabla f(\Theta(x^*))$  denote the gradient image of  $\Theta(x^*)$ , i.e., the set of all gradients that exist on  $\Theta(x^*)$ . If  $\nabla f(\Theta(x^*))$  lies on an open half-space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\Psi(\Theta(x^*)) = \emptyset$ .*

Trivially, if  $x_0 \in \Theta(x^*)$ , then  $\nabla f(x_0) \in \nabla f(\Theta(x^*))$ . If  $f$  satisfies the condition in Corollary 4.6 on  $\Theta(x^*)$ , then  $-\nabla f(x_0) \notin \nabla f(\Theta(x^*))$ . That is, for  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  no point  $x_l^* \in \Theta(x^*)$  exists such that  $\nabla f(x_l^*) = -l$ , which implies that there are no critical points of  $f_l$  in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Clearly, if no critical points remain after regularization, then the original degenerate critical point has been eliminated, there are no

false minima in  $\Theta(x^*)$ , and  $g_l^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(x^*)$  according to Theorem 4.5. Generally, this condition is satisfied by objectives with isolated non-strict saddle points, such as in Example 4.7.

**Example 4.7. (No Critical Points After Regularization)**

Consider the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + xy^2$ , which has a non-strict saddle point at  $(0, 0)$  that satisfies the condition in Corollary 4.6. This is because  $\nabla_x f(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$ , which is non-negative everywhere.  $W^s(0, 0)$  is represented by the red region in Figure 4, and for every  $x_0 \in W^s(0, 0)$ , we see that the regularizer  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  results in no critical points of  $f_l$  in  $\Theta(0, 0)$ , and  $g_l^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(0, 0)$ .




Figure 4. The point  $x_0 = (1.5, 0.5)$  lies in  $W^s(0, 0)$  for the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + xy^2$ , so  $g^k(x_0)$  converges to  $(0, 0)$  (left). With  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$  the critical point at  $(0, 0)$  is eliminated, and  $g_l^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(x_0)$  for  $\theta = 3$  in 7 iterations, and enters  $W^u(0, 0)$  (right).

**Corollary 4.8.** If  $\Lambda^+ \cap \Theta(p) = \emptyset$  then  $\Psi(\partial\Theta(p)) = \emptyset$ .

From Theorem 4.5, if there are no false minima in  $\Theta(x^*)$  after regularization, then  $g^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(x^*)$ . False minima must lie in  $\Lambda^+$  and if  $\Lambda^+ \cap \Theta(x^*)$  is empty (i.e., the Hessian is not positive definite anywhere on  $\Theta(x^*)$ ), then no false minima can exist for any choice of  $l$ . Any critical points of  $f_l$  must be strict saddles. Generally, this condition is satisfied by objectives with non-isolated non-strict saddle points, such as in Example 4.9.

**Example 4.9. (No Minima After Regularization)**

Consider the function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}xy^3$ , which has a non-strict critical subspace on the  $x$ -axis. For this function  $-\nabla f(x, y) = \nabla f(-x, -y)$ , meaning choosing  $l = \nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  for any  $(x_0, y_0)$  will create a critical point of  $f_l$  at  $(-x_0, -y_0)$ . However,  $\nabla^2 f(x, y)$  has a negative eigenvalue at every point with  $y \neq 0$ , meaning this critical point will be a strict saddle, and  $g_l^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(0, 0)$ , as shown in Figure 5.

## 5. Convergence to Local Mimima

Theorem 4.5 has shown that, under Assumptions 3.9 and 4.4, Algorithm 1 will exit  $\Theta(x^*)$  for any saddle point  $x^*$  of  $f$ .




Figure 5. The function  $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{3}x^3 + xy^2$  has a critical subset at the line  $y = 0$ . The point  $x_0 = (1.5, 1)$  lies in  $W^s(y = 0)$ , so  $g^k(x_0)$  converges to  $y = 0$  (left). With  $l = \nabla f(x_0)$ , the critical subset at  $y = 0$  is eliminated and a strict saddle point of  $f_l$  is created at  $(-1.5, -1)$ , and  $g_l^k(x_0)$  escapes  $\Theta(x_0)$  for  $\theta = 4.7$  in 15 iterations, and enters  $W^u(y = 0)$  (right).

In order to show that Algorithm 1 eventually converges to a minimum, it must be shown that after exiting  $\Theta(x^*)$  and reverting to non-regularized dynamics, Algorithm 1 does not immediately re-enter  $\Theta(x^*)$ . In order to examine the possibility of this behavior, we examine how the dynamics of  $g_l$  inside  $\Theta(x^*)$  and the dynamics of  $g$  outside  $\Theta(x^*)$  interact on the boundary of  $\Theta(x^*)$ . The boundary of  $\Theta(x^*)$  is denoted  $\partial\Theta(x^*) = \{x \in \Theta(x^*) : \|\nabla f(x)\|_2 = \theta\}$ .

Suppose that  $x_{k_p} = g_l^{k_p}(x_0)$  is the iteration at which Algorithm 1 exits  $\Theta(x^*)$  (i.e.,  $x_{k_p-1} \in \Theta(x^*)$  and  $x_{k_p} \notin \Theta(x^*)$ ). Then the regularized gradient  $-\nabla f_l$  pointed “out” of  $\Theta(x^*)$  to make this exit possible, and, because  $x_{k_p}$  is the first iterate computed after the exit,  $x_{k_p}$  will lie near the region of  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  for which  $-\nabla f_l$  points “out” of  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Since Algorithm 1 reverts to non-regularized dynamics at  $x_{k_p}$ , we want  $g(x_{k_p})$  to move away from  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Intuitively, this means  $x_{k_p}$  should lie near the region of  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  for which  $-\nabla f$  also points “out” of  $\Theta(x^*)$ . That is, we want the “exit” region of  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  defined by  $-\nabla f_l$  to lie inside the “escape” region defined by  $-\nabla f$ .

Borrowing notation from (Katz, 2019), we formalize this condition by explicitly defining the regions of  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  for which  $-\nabla f_l$  and  $-\nabla f$  point outside  $\Theta(x^*)$ . By definition,  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  is a subset of a level set of the function  $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2$ . Therefore  $\nabla h(x)$  is normal to  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  for all  $x \in \partial\Theta(x^*)$ . If the product  $\nabla f^T(x)\nabla h(x)$  is negative for some  $x \in \partial\Theta(x^*)$ , then  $-\nabla f(x)$  points “out” of  $\Theta(p)$ . Because  $\nabla h(x) = \nabla^2 f(x)\nabla f(x)$ , we have the following definition:

**Definition 5.1.** For  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  and  $l$ ,  $\partial_l^- \Theta(x^*) = \{x \in \partial\Theta(x^*) : (\nabla f(x) + l)^T \nabla^2 f(x) \nabla f(x) < 0\}$ .

Note that if  $l = 0$ , then  $\partial_0^- \Theta(x^*)$  defines the “escape” region dependent on  $-\nabla f$ . Also note that equivalent regions where the negative gradient points into  $\Theta(x^*)$  ( $\partial_l^+ \Theta(x^*)$ ) and is tangent to  $\partial\Theta(x^*)$  ( $\partial_l^0 \Theta(x^*)$ ) can be defined when

the product in Definition 5.1 is positive or zero. Intuitively, Algorithm 1 will pass through  $\partial_l^- \Theta(x^*)$  when it exits  $\Theta(x^*)$ , and will escape if  $x_{k_p}$  lies near  $\partial_l^0 \Theta(x^*)$ . This leads us to the following assumption:

**Assumption 5.2.** For a saddle point  $x^*$  and regularizer  $l$ ,  $\partial_l^- \Theta(x^*) \subseteq \partial_0^- \Theta(x^*)$ .

Under Assumption 5.2, when Algorithm 1 exits  $\Theta(x^*)$ , it will exit into a region that takes it away from  $\Theta(x^*)$ . While determining other sufficient conditions for which Assumption 5.2 holds is a subject of future work, it has been observed to hold in all examples presented in this paper.

If Algorithm 1 escapes all saddle points, then it must eventually enter  $\Theta(x^*)$  for a local minimum  $x^*$ . If this minimum is non-degenerate (i.e.,  $x^* \in \Lambda^+$ ), then there will be an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x^*$  for which  $U \subset \Lambda^+$ . We assume that  $\theta$  is chosen small enough such that  $\Theta(x^*)$  is restricted to this region.

**Assumption 5.3.**  $\theta$  is chosen small enough such that, for every critical point of  $f$   $x^* \in \Lambda^+$ ,  $\Theta(x^*) \subset \Lambda^+$ .

Under Assumption 5.3, linear regularization with  $\|l\|_2 < \theta$  will only perturb the minimum (i.e., it will not be eliminated or bifurcated into two critical points) and the perturbed minimum  $x_l^*$  will remain in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Furthermore, if  $f$  satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality on  $\Theta(x^*)$ , which is a weaker condition than strong convexity (Karimi et al., 2016), the error due to regularization can be bounded in terms of  $\theta$ .

**Theorem 5.4.** Let Assumption 5.3 hold for a function  $f$ , let  $\|l\|_2 < \theta$ , and let  $x^*$  be a non-degenerate minimum of  $f$ . Then  $f_l$  will have exactly one critical point  $x_l^*$  in  $\Theta(x^*)$ , and  $x_l^*$  will be a non-degenerate minimum. Additionally, if  $f$  satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality with constant  $c$  on  $\Theta(x^*)$ , then the error in cost between  $x_l^*$  and  $x^*$  that is induced by regularizing is bounded by  $f(x_l^*) - f(x^*) \leq \frac{\theta^2}{2c}$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix A.5.  $\square$

## 6. Numerical Results

To isolate the impact of linear regularizers, we consider a simple neural network model that sees only a single regularization event occur during its training, and we quantify the impact that a single regularization has. Specifically, we compare the performance of Algorithm 1 (Regularized GD) with full batch non-regularized gradient descent (GD) on the training of a fully connected feedforward deep neural network on the MNIST database, implemented in PyTorch. The model has four hidden layers of width 1,000 with ReLU activation functions. The cross entropy loss function of this model has non-strict saddle points according to Corollary 3.2 of (Kawaguchi, 2016). Regularized GD uses the

gradient threshold  $\theta = 5$ , and both algorithms use learning rate  $\gamma = 0.00005$ . Both algorithms are initialized with the same random weights and run for 1,000 epochs. This is repeated for 100 trials.




Figure 6. Loss at each epoch for GD and Regularized GD

The average loss at epoch 1,000 achieved by GD is 0.4575, which is 32.8% greater than the average loss achieved by Regularized GD in the same number of epochs, which is 0.3446. Figure 6 presents the change in loss for a typical trial, in which both algorithms are identical until the gradient threshold  $\theta = 5$  is crossed at epoch 312. That is, a single regularization event during training is responsible for a nearly one-third difference in the final value of the loss function.

## 7. Concluding Remarks

We have presented a local linear regularization scheme for non-convex optimization that enforces satisfaction of the SSP. This scheme is proven to escape a broad class of isolated and non-isolated non-strict saddle points, and demonstrated superior performance to full batch gradient descent on the training of a neural network model with non-strict saddle points. Future work will address identifying sufficient conditions that ensure the satisfaction of Assumptions 4.4 and 5.2. We note that the results presented in this paper are not restricted to gradient descent; they can be applied to any optimization method that avoids strict saddles.

## References

Agarwal, N., Allen-Zhu, Z., Bullins, B., Hazan, E., and Ma, T. Finding approximate local minima faster than gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 1195–1199, 2017.

- Anandkumar, A. and Ge, R. Efficient approaches for escaping higher order saddle points in non-convex optimization. In *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 81–102. PMLR, 2016.
- Chen, X. and Toint, P. L. High-order evaluation complexity for convexly-constrained optimization with non-lipschitzian group sparsity terms. *Mathematical Programming*, 187(1):47–78, 2021.
- Daneshmand, H., Kohler, J., Lucchi, A., and Hofmann, T. Escaping saddles with stochastic gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1155–1164. PMLR, 2018.
- Dixit, R. and Bajwa, W. U. Exit time analysis for approximations of gradient descent trajectories around saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01106*, 2020.
- Du, S. S., Jin, C., Lee, J. D., Jordan, M. I., Póczos, B., and Singh, A. Gradient descent can take exponential time to escape saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10412*, 2017.
- Facchinei, F. and Pang, J.-S. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- Ge, R., Huang, F., Jin, C., and Yuan, Y. Escaping from saddle points - online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 797–842. PMLR, 2015.
- Guckenheimer, J. and Holmes, P. *Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems, and bifurcations of vector fields*, volume 42. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Jin, C., Ge, R., Netrapalli, P., Kakade, S. M., and Jordan, M. I. How to escape saddle points efficiently. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1724–1732. PMLR, 2017.
- Jin, C., Netrapalli, P., and Jordan, M. I. Accelerated gradient descent escapes saddle points faster than gradient descent. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pp. 1042–1085. PMLR, 2018.
- Karimi, H., Nutini, J., and Schmidt, M. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-łojasiewicz condition. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- Katz, G. *Morse Theory of Gradient Flows, Concavity and Complexity on Manifolds with Boundary*. World Scientific, 2019.
- Kawaguchi, K. Deep learning without poor local minima. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07110*, 2016.
- Lee, J. D., Simchowitz, M., Jordan, M. I., and Recht, B. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers. In *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 1246–1257. PMLR, 2016.
- Lee, J. D., Panageas, I., Piliouras, G., Simchowitz, M., Jordan, M. I., and Recht, B. First-order methods almost always avoid saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.07406*, 2017.
- Lerario, A. Plenty of morse functions by perturbing with sums of squares. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1111.3851*, 2011.
- Matsumoto, Y. *An introduction to Morse theory*, volume 208. American Mathematical Soc., 2002.
- Milnor, J. *Lectures on the h-cobordism theorem*. Princeton university press, 1965.
- Murty, K. G. and Kabadi, S. N. Some np-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 39:117–129, 1987.
- Nguyen, Q. and Hein, M. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2603–2612. PMLR, 2017.
- Nicolaescu, L. *An invitation to Morse theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- Panageas, I. and Piliouras, G. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers: Non-isolated critical points and invariant regions. In *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- Schaeffer, H. and McCalla, S. G. Extending the step-size restriction for gradient descent to avoid strict saddle points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.01753*, 2019.
- Truong, T. T. New q-newton’s method meets backtracking line search: good convergence guarantee, saddle points avoidance, quadratic rate of convergence, and easy implementation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.10249*, 2021.
- Xu, Y., Jin, R., and Yang, T. First-order stochastic algorithms for escaping from saddle points in almost linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.01944*, 2017.
- Yang, J., Hu, W., and Li, C. J. On the fast convergence of random perturbations of the gradient flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.00837*, 2017.
- Zhu, X., Han, J., and Jiang, B. An adaptive high order method for finding third-order critical points of non-convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.04191*, 2020.

## A. Appendix

### A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.7

Lemma 2.7 is equivalent to Lemma A in (Milnor, 1965). The following proof is not new, and it closely follows the proof of Lemma A in (Milnor, 1965). We present it here in the notation and terminology of this paper for completeness.

This proof will utilize Sard's Theorem, which states that the set of critical values of a smooth map  $h : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  has measure zero in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Matsumoto, 2002). Consider the manifold  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . It has a submanifold  $M = \{(x, l) \mid \nabla(f(x) + l^T x) = 0\}$ . That is,  $M$  consists of all the pairs of points  $x$  and linear regularizers  $l$  such that  $\nabla f(x) + l = 0$ . Trivially, we see this means that  $l = -\nabla f(x)$  and that the bijection  $x \rightarrow (x, -\nabla f(x))$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  onto  $M$ . Each pair  $(x, l) \in M$  corresponds to a critical point of  $f(x) + l^T x$ , and this critical point is degenerate if and only if  $\nabla^2 f(x)$  is singular. Now, consider a projection  $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  that sends  $(x, l)$  to  $l$ . Because  $l = -\nabla f(x)$ , this projection is simply  $\pi(x) = -\nabla f(x)$ . This means that the Jacobian matrix of  $\pi$  is  $-\nabla^2 f(x)$ . Let  $X$  be the set of points  $x$  at which  $-\nabla^2 f(x)$  is singular. Then, Sard's Theorem states that the image  $\pi(X)$  has Lebesgue measure 0 in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . That is, the set of regularizers  $l$  for which a corresponding point  $x$  exists such that  $(x, l)$  is in  $M$ , and  $\nabla^2 f(x)$  is singular, has measure zero. Therefore, almost all choices of  $l$  will result in  $f(x) + l^T x$  having only non-singular critical points.  $\square$

### A.2. Proof of Theorem 3.4

Consider the function  $f(x) = (x - 1)^3(x + 1)^3$ . This function has a minimum at  $x = 0$ , and non-strict saddle points at  $x = -1$  and  $x = 1$ . For both non-strict saddle points,  $\nabla^2 f(x) = 0$ . For  $x = 1$ , we have  $\nabla^3 f(x) = 48$ , and for  $x = -1$  we have  $\nabla^3 f(x) = -48$ . Now consider the function  $f_l(x) = (x - 1)^3(x + 1)^3 + lx$  for  $l \in \mathbb{R}$  arbitrarily small. From Theorem 3.4.1 in (Guckenheimer & Holmes, 2013) and the discussion that follows, any positive choice of  $l$  will induce a saddle-node bifurcation at a degenerate critical point with  $\nabla^3 f(x) < 0$  and eliminate one with  $\nabla^3 f(x) > 0$ . The converse is true for a negative choice of  $l$ . Because the sign of  $\nabla^3 f(x)$  differs for both degenerate critical points, either choice of sign for  $l$  will induce a saddle-node bifurcation in one and eliminate the other, and thus all non-zero values of  $l$  induce a bifurcation that creates a false minimum.  $\square$

### A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.10

Consider the function  $h(x, \mu) = \nabla f(x) + \mu l$  with  $\|l\|_2 < \theta$ . This function maps  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . In this construction,  $(x^*, 0)$  represents some critical point of the non-regularized function  $f$ . Consider a point  $(x_l^*, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, 1]$  where  $\nabla f(x_l^*) + l = 0$ , which corresponds to a critical point of the regularized function  $f(x) + l^T x$ . From Lemma 2.7,  $\nabla^2 f(x_l^*)$  is non-singular almost always. Therefore, the Implicit Function Theorem (Theorem 2.3 in (Matsumoto, 2002)) states that there exists an open neighborhood  $U \subset \mathbb{R}$  containing  $\mu = 1$  such that there exists a smooth function  $\zeta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\zeta(1) = x_l^*$  and  $\nabla f(\zeta(\mu)) + \mu l = 0$  for all  $\mu \in U$ . That is, starting at  $\mu = 1$  and moving in the negative direction,  $(\zeta(\mu), \mu)$  is a smooth curve in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, 1]$  that describes the location of a critical point for different values of  $\mu$ . Observe that  $x_l^*$  is due to either a bifurcation of  $x^*$  (if  $x^*$  is degenerate) or a perturbation of  $x^*$  (if  $x^*$  is non-degenerate) if  $(x^*, 0)$  and  $(x_l^*, 1)$  are connected by the smooth curve defined by  $\zeta$ . Because  $\|\nabla f(\zeta(\mu))\|_2 = \mu \|l\|_2 < \theta$  for all  $\mu \in [0, 1]$ , this curve must lie in the connected subset of  $L_\theta \times [0, 1]$  that contains  $(x^*, 0)$ . This is the definition of  $\Theta(x^*) \times [0, 1]$ , and therefore  $x_l^* \in \Theta(x^*)$ .  $\square$

### A.4. Proof of Theorem 4.5

*Proof:* The update  $g_l(x)$  is equivalent to gradient descent on the function  $f_l(x) = f(x) + l^T x$ . Lemma 2.7 implies no critical points of  $f_l$  lie in  $\Lambda^0$ , and Assumption 4.4 implies none lie in  $\Lambda^+$ . Therefore any critical points in  $\Theta(x^*)$  must lie in  $\Lambda^-$ , which implies that they are strict saddles. Lemma 4.2 states that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_l^k(x_0)$  is almost never a strict saddle. Therefore  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_l^k(x_0)$  will almost always lie outside  $\Theta(x^*)$ , implying it exits  $\Theta(x^*)$  in finite time.  $\square$

### A.5. Proof of Theorem 5.4

*Proof:* From Theorem 3.10, any perturbation of  $x^*$  must remain in  $\Theta(x^*)$ . Because Assumption 5.3 implies  $\Lambda^0 \cap \Theta(x^*) = \emptyset$ , there are no points in  $\Theta(x^*)$  for which  $\nabla^2 f(x)$  is singular, therefore there must exist exactly one point  $x_l^* \in \Theta(x^*)$  for which  $\nabla f(x_l^*) + l = 0$ , and  $x_l^* \in \Lambda^+$ . Satisfaction of the Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality with constant  $c > 0$  on  $\Theta(x^*)$

implies that, for every point  $x \in \Theta(x^*)$ , the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \geq c(f(x) - f^*)$$

is satisfied, where  $f^*$  is a minimizer of  $f$  on  $\Theta(x^*)$ . By Assumption 3.9,  $f^* = f(x^*)$ , and since  $x_i^* \in \Theta(x^*)$ , then  $\|\nabla f(x_i^*)\|_2 \leq \theta$ . The result follows by substitution.  $\square$