

# Mean Field Analysis of Neural Networks

Justin Sirignano\* and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos<sup>†‡</sup>

June 6, 2022

## Abstract

Machine learning has revolutionized fields such as image, text, and speech recognition. There's also growing interest in applying machine and deep learning ideas in engineering, robotics, biotechnology, and finance. Despite their immense success in practice, there is limited mathematical understanding of neural networks. We mathematically study neural networks in the asymptotic regime of simultaneously (A) large network sizes and (B) large numbers of stochastic gradient descent training iterations. We rigorously prove that the empirical distribution of the neural network parameters converges to the solution of a nonlinear partial differential equation. This result can be considered a law of large numbers for neural networks. In addition, a consequence of our analysis is that the trained parameters of the neural network asymptotically become independent, a property which is commonly called “propagation of chaos”.

## 1 Introduction

Machine learning and in particular deep learning has achieved immense practical success over the past decade. Examples of these recent advances can be found in [11], [18], and [23]. These advances have sparked interest in the mathematical analysis of neural networks. Recent papers which mathematically study neural networks include [6], [20], and [26]. There also exist classical results regarding the approximation power of neural networks [5], [13], and [14].

Our result characterizes neural networks in the asymptotic regime of large network sizes and large numbers of stochastic gradient descent iterations. We rigorously prove that the empirical distribution of the neural network weights will weakly converge to a distribution. This distribution satisfies a nonlinear partial differential equation (PDE). The proof relies upon weak convergence analysis for interacting particle systems. The result can be considered a “law of large numbers” for neural networks when both the network size and the number of stochastic gradient descent steps grow to infinity.

Recently, [1] rigorously established a weak convergence result for a class of machine learning algorithms. Weak convergence analysis has been widely used in other fields (for example, see [2], [3], [7], and [12] for a non-exhaustive list). In fact, mean field analysis has been actively used for many years to study biological neural networks and physical systems of interacting particles, see for example [8], [15], [21], [4], [24], and the references therein.

Upon completion of this work, we became aware of the very recent work of [22] where a related PDE limit result for neural networks is derived. Our convergence analysis, setup, and assumptions are different. In contrast to [22], we do not assume that the gradient of the neural network is a priori globally Lipschitz and bounded. Neural network models (and their gradients) are typically not globally Lipschitz and not bounded. Furthermore, we rigorously prove relative compactness of the pre-limit measure valued process (which is not shown in [22]), identification of its limit, and uniqueness of the limit point in the appropriate space. Our method of proof leverages on weak convergence analysis in an appropriate Skorokhod space for measure-valued processes, see also [1, 2].

---

\*Department of Industrial & Systems Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Urbana, E-mail: jasirign@illinois.edu

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University, Boston, E-mail: kspiliop@math.bu.edu

<sup>‡</sup>K.S. was partially supported by the National Science Foundation (DMS 1550918)

Consider the one-layer neural network

$$g_{\theta}^N(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N c^i \sigma(w^i \cdot x), \quad (1.1)$$

where for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $c^i \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x, w^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For notational convenience we shall interpret  $w^i \cdot x = \sum_{j=1}^d w^{i,j} x^j$  as the standard scalar inner product. The objective function is

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{Y,X}[(Y - g_{\theta}^N(X))^2], \quad (1.2)$$

where the data  $(Y, X)$  is assumed to have a joint distribution  $\pi(dx, dy)$ . We shall write  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  for the state spaces of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. The parameters  $\theta = (c^1, \dots, c^N, w^1, \dots, w^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+d)N}$  are estimated using stochastic gradient descent:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{k+1}^i &= c_k^i + \frac{\alpha}{N} (y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) \sigma(w_k^i \cdot x_k), \\ w_{k+1}^{i,j} &= w_k^i + \frac{\alpha}{N} (y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) c_k^i \sigma'(w_k^i \cdot x_k) x_k^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, d, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the learning rate. Stochastic gradient descent minimizes (1.2) using a sequence of noisy (but unbiased) gradient descent steps. Stochastic gradient descent typically converges more rapidly than gradient descent for large datasets. For this reason, stochastic gradient descent is widely used in machine learning.

Define the empirical measure

$$\nu_k^N(dc, dw) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{c_k^i, w_k^i}(dc, dw). \quad (1.4)$$

The neural network's output can be re-written in terms of the empirical measure:

$$g_{\theta_k}^N(x) = \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \nu_k^N \rangle. \quad (1.5)$$

$\langle f, h \rangle$  denotes the inner product of  $f$  and  $h$ . For example,  $\langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \nu_k^N \rangle = \int c\sigma(w \cdot x) \nu_k^N(dc, dw)$ .

The scaled empirical measure is

$$\mu_t^N = \nu_{\lfloor Nt \rfloor}^N. \quad (1.6)$$

At any time  $t$ , the scaled empirical measure  $\mu_t^N$  is a random element of  $D_E([0, T]) = D([0, T]; E)^1$  with  $E = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ . We study the convergence in distribution of  $\mu_t^N$  in the Skorokhod space  $D_E([0, T])$ .

Our main results are stated below. Theorem 1.2 (and the associated Remark 1.3) is a law of large numbers describing the distribution of the trained parameters when  $N$  is large. Theorem 1.5 describes the behavior of individual parameters when  $N$  is large. Theorem 1.5 is a ‘‘propagation of chaos’’ result. Section 1.1 presents several insights provided by these asymptotic results.

We shall work on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  on which all the random variables are defined. The probability space is equipped with a filtration  $\mathfrak{F}_t$  that is right continuous and  $\mathfrak{F}_0$  contains all  $\mathbb{P}$ -negligible sets.

At this point, let us recall the definition of chaoticity. Let  $q$  be a probability measure on a Polish space  $\mathcal{Z}$  and, for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbb{Q}^N$  be a symmetric probability measure on the product space  $\mathcal{Z}^N$ . Then  $(\mathbb{Q}^N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  is called  $q$ -chaotic if, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the joint distribution law of the first  $k$  marginals of  $\mathbb{Q}^N$  converge weakly to the product measure  $\otimes^k q$ .

We impose the following assumption.

**Assumption 1.1.** We have that

- The activation function  $\sigma \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e.  $\sigma$  is one time continuously differentiable and bounded.

---

<sup>1</sup> $D_S([0, T])$  is the set of maps from  $[0, T]$  into  $S$  which are right-continuous and which have left-hand limits.

- The data  $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is compactly supported.
- The sequence of data samples  $(x_k, y_k)$  is i.i.d.
- The random initialization is such that  $(c_0^i, w_0^i)$  is generated from a distribution that has compact support which is also  $\bar{\mu}_0$ -chaotic for a probability measure  $\bar{\mu}_0$  on  $E$ .

Under Assumption 1.1, the initial empirical measure satisfies  $\mu_0^N \xrightarrow{d} \bar{\mu}_0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . In addition, due to our assumption on the distribution of the  $(x_k, y_k)$  data and of the initialization  $(c_0^i, w_0^i)_{i=1}^N$ , the joint distribution of  $(c_k^i, w_k^i)_{i=1}^N \in (\mathbb{R}^{1+d})^{\otimes N}$  is exchangeable and, consequently,  $\nu_k^N$  is a Markov chain in the space of probability measures on  $E$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume Assumption 1.1. The scaled empirical measure  $\mu_t^N$  converges in distribution to  $\bar{\mu}_t$  in  $D_E([0, T])$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . For every  $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ ,  $\bar{\mu}$  satisfies the measure evolution equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, \bar{\mu}_t \rangle &= \langle f, \bar{\mu}_0 \rangle + \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \bar{\mu}_s \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \partial_c f, \bar{\mu}_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \bar{\mu}_s \rangle) \langle c \sigma'(w \cdot x) x \cdot \nabla_w f, \bar{\mu}_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

*Remark 1.3.* Since weak convergence to a constant implies convergence in probability, Theorem 1.2 leads to the stronger result of convergence in probability

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ d_E(\mu^N, \bar{\mu}) \geq \delta \} = 0$$

for every  $\delta > 0$ .

**Corollary 1.4.** *Assume Assumption 1.1. Suppose that  $\bar{\mu}_0$  admits a density  $p_0(c, w)$  and there exists a solution to the nonlinear partial differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p(t, c, w)}{\partial t} &= -\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left( (y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), p(t, c', w') \rangle) \frac{\partial}{\partial c} [\sigma(w \cdot x) p(t, c, w)] \right) \pi(dx, dy) \\ &- \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left( (y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), p(t, c', w') \rangle) x \cdot \nabla_w [c \sigma'(w \cdot x) p(t, c, w)] \right) \pi(dx, dy), \\ p(0, c, w) &= p_0(c, w). \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

Then, we have that the solution to the measure evolution equation (1.7) is such that

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dc, dw) = p(t, c, w) dc dw.$$

In Theorem 1.5 we prove that the neural network has the ‘‘propagation of chaos’’ property.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Assume Assumption 1.1. Consider  $T < \infty$  and let  $t \in (0, T]$ . Define the probability measure  $\rho_t^N \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{(1+d)N})$  where*

$$\rho_t^N(dx^1, \dots, dx^N) = \mathbb{P}[(c_{[Nt]}^1, w_{[Nt]}^1) \in dx^1, \dots, (c_{[Nt]}^N, w_{[Nt]}^N) \in dx^N].$$

Then, the sequence of probability measures  $\rho_t^N$  is  $\bar{\mu}$ -chaotic. That is, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_1(x^1) \times \dots \times f_k(x^k), \rho_t^N(dx^1, \dots, dx^N) \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^k \langle f_i, \bar{\mu} \rangle, \quad \forall f_1, \dots, f_k \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}).$$

## 1.1 Insights from Law of Large Numbers and Numerical Studies

The law of large numbers (1.7) suggests several interesting characteristics of trained neural networks (at least in the setting studied in this paper).

- As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the neural network converges (in probability) to a deterministic model. This is despite the fact that the neural network is randomly initialized and it is trained on a random sequence of data samples via stochastic gradient descent.
- The learning rate  $\alpha$  was assumed to be constant and to not decay with time. Despite this, the noise disappears and the neural network’s parameter distribution converges to a deterministic evolution equation. This is due to the normalization of  $\frac{1}{N}$  in the hidden layer replacing the role of the learning rate decay.
- Under the setup of (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3), the limiting equation characterizing the evolution of the distribution of parameters is a first-order PDE. Therefore, the asymptotic dynamics are of a “transport” instead of a “diffusive” nature.
- The propagation of chaos result (1.9) indicates that, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the dynamics of the weights  $(c_k^i, w_k^i)$  will become independent of the dynamics of the weights  $(c_k^j, w_k^j)$  for any  $i \neq j$ . Note that the dynamics  $(c_k^i, w_k^i)$  are still random due to the random initialization. However, the dynamics of the  $i$ -th set of weights will be uncorrelated with the dynamics of the  $j$ -th set of weights in the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

In order to illustrate some aspects of the theoretical results of this paper, we performed the following numerical study.

Figure 1 displays the convergence of the distribution of the parameters in a trained neural network as the number of hidden units  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The neural network has a single hidden layer followed by a softmax function. Figure 1 reports the distribution of the parameters connecting the hidden layer to the softmax function. The distributions are presented as histograms. The neural network is trained on the MNIST dataset, which is a standard image dataset in machine learning [19]. The dataset includes 60,000 images of handwritten numbers. The neural network is trained to label the handwritten numbers using only the image pixels as an input (i.e., it learns to recognize images as a human would). In the MNIST dataset, each image has 784 pixels.

Figure 1 shows that the distribution of parameters converges to a fixed distribution as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This can be seen by the fact that the distributions for  $N = 10,000$ ,  $N = 100,000$ , and  $N = 250,000$  are nearly identical. A priori it is unclear if the distribution of neural network parameters should converge as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Our theory and numerical results confirm that this is indeed the case.

## 1.2 Overview of the Proof

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 proves relative compactness of the family  $\{\mu^N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Section 3 identifies the limit point of any convergent subsequence. The limit point must satisfy the measure evolution equation (1.7). Section 4 proves uniqueness of the evolution equation (1.7) via a fixed point argument. In particular, by Prokhorov’s Theorem, these results prove that the sequence of probability measures  $\pi_N$  of the processes  $\mu^N$  weakly converge to  $\pi$ , the probability measure of the process  $\bar{\mu}$  satisfying equation (1.7). These results are collected together in Section 5 to prove Theorem 1.2, Corollary 1.4, and Theorem 1.5. We conclude with a discussion of our results in Section 6.

## 2 Relative Compactness

We now prove relative compactness of the family  $\{\mu^N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $D_E([0, T])$  where  $E = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ . It is sufficient to show compact containment and regularity of the  $\mu^N$ ’s (see for example Chapter 3 of [9]).

**Lemma 2.1.** *For each  $\eta > 0$  and  $t \geq 0$ , there is a compact subset  $\mathcal{K}$  of  $E$  such that*

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{P}[\mu_t^N \notin \mathcal{K}] < \eta.$$




Figure 1: Distribution of parameters for a neural network trained on MNIST dataset. Clockwise:  $N = 1,000$ ,  $N = 10,000$ ,  $N = 100,000$ , and  $N = 250,000$  hidden units.

*Proof.* We start by establishing some useful a-priori bounds on  $c_k^i$  and  $w_k^i$ . The unimportant finite constants  $C, C_1, C_2, C_3 < \infty$  may change from line to line. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{k+1}^i| &\leq |c_k^i| + \alpha |y_k - g_{\theta_k^N}(x_k)| \frac{1}{N} |\sigma(w_k^i \cdot x_k)| \\ &\leq |c_k^i| + \frac{\alpha C |y_k|}{N} + \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_k^i|, \end{aligned}$$

where to derive the last line we used the definition of  $g_{\theta_k^N}(x)$  via (1.1) and the uniform boundedness assumption on  $\sigma$ . Then, we subsequently obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^i| &= |c_0^i| + \sum_{j=1}^k [|c_j^i| - |c_{j-1}^i|] \\ &\leq |c_0^i| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\alpha C |y_{j-1}|}{N} + \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^N |c_{j-1}^i|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_k^i| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_0^i| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\alpha C |y_{j-1}|}{N} + \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^N |c_{j-1}^i| \\ &\leq C \left[ 1 + \frac{k}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^k \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_{j-1}^i| \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $c_0^i$ ,  $X$ , and  $Y$  have compact support. By Gronwall's inequality, for  $k < TN$ ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_k^i| \leq C_1 \exp(C_2 T).$$

Let us now set  $K = C_1 \exp(C_2 T)$ . Then, for  $k < TN$  and uniformly in  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$|c_k^i| \leq |c_0^i| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\alpha C |y_{j-1}|}{N} + \frac{C}{N} \sum_{j=1}^k K \leq C_3 T,$$

for some constant  $C_3 < \infty$ . Similarly, we obtain for the Euclidean norm of  $w_{k+1}^i$

$$\|w_{k+1}^i\| \leq \|w_k^i\| + \frac{C}{N} |y_k| + \frac{C}{N^2} |c_k^i| \sum_{i=1}^N |c_k^i| |\sigma(w_k^i \cdot x_k)| \|x_k\|.$$

The latter can be simplified using the fact that  $X$  and  $Y$  have compact support. and the fact that  $|c_k^i|$  is bounded for  $k < TN$ . Then, we have that

$$\|w_{k+1}^i\| \leq \|w_k^i\| + \frac{C}{N}.$$

Therefore, for  $k < TN$ , and uniformly in  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$\|w_k^i\| \leq CT,$$

for some constant  $0 < C < \infty$ .

Hence, we have obtained that there is a uniform constant  $C$  (which does not depend on  $k$  nor  $N$ , but can depend on  $T$ ) such that for all  $k < TN$

$$|c_k^i| + \|w_k^i\| \leq C.$$

This uniform bound actually implies the stronger statement of compact support. In particular, notice that the set  $[-C, C]^{1+d}$  is compact, and define

$$\mathcal{K} = \{\omega \in M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}) : \omega([-C, C]^{1+d}) = 1\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{K} \subset M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ , and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.  $\mu_t^N \in \mathcal{K}$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

We now establish regularity of the  $\mu^N$ 's. Define the function  $q(z_1, z_2) = \min\{|z_1 - z_2|, 1\}$  where  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *For any  $p \in (0, 1)$ , there is a constant  $C < \infty$  such that for  $0 \leq u \leq \delta$ ,  $0 \leq v \leq \delta \wedge t$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} [q(\langle f, \mu_{t+u}^N \rangle, \langle f, \mu_t^N \rangle) q(\langle f, \mu_t^N \rangle, \langle f, \mu_{t-v}^N \rangle) | \mathcal{F}_t^N] \leq C \delta^p.$$

*Proof.* We start by noticing that a Taylor expansion gives for  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, \mu^N(t) \rangle - \langle f, \mu^N(s) \rangle| &= |\langle f, \mu^N(t) \rangle - \langle f, \mu^N(s) \rangle| = |\langle f, \nu_{[Nt]}^N \rangle - \langle f, \nu_{[Ns]}^N \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |f(c_{[Nt]}^i, w_{[Nt]}^i) - f(c_{[Ns]}^i, w_{[Ns]}^i)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\partial_c f(\bar{c}_{[Nt]}^i, \bar{w}_{[Nt]}^i)| |c_{[Nt]}^i - c_{[Ns]}^i| \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\nabla_w f(\bar{c}_{[Nt]}^i, \bar{w}_{[Nt]}^i)\| \|w_{[Nt]}^i - w_{[Ns]}^i\|, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

for points  $\bar{c}^i, \bar{w}^i$  in the segments connecting  $c_{[Ns]}^i$  with  $c_{[Nt]}^i$  and  $w_{[Ns]}^i$  with  $w_{[Nt]}^i$ , respectively.

Let's now establish a bound on  $|c_{[Nt]}^i - c_{[Ns]}^i|$  for  $s < t \leq T$ . Let  $0 < p < 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_{[Nt]}^i - c_{[Ns]}^i| &= \left| \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} (c_{k+1} - c_k) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} \left| \alpha(y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) \frac{1}{N} \sigma(w_k^i \cdot x_k) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} C \leq C(t-s) \\
&\leq C(t-s)^p \mathbf{1}_{t-s < 1} + C(t-s)^p T^{1/p} \mathbf{1}_{t-s \geq 1} \\
&\leq C(t-s)^p,
\end{aligned}$$

where Assumption 1.1 was used. Let's now establish a bound on  $\|w_{[Nt]}^i - w_{[Ns]}^i\|$  for  $s < t \leq T$ . Making use of the uniform bounds established in Lemma 2.1, we obtain similarly to the previous bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_{[Nt]}^i - w_{[Ns]}^i\| &= \left\| \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} (w_{k+1} - w_k) \right\| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} \left\| \alpha(y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) \frac{1}{N} c_k^i \sigma'(w_k^i \cdot x_k) x_k \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=[Ns]}^{[Nt]-1} C \leq C(t-s) \leq C(t-s)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we return to equation (2.1). By Lemma 2.1, the quantities  $(\bar{c}_{[Nt]}^i, \bar{w}_{[Nt]}^i)$  are bounded for  $0 < s < t \leq T$ . Therefore, for  $0 < s < t \leq T$ ,

$$|\langle f, \mu^N(t) \rangle - \langle f, \mu^N(s) \rangle| \leq C(t-s)^p.$$

where  $C < \infty$  is some unimportant constant. Then, the statement of the Lemma follows.  $\square$

We can now prove the required relative compactness of the sequence  $\{\mu^N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ . This implies that every subsequence  $\mu^N$ 's has a convergent sub-subsequence.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The sequence of probability measures  $\{\mu^N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  is relatively compact in  $D_E([0, T])$ .*

*Proof.* Given Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, Theorem 8.6 of Chapter 3 of [9], gives the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

### 3 Identification of the Limit

We consider the evolution of the empirical measure  $\nu_k^N$  via test functions  $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ . A Taylor expansion yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, \nu_{k+1}^N \rangle - \langle f, \nu_k^N \rangle &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( f(c_{k+1}^i, w_{k+1}^i) - f(c_k^i, w_k^i) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_c f(c_k^i, w_k^i) (c_{k+1}^i - c_k^i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_w f(c_k^i, w_k^i) (w_{k+1}^i - w_k^i) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_c^2 f(\bar{c}_k^i, \bar{w}_k^i) (c_{k+1}^i - c_k^i)^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (c_{k+1}^i - c_k^i) \nabla_{cw} f(\bar{c}_k^i, \bar{w}_k^i) (w_{k+1}^i - w_k^i) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{k+1}^i - w_k^i)^\top \nabla_w^2 f(\bar{c}_k^i, \bar{w}_k^i) (w_{k+1}^i - w_k^i),
\end{aligned}$$

for points  $\bar{c}_k^i, \bar{w}_k^i$  in the segments connecting  $c_{k+1}^i$  with  $c_k^i$  and  $w_{k+1}^i$  with  $w_k^i$ , respectively. Notice now that the uniform bounds of Lemma 2.1 and the relation (1.3) imply that as  $N$  gets large

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, \nu_{k+1}^N \rangle - \langle f, \nu_k^N \rangle &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_c f(c_k^i, w_k^i) \alpha(y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) \sigma(w_k^i \cdot x_k) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha(y_k - g_{\theta_k}^N(x_k)) c_k^i \sigma'(w_k^i \cdot x_k) \nabla_w f(c_k^i, w_k^i) \cdot x_k + O(N^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The term  $O(N^{-2})$  is a result of  $f \in C_b^2$ ,  $(X, Y)$  having compact support, and  $|c_k^i| + \|w_k^i\| < C$  for  $k < TN$ . We next define the drift and martingale components:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_k^{1,N} &= \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle \pi(dx, dy), \\
D_k^{2,N} &= \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle c\sigma'(w \cdot x) x \cdot \nabla_w f, \nu_k^N \rangle \pi(dx, dy), \\
M_k^{1,N} &= \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \nabla_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N}, \\
M_k^{2,N} &= \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle c\sigma'(w \cdot x_k) x \cdot \nabla_w f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{2,N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the different terms together, we then obtain

$$\langle f, \nu_{k+1}^N \rangle - \langle f, \nu_k^N \rangle = D_k^{1,N} + D_k^{2,N} + M_k^{1,N} + M_k^{2,N} + O(N^{-2}).$$

Next, we define the scaled versions of  $D^{1,N}, D^{2,N}, M^{1,N}$  and  $M^{2,N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{1,N}(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} D_k^{1,N}, & D^{2,N}(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} D_k^{2,N}, \\
M^{1,N}(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} M_k^{1,N}, & M^{2,N}(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} M_k^{2,N}.
\end{aligned}$$

The scaled empirical measure satisfies, as  $N$  grows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, \mu_t^N \rangle - \langle f, \mu_0^N \rangle &= \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \mu_s^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \nabla_c f, \mu_s^N \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \\
&+ \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \mu_s^N \rangle) \langle c\sigma'(w \cdot x) x \cdot \nabla_w f, \mu_s^N \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \\
&+ M^{1,N}(t) + M^{2,N}(t) + O(N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$



In fact as we show below  $M^{1,N}(t)$  and  $M^{2,N}(t)$  converge to 0 in  $L^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( M^{1,N}(t) \right)^2 \right] &= 0, \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( M^{2,N}(t) \right)^2 \right] &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_j - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_j), \nu_j^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_j) \partial_c f, \nu_j^N \rangle - D_j^{1,N} \right) \right] \tag{3.1}\end{aligned}$$

If  $j > k$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_j - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_j), \nu_j^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_j) \partial_c f, \nu_j^N \rangle - D_j^{1,N} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_j - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_j), \nu_j^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_j) \partial_c f, \nu_j^N \rangle - D_j^{1,N} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right) \times 0 \right] \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.1) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right)^2 \right]. \tag{3.2}\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( M^{1,N}(t) \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle - D_k^{1,N} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \alpha(y_k - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x_k), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x_k) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle \right)^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c\sigma(w \cdot x), \nu_k^N \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \partial_c f, \nu_k^N \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{N^2} \lfloor Nt \rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

The final inequality comes from the bounds proven in Section 2 and the compact support of  $(X, Y)$ . A similar bound can be also established for  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( M^{2,N}(t) \right)^2 \right]$ . The result directly follows.  $\square$

Let  $\pi^N$  be the probability measure of a convergent subsequence of  $(\mu^N)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . Each  $\pi^N$  takes values in the set of probability measures  $\mathcal{M}(D_E([0, T]))$ . Relative compactness, proven in Section 2, implies that there is a subsequence  $\pi^{N_k}$  which weakly converges. We must prove that any limit point  $\pi$  of a convergent subsequence  $\pi^{N_k}$  will satisfy the evolution equation (1.7).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\pi^{N_k}$  be a convergent subsequence with a limit point  $\pi$ . Then  $\pi$  is a Dirac measure concentrated on  $\bar{\mu} \in D_E([0, T])$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  satisfies the measure evolution equation (1.7).*

*Proof.* We define a map  $F(\mu) : D_E([0, T]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ ,  $g_1, \dots, g_p \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$  and  $0 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_p \leq t$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mu) &= \left| \left( \langle f, \mu_t \rangle - \langle f, \mu_0 \rangle - \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \mu_s \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \partial_c f, \mu_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \right. \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \mu_s \rangle) \langle c\sigma'(w \cdot x) x \cdot \nabla_w f, \mu_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \langle g_1, \mu_{s_1} \rangle \times \dots \times \langle g_p, \mu_{s_p} \rangle \Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by the proof of Lemma 3.1, we obtain for large  $N$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi^N} [F(\mu)] &= \mathbb{E}[F(\mu^N)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \left( M^{1,N}(t) + M^{2,N}(t) + O(N^{-1}) \right) \prod_{i=1}^p \langle g_i, \mu_{s_i}^N \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[|M^{1,N}(t)|] + \mathbb{E}[|M^{2,N}(t)|] + O(N^{-1}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[(M^{1,N}(t))^2]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[(M^{2,N}(t))^2]^{1/2} + O(N^{-1}) \\
&\leq C \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{N} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^N} [F(\mu)] = 0.$$

Since  $F(\cdot)$  is continuous and  $F(\mu^N)$  is uniformly bounded (due to the uniform boundedness results of Section 2),

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[F(\mu)] = 0.$$

Since this holds for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$  and  $g_1, \dots, g_p \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})$ ,  $\bar{\mu}$  satisfies the evolution equation (1.7).  $\square$

It remains to prove that the evolution equation (1.7) has a unique solution. This is the content of Section 4.

## 4 Uniqueness

We prove uniqueness of a solution to the evolution equation (1.7). We will set up a Picard type of iteration and prove that it has a unique fixed point through a contraction mapping. We start by noticing that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, \bar{\mu}_t \rangle &= \langle f, \bar{\mu}_0 \rangle + \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \bar{\mu}_s \rangle) \langle \sigma(w \cdot x) \partial_c f, \bar{\mu}_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - \langle c' \sigma(w' \cdot x), \bar{\mu}_s \rangle) \langle c \sigma'(w \cdot x) x \nabla_w f, \bar{\mu}_s \rangle \pi(dx, dy) \right) ds. \\ &= \langle f, \bar{\mu}_0 \rangle + \int_0^t \langle G(z, Q(\bar{\mu}_s, \cdot)) \cdot \nabla f, \bar{\mu}_s \rangle ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where for  $z = (c, w_1, \dots, w_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$ ,  $Q(\bar{\mu}, x) = \langle c \sigma(w \cdot x), \bar{\mu} \rangle$  we have

$$G(z, Q(\bar{\mu}, \cdot)) = (G_1(z, Q(\bar{\mu}, \cdot)), G_2(z, Q(\bar{\mu}, \cdot))) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(z, Q(\bar{\mu}, \cdot)) &= \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - Q(\bar{\mu}, x)) \sigma(w \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) \in \mathbb{R} \\ G_2(z, Q(\bar{\mu}, \cdot)) &= \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha(y - Q(\bar{\mu}, x)) c \sigma'(w \cdot x) x \pi(dx, dy) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

We remark here that a solution to (4.1),  $\bar{\mu}_\cdot$ , is associated to the nonlinear random process  $Z_t$  (see for example [16]) satisfying the random ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t &= Z_0 + \int_0^t G(Z_s, Q(\bar{\mu}_s, \cdot)) ds \\ Z_0 &\sim \bar{\mu}(0, c, w) \\ \bar{\mu}_t &= \text{Law}(Z_t) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

This ODE is random due to the random initial data.

Let us now define the following mappings. Let  $F : D([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) \mapsto D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$  be such that for a path  $(R_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in D([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ , we have that  $F(R_\cdot) = \text{Law}(Y_\cdot)$  where  $Y_\cdot$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= Y_0 + \int_0^t G(Y_s, R_s) ds \\ Y_0 &\sim \bar{\mu}(0, c, w). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us also define the map  $L : D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})) \mapsto D([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$  taking a measure valued process  $\mu_t$  and mapping it to  $Q(\mu_t, x) = L(\mu)$  where

$$Q(\mu_t, x) = \langle c \sigma(w \cdot x), \mu_t \rangle.$$

Then, we consider the mapping  $H : D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})) \mapsto D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$  defined via the composition of the mappings  $F$  and  $L$ , we set  $H = F \circ L$ . Sometimes, in order to emphasize the dependence on  $T$ , we may write  $H_T$  for  $H$ .

It is clear that if  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a fixed point of  $H$ , then  $\text{Law}(Z_t) = H_t(\mu_\cdot)$  is a solution to (4.1). Conversely, if  $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a solution to (4.2) then its law will be a fixed point of  $H$ , implying that  $\text{Law}(Z_t) = H_t(\mu)$ . In addition, if  $\mu$  is a weak measure valued solution to (4.1), then it must be a fixed point of  $H$  and thus satisfy (4.2), proving our result.

Now, we need to show that  $H$  is a contraction mapping for  $t \in [0, T]$ . The first step is to show that in studying the fixed point of  $H$ , we can in fact consider  $H : C([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d})) \mapsto C([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$ . This will allow us to work in  $C([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$  instead of working in the larger space  $D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$  streamlining some elements of the proof.

For this reason we first derive some a-priori bounds and study regularity for  $Z_t$  satisfying the random ODE given by (4.2) where  $\bar{\mu}_t$  is the probability measure of the parameters at time  $t$ . Denoting by  $\mathbb{E}$  the expectation operator taken with respect to this measure (notice that here  $(x, y)$  are considered to be integration variables) we essentially consider the following system of random ODE's.

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= c_0 + \int_0^t \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (y - \mathbb{E}[c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)]) \sigma(w_s \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds, \\ w_t &= w_0 + \int_0^t \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (y - \mathbb{E}[c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)]) c_s \sigma'(w_s \cdot x) x \pi(dx, dy) ds. \\ (c_0, w_0) &\sim \bar{\mu}(0, c, w). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Lemma 4.1 shows that there is regularity in time and it also provides us with some useful a-priori uniform bounds.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There is a constant  $C < \infty$ , depending on  $T$ , such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (|c_t| + \|w_t\|) \leq C,$$

and for every  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$  we have that

$$|c_t - c_s| + \|w_t - w_s\| \leq C(t - s).$$

*Proof.* Let's examine  $c_t$  first and establish a bound on its growth. The constant  $C$  may change from line to line and it may also depend upon the final time  $T$ .

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= c_0 + \int_0^t \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (y - \mathbb{E}[c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)]) \sigma(w_s \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds. \\ c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x) &= \sigma(w_t \cdot x) c_0 + \sigma(w_t \cdot x) \int_0^t \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (y - \mathbb{E}[c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)]) \sigma(w_s \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds. \\ |c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x)| &\leq C|c_0| + C \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} |(y - \mathbb{E}[c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)]) \sigma(w_s \cdot x)| \pi(dx, dy) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is bounded. Now, we will use the facts that  $c_0, X$ , and  $Y$  have compact support.

$$\begin{aligned} |c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x)| &\leq C_1 + C_2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}[|c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x)|] \pi(dx, dy) ds. \\ |c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x)| &\leq C_1 + C_2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x')|] \pi(dx, dy) ds. \\ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x)|] &\leq C_1 + C_2 \int_0^t \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|c_s \sigma(w_s \cdot x')|] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Gronwall's inequality,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|c_t \sigma(w_t \cdot x)|] \leq C,$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ . Therefore, going back to (4.4) and recalling Assumption 1.1 we get that uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$

$$|c_t| \leq C.$$

Similarly, now from (4.3) we also obtain that there is a constant  $C < \infty$ , uniform in  $t \in [0, T]$  such that

$$\|w_t\| \leq C.$$

The latter statements imply the first statement of the lemma. Let us now prove the second statement of the lemma. Similarly to the calculations above and using the uniform bounds on  $c_t$  and  $w_t$  together with Assumption 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_t - c_s| &= \left| \int_s^t \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (y - \mathbb{E}[c_u \sigma(w_u \cdot x)]) \sigma(w_u \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) du \right| \\ &\leq C(t - s). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding statement  $\|w_t - w_s\| \leq C(t - s)$  follows along the same lines, concluding the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

As a consequence of the regularity result in Lemma 4.1, (4.3) is a continuous process. Therefore, we can prove a contraction in  $C([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$  (instead of studying the process in the larger space  $D([0, T]; M(\mathbb{R}^{1+d}))$ ).

Now that we have established this a-priori boundedness and regularity result, let us go back to the proof of uniqueness. Notice that Lemma 4.1 shows that  $c_t$  and  $w_t$  are bounded on  $[0, T]$ . Motivated by this fact, let us define the ‘‘bump’’ function  $b(z) \in C^\infty$  which is one for  $|z| \leq B$  and zero for  $|z| \geq 2B$ . If, for example  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |c_t| \leq C$  then we set  $B = 2C$ . Lemma 4.1 allows us to do so.

Let us define for notational convenience  $C_T = C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{1+d})$  and let  $M_T$  be the set of probability measures on  $C_T$ . Consider an element  $m \in M_T$ . Motivated by the discussion before Lemma 4.1 let us set  $\text{Law}(Y) = H(m.)$ , where, slightly abusing notation,  $Y = (c, w)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= c_0 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \left( y - \langle G_{s,x}, m \rangle \right) \sigma(w_s \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds, \\ w_t &= w_0 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \left( y - \langle G_{s,x}, m \rangle \right) c_s \sigma'(w_s \cdot x) x \pi(dx, dy) ds, \\ G_{s,x} &= c'_s \sigma(w'_s \cdot x) b(c'_s), \\ (c_0, w_0) &\sim \bar{\mu}(0, c, w). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

We next show existence and uniqueness of a fixed point  $\text{Law}(c_t, w_t)$  for the mapping  $H$ , as defined via (4.4). For  $m, m' \in M_T$  and  $p \geq 1$  define the metric

$$D_{T,p}(m, m') = \inf \left\{ \left( \int_{C_T \times C_T} \sup_{s \leq T} \|x_s - y_s\|_p^p \wedge 1 d\nu(x, y) \right)^{1/p}, \nu \in P(m, m') \right\},$$

where  $P(m, m')$  is the set of probability measures on  $C_T \times C_T$  such that the marginal distributions are  $m$  and  $m'$ , respectively. The space  $M_T$  endowed with the metric  $D_T$  is a complete metric space.

Now, for two elements  $m^1, m^2 \in M_T$ , let us set  $\text{Law}(Y^i) = \text{Law}((c^i, w^i)) = H(m^i)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$  with  $i = 1, 2$ . So, let  $(c_t^1, w_t^1)$  satisfying (4.4) with  $m = m^1$  and  $(c_t^2, w_t^2)$  satisfying (4.4) with  $m = m^2$ . The processes  $(c_t^1, w_t^1)$  and  $(c_t^2, w_t^2)$  have the same initial conditions. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} (c_0^1, w_0^1) &= (c_0^2, w_0^2) = (c_0, w_0), \\ (c_0, w_0) &\sim \bar{\mu}(0, c, w). \end{aligned}$$

We now prove a contraction for the mapping  $H$  for some  $0 < T_0 < T$ . By definition,  $(c_t^1, w_t^1)$  and  $(c_t^2, w_t^2)$  have marginal distributions  $H(m^1)$  and  $H(m^2)$ , respectively, on the time interval  $[0, T_0]$ . Once this is proven, we can extend this to the entire interval  $[0, T]$  since  $T_0$  is not affected by the input measures  $m^1, m^2$  or by which subinterval of  $[0, T]$  we are considering. We have the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $m^1, m^2 \in M_T$  and  $T < \infty$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C < \infty$  that may depend on  $T$  such that*

$$D_{t,1}(H(m^1), H(m^2)) \leq C \int_0^t D_{u,1}(m^1, m^2) du,$$

for any  $0 < t < T$ .

*Proof.* Using the formula (4.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_t^1 - c_t^2 &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \left( y - \langle G_{s,x}, m^1 \rangle \right) \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \left( y - \langle G_{s,x}, m^2 \rangle \right) \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds, \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha y \left( \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) - \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) \right) \pi(dx, dy) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \langle G_{s,x}, m^2 \rangle \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds - \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \langle G_{s,x}, m^1 \rangle \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds, \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha y \left( \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) - \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) \right) \pi(dx, dy) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \langle G_{s,x}, m^2 \rangle \left( \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) - \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \right) \pi(dx, dy) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \alpha \langle G_{s,x}, m^2 - m^1 \rangle \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds \end{aligned}$$

First, let's address the mean-field term. Recall that  $c'_s \sigma(w'_s x) b(c'_s)$  and  $\sigma'(\cdot)$  are bounded and that  $X, Y$  have compact support. Therefore, we get that

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \langle c'_s \sigma(w'_s x) b(c'_s), m^2 \rangle \left( \sigma(w_s^2 \cdot x) - \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \right) \pi(dx, dy) ds \right| \leq C \int_0^t \|w_s^2 - w_s^1\| ds.$$

We next bound the term

$$\left| \int_0^t \int \left( \langle c'_s \sigma(w'_s x) b(c'_s), m^2 - m^1 \rangle \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds \right) \right|$$

Since the map  $(c, w) \mapsto c \sigma(w \cdot x) b(c)$  is globally Lipschitz, we have that

$$|c^2 \sigma(w^2 \cdot x) b(c^2) - c^1 \sigma(w^1 \cdot x) b(c^1)| \leq K(|c^2 - c^1| + \|w^2 - w^1\|),$$

where  $K$  does not depend upon  $x$  (since  $X$  has compact support). Then, for  $0 \leq s \leq T$ ,

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \left( \langle c'_s \sigma(w'_s x) b(c'_s), m^2 - m^1 \rangle \right) \sigma(w_s^1 \cdot x) \pi(dx, dy) ds \right| \leq K \int_0^t D_{s,1}(m^1, m^2) ds.$$

Similar calculations also give the necessary bound for the difference  $w_t^1 - w_t^2$ . Hence, for  $0 \leq s \leq T$ , we eventually have the bound

$$\sup_{u \leq s} [|c_u^1 - c_u^2| + \|w_u^1 - w_u^2\|] \leq C_1 \int_0^s \left( |c_u^2 - c_u^1| + \|w_u^2 - w_u^1\| \right) du + C_2 \int_0^s D_{u,1}(m^1, m^2) du.$$

We then also have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq s} [ |c_u^1 - c_u^2| + \| w_u^1 - w_u^2 \| ] \right] \leq C_1 \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{\tau \leq u} [ |c_\tau^2 - c_\tau^1| + \| w_\tau^2 - w_\tau^1 \| ] \right] du + C_2 \int_0^s D_{u,1}(m^1, m^2) du.$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we then get for  $s \leq T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq s} [ |c_u^1 - c_u^2| + \| w_u^1 - w_u^2 \| ] \right] \leq C_2 \exp(C_1 s) \int_0^s D_{u,1}(m^1, m^2) du.$$

The latter display immediately implies the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

Lemma 4.2 immediately proves there is a contraction on the interval  $[0, T_0]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} D_{t,1}(H(m^1), H(m^2)) &\leq C \int_0^t D_{u,1}(m^1, m^2) du \\ &\leq C \int_0^t D_{t,1}(m^1, m^2) du \\ &\leq Ct D_{t,1}(m^1, m^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then, choose  $T_0$  such that  $CT_0 < 1$ . In fact we have Lemma 4.3.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $T < \infty$ . The mapping  $H_T = (F \circ F)_T$  has a unique fixed point.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.2 and the Banach fixed-point theorem we readily obtain that there is  $0 < T_0 < \infty$  such that  $H_{T_0}(m)$  will be a contraction map leading to (4.4) having a unique solution on  $[0, T_0]$ . We then extend this construction to the whole interval  $[0, T]$  by dividing the interval  $[0, T]$  into sub-intervals  $[0, T_0], [T_0, 2T_0], \dots, [T - T_0, T]$ . In each sub-interval, it can be shown that the solution is unique by proving a contraction as was done in Lemma 4.2, which can be done as  $T_0$  can be always taken to be of the same magnitude, i.e. it does not depend on which sub-interval is being examined. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of the Main Results

We now collect the results to prove Theorem 1.2, Corollary 1.4, and Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Let  $\pi^N$  be the probability measure corresponding to  $\mu^N$ . Each  $\pi^N$  takes values in the set of probability measures  $\mathcal{M}(D_E([0, T]))$ . Relative compactness, proven in Section 2, implies that every subsequence  $\pi^{N_k}$  has a further sub-sequence  $\pi^{N_{k_m}}$  which weakly converges. Section 3 proves that any limit point  $\pi$  of  $\pi^{N_{k_m}}$  will satisfy the evolution equation (1.7). Section 4 proves that the solution of the evolution equation (1.7) is unique. Therefore, by Prokhorov's Theorem,  $\pi^N$  weakly converges to  $\pi$ , where  $\pi$  is the distribution of  $\bar{\mu}$ , the unique solution of (1.7). That is,  $\mu^N$  converges in distribution to  $\bar{\mu}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.4.* The result follows from applying integration by parts to (1.7). We also use the fact that  $\bar{\mu} \rightarrow 0$  as  $|c|, |w| \rightarrow \infty$  (due to the bound in Lemma 4.1). We also note that if a solution exists to (1.8), then it is unique due to the uniqueness of (1.7).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* By Theorem 1.2 we have that the scaled empirical measure  $\mu^N$  converges in distribution in  $D_E([0, T])$  towards a deterministic limit  $\bar{\mu}$ . with the joint distribution of the weights  $(c_k^i, w_k^i)_{i=1}^N \in (\mathbb{R}^{1+d})^{\otimes N}$  being exchangeable. Then, by the Tanaka-Sznitman theorem (see for example Theorem 3.2 in [10] or [25]) we get that  $\rho^N$  will be  $\bar{\mu}$ -chaotic.  $\square$

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we develop a law of large numbers result for neural networks as the number of hidden layers and stochastic gradient descent iterations grow. The limiting distribution of the parameters is rigorously shown to satisfy an explicitly stated first order nonlinear deterministic PDE, in the form of a measure evolution equation. The limiting PDE is a function of the inputs to the model, such as the learning rate, activation function, and distribution of the observed data. A numerical study on the well-known MNIST dataset illustrates the theoretical results of this paper.

## References

- [1] C. Wang, J. Mattingly, and Y. Lu. Scaling limit: Exact and tractable analysis of online learning algorithms with applications to regularized regression and PCA. 2017, arXiv:1712.04332.
- [2] K. Giesecke, K. Spiliopoulos, and R. Sowers. Default clustering in large portfolios: Typical events. *The Annals of Applied Probability*. 23(1), 2013, 348-385.
- [3] K. Giesecke, K. Spiliopoulos, R. Sowers, and J. Sirignano. Large portfolio asymptotics for loss from default. *Mathematical Finance*. 25(1), 77-114, 2015.
- [4] J. Touboul. Propagation of chaos in neural fields. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 24(3), 1298-1328, 2014.
- [5] A. Barron. Approximation and estimation bounds for artificial neural networks. *Machine Learning*, 14(1), 115-133, 1994.
- [6] P. Bartlett, D. Foster, and M. Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 6241-6250, 2017.
- [7] L. Bo and A. Capponi. Systemic risk in interbanking networks. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*. 6(1), 386-424, 2015.
- [8] F. Delarue, J. Inglis, S. Rubenthaler, and E. Tanre. Particle systems with a singular mean-field self-excitation. Application to neuronal networks. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125(6), 2451-2492, 2015.
- [9] S. Ethier and T. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. 1986, Wiley, New York, MR0838085.
- [10] A.D. Gottlieb. Markov transitions and the propagation of chaos. In: ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI. PhD Thesis, University of California, Berkeley. 1998.
- [11] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. *Deep Learning*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2016.
- [12] B. Hambly and S. Ledger. A stochastic McKean-Vlasov equation for absorbing diffusions on the half-line. *The Annals of Applied Probability*. 27(5), 2698-2752, 2017.
- [13] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Networks*, 2(5), 359-366, 1989.
- [14] K. Hornik. Approximation capabilities of multilayer feedforward networks. *Neural Networks*, 4(2), 251-257, 1991.
- [15] J. Inglis and D. Talay. Mean-field limit of a stochastic particle system smoothly interacting through threshold hitting-times and applications to neural networks with dendritic component. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 47(5), 3884-3916, 2015.
- [16] V.N. Kolokoltsov. *Nonlinear Markov processes and kinetic equations* Vol. 182, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [17] C. Kuan and K. Hornik. Convergence of learning algorithms with constant learning rates. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 2(5), 484-489, 1991.
- [18] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton. Deep Learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436, 2015.
- [19] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278-2324, 1998.
- [20] S. Mallat. Understanding deep convolutional neural networks. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. 374.2065, 20150203, 2016.



- [21] O. Moynot and M. Samuelides. Large deviations and mean-field theory for asymmetric random recurrent neural networks. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 123(1), 41-75, 2002.
- [22] S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P. Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks 2018, arXiv: 1804.06561.
- [23] D. Silver et al. Mastering the game of Go with deep networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587), 484-489, 2016.
- [24] H. Sompolinsky, A. Crisanti, and H. Sommers. Chaos in random neural networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 61(3), 259, 1988.
- [25] A-S. Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. in *Ecole d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX - 1989*. series, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, P.-L. Hennequin, Ed. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg. 1464, 165-251, 1991.
- [26] M. Telgarsky. Benefits of depth in neural networks. 2016, arXiv:1602.04485.