

# How Many Samples are Needed to Estimate a Convolutional or Recurrent Neural Network? \*

**Simon Du**<sup>†</sup>

SSDU@CS.CMU.EDU

**Yining Wang**<sup>†</sup>

YININGWA@CS.CMU.EDU

*Machine Learning Department, School of Computer Science*

*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Xiyu Zhai**

XIYUZHAI@MIT.EDU

*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

**Sivaraman Balakrishnan**

SIVA@STAT.CMU.EDU

*Department of Statistics and Data Science*

*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Ruslan Salakhutdinov**

RSALAKHU@CS.CMU.EDU

**Aarti Singh**

AARTI@CS.CMU.EDU

*Machine Learning Department, School of Computer Science*

*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

**Editor:**

## Abstract

It is widely believed that the practical success of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) owes to the fact that CNNs and RNNs use a more compact parametric representation than their Fully-Connected Neural Network (FNN) counterparts, and consequently require fewer training examples to accurately estimate their parameters. We initiate the study of rigorously characterizing the sample-complexity of estimating CNNs and RNNs. We show that the sample-complexity to learn CNNs and RNNs scales linearly with their intrinsic dimension and this sample-complexity is much smaller than for their FNN counterparts. For both CNNs and RNNs, we also present lower bounds showing our sample complexities are tight up to logarithmic factors. Our main technical tools for deriving these results are a localized empirical process analysis and a new technical lemma characterizing the convolutional and recurrent structure. We believe that these tools may inspire further developments in understanding CNNs and RNNs.

**Keywords:** convolutional neural networks, recurrent neural networks, sample-complexity, minimax analysis

## 1. Introduction

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) have achieved remarkable impact in many machine learning applications. The key building block

\*. A preliminary version of this paper titled “How Many Samples are Needed to Estimate a Convolutional Neural Network” appeared in Proceedings of the 32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018), with results for convolutional neural networks only.

†. Simon Du and Yining Wang contributed equally to this work.

of these improvements is the use of weight sharing layers to replace traditional fully connected layers, dating back to LeCun et al. (1995); Rumelhart et al. (1988). A common folklore for explaining the success of CNNs and RNNs is that they use a more compact representation than Fully-connected Neural Networks (FNNs) and thus require fewer samples to reliably estimate. However, to our knowledge, there is no rigorous characterization of the precise sample-complexity of learning a CNN or an RNN and thus it is unclear, from a statistical point of view, why using CNNs or RNNs often results in a better performance than just using FNNs.

**Our Contributions:** In this paper, we take a step towards understanding the statistical behavior of CNNs and RNNs. We adapt tools from localized empirical process theory (van de Geer, 2000) and combine them with a structural property of convolutional filters in CNNs (see Lemma 9, 10) or the recurrent transition matrix in RNNs (see Lemma 11) to give a sharp characterization of the sample-complexity of estimating simple CNNs and RNNs.

1. We first consider the problem of estimating a convolutional filter with *average* pooling (described in Section 2.1) using the least squares estimator. We show in the standard statistical learning setting, under some conditions on the input distribution, the least squares estimate  $\hat{w}$  satisfies:

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} |F^{\text{CA}}(x, \hat{w}) - F^{\text{CA}}(x, w_0)|^2} = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{m/n}\right),$$

where  $\mu$  is the input distribution,  $w_0$  is the underlying true convolutional filter,  $m$  is the filter size, and  $F^{\text{CA}}(\cdot)$  denotes the convolutional network with average pooling. Notably, to achieve an  $\epsilon$  error, the CNN only needs  $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$  samples whereas the FNN needs  $\Omega(d/\epsilon^2)$  with  $d$  being the input size. Since the filter size  $m \ll d$ , this result clearly justifies the folklore that the convolutional layer is a more compact representation. Furthermore, we complement this upper bound with a minimax lower bound which shows the error bound  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m/n})$  is tight up to logarithmic factors.

2. Next, we consider a one-hidden-layer CNN in which the filter  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and output weights  $a \in \mathbb{R}^r$  are unknown. This architecture was previously considered in Du et al. (2018a). However, the focus of that work was on understanding the dynamics of gradient descent. Using similar tools as in analyzing a single convolutional filter, we show that the least squares estimator achieves the error bound  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{(m+r)/n})$  if the ratio between the stride size and the filter size is a constant. Further, we present a minimax lower bound showing that the obtained rate is tight up to logarithmic-factors.
3. Lastly, we consider an RNN as described in (7). Based on a new structural lemma for the RNN model, we show that the least squares estimator has prediction error upper bounded as  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dr/n})$ , where  $d$  is the input dimension and  $r$  is the dimension of the hidden state. On the other hand, the corresponding FNN has  $Ld$  features where  $L$  is the length of the input sequence. In typical applications, we have that  $r \ll L \ll d$  (see for instance the paper of Mikolov et al. (2010)). Our result demonstrates the sample-complexity benefits from using the RNN to exploit the hidden structure rather than using the FNN.

To our knowledge, these theoretical results are the first sharp analyses of the statistical sample-complexity of the CNN and RNN.

### 1.1 Comparison with existing work

Our work is closely related to the analysis of the generalization ability of neural networks (Arora et al., 2018; Anthony and Bartlett, 2009; Bartlett et al., 2017b,a; Neyshabur et al., 2017; Konstantinos et al., 2017; Li et al., 2018). These generalization bounds are often of the form:

$$L(\theta) - L_{\text{tr}}(\theta) \leq D/\sqrt{n} \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  represents the parameters of a neural network,  $L(\cdot)$  and  $L_{\text{tr}}(\cdot)$  represent population and empirical error under some *additive* loss, and  $D$  is the model capacity and is finite only if the (spectral) norm of the weight matrix for each layer is bounded. Comparing with generalization bounds based on model capacity, our result has two advantages:

- If  $L(\cdot)$  is taken to be the mean-squared<sup>1</sup> Eq. (1) implies an  $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$  sample-complexity to achieve a standardized mean-square error of  $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\cdot|^2} \leq \epsilon$ , which is considerably larger than the  $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$  sample-complexity we establish in this paper.
- Since the complexity  $D$  of a model class in regression problems typically depends on the magnitude of model parameters, generalization error bounds like (1) are not scale-independent and deteriorate if the magnitude of the parameters is large. In contrast, our analysis has no dependence on the magnitude.

On the other hand, we consider the special case where the neural network model is well-specified and the labels are generated according to a neural network with unbiased additive noise (see (2)) whereas the generalization bounds discussed in this section are typically model agnostic.


### 1.2 Other related work

Recently, researchers have made progress in theoretically understanding various aspects of neural networks, including understanding the hardness of estimation (Goel et al., 2016; Song et al., 2017; Brutzkus and Globerson, 2017), the landscape of the loss function (Kawaguchi, 2016; Choromanska et al., 2015; Hardt and Ma, 2016; Haeffele and Vidal, 2015; Freeman and Bruna, 2016; Safran and Shamir, 2016; Zhou and Feng, 2017; Nguyen and Hein, 2017a,b; Ge et al., 2018; Zhou and Feng, 2017; Safran and Shamir, 2017; Du and Lee, 2018), the dynamics of gradient descent (Tian, 2017; Zhong et al., 2017b; Li and Yuan, 2017), and developing provable learning algorithms (Goel and Klivans, 2017a,b; Zhang et al., 2015).

Focusing on the convolutional neural network, most existing work has analyzed the convergence rate of gradient descent or its variants (Du et al., 2018c,a; Goel et al., 2018; Brutzkus and Globerson, 2017; Zhong et al., 2017a). Our paper differs from these past works in that we do not consider the computational-complexity but only the sample-complexity and the fundamental information theoretic limits of estimating a CNN.

---

1. Because the mean-squared error  $\mathbb{E}|\cdot|^2$  is a sum of independent random variables, it is common to apply generalization error bounds directly on this quantity.



(a) Prediction function formalized (4). It consists of a convolutional filter followed by averaged pooling. The convolutional filter is unknown.

(b) Prediction function formalized in (5) It consists of a convolutional filter followed by a linear prediction layer. Both layers are unknown.

Figure 1: CNN architectures that we consider in this paper.

The convolutional structure has also been studied in the dictionary learning (Singh et al., 2018) and blind de-convolution (Zhang et al., 2017) literature. These papers studied the unsupervised setting where their goal is to recover structured signals from observations generated according to convolution operations whereas our paper focuses on the supervised learning setting where the target (ground-truth) predictor has a convolutional structure.

Our formulation of an RNN can be viewed as a special case of the classical (Kalman, 1960) problem of learning a linear dynamical system (Hazan et al., 2017; Hardt et al., 2018; Simchowitz et al., 2018; Oymak and Ozay, 2018). These recent works consider both computational and statistical issues and to our knowledge, their sample-complexity results are not tight.

Lastly, a line of recent works has studied over-parameterized neural networks, requiring the width of the neural network at every layer to be larger than the number of data points (Du et al., 2019, 2018b; Allen-Zhu et al., 2018b,b; Allen-Zhu and Li, 2019; Zou et al., 2018; Li and Liang, 2018; Arora et al., 2019). In particular, Arora et al. (2019); Allen-Zhu et al. (2018a); Allen-Zhu and Li (2019) showed that these over-parameterized neural networks can also generalize in some cases. These works are different from ours in their focus. We do not consider the over-parameterized setup. Instead we present tight information-theoretic characterizations of the fundamental statistical limits of estimating CNNs and RNNs.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the convolutional filter, convolutional neural network and recurrent neural network models that we study. We then introduce briefly the least squares estimator that we study for our upper bounds, and introduce the minimax risk which we subsequently lower bound.

### 2.1 Problem Setup

The  $i$ -th labeled data point is denoted as  $(X^i, Y^i)$ , where  $X^i$  is the input vector for the  $i$ -th data point and  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  represents its corresponding label. The basic models we study in

this paper are best abstracted in the form,

$$Y_i = F(X_i; \theta) + \xi_i, \quad (2)$$

where  $F$  represents the network,  $\theta \in \Theta$  are the underlying true parameters of the network, and  $\{\xi_i\}$  are zero-mean random variables capturing the measurement noise.

### 2.1.1 CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS WITH AVERAGE POOLING

We consider convolutional neural networks (CNN) with vector inputs, represented by  $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The convolutional filter is assumed to be of size  $m$ , with weight vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . The filter is applied to different segments of the input vector  $x^i$ , with a *stride* of  $s$ . More specifically, the CNN computes the inner products of

$$w^\top Q_s^0(x^i), \quad w^\top Q_s^1(x^i), \quad \dots, \quad w^\top Q_s^{\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor}(x^i), \quad (3)$$

where  $Q_s^\ell(x^i) = (x_{\ell s+1}^i, \dots, x_{\ell s+m}^i)$  is an  $m$ -dimensional segment of  $x^i$ . Afterwards, *average pooling* is used to aggregate the convolved inner products to obtain the final output:

$$Y^i = F^{\text{CA}}(X^i; w) + \xi_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor} w^\top Q_s^\ell(x^i) + \xi_i. \quad (4)$$

A graphical illustration of the CNN model with average pooling is given in Fig. 1a. Throughout the remainder of the paper, in order to simplify our analysis and notation we assume that both  $d$  and  $m$  are divisible by  $s$ , and consequently that  $\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor = (d-m)/s$ .

### 2.1.2 CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS WITH WEIGHTED POOLING

In addition to CNNs with average pooling, we also consider CNNs with an additional unknown *weighted* pooling layer, making the model essentially a two-layer neural network. To be more specific, building upon the convolutional inner products computed in Eq. (3), the outputs of CNNs with weighted pooling can be modeled as

$$Y^i = F^{\text{CW}}(X^i; w, a) + \xi_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor} a_\ell w^\top Q_s^\ell(x^i) + \xi_i, \quad (5)$$

where  $a = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor + 1}$  is an unknown vector of the additional weighted pooling layer, and  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are noise variables.

A graphical illustration of the CNN model with weighted pooling is given in Fig. 1b. Again, we assume that both  $d$  and  $m$  are divisible by  $s$ , and therefore  $\lfloor (d-m)/s \rfloor = (d-m)/s$ .

### 2.1.3 RECURRENT NEURAL NETWORKS

The recurrent neural network (RNN) is assumed to have  $r$  hidden units. More specifically, each input element  $x_t^i$  is associated with a latent representation  $h_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ . The network also has a pre-specified “starting state”  $h^i = 0$ . The dynamics of the latent representation is modeled as:

$$h_t^i = Ah_{t-1}^i + Bx_t^i, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, L, \quad (6)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$  are unknown weight matrices to be learnt. We assume a linear (identity) activation in (6). Finally, the regression response  $Y^i$  corresponding to  $X^i$  is modeled by an average pooling over the final state, i.e.:

$$Y^i = F^R(X^i, A, B) + \xi_i = \mathbf{1}^\top h_L^i + \xi_i, \quad (7)$$

where  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are noise variables.

## 2.2 Least-squares estimation

The estimators we consider throughout this paper are *least-squares* estimators. More specifically, on a training data set  $\{X^i, Y^i\}_{i=1}^n$  generated from an underlying network  $F$ , we solve the following problem to estimate the network parameters:

$$\hat{\theta} \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y^i - F(X^i; \theta)|^2. \quad (8)$$

Note that this optimization problem might not have a unique solution for networks  $F^{\text{CW}}$  or  $F^R$ . For instance, we may choose different scalings between  $w$  and  $a$  in  $F^{\text{CW}}$ , or exchange two hidden units in  $F^R$  when  $r \geq 2$ , and obtain the same function  $F$  and objective value. In such cases, any solution  $\hat{\theta}$  leading to the optimal least-squares objective value can be chosen, and our statistical guarantees apply to this estimate  $\hat{\theta}$ .

We remark that we only focus on the statistical rate of convergence for this estimator and we leave the analysis of computational complexity of solving the least squares problem as future work. In our experiments, we simply use gradient descent to obtain an estimate.

## 2.3 Assumptions and minimax analysis

We use *minimax analysis* (Lehmann and Casella, 2006; Tsybakov, 2009; Wasserman, 2013) to understand the fundamental limit of estimating convolutional and recurrent neural networks. We begin by introducing two regularity assumptions imposed on the distributions of  $\{X^i\}$  and  $\{Y^i\}$ :

- (A1) (Sub-gaussian noise):  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are independent, centered sub-Gaussian random variables with sub-Gaussian parameters upper bounded by  $\sigma^2$ ;
- (A2) (Non-degenerate random design): there exists a centered underlying sub-Gaussian distribution  $\mu$  with sub-Gaussian parameter  $C$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$  (for  $F^{\text{CA}}$  and  $F^{\text{CW}}$ ) or  $\{x_t^i\}_{i,t=1}^{n,L}$  (for  $F^R$ ) is i.i.d. sampled from  $P_X$ ; furthermore  $cI \preceq \mathbb{E}_\mu[xx^\top] \preceq CI$  for some constants  $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ .

To resolve the issues of non-identifiability of the parameter  $\theta$ , we use the *population prediction error* instead of the more classical parameter estimation error to characterize the information-theoretic sample-complexity of estimating convolutional or recurrent neural networks. Given a parameter estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  and the true underlying parameter  $\theta$  of a neural network  $F$ , the mean-square prediction error is defined as:

$$\text{err}(\hat{\theta}, \theta) := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\mu |F(x; \theta) - F(x; \hat{\theta})|^2}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mu$  is the (unknown) underlying distribution defined in Assumption (A2).

To evaluate and benchmark the quality of the least-squares estimator, we adopt the minimax framework to characterize the fundamental hardness of the estimation problems we study in this paper. The *minimax risk* of prediction is defined as

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F) := \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \theta} \left[ \text{err}(\hat{\theta}, \theta) \right], \quad (10)$$

where the  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \theta}$  notation summarizes the data generating process  $\{X^i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu$ ,  $Y^i = F(X^i; \theta) + \xi_i$ , and we use the notation  $\mathfrak{M}(n; F)$  to emphasize that the minimax risk depends crucially on the specific type of networks to be estimated and the size of the training sample. Although the minimax risk typically also depends on other problem parameters such as the input dimension, we suppress this dependency in the notation  $\mathfrak{M}(n; F)$  to concisely present our results.

### 3. Main results

In this section, we present our main upper and lower bounds on the minimax risk.

#### 3.1 Upper bounds

Throughout this section we assume the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold. We also suppress constants potentially depending on  $c$  and  $C$  (defined in Assumption A2) in the asymptotic  $\lesssim$  notation. We will establish the following upper bounds on the minimax prediction error of convolutional or recurrent neural networks.

**Theorem 1** *For  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$  and sufficiently large<sup>2</sup>  $n$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$  over the random draws of  $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$  (for  $F^{\text{CA}}$  and  $F^{\text{CW}}$ ) or  $\{x_t^i\}_{i,t=1}^{n,L}$  (for  $F^{\text{R}}$ ), it holds that*

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{CA}}) \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 m \log d}{n}}; \quad (11)$$

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{CW}}) \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 \min\{d, m + (d/s) \times (m/s)\} \cdot \log d}{n}}; \quad (12)$$

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{R}}) \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 (d + L) \min\{r, d\} \log(Ld)}{n}}. \quad (13)$$

#### Remarks:

1. All upper bounds are conditioned on the random draws of  $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$  or  $\{x_t^i\}_{i,t=1}^{n,L}$  (i.e., with expectation taken over the randomness of the noise variables  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ), and are attained by the least-squares estimator defined in (8).

---

2. A detailed scalings of  $n$  and other problem dependent parameters are given in the remarks immediately following Theorem 1.

2. The number of training data points  $n$  is “sufficiently large” under the context of Theorem 1 if it satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } F^{\text{CA}} : \quad n &\gtrsim c^{-1}C^2m \cdot \log(c^{-1}Cd \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{CW}} : \quad n &\gtrsim c^{-1}C^2 \min\{d, m + (m/s) \times (d/s)\} \cdot \log(c^{-1}Cd \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{R}} : \quad n &\gtrsim c^{-1}C^2(d + L) \min\{d, r\} \cdot \log(c^{-1}CLd \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

All upper bounds in Theorem 1 have convergence rates  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  for the standardized mean-square error (see Eq. (9)), which are in contrast to previous works based on concentration inequalities yielding mostly  $1/n^{1/4}$  convergence rates (Bartlett et al., 2017a; Neyshabur et al., 2015). Furthermore, all upper bounds in Theorem 1 are *scale-invariant*, because they do not depend in any way on the magnitude of the network weights  $w, a, A$  or  $B$ .

Omitting logarithmic terms, the results in Theorem 1 also match the intuition of “parameter counts”, which simply counts the number of unknown weight parameters in a neural network. More specifically, for the  $F^{\text{CA}}$  network, there are  $m$  unknown weight parameters ( $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ), which matches the  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m/n})$  rate in Eq. (11); for the  $F^{\text{CW}}$  network, there are  $(m + d/s)$  unknown weight parameters ( $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d/s}$ ), which matches the  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{(\min\{d, m + (m/s) \times (d/s)\})/n})$  rate in Eq. (12) when the stride  $s$  is on the same order of the filter size  $m$  (i.e.,  $m/s = O(1)$ ); for the  $F^{\text{R}}$  network, there are  $(dr + r^2)$  unknown weight parameters ( $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ ), which matches the  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{((d + L) \min\{d, r\})/n})$  rate in Eq. (13) when  $r \ll L \ll d$ , a common setting in natural language processing applications (Mikolov et al., 2010).

The three upper bound results in Theorem 1 share the same proof framework, yet with different covering number analysis tailored to each neural network structure separately. The proof framework is built upon the probability tool of *self-normalized empirical processes*, which (with high-probability) upper bounds the supremum of an empirical process with suitable normalization. Such upper bounds would eventually depend on the covering numbers of self-normalized parameter spaces, which we upper bound for different network structures ( $F^{\text{CA}}$ ,  $F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $F^{\text{R}}$ ) separately.

### 3.2 Lower bounds

To complement our results in Theorem 1, we prove the following theorem which establishes *lower bounds* on the minimax rates  $\mathfrak{M}(n; \cdot)$ , showing the information-theoretic limits of sample-complexity that no estimator could violate.

**Theorem 2** *Suppose  $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I)$  for  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $\{x_t^i\}_{i,t=1}^{n,L} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  for  $F^{\text{R}}$ . Suppose also  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . Then there exists a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{CA}}) \geq C \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 m}{n}}; \quad (14)$$

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{CW}}) \geq C \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 (m + d/s)}{n}}; \quad (15)$$

$$\mathfrak{M}(n; F^{\text{R}}) \geq C \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 \min\{rd, Ld\}}{n}}. \quad (16)$$



**Remarks:**

1. Theorem 2 establishes lower bounds for the *worst-case* prediction error of  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $F^{\text{R}}$  for *any* learning algorithm that takes as input  $n$  labeled data points and outputs a prediction network  $\widehat{F}$ . This is clear from the definition of the minimax rates  $\mathfrak{M}(n; \cdot)$ .
2. While Theorem 2 considers isotropic Gaussian  $\{x^i\}$ ,  $\{x_t^i\}$  and Gaussian noises  $\{\xi_i\}$ , this should *not* be interpreted as a limitation because the isotropic Gaussian data points and noises are a special case of the general learning problem covered by the upper bounds in Theorem 1. Hence, a lower bound for the isotropic Gaussian case implies a lower bound for the more general case.

The lower bound results in Theorem 2 also corroborate the “parameter counting” intuition, and match the upper bound results in Theorem 1 up to logarithmic factors, under common scenarios and settings. More specifically, for the  $F^{\text{CA}}$  network, Eq. (14) matches Eq. (11) up to  $O(\sqrt{\log d})$  terms; for the  $F^{\text{CW}}$  network, Eq. (15) matches Eq. (12) up to  $O(\sqrt{\log d})$  terms, when  $s = \Omega(m)$  (and therefore  $m/s = O(1)$ ); for the  $F^{\text{R}}$  network, Eq. (16) matches Eq. (13) up to  $O(\sqrt{\log(Ld)})$  terms, provided that  $r = O(L)$  and  $L = O(d)$ .

To prove Theorem 2, we reduce it via standard results for lower bounding the minimax risk to the problem of finding “free segments” in certain structured linear models (Lemma 14). Such “free segments” are then analyzed in a case-by-case manner for the three networks structures  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}, F^{\text{R}}$  considered.

## 4. Proofs of upper bounds

While Theorem 1 technically consists of three different upper bounds, their proofs are similar to each other and therefore we decide to state the proofs in a unified framework, presented in this section. Some technical proofs are also deferred to the appendix for a cleaner presentation.

The proof can be roughly divided into three parts. In the first part, we use the standard statistical analysis of least-squares estimators, which uses the “basic inequality” to translate the task of upper bounding prediction error into upper bounding the covering number of a suitably self-normalized empirical process (van de Geer, 2000). In the second part, we use restricted eigenvalue arguments similar to (Bickel et al., 2009) to further simplify the self-normalized parameter class constructed in the first step. Finally, in the last part which is the most important step, we use a novel “linear subspace” argument to derive a relatively tight upper bound on the covering number of the desired self-normalized parameter class.

### 4.1 Structured linear models and the basic inequality

Our first observation is that all three models ( $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $F^{\text{R}}$ ) are *structured linear models*, meaning that they can be written as a linear regression model with additional structures imposed on the linear regressors. More specifically, we have the following proposition:

**Proposition 3** *Define vectors  $z^i$  and  $\theta$  as following:*

1. For  $F^{\text{CA}}$ ,  $z^i := X^i$  and  $\theta := \sum_{\ell=0}^{r-1} S_s^\ell(w)$ , where

$$S_s^\ell(w) = \underbrace{[0, \dots, 0]}_{\ell s \text{ zeros}}, w_1, \dots, w_m, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

2. For  $F^{\text{CW}}$ ,  $z^i := X^i$  and  $\theta := \sum_{\ell=0}^{r-1} a_\ell S_s^\ell(w)$ ;

3. For  $F^{\text{R}}$ ,  $z^i := (x_1^i \ x_2^i \ \dots \ x_L^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{Ld}$  and  $\theta := (\mathbf{1}^\top A^{L-1} B \quad \mathbf{1}^\top A^{L-2} B \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{1}^\top B)$ .

Then it holds for any  $F \in \{F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}, F^{\text{R}}\}$  that  $F(X^i; \theta) \equiv \langle z^i, \theta \rangle$ .

Proposition 3 is easily verified using definitions and elementary algebra. For notational simplicity, we will also use  $D$  to denote the dimension of the structured linear model induced by certain types of neural networks. In particular, for  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$  we have  $D = d$ , and for  $F^{\text{R}}$  we have  $D = Ld$ .

Let  $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^D$  be the least-squares estimator on training data  $\{X^i, Y^i\}_{i=1}^n$ . Define the *empirical norm* of and  $D$ -dimensional vector  $\vartheta$  as

$$\|\vartheta\|_X^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle z^i, \vartheta \rangle|^2. \quad (17)$$

Because  $\hat{\theta}$  minimizes the least-squares objective as defined in Eq. (8), we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \langle z^i, \hat{\theta} \rangle)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \langle z^i, \theta \rangle)^2.$$

Because  $Y_i = \langle z^i, \theta \rangle + \xi_i$ , the above inequality is reduced to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle z^i, \theta - \hat{\theta} \rangle + \xi_i)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2.$$

Re-arranging terms and canceling the  $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2/n$  on both sides of the above inequality, we obtain

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \langle z^i, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle. \quad (18)$$

## 4.2 Self-normalized empirical process and the Dudley's integral

Let  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  be the parameter set. That is, a  $D$ -dimensional vector  $\theta$  belongs to  $\Theta$  if and only if there exist a parameter configuration yielding  $\theta$  in the structured linear model defined in Proposition 3. Define the *self-normalized* parameter set  $\bar{\Theta}_X$  as

$$\bar{\Theta}_X := \{\phi = \theta - \theta' : \theta, \theta' \in \Theta, \|\phi\|_X \leq 1\}. \quad (19)$$

Define  $\mathbb{G}_X(\phi) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \langle z^i, \phi \rangle$  as the empirical process associated with  $\phi$ . We have the following lemma:

**Lemma 4** *For the parameter sets  $\Theta$  defined in Proposition 3 we have that:*

$$\sup_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle \leq \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \sup_{\phi \in \Theta_X} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \phi \rangle.$$

This lemma essentially follows by arguing that for each possible  $\hat{\theta} - \theta$  for  $\hat{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta$ , there is a corresponding vector  $\phi \in \Theta_X$  such that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle = \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \phi \rangle.$$

We defer the proof to the appendix. As a consequence of this lemma, by canceling out a  $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X$  term on both sides of Eq. (18), we have

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \leq 2 \cdot \sup_{\phi \in \Theta_X} \mathbb{G}_X(\phi). \quad (20)$$

Finally, note that for any  $\phi, \phi' \in \bar{\Theta}_X$ ,  $\mathbb{G}_X(\phi) - \mathbb{G}_X(\phi')$  is a centered sub-Gaussian random variable with sub-Gaussian parameter upper bounded by  $\sigma^2 \|\phi - \phi'\|_X^2$ . Subsequently, using Dudley's entropy integral (Dudley, 1967), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\phi \in \bar{\Theta}_X} \mathbb{G}_X(\phi) \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X)} d\epsilon, \quad (21)$$

where  $N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  is the covering number of  $\bar{\Theta}_X$  in  $\|\cdot\|_X$  (i.e., the size of the smallest set  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\sup_{\phi \in \bar{\Theta}_X} \inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi - \phi'\|_X \leq \epsilon$ ).

Combining Eqs. (20) and (21) we arrive at the following main inequality of this part of the proof:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \right] \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X)} d\epsilon. \quad (22)$$

### 4.3 Restricted eigenvalues

The  $\|\phi\|_X \leq 1$  constraint in the definition of  $\bar{\Theta}_X$  is quite difficult to exploit, and we hope to replace it with simpler constraints such as  $\|\phi\|_2 \leq 1$ . Traditionally, this is done by bounding the eigenvalues of the *sample covariance* of  $\{X^i\}_{i=1}^n$  and their corresponding expanded form  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$ . Unfortunately, in the regime of  $n \ll D$  the sample covariance of  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$  is certainly rank-deficient, making such an argument void.

To overcome this difficulty, we introduce *restricted eigenvalues* which are used extensively in high-dimensional statistics (Bickel et al., 2009; Wainwright, 2009).

**Definition 5 (Restricted Eigenvalues)** *For a data set  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$ , its smallest and largest restricted eigenvalues with respect to a parameter class  $\Phi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  is defined as*

$$\lambda_{\min}(\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n; \Phi) := \inf_{\phi \in \Phi} \|\phi\|_X^2 / \|\phi\|_2^2; \quad (23)$$

$$\lambda_{\max}(\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n; \Phi) := \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} \|\phi\|_X^2 / \|\phi\|_2^2. \quad (24)$$

For any  $\rho > 0$ , define  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  as

$$\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho) := \{\phi = \theta - \theta' : \theta, \theta' \in \Theta, \|\phi\|_2 \leq \rho\}. \quad (25)$$

Comparing the definitions of  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$  with  $\bar{\Theta}_X$ , the major difference is in the normalizing norm: in the definition of  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$  the  $\|\cdot\|_2$  norm is used to constrain the parameter set while in  $\bar{\Theta}_X$  the empirical norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  is used. Also, the definition of  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$  involves an additional “radius” parameter  $\rho > 0$ , allowing for more flexibility in later proofs.

The following lemma establishes restricted eigenvalues of  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$  with respect to  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$ , provided that the training set size  $n$  is sufficiently large.

**Lemma 6** *Suppose  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$  are sub-Gaussian random vectors with variance parameter  $Z^2$ . For any  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$  it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) &\geq \frac{c}{4} - O(Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}) \cdot \left( \epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_2(1), \|\cdot\|_2) \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right); \\ \lambda_{\max}(\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) &\leq 4C + O(Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}) \cdot \left( \epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_2(1), \|\cdot\|_2) \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 7** *For  $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$  defined in Proposition 3, their sub-Gaussian parameters  $Z^2$  can be bounded as  $Z^2 \leq C^2$  for all  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $F^{\text{R}}$ , where  $C$  is the constant in Assumption (A2).*

The proof of Lemma 6 is quite involved and we defer it to the appendix. Note that the right sides of both inequalities in Lemma 6 do *not* depend on  $\rho$ . This is natural and is expected, because the restricted eigenvalues defined in Eqs. (23,24) are scale-invariant.

#### 4.4 Covering number upper bounds

The objective of this section is to give upper bounds on covering numbers of self-normalized parameter classes. Since the parameter classes depend heavily on the underlying network structures, we derive their corresponding covering numbers separately. However, the derivation of all covering numbers will rely on a crucial lemma bounding the covering number of *low-dimensional linear subspaces*, which we state below:

**Lemma 8** *Fix  $q, k \leq q, \rho > 0$ , and  $\epsilon' \in (0, 1/2]$ . There exists a set  $\mathcal{W}$  consisting of a finite number of  $k$ -dimensional linear subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  that satisfies the following: for any  $K$ -dimensional linear subspace  $S$  in  $\mathbb{R}^q$ , there exists  $S' \in \mathcal{W}$  such that*

$$\sup_{u \in S, \|u\|_2 \leq \rho} \inf_{v \in S', \|v\|_2 \leq \rho} \|u - v\|_2 \leq \epsilon'. \quad (26)$$

*Furthermore, the size of  $\mathcal{W}$  can be upper bounded as  $\log |\mathcal{W}| \lesssim kq \log(\rho q / \epsilon')$ .*

The proof of Lemma 8 is deferred to the appendix.

#### 4.4.1 COVERING NUMBER FOR $F^{\text{CA}}$

**Lemma 9** *For  $\Theta$  induced by  $F^{\text{CA}}$  and any  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ , it holds that*

$$\log(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho), \|\cdot\|_2) \lesssim m \log(\rho d/\epsilon).$$

**Proof** Let  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$  be  $d$ -dimensional parameterizations of  $w$  and  $w'$ , respectively, as derived in Proposition 3. Denote also  $\theta(\mathcal{I}_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d/s\}$  as the  $j$ th  $s$ -dimensional segment of  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , corresponding to the segment starting with the  $((j-1)s+1)$ -th entry and ending with the  $js$ -th entry. Denote also  $w(\mathcal{I}_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$  as the  $j$ th  $s$ -dimensional segment of  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $J = m/s$ . For  $\phi = \theta - \theta'$ , it is easy to verify that

$$\phi(\mathcal{I}_j) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\min\{j, J\}} w(\mathcal{I}_\ell) - w'(\mathcal{I}_\ell), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d/s. \quad (27)$$

Because  $\|\phi\|_2 \leq \rho$ , we have that  $\|\phi(\mathcal{I}_j)\|_2 \leq \rho$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, d/s$ , and subsequently

$$\|w(\mathcal{I}_j) - w'(\mathcal{I}_j)\|_2 \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^j \|\phi(\mathcal{I}_\ell)\|_2 \leq J\rho, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \quad (28)$$

Therefore,

$$\|w - w'\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \|w(\mathcal{I}_j) - w'(\mathcal{I}_j)\|_2 \leq J^2\rho. \quad (29)$$

Next construct a covering set  $\mathcal{H}$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\|x\|_2 \leq J^2\rho$ ,  $\min_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \|x - z\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$  for some parameter  $\epsilon' > 0$  to be specified later. Such construction is standard (see, e.g., van de Geer (2000)), and the size of  $\mathcal{H}$  can be upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{H}| \lesssim m \log(J\rho/\epsilon')$ . Because  $w - w' \in \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfies  $\|w - w'\|_2 \leq J^2\rho$ , it holds that

$$\min_{v \in \mathcal{H}} \|(w - w') - v\|_2 \leq \epsilon'. \quad (30)$$

Define  $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as  $\tilde{v}(\mathcal{I}_j) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\min\{j, J\}} v(\mathcal{I}_\ell)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d/s$ . Eq. (30) and (27) imply that

$$\|\phi - \tilde{v}\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d/s} \max_{\ell \leq J} \|(w(\mathcal{I}_\ell) - w'(\mathcal{I}_\ell)) - v(\mathcal{I}_\ell)\|_2 \leq d\epsilon'/s \leq d\epsilon'.$$

Setting  $\epsilon' = \epsilon/d$  we have  $\log |\mathcal{H}| \lesssim m \log(d\rho/\epsilon)$ , which completes the proof of Lemma 9. ■

#### 4.4.2 COVERING NUMBER FOR $F^{\text{CW}}$

**Lemma 10** *For  $\Theta$  induced by  $F^{\text{CW}}$  and any  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ , it holds that*

$$\log(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho), \|\cdot\|_2) \lesssim \min\{d, m + (d/s) \times (m/s)\} \cdot \log(\rho d/\epsilon).$$

**Proof** Let  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$  be  $d$ -dimensional parameterizations of  $w, a$  and  $w', a'$ , respectively, as derived in Proposition 3. Denote also  $\theta(\mathcal{I}_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d/s\}$  as the  $j$ th  $s$ -dimensional segment of  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , corresponding to the segment starting with the  $((j-1)s+1)$ -th entry and ending with the  $js$ -th entry. Denote also  $w(\mathcal{I}_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$  as the  $j$ th  $s$ -dimensional segment of  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $J = m/s$ . For  $\phi = \theta - \theta'$ , it is easy to verify that

$$\phi(\mathcal{I}_j) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\min\{j, J\}} a_\ell w(\mathcal{I}_\ell) - a'_\ell w'(\mathcal{I}_\ell), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d/s. \quad (31)$$

Clearly, Eq. (31) implies that

$$\phi(\mathcal{I}_j) \in \text{span}\{w(\mathcal{I}_1), w'(\mathcal{I}_1), \dots, w(\mathcal{I}_J), w'(\mathcal{I}_J)\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d/s, \quad (32)$$

where  $J = m/s$ . This observation motivates a two-step construction of covering sets of  $\overline{\Theta}_2(\rho)$ : by first constructing a covering set of all  $2J$ -dimensional linear subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^s$ , and then covering all vectors within each linear subspace whose  $\ell_2$  norms are upper bounded by  $\rho$ .

Choosing  $q = s$  and  $k = \min\{2J, s\}$  in Lemma 8, we have a covering set  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $2J$ -dimensional linear subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^s$  with size upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{W}| \lesssim Js \log(\rho s/\epsilon') = m \log(\rho s/\epsilon')$ . Next, for each linear subspace  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ , construct a finite covering set  $\mathcal{H}(W) \subseteq W$  such that  $\sup_{x \in W, \|x\|_2 \leq \rho} \min_{v \in \mathcal{H}(W)} \|x - v\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$ . Because  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^s$  and  $\dim(W) \leq k \leq 2J$ , such a finite covering set  $\mathcal{H}(W)$  exists with  $\log |\mathcal{H}(W)| \lesssim J \log(\rho/\epsilon') = (m/s) \times \log(\rho/\epsilon')$ .

Next, construct covering set  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  as

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \underbrace{\mathcal{H}(W) \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}(W)}_{d/s \text{ times}}.$$

By Eq. (32) and the covering properties of  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{H}(W)$ , it holds that

$$\sup_{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta} \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \|(\theta - \theta') - v\|_2 \leq 2d\epsilon'/s \leq 2d\epsilon'.$$

Furthermore, the size of  $\mathcal{M}$  can be upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{M}| \leq \log |\mathcal{W}| + \max_{W \in \mathcal{W}} L \log |\mathcal{H}(W)| \lesssim m \log(\rho s/\epsilon') + (d/s) \times (m/s) \times \log(\rho/\epsilon')$ . Setting  $\epsilon' = \epsilon/(2d)$ , we obtain a covering  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\overline{\Theta}_2(\rho)$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_2$  up to precision  $\epsilon$ , with size  $\log |\mathcal{M}| \lesssim (m + (d/s) \times (m/s)) \log(\rho d/\epsilon)$ .

Finally, note that  $\log N(\epsilon; \overline{\Theta}_2(\rho), \|\cdot\|_2) \lesssim d \log(\rho/\epsilon)$  always holds because  $\overline{\Theta}_2(\rho) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 \leq \rho\}$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 10.  $\blacksquare$

#### 4.4.3 COVERING NUMBER FOR $F^R$

**Lemma 11** For  $\Theta$  induced by  $F^R$  and any  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ , it holds that

$$\log(\epsilon; \overline{\Theta}_2(\rho), \|\cdot\|_2) \lesssim (d + L) \cdot \min\{d, r\} \log(\rho L d/\epsilon).$$

**Proof** Let  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$  be  $Ld$ -dimensional parameterizations of  $A, B$  and  $A', B'$ , respectively, as derived in Proposition 3. Denote also  $\theta(\mathcal{I}_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  as the  $j$ th  $d$ -dimensional segment of  $\theta$ , corresponding to the segment starting with the  $((j-1)d+1)$ -th entry and ending with the  $jd$ -th entry. By definition,  $\phi = \theta - \theta'$  satisfies

$$\phi(\mathcal{I}_j) = \theta(\mathcal{I}_j) - \theta'(\mathcal{I}_j) = \mathbf{1}^\top A^{L-j} B - \mathbf{1}^\top (A')^{L-j} B'. \quad (33)$$

Let  $b_1, \dots, b_r, b'_1, \dots, b'_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the rows of  $B$  and  $B'$ , respectively. Eq. (33) then implies

$$\phi(\mathcal{I}_j) \in \text{span}\{b_1, \dots, b_r, b'_1, \dots, b'_r\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (34)$$

Eq. (34) motivates a two-step construction of covering sets of  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$ : by first constructing a covering set of all  $2r$ -dimensional linear subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and then covering all vectors within each linear subspace whose  $\ell_2$  norms are upper bounded by  $\rho$ .

Choosing  $q = d$  and  $k = \min\{2r, d\}$  in Lemma 8, we have a covering set  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $2r$ -dimensional linear subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with size upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{W}| \lesssim \min\{d, r\} \cdot d \log(\rho d / \epsilon')$ . Next, for each linear subspace  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ , construct a finite covering set  $\mathcal{H}(W) \subseteq W$  such that  $\sup_{x \in W, \|x\|_2 \leq \rho} \min_{v \in \mathcal{H}(W)} \|x - v\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$ . Because  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\dim(W) \leq k = \min\{2r, d\}$ , such a finite covering set  $\mathcal{H}(W)$  exists with  $\log |\mathcal{H}(W)| \lesssim \min\{2r, d\} \log(\rho / \epsilon')$ .

Next, construct covering set  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{Ld}$  as

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \underbrace{\mathcal{H}(W) \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}(W)}_{L \text{ times}}.$$

By Eq. (34) and the covering properties of  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{H}(W)$ , it holds that

$$\sup_{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta} \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \|(\theta - \theta') - v\|_2 \leq 2L\epsilon'.$$

Furthermore, the size of  $\mathcal{M}$  can be upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{M}| \leq \log |\mathcal{W}| + \max_{W \in \mathcal{W}} L \log |\mathcal{H}(W)| \lesssim \min\{d, r\} (d \log(\rho d / \epsilon') + L \log(\rho / \epsilon'))$ . Setting  $\epsilon' = \epsilon / (2L)$ , we obtain a covering  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_2$  up to precision  $\epsilon$ , with size  $\log |\mathcal{M}| \lesssim (d+L) \cdot \min\{d, r\} \log(\rho L d / \epsilon)$ . ■

## 4.5 Putting everything together

In this section we complete the proofs of the three minimax upper bounds in Theorem 1. First we derive conditions under which  $\lambda_{\min}(\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) \geq c/8$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) \leq 8C$  with high probability. Select  $\epsilon = \kappa c / C \sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}$  for some sufficiently small constant  $\kappa > 0$ , so that the  $\epsilon \cdot O(C^2 \sqrt{\log n / \delta})$  term in Lemma 6 is upper bounded by  $c/16$ . Using the upper bounds on  $\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho), \|\cdot\|_2)$  in Lemmas 9, 10 and 11, it is easy to verify that, if  $n$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } F^{\text{CA}} : \quad & n \gtrsim c^{-1} C^2 m \cdot \log(c^{-1} C d \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{CW}} : \quad & n \gtrsim c^{-1} C^2 \min\{d, m + (m/s) \times (d/s)\} \cdot \log(c^{-1} C d \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{R}} : \quad & n \gtrsim c^{-1} C^2 (d+L) \min\{d, r\} \cdot \log(c^{-1} C L d \log(n/\delta)) \log^2(n/\delta), \end{aligned}$$

then with probability  $1 - \delta$ , both  $\lambda_{\min}(\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) \geq c/8$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n; \bar{\Theta}_2(\rho)) \leq 8C$  hold. The rest of the proof will be conditioned on the success event that these two RE-type inequalities hold.

When the RE conditions hold, we have  $(c/16)\|\phi\|_2^2 \leq \|\phi\|_X^2 \leq 16C\|\phi\|_2^2$  for all  $\phi \in \Theta$ . The covering number  $\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  can then be upper bounded as

$$\log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X) \leq \log N(\epsilon/4\sqrt{C}; \bar{\Theta}_2(4/\sqrt{c}), \|\cdot\|_2).$$

Invoking Lemmas 9, 10 and 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } F^{\text{CA}} : \quad & \log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X) \lesssim m \log(c^{-1}Cd/\epsilon), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{CW}} : \quad & \log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X) \lesssim \min\{d, m + (m/s) \times (d/s)\} \cdot \log(c^{-1}Cd/\epsilon), \\ \text{For } F^{\text{R}} : \quad & \log N(\epsilon; \bar{\Theta}_X, \|\cdot\|_X) \lesssim (d + L) \cdot \min\{d, r\} \log(c^{-1}CLd/\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Incorporating the above inequalities into Eq. (22), and noting that  $\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\max\{\log(1/\epsilon), 0\}} d\epsilon = O(1)$ , we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

## 5. Proofs of lower bounds

To prove the minimax lower bounds in Theorem 2 we use the following result from Tsybakov (2009):

**Lemma 12 (Tsybakov (2009))** *Let  $\Theta_M = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_M)$  be a finite collection of parameters and let  $P_j$  be the distribution induced by parameter  $\theta_j$ , for  $j \in \{0, \dots, M\}$ . Let also  $\mathfrak{d} : \Theta_M \times \Theta_M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a semi-distance. Suppose the following conditions hold:*

1.  $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_j, \theta_k) \geq 2\rho > 0$  for all  $j, k \in \{0, \dots, M\}$ ;
2.  $P_j \ll P_0$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ; <sup>3</sup>
3.  $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \text{KL}(P_j \| P_0) \leq \gamma \log M$ ;

then the following bound holds:

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta_j \in \Theta_M} \Pr_j \left[ \mathfrak{d}(\hat{\theta}, \theta_j) \geq \rho \right] \geq \frac{\sqrt{M}}{1 + \sqrt{M}} \left( 1 - 2\gamma - 2\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\log M}} \right). \quad (35)$$

With Lemma 12, the problem of lower bounding the minimax risk  $\mathfrak{M}(n; \cdot)$  can be reduced to the question of constructing appropriate ‘‘adversarial’’ parameter sets  $\Theta' \in \Theta$ , with upper bounded KL divergence and lower bounded distance measure  $\mathfrak{d}(\cdot, \cdot)$  between considered parameters. Because in our lower bounds the data points  $\{x^i\}$  (for  $F^{\text{CA}}, F^{\text{CW}}$ ) or  $\{x_t^i\}$  (for  $F^{\text{R}}$ ) follow isotropic Gaussian distributions, and the noise variables are distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ , we have the following corollary as a consequence of Lemma 12:

---

3.  $P \ll Q$  means that the support of  $P$  is contained in the support of  $Q$ .



**Corollary 13** *Let  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  be the parameter set induced by network  $F$ , as derived in Proposition 3. For any finite subset  $\Theta' = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_M\} \subseteq \Theta$ , denote  $\rho_{\min} := \min_{j>0} \|\theta_0 - \theta_j\|_2/2$  and  $\rho_{\text{avg}}^2 := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|\theta_i - \theta_0\|_2^2$ . Then for any  $n$ ,*

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}_n} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_\mu [\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta\|_2] \geq \rho_{\min} \times \frac{\sqrt{M}}{1 + \sqrt{M}} \left( 1 - \frac{n\rho_{\text{avg}}^2}{\sigma^2 \log M} - 2\sqrt{\frac{n\rho_{\text{avg}}^2}{2\sigma^2 \log^2 M}} \right).$$

The proof of Corollary 13 involves some routine verifications of the conditions in Lemma 12, and is placed in the appendix.

The following lemma considers the special case when a certain number of components in  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  are allowed to vary freely.

**Lemma 14** *Let  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  be the parameter set induced by network  $F$ , and  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [D]$  be a subset of components. Suppose for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ , there exists  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $\theta$  restricted to  $\mathcal{I}$  equals  $u$ . Then there exists a finite subset  $\Theta' \subseteq \Theta$  as in Corollary 13, with  $\log M \asymp |\mathcal{I}|$  and  $\rho_{\min} \asymp \rho_{\text{avg}} \asymp \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .*

Lemma 14 will be proved in the appendix, based on the standard construction of separable constant-weight codes (e.g., (Wang and Singh, 2016, Lemma 9), (Graham and Sloane, 1980, Theorem 7)). It will play a central role in the proofs of lower bounds for the networks  $F^{\text{CA}}$ ,  $F^{\text{CW}}$  and  $F^{\text{R}}$ , as we state separately below.

### 5.1 Proof of minimax lower bound for network $F^{\text{CA}}$

We shall prove the following lemma, showing that the first  $m$  components of  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  can vary freely under  $F^{\text{CA}}$ .

**Lemma 15** *Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\Theta = \{\theta(w) : w \in \mathbb{R}^m\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\theta(w) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{(d-m)/s} \mathcal{S}_s^\ell(w)$  as defined in Proposition 3. Then for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , there exists  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $\theta$  restricted on  $\mathcal{I}$  equals  $u$ .*

**Proof** Recall that  $J = m/s$  is a positive integer. Let  $u(\mathcal{J}_1), \dots, u(\mathcal{J}_J)$  denote the  $J$  segments of  $u$ , each of length  $s$ . To construct the weight vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we decompose  $w$  into  $w(\mathcal{J}_1), \dots, w(\mathcal{J}_J)$  as well, and construct

$$w(\mathcal{J}_j) = u(\mathcal{J}_j) - \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} u(\mathcal{J}_k), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, J-1.$$

Because  $\theta(w) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{(d-m)/s} \mathcal{S}_s^\ell(w)$ , it is easy to verify that  $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$  constructed above and its corresponding  $\theta(w)$  has the same first  $m$  components as  $u$ . The lemma is thus proved. ■

With Lemma 15, Eq. (14) in Theorem 2 immediately follows from Corollary 13 and Lemma 14, with  $\epsilon$  in Lemma 14 set as  $\epsilon \asymp \sigma\sqrt{m/n}$ .

## 5.2 Proof of minimax lower bound for network $F^{\text{CA}}$

Because  $d/s + m \leq 2 \max(d/s, m)$ , it suffices to prove minimax lower bounds of  $\sqrt{\sigma^2 m/n}$  and  $\sqrt{\sigma^2 d/(sn)}$  separately.

**Lemma 16** *Let  $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 1+s, \dots, 1+(d/s-1)s\}$ . Let also  $\Theta = \{\theta(w, a) : w \in \mathbb{R}^m, a \in \mathbb{R}^{d/s}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the induced parameter space, where  $\theta(w, a) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{(d-m)/s} a_\ell \mathcal{S}_s^\ell(w)$ . Then for any  $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2\}$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ , there exists  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $\theta$  restricted on  $\mathcal{I}$  equals  $u$ .*

**Proof** We first prove the lemma for  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_1$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}_1|}$ . Consider  $a = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $w = u$ . Then  $\theta(w, a) = (w, 0, \dots, 0)$  and therefore the first  $m$  components of  $w$  equal  $u$ .

We next prove the lemma for  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_2$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}_2|}$ . Consider  $w = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $a = u$ . Then  $\theta(w, a) = (a_0, 0, \dots, 0, a_1, 0, \dots)$  and therefore  $\theta(w, a)$  restricted to  $\mathcal{I}_2$  equal  $u$ .  $\blacksquare$

With Lemma 15, Eq. (15) in Theorem 2 immediately follows from Corollary 13 and Lemma 14, with  $\epsilon$  in Lemma 14 set as  $\epsilon \asymp \sigma \sqrt{\max\{m, d/s\}/n}$ .

## 5.3 Proof of minimax lower bound for network $F^{\text{R}}$

We establish the following lemma showing that for the network  $F^{\text{R}}$  and its equivalent linear parameter  $\theta$  defined in Proposition 3, the last  $\min\{rd, Ld\}$  components of  $\theta$  are free to vary.

**Lemma 17** *Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, \min(rd, Ld)\}$  and  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{Ld}$  be the parameter space induced by  $F^{\text{R}}$ , as shown in Proposition 3. Then for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ , there exists  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $\theta$  restricted on  $\mathcal{I}$  equals  $u$ .*

**Proof** Denote  $r' = \min\{r, L\}$  and for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ , let  $u(\mathcal{J}_1), \dots, u(\mathcal{J}_{r'}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be its  $r'$  segments, each of length  $d$ . Let also  $\theta(\mathcal{J}_1), \dots, \theta(\mathcal{J}_{r'})$  be the corresponding  $d$ -dimensional segments of the last  $r'd$  components of  $\theta$ , corresponding to an RNN network  $F^{\text{R}}$  with weight matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ . By definition,  $\theta(\mathcal{J}_\ell) = \mathbf{1}^\top A^{r'-\ell} B$ .

Consider diagonal matrix  $A = \text{diag}(\{a_i\}_{i=1}^r)$ . Because  $\theta(\mathcal{J}_\ell) = u(\mathcal{J}_\ell)$  for all  $\ell \in [r']$ , we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r a_i^\ell b_{ij} = [u(\mathcal{J}_{r'-\ell+1})]_j, \quad \ell \in \{0, \dots, r'-1\}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (36)$$

Define matrix  $G \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r'}$  as  $G_{i\ell} = \{a_i^\ell\}_{i,\ell=1}^{r,r'}$ . Subsequently, Eq. (36) can be compactly rewritten as

$$Gc_j = v_j, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (37)$$

where  $c_j = \{b_{ij}\}_{i=1}^r$  and  $v_j = \{[u(\mathcal{J}_{r'-\ell+1})]_{\ell=0}^{r'-1}\}$  are both  $r$ -dimensional vectors. Because  $r' \leq r$  and the vectors  $\{c_j\}$  “partition” the parameter matrix  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ , to prove the existence of such  $\{c_j\}$  for any  $\{v_j\}$  we only need to show that the rows of  $G$  are linearly independent. By taking  $a_i := i/r$ , it is clear that  $G$  has linearly independent rows because it is a Vandermonde matrix with distinct roots  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^r$ .  $\blacksquare$




Figure 2: Experiments on the problem of estimating a convolutional filter with average pooling described in Eq. (4) with stride size  $s = 1$ .




Figure 3: Experiments on the problem of estimating a convolutional filter with average pooling described in Eq. (4) with stride size  $s = m$ , i.e., non-overlapping.

With Lemma 17, Eq. (16) in Theorem 2 follows from Corollary 13 and Lemma 14, with  $\epsilon$  in Lemma 14 set as  $\epsilon \asymp \sigma \sqrt{\min\{rd, Ld\}/n}$ .

## 6. Experiments

In this section we use simulations to verify our theoretical findings.. We first consider CNNs. We let the ambient dimension  $d$  be 64 and the input distribution be Gaussian with mean 0 and identity covariance. In all plots, CNN represents using convolutional parameterization corresponding to Eq. (4) or Eq. (5) and FNN represents using fully connected parametrization.

In Figure 2 and Figure 3, we consider the problem of estimating a convolutional filter with average pooling. We vary the number of samples, the dimension of filters and the stride size. Here we compare parameterizing the prediction function as a  $d$ -dimensional linear predictor and as a convolutional filter followed by average pooling. Experiments show CNN parameterization is consistently better than the FNN parameterization. Further, as number of training samples increases, the prediction error goes down and as the dimension of filter increases, the error goes up. These facts qualitatively justify our derived error bound  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)$ . Lastly, in Figure 2 we choose stride  $s = 1$  and in Figure 3 we choose stride size equals to the filter size  $s = m$ , i.e., non-overlapping. Our experiment shows the stride




Figure 4: Experiment on the problem of one-hidden-layer convolutional neural network with a shared filter and a prediction layer described in Eq. (5). The filter size  $m$  is chosen to be 8.




Figure 5: Experiment on RNN described in Eq. (7), we choose  $d = L = 50$  and varies the number of hidden units  $r$  and number of training data.

does *not* affect the prediction error in this setting which coincides our theoretical bound in which there is no stride size factor.

In Figure 4, we consider the one-hidden-layer CNN model  $F^{\text{CW}}$ . Here we fix the filter size  $m = 8$  and vary the number of training samples and the stride size. When stride  $s = 1$ , convolutional parameterization has the same order parameters as the linear predictor parameterization ( $r = 57$  so  $r + m = 65 \approx d = 64$ ) and Figure 4a shows they have similar performances. In Figure 4b and Figure 4c we choose the stride to be  $m/2 = 4$  and  $m = 8$  (non-overlapping), respectively. Note these settings have less parameters ( $r + m = 23$  for  $s = 4$  and  $r + m = 16$  for  $s = 8$ ) than the case when  $s = 1$  and so CNN gives better performance than FNN.

We conduct similar experiments to compare RNN and FNN in Figure 5. We set input dimension  $d = 50$  and length of the sequence  $L = 50$ . Again we use Gaussian input and vary the number of hidden units and number of training data. From Figure 5, it is clear that RNN parameterization requires much fewer samples than the naive FNN parameterization.

## 7. Concluding remarks and discussion

In this paper we give rigorous characterizations of the statistical efficiency of CNN with simple architectures. Now we discuss how to extend our work to more complex models and main difficulties.

**Non-linear Activation:** Our paper only considered CNN and RNN with linear activation. A natural question is what is the sample-complexity of estimating a CNN and RNN with non-linear activation like Rectified Linear Units (ReLU). We find that even without convolution structure, this is a difficult problem. For linear activation function, we can show the empirical loss is a good approximation to the population loss and we used this property to derive our upper bound. However, for ReLU activation, we can find a counter example for any finite  $n$ . We believe if there is a better understanding of non-smooth activation, we can extend our analysis framework to derive sharp sample-complexity bounds for CNN and RNN with non-linear activation function.

**Multiple Filters:** For both CNN models we considered in this paper, there is only one shared filter. In commonly used CNN architectures, there are multiple filters in each layer and multiple layers. Note that if one considers a model of  $k$  filters with linear activation with  $k > 1$ , one can always replace this model by a single convolutional filter that equals to the summation of these  $k$  filters. Thus, we can formally study the statistical behavior of wide and deep architectures only after we have understood the non-linear activation function. Nevertheless, we believe our empirical process based analysis is still applicable.

## Appendix A. Proofs of technical lemmas

### A.1 Proof of Lemma 4

For each of the parameter sets  $\Theta$  we consider we need to verify that,

$$\sup_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle \leq \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \sup_{\phi \in \Theta_X} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_j \langle z^i, \phi \rangle.$$

It suffices to show for  $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$  that the vector  $v := (\hat{\theta} - \theta) / \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \in \Theta_X$ . It is clear that the vector  $\|v\|_X \leq 1$ , and to complete the proof using the definition of the set  $\Theta_X$  it is sufficient to show that  $\theta / \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X, \hat{\theta} / \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \in \Theta$ . Recall, the definitions:

1. For  $F^{\text{CA}}$ ,  $\Theta$  is the set of all  $\theta := \sum_{\ell=0}^{r-1} S_s^\ell(w)$ , where

$$S_s^\ell(w) = [\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\ell s \text{ zeros}}, w_1, \dots, w_m, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

2. For  $F^{\text{CW}}$ ,  $\Theta$  is the set of all  $\theta := \sum_{\ell=0}^{r-1} a_\ell S_s^\ell(w)$ ;
3. For  $F^{\text{R}}$ ,  $\Theta$  is the set of all  $\theta := (\mathbf{1}^\top A^{L-1} B \quad \mathbf{1}^\top A^{L-2} B \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{1}^\top B)$ .

In each case, given  $\theta \in \Theta$  we can see that  $c\theta \in \Theta$  for any  $c \geq 0$ . In more detail, in cases (1) and (2) we simply replace  $w$  by  $cw$  and in case (3) we replace  $B$  by  $cB$  to obtain a valid vector  $c\theta \in \Theta$ . As a consequence we see that,  $\theta / \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X, \hat{\theta} / \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_X \in \Theta$ , completing the proof.

### A.2 Proof of Lemma 6

Without loss of generality we only need to consider  $\phi = \theta - \theta'$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ , and  $\|\phi\|_2 = 1$  (regardless of the value of  $\rho$ ), because the restricted eigenvalues are scale-invariant. Also, we shall only prove the lower bound on  $\lambda_{\min}$ , with the upper bound on  $\lambda_{\max}$  being a simple symmetric argument.

Let  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \overline{\Theta}_2(1)$  be the smallest set such that for any  $\phi = \theta - \theta'$ ,  $\|\phi\|_2 = 1$ , there exists  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\|\phi - \phi'\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ . We then have for  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n; \overline{\Theta}_2(\rho)) &\geq \inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} (\|\phi'\|_X - \|\phi - \phi'\|_X)^2 \geq \inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} (\|\phi'\|_X - \max_i \|z^i\|_2 \|\phi - \phi'\|_2)^2 \\ &\geq \inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} (\|\phi'\|_X - O(Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}) \cdot \epsilon)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\geq \inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi'\|_X^2 - O(Z\epsilon\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}), \quad (39)$$

where Eq. (38) holds with probability  $1 - \delta/2$  because  $\max_i \|z^i\|_2 = O(Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)})$  with probability  $1 - \delta/2$ , by standard sub-Gaussian concentration inequalities.

In the rest of this proof we lower bound  $\inf_{\phi' \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi'\|_X^2$ . For every  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ , there must exist  $\phi \in \overline{\Theta}_2(1)$ ,  $\|\phi\|_2 = 1$  such that  $\|\phi' - \phi\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ , because otherwise we can remove  $\phi'$  from  $\mathcal{H}$ , which would violate the minimality of  $\mathcal{H}$ . We then have  $\|\phi'\|_2 \geq \|\phi\|_2 - \|\phi - \phi'\|_2 \geq 1 - \epsilon \geq 1/2$ , because  $\epsilon \leq 1/2$  as assumed. This implies that  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\|\phi'\|_\mu := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\mu[|\langle z, \phi' \rangle|^2]} \geq 1/2\sqrt{c}$  and  $\|\phi'\|_\mu \leq 2\sqrt{C}$  for all  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ , thanks to Assumption (A2).

Next fix arbitrary  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ . By sub-Gaussianity of  $\{z^i\}$ , with probability  $1 - \delta/2$  we have that  $\max_i |\langle z^i, \phi' \rangle| \lesssim Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}$  because  $\|\phi'\|_2 \leq 2$ . Using Hoeffding's inequality (Hoeffding, 1963) we have with probability  $1 - \delta/2$ , conditioned on the event  $\max_i |\langle z^i, \phi' \rangle| \lesssim Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}$ , that

$$\left| \|\phi'\|_X^2 - \|\phi'\|_\mu^2 \right| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle z^i, \phi' \rangle|^2 - \mathbb{E}_\mu[|\langle z, \phi' \rangle|^2] \right| \lesssim Z\sqrt{\log(n/\delta)} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}. \quad (40)$$

Lemma 6 is then proved, by combining Eqs. (39,40) and the established fact that  $1/2\sqrt{c} \leq \|\phi'\|_\mu \leq 2\sqrt{C}$ , and using an union bound over all  $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ , whose size is upper bounded by  $|\mathcal{H}| \leq N(\epsilon; \overline{\Theta}_2(1), \|\cdot\|_2)$ .

### A.3 Proof of Lemma 8

Without loss of generality we only prove Lemma 8 for the case of  $\rho = 1$ , while the general case of  $\rho \neq 1$  is implied by multiplying  $u, v$  and  $\epsilon'$  by  $\rho$  in Eq. (26).

Let  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  be two linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^q$  of dimension at most  $K$ . Let  $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times k}$  be the corresponding orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ , with orthogonal columns. Any  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\|u\|_2 \leq 1$  can then be written as  $u = U\alpha$  with  $\|\alpha\|_2 = 1$ . Consider  $v := V\alpha$ . It is easy to verify that  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\|v\|_2 \leq 1$ . In addition,  $\|u - v\|_2 = \|(U - V)\alpha\|_2 \leq \|U - V\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|U - V\|_F$ . Subsequently, a covering of  $\{U \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times k} : \|U\|_F \leq \sqrt{k}\|U\|_{\text{op}} = \sqrt{k}\}$  in  $\|\cdot\|_F$  up to precision  $\epsilon'$  implies a covering in the sense of Eq. (26). By viewing  $U$  as a  $(k \times q)$ -dimensional vector in the Euclidean space, it is easy to see that such a cover exists with size  $\log N \lesssim (kq) \log(kq/\epsilon') \lesssim kq \log(q/\epsilon')$ .

### A.4 Proof of Corollary 13

Select  $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_j, \theta_k) := \|\theta_j - \theta_k\|_2$ . Condition 1 in Lemma 12 is clearly satisfied with  $\rho = \rho_{\min} = \min_{j>0} \|\theta_0 - \theta_j\|_2/2$ . Condition 2 in Lemma 12 is also satisfied, because the noise variables  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  follow Gaussian distributions whose support span the entire  $\mathbb{R}$ . For Condition 3, note that the KL divergence between  $P_j, P_0$  parameterized by  $\theta_j$  and  $\theta_0$  can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(P_j \| P_0) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{x_i} \left[ \text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(x_i^\top \theta_j, \sigma^2) \| \mathcal{N}(x_i^\top \theta_0, \sigma^2)) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{x_i} \left[ \frac{|x_i^\top (\theta_j - \theta_0)|^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{n \|\theta_j - \theta_0\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(0, I)$ . Hence,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \text{KL}(P_j \| P_0) = \frac{n}{2\sigma^2} \times \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \|\theta_j - \theta_0\|_2^2 = \frac{n}{2\sigma^2} \times \rho_{\text{avg}}^2,$$

and therefore  $\gamma$  in Condition 3 of Lemma 12 can be chosen as  $\gamma = (n\rho_{\text{avg}}^2)/(2\sigma^2 \log M)$ .

### A.5 Proof of Lemma 14

Without loss of generality assume  $\mathcal{I}$  corresponds to the first  $|\mathcal{I}|$  components of  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ . The first step is to construct a finite set of binary vectors  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$  such that

$$\forall h, h' \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \Delta_H(h, h') = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \mathbf{1}\{h_i \neq h'_i\} \gtrsim |\mathcal{I}|. \quad (41)$$

Using the construction of constant-weight codes (e.g., (Wang and Singh, 2016, Lemma 9), (Graham and Sloane, 1980, Theorem 7)), a finite set  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying Eq. (41) exists, with size lower bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{H}| \gtrsim |\mathcal{I}|$ .

Next define

$$\Theta' := \{\theta \in \Theta : \theta(\mathcal{I}) = \epsilon h, h \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

The existence of such a  $\Theta'$  is guaranteed by the condition of this lemma, where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a small positive number to be specified later. It is easy to see that  $\Theta'$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  has one-to-one correspondence, and therefore  $\log |\Theta'| = \log |\mathcal{H}| \gtrsim |\mathcal{I}|$ . Furthermore, for any  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta'$  and their corresponding  $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta - \theta'\|_2 &\geq \|\theta(\mathcal{I}) - \theta'(\mathcal{I})\|_2 = \epsilon \times \sqrt{\Delta_H(h, h')} \gtrsim \epsilon \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}; \\ \|\theta - \theta'\|_2^2 &\geq \|\theta(\mathcal{I}) - \theta'(\mathcal{I})\|_2^2 = \epsilon^2 \times \Delta_H(h, h') \gtrsim \epsilon^2 |\mathcal{I}|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\rho_{\min} \gtrsim \epsilon |\mathcal{I}|$  and  $\rho_{\text{avg}}^2 \gtrsim \epsilon^2 |\mathcal{I}|$ . Setting  $\epsilon \asymp \sigma/\sqrt{n}$  and invoking Corollary 13 we complete the proof of Lemma 14.

## References

- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Can SGD learn recurrent neural networks with provable generalization? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01028*, 2019.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Yingyu Liang. Learning and generalization in overparameterized neural networks, going beyond two layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04918*, 2018a.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03962*, 2018b.
- Martin Anthony and Peter L Bartlett. *Neural network learning: Theoretical foundations*. cambridge university press, 2009.
- Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Behnam Neyshabur, and Yi Zhang. Stronger generalization bounds for deep nets via a compression approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05296*, 2018.
- Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Ruosong Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08584*, 2019.
- Peter L Bartlett, Dylan J Foster, and Matus J Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6241–6250, 2017a.
- Peter L Bartlett, Nick Harvey, Chris Liaw, and Abbas Mehrabian. Nearly-tight VC-dimension and pseudodimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.02930*, 2017b.
- Peter J Bickel, Yaacov Ritov, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(4):1705–1732, 2009.
- Alon Brutzkus and Amir Globerson. Globally optimal gradient descent for a convnet with gaussian inputs. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 605–614. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Anna Choromanska, Mikael Henaff, Michael Mathieu, Gérard Ben Arous, and Yann LeCun. The loss surfaces of multilayer networks. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 192–204, 2015.
- Simon Du, Jason Lee, Yuandong Tian, Aarti Singh, and Barnabas Poczos. Gradient descent learns one-hidden-layer CNN: Dont be afraid of spurious local minima. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1339–1348, 2018a.
- Simon S Du and Jason D Lee. On the power of over-parametrization in neural networks with quadratic activation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1328–1337, 2018.



- Simon S Du, Jason D Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03804*, 2018b.
- Simon S. Du, Jason D. Lee, and Yuandong Tian. When is a convolutional filter easy to learn? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018c.
- Simon S. Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- R. M. Dudley. The sizes of compact subsets of hilbert space and continuity of gaussian processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 1:290–330, 1967.
- C Daniel Freeman and Joan Bruna. Topology and geometry of half-rectified network optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01540*, 2016.
- Rong Ge, Jason D. Lee, and Tengyu Ma. Learning one-hidden-layer neural networks with landscape design. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Surbhi Goel and Adam Klivans. Eigenvalue decay implies polynomial-time learnability for neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03708*, 2017a.
- Surbhi Goel and Adam Klivans. Learning depth-three neural networks in polynomial time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.06010*, 2017b.
- Surbhi Goel, Varun Kanade, Adam Klivans, and Justin Thaler. Reliably learning the ReLU in polynomial time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.10258*, 2016.
- Surbhi Goel, Adam Klivans, and Raghu Meka. Learning one convolutional layer with overlapping patches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02547*, 2018.
- Ron Graham and Neil Sloane. Lower bounds for constant weight codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 26(1):37–43, 1980.
- Benjamin D Haeffele and René Vidal. Global optimality in tensor factorization, deep learning, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.07540*, 2015.
- Moritz Hardt and Tengyu Ma. Identity matters in deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04231*, 2016.
- Moritz Hardt, Tengyu Ma, and Benjamin Recht. Gradient descent learns linear dynamical systems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):1025–1068, 2018.
- Elad Hazan, Karan Singh, and Cyril Zhang. Learning linear dynamical systems via spectral filtering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6702–6712, 2017.
- Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- Rudolph Emil Kalman. A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Journal of basic Engineering*, 82(1):35–45, 1960.

- Kenji Kawaguchi. Deep learning without poor local minima. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 586–594, 2016.
- Pitas Konstantinos, Mike Davies, and Pierre Vandergheynst. PAC-Bayesian margin bounds for convolutional neural networks-technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00171*, 2017.
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, et al. Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series. *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks*, 3361(10):1995, 1995.
- Erich L Lehmann and George Casella. *Theory of point estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- Xingguo Li, Junwei Lu, Zhaoran Wang, Jarvis Haupt, and Tuo Zhao. On tighter generalization bound for deep neural networks: Cnns, resnets, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05159*, 2018.
- Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01204*, 2018.
- Yuanzhi Li and Yang Yuan. Convergence analysis of two-layer neural networks with relu activation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 597–607, 2017.
- Tomáš Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukáš Burget, Jan Černocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Eleventh annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2010.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. Norm-based capacity control in neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1376–1401, 2015.
- Behnam Neyshabur, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, David McAllester, and Nathan Srebro. A PAC-Bayesian approach to spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09564*, 2017.
- Quynh Nguyen and Matthias Hein. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08045*, 2017a.
- Quynh Nguyen and Matthias Hein. The loss surface and expressivity of deep convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10928*, 2017b.
- Samet Oymak and Necmiye Ozay. Non-asymptotic identification of lti systems from a single trajectory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05722*, 2018.
- David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, Ronald J Williams, et al. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Cognitive modeling*, 5(3):1, 1988.
- Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. On the quality of the initial basin in overspecified neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 774–782, 2016.
- Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. Spurious local minima are common in two-layer relu neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08968*, 2017.

- Max Simchowitz, Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08334*, 2018.
- Shashank Singh, Barnabás Póczos, and Jian Ma. Minimax reconstruction risk of convolutional sparse dictionary learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1327–1336, 2018.
- Le Song, Santosh Vempala, John Wilmes, and Bo Xie. On the complexity of learning neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5514–5522, 2017.
- Yuandong Tian. An analytical formula of population gradient for two-layered relu network and its applications in convergence and critical point analysis. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 3404–3413, 2017.
- Alexandre B Tsybakov. Introduction to nonparametric estimation, 2009.
- Sara A van de Geer. *Empirical Processes in M-estimation*, volume 6. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- Martin J Wainwright. Sharp thresholds for high-dimensional and noisy sparsity recovery using  $\ell_1$ -constrained quadratic programming (lasso). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(5):2183–2202, 2009.
- Yining Wang and Aarti Singh. Noise-adaptive margin-based active learning and lower bounds under tsybakov noise condition. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2016.
- Larry Wasserman. *All of statistics: a concise course in statistical inference*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Yuchen Zhang, Jason D Lee, Martin J Wainwright, and Michael I Jordan. Learning half-spaces and neural networks with random initialization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.07948*, 2015.
- Yuqian Zhang, Yenson Lau, Han-wen Kuo, Sky Cheung, Abhay Pasupathy, and John Wright. On the global geometry of sphere-constrained sparse blind deconvolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4894–4902, 2017.
- Kai Zhong, Zhao Song, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Learning non-overlapping convolutional neural networks with multiple kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.03440*, 2017a.
- Kai Zhong, Zhao Song, Prateek Jain, Peter L Bartlett, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Recovery guarantees for one-hidden-layer neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 4140–4149. JMLR. org, 2017b.
- Pan Zhou and Jiashi Feng. The landscape of deep learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07038*, 2017.

Difan Zou, Yuan Cao, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic gradient descent optimizes over-parameterized deep ReLU networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08888*, 2018.