

# On the Approximation Capabilities of ReLU Neural Networks and Random ReLU Features

Yitong Sun

Department of Mathematics  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI, 48109  
syitong@umich.edu

Anna Gilbert

Department of Mathematics  
University of Michigan  
annacg@umich.edu

Ambuj Tewari

Department of Statistics  
University of Michigan  
tewaria@umich.edu

August 19, 2019

## Abstract

We study the approximation properties of random ReLU features through their reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). We first prove a universality theorem for the RKHS induced by random features whose feature maps are of the form of nodes in neural networks. The universality result implies that the random ReLU features method is a universally consistent learning algorithm. We prove that despite the universality of the RKHS induced by the random ReLU features, composition of functions in it generates substantially more complicated functions that are harder to approximate than those functions simply in the RKHS. We also prove that such composite functions can be efficiently approximated by multi-layer ReLU networks with bounded weights. This depth separation result shows that the random ReLU features models suffer from the same weakness as that of shallow models. We show in experiments that the performance of random ReLU features is comparable to that of random Fourier features and, in general, has a lower computational cost. We also demonstrate that when the target function is the composite function as described in the depth separation theorem, 3-layer neural networks indeed outperform both random ReLU features and 2-layer neural networks.

## 1 Introduction

Random features methods have drawn researchers' attention since Rahimi and Recht (2008) showed their connections to kernel methods. Examples include random Fourier features with Gaussian feature distribution approximating Gaussian kernels, and random binning features approximating Laplacian kernels. In supervised learning tasks, a linear regression function or classifier is learned on top of these random features.

When random features are used as standalone learning methods; that is, no kernels are chosen in advance, we want flexibility in choosing the feature map and feature distribution for such purposes as to lower computational cost or to inject prior knowledge. In this paper, we consider the random features using the following form of feature maps

$$\sigma(\omega \cdot x + b),$$

where  $(\omega, b)$  are the parameters to be randomly chosen according to a certain distribution. Linear combinations of this type of random features give solutions to supervised learning tasks in the form of neural networks. This provides a foundation for the comparison between kernel methods and neural networks.

We are particularly interested in using ReLU as the feature map, because ReLU activation nodes are widely used in deep neural networks for their computational advantages. Note that we do not need to evaluate the derivatives of feature maps in random features methods, so the advantage of ReLU in preventing vanishing or exploding gradient does not play a role in our case. However, using ReLU in random features methods may still provide other computational advantages over sigmoidal or sinusoidal feature maps. We will see in our experiments that random ReLU features models output sparser feature vectors, since each node either outputs 0 or identity.

To justify the use of a certain random feature in supervised learning tasks, we need to answer the question: *For a given feature map and a given feature distribution, under what conditions it is guaranteed that there exists a linear combination of randomly chosen features that is a good approximator to the target continuous function?*

In general, a supervised learning algorithm or its hypothesis class is called universal, if the hypothesis class is dense in the space of continuous functions. From classic results we know that neural networks of any non-polynomial activation functions are universal (Leshno et al., 1993). Even though linear combinations of non-polynomial activation functions form a dense subset in the space of continuous functions, it requires appropriate setup of parameters inside the activation functions to construct the approximator. And thus it does not imply that by randomly sampling inner weights, with high probability there exists a linear combination of randomly-chosen nodes approximating the target continuous function well.

In this work, we study the question asked above through the universality of the reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS) corresponding to the random features. Random Fourier features with Gaussian feature distribution and random binning features are potentially good choices in supervised learning tasks because their corresponding RKHS are universal (Micchelli et al., 2006). When the feature map is chosen to be  $\text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot \mathbf{x} + b)$  where the parameters vector  $(\omega, b)$  obeys the standard Gaussian over  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  or the uniform distribution over  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , the induced kernel is one of the arccos kernels and can be written in a closed form (Cho and Saul, 2009). When some other distributions or feature maps are considered, there may not be good closed forms for the induced kernels. Bach (2017a) analyzed the approximation property of the arccos kernels. Proposition 3 in Bach (2017a) implies the universality of arccos kernels by explicitly constructing functions in the RKHS of arccos kernels as approximators to Lipschitz functions. However this approach relies on the closed form of arccos kernels and thus may not work for random ReLU features with feature distribution other than Gaussian or uniform over the unit sphere. In this paper, we use tools from functional analysis and provide a set of broad sufficient conditions on the feature map  $\sigma$  and distribution of  $(\omega, b)$  for the universality of the corresponding RKHS.

Based on the universality result, the approximation capability of a random feature can be characterized by how well it approximates functions in the RKHS. For this part, by applying Bach (2017b)'s result, we reproduce Huang et al. (2006)'s result for bounded feature maps with a much simpler proof, and extend it to unbounded but admissible random features (See details of the admissibility condition in Section 3). These results provide an answer to the question we asked above on the existence of good approximators when using random features methods. We further show that the good hypothesis can always be found by solving the constrained empirical risk minimization problem on top of random ReLU features.

To further study the RKHS induced by the random ReLU feature, we investigate the composition of functions from its RKHS. Eldan and Shamir (2016) show that 3-layer ReLU networks with polynomial many nodes can express functions that cannot be approximated by any 2-layer ReLU networks with polynomially many ( $\text{poly}(d)$ ) nodes. Daniely (2017) constructs examples over  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  that can be well approximated by 3-layer ReLU networks with number of nodes and weights less than  $\text{poly}(d)$ , but not by any 2-layer ReLU networks with much more ( $\Omega(\exp(d))$ ) nodes and much larger weights. Lee et al. (2017) shows a similar depth

separation result for functions in Barron’s class (Barron, 1993) and their compositions. Following these works, we show a depth separation result for functions in the RKHS induced by the random ReLU feature. It shows that compositions of functions from the RKHS generate substantially more complicated functions that are hard to be approximated by functions in the RKHS. We also prove that compositions of functions from the RKHS can be approximated by a multi-layer ReLU network, with all weights bounded by constants depending on the RKHS norm of components of target functions. The depth separation result and the multi-layer approximation result together suggest that random ReLU features suffer from the common weakness of shallow models compared to deep ones.

To verify the performance of the random ReLU features method, we compared them to the random Fourier features method on several real and synthetic datasets. It is confirmed in our experiments that the random ReLU features method can achieve similar performance with random Fourier features method with lower computational cost. We also designed synthetic datasets according to the construction in the depth separation result and use them to demonstrate the difference among the performance of random ReLU features, 2-layer neural networks and 3-layer neural networks. The experiment clearly shows the limit of shallow models.

The overall contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

1. We establish sufficient conditions for the universality of kernels induced by a broad class of random features (Theorem 1). Based on this result we are able to prove the universality of random features in admissible cases (Corollary 1 and 2).
2. We describe the random ReLU features method (Algorithm 1) and show that it is universally consistent. We compare the performance of random ReLU features to random Fourier features and confirm the advantages of random ReLU features in computational cost.
3. We prove that compositions of functions in the RKHS induced by the random ReLU features generate more complicated functions (Proposition 3). And such composite functions can be efficiently approximated by multilayer ReLU networks (Proposition 4). Our experiments confirm the gap between the performance of shallow and deep models, and show that the good deep approximator can be found by simply running stochastic gradient descent.

In Section 2, we describe random features and reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and define the notations we use in the paper. The universality of the random ReLU features is given in Section 3. We describe a simple random ReLU features method and show its universal consistency in Section 4. The depth separation result of RKHSs induced by the random ReLU feature and the approximation by multilayer ReLU networks are presented in Section 5. The performance of random ReLU features in experiments and their strength and weakness are discussed in Section 6. All the proofs and extra experiment results can be found in the appendices.

## 2 Preliminaries on Random Features

Throughout the paper, we assume that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a closed subset contained in the ball centered at the origin of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with radius  $r$ . Let  $C(\mathcal{X})$  denote the space of all continuous functions on  $\mathcal{X}$  equipped with the supremum norm. When a subset of  $C(\mathcal{X})$  is dense, we call it universal.

For any positive symmetric kernel function  $k(x, x')$ , we call  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow H$ , where  $H$  is a Hilbert space, a feature map of  $k$ , if

$$k(x, x') = \langle \phi(x), \phi(x') \rangle_H. \tag{1}$$

Feature representations of kernels are very useful for understanding the approximation property of the RKHS, and also for scaling up kernel methods to large data sets. In practice, one can choose a kernel function for the

problem first, and then pick up a feature map based on some transformation of the kernel function. The process can also be reversed. One can design a map  $\phi$  from  $\mathcal{X}$  to a Hilbert space  $H$  first, and then define the kernel function by Equation 1. A class of useful feature maps chooses  $H$  to be  $L^2(\Omega, \omega, \mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is a probability distribution over the parameter space  $\Omega$ . We call the pair  $(\phi, \mu)$  a random feature. The corresponding kernel function and the RKHS are denoted by  $k_{\phi, \mu}$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{\phi, \mu}, \|\cdot\|_{\phi, \mu})$ , respectively. Any function  $f$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{\phi, \mu}$  can be described by

$$f(x) = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x; \omega) g(\omega) d\mu(\omega),$$

for some  $g \in L^2(\Omega, \omega, \mu)$ . The function  $g$  in the representation of  $f$  is not unique, and  $\|f\|_{\phi, \mu}$  equals the infimum of the  $L^2$  norm of all such  $g$ 's. Because  $\mu$  is a probability measure, we can approximate  $f$  using  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(x; \omega_i) g(\omega_i)$  with  $\omega_i$  sampled independently according to  $\mu$ . In a supervised learning task, the coefficients  $g(\omega_i)$  can be determined by a training process minimizing the empirical risk with respect to some loss function; this is known as the random features method. The generalization error of random Fourier features methods has been studied by Rudi and Rosasco (2017) and Sun et al. (2018). They have been shown to be able to achieve fast learning rates with number of nodes far fewer than the sample size. The performance of random features in practical problems such as speech recognition has also been investigated; see Huang et al. (2014). Note that in the entire process of applying a random features method, the kernel function does not show up at all.

The feature map we considered in this work is of the form  $\phi(x; \omega, b) = \sigma(\omega \cdot x + b)$  where  $\sigma$  is a non-linear continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We refer this feature map as of *neural network type*. To simplify our notations, we denote by  $(x, 1)$  the concatenation of the  $d$ -dimensional vector  $x$  and a scalar 1. Since we do not treat the bias variable  $b$  differently from the coefficients  $\omega$ , we view all the inner weights in one node as a  $d + 1$  dimensional vector and call it  $\omega$ . Hence, the function expressed by  $N$  random features will appear as

$$f_N(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \sigma(\omega_i \cdot (x, 1)).$$

We are most interested in the case where  $\sigma(z) = \max(0, z)$ , which is the ReLU node.

Other notations include:  $\mathbb{P}$  denotes the data distribution over  $\mathcal{X}$ ;  $|\cdot|$  means the Euclidean norm when the operand is a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , but the total variation norm when the operand is a measure;  $f_{i:j}$  represents the composition of functions  $f_j \circ \dots \circ f_i$ ;  $\mathbf{R}^\ell$  denotes the expected risk with respect to the loss  $\ell$ ; and  $\tau_d$  denotes the uniform probability distribution on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ .

### 3 Universality of Random Features

We start with the universality of the RKHS induced by random features of neural network type.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that  $|\sigma(z)| \leq K|z|^k + M$  for some  $M, K \geq 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Let  $\mu$  be a probability distribution whose support is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with  $\int |\omega|^{2k} d\mu(\omega) \leq M_2$ . If  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial, the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma, \mu}$  is universal.*

Theorem 1 shows that the RKHSs induced by a broad class of random features of neural network type are dense in the space of continuous functions. And hence the random features satisfying these conditions have a strong approximation capability.

Theorem 1 requires the feature distribution to be supported almost everywhere on  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . However, when the feature map is ReLU, this requirement can be relaxed due to the homogeneity. The following proposition provides us a sufficient condition for the universality of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \mu}$ .

**Proposition 1.** *When  $\mu$  is a probability distribution supported on a dense subset of a  $d$ -dimensional ellipsoid centered at the origin, the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU},\mu}$  is universal.*

This proposition is only stated for the regular feature space like  $\mathbb{S}^d$  or ellipsoids around the origin for simplicity of the statement. The proof actually works for any set  $\Omega$  satisfying the following property: for any  $\omega \neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , there exists a scalar  $c > 0$  such that  $c\omega \in \Omega$ . This proposition allows us to restrict the ReLU feature map to be a bounded function when the data set is bounded. And this will be important for us when we prove the approximation capability of random ReLU features.

As we mentioned in the introduction, the universality of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU},\mu}$ , when  $\mu$  is the uniform distribution over the unit sphere, has been shown implicitly by Bach (2017a). However, due to the non-constructive approach we take, it is much easier for us to prove the universality of the RKHS induced by  $(\text{ReLU}, \mu)$  with  $\mu$  supported over various domains.

In the next, we study the approximation properties of random ReLU features. As we mentioned in the introduction, since random features methods are not deterministic, the approximation property has to be stated with probability. Therefore we first give the following definition.

**Definition 1.** *Given a random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$ , if for any  $f$  in  $C(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ , there exist a positive integer  $N$  such that with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ , we can find coefficients  $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^N$  such that*

$$\|f_N - f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} < \epsilon,$$

*we say that the random feature is universal.*

If we know that the RKHS induced by the random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is universal, to show that it is universal in the sense of Definition 1, we need only verify that any function  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\sigma,\mu}$  can be approximated by a linear combination of finitely many random features,  $f_N$ , with high probability of random choice of  $\omega_i$ . This has been studied in Bach (2017b). To apply Bach's result, we make the following definition.

**Definition 2.** *A random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is called admissible if for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,*

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \langle \sigma_\omega, (\Sigma + \lambda I)^{-1} \sigma_\omega \rangle < \infty,$$

*where  $\Sigma : L_2(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{P})$  is defined by  $\Sigma f = \int k_{\sigma,\mu}(x, y) f(y) d\mathbb{P}(y)$ , and  $\sigma_\omega(x) = \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))$ .*

This property is used in earlier work (Sun et al., 2018; Rudi and Rosasco, 2017) to efficiently obtain random features in their learning rate analysis. It is a data-dependent property except for special cases such as bounded feature maps. How to design the admissible random features remains an open problem. Though it is data-dependent, it does not depend on the labels or target functions. And hence we may gain advantages in supervised learning tasks if we can design random features according to the characteristics of the data distribution.

With this admissibility assumption, we have the following sufficient condition for the universality of random features. This answers the question we asked in the introduction.

**Corollary 1.** *Assume that  $|\sigma(z)| \leq K|z|^k + M$  for some  $M, K \geq 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Let  $\mu$  be a probability distribution whose support is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with  $\int |\omega|^{2k} d\mu(\omega) \leq M_2$ . If  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial and  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is admissible with respect to the data distribution  $\mathbb{P}$ , the random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is universal.*

Though the admissibility assumption is usually data-dependent, the random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  with a bounded  $\sigma$  is always admissible. Therefore, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** *When  $\sigma$  is bounded and  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma,\mu}$  is universal. The random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is universal.*

Huang et al. (2006) proved that under the assumptions of Corollary 2, for any continuous function  $f$  and randomly generated  $\omega_i$ 's, with probability 1, there exist  $c_i$ 's such that  $f_N$  converges to  $f$  under  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ -norm as  $N$  goes to infinity. Note that Definition 1 only requires the convergence in probability instead of almost surely, and thus Corollary 2 seems to be weaker than Huang's result. They are actually equivalent. To see this, first note that the statement is on the existence of the approximator in the linear space of  $n$  random basis elements. Denote by  $E(\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$  the space spanned by  $\{\sigma(\omega_i \cdot (x, 1))\}_{i=1}^n$ . The convergence in probability stated in Corollary 2 implies that there exists a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  such that with probability 1, the infinite sequence of  $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  sampled randomly satisfies that  $E(\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^{n_k})$  contains an approximator converging to the target function as  $k$  goes to infinity. Since  $E(\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^n) \subset E(\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^m)$  whenever  $n \leq m$ , the almost sure convergence holds for all  $n$ .

Corollary 2 shows that random ReLU features with feature distribution  $\mu$  supported on ellipsoids around the origin can approximate any continuous function with high probability over the random choice of parameter  $\omega_i$ 's. The proofs of all the results in this section can be found in Appendix A. We will give a detailed description of the random ReLU features method in the supervised learning context and discuss its performance in Section 4 and Section 6.

## 4 Universal Consistency of the Random ReLU Features Method

Algorithm 1 describes the supervised learning algorithm using random ReLU features.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Random ReLU features method.

---

**input** :  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m, \gamma, R, N$

**Output** :  $f_N(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \text{ReLU}(\omega_j \cdot (x_i, 1/\gamma))$

Generate  $\{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathbb{S}^d$  according to  $\tau_d$ , the uniform distribution over  $\mathbb{S}^d$ ;

Choose appropriate loss function  $\ell$  according to the type of tasks, and solve the optimization problem:

$$\underset{\sum_{j=1}^N c_j^2 \leq R^2}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell \left( \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \text{ReLU}(\omega_j \cdot (x_i, 1/\gamma)), y_i \right)$$


---

The first hyper-parameter  $\gamma$  plays a similar role of the bandwidth parameter in random Fourier features method. Since the numerical ranges of features in different datasets may be large, introducing the bandwidth parameter can help normalize the data.

The second hyper-parameter  $R$  is the constraint on the 2-norm of the outer weights during the training. Considering the constrained instead of regularized form of optimization simplifies the generalization error analysis, and it is also practical based on our experiment results. In fact, since for a fixed number of random features, the capacity of the hypothesis class is limited, random features methods are less vulnerable to overfitting than traditional kernel method. This has been confirmed that carefully choosing the batch size and step size can avoid overfitting without use of regularizer or norm constraint in random features methods in regression tasks (Carratino et al., 2018).

Now we show that the random ReLU features method is a universally consistent supervised learning algorithm. For any function  $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$ , the standard statistical learning theory guarantees that Algorithm 1 will return a solution with excess risk sufficiently small if the sample size  $m$  and the number of features  $N$  are large enough and  $R$  is chosen to be greater than  $2\|f_0\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$ ; see Appendix B for details. Meanwhile, by

Proposition 1, we know that for any continuous function  $f^*$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  such that

$$\|f_0 - f^*\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \epsilon.$$

This proves the following statement.

**Proposition 2.** *The random ReLU features method (Algorithm 1) is universally consistent.*

To obtain a meaningful learning rate of the random ReLU features method beyond the universal consistency of the algorithm, we need to obtain tight upper bounds on the generalization and approximation errors. The generalization error bound tighter than Proposition 5 in Appendix B can be obtained by using local Rademacher complexity as in Sun et al. (2018). However, it is not clear yet how to obtain a tight bound on the approximation error. This is also discussed in Appendix B. We compare the performance of the random ReLU features method on several real and synthetic datasets with the random Fourier features method in Section 6.

## 5 Composition of Functions in the RKHS Induced by Random ReLU Features

Random features models belong to so-called shallow models. It is widely believed that an advantage of deep models over shallow ones is their capability to efficiently approximate composite functions. The following proposition shows that the composition of functions in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  generates substantially more complicated functions that are hard to be approximated by functions in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$ .

**Proposition 3.** *There exist universal constants  $c, C$  such that for any  $d > C$ , we can construct a probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  supported on a compact set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , and two functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\|f\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  and  $\|g\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_1}$  less than  $\text{poly}(d)$  such that the following holds. For every function  $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  with  $\|h\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \leq C \exp(cd)$ ,*

$$\|h - g \circ f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \geq c.$$

The proof is based on the construction of Daniely (2017). We first check that the functions considered in his work belong to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_1}$  with  $\text{poly}(d)$  norm. The key lemma in this step, Lemma 3, shows that power functions of the projections over a given direction belong to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  with a small norm. Then by Daniely’s work, we know that such a composite function can not be approximated by any 2-layer ReLU networks with all the weights and the number of nodes less than  $O(\exp(d))$ . On the other hand, we show in Corollary 3 that any functions in the RKHS with norm less than  $O(\exp(d))$  can be approximated by 2-layer ReLU networks with weights and number of nodes less than  $O(\exp(d))$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 3. See Appendix E for details.

Let’s define the RKHS norm for a vector valued function as the 2-norm of the RKHS norm of its components; that is, for  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{\oplus m}$ ,  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 := \sum_{i=1}^m \|(f)_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ . Proposition 4 shows that the composition of functions in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau}$  can always be efficiently approximated by a multilayer ReLU networks.

**Proposition 4.** *Assume that for all  $1 \leq i \leq L + 1$ ,  $K_i$  is a compact set with radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ , among which  $K_1 = \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $B^{m_i}$  denote the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ .  $\mathbb{P}$  is a probability measure on  $K_1$ .  $f_i : K_i + sB^{m_i} \rightarrow K_{i+1}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{m_i}}^{\oplus m_{i+1}}$  with RKHS norm less than  $R_i$ , for an  $s > 0$  and any  $1 \leq i \leq L$ . Then for  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $L$ -layer neural networks  $g_{1:L}$  with  $m_{i+1}N_i$  nodes in each layer, where*

$$N_i = \frac{\prod_{j=i}^L R_j^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2},$$

such that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f_{1:L} - g_{1:L}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon,$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on  $L, s, r, \{R_i\}_{i=1}^L$ . Moreover, the Frobenius norm of all the weight matrices are bounded by constants depending on  $R_i, r, s, m_i$  and bias terms are bounded by 1.

## 6 Experiments

We first compared the performance of the random ReLU features with the popular random Fourier features with the Gaussian feature distribution on four synthetic datasets (see Appendix F) and three real datasets: MNIST (Lecun and Cortes), adult and covtype (Dheeru and Karra Taniskidou (2017)).

For all four synthetic datasets, we used 20 random features for each method; for real datasets we used 2000 random features. We used hinge loss in binary classification tasks, and logistic loss in multi-class classification tasks. We chose to constrain the 2-norm of the outer weights by a large constant ( $10^3$  for synthetic datasets and  $10^4$  for real datasets) as described in Section 4. The optimization method was the plain stochastic gradient descent and the model was implemented using Tensorflow (Martín Abadi et al., 2015). The learning rate and bandwidth parameters were screened carefully for both models through grid search.

In Figure 1, we present the dependence of two methods on the bandwidth parameters in the screening step. Each point displays the best 5-fold cross validation accuracy among all learning rates. We can see that the performance of the random Fourier features with Gaussian distribution is more sensitive to the choice of bandwidth than the random ReLU features method. We list the accuracy and training time for two methods in




Figure 1: Cross validation accuracy of random Fourier features and random ReLU features. Left: adult. Middle: mnist. Right: covtype.

Table 1. For all the datasets, the random ReLU features method requires shorter training time. By checking the feature vectors, we found that half of coordinates of the random ReLU feature vectors are zeros, while none of coordinates of the random Fourier feature vectors are zeros. The random ReLU features method outperforms the random Fourier features with higher accuracy on adult and MNIST datasets. Its performance is similar to the random Fourier features method on sine, checkboard and square datasets. However, its performance on strips and covtype dataset is significantly worse.

The depth separation and multi-layer approximation results in Section 5 only prove the *existence* of the advantage of deeper models. It is not clear whether we can *find* good multi-layer approximators with significantly better performance than shallow models. Therefore, we designed a synthetic dataset that is supposedly hard to learn by shallow models according to the depth separation result, and used it to show the performance gap between deep and shallow models. The data uniformly distribute over  $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$  and the labels are generated by the target function  $\sin(8\pi(x_1x_3 + x_2x_4))$ ; see Figure 4. For this regression task, we trained

Table 1: Left: accuracy of random ReLU features versus random Fourier features. Right: training time of random ReLU features versus random Fourier features; The unit is second. The results are averages over 10 trials.

	Fourier	ReLU		Fourier	ReLU
sine	0.993(0.007)	0.984(0.005)	sine	1.597(0.050)	1.564(0.052)
strips	0.834(0.084)	0.732(0.006)	strips	1.598(0.056)	1.565(0.052)
square	0.948(0.038)	0.934(0.015)	square	1.769(0.061)	1.743(0.057)
checkboard	0.716(0.045)	0.743(0.027)	checkboard	1.581(0.078)	1.545(0.073)
adult	0.838(0.002)	0.846(0.002)	adult	6.648(0.181)	5.849(0.216)
mnist	0.937(0.001)	0.951(0.001)	mnist	70.438(0.321)	69.229(1.080)
covtype	0.816(0.001)	0.769(0.002)	covtype	125.719(0.356)	112.613(1.558)

three types of models: random ReLU features models, 2-layer neural networks, and 3-layer neural networks. The random ReLU features models and 2-layer neural networks have exactly the same structure. The only difference is whether the inner weights are randomly chosen or trained together with the outer weights. The number of nodes in the hidden layer of the random ReLU features models and 2-layer neural networks ranges from 20 to 5120 with each level doubling the preceding one. The 3-layer neural networks are fully connected with the equal width in each layer. To make a fair comparison, we fixed the total number of parameters of the 3-layer neural networks to be equal to the shallow models at each level. We used the adam optimizer in Tensorflow for the training of three types of models with learning rates screened using holdout validation. From




Figure 2: Performance of the deep and shallow models in the regression task. Left: mean squared error of three models at different levels of total parameters. The results are averages over 10 trials. Middle: the predicted labels (red) by the best random ReLU features model compared to the true labels (blue) plotted against the dot product  $x_1x_3 + x_2x_4$ . Right: the predicted labels (red) by the best 3-layer neural networks compared to the true labels (blue).

Figure 2, we can see that 3-layer neural networks consistently achieve significantly better performance whereas the gap between the 2-layer neural networks and random ReLU is not very large. By plotting the predicted labels on test dataset, we can see that the 3-layer neural network with the best performance indeed learns a function closer to the target function. In contrast, the random ReLU features model learns a more regular function and does not fully adapt to the rapid oscillation of the target function. Considering that 2-layer neural networks have much more adjustable parameters than random ReLU models, it is surprising that the 2-layer neural networks' performance is not significantly better than the random ReLU. This implies that the structure of models has a more important impact on the performance than the number of adjustable parameters. We also run experiments based on Eldan and Shamir's construction and observe similar phenomenon; see Appendix F.

The code of all the experiments can be found at: <https://github.com/syitong/randrelu>

## **7 Conclusion**

The study of universality of random features provides theoretical foundation of designing new random features algorithms. By comparing with random Fourier features, we believe that random ReLU features can bring improvement in computational cost in many tasks. The depth separation result shows the drawbacks of shallow models. But designing random features with composition structure is worth studying further. The performance comparison between random ReLU features models and 2-layer ReLU networks shows the possible trade-off between the number of random features and the number of total trainable parameters, which is interesting from the theoretical viewpoint since the optimality is always achievable for random features methods.

## References

- D. Azevedo and V. A. Menegatto. Sharp estimates for eigenvalues of integral operators generated by dot product kernels on the sphere. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 177:57–68, January 2014. ISSN 0021-9045. doi: 10.1016/j.jat.2013.10.002.
- Francis Bach. Breaking the Curse of Dimensionality with Convex Neural Networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(19):1–53, 2017a.
- Francis Bach. On the Equivalence between Kernel Quadrature Rules and Random Feature Expansions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(21):1–38, 2017b.
- Andrew R Barron. Universal approximation bounds for superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, 39(3):930–945, 1993.
- Luigi Carratino, Alessandro Rudi, and Lorenzo Rosasco. Learning with SGD and Random Features. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 10192–10203. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Youngmin Cho and Lawrence K. Saul. Kernel Methods for Deep Learning. In Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. D. Lafferty, C. K. I. Williams, and A. Culotta, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 22*, pages 342–350. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- Amit Daniely. Depth Separation for Neural Networks. *CoRR*, abs/1702.08489, 2017.
- Dua Dheeru and Efi Karra Taniskidou. *UCI Machine Learning Repository*. University of California, Irvine, School of Information and Computer Sciences, 2017.
- Ronen Eldan and Ohad Shamir. The power of depth for feedforward neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 907–940, 2016.
- Guang-Bin Huang, Lei Chen, Chee Kheong Siew, et al. Universal approximation using incremental constructive feedforward networks with random hidden nodes. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 17(4):879–892, 2006.
- P. S. Huang, H. Avron, T. N. Sainath, V. Sindhwani, and B. Ramabhadran. Kernel methods match Deep Neural Networks on TIMIT. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 205–209, May 2014. doi: 10.1109/ICASSP.2014.6853587.
- P.D. Lax. *Functional Analysis*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley, 2002. ISBN 978-0-471-55604-6.
- Yann Lecun and Corinna Cortes. *The MNIST Database of Handwritten Digits*.
- Holden Lee, Rong Ge, Tengyu Ma, Andrej Risteski, and Sanjeev Arora. On the Ability of Neural Nets to Express Distributions. In Satyen Kale and Ohad Shamir, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 65 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1271–1296, Amsterdam, Netherlands, July 2017. PMLR.
- Moshe Leshno, Vladimir Ya Lin, Allan Pinkus, and Shimon Schocken. Multilayer feedforward networks with a nonpolynomial activation function can approximate any function. *Neural Networks*, 6(6):861 – 867, 1993. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080\(05\)80131-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080(05)80131-5).

- Martín Abadi, Ashish Agarwal, Paul Barham, Eugene Brevdo, Zhifeng Chen, Craig Citro, Greg S. Corrado, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Ian Goodfellow, Andrew Harp, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Yangqing Jia, Rafal Jozefowicz, Lukasz Kaiser, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Dandelion Mané, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek Murray, Chris Olah, Mike Schuster, Jonathon Shlens, Benoit Steiner, Ilya Sutskever, Kunal Talwar, Paul Tucker, Vincent Vanhoucke, Vijay Vasudevan, Fernanda Viégas, Oriol Vinyals, Pete Warden, Martin Wattenberg, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. *TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Systems*. 2015.
- Charles A Micchelli, Yuesheng Xu, and Haizhang Zhang. Universal kernels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(Dec):2651–2667, 2006.
- Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. The MIT Press, 2012. ISBN 0-262-01825-X 978-0-262-01825-8.
- Gilles Pisier. Remarques sur un résultat non publié de B. Maurey. *Séminaire Analyse fonctionnelle (dit "Maurey-Schwartz")*, pages 1–12, 1980.
- Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht. Random Features for Large-Scale Kernel Machines. In J. C. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. T. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 1177–1184. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008.
- Alessandro Rudi and Lorenzo Rosasco. Generalization properties of learning with random features. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3218–3228, 2017.
- I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer New York, 2008. ISBN 978-0-387-77242-4.
- Yitong Sun, Anna Gilbert, and Ambuj Tewari. But How Does It Work in Theory? Linear SVM with Random Features. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 3383–3392. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.

## A Proof of Universality of Random Features

To show that a subset is dense in a Banach space, we need only consider its annihilator as described by the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *For a Banach space  $\mathcal{B}$  and its subset  $U$ , the linear span of  $U$  is dense in  $\mathcal{B}$  if and only if  $U^\perp$ , the annihilator of  $U$ , is  $\{0\}$ .*

The proof can be easily derived from Theorem 8 in Chapter 8 of Lax (2002). It is a consequence of Hahn-Banach theorem. The dual space of  $C(\mathcal{X})$  is the space of all signed measures equipped with the total variation norm, denoted by  $M(\mathcal{X})$  (see Theorem 14 in Chapter 8 of Lax (2002)). As the consequence of Lemma 1 and the duality between  $C(\mathcal{X})$  and  $M(\mathcal{X})$ , Micchelli et al. (2006) use the following useful criteria for justifying the dense subset of  $C(\mathcal{X})$ .

**Lemma 2.**  *$\mathcal{F} \subset C(\mathcal{X})$  is universal if and only if for any signed measure  $\nu$ ,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) d\nu(x) = 0 \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \implies \nu = 0.$$

When the kernel or respectively the activation function is continuous, the universality of the RKHS or that of neural nets can be established by applying Lemma 2.

Bach (2017b) proved the following useful theorem, which we will use to verify the finite approximability of RKHSs induced by various random features.

**Theorem 2** (Bach's approximation theorem). *Let*

$$d_{\max}(1, \epsilon) := \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \|(\Sigma + \epsilon I)^{-1/2} \phi(\cdot; \omega)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}^2,$$

where  $\Sigma : L_2(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{P})$  is defined by

$$\Sigma f = \int k_{\sigma, \mu}(x, y) f(y) d\mathbb{P}(y).$$

For  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ , when

$$N \geq 5d_{\max}(1, \epsilon) \log \left( \frac{16d_{\max}(1, \epsilon)}{\delta} \right), \quad (2)$$

with probability over  $\phi_N$  greater than  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{\phi, \mu} \leq 1} \inf_{|\beta| \leq 2} \|f - \beta \cdot \phi_N(\cdot)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}. \quad (3)$$

We first prove Theorem 1, which is a very general result on the universality of RKHS induced by random features. It is a combination of several functional analysis results and the result of Leshno et al. (1993).

**Theorem (1).** *Assume that  $|\sigma(z)| \leq K|z|^k + M$  for some  $M, K \geq 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Let  $\mu$  be a probability distribution whose support is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with  $\int |\omega|^{2k} d\mu(\omega) \leq M_2$ . If  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial, the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma, \mu}$  is universal.*

*Proof.* First, it is easy to see that  $\sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mu)$ . Indeed, since  $|\sigma(z)| \leq K|z|^k + M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sigma^2(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) d\mu(\omega) &\leq 2 \int K^2(\omega \cdot (x, 1))^{2k} d\mu(\omega) + 2M^2 \\ &\leq 2K^2 \int |\omega|^{2k} (|x|^2 + 1)^k d\mu(\omega) + 2M^2 \\ &\leq 2K^2(r^2 + 1)^k M_2 + 2M^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $r$  is the radius of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Next, we show that the functions in  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma,\mu}$  are all continuous. For  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\sigma,\mu}$ , assume that

$$f(x) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega)$$

for some  $g \in L^2(\mu)$ . To show that  $f$  is continuous at a given point  $x$ , we want to show that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$  whenever  $|x - y| < \delta$ . Denote

$$I_1(R) := \left| \int_{|\omega|>R} (\sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) - \sigma(\omega \cdot (y, 1)))g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega) \right|,$$

and

$$I_2(R) := \left| \int_{|\omega|\leq R} (\sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) - \sigma(\omega \cdot (y, 1)))g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega) \right|.$$

Then since

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(R) &\leq \int_{|\omega|>R} (K(|\omega \cdot (x, 1)|^k + |\omega \cdot (y, 1)|^k) + 2M) |g(\omega)| \, d\mu(\omega) \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|g\|_{L^2} \left( \int_{|\omega|>R} K^2|\omega|^{2k}(r^2 + 1)^k + M^2 \, d\mu(\omega) \right), \end{aligned}$$

we know that  $I_1(R) \rightarrow 0$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, for sufficiently large  $R$ , we have  $I_1(R) < \epsilon/2$ . On the other hand, since  $\sigma$  is continuous, there exists  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that  $|\omega \cdot (x, 1) - \omega \cdot (y, 1)| < \delta_1$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(R) &\leq \int_{|\omega|\leq R} \frac{\epsilon}{2\|g\|_{L^2}} |g(\omega)| \, d\mu(\omega) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

So if we set  $\delta = \delta_1/R$ , we will have  $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$ .

We just proved that all the functions in the  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma,\mu}$  are all continuous. So we can use Lemma 2 to justify the universality. For a signed measure  $\nu$  with finite total variation, assume that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega)d\nu(x) = 0,$$

for all  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mu)$ . We want to show that  $\nu$  must be the 0 measure. Since the function  $\sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))g(\omega)$  is integrable over  $\mu \times \nu$ , by Fubini's theorem we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) \right) g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega),$$

equals 0 for all  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mu)$ . Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) = 0 \, \mu\text{-a.e.} \quad (4)$$

Indeed the function of  $\omega$  defined on the left hand side of Equation 4 has to be 0 everywhere because of continuity. Since  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial, by Leshno et al. (1993), we know that  $\nu$  must be a 0 measure. If it is

not, then there exists  $f$  in  $C(\mathcal{X})$  such that  $\int f \, d\nu = \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Because the linear span of  $\sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))$  is dense in  $C(\mathcal{X})$ , there must exist  $c_i$ s and  $\omega_i$ s such that

$$\int \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \sigma(\omega_i \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

This contradicts Equation 4. □

It is interesting to note that in the proof the universality of the RKHS can be derived from that of corresponding neural networks.

When the activation node  $\sigma$  is homogeneous, we can modify the above proof to obtain Proposition 1.

**Proposition (1).** *When  $\mu$  is a probability distribution supported on a dense subset of an  $d$ -dimensional ellipsoid centered at the origin. Then the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \mu}$  is universal.*

*Proof.* The proof is the same up to Eq. 4. We claim that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) = 0$$

for all  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . If not, there exists  $\beta \neq 0$  such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{ReLU}(\beta \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) = \epsilon > 0.$$

Then there exists a positive constant  $c$  such that  $c\beta$  belongs to the ellipsoid. By homogeneity, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{ReLU}(c\beta \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x) = c\epsilon > 0.$$

The function

$$g : \omega \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\nu(x)$$

is continuous over the ellipsoidal feature space  $\Omega$ , as a consequence of the fact that ReLU is Lipschitz. And thus there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $g(\omega)$  is greater than  $c\epsilon/2$  for all  $\omega \in B^{d+1}(c\beta, \delta) \cap \Omega$ . This contradicts Eq. 4 and the fact that the support of  $\mu$  is dense over  $\Omega$ . Then by the same argument at the end of the proof of Theorem 1, we complete the proof of the proposition. □

**Corollary (1).** *Assume that  $|\sigma(z)| \leq K|z|^k + M$  for some  $M, K \geq 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Let  $\mu$  be a probability distribution whose support is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with  $\int |\omega|^{2k} \, d\mu(\omega) \leq M_2$ . If  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial and  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is admissible with respect to the data distribution  $\mathbb{P}$ , the random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is universal.*

*Proof.* The condition guarantees that  $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma, \mu}$  is dense in  $C(\mathcal{X})$ . For any  $f$  in  $C(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}_{\sigma, \mu}$  such that  $\sup_x |f(x) - \tilde{f}(x)| < \epsilon$ , which implies that  $\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} < \epsilon$ . Assume that

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega),$$

where  $\|g\|_{L_2(\mu)} = G$ . Since  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is admissible, there exists  $\lambda \leq \epsilon^2/(4G^2)$  such that

$$d_{\max}(1, \lambda) = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \langle \sigma_{\omega}, (\Sigma + \lambda I)^{-1} \sigma_{\omega} \rangle < \infty.$$

So by Theorem 2, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\|\tilde{f} - f_N\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} \leq 2G\sqrt{\lambda} \leq \epsilon,$$

with probability over the random  $\omega_i \sim \mu$  greater than  $1 - \delta$ . □

**Corollary (2).** When  $\sigma$  is bounded nonconstant and the support of  $\mu$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . The random feature  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is universal.

*Proof.* We need only check that  $(\sigma, \mu)$  is admissible. Assume  $|\sigma| \leq \kappa$ . Then, for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \langle \sigma_\omega, (\Sigma + \lambda I)^{-1} \sigma_\omega \rangle \leq \lambda^{-1} \|\sigma_\omega\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda}.$$

□

## B Generalization and Approximation Errors of Random ReLU Features

For the generalization error, we have the following proposition. Note that even though the proposition is stated for 1-Lipschitz losses, it works for any Lipschitz constant. And for the regression task, the squared loss is still Lipschitz since the output of all the functions in our setup is bounded by constants.

**Proposition 5.** Let  $\ell$  be 1-Lipschitz loss. And  $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  with norm less than  $R$ . If we choose  $m$  samples and  $N$  random features, where

$$m \geq \left[ \left( 4 + 2\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \frac{R(\sqrt{r^2 + 1} + 1)}{\epsilon} \right]^2,$$

and

$$N \geq \frac{5(r^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2} \ln \left( \frac{16(r^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2 \delta} \right),$$

and set  $\gamma = 1$  and  $R = 2R_{f_0}$  in Algorithm 1. Then, with probability greater than  $1 - 2\delta$ , we have

$$\mathbf{R}^\ell(f_N) - \mathbf{R}^\ell(f_0) \leq 3\epsilon,$$

where  $f_N$  is the solution returned by Algorithm 1.

*Proof.* Recall that the radius of  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $r$ . Since  $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  and its norm is less than  $R_{f_0}$ , by Theorem 2, there exists

$$g : x \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \text{ReLU}(\omega_i \cdot (x, 1)),$$

with  $\sum c_i^2 \leq 4R_{f_0}^2$ , such that with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$  over the features  $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ ,

$$\|g - f_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \epsilon, \tag{5}$$

given that

$$N \geq \frac{20(r^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2} \ln \left( \frac{64(r^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2 \delta} \right).$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{R}^\ell(g) - \mathbf{R}^\ell(f_0) \leq \epsilon. \tag{6}$$

Next, we want to bound the excess risk between the solution  $f_N$  returned by the algorithm and  $g$ . Denote the RKHS induced by ReLU and the empirical distribution over  $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$  by  $\mathcal{H}_N$ . Then both  $f_N$  and  $g$  belongs

to  $B(2R_{f_0})$ , the ball centered at 0 with radius  $2R_{f_0}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_N$ . By the statistical theory (Mohri et al. (2012)) we know that

$$\mathbf{R}^\ell(f_N) - \mathbf{R}^\ell(g) \leq 2 \sup_{f \in B(2R_{f_0})} \left| \mathbb{E} \ell(f(x), y) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell(f(x_i), y_i) \right| \quad (7)$$

$$\leq 2\mathfrak{R}_m(\ell \circ B(2R_{f_0})) + \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{2R_{f_0}(\sqrt{r^2+1}+1)}{\sqrt{m}}} \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \frac{4R_{f_0}\sqrt{r^2+1}}{\sqrt{m}} + \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{2R_{f_0}(\sqrt{r^2+1}+1)}{\sqrt{m}}}, \quad (9)$$

$$(10)$$

with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ . Set

$$m = \left( 4R_{f_0} + 2R_{f_0} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \frac{(\sqrt{r^2+1}+1)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

Taking the union bound over the two inequalities, the proof is complete.  $\square$

For a function  $f$  that does not belong to the RKHS of uniform ReLU features, we want to find a function  $g$  in the RKHS to approximate it. In particular, to study the learning rate of random ReLU features support vector machines, we need to know how to construct an approximator in the RKHS for the Bayes classifier  $\text{sign}(2\eta(x) - 1)$ . Here we may adopt the assumption used in Steinwart and Christmann (2008); Sun et al. (2018) that  $\Delta x \geq \tau$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_{-1}$  and  $\eta(x) > \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $x$ . Again, we consider that  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ . Then following the proof of Proposition 3 of Bach (2017a), we can construct the approximator of the Bayes classifier by

$$g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} \text{sign}(2\eta(y) - 1) \frac{1 - r^2}{(1 + r^2 - 2r(x \cdot y))^{(d+1)/2}} d\sigma_d(y).$$

Then by choosing  $1 - r = C(d)\delta^{-2/(d+1)}$ , we have  $\|g\|_{\text{RKHS}} \leq \delta$  and

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\text{sign}(2\eta(x) - 1) - g(x)| \leq C(d, \tau)\delta^{-2/(d+1)}.$$

And we also have  $|g(x)| \leq 1$  for all  $x$ . If we further have that the spectrum of the kernel operator against the data distribution decays in the rate  $\lambda_i = O(i^{-d/2})$ , then we can prove that the learning rate of random ReLU with optimized feature sampling will achieve  $O(m^{-1/8})$  with  $m$  samples and  $\sqrt{m}$  random features. If the spectrum of the kernel operator against the data distribution decays exponentially, the learning rate can be largely improved to  $O(1/m)$  with  $\log m$  features. However, it is not clear how to characterize the data distribution satisfying this requirement on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , if such a data distribution exists.

## C Proof of the Depth Separation

Before the proof of the depth separation, we first show how to upper bound the RKHS norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  of the function  $\sqrt{\|x\|^2 + 1}$ . To get the upper bound, we start with the polynomials of projection  $f(\tilde{x}) = \alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p$  defined on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , and its RKHS norm in the space induced by  $\text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot \tilde{x})$  and  $\tau_d$ , the uniform distribution over  $\mathbb{S}^d$ . We denote this RKHS by  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ . And we use  $\tilde{x}$  to emphasize that these are points on the unit sphere, while  $x$  represents a point in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

A sufficient condition for the membership of RKHS induced by the random feature (ReLU,  $\tau_d$ ) is provided in Bach (2017b). It shows that functions with bounded  $\frac{d}{2} + \frac{3}{2}$  derivatives are in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$ , and the RKHS norm is upper bounded by the  $\lceil \frac{d}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \rceil$ th derivative. For the polynomials of projection, we provide a different way to evaluate a tighter upper bound of its norm.

The tool we use here is spherical harmonics. The kernel derived the uniform ReLU features (ReLU,  $\tau_d$ ) can be explicitly written as follows (Cho and Saul, 2009),

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^d} \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot \tilde{x}) \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot \tilde{x}') d\tau_d(\omega) = \frac{1}{2(d+1)\pi} \left[ \sqrt{1 - (\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{x}')^2} + (\pi - \arccos(\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{x}')) \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{x}' \right],$$

Note that we rewrite the kernel function in a different but equivalent form compared to the formula in Cho's work to emphasize that it is of the form  $k(\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y})$ , so called dot product kernels. The kernel function  $k(s)$  has the Taylor expansion

$$\frac{1}{2(d+1)} \left( \frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2}s + \frac{1}{2\pi}s^2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2k-3)!!}{(2k)!!} \frac{1}{2k-1} s^{2k} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j s^j.$$

Then by Azevedo and Menegatto (2014), we know that  $k(\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y})$  has Mercer type expansion

$$k(\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N(i,d)} \lambda_i Y_{i,j}^d(\tilde{x}) Y_{i,j}^d(\tilde{y}),$$

where  $\{Y_{i,j}^d\}$  are the spherical harmonics on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ ,  $N(i, d)$  is the dimension of the eigenspace corresponding to  $i$ th eigenvalue and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &= |\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| \int_{-1}^1 k(s) P_i^d(s) (1-s^2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} ds \\ &= |\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| \int_{-1}^1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j s^j P_i^d(s) (1-s^2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} ds \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j c(i, j, d). \end{aligned}$$

$c(i, j, d) > 0$  when  $i \leq j$  and  $i \equiv j \pmod{2}$  and  $c(i, j, d) = 0$  otherwise. Now consider the function  $f(\tilde{x}) = \alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\beta \in \mathbb{S}^d$ . Its projection onto the subspace spanned by  $Y_{i,j}^d$  is given by the Funk-Hecke formula

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^d} \alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p Y_{i,j}^d(\tilde{x}) d\sigma_d(\tilde{x}) = \alpha c(i, p, d) Y_{i,j}^d(\beta).$$

In other words, for even number  $p$  or  $p = 1$ ,

$$\alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_j \alpha c(i, p, d) Y_{i,j}^d(\beta) Y_{i,j}^d(\tilde{x}).$$

Then the RKHS norm of  $f$  is given by

$$\|f\|_{\text{RKHS}}^2 = \alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_j \frac{c^2(i, p, d)}{\lambda_i} (Y_{i,j}^d(\beta))^2.$$

Note that  $\lambda_i \geq a_p c(i, p, d)$ . So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\text{RKHS}}^2 &\leq \alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_j a_p^{-1} c(i, p, d) (Y_{i,j}^d(\beta))^2 \\ &= a_p^{-1} \alpha^2 (\beta \cdot \beta)^p \\ &= a_p^{-1} \alpha^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a_p \geq \frac{1}{2(d+1)\pi p^2}$ , for  $p = 1$  or even  $p$ , we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.**  $\|\alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \sqrt{2(d+1)\pi} \alpha p$ .

Using this result, we can further justify whether a function belongs to the  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  based on its Taylor expansion.

Next, we show that the function  $g(x) = \alpha(\beta \cdot (x, 1))^p (1 + \|x\|^2)^{(1-p)/2}$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$ . Assume that  $f(\tilde{x}) = \alpha(\beta \cdot \tilde{x})^p$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\beta \cdot (x, 1))^p (1 + x^2)^{(1-p)/2} &= \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + 1} f\left(\frac{(x, 1)}{\sqrt{\|x\|^2 + 1}}\right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} h(\omega) \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\tau_d(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

for some  $h \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^d, \tau_d)$ . So

$$\|g\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \leq \|h\|_{L^2(\tau_d)} = \|f\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \sqrt{2(d+1)\pi} \alpha p.$$

When  $p = 2$ ,  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = \vec{e}_j$ , we have

$$\left\| \frac{x_j^2}{\sqrt{1 + \|x\|^2}} \right\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \leq 2\sqrt{2(d+1)\pi}.$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sqrt{1 + \|x\|^2} \right\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \frac{x_j^2}{\sqrt{1 + \|x\|^2}} \right\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)^{3/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Similarly, when  $x \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ , we have

$$\|\alpha(\beta \cdot (x, 1))^p\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}} \leq |\beta|^p 3^{p/2} \sqrt{(4d+2)\pi} \alpha p.$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{1:d} \cdot x_{d+1:2d}\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \|x_j x_{j+d}\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \left\| ((x \cdot (\vec{e}_j + \vec{e}_{j+d}))^2 - (x \cdot \vec{e}_j)^2 - (x \cdot \vec{e}_{j+d})^2) \right\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

$$\leq 12d\sqrt{(4d+2)\pi}. \tag{13}$$

To show the depth separation results, we need only prove the following claim.

**Proposition 6.** *There exist  $f : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}}$ ,  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_1}$ , both with norm less than  $\text{poly}(d)$ , a probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ , and a constant  $c$ , such that for any 2-layer ReLU networks  $h$  with number of nodes fewer than  $2^{\Omega(d \log(d))}$  and weights less than  $2^d$ ,*

$$\|h - g \circ f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} > c.$$

This proposition implies that no functions in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}}$  with norm less than  $\text{poly}(d)$  can approximate this composite function. Otherwise it contradicts the fact that any functions in the  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}}$  with norm less than  $R$  can be approximated with an error of  $\epsilon$  by a 2-layer ReLU network with  $O(R^2/\epsilon^2)$  nodes and weights less than a certain absolute constant by Corollary 3. And for the case of odd dimensions  $d$  in Proposition 3, we can just set  $\mathcal{X}$  to be  $\mathbb{S}^{(d-1)/2} \times \mathbb{S}^{(d-1)/2}$  and use the construction for even dimensions. Now we prove the above proposition.

*Proof.* We use the construction of Example 2 in Daniely (2017), where  $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \cdot x_d + i$  and  $g(t) = \sin(\pi d^3 t)$ , and the data distribution is the uniform distribution over  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ .  $f$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_{2d}}$  with RKHS norm less than  $12d\sqrt{(4d+2)\pi}$  as shown by Eq 13.  $g$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_1}$  with RKHS norm less than  $Cd^3$  where  $C$  is an absolute constant by Proposition 5.  $\square$

By using Eldan and Shamir's result, we can also construct a function from  $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  composed by two functions from  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_1}$  respectively, which cannot be approximated by any 2-layer ReLU networks with  $\text{poly}(d)$  nodes. The procedure is as follows.

For any  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{S}^d$  and  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define

$$f_i(t) = c_i \text{ReLU}(t(1 - (\omega_i)_{d+1}^2)^{1/2} + \omega_{d+1}).$$

Then

$$f_i \left( x \cdot \frac{(\omega_i)_{1:d}}{\|(\omega_i)_{1:d}\|} \right) = c_i \text{ReLU}(\omega_i \cdot (x, 1)),$$

where we use the convention that  $0/\|0\| = 0$ . Then by Proposition 13 of Eldan and Shamir (2016), we know for any  $\omega_i$  and  $c_i$ , there exists a function  $\tilde{g}$  and data distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N f_i \left( x \cdot \frac{(\omega_i)_{1:d}}{\|(\omega_i)_{1:d}\|} \right) - \tilde{g}(x) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \geq \frac{\delta}{\alpha},$$

where  $\delta$  and  $\alpha$  are two constants. Now we construct  $\tilde{g}$  as a composite function  $g \circ f$ . We choose  $f(x) = \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + 1}$ . By Equation 11,  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)^{3/2}$ . The data distribution is also chosen to be the squared Fourier transform of the indicator function of unit volume ball, the same with Eldan and Shamir (2016). Then we construct  $g$  based on the function  $\tilde{g}$  in Proposition 13 in Eldan and Shamir (2016). By Lemma 12 in Eldan and Shamir's work, we know that there exists  $N$ -Lipschitz function  $g_1$  where  $N = c(\alpha d)^{3/2}$  supported on  $[\alpha\sqrt{d}, 2\alpha\sqrt{d}]$  with range in  $[-1, 1]$  such that

$$\|g_1(\|x\|) - \tilde{g}(\|x\|)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \leq \frac{3}{\alpha^2 \sqrt{d}}.$$

Now we define  $g_2(t) = g_1(\sqrt{t^2 - 1})$ . It is supported on  $[\sqrt{\alpha^2 d + 1}, \sqrt{4\alpha^2 d + 1}]$  and  $3N$ -Lipschitz. And we have  $g_2(\sqrt{\|x\|^2 + 1}) = g_1(\|x\|)$ . The last step is to find an approximator from  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  for  $g_2$ . This can be done by applying Proposition 6 in Bach (2017b), which implies in our setup that there exists a function  $g$  with  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq M$  and

$$\sup_{|t| \leq \sqrt{4\alpha^2 d + 1}} |g(t) - g_2(t)| \leq CN\sqrt{4\alpha^2 d + 1} \left( \frac{M}{3N\sqrt{4\alpha^2 d + 1}} \right)^{-1/2},$$

where  $C$  is a universal constant. By setting  $M = (3N\sqrt{4\alpha^2d + 1})^{3/2}\alpha^2\sqrt{d}$ , we have

$$\|g \circ f - \tilde{g}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\alpha d^{1/4}}\right).$$

Therefore, we proved that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N f_i \left( x \cdot \frac{(\omega_i)_{1:d}}{\|(\omega_i)_{1:d}\|} \right) - g \circ f(x) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \geq \frac{\delta}{2\alpha} := c,$$

Eldan and Shamir's hard-to-approximate result does not rely on any magnitude constraint over weights of networks, in which sense it is stronger than Daniely's result. The function constructed by Eldan and Shamir is compactly supported, but the data distribution is over the whole  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and thus it does not rule out the possibility that such a target composite function can be well-approximated by a 2-layer ReLU network against any data distribution whose support is the same with the target function.

## D Approximation Results of Single-Hidden-Layer ReLU Networks

Before the proof of the the multi-layer approximation result, We first prove a single-hidden-layer approximation result for ReLU networks with bounds on the inner weights. We consider the functions with the following representation

$$f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x, 1)) \, d\rho(\omega),$$

where  $\rho \in M(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ . In particular, we denote the set of all such functions with  $\int |\omega| \, d|\rho|(\omega) \leq R$  by  $\Lambda_R$ . We further define that  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X}) = \bigcup_{R>0} \Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$ .

Some properties of  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X})$  are given below.

### Proposition 7.

1.  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X})$  consists of continuous functions.
2. Functions in  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$  are  $R$ -Lipschitz.
3. Assume that  $\mu$  is a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with  $\int_{\Omega} |\omega|^2 \, d\mu(\omega) = M_2$ . Then  $\{f : \|f\|_{\text{ReLU}, \mu} \leq R\} \subset \Lambda_{R\sqrt{M_2}}(\mathcal{X})$ .
4.  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X})$  is universal.

*Proof.*

1. This is implied by the second statement.
2. ReLU is 1-Lipschitz. For  $f$  in  $\Lambda_C(\mathcal{X})$  and  $x_1, x_2$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| &= \left| \int (\text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x_1, 1)) - \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x_2, 1))) \, d\rho(\omega) \right| \\ &\leq \int |\text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x_1, 1)) - \text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x_2, 1))| \, d|\rho|(\omega) \\ &\leq \int |\omega \cdot (x_1 - x_2, 0)| \, d|\rho|(\omega) \\ &\leq R|x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

3. For any  $f$  in the ball of radius  $R$  of the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU},\mu}$ , we have that

$$f(x) = \int \sigma(\omega \cdot (x, 1))g(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \int g^2(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega) \leq R^2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\omega||g(\omega)| \, d\mu(\omega) &\leq \left( \int \omega \cdot \omega \, d\mu(\omega) \int g^2(\omega) \, d\mu(\omega) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{M_2}R. \end{aligned}$$

4. This can be shown by the fact that all ReLU networks belong to  $\Lambda$  and the set of ReLU networks is universal. □

Usually  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU},\mu}$  is strictly included in  $\Lambda$  and so is  $\Lambda$  in  $C(\mathcal{X})$ . Indeed, when  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, for any fixed  $\omega$ ,  $\text{ReLU}(\omega \cdot (x, 1))$  belongs to  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X})$ , but not  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU},\mu}$ . And  $\Lambda(\mathcal{X})$  only contains Lipschitz functions, but there clearly exist continuous functions over  $\mathcal{X}$  that are not Lipschitz. Actually  $\Lambda_R$  is also strictly smaller than the set of  $R$ -Lipschitz functions by the depth separation result in Eldan and Shamir (2016).

For the functions in  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$ , we can approximate them by ReLU networks. Stronger than Barron's approximation theorem, our theorem provides  $O(1)$  upper bounds for both inner and outer weights of the single-hidden-layer neural networks.

**Theorem 3.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{X}$  is bounded by a ball of radius  $r$ .  $\mathbb{P}$  is a probability measure on  $\mathcal{X}$ . For any  $f \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$ , there exists  $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \text{ReLU}(\tilde{\omega}_i \cdot (x, 1))$  with  $|c_i| = \tilde{R}/N \leq R/N$ , and  $|\tilde{\omega}_i| = 1$  for all  $i$ , such that  $\|f - g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq R\sqrt{r^2 + 1}/\sqrt{N}$ .*

This theorem shows that for ReLU networks to approximate the functions in  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$  within an error of  $\epsilon$ , only  $O(C/\epsilon^2)$  nodes are required. Moreover, every outer weights in front of nodes are bounded by  $O(\epsilon^2)$  and only differ by signs, and the inner weights are of unit length. Compared with the theorem in Barron (1993), where outer weights are bounded by a constant under  $\ell^1$  norm, but the bound on inner weights depends inversely on the approximation error, our extra bounds on inner weights largely shrink the search area for approximators. This improvement comes from the fact that functions in  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$  are defined by the transformation induced by ReLU functions, which is homogeneous of degree 1. The proof is an application of Maurey's sparsification lemma (Pisier, 1980).

**Lemma 4** (Maurey's sparsification). *Assume that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are  $n$  i.i.d. random variables with values in the unit ball of a Hilbert space. Then with probability greater than  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}X_1 \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right). \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, there exists  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in the unit ball such that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \mathbb{E}X_1 \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (15)$$

With this lemma, we can prove Theorem 3.

*Proof.* If  $f$  is constantly 0, we only need to choose  $c_i$  to be 0 for all  $i \in [N]$ . Now assume that  $f$  is not constantly 0. Then we can always restrict the feature space to  $S = \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus \{0\}$  and have  $0 < \int_S |\omega| \, d|\rho|(\omega) = \tilde{R} \leq R$ .  $f$  can be written into the following form

$$f(x) = \int_S \tilde{R} \tau(\omega) \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{\omega \cdot (x, 1)}{|\omega|} \right) \frac{|\omega|}{\tilde{R}} \, d|\rho|(\omega),$$

where  $\tau(\omega)$  equals 1 when  $\omega$  belongs to the positive set of  $\rho$  and -1 when it belongs to the negative set of  $\rho$ . Since  $\frac{|\omega|}{\tilde{R}} \, d|\rho|(\omega)$  is a probability measure and

$$\left\| \tilde{R} \tau(\omega) \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{\omega \cdot (x, 1)}{|\omega|} \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \tilde{R} a_{\text{ReLU}} \sqrt{r^2 + 1},$$

we can apply Lemma 4 and get the conclusion that there exists  $\omega_i$ s such that

$$\left\| f - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{R} \tau(\omega_i) \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{\omega_i \cdot (x, 1)}{|\omega_i|} \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \frac{\tilde{R} a_{\text{ReLU}} \sqrt{r^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

By setting  $\tilde{\omega}_i = \omega_i/|\omega_i|$  and  $c_i = \tilde{R} \tau(\omega_i)/N$ , the statement is proved.  $\square$

A direct corollary of this theorem is as follows.

**Corollary 3.** *For any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  with  $\|f\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \leq R$ , there exists  $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \text{ReLU}(\tilde{\omega}_i \cdot (x, 1))$  with  $|c_i| = \tilde{R}/N \leq R/N$ , and  $|\tilde{\omega}_i| = 1$  for all  $i$ , such that  $\|f - g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq R \sqrt{r^2 + 1} / \sqrt{N}$ .*

## E Proof of Approximation Results of Multi-Layer ReLU Networks

We extend the definition of  $\Lambda_R$  in Appendix D to vector-valued functions.

**Definition 3.** *For a map  $f$  from  $\mathbb{R}^m$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we say that it belongs to the class  $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{X})$  if each component  $(f)_i \in \Lambda_{R_i}(\mathcal{X})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\sum_i R_i^2 \leq R^2$ .*

Note that Proposition 7 (2) still holds for the vector valued function class  $\Lambda_R$ , and any vector valued function  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d}$  with  $\|f\|_{\text{ReLU}, \tau_d} \leq R$  also belongs to  $\Lambda_R$ . Therefore, to prove the approximation result in Proposition 4, we need only prove it for  $\Lambda_R$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that for all  $1 \leq i \leq L + 1$ ,  $K_i$  is a compact set with radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{m_i}$  and  $B^{m_i}$  is the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ .  $K_1 = \mathcal{X}$ .  $f_i : K_i + sB^{m_i} \rightarrow K_{i+1}$  belongs to  $\Lambda_{R_i}(K_i + sB^{m_i})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq L$ . Then for any  $1 \leq \ell \leq L$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a set  $S_\ell \subset K_1$  with*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_\ell) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{s^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \frac{i^2}{\prod_{j=i+1}^L R_j^2},$$

and an  $\ell$ -layer neural networks  $g_{1:\ell}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} g_i &: \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_{i+1}} \\ (g_i(x))_j &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_i} c_{i,j,k} \sigma(\omega_{i,j,k} \cdot (x, 1)) \\ |c_{i,j,k}| &= \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,j}}{N_i} \leq \frac{R_{i,j}}{N_i} \\ |\omega_{i,j,k}| &\leq 1 \\ N_i &= \frac{\prod_{j=i}^L R_j^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2}, \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\left( \int_{S_\ell} |f_{1:\ell} - g_{1:\ell}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\ell \epsilon}{\prod_{i=\ell+1}^L R_i},$$

with the convention that  $\prod_{i=L+1}^L R_i = 1$ . Moreover, the  $i$ th layer of the neural network  $g_{1:\ell}$  contains  $m_{i+1} N_i$  nodes. The weight matrix from layer  $i$  to layer  $i+1$ , denoted by  $W_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ , has Frobenius norm bounded by  $\sqrt{m_{i+2}}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq L-1$ ,  $\|W_{0 \rightarrow 1}\|_F \leq \prod_{i=1}^L R_i \sqrt{m_2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}$ , and  $\|W_{L \rightarrow L+1}\|_F \leq \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + 1}$ . Each bias term is bounded by 1.

*Proof.* For  $\ell = 1$ , we construct the approximation  $g_1$  for  $f_1$  by applying Theorem 3 to each component of  $f_1$ . First, set  $S_1 = K_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_1} |g_1(x) - f_1(x)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} \int_{S_1} (f_1(x) - g_1(x))_i^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} \frac{R_{1,i}^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{N_1} \\ &\leq \frac{R_1^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{N_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$N_1 = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^L R_i^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{\epsilon^2}$$

and the conclusion holds for  $\ell = 1$ . Assume that there exist  $g_{1:\ell}$  and  $S_\ell$  as described in the theorem. Define

$$S_{\ell+1} = S_\ell \cap \{x \in K_1 : |g_{1:\ell}(x) - f_{1:\ell}(x)| \leq s\}.$$

Then by Markov's inequality and induction assumption,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\ell+1}) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{s^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \frac{i^2}{\prod_{j=i+1}^L R_j^2} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \ell^2}{s^2 \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L R_i^2}.$$

Then we want to construct  $g_{\ell+1}$  on  $g_{1:\ell}(S_{\ell+1})$  to approximate  $f_{\ell+1}$ , again by applying Theorem 3 to each component of  $f_{\ell+1}$ . Note that the measure we consider here is the push-forward of  $\mathbb{P}$  by  $g_{1:\ell}$ , which is a positive measure with total measure less than 1.

$$\int_{g_{1:\ell}(S_{\ell+1})} |g_{\ell+1}(x) - f_{\ell+1}(x)|^2 dg_{1:\ell}(\mathbb{P})(x) \leq \frac{R_{\ell+1}^2 ((r+s)^2 + 1)}{N_{\ell+1}}.$$

And by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \int_{S_{\ell+1}} |g_{1:\ell+1}(x) - f_{1:\ell+1}(x)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left( \int_{S_{\ell+1}} |g_{\ell+1} \circ g_{1:\ell}(x) - f_{\ell+1} \circ g_{1:\ell}(x)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \left( \int_{S_{\ell+1}} |f_{\ell+1} \circ g_{1:\ell}(x) - f_{\ell+1} \circ f_{1:\ell}(x)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq \frac{R_{\ell+1} \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{N_{\ell+1}}} + R_{\ell+1} \frac{\ell \epsilon}{\prod_{i=\ell+1}^L R_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$N_{\ell+1} = \frac{((r+s)^2 + 1) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^L R_i^2}{\epsilon^2},$$

and we get the upper bound

$$\left( \int_{S_{\ell+1}} |g_{1:\ell+1}(x) - f_{1:\ell+1}(x)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(x) \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{(\ell+1)\epsilon}{\prod_{i=\ell+2}^L R_i}.$$

Now let's examine the weight matrix and the bias term of the neural network  $g_{1:\ell}$ . Note that the weight matrix from  $i$ th layer to the  $(i+1)$ th layer of  $g_{1:\ell}$  consists of  $c_{i,j,k}$  from  $g_i$  and  $\omega_{i+1,j,k}$  from  $g_{i+1}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq L-1$ , the exact form of the weight matrices is given by the matrix product  $W_{i \rightarrow i+1} = AB$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{i \rightarrow i+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\omega_{i+1,1,1})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,1,1})_{m_{i+1}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\omega_{i+1,1,N_{i+1}})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,1,N_{i+1}})_{m_{i+1}} \\ (\omega_{i+1,2,1})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,2,1})_{m_{i+1}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\omega_{i+1,2,N_{i+1}})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,2,N_{i+1}})_{m_{i+1}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\omega_{i+1,m_{i+2},1})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,m_{i+2},1})_{m_{i+1}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\omega_{i+1,m_{i+2},N_{i+1}})_1 & \cdots & (\omega_{i+1,m_{i+2},N_{i+1}})_{m_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix} \\
B_{i \rightarrow i+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,1}\tau_{i,1,1}}{N_i} \cdots \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,1}\tau_{i,1,N_i}}{N_i} & 0 \cdots 0 & 0 \cdots 0 \\ 0 \cdots 0 & \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,2}\tau_{i,2,1}}{N_i} \cdots \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,2}\tau_{i,2,N_i}}{N_i} & 0 \cdots 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 \cdots 0 & 0 \cdots 0 & \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,m_{i+1}}\tau_{i,m_{i+1},1}}{N_i} \cdots \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,m_{i+1}}\tau_{i,m_{i+1},N_i}}{N_i} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

$\tau_{i,j,k}$ s are all  $\pm 1$ . Since  $|\omega_{i,j,k}| \leq 1$ , each components are also bounded by 1. For  $k$ th row of  $W_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |(W_{i \rightarrow i+1})_k|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i+1}} N_i \frac{\tilde{R}_{i,j}^2}{N_i^2} \\ &\leq \frac{R_i^2}{N_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $|W_{i \rightarrow i+1}|_F^2 \leq R_i^2 N_{i+1} m_{i+2} / N_i$ . Plugging into the expressions of  $N_i$  and  $N_{i+1}$  and taking square root, we get the upper bound  $m_{i+2}$  as in the statement. For the bias term, we simply use the fact that it is a coordinate of  $\omega$  and thus bounded by 1.

For the bottom layer the weight matrix is just given by  $A_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ , its Frobenius norm can only be bounded by  $(N_1 m_2)^{1/2}$ . On the other hand, the weight matrix of the top layer is given by  $B_{L \rightarrow L+1}$ , whose Frobenius norm is bounded by  $R_L / \sqrt{N_L}$ . Since  $N_i$  is of the scale  $1/\epsilon^2$ ,  $|A_{0 \rightarrow 1}|_F$  is of the scale  $\epsilon$  while  $|B_{L \rightarrow L+1}|_F$  is of the scale  $1/\epsilon$ . To resolve this issue, we can rescale  $A_{0 \rightarrow 1}$  down by a factor of  $\epsilon$ . Because the ReLU nodes are homogeneous of degree 1, for the function  $g_{1:L}$  remains unchanged, we need only scale all the bias terms in the intermediate layers down by the same factor  $\epsilon$ , and scale up  $B_{L \rightarrow L+1}$  by the factor of  $1/\epsilon$ . For  $\epsilon < 1$ , this rescaling keeps the weights matrices in the intermediate layers unchanged, the bias terms are still all less than 1. And

$$\begin{aligned} |\epsilon A_{0 \rightarrow 1}|_F &\leq \prod_{i=1}^L R_i \sqrt{m_2((r+s)^2 + 1)}, \\ |B_{L \rightarrow L+1}/\epsilon|_F &\leq \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition. 4.** *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 4, we have*

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f_{1:L} - g_{1:L}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon,$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on  $L, s, r, \{R_i\}_{i=1}^L$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 4, we know that

$$\left( \int_{S_L} |f_{1:L} - g_{1:L}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \leq L\epsilon. \quad (16)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(S_L) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{s^2} \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} \frac{i^2}{\prod_{j=i+1}^L R_j^2}.$$

By the bounds on the weights of  $g_{1:L}$ , know that

$$|g_{1:L}| \leq \sqrt{r^2 + 1} \prod_{i=1}^L R_i.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus S_L} |f_{1:L} - g_{1:L}|^2 \, d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} &\leq \left( \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus S_L} (|f_{1:L}|^2 + |g_{1:L}|^2) \, d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left( r + (r^2 + 1)^{1/2} \prod_{i=1}^L R_i \right) \frac{\epsilon}{s} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} \frac{i^2}{\prod_{j=i+1}^L R_j^2} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C\epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

By Eq. 16 and 17, we have

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f_{1:L} - g_{1:L}|^2 \, d\mathbb{P} \right)^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon,$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on  $L, s, r, \{R_i\}_{i=1}^L$ . □

## F Extra Plots of Experiments

In this section, we provide extra figures obtained from our experiments.

Figure 3 shows the distribution of synthetic data we use in the performance comparison between random Fourier features and random ReLU.




Figure 3: Illustrations on the distribution of synthetic datasets. Top left: sine. Top right: strips. Bottom left: square. Bottom right: checkboard.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the data and the target function in our experiment on depth separation. It is based on Daniely’s construction.

We also test the depth separation phenomenon using Eldan and Shamir’s construction. Figure 5 shows the distribution of the data and the target functions constructed by Eldan and Shamir. The data distribution is rotation invariant over  $\mathbb{R}^4$  with rapid oscillating radial density. The classification target function  $g$  is  $\pm 1$  at the high density region and 0 otherwise. The regression target function  $\tilde{g}$  is obtained by mollifying  $g$  with the smooth bump function.

From Figure 6 and Figure 7, we can see that the performance of the three models in both classification and regression tasks over Eldan and Shamir’s example is consistent with that of Daniely’s example.




Figure 4: Illustration of distributions of synthetic data of Daniely's example. Left: density of  $x_1x_3 + x_2x_4$ . Right: Smoothed (blue) and unsmoothed (red) target labels against  $x_1x_3 + x_2x_4$ .




Figure 5: Illustration of distributions of synthetic data for depth separation experiment. Left: radial density of data. Right: Smoothed (blue) and unsmoothed (red) target labels against the radius.




Figure 6: Left: performance of the deep and shallow models in the classification task. Right: performance of the deep and shallow models in the regression task.




Figure 7: Left: the predicted labels (red) by the best random ReLU features model compared to the true labels (blue) plotted against the radius  $|x|$ . Middle: the predicted labels (red) by the best 2-layer neural nets compared to the true labels (blue). Right: the predicted labels (red) by the best 3-layer neural nets compared to the true labels (blue).