
LEARNING OPERATORS FOR IDENTIFYING WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

Dixi Wang

Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
dixiawang@ufl.edu

Cheng Yu

Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
chengyu@ufl.edu

June 21, 2023

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on investigating the learning operators for identifying weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. Our objective is to establish a connection between the initial data as input and the weak solution as output. To achieve this, we employ a combination of deep learning methods and compactness argument to derive learning operators for weak solutions for any large initial data in 2D, and for low-dimensional initial data in 3D. Additionally, we utilize the universal approximation theorem to derive a lower bound on the number of sensors required to achieve accurate identification of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. Our results demonstrate the potential of using deep learning techniques to address challenges in the study of fluid mechanics, particularly in identifying weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations.

1 Introduction

The incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (ICNS) in the periodic domain $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d = 2$ or 3 is written as:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{T}^d \times [0, T], \quad (1)$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{T}^d \times [0, T], \quad (2)$$

with initial data

$$\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0 \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}^d. \quad (3)$$

Here $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the velocity field, $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the pressure, and $\nu > 0$ is the viscosity coefficient.

The Navier-Stokes equations are fundamental in the fields of science and engineering. Despite extensive research, the mathematical understanding of the incompressible Navier-Stokes (ICNS) remains incomplete. One of the most significant challenges is the lack of global-in-time smooth solutions for ICNS in three dimensions, which has been a long-standing open problem. While global Leray-Hopf weak solutions have been proven to exist for dimensions $d \geq 2$, uniqueness has only been established in 2D, leaving the uniqueness of 3D Leray-Hopf solutions an open problem [Lio96]. These unresolved issues highlight the complexity of the Navier-Stokes equations and the need for continued research in this area. Therefore, this paper focuses on investigating the learning operators for weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, aiming to contribute to the understanding and development of this critical field.

Deep neural networks, as *universal approximators* can approximate finite-dimensional continuous functions up to arbitrary accuracy [Bar93]. In recent years, we have witnessed tremendous success of network-based PDE solvers working with smooth solutions in explicit form with high accuracy. For example, *physics informed neural networks* (PINNs) can solve both forward problems as well as inverse problems [RK18],[RPK19]. When the solution attains singularities, [Zan+20] parameterized both the weak solution and the test function by neural networks and learn the parameters in an adversarial manner governed by weak formulation. In [Che+22], the authors proposed the Friedrichs learning to transform the PDE problem into a minmax optimization problem, their algorithm is capable to capture the discontinuity of the solution without a priori knowledge.

Although deep learning has achieved huge success in many applications, its statistical theory, particularly on operator approximations between infinite-dimensional spaces, is still limited. The universal approximation theorem, which allows networks to approximate operators between two compact subsets of infinite-dimensional Banach spaces, was first proved by [CC95]. Later [LJK21] introduced DeepONets, a combination of branch and trunk nets, that can approximate a continuous operator mapping from a compact subset of an infinite-dimensional space to another Banach space within any desired precision. However, neither of these results provides explicit estimation on the complexity of the networks involved. In 2017, Yarotsky [Yar17] described a ReLU network architecture with a certain depth and complexity that can approximate any functions within the unit ball of the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{m,\infty}([0, 1]^d)$ to any desired precision. [Liu+22] derived an upper bound on the generalization error for learning Lipschitz operators between infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces by neural networks, which reveals a direct relationship between generalization error and the number of data samples. [LMK22] weakened the assumptions on continuity and compactness of the input space and provided explicit bounds for DeepONets. [Jia+23] derived an error bound for Hölder continuous functions, with a prefactor in the error bound dependent on the dimension in polynomial order. Overall, these findings provide insights into the capabilities and limitations of neural networks in approximating operators between infinite-dimensional spaces and shed light on the complexity of the networks required for different levels of precision.

Both [Liu+22] and [LMK22] employ a model reduction method, which is a common technique in data-driven learning for time-dependent parametrized PDEs as documented in the literature [Roz14; Bha+21]. In order to approximate maps between infinite-dimensional spaces, a typical first step is to reduce the dimensions of both input and output spaces using encoders and decoders (also known as projectors and reconstructors). Encoders are used to project high-dimensional data onto a lower-dimensional space, while decoders are used to map the reduced data back to the original space. Popular choices of encoders include orthogonal basis of a separable Hilbert space and PCA (principal component analysis) encoder. Basis encoders, such as orthogonal polynomials and trigonometric basis, are independent of the training data and only depend on the underlying Hilbert space. In contrast, PCA encoder is data-driven and has become increasingly popular in recent years due to its simplicity of implementation and good numerical performance [Sha+05; BBZ07].

The Navier-Stokes equations present challenges for accurately capturing weak solutions using traditional numerical methods in various settings. Deep neural networks, on the other hand, offer a highly flexible approach for approximating solutions to some PDEs under different settings. Hence, in this paper, we explore the use of deep learning operators to identify weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, which can provide a more efficient and accurate approach to fluid dynamics problems.

The current paper builds upon and is inspired by [Bha+21] and [LJK21], the aim of this paper is to use deep neural networks to learn a nonlinear operator that maps from an observed initial function space to the space of Leray-Hopf solutions to (1)-(3) in both 2D and 3D cases via nonparametric regression estimation. We also aim to estimate the number of sensors required to achieve good accuracy in the 3D case on $[-\pi, \pi]^3$. In [LJK21], the authors treated initial functions as input functions of an unknown operator and estimated the number of sensors required when the input functions were modeled as Gaussian processes. Later, in [LMK22], the approximation error of DeepONet was analyzed, and input functions were projected from an infinite-dimensional space into an m -dimensional vector space, where m is the number of sensors. However, the high dimensionality of the input vector space can limit the efficiency of learning in realistic tasks. To address this issue, we adopt a different approach by encoding the input functions using eigenfunctions of the Stokes operator into a D -dimensional vector space, where D is independent of m . Given a desired level of accuracy, we estimate the number of sensors required based on the *universal approximation theorem* [CC95].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we define weak solutions and deep neural networks. We introduce the learning framework by specifying the encoder and decoder for our work and making several assumptions on the operator learning problem, Then we state our main results. In Section 3, we first briefly describe the Galerkin approximation then we prove a key Lipschitz property of the solution operator at each Galerkin level. Based on this Lipschitz continuity, we prove a lemma on the network approximation error. The proof of Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 follows. Finally in Section 4, we prove Theorem 2.9 on an estimation of number of sensors needed to obtain a good accuracy.

2 Notation, learning setting and statement of main results

2.1 Weak solutions

We briefly introduce Leray-Hopf weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. For convenience, we define the following function spaces:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V} &= \{\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d) \mid \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi} = 0\}, \\ H &= \text{closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{T}^d), \\ V_s &= \text{closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } H^s(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad s > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. The space V_s is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_s} = \|\cdot\|_{H_0^s(\mathbb{T}^d)}$. In particular, if $s = 1$, denote $V = V_1$, and one can identify the space $V = \{v \in H_0^1(\mathbb{T}^d) \mid \operatorname{div} v = 0\}$.

The weak solution is given in the following sense:

Definition 2.2. For any $T > 0$, $\mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x})$ is a Leray-Hopf weak solution of system 1-3 if

$$\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H), \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathbf{u} \, d\mathbf{x} = 0,$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}- \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \boldsymbol{\phi} \, d\mathbf{x} dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \, d\mathbf{x} dt + \nu \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla \mathbf{u} : \nabla \boldsymbol{\phi} \, d\mathbf{x} dt \\ = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}(0) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d \times [0, T)) \text{ with } \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\phi} = 0,\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

and the energy inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \nu \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})|^2 \, d\mathbf{x}.\tag{5}$$

2.2 Learning framework

A feedforward neural network $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is written as:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = W_L \cdot \sigma(W_{L-1} \cdots \sigma(W_1 \mathbf{x} + b_1) + \cdots + b_{L-1}) + b_L, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n,\tag{6}$$

where W_i and b_i are the weight matrix and bias vector for layer $i = 1, \dots, L$. L denotes the depth of the network, and σ is an activation function applied element-wise to the intermediate outputs. In this paper, we focus on neural networks using the rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation function:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = (\max\{0, x_1\}, \max\{0, x_2\}, \dots, \max\{0, x_n\}), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We consider a network class \mathcal{F}_{NN} that contains ReLU neural networks mapping from a compact domain of the input space $[-M, M]^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to the output space $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$, $M > 0$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{NN}(n, n', L, r, M) &= \{\Gamma = [f^{(1)}, f^{(2)}, \dots, f^{(n')}]^T : \text{for each } k = 1, \dots, n', \\ & f^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) : [-M, M]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is in the form (6) with } L^{(k)} \leq L, r^{(k)} \leq r\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $r^{(k)}$ denotes the number of weights and bias of $f^{(k)}$.

2.3 Our learning setup

Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure on H , we assume that \mathbb{P} is supported on a compact set $K \subset H$. Let $S(N) = \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a training set from which $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is a finite collection of N i.i.d. draws from \mathbb{P} , and $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are the corresponding output samples w.r.t. the push-forward measure $\Psi_{\#}\mathbb{P}$ and evaluated at a fixed time. The training data is generated using pseudo-spectral methods. We denote by $Y := L^2(0, T; V)$ as the space of outputs to simplify the notation and let $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be the unknown operator mapping initial functions to the Leray-Hopf solutions of the ICNS. Instead of a direct attempt to approximating Ψ between infinite-dimensional spaces, we exploit a finite-dimensional structure by reducing the dimensions of the input and output spaces using so-called encoders and decoders.

The Galerkin approximation in Section 3.1 provides a natural choice of encoders and decoders for the underlying PDE. Let $d_H > 0$ be the dimension of the encoded vector space for the input space H , we define the following induced encoder $\mathcal{E}^{d_H} : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_H}$:

$$\mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) := (\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_1 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_{d_H} \rangle)^T, \quad (8)$$

where $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^{d_H}$ are the first d_H eigenfunctions of the Stokes operator. Conversely, we define the decoder $\mathcal{D}^{d_H} : \mathbb{R}^{d_H} \rightarrow H$ by

$$\mathcal{D}^{d_H}(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{i=1}^{d_H} a_i \mathbf{w}_i, \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{d_H}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_H}. \quad (9)$$

Denote $\Pi_{d_H} := \mathcal{D}^{d_H} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}$. It should be satisfied that

$$\mathcal{E}^{d_H} \circ \mathcal{D}^{d_H} = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{d_H}} : \mathbb{R}^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_H}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{d_H} \approx \text{Id}_H : H \rightarrow H. \quad (10)$$

Suppose the dimension of the encoded vector space for the solution space Y is d_Y . We define the encoder $\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ and the decoder $\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} : \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \rightarrow Y$ similarly:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^{d_Y}(\mathbf{y}) &:= (\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_1 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}_{d_Y} \rangle)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}, \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{y} \in Y, \\ \mathcal{R}^{d_Y}(\mathbf{b}) &:= \sum_{i=1}^{d_Y} b_i \mathbf{w}_i, \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{d_Y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here, we regard each b_i as an evaluation of $d_i^{d_Y}(t)$ defined in (18) at a fixed time. Denote $\Pi_{d_Y} := \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \mathcal{P}^{d_Y}$. Again, it should be satisfied that

$$\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}} : \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{d_Y} \approx \text{Id}_Y : Y \rightarrow Y. \quad (12)$$

We have the following lemma for the properties of these operators, which is necessary in our proof later.

Lemma 2.3. \mathcal{E}^{d_H} , \mathcal{D}^{d_H} , \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} , \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} are Lipschitz operators with Lipschitz coefficients 1.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in H$. Since H is a separable Hilbert space and the eigenfunctions $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of the Stokes operator $-\Delta$ form an orthonormal basis of H , we have


$$\|\mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d_H} |\langle \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty |\langle \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle|^2 = \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_H^2.$$

For any $\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_H}$,

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{d_H}(\mathbf{a}) - \mathcal{D}^{d_H}(\bar{\mathbf{a}})\|_H^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_H} (a_i - \bar{a}_i) \mathbf{w}_i \right\|_H^2 = \|\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{a}}\|_2^2.$$

A similar argument gives the Lipschitz continuity of \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} , \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} and their Lipschitz constants 1. \square

Once we define the encoders and decoders, a finite-dimensional map on the discretization grid can be learned by deep neural networks. The whole process is illustrated in the following diagram:



2.4 Main results

We state our main results in this subsection. First, we need following assumptions.

Assumption 2.4. For every initial function $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H$,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_H \leq R, \quad \text{for some } R \in \mathbb{R}^+. \quad (13)$$

Thus initial functions are chosen from the ball $B_R(H) := \{\mathbf{x} \in H; \|\mathbf{x}\|_H \leq R\}$. In 3D case, we need the following restriction on the initial function:

Assumption 2.5. Let $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be the orthonormal basis of H . There exists $D \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that every initial function \mathbf{u}_0 satisfies

$$\mathbf{u}_0 \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_D\} \subset H.$$

We call such initial data as low-dimensional initial data.

Remark 2.6. As one shall see in Lemma 3.1, Assumption 2.5 imposes an uniform upper bound on the Lipschitz constant L_{Ψ^k} , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, in 3D case so that both the network approximation error and the projection error can be controlled given an accuracy ϵ . The low-dimensional structure has been proposed in several examples to improve the convergence rate significantly ([BW09],[Jia+23]), and has been observed in applications such as image processing. In [Roz14], the authors analyzed the reduced basis method on various PDE models, and discussed when it leads to a good approximation error.

For 2D Leray-Hopf solutions, we have the following result:

Theorem 2.7. *Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure supported on $B_R(H)$ and $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be a \mathbb{P} -measurable operator mapping initial function $\mathbf{x} \in B_R(H)$ to the Leray-Hopf weak solution to the 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (1)-(3). Let $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $d_H(L_\Psi, \epsilon), d_Y(\epsilon) > 0$, $N = N(d_H, d_Y)$, a ReLU network $\Gamma_{NN} \in \mathcal{F}_{NN}(d_H, d_Y, L, r, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}})$ with $L = L(d_H, d_Y, L_\Psi, R, \epsilon)$ and $r = r(d_H, d_Y, L_\Psi, R, \epsilon)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \Gamma_{NN} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 < \epsilon. \quad (14)$$

For 3D Leray-Hopf solutions, we have the following result:

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose Assumption 2.5 holds. Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure supported on $B_R(H)$ and $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be a \mathbb{P} -measurable operator mapping initial function $\mathbf{x} \in B_R(H)$ to the Leray-Hopf weak solution to the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (1)-(3). Let $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $d_H(L_\Psi, \epsilon) \geq D$, $d_Y(\epsilon) > 0$, $N = N(d_H, d_Y)$, a ReLU network $\Gamma_{NN} \in \mathcal{F}_{NN}(d_H, d_Y, L, r, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}})$ with $L = L(d_H, d_Y, L_\Psi, R, \epsilon)$ and $r = r(d_H, d_Y, L_\Psi, R, \epsilon)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \Gamma_{NN} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 < \epsilon. \quad (15)$$

The double expectation averages over new inputs \mathbf{x} drawn from \mathbb{P} and over realizations of the i.i.d. data $S(N)$. Finally, we give an estimation on data generation of the approximation theory to 3D Leray-Hopf solutions. One can choose uniformly $m + 1$ points $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \in [-\pi, \pi]^3$ as location of sensors. From Section 3.1, we know $\mathbf{w}_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, D$. We define a function $\mathbf{w}_i^m(\mathbf{x})$ to be the trilinear interpolation of $\mathbf{w}_i(\mathbf{x})$ based on $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m$. Using Taylor expansion, there exists a constant $\kappa(D, m) > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in [-\pi, \pi]^3} |\mathbf{w}_i(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{w}_i^m(\mathbf{x})| \leq \kappa(D, m), \quad (16)$$

where $\kappa(D, m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that Assumption 2.4 and Assumption 2.5 hold for some $R, D > 0$ and m is a positive integer making*

$$C_1 e^{CR^4 \lambda_D} \kappa(D, m) < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon,$$

where $C_1 = C_1(D, R) > 0$. Let $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be the operator mapping initial function $\mathbf{u}_0 \in B_R(H)$ to the Leray-Hopf weak solution to the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (1)-(3). Then there exist $d_H, d_Y, k > 0$ and a depth-2 ReLU neural network with weights and bias $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d_H}$, $b_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_H}$, $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y \times k}$, $b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$, such that

$$\|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathcal{E}^D(\mathbf{u}_0)^T) + b_2)\|_Y < \epsilon.$$

3 Learning operator to the weak solutions

3.1 Galerkin approximation.

From now on, $s = d/2$. The global existence of Leray-Hopf solutions was established based on Galerkin approximation. The eigenfunctions $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of the Stokes operator $-\Delta$ form an orthonormal basis of H . Precisely, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we choose $\beta_k, \beta_{-k} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\{\beta_k \cos(k \cdot \mathbf{x})\} \cup \{\beta_k \sin(k \cdot \mathbf{x})\}$ forms the orthonormal basis and the corresponding eigenvalue is given by $\lambda_k = |k|^2$. We re-label the sequence $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that the corresponding $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing.

For any $\mathbf{h} \in H$, \mathbf{h} can be written as $\mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle \mathbf{w}_i$. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a projection operator $P_m : H \rightarrow \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\}$ by

$$P_m(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle \mathbf{w}_i.$$

The m -th order Galerkin approximation of Navier-Stokes equations is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{u}^m + P_m[(\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m] - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}^m &= 0, \\ \mathbf{u}_0^m &= P_m(\mathbf{u}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Suppose the solution of (17) takes the form

$$\mathbf{u}^m(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{k=1}^m d_k^m(t) \mathbf{w}_k(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\} \quad (18)$$

with m unknown functions $d_k^m, k = 1, 2, \dots, m$. We multiply (17) with \mathbf{w}_k and integrate over \mathbf{x} . By orthogonality of $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and the properties of eigenfunctions, we obtain an ODE system in $d_k^m(t), k = 1, 2, \dots, m$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} d_k^m(t) + \nu \lambda_k d_k^m(t) + \sum_{j,l=1}^m d_j^m(t) d_l^m(t) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathbf{w}_j(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{w}_l(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{w}_k(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (19)$$

By classical ODE theory, there exists $T > 0$ such that the ODE system (19) admits unique solutions $\{d_k^m(t)\}_{k=1}^m \in C^1((0, T))$. Let $t \in (0, T]$, multiply 17 by \mathbf{u}^m and integrate over \mathbf{x} to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t \mathbf{u}^m \cdot \mathbf{u}^m \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m \cdot \mathbf{u}^m \, d\mathbf{x} - \nu \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Delta \mathbf{u}^m \cdot \mathbf{u}^m \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

By the incompressibility of \mathbf{u}^m , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m \cdot \mathbf{u}^m \, d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (20)$$

Thus we can obtain the following m -dimensional energy equality

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}^m(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 = 0.$$

Integrating on $t \in [0, T]$, $T > 0$, this energy equality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}^m(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \\ \nu \int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \, dt &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Therefore $\{\mathbf{u}^m\}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H)$ for any positive T . In particular, $\{d_k^m(t)\}_{k=1}^m$ is uniformly bounded in t , hence T can be ∞ .

By classical theory of weak solutions, $\{\mathbf{u}^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence, still denoted by $\{\mathbf{u}^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, that strongly converges to $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0, T; V)$, and \mathbf{u} is a Leray-Hopf weak solution to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations 1-3. Readers may refer to [Lio96] for more details.

3.2 Properties of Approximating Operators

In this Section, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed order in the Galerkin approximation. We have seen in Section 3.1 that the first m principal eigenfunctions $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\}$ together with the projection operator P_m provide a way to reduce the dimension of the target operator between infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces to a mapping between finite dimensional vector space. The goal of this subsection is to show that the solution operator is Lipschitz in term of initial data.

Let $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H$, denote \mathbf{u}_0^m to be

$$\mathbf{u}_0^m := P_m(\mathbf{u}_0) := \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle \mathbf{w}_i. \quad (22)$$

By Assumption 2.4, $\|\mathbf{u}_0^m\|_H \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_H \leq R$.

Denote by $\Psi^m : \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\} \rightarrow Y$ the operator mapping \mathbf{u}_0^m to \mathbf{u}^m , where \mathbf{u}^m is the unique solution of m -th order Galerkin equation (17). By energy inequality (21) and Assumption 2.4,

$$\|\Psi^m(\mathbf{u}_0^m)\|_Y = \|\mathbf{u}^m\|_Y \leq C(\nu)\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_H \leq C(\nu)R,$$

where $C(\nu)$ is a positive constant depending on ν , but independent of m . The next lemma shows that Ψ^m is a Lipschitz operator with respect to the initial function.

Lemma 3.1. Let $d = 2, 3$, and $T > 0$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Psi^m : \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\} \rightarrow Y$$

is a Lipschitz operator, i.e. for any $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_0 \in H$ satisfying (13) and $\mathbf{u}_0^m, \mathbf{v}_0^m$ given in (22),

$$\|\Psi^m(\mathbf{u}_0^m) - \Psi^m(\mathbf{v}_0^m)\|_Y \leq L_{\Psi^m}\|\mathbf{u}_0^m - \mathbf{v}_0^m\|_H. \quad (23)$$

Proof. Without any ambiguities, we omit the subscript of norms. Let $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_0 \in H$ with finite initial energy (13), we denote by

$$\mathbf{u}^m := \Psi^m(\mathbf{u}_0^m), \quad \mathbf{v}^m := \Psi^m(\mathbf{v}_0^m)$$

the corresponding solutions respectively to the m -th order Galerkin approximation (17) in the form 18.

Accordingly, we denote by

$$\mathbf{h}_0^m = \mathbf{u}_0^m - \mathbf{v}_0^m, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{h}^m = \mathbf{u}^m - \mathbf{v}^m.$$

For any $s \in (0, T]$, multiply (17) at time s with $\mathbf{h}^m(s)$ and integrate in x to get

$$-\langle \mathbf{u}^m, \partial_t \mathbf{h}^m \rangle + \nu \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}^m, \nabla \mathbf{h}^m \rangle + \langle (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle = -\frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{u}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle, \quad (24)$$

Similarly,

$$-\langle \mathbf{v}^m, \partial_t \mathbf{h}^m \rangle + \nu \langle \nabla \mathbf{v}^m, \nabla \mathbf{h}^m \rangle + \langle (\mathbf{v}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle = -\frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{v}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle. \quad (25)$$

The difference of 24 and 25 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^2 &\leq \left| \langle (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m - (\mathbf{v}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \langle (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle - \langle (\mathbf{u}^m - \mathbf{h}^m) \cdot \nabla (\mathbf{u}^m - \mathbf{h}^m), \mathbf{h}^m \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \langle (\mathbf{u}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{h}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle + \langle (\mathbf{h}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle - \langle (\mathbf{h}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{h}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

By (20) and the incompressibility of \mathbf{h}^m , the first and the last terms on the right side of 26 vanish. Thus we have the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^2 \leq \left| \langle (\mathbf{h}^m \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^m, \mathbf{h}^m \rangle \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\mathbf{h}^m|^2 |\nabla \mathbf{u}^m| dx. \quad (27)$$

The Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality with $\theta = \frac{d}{4}$ implies that

$$\|\mathbf{h}^m\|_{L^4}^2 \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^{d/2} \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^{2-d/2}$$

holds for $d = 2, 3$. Then 27 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^2 &\leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m\| \cdot \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^{2-d/2} \cdot \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^{d/2} \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 \cdot \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m\|^{4/4-d} + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{h}^m\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used Young's inequality and the constant C depends on d and ν .

By Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$\|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{h}_0^m\|^2 \exp\left(C \int_0^s \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m\|^{4/4-d} dt\right). \quad (28)$$

When $d = 2$, one may use (21) and (13) such that (28) can be bounded by $\|\mathbf{h}_0^m\|^2 \exp(CR^2)$ with C depending on ν and d but independent of m . In this case, by the definition of \mathbf{h}^m and \mathbf{h}_0^m , Ψ^m is a Lipschitz operator with Lipschitz constant $L_{\Psi^m} = \exp(CR^2)$ independent of m .

When $d = 3$, (28) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 &\leq \|\mathbf{h}_0^m\|^2 \exp\left(C \int_0^s \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m\|^4 dt\right) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|\mathbf{h}_0^m\|^2 \exp\left(C \sup_t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m(t)\|^2\right)}_{\text{I}} \cdot \underbrace{\int_0^s \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m(t)\|^2 dt}_{\text{II}}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

It is clear that II is uniformly bounded by $\|\mathbf{u}^m\|^2 \leq R^2$ according to (21). As for I, we use energy inequality (21) and the fact that $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\}$ is an orthonormal basis and the corresponding eigenvalue λ_k is non-decreasing to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^m(t)\|^2 &= \sup_t \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m d_k^m(t) \nabla \mathbf{w}_k \right\|^2 \\ &= \sup_t \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k (d_k^m(t))^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_m \sup_t \|\mathbf{u}^m(t)\|^2 \leq \lambda_m \|\mathbf{u}_0^m\|^2 \leq \lambda_m R^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now (29) becomes

$$\|\mathbf{h}^m\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{h}_0^m\|^2 \exp(CR^4 \lambda_m)$$

with C depending on ν , d and λ_m depending on m . Therefore in 3D case, Ψ^m is a Lipschitz operator with Lipschitz constant

$$L_{\Psi^m} = \exp(CR^4 \lambda_m)$$

depending on m . □

Remark 3.2. In 2-dimensional case, the Lipschitz constant L_{Ψ^m} is independent of m , this implies that by taking $m \rightarrow \infty$, Ψ is also Lipschitz with the same Lipschitz constant as each Ψ^m . The Lipschitz condition on Ψ provides an alternative approach to prove the uniqueness of 2D Leray-Hopf weak solution.

Remark 3.3. In 3-dimensional case, the Lipschitz constant $L_{\Psi^m} = \exp(CR^4 \lambda_m)$ depends on m as we arrange the basis functions $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in an order that λ_k is non-decreasing. The Galerkin approximating sequence $\{\mathbf{u}^m\}$ converges to \mathbf{u} in $L^2(0, T; V)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, the corresponding $L_{\Psi^m} \rightarrow \infty$ exponentially fast.

3.3 The Empirical Projection Error

The empirical projection errors on both H and Y spaces w.r.t. a finite collection of training data $S(N) = \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ can be bounded using a Monte Carlo type estimate. Given encoding dimension $d_H, d_Y > 0$, the projection errors are denoted by:

$$\text{Pr} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\mathbf{x} - \Pi_{d_H} \mathbf{x}\|_H^2, \quad \text{Pr}^{\Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}} \|\mathbf{y} - \Pi_{d_Y} \mathbf{y}\|_Y^2. \quad (30)$$

And the corresponding empirical projection errors are given by:

$$\text{Pr}(N) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{x}_j - \Pi_{d_H} \mathbf{x}_j\|_H^2, \quad \text{Pr}^{\Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}}(N) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{y}_j - \Pi_{d_Y} \mathbf{y}_j\|_Y^2. \quad (31)$$

We state the following lemma which is a partial result of Theorem 3.4 [Bha+21], and the proof can be found therein.

Lemma 3.4. There exist constants $Q_H, Q_Y \geq 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_j \sim \mathbb{P}} [\text{Pr}(N)] \leq \sqrt{\frac{Q_H d_H}{N}} + \text{Pr}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_j \sim \Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}} [\text{Pr}^{\Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}}(N)] \leq \sqrt{\frac{Q_Y d_Y}{N}} + \text{Pr}^{\Psi_{\# \mathbb{P}}}. \quad (32)$$

3.4 The Networks Approximation Error

In this subsection, we prove an auxiliary lemma on the networks approximation error, together with projection errors in both H, Y spaces we can prove our main results Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.8. This lemma is inspired by [Bha+21] Theorem 3.5, the difference comes from the choice of encoder and decoder. In [Bha+21], the authors use PCA as an empirical dimension reduction method; while in our work, we use deterministic basis which is independent of training data.

Given $d_H, d_Y > 0$, we define $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ as

$$\psi := \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ \mathcal{D}^{d_H}, \quad (33)$$

We aim to approximate ψ by some ReLU neural networks $\Gamma_{NN} : \mathbb{R}^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$. We also define two operators $\Psi_\Delta, \Psi_{NN} : H \rightarrow Y$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_\Delta &:= \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \psi \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}, \\ \Psi_{NN} &:= \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \Gamma \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.5. Let H, Y be two separable Hilbert spaces defined in Section 2. Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure on $B_R(H) := \{x \in H; \|x\|_H \leq R\}$ with compact support. Let $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be a Lipschitz operator with Lipschitz constant L_Ψ . Fix $d_H, d_Y > 0$, the encoders and decoders on H, Y : $\mathcal{E}^{d_H}, \mathcal{D}^{d_H}, \mathcal{P}^{d_Y}, \mathcal{R}^{d_Y}$ are defined in (8),(9) and (11). Let $\delta > 0$, there exist a constant $c = c(d_H, d_Y) > 0$ and a ReLU neural network

$$\Gamma_{NN} \in \mathcal{F}_{NN}(d_H, d_Y, L, r, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}})$$

such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \Gamma_{NN} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 < 2\delta^2 + 4L_\Psi \left(\sqrt{\frac{Q_H d_H}{N}} + \Pr \right) + 4 \left(\sqrt{\frac{Q_Y d_Y}{N}} + \Pr^{\Psi_{\mathbb{P}}} \right)$$

for some $Q_H, Q_Y \geq 0$, where

$$L \leq c \left[\log \left(\frac{R \sqrt{d_Y}}{\delta \sqrt{d_H}} \right) + 1 \right], \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq c \left(\frac{\delta \sqrt{d_H}}{2R} \right)^{-d_H} \left[\log \left(\frac{R \sqrt{d_Y}}{\delta \sqrt{d_H}} \right) + 1 \right].$$

Proof. We simply write $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}}$ as $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}$, and decompose $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Psi_{NN}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2$ as:

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Psi_{NN}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 \leq \underbrace{2 \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Psi_{NN}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2}_I + \underbrace{2 \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2}_II. \quad (34)$$

We first look at II, recall the definition of Π_{d_H}, Π_{d_Y} in (10) and (12):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Psi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ \mathcal{D}^{d_H} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Pi_{d_Y} \Psi(\Pi_{d_H}(\mathbf{x})) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Pi_{d_Y} \Psi(\Pi_{d_H}(\mathbf{x})) - \Pi_{d_Y} \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 + 2 \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Pi_{d_Y} \Psi(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 \\ &\leq 2L_\Psi \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \|\Pi_{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|_H^2 + 2 \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \Psi_{\mathbb{P}}} \|\Pi_{d_Y} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}\|_Y^2 \\ &= 2L_\Psi \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_j \sim \mathbb{P}} [\Pr(N)] + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_i \sim \Psi_{\mathbb{P}}} [\Pr^{\Psi_{\mathbb{P}}}(N)] \\ &\leq 2L_\Psi \left(\sqrt{\frac{Q_H d_H}{N}} + \Pr \right) + 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{Q_Y d_Y}{N}} + \Pr^{\Psi_{\mathbb{P}}} \right),\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where we use Lemma 3.4 in the last inequality. We next control I by first approximating ψ by some ReLU networks. From (33), ψ is a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant L_Ψ . For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_H}$,

$$\psi(\mathbf{a}) = (\psi^{(1)}(\mathbf{a}), \dots, \psi^{(d_Y)}(\mathbf{a})),$$

with $\psi^{(j)} \in C(\mathbb{R}^{d_H}; \mathbb{R}), j = 1, \dots, d_Y$. In order to satisfy Assumption 2.4, we require that $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{d_H}) \in [-\frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}]^{d_H}$. Next we perform a change of variables, define $\tilde{\psi}^{(j)} : [0, 1]^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

by

$$\tilde{\psi}^{(j)}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\sqrt{d_H}}{2R} \psi^{(j)}\left(\frac{2R}{\sqrt{d_H}}\mathbf{s} - \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}\right), \quad \mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^{d_H}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\psi^{(j)}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{2R}{\sqrt{d_H}} \tilde{\psi}^{(j)}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d_H}\mathbf{s} + R}{2R}\right),$$

and one can check that $\tilde{\psi}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, d_Y$ is Lipschitz and share the same Lipschitz constant as $\psi^{(j)}$. Given $\delta > 0$, we apply [Yar17] Theorem 1 to $\tilde{\psi}^{(j)}$ for each j and obtain ReLU networks

$$\tilde{f}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{f}^{(d_Y)} : [0, 1]^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$|\tilde{f}^{(j)}(\mathbf{s}) - \tilde{\psi}^{(j)}(\mathbf{s})| < \frac{\delta \sqrt{d_H}}{2R \sqrt{d_Y}}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^{d_H}.$$

Denote by $L^{(j)}$ the depth of $\tilde{f}^{(j)}$, and $r^{(j)}$ the number of weights and bias of $\tilde{f}^{(j)}$. $L^{(j)}, r^{(j)}$ satisfy:

$$L^{(j)} \leq c^{(j)} \left[\log\left(\frac{R \sqrt{d_Y}}{\delta \sqrt{d_H}}\right) + 1 \right], \quad r^{(j)} \leq c^{(j)} \left(\frac{\delta \sqrt{d_H}}{2R}\right)^{-d_H} \left[\log\left(\frac{R \sqrt{d_Y}}{\delta \sqrt{d_H}}\right) + 1 \right]$$

for some $c^{(j)} > 0$ depending on d_H . Then we define $f^{(j)} : \mathbb{R}^{d_H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f^{(j)}(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{2R}{\sqrt{d_H}} \tilde{f}^{(j)}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d_H}\mathbf{a} + R}{2R}\right) \quad (36)$$

for any $\mathbf{a} \in [-\frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}]^{d_H}$, and $|(f^{(1)}(\mathbf{a}), \dots, f^{(d_Y)}(\mathbf{a})) - \psi(\mathbf{a})|_2 < \delta$.

Now, define $\Gamma_{NN}(\mathbf{a}) := (f^{(1)}(\mathbf{a}), \dots, f^{(d_Y)}(\mathbf{a}))$, and set $\Gamma_{NN} \equiv 0$ outside $[-\frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}]^{d_H}$. Such Γ_{NN} satisfies

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in [-\frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{d_H}}]^{d_H}} |\Gamma_{NN}(\mathbf{a}) - \psi(\mathbf{a})|_2 < \delta.$$

Finally, we can bound I as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\Psi_{NN}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi_{\Delta}(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 \\ &= \int_{B_R(H)} \|\Psi_{NN}(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi_{\Delta}(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \int_{B_R(H)} \|\mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \Gamma_{NN} \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ \psi \circ \mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x})\|_Y^2 d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \int_{B_R(H)} \|\Gamma_{NN}(\mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x})) - \psi(\mathcal{E}^{d_H}(\mathbf{x}))\|_2^2 d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) < \delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Here we used $L_{\mathcal{R}^{d_Y}} = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(B_R(H)) \leq 1$. Combining (37) with (34) and (35), we finish the proof. \square

3.5 Approximation Theory of Leray-Hopf Solutions

In this subsection, we combine Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 to prove Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 on the existence of a finite ReLU neural network that can approximate the Leray-Hopf solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations.

3.5.1 2D Leray-Hopf Solutions

Let $\epsilon > 0$. In the case that $d = 2$, thanks to Lemma 3.1 and Remark 3.2, the solution operator $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ is a Lipschitz operator and $L_\Psi = e^{CR^2}$ with $C = C(\nu)$ and ν is the viscosity coefficient. Suppose we have a training dataset $S(N) = \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$, we first bound the projection error on H .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr} &:= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}} \|\mathbf{x} - \Pi_{d_H}(\mathbf{x})\|_H^2 = \int_{B_R(H)} \left\| \sum_{i=d_H+1}^{\infty} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_i) \mathbf{w}_i \right\|_H^2 d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i=d_H+1}^{\infty} \int_{B_R(H)} |(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_i)|^2 d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus Pr is non-negative and monotone decreasing as $d_H \rightarrow \infty$. We can choose d_H and N large enough such that $\text{Pr} + \sqrt{\frac{Q_H d_H}{N}} < \frac{1}{16L_\Psi} \epsilon$. Similarly, we choose d_Y and further enlarge N such that $\text{Pr}^{\Psi^{\mathbb{P}}} + \sqrt{\frac{Q_Y d_Y}{N}} < \frac{1}{16} \epsilon$. Note that the choice of d_H, d_Y is independent of N . Let $\delta = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{2}$ in Lemma 3.5, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.7.

3.5.2 3D Leray-Hopf Solutions

The major difference between 2D and 3D cases is that, we do not have the uniform boundedness of the Lipschitz constant $L_{\Psi^k}, k = 1, 2, \dots$ as discussed in Remark 3.2 and Remark 3.3. When the Galerkin approximation order $k \rightarrow \infty$, the corresponding Lipschitz constant $L_{\Psi^k} \rightarrow \infty$ exponentially fast for each Ψ^k . This property can cause an extremely slow convergence of the approximation error, even failure in convergence. To alleviate the curse of dimensionality, we propose Assumption 2.5 as a special case in 3D setting.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_D\}$, the Galerkin approximations produce a sequence of solutions $\{\mathbf{u}^1, \mathbf{u}^2, \dots, \mathbf{u}^D, \mathbf{u}^D, \dots\}$ with all the rest terms being \mathbf{u}^D . Extracting a convergent subsequence, the 3D Leray-Hopf solution \mathbf{u} under Assumption 2.5 is equal to \mathbf{u}^D . By Lemma 3.1, $\Psi = \Psi^D$ is a Lipschitz operator in terms of the initial function.

Let $d_H = D$, then the projection error on H vanishes. By Lemma 3.4, we can choose \tilde{d}_Y and N large enough such that

$$\Pr^{\Psi_{\#}\mathbb{P}} + \sqrt{\frac{Q_Y \tilde{d}_Y}{N}} < \frac{1}{8}\epsilon.$$

Let $\delta = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{2}$ in Lemma 3.5 and choose $d_Y := \max\{\tilde{d}_Y, D\}$, we finish the proof of Theorem 2.8.

Remark 3.6. When the initial function lies in a finite-dimensional subspace of H , the Lipschitzness of Ψ in terms of initial function implies the uniqueness of 3D weak solution to the ICNS.

4 Data Generation in 3D

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.9, in which we investigate how many sensors are needed to achieve accuracy ϵ for identifying weak solutions to the ICNS using neural networks with 1 hidden layer.

Let $d_H, d_Y > 0$. According to Section 3.5.2, we assume that $d_H = D$. The initial function \mathbf{u}_0 satisfies Assumption 2.4 and Assumption 2.5, i.e.

$$\mathbf{u}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^D a_i \mathbf{w}_i, \quad \text{with each } a_i := \langle \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle, \quad \text{and } \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_H = \left(\sum_{i=1}^D a_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq R \quad (38)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_D$ are the first D components of the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{w}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of H . In practice, we generate \mathbf{u}_0 by randomly sampling \mathbf{a} from the compact subset

$$\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_D) \in \left[-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}} \right]^D.$$

As we consider the 3D problem in periodic domain, one can choose uniformly $m + 1$ points $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \in [-\pi, \pi]^3$ as location of sensors. For each $\mathbf{w}_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, D$, we define a function $\mathbf{w}_i^m(\mathbf{x})$ to be the trilinear interpolation of $\mathbf{w}_i(\mathbf{x})$ based on $m + 1$ sensors $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m$. Denote the operator mapping \mathbf{w}_i to \mathbf{w}_i^m by T_m , then T_m is a continuous operator. Moreover, by Taylor expansion up to the second order, there exists a constant $\kappa(D, m) \sim \frac{D}{m}$ such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in [-\pi, \pi]^3} |\mathbf{w}_i(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{w}_i^m(\mathbf{x})| \leq \kappa(D, m), \quad (39)$$

and $\kappa(D, m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. For each \mathbf{u}_0 in (38), we define \mathbf{u}_0^m based on m sensors as:

$$\mathbf{u}_0^m(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^D a_i \mathbf{w}_i^m(\mathbf{x}). \quad (40)$$

Let $\Psi : H \rightarrow Y$ be the operator discussed in Section 3.5.2. Then Ψ is a Lipschitz operator with

$$L_\Psi = L_{\Psi^D} = e^{CR^4\lambda_D}$$

where $C = C(\nu)$ and ν is the viscosity coefficient. Let $\mathcal{D}^D : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow H$ be the decoder on H defined in (9) and $\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ be the encoder on Y defined in (11). By Lemma 2.3, \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant 1. We can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) - \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ T_m \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a})\|_2 \\ & \leq e^{CR^4\lambda_D} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^m\|_H \leq C_1 e^{CR^4\lambda_D} \kappa(D, m), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(D, R) > 0$. Let $V \subset \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_D\}$ such that V contains all the possible initial functions \mathbf{u}_0 . Then V is a compact subset as it is the image of a continuous map on a compact domain:

$$V = \left\{ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in \left[-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}} \right]^D \right\}.$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} G_m & := \{(\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}_0), \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}_m))^T \mid \mathbf{u}_0 \in V\} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(m+1, 3), \\ V^m & := \{\mathbf{u}_0^m \mid \mathbf{u}_0 \in V\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(m+1, 3)$ denotes the set of all real $(m+1) \times 3$ matrices. Naturally there is a bijection between G_m and V^m , and \mathcal{D}^D is also a bijection between $\left[-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}} \right]^D$ and V . For each $\mathbf{a} \in \left[-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}} \right]^D$, we may define a function $\phi_m : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ by

$$\phi_m(\mathbf{a}) := \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ T_m \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}).$$

Then ϕ is a continuous function. Given an approximation error ϵ , choose the number of sensors m such that the right hand side of (41) satisfies

$$C_1 e^{CR^4\lambda_D} \kappa(D, m) < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon. \quad (42)$$

We can apply the universal approximation theorem [CC95] which states that there exist a ReLU neural network with weights and bias

$$W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times D}, \quad b_1 \in \mathbb{R}^D, \quad W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y \times k}, \quad b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y},$$

such that

$$\|\phi_m(\mathbf{a}) - (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}^T) + b_2)\|_2 < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon - C_1 e^{CR^4\lambda_D} \kappa(D, m)$$

holds for all $\mathbf{a} \in [-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}]^D$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) - (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}^T) + b_2)\|_2 \\
& \leq \|\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) - \mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ T_m \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a})\|_2 \\
& \quad + \|\mathcal{P}^{d_Y} \circ \Psi \circ T_m \circ \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) - (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}^T) + b_2)\|_2 \\
& < C_1 e^{CR^4 \lambda_D} \kappa(D, m) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon - C_1 e^{CR^4 \lambda_D} \kappa(D, m) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Suppose d_Y is chosen sufficiently large such that for any $\mathbf{u}_0 \in V$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\Pi_D(\mathbf{u}_0)))\|_Y & \leq \|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0))\|_Y + \|\Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0)) - \Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\Pi_D(\mathbf{u}_0)))\|_Y \\
& = \|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0))\|_Y < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Recall the definition of \mathcal{E}^{d_H} , \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} in (8)-(11) and Lemma 2.3, we combine (43) and (44) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathcal{E}^D(\mathbf{u}_0)^T) + b_2)\|_Y \\
& \leq \|\Psi(\mathbf{u}_0) - \Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\Pi_D(\mathbf{u}_0)))\|_Y + \|\Pi_{d_Y}(\Psi(\Pi_D(\mathbf{u}_0))) - \mathcal{R}^{d_Y} \circ (W_2 \cdot \sigma(W_1 \cdot \mathcal{E}^D(\mathbf{u}_0)^T) + b_2)\|_Y \\
& < \frac{1}{2} \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon = \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

holds for any $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathcal{D}^D(\mathbf{a}) \in V$, and $\mathbf{a} \in [-\frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}, \frac{R}{\sqrt{D}}]^D$. Therefore, we conclude that the number of sensors m should at least satisfy (42) to achieve an approximation accuracy ϵ .

References

- [Bac17] Francis Bach. “Breaking the Curse of Dimensionality with Convex Neural Networks”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18.19 (2017), pp. 1–53. ISSN: 1533-7928. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/14-546.html> (visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Bar93] A.R. Barron. “Universal approximation bounds for superpositions of a sigmoidal function”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 39.3 (May 1993), pp. 930–945.
- [BBZ07] Gilles Blanchard, Olivier Bousquet, and Laurent Zwald. “Statistical properties of kernel principal component analysis”. In: *Machine Learning* 66.2 (Mar. 2007), pp. 259–294.
- [Bha+21] Kaushik Bhattacharya et al. “Model Reduction And Neural Networks For Parametric PDEs”. In: *The SMAI Journal of computational mathematics* 7 (2021), pp. 121–157.
- [BK19] Benedikt Bauer and Michael Kohler. “On deep learning as a remedy for the curse of dimensionality in nonparametric regression”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 47.4 (2019), pp. 2261–2285.
- [BW09] Richard G. Baraniuk and Michael B. Wakin. “Random Projections of Smooth Manifolds”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 9.1 (Feb. 2009), pp. 51–77.

- [CC95] Tianping Chen and Hong Chen. “Universal approximation to nonlinear operators by neural networks with arbitrary activation functions and its application to dynamical systems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* 6.4 (July 1995). Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, pp. 911–917.
- [CD15] Albert Cohen and Ronald DeVore. “Approximation of high-dimensional parametric PDEs*”. In: *Acta Numerica* 24 (May 2015). Publisher: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–159.
- [Che+22] Fan Chen et al. *Friedrichs learning: weak solutions of partial differential equations via deep learning*. 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2012.08023.pdf>.
- [DHT14] T. A. Driscoll, N. Hale, and L.N. Trefethen. “Chebfun guide”. In: (2014).
- [EMW22] Weinan E, Chao Ma, and Lei Wu. “The Barron Space and the Flow-Induced Function Spaces for Neural Network Models”. en. In: *Constructive Approximation* 55.1 (Feb. 2022), pp. 369–406. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Jia+23] Yuling Jiao et al. *Deep Nonparametric Regression on Approximate Manifolds: Non-Asymptotic Error Bounds with Polynomial Prefactors*. arXiv:2104.06708 [math, stat]. Jan. 2023. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.06708> (visited on 02/17/2023).
- [Lio96] P.-L. Lions. “Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 1”. In: *Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 1*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [Liu+22] Hao Liu et al. *Deep Nonparametric Estimation of Operators between Infinite Dimensional Spaces*. arXiv:2201.00217 [cs, stat]. Jan. 2022. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [LJK21] Lu Lu, Pengzhan Jin, and George Em Karniadakis. “DeepONet: Learning nonlinear operators for identifying differential equations based on the universal approximation theorem of operators”. In: *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3.3 (Mar. 2021). arXiv:1910.03193 [cs, stat], pp. 218–229. ISSN: 2522-5839. (Visited on 02/17/2023).
- [LMK22] Samuel Lanthaler, Siddhartha Mishra, and George E Karniadakis. “Error estimates for DeepONets: a deep learning framework in infinite dimensions”. en. In: *Transactions of Mathematics and Its Applications* 6.1 (Mar. 2022), tnac001. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Ney+17] Behnam Neyshabur et al. “Exploring Generalization in Deep Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [NTS15] Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. *In Search of the Real Inductive Bias: On the Role of Implicit Regularization in Deep Learning*. arXiv:1412.6614 [cs, stat]. Apr. 2015. (Visited on 03/12/2023).
- [PS21] Daniel Potts and Michael Schmischke. “Approximation of high-dimensional periodic functions with Fourier-based methods”. In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 59.5 (Jan. 2021), pp. 2393–2429. ISSN: 0036-1429, 1095-7170. (Visited on 02/17/2023).
- [PV18] Philipp Petersen and Felix Voigtlaender. *Optimal approximation of piecewise smooth functions using deep ReLU neural networks*. arXiv:1709.05289 [cs, math, stat]. May 2018.

- [RK18] M. Raissi and G. E. Karniadakis. “Hidden physics models: Machine learning of non-linear partial differential equations”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 357 (2018), pp. 125–141.
- [Roz14] Gianluigi Rozza. “Fundamentals of reduced basis method for problems governed by parametrized PDEs and applications”. In: *Separated Representations and PGD-Based Model Reduction*. Ed. by Francisco Chinesta and Pierre Ladevèze. Vol. 554. Series Title: CISM International Centre for Mechanical Sciences. Vienna: Springer Vienna, 2014, pp. 153–227. doi: 10.1007/978-3-7091-1794-1_4.
- [RPK19] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis. “Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 378 (2019), pp. 686–707.
- [Sch19] Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. *Deep ReLU network approximation of functions on a manifold*. arXiv:1908.00695 [cs, stat]. Aug. 2019.
- [Sch20] Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. “Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 48.4 (Aug. 2020). ISSN: 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/19-AOS1875. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06633>.
- [Sch21] Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. “The Kolmogorov–Arnold representation theorem revisited”. en. In: *Neural Networks* 137 (May 2021), pp. 119–126. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Sha+05] J. Shawe-Taylor et al. “On the eigenspectrum of the gram matrix and the generalization error of kernel-PCA”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 51.7 (July 2005), pp. 2510–2522.
- [SYZ20] Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. “Deep Network Approximation Characterized by Number of Neurons”. In: *Communications in Computational Physics* 28.5 (June 2020), pp. 1768–1811. (Visited on 02/17/2023).
- [SYZ22] Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. “Optimal Approximation Rate of ReLU Networks in terms of Width and Depth”. In: *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 157 (Jan. 2022), pp. 101–135.
- [VS18] Aladin Virmaux and Kevin Scaman. “Lipschitz regularity of deep neural networks: analysis and efficient estimation”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Woj20] Weinan E & Stephan Wojtowytsch. “On the Banach Spaces Associated with Multi-Layer ReLU Networks: Function Representation, Approximation Theory and Gradient Descent Dynamics”. In: *SIAM Transactions on Applied Mathematics* 1.3 (June 2020), pp. 387–440. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Yar17] Dmitry Yarotsky. “Error bounds for approximations with deep ReLU networks”. en. In: *Neural Networks* 94 (Oct. 2017), pp. 103–114. (Visited on 03/13/2023).
- [Yar18] Dmitry Yarotsky. “Optimal approximation of continuous functions by very deep ReLU networks”. en. In: *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*. ISSN: 2640-3498. PMLR, July 2018, pp. 639–649. (Visited on 03/13/2023).

- [Zan+20] Y. Zang et al. “Weak adversarial networks for high-dimensional partial differential equations”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 411 (2020), pp. 109409, 14.