

Toward Infinite-Long Prefix in Transformer

Jiuxiang Gu* Yingyu Liang† Zhenmei Shi‡ Zhao Song§ Chiwun Yang¶

Abstract

Prompting and contextual-based fine-tuning methods, which we call Prefix Learning, have been proposed to enhance the performance of language models on various downstream tasks that can match full parameter fine-tuning. There remains a limited theoretical understanding of how these methods work. In this paper, we aim to relieve this limitation by studying the learning ability of Prefix Learning from the perspective of prefix length. In particular, we approximate the infinite-long Prefix Learning optimization process by the Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) technique. We formulate and solve it as a learning problem of the infinite-long prefix in a one-layer attention network. Our results confirm the over-parameterization property and arbitrary small loss convergence guarantee of the infinite-long Prefix Learning in attention. To the implementation end, we propose our NTK-Attention method, which is “equivalent” to attention computation with arbitrary prefix length efficiently. Its time complexity mainly depends on the sub-quadratic of input length (without prefix), and our method only requires $d^2 + d$ extra parameters for representation, where d is the feature dimension. In addition, we conducted experiments that compare our NTK-Attention with full parameters fine-tuning, LoRA, and P-Tuning V2 methods across vision or natural language datasets. The results indicate our approach may be a promising parameter-efficient-fine-tuning method since it has demonstrated superior performance in numerous scenarios. Our code can be found at <https://github.com/ChristianYang37/chiwun/tree/main/src/NTK-Attention>.

* jigu@adobe.com. Adobe Research.

† yingyul@hku.hk. The University of Hong Kong. yliang@cs.wisc.edu. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

‡ zhmeishi@cs.wisc.edu. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

§ zsong@adobe.com. Adobe Research.

¶ christiannyang37@gmail.com. Sun Yat-sen University.

1 Introduction

The advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Vision LLMs (vLLMs) - including prominent examples like ChatGPT [Cha22], GPT-4 [AAA+23, BCE+23], Claude [Cla24], Llama [TLI+23, TMS+23], Gemini [Gem24], ViT [DBK+20], DETR [CMS+20], BLIP [LLXH22, LLSH23], CLIP [RKH+21], and others - has significantly advanced the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI). These models have exhibited impressive performances across a spectrum of tasks, encompassing chat systems [MRKK23, XGDM23, ZCS+24], text-to-image conversion [QZXT19, FHR+21, ZZZK23], AI mathematical inference [HBB+20, YJS+23, YYZ+23], and many more.

However, despite these advancements, pre-existing LLMs often fall short in specialized domains that demand a deeper understanding of professional knowledge [TSG+16, DCLT18, GMS+20, HSW+21, Sun23, KSK+23, LWDC23, TTE+23, GLL+24b]. This has led to the development of fine-tuning/adaptation [SCL+22, XSW+23, SMF+24] methodologies aimed at enhancing the proficiency of these models in executing more specialized tasks [MGD+22]. Several notable contributions in this area, such as LoRA [HSW+21], P-Tuning [LJF+21, LZD+23], and $(IA)^3$ [LTM+22], have displayed performances rivaling those of full-parameter fine-tuning techniques. This underscores the potential of these fine-tuning strategies to further refine the capabilities of Large Language Models.

Among the methods utilized, most contextual-based fine-tuning methods, e.g., Prompt-Tuning [LARC21, LYF+21], Prefix-Tuning [LL21], P-Tuning [LZD+23, LJF+21], use enhanced input sequences to their attention. In particular, these methods are gaining significant traction due to their ease of implementation across various model architectures. They can also significantly prevent catastrophic forgetting in LLMs since all pre-trained parameters remain static [WPK+23]. Consequently, they have gained substantial popularity in fine-tuning LLMs for professional applications [SCL+23, YJT+24]. Furthermore, prompting methods like Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [WWS+22b, WWS+22a, FPS+22] and Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) [LPP+20, JXG+23, GXG+23] employ improved sequences as inputs to enhance the accuracy of LLMs' outputs. We refer to the above approaches as Prefix Learning within the scope of this paper since all methods that involve optimizing input tokens for language models to improve their performance are essentially optimizations of the prefix input matrix in attention (see detailed formulation in Section 2.2).

Scaling Law in Prefix Learning. A popular observation has been widely found in many prefix learning studies called *scaling law in prefix learning*. This law primarily describes that as the prefix length increases, the model's ability to master complex skills also improves [LJF+21]. Specifically, the performance of fine-tuned models is enhanced with the growth of prefix length within a certain range [LARC21, LZD+23]. A similar trend is observed in prompting methods [RM21, ANC+22] and the in-context learning (ICL) mechanism [BMR+20, DLD+22, SWXL23, VONR+23, XSL24], where longer and more complex prompts lead to better inference abilities in LLMs [FPS+22]. Providing more examples in ICL results in improved LLMs performance [BMR+20, ASZ+24]. In many scenarios, prefix learning exhibits a scaling law proportional to the performance and prefix length.

Despite the wide use and surprising performance of prefix learning, we still have a limited understanding of why and how prefix learning operates under the scaling of prefix length [WCWH23, PTB24a, PTB24b]. Intuitively, studying the model when prefix length is ultra-long helps us to explore its principles. However, implementing ultra-long prefix learning in practice is extremely difficult due to memory limitations. In response to these challenges and limited understanding, we introduce the Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) technique [JGH18] to process the optimization problem of ultra-long prefix learning. Especially, we are active in studying the optimization of prefix learning when prefix length is infinite-long.

In this paper, to explore the principle of prefix learning from the perspective of scaling the prefix length and to bridge the understanding between prefix learning and kernel-like adaptation, we have made the following contribution:

- We first study the theory of the **infinite-long prefix** in the attention network. Our theoretical analysis benefits from the NTK and over-parameterization techniques. Our results confirm that the infinite-long prefix gives the attention networks the over-parameterization property that can converge on any dataset. This property is pretraining-independent, which means even a stupid language model with infinite-long prefix length can converge on any dataset regardless of whether it has learned similar data during the pretraining. (See Section 3)
- To implement efficiently, we propose NTK-Attention, which is “equivalent” to attention computation with the infinite-long prefix, utilizing two trainable parameters $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in each head of attention. This algorithm, inspired by polynomial approximation methods, reduces the time complexity of attention with the m -long prefix from $O(mLd + L^2d)$ to $O(L^{1+o(1)}d)$ where L denotes the input token length, m denotes the prefix length and d denotes model feature dimension. (See Section 4)
- We verify our theoretical results by conducting experiments, including (1) a comparison between our NTK-Attention and full parameters fine-tuning on Cifar-100 and food-101 datasets with the same pretrained ViT backbone; (2) a comparison among our NTK-Attention, LoRA and P-Tuning V2 (with different m) on SuperGLUE datasets with the same pretrained ChatGLM3-6B backbone. As we stated in Section 3 and Section 4, the experimental results showcase superior performance of our NTK-Attention compared to P-Tuning V2, further confirming the *scaling law in prefix learning*. Besides, our algorithm also shows a promising ability to learn downstream tasks since it achieved accuracy advantages that are higher than 5.74% and 1.07% on vision and natural language datasets, respectively. (See Section 5)

2 Background and Preliminary

In this section, we briefly introduce the techniques we use and review closely related works. In Section 2.1, we give an introduction to NTK and the over-parameterized neural networks. In Section 2.2, we explain how we formulate the contextual-based fine-tuning method and prompting method into a prefix optimization problem, which is called prefix learning. In Section 2.3, we provide the notations and definitions used in this paper.

2.1 Neural Tangent Kernel and Ultra-wide Neural Network

Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) [JGH18] studies the gradient flow of neural networks in the training process. They showed neural networks are equivalent to Gaussian processes in the infinite-width limit at initialization. A bunch of works have explained the strong performance and the learning ability of neural networks as over-parameterization [LL18, DZPS19, SY19, AZLS19, WLLM19, BM19, LSP+20, CB20, SWL21, ZGJ21, SK22, GMS23, GLL+24a, SWL24] and many more. Furthermore, [ADH+19] gave the first exact algorithm on computing Convolutional NTK (CNTK), [AWBB20] proposed Recurrent NTK, and [HBSDN20] presented NNGP for attention networks. These works have demonstrated advanced performance by utilizing NTK in different neural network architectures. Particularly, [MWY+23] has studied the training dynamic of fine-tuning an LLM from an NTK perspective and confirmed the efficiency of such fine-tuning methods.

Detailed NTK Formulation. We denote $f(W, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ as the output of a neural network, where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ is all the parameters in the network and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the input. Given a training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (d+1)}$, consider training the neural network by minimizing the squared loss over \mathcal{D} as: $\ell(W) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(W, x_i) - y_i)^2$. For simplicity, we study gradient flow, a.k.a., gradient descent with an infinitesimally small learning rate. In this case, the dynamics of parameters can be described by an ordinary differential equation (ODE): $\frac{dW(t)}{dt} = -\nabla \ell(W(t))$. The standard NTK literature [JGH18, DZPS19, SY19, AAB⁺20] study the outputs of neuron $\phi(\langle w, x \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}$ where $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an activation (e.g. ReLU [KSH12, SZ14, HZRS16, Aga18], sigmoid [HM95, JP20], GeLU [HG16], LeakyReLU [XWCL15]). Let m denote the width of a neural network, then $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be viewed as a single column of W . (Similarly for $w(t)$ and $W(t)$ at timestamp t .) To understand the convergence behavior of training an over-parameterized network, one key observation is to define kernel function $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, which is $H(t)_{i,j} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \langle \frac{d\phi(\langle w_r(t), x_i \rangle)}{dw_r(t)}, \frac{d\phi(\langle w_r(t), x_j \rangle)}{dw_r(t)} \rangle$ for $i, j \in [n]$. Here, we call $H(0)$ NTK. When m large enough, we have $\|H(0) - H(t)\|_F^2 \leq \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.1)$ and integer $t > 0$. Then the dynamic of f can be described by $f(W(t), x) - y$ and $H(t)$.

2.2 Prefix Learning for Language Models

Prefix Learning [LARC21, DHZ⁺21, WZL⁺22, ZYLL22, LYF⁺21, PTB24a], including Prompt-Tuning [LARC21], Prefix-Tuning [LL21], P-Tuning [LZD⁺23, LJF⁺21], Reweighted In-Context Learning (RICL) [CSY23] and so on, is proposed to enhance the performance of language models on the downstream tasks and to reduce the costs of computational resources of fine-tuning the whole model. Those methods optimize task-specific prompts for downstream task improvement. On the other hand, besides the Parameter-Efficient-Fine-Tuning (PEFT) approaches [MGD⁺22] we mentioned above, Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) [LPP⁺20, JXG⁺23, GXG⁺23] and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [WWS⁺22b, WWS⁺22a, FPS⁺22] can also be considered as prefix learning since both can be formulated as the following problem: For a network f and a metric ℓ , given a dataset of $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where X_i denotes input matrix and Y_i denotes output matrix, find a optimal prefix matrix P^* that satisfies $P^* = \arg \min_P \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(\begin{bmatrix} P \\ X_i \end{bmatrix}), Y_i)$.

2.3 Attention Computation with Prefix

The scaling law in prefix learning that introduced in Section 1 might bring LLMs with better performances. However, most language models are transformer-based [VSP⁺17, BMR⁺20], whose attention computation requires both quadratic time complexity and quadratic space complexity about the input sequence length [AS23, AS24b, HJK⁺24, KMZ23, ALSY23, YAH⁺24, DSY24]. Thus, to maximize the ability, the cost of language models will be expensive in training and inference when utilizing an ultra-length prompt, which seems to be a huge challenge.

In this paper, we study a one-layer attention network defined as below.

Definition 2.1 (Attention). *Let $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the query, key, and value projections matrices. We denote the prefix matrix as $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Given an input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we have concatenation $S := \begin{bmatrix} P \\ X \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$. Let $Q = XW_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, $K = SW_K \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$ and $V = SW_V \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$. Then, the standard attention computation is defined as:*

$$\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) := D^{-1}AV \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}, \quad (1)$$

where $A := \exp(QK^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times (m+L)}$ and $D := \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_{m+L})$.

Remark 2.2. In Definition 2.1, we divide the softmax operation into an element-wise exp operation and a diagonal normalization matrix D to obtain a clear formulation.

However, this approach necessitates a time complexity and space complexity of $O(mLd + L^2d)$, which is impractical due to a large m . In the following, we will provide our perspective on the infinite-long prefix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ using the framework of over-parameterization. In addition, we will give an approximate algorithm for the computation of Eq. (1) within a reduction of the computational complexity. Notably, our result for a one-layer attention network can be extended to any transformer-based model, e.g., multi-layer multi-head attention networks.

3 Decomposed Analysis on Infinite-Long Prefix Learning in Attention

In this section, we explore the theory behind optimizing the ultra-long prefix matrix in training a one-layer attention network, a main contribution of this paper. The success in explaining the learning ability of prefix learning would provide a brand-new insight into why and how prefix learning operates under the scaling of prefix length. Our theoretical study benefits from the theory of Hierarchical Learning [BLPL06, ZF14, AAM22, AZL23, DLS23, CSY24], which simplifies the multi-layer training of deep networks into the greedy regression training of single-layer networks, we show how we decompose the training of prefix learning in attention into our defined *one-token attention with prefix* problem in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2, we introduce NTK with softmax activation, mathematically equivalent to the original problem. In Section 3.3, we provide the close-form of our kernel function. Conclusively, we state the main result, a convergence guarantee of optimization ultra-long prefix in a one-layer attention network, in Section 3.4.

3.1 One-Token Attention with Prefix

Observing Eq. (1), we can rewrite the training of transformers as a regression problem. Given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|X_i| \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{|X_i| \times d}$, where $|\cdot|$ means the length of matrix, we denote $f(X_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{|X_i| \times d} = \text{Attn}(Q_i, K_i, V_i)$ where $Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|X_i| \times d} = X_i W_Q$, $K = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ X_i \end{bmatrix} W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+|X_i|) \times d}$ and $V = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ X_i \end{bmatrix} W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+|X_i|) \times d}$ as they were computed due to X_i as Definition 2.1. Minimizing Frobenius norm (which is entry-wise ℓ_2 norm loss for a matrix) loss on each data point, we could get the following objective function:

$$\mathcal{L}(P) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|f(X_i) - Y_i\|_F^2. \quad (2)$$

Note that we can break all data of the matrix vector-wisely since only the prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is updating. The input and target data could be trivially concluded into a new dataset, with each data an input-output vector pair, which is equivalent to the original one in optimization. In detail, let this dataset be $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\tilde{n} = \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i|$, so we can rewrite $\mathcal{L}(P)$ as $0.5 \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} \|f(x_i) - y_i\|_2^2$, so-called one-token attention with prefix.

To further simplify our problem, we now consider the loss of one particular entry in $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The key point of this simplicity is the Value projection in attention $W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Since it's fixed, we can choose only one row, which denotes $w_v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We first provide the Value function.

Definition 3.1 (Value function). *Given Value projection vector w_v , for an input vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define Value function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $v(x) := \langle w_v, x \rangle$.*

Next, we state the Similarity function in attention as follows, which utilizes the exponential function to compute the similarity between two vectors.

Definition 3.2 (Similarity function). *Given Query and Key projection matrix $W_Q, W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, denote $W_{qk} = W_Q W_K^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for two input vector $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define Similarity function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $s(a, b) := \exp(a^\top W_{qk} b)$.*

Then, we formally define our one-token attention with prefix as rewrote function $f(x, P) \in \mathbb{R}$ where P denotes the prefix matrix. It is the primary function we'd like to study in this paper.

Definition 3.3 (One-token attention with prefix). *Given an input vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Given prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Let function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition 3.1 and function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition 3.2. We define One-Token Attention $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows: $f(x, P) := \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x)}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)}$, here $P_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the r -th row of P for any $r \in [m]$.*

3.2 NTK Problem Setup

Here, we provide our NTK problem setup for our analysis, since Definition 3.3 is not simple enough to compute NTK, we recall that the $s(x, x)$ and $v(x)$ are irrelevant to the parameters during prefix learning, for simplicity, we ignore these terms. Then, we can formulate our NTK below.

Definition 3.4 (Initialization). *We define function $F : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $F(W, z) = m \frac{\sum_{r \in [m]} \exp(w_r^\top z) w_r}{\sum_{r \in [m]} \exp(w_r^\top z)}$. Here we use $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$ to denote the r -th column of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and we select $\sigma = 1$.*

Remark 3.5. *Due to the denominator term, our F uses a softmax activation function, which is much more complicated than existing literature, such as ReLU or exp activation function.*

The following remark clearly show the equivalent between F in Definition 3.4 and f in Definition 3.3:

Remark 3.6. *Let $z = W_{qk}^\top x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W = P^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ (which means $w_r = P_r$). Then, we have $\langle \frac{w_v}{m}, F(W, z) \rangle = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r)}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r)}$.*

Below is the training objective we aim to solve in the analysis, which is equivalent to Eq. (2).

Definition 3.7 (Training objective). *Given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, let function F be defined as Definition 3.4. We define the training objective $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows: $\mathcal{L}(W) := 0.5 \sum_{i=1}^n \|F(W, x_i) - y_i\|_2^2$. We denote $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$.*

Particularly, having our training objective, we use gradient descent to update our weights of the prefix matrix, such that we implement $W(t+1) = W(t) - \eta \nabla_{W(t)} \mathcal{L}$, where $W(t)$ denotes the trainable weight $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ at timestamp $t \geq 0$ and $\eta > 0$ is the learning rate.

3.3 Neural Tangent Kernel

We first simplify the softmax function notation.

Definition 3.8. *We define the softmax function $S : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ as follows $S(W^\top x) := \langle \exp(W^\top x), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle^{-1} \exp(W^\top x)$.*

Then, our neural tangent kernel of our prefix learning has the following close-form.

Definition 3.9 (Kernel function). *For simplicity, we denote $\mathcal{S}(W^\top x_i)$ as $\mathbf{S}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ and let $v_{k,r}$ be defined in Definition D.11. We define the function (Gram matrix) $H : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}$ as following*

$$H(W) := \begin{bmatrix} H_{1,1} & H_{1,2} & \cdots & H_{1,d} \\ H_{2,1} & H_{2,2} & \cdots & H_{2,d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ H_{d,1} & H_{d,2} & \cdots & H_{d,d} \end{bmatrix},$$

and for each $k_1, k_2 \in [d]$, we have $H_{k_1, k_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as

$$[H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(W) := \frac{1}{m} x_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m \langle v_{k_1, r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot m \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2, r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot m \mathbf{S}_{j,r}.$$

For any timestamp τ , for simplicity, we denote $H(\tau) := H(W(\tau))$ and denote $H(0)$ as H^* .

Note the matrix H^* is a positive semi-definite (PSD) matrix, its minimum eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*) > 0$.

3.4 Main Result: Convergence Guarantee

Our main result is presented as follows.

Theorem 3.10 (Main result, informal version of Theorem G.2). *For any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 0.1)$, let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*) > 0$ (H^* is defined in Definition 3.9), $B = \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$, $m = \lambda^{-2} \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$, $\eta = \lambda m^{-1} / \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$ and $\hat{T} = \Omega((m\eta\lambda)^{-1} \log(nd/\epsilon))$. Then, after \hat{T} iterations, we have $\|\mathbf{F}(\hat{T}) - Y\|_F^2 \leq \epsilon$ holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.*

Proof sketch of Theorem 3.10. See complete proof in Appendix G.1.

We use the math induction to show that the weight w perturbation is small so that the loss landscape is almost convex around the network’s initialization in Lemma G.3, Lemma G.4 and Lemma G.5. Then, we conclude the results by standard convex optimization analysis. \square

Theorem 3.10 mainly describes the following fact for any dataset with n data points. After initializing the prefix matrix from a normal distribution, assuming the minimum eigenvalue of NTK $\lambda > 0$, setting m to be a large enough value for over-parameterization, then within finite training time, the loss can be minimized to ϵ . Corresponding to the real-world implementation, it gives insight that infinite-long prefix learning can learn new downstream datasets in fine-tuning LLMs. This theoretically provides a possible explanation for the scaling law in prefix learning from the NTK intuition — when the prefix length grows, the learning ability is enhanced. It helps relieve our limited understanding of the working mechanism of prefix learning.

4 NTK-Attention: Inject Infinite-Long prefix into Transformer

In the preceding section, we discussed the convergence of over-parameterization in attention networks. This was achieved by introducing an ultra-long matrix, denoted as $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, which serves

as the trained prefix of attention. Given the practical impossibilities of implementing networks of infinite length, this section proposes an approximate algorithm. This algorithm, our NTK-Attention, is designed to compute the attention output of the input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ with the infinite-long prefix matrix P . The derivation and motivation of our algorithm is stated in Section 4.1. Then, we give the formal form and initialization in Section 4.2. Section 4.3 and Section 4.4 demonstrate our method that is successful in approximating the ultra-long prefix by theoretical and practical confirmation.

4.1 Derivation

There exists a wealth of attention approximation algorithms capable of executing attention computations within $n^{1+o(1)}$ time [HJK⁺24, GLL⁺24c, GLS⁺24]. However, our focus lies predominantly with the polynomial method [TBY⁺19, KVPF20, AS23, AS24b]. This method has exhibited exceptional performance in terms of both time and space complexity through the use of a streaming algorithm. It is an ideal tool for effectively computing our over-parameterized attention since it can inject Key and Value state matrices of any length of prefix into two linear projections as we describe in the following.

In the context of attention networks, the Query, Key, and Value state matrices, denoted as $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, are assumed to have all entries bounded [AS23]. Under this condition, the polynomial method first constructs a linear function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies the following relation ($i, j \in [L]$):

$$\phi(Q_i)^\top \phi(K_j) \approx \exp(Q_i^\top K_j). \quad (3)$$

Here, i and j represent the i -th row of Q and the j -th row of K respectively. The i -th row of the approximate attention is then computed as follows: $\text{PolyAttn}(Q, K, V)_i := \frac{\phi(Q_i)^\top \sum_{j=1}^L \phi(K_j) V_j^\top}{\phi(Q_i)^\top \sum_{j=1}^L \phi(K_j)}$.

Let $Z := \sum_{j=1}^L \phi(K_j) V_j^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k := \sum_{j=1}^L \phi(K_j) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, considering a one-layer attention network with Query, Key, and Value projection matrices $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, given any input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ and any prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with a large length m , there exists a matrix Z and a vector k (defined above) satisfying the following conditions:

$$Z = \sum_{r=1}^m \phi(W_K^\top P_r) P_r W_V, \quad k = \sum_{r=1}^m \phi(W_K^\top P_r). \quad (4)$$

Therefore, we propose an approach known as NTK-Attention to approximate the attention output with the prefix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. In this method, we introduce Z and k as two linear projections of the NTK-Attention network, where input is given as $\phi(Q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i \in [L]$. Further details on how this method integrates the infinite-long prefix into attention networks will be discussed in the following sections (Section 4.2 and Section 4.3).

Furthering our derivation, based on the already established NTK convergence of the prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ for any dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we can readily extend this result. Specifically, for any dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(X_i, Y_i) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|X_i| \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{|Y_i| \times d}\}_{i=1}^n$, we can assure the convergence. Similar equivalences of convergence have been previously demonstrated in [DLS23, SYZ24, LSWY23, DSXY23]. Moreover, by referencing Eq. (3), we can argue that the training of Z and k approximates the training of P [TBY⁺19, KVPF20, HJK⁺24, AS24a]. This simplifies the understanding and learning process, making NTK-Attention a promising method for attention network computations.

4.2 Algorithm

We formally state the algorithm of our NTK-Attention below.

Algorithm 1 NTK-Attention

Input: Query, Key and Value states matrices $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, casual masking $M \in \{0, 1\}^{L \times L}$
Output: Approximated attention output $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$

- 1: **procedure** NTKATTENTION(Q, K, V)
- 2: Let function $\phi(\cdot)$ be as Lemma H.7.
- 3: Compute attention matrix $A \leftarrow \exp(QK^\top) \circ M$
- 4: Compute the summation of each row of attention matrix $D \leftarrow \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_L + \phi(Q)k)$
- 5: Compute approximated attention output $T \leftarrow D^{-1}(AV + \phi(Q)Z)$
- 6: **return** T
- 7: **end procedure**

The algorithm described above is flexible and can accommodate any form of causal masking $M \in \{0, 1\}^{L \times L}$. This adaptability allows for the adjustment of attention according to the requirements of different tasks. For instance, we can use $M = \mathbf{1}_{L \times L}$ for models like BERT [DCLT18], RoBERTa [LOG+19], and ViT [DBK+20]. Alternatively, for generative models like GPTs [RWC+19, BMR+20, BCE+23, AAA+23], we can set M as an all 1 lower triangular matrix.

Initialization of Z and k . In Section 3.2, we established that the optimal initialization for the prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is to have $P_r \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ for $r \in [m]$. Assuming we have weights of the attention network $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and by setting the value of the integer m sufficiently large, we first initialize a prefix matrix P from a normal distribution. We then compute $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as per equation Eq. (4). This process ensures an effective and efficient initialization for our NTK-Attention algorithm.

4.3 Error Bound

To overcome the computational efficacy challenge of attention with the infinite-long prefix that we mentioned in Section 2.3, our proposed NTK-Attention method offers an approximation to the $\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ in Eq. (1), represented by $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. This approach requires a significantly reduced time complexity and space complexity of $O(L^{1+o(1)}d)$, making it a more feasible solution. Furthermore, let $\epsilon \geq 0$ is a sufficiently small value, T satisfies the following condition:

$$\|T - \text{Attn}(Q, K, V)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 4.1 (Informal version of Theorem H.2). *Let m denote the prefix length. Given an input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we denote $Q = XW_Q$, $K = XW_K$ and $V = XW_V$. If the condition $\|Q\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m})$, $\|K\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m})$, $\|V\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m})$ and $d = O(\log m)$ holds, then Algorithm 1 outputs a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ that satisfies Eq. (5) with error $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(m)$ within time complexity of $O(L^2d)$.*

Furthermore, if we replace the original attention operation (attention computation on input X) with fast attention algorithms like HyperAttention [HJK+24], then we have our more efficient NTK-Attention as the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2 (Informal version of Corollary H.3). *Let m denote the prefix length. Given an input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we denote $Q = XW_Q$, $K = XW_K$ and $V = XW_V$. If the condition*

$\|Q\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m}), \|K\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m}), \|V\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log m})$ and $d = O(\log m)$ holds, then there exists an algorithm outputs a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ that satisfies Eq. (5) with error $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(m)$ within time complexity of $O(L^{1+o(1)}d)$.

4.4 How well NTK-Attention Express Ultra-long Prefix?

We conducted an experiment to evaluate our one-layer NTK-Attention network approximation ability to the prefix learning under different prefix lengths. To begin with, we randomly initialize entries of $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Next, we choose different value of m from $\{2^1, 2^2, \dots, 2^{18}\}$ where the highest length of prefix is $2^{18} = 262,144 \approx 262\text{k}$. Hence, entries of the prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ are also initialized from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. To compare, we set a training dataset $\{X_i\}_i^{n_1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ and a test dataset $\{X_i\}_i^{n_2} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, and each entry are sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The Frobenius norm is introduced to evaluate the difference between $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ from Algorithm 1 and $\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. The metric is:

$$\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{Ldn_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \|T_i - \text{Attn}(Q_i, K_i, V_i)\|_F^2 / \|Q_i K_i^\top\|_\infty. \quad (6)$$

It is the mean value of Frobenius norm error on the test dataset, where T_i, Q_i, K_i, V_i are computed by the input X_i from the test dataset. The reason we use $\|Q_i K_i^\top\|_\infty^{-1}$ to scale the loss is that large entries in $Q_i K_i^\top$ will damage the performance of fast attention computation [AS23]. The experiment was repeated 50 times, and the average results were taken to obtain a stable result. For all variables mentioned above, we provide their setting as follows: $d = 64, n_1 = 40000, n_2 = 8000, L = 128$.

We present our findings in Figure 1, illustrating the success of our NTK-Attention method in maintaining the error of approximating attention computation with an ultra-long prefix matrix. Notably, when the length of the prefix has increased by nearly 131,000 \times , the growth of error (computed by the difference between maximum error and minimum error) has increased by only a factor of 100 \times . This demonstrates the remarkable resilience of our approach in handling extensive prefix matrices, showcasing its potential for practical applications.

5 Empirical Evaluation on Pretrained Model Fine-Tuning

In this section, to verify the effectiveness of our presented NTK-Attention, we conducted an evaluation of natural language understanding and fine-grained image classification tasks. All experiments in this section involve the Huggingface [WDS+19] trainer with AdamW optimizer [KB14], and all hyper-parameters of the optimizer are set to the defaults. We provide more details in Appendix K.

Evaluation on Natural Language Understanding Datasets. In this experiment, we utilize five binary classification datasets in SuperGLUE [WPN+19] for evaluation, where they are BoolQ, CB, Copa, MultiRC and RTE datasets. In particular, we introduced a pretrained large




Figure 1: The error of our NTK-Attention in approximating prefixes of different lengths, where m denotes the length, and \mathcal{L} is defined as Eq. (6).

language model ChatGLM3-6B [ZLD+22, DQL+22] as our base model. For comparison, we set P-Tuning V2 [LZD+23, LJF+21] with different lengths of virtual prefix $\{1, 10, 100\}$ and LoRA [HSW+21] with its rank $r = 8$ as our baseline.

LoRA in [HSW+21, ZL23, HSK+24] introduces two trainable matrices for low-rank adaptation. Usually, LoRA makes adaptation on Query and Value projections $W_Q, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ in Attention, denoted the adaptation as $W_{\Delta Q}, W_{\Delta V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Given an input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we can form LoRA as follows: $\tilde{D}^{-1} \tilde{A} X (W_V + W_{\Delta V})$, where $\tilde{A} := \exp(X(W_Q + W_{\Delta Q})W_K^\top X^\top)$, $\tilde{D} := \text{diag}(\tilde{A}\mathbf{1}_L)$ and $W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the Key projection weights. We can see that LoRA updates query and value weights during training, while our NTK-Attention compresses the additional prefix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ into $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to achieve that (Algorithm 1), which is a completely different mechanism.

We provide the results of performances in Table 2. Interestingly, as m increases, the performance of P-Tuning V2 also improves, which is consistent with our conclusion. Especially, we believe that the "equivalence" between our NTK-Attention and infinite-long prefix learning is the reason that our NTK-Attention achieved much higher performance than P-Tuning V2 with $m = 100$. Moreover, our NTK-Attention may be a promising PEFT method since it showcases better performance than LoRA on CB, Copa, MultiRC datasets and the average score.

Evaluation on Vision Datasets. Here, in the vision datasets, we fine-tune the ImageNet-21k [DDS+09] pretrained ViT-Base [DBK+20], where we denote ViT-Base as ViT. We introduce our baseline that fine-tunes full parameters in ViT for comparison, which is the standard method to improve the model performance on downstream datasets, denoted as FFT-ViT (**F**ull parameters **F**ine-**T**uned **V**iT). At the same time, we replace all attention layers in the model with our NTK-Attention, where the attention weights $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are trained and given from the original model and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the only trainable parameters in each layer and initialized as in Section 4, denote as NTK-ViT.

We evaluated NTK-ViT on two fine-grained image classification datasets - Cifar-100 [KH+09] and Food-101 [BGVG14]. The result is stated in Table 1, from it, we believe our NTK-Attention can perform comparably to the fine-tuning method in some situations since it demonstrates better 6.54% and 4.94% higher accuracy scores on the Cifar-100 dataset and Food-101 dataset respectively.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we analyze the optimization process in infinite-long prefix learning by NTK intuition to relieve the limited understanding of fine-tuning prefixes in transformer-based models. Our results indicate the over-parameterization property and arbitrary small convergence guarantee of the infinite-long prefix learning in a one-layer attention network, which considerably demonstrates the learning ability to fine-tune prefixes on downstream datasets and confirms *scaling law in prefix learning*. Accordingly, we propose NTK-Attention, which utilizes two linear projections to approximate attention computation with the infinite-long prefix. This algorithm has achieved excellent performance that compares to full parameters fine-tuning, LoRA and P-Tuning V2 methods on

Model	Dataset	
	Cifar-100	Food-101
FFT-ViT	85.15±0.13	84.76±0.07
NTK-ViT (ours)	91.69±0.05	89.70±0.01

Table 1: Accuracy scores (the unit of measurement is %) of model FFT-ViT [DBK+20] and NTK-ViT (ours) on Cifar-100 [KH+09] and Food 101 datasets. In particular, we bold the best score in each dataset.

Method	Task					Average
	BoolQ	CB	Copa	MultiRC	RTE	
P-Tuning V2 $m = 1$	65.69±0.32	67.06±0.37	52.00±1.00	53.59±0.28	65.97±0.22	60.86±0.44
P-Tuning V2 $m = 10$	66.67±0.23	74.07±0.00	54.00±0.00	54.17±0.71	66.55±0.25	63.10±0.24
P-Tuning V2 $m = 100$	69.42±0.02	74.54±0.47	64.50±0.50	61.62±2.28	76.77±0.83	69.37±0.82
LoRA	76.52 ±0.10	90.23±0.39	86.50±0.50	65.09±0.41	87.76 ±0.37	81.24±0.35
NTK-Attention (ours)	75.06±0.12	96.04 ±0.84	88.00 ±2.00	65.85 ±0.33	86.59±0.52	82.31 ±0.76

Table 2: Fine-tuned performances of ChatGLM3-6B [ZLD⁺22, DQL⁺22] with different methods that includes P-Tuning V2 [LZD⁺23, LJF⁺21], LoRA [HSW⁺21] and our NTK-Attention method on SuperGLUE datasets [WPN⁺19]. The metric of these datasets is accuracy (the unit of measurement is %). In particular, we bold the best score in each dataset.

various datasets, showcasing promising potential to be a more efficient fine-tuning method.

Acknowledgement

Research is partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grants 2023239-DMS, CCF-2046710, and Air Force Grant FA9550-18-1-0166.

Appendix

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background and Preliminary	2
2.1	Neural Tangent Kernel and Ultra-wide Neural Network	2
2.2	Prefix Learning for Language Models	3
2.3	Attention Computation with Prefix	3
3	Decomposed Analysis on Infinite-Long Prefix Learning in Attention	4
3.1	One-Token Attention with Prefix	4
3.2	NTK Problem Setup	5
3.3	Neural Tangent Kernel	5
3.4	Main Result: Convergence Guarantee	6
4	NTK-Attention: Inject Infinite-Long prefix into Transformer	6
4.1	Derivation	7
4.2	Algorithm	8
4.3	Error Bound	8
4.4	How well NTK-Attention Express Ultra-long Prefix?	9
5	Empirical Evaluation on Pretrained Model Fine-Tuning	9
6	Conclusion	10
A	Preliminary	14
A.1	Facts	14
B	Probability	14
C	Definitions	16
C.1	Loss function	17
D	Gradient Computation	18
D.1	Computing Gradient	18
D.2	Gradient Descent	20
E	Neural Tangent Kernel	23
E.1	Kernel Perturbation	23
E.2	Kernel PSD during Training Process	26
F	Decompose Loss	27
F.1	Bounding C_0	32
F.2	Bounding $C_{1,2}$	36
F.3	Bounding C_2	38
F.4	Bounding C_3	40
F.5	Bounding Loss during Training Process	43

F.6	Helpful Lemma	43
G	Induction	47
G.1	Main Result	47
G.2	Induction Part 1. For Weights	48
G.3	Induction Part 2. For Loss	48
G.4	Induction Part 3. For Gradient	49
G.5	Bounding Loss at Initialization	50
H	NTK-Attention	50
H.1	Definitions	50
H.2	Error Bound	50
H.3	Tools from Fast Attention	51
I	Taylor Series	52
J	Gradient Computation	54
J.1	Gradient of $f(x, P)$	54
J.2	Gradient of $s(x, P_r)$	55
J.3	Gradient of $v(x)$	56
K	Experimental Details	56
L	Discussion	57
M	Limitations	57
N	Societal Impact	57

Roadmap. In Appendix A, we provide the preliminary we use in our analysis. In Appendix B, we state helpful probability tools. In Appendix C, we provide the basic definition we use in this paper. We give Lemmas about gradient computation in Appendix D. In Appendix E, we present our computation of NTK in our analysis. In Appendix F, we show how we decompose our training objective term in analysis to simplify proofs. In Appendix G, we post our main results and inductive analysis of training. In Appendix H, we compute the error bound on our NTK-Attention approximating ultra-long prefix in attention. In Appendix I, we state helpful tools about the Taylor series. We give more Lemmas about gradient computation in Appendix J. The experimental details for our empirical evaluation is shown in Appendix K. We provide a further discussion in Appendix L. We discuss the limitations of this paper in Appendix M. We discuss the societal impacts of this paper in Appendix N.

A Preliminary

We provide our notations for this paper as follows:

Notations In this paper, we use integer d to denote the dimension of networks. We use integer m to denote the prefix length in prefix learning, we think m is an ultra-big number. We use L to denote the input length in language models. $\nabla_x f(x)$ and $\frac{df(x)}{dx}$ are both means to take the derivative of $f(x)$ with x . Let a vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote the ℓ_2 norm as $\|z\|_2 := (\sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2)^{1/2}$, the ℓ_1 norm as $\|z\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|$, $\|z\|_0$ as the number of non-zero entries in z , $\|z\|_\infty$ as $\max_{i \in [n]} |z_i|$. We use z^\top to denote the transpose of a z . We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the inner product. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we use $\text{vec}(A)$ to denote a length nd vector. We denote the Frobenius norm as $\|A\|_F := (\sum_{i \in [n], j \in [d]} A_{i,j}^2)^{1/2}$. For any positive integer n , we use $[n]$ to denote set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ to denote the expectation. We use $\Pr[\cdot]$ to denote the probability. We use ϵ to denote the error. We define $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ as a function that outputs the minimum eigenvalues of the input matrix, e.g. matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$, $\lambda_{\min}(A) = \min\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$.

A.1 Facts

Fact A.1. For any $x \in (-0.01, 0.01)$, we have

$$\exp(x) = 1 + x + \Theta(1)x^2$$

Fact A.2. For any $x \in (0, 0.1)$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x^i \leq \frac{1}{1-x}$$

B Probability

Here, we state a probability toolkit in the following, including several helpful lemmas we'd like to use. Firstly, we provide the lemma about Chernoff bound in [Che52] below.

Lemma B.1 (Chernoff bound, [Che52]). Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where $X_i = 1$ with probability p_i and $X_i = 0$ with probability $1 - p_i$, and all X_i are independent. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$. Then

- $\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \exp(-\delta^2\mu/3)$, $\forall \delta > 0$;
- $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu] \leq \exp(-\delta^2\mu/1)$, $\forall 0 < \delta < 1$.

Next, we offer the lemma about Hoeffding bound as in [Hoe94].

Lemma B.2 (Hoeffding bound, [Hoe94]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n denote n independent bounded variables in $[a_i, b_i]$ for $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $X := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, then we have*

$$\Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right)$$

We show the lemma of Bernstein inequality as [Ber24].

Lemma B.3 (Bernstein inequality, [Ber24]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n denote n independent zero-mean random variables. Suppose $|X_i| \leq M$ almost surely for all i . Then, for all positive t ,*

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \geq t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] + Mt/3}\right)$$

Then, we give the Khintchine's inequality in [Khi23, Haa81] as follows:

Lemma B.4 (Khintchine's inequality, [Khi23, Haa81]). *Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ be i.i.d sign random variables, and let z_1, \dots, z_n be real numbers. Then there are constants $C > 0$ so that for all $t > 0$*

$$\Pr\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^n z_i \sigma_i\right| \geq t \|z\|_2\right] \leq \exp(-Ct^2)$$

We give Hason-wright inequality from [HW71, RV13] below.

Lemma B.5 (Hason-wright inequality, [HW71, RV13]). *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote a random vector with independent entries x_i with $\mathbb{E}[x_i] = 0$ and $|x_i| \leq K$. Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then, for every $t \geq 0$*

$$\Pr[|x^\top A x - \mathbb{E}[x^\top A x]| > t] \leq 2 \exp(-c \min\{t^2/(K^4 \|A\|_F^2), t/(K^2 \|A\|)\})$$

We state Lemma 1 on page 1325 of Laurent and Massart [LM00].

Lemma B.6 (Lemma 1 on page 1325 of Laurent and Massart, [LM00]). *Let $X \sim \mathcal{X}_k^2$ be a chi-squared distributed random variable with k degrees of freedom. Each one has zero mean and σ^2 variance. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X - k\sigma^2 \geq (2\sqrt{kt} + 2t)\sigma^2] &\leq \exp(-t) \\ \Pr[X - k\sigma^2 \leq 2\sqrt{kt}\sigma^2] &\leq \exp(-t) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we provide a tail bound for sub-exponential distribution [FKZ⁺11].

Lemma B.7 (Tail bound for sub-exponential distribution, [FKZ⁺11]). *We say $X \in \text{SE}(\sigma^2, \alpha)$ with parameters $\sigma > 0, \alpha > 0$, if*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq \exp(\lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2), \forall |\lambda| < 1/\alpha.$$

Let $X \in \text{SE}(\sigma^2, \alpha)$ and $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$, then:

$$\Pr[|X - \mu| \geq t] \leq \exp(-0.5 \min\{t^2/\sigma^2, t/\alpha\})$$

In the following, we show the helpful lemma of matrix Chernoff bound as in [Tro11, LDFU13].

Lemma B.8 (Matrix Chernoff bound, [Tro11, LDFU13]). *Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set of positive-semidefinite matrices with dimension $d \times d$, and suppose that*

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_{\max}(X) \leq B.$$

Sample $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ uniformly at random from \mathcal{X} without replacement. We define μ_{\min} and μ_{\max} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\min} &:= n \cdot \lambda_{\min}\left(\mathbb{E}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}(X)\right) \\ \mu_{\max} &:= n \cdot \lambda_{\max}\left(\mathbb{E}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}(X)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\lambda_{\min}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right) \leq (1 - \delta)\mu_{\min}] &\leq d \cdot \exp(-\delta^2 \mu_{\min}/B) \text{ for } \delta \in (0, 1], \\ \Pr[\lambda_{\max}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right) \leq (1 + \delta)\mu_{\max}] &\leq d \cdot \exp(-\delta^2 \mu_{\max}/(4B)) \text{ for } \delta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

C Definitions

This section provides the fundamental definitions of our NTK analysis in this paper.

To begin with, we re-denote our weight of prefix in attention as $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $a \in \{-1, +1\}^m$ as follows¹:

Definition C.1. *We choose $a \in \{-1, +1\}^m$ to be weights that each entry a_r is randomly sampled from -1 with probability $1/2$ and $+1$ with probability $1/2$.*

Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ denote random Gaussian weights, i.e., each entry independently draws from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. For each $r \in [m]$, we use $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to denote the r -th column of W .

Since we have established the equivalence between the ultra-long prefix matrix in attention and our theory in Section 3.2, it's reasonable we utilize the following definition of F to decompose the model function and facilitate our analysis.

Definition C.2. *We define function $F : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$F(W, x, a) = m \frac{\sum_{r \in [m]} a_r \exp(w_r^\top x) w_r}{\sum_{r \in [m]} \exp(w_r^\top x)}$$

Here we use $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to denote the r -th column of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$.

To further break down the complicated F for more convenience analysis. We give an operator function α as follows:

Definition C.3. *We define $\alpha(x)$ as follows*

$$\alpha(x) := \left\langle \exp(\underbrace{W^\top}_{m \times d} \underbrace{x}_{d \times 1}), \mathbf{1}_m \right\rangle$$

¹Note that the proof of the case with a and without a are similar. We mainly focus on the proofs under the setting that includes a .

Thus, we can rewrite F in the following claim.

Claim C.4. *We can rewrite $F(W, x, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as follows*

$$F(W, x, a) = m \underbrace{\alpha(x)^{-1}}_{\text{scalar}} \underbrace{W}_{d \times m} \underbrace{(a \circ \exp(W^\top x))}_{m \times 1}$$

Proof. We can show

$$\begin{aligned} F(W, x, a) &= m \frac{\sum_{r \in [m]} a_r \exp(w_r^\top x) w_r}{\sum_{r \in [m]} \exp(w_r^\top x)} \\ &= m \alpha(x)^{-1} \sum_{r \in [m]} a_r \exp(w_r^\top x) w_r \\ &= m \alpha(x)^{-1} W (a \circ \exp(W^\top x)) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.2, the second step follows from Definition C.3 and simple algebras, the third step follows from $w_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoting the r -th column of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and simple algebras. \square

In the following Definition C.6 and Definition C.5, we further derive and define two operator functions to convenient our analysis.

Definition C.5. *We define β as follows*

$$\beta_k := W_{k,*} \circ a, \forall k \in [d]$$

Let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ be defined as $\underbrace{\beta}_{d \times m} = \underbrace{W}_{d \times m} \underbrace{\text{diag}(a)}_{m \times m}$

Here, we define softmax.

Definition C.6. *We define $S \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as follows*

$$S := \underbrace{\alpha(x)^{-1}}_{\text{scalar}} \cdot \underbrace{\exp(W^\top x)}_{m \times 1}.$$

Here, we use β and S to re-denote the model function F .

Definition C.7. *For each $k \in [d]$, let $W_{k,*}^\top$ denote the k -th row of W , we define*

$$F_k(W, x, a) := m \underbrace{\alpha(x)^{-1}}_{\text{scalar}} \underbrace{\langle W_{k,*} \circ a, \exp(W^\top x) \rangle}_{m \times 1}$$

Then, we can rewrite it as

$$F_k(W, x, a) := m \langle \beta_k, S \rangle.$$

C.1 Loss function

Here, we state the training objective that we aim to solve in the analysis.

Definition C.8. *Given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let function $F : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as Definition C.2, we define the training objective $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:*

$$\mathcal{L}(W) := 0.5 \sum_{i=1}^n \|F(W, x_i, a) - y_i\|_2^2$$

D Gradient Computation

In this section, we first compute the gradients that we need for the analysis of NTK. Then we define the training dynamic of our model in the process of gradient descent.

D.1 Computing Gradient

We give our computation of the gradients as the following lemma.

Lemma D.1. *If the following conditions hold*

- *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.1.*
- *Let $\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3*
- *Let $S \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.6*
- *Let $F \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as Definition C.7*

Then, we can show that for each $r \in [m]$

- **Part 1.** *For $k_1 \in [d]$, we have*

$$\frac{dW^\top x}{dw_{r,k_1}} = x_{k_1} e_r$$

- **Part 2.** *For $k_1 \in [d]$, we have*

$$\frac{d \exp(W^\top x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} = (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ \exp(W^\top x)$$

- **Part 3.** *For $k_1 \in [d]$, we have*

$$\frac{d\alpha(x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} = \langle x_{k_1} e_r, \exp(W^\top x) \rangle$$

- **Part 4.** *For $k_1 \in [d]$, we have*

$$\frac{d\alpha(x)^{-1}}{dw_{r,k_1}} = -\alpha(x)^{-1} \langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle$$

- **Part 5.** *For $k_1 \in [d]$, we have*

$$\frac{dS}{dw_{r,k_1}} = -\langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle \cdot S + (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ S$$

- **Part 6.** *For $k_1, k \in [d]$ and $k_1 \neq k$, we have*

$$\frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_{r,k_1}} = +0 - mx_{k_1} \cdot S_r \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + mx_{k_1} S_r \beta_{k,r}$$

- **Part 7.** For $k_1, k \in [d]$ and $k_1 = k$, we have

$$\frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_{r,k}} = +m\langle a \circ e_r, S \rangle - mx_k \cdot S_r \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + mx_k S_r \beta_{k,r}$$

- **Part 8.** For $k \in [d]$, we have

$$\frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_r} = ma_r S_r \cdot e_k - m\langle \beta_k, S \rangle S_r \cdot x + m\beta_{k,r} S_r \cdot x$$

Proof. **Proof of Part 1.**

$$\frac{dW^\top x}{dw_{r,k_1}} = x_{k_1} e_r$$

where this step follows from simple differential rules.

Proof of Part 2.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d \exp(W^\top x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} &= \exp(W^\top x) \circ \frac{dW^\top x}{dw_{r,k_1}} \\ &= (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ \exp(W^\top x) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from chain rules, the second step follows from Part 1 of this Lemma.

Proof of Part 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\alpha(x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} &= \left\langle \frac{d \exp(W^\top x)}{dw_{r,k_1}}, \mathbf{1}_m \right\rangle \\ &= \langle x_{k_1} e_r, \exp(W^\top x) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.3 and simple algebras, the second step follows from Part 2 of this Lemma.

Proof of Part 4.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\alpha(x)^{-1}}{dw_{r,k_1}} &= -\alpha(x)^{-2} \frac{d\alpha(x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} \\ &= -\alpha(x)^{-1} \langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where this step follows from chain rules, the second step follows from Part 3 of this Lemma.

Proof of Part 5.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dw_{r,k_1}} &= \frac{d\alpha(x)^{-1}}{dw_{r,k_1}} \cdot \exp(W^\top x) + \alpha(x)^{-1} \cdot \frac{d \exp(W^\top x)}{dw_{r,k_1}} \\ &= -\alpha(x)^{-1} \langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle \cdot \exp(W^\top x) + \alpha(x)^{-1} \cdot (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ \exp(W^\top x) \\ &= -\langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle \cdot S + (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ S \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.6 and differential rules, the second step follows from Part 2 and Part 4 of this Lemma, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 6. For $k_1 \neq k$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_{r,k_1}} &= + m \left\langle \frac{d\beta_k}{dw_{r,k_1}}, S \right\rangle + m \left\langle \beta_k, \frac{dS}{dw_{r,k_1}} \right\rangle \\ &= - m \langle x_{k_1} e_r, S \rangle \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + m \langle \beta_k, (x_{k_1} e_r) \circ S \rangle \\ &= + 0 - m x_{k_1} \cdot S_r \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + m x_{k_1} S_r \beta_{k,r} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.7 and simple algebras, the second step follows from Definition C.5, simple algebras and Part 5 of this Lemma, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 7. For $k_1 = k$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_{r,k}} &= + m \left\langle \frac{d\beta_k}{dw_{r,k}}, S \right\rangle + m \left\langle \beta_k, \frac{dS}{dw_{r,k}} \right\rangle \\ &= + m \langle a \circ e_r, S \rangle - m \langle x_k e_r, S \rangle \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + m \langle \beta_k, (x_k e_r) \circ S \rangle \\ &= + m \langle a \circ e_r, S \rangle - m x_k \cdot S_r \cdot \langle \beta_k, S \rangle + m x_k S_r \beta_{k,r} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.7 and simple algebras, the second step follows from Definition C.5, simple algebras and Part 5 of this Lemma, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 8.

This part of proof follows from the combination of Part 6 and Part 7 of this Lemma. \square

D.2 Gradient Descent

After we computed the gradient of the model function above, we are now able to define the training dynamic of F by updating weight using gradient descent.

We use e_r to denote a vector where the r -th coordinate is 1 and everywhere else is 0. $\forall r \in [m], \forall k \in [d]$, we have $\frac{dF(W, x, a)_k}{dw_r} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be written as

$$\underbrace{\frac{dF_k(W, x, a)}{dw_r}}_{d \times 1} = m a_r S_r \cdot e_k - m \langle \beta_k, S \rangle S_r \cdot x + m \beta_{k,r} S_r \cdot x. \quad (7)$$

Hence, by defining several following dynamical operator functions, we can further convenient our proofs.

We first define $u_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for simplification as follows:

Definition D.2. For each $i \in [n]$, we define $u_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$\underbrace{u_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1} := \exp\left(\underbrace{W(\tau)^\top}_{m \times d} \underbrace{x_i}_{d \times 1}\right)$$

Secondly, we re-denote $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ below, which holds due to the definition of $\alpha(x)$ and the updating of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$.

Definition D.3. For each $i \in [n]$, we define $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\underbrace{\alpha_i(\tau)}_{\text{scalar}} := \left\langle \underbrace{u_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1}, \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_m}_{m \times 1} \right\rangle.$$

We define $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for convenience.

Definition D.4. For each $k \in [d]$, we define $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$\underbrace{\beta_k(\tau)}_{m \times 1} = \underbrace{(W_{k,*}(\tau))}_{m \times 1} \circ \underbrace{a}_{m \times 1}$$

Remark D.5. The purpose of defining notation β is to make our proofs more aligned with softmax NTK proofs in previous work [GLL⁺24a].

We define $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for convenience as follows :

Definition D.6. For each $i \in [n]$, for each $k \in [d]$, we define $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as follows

$$\underbrace{\theta_{k,i}(\tau)}_{m \times 1} := \underbrace{\beta_k(\tau)}_{m \times 1} \cdot \underbrace{\alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}}_{\text{scalar}}$$

We denote $S_r(\tau)$.

Definition D.7. For each $i \in [n]$. Let $S_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as

$$\underbrace{S_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1} := \underbrace{\alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}}_{\text{scalar}} \cdot \underbrace{u_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1}$$

for integer $\tau \geq 0$. For $r \in [m]$, we denote $S_{i,r}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ as the r -th entry of vector $S_i(\tau)$.

Now, we can define F at different timestamps.

Definition D.8 ($F(\tau)$, dynamic prediction). For each $k \in [d]$, for each $i \in [n]$, we define $F_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for any timestamp τ , as

$$F_{k,i}(\tau) := m \langle u(\tau), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle^{-1} \langle W(\tau)_{k,*} \circ a, u(\tau) \rangle.$$

Here $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It can be rewritten as

$$F_{k,i}(\tau) = m \cdot \langle \underbrace{\beta_k(\tau)}_{m \times 1}, \underbrace{S_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1} \rangle.$$

and also

$$F_{k,i}(\tau) = m \cdot \langle \underbrace{\theta_{k,i}(\tau)}_{m \times 1}, \underbrace{u_i(\tau)}_{m \times 1} \rangle$$

We consider d -dimensional MSE loss.

Definition D.9 (Loss function over time). We define the objective function \mathcal{L} as below:

$$\mathcal{L}(W(\tau)) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{k \in [d]} (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i})^2.$$

Thus, we define the gradient of w .

Definition D.10 ($\Delta w_r(\tau)$). For any $r \in [m]$, we define $\Delta w_r(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta w_r(\tau) \\ := & m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(a_r S_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k - \langle \beta_k(\tau), S_i(\tau) \rangle S_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x + \beta_{k,r} S_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we utilize v to simplify $\Delta w_r(\tau)$, we have the following:

Definition D.11. For each $k \in [d]$, for each $r \in [m]$, we define $v_{k,r}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as follows

$$v_{k,r}(\tau) := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau).$$

Note that we can simplify the gradient calculation by the fact $1 = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle$ for $i \in [n]$. Thus, we have the following claim.

Claim D.12. We can rewrite $\Delta w_r(\tau)$ as follows

$$\Delta w_r(\tau) = m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x_i + a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) e_k \right)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta w_r(\tau) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k - \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x + \beta_{k,r} \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \\ & \quad \cdot \left(a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k - \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x + \beta_{k,r} \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \\ & \quad \cdot \left(a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k - \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x + \langle \beta_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k + \langle \beta_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot e_k + \langle v_{k,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition D.10, the second step follows from the fact $1 = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle$ for $i \in [n]$, the third and fourth steps follow from simple algebras, the last step follows from Definition D.11. □

We use the gradient descent (GD) algorithm with the learning rate η to train the network. As we only train the hidden layer W and fix a , we have the following gradient update rule.

Definition D.13 (Gradient descent). The gradient descent algorithm for optimizing the weight matrix W is defined as:

$$W(\tau + 1) = W(\tau) - \eta \Delta W(\tau).$$

where $\Delta W(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $\Delta w_r(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the r -th column of $\Delta W(\tau)$ defined in Definition D.10.

E Neural Tangent Kernel

Now in this section, we give the exact computation of NTK in our analysis below.

Definition E.1 (Kernel function, Definition 3.6 in [GLL⁺24a]). *For simplicity, we denote $\mathbf{S}(W^\top x_i)$ as $\mathbf{S}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ and $v_{k,r} = \beta_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We define the function (Gram matrix) $H : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{nd \times nd}$ as following*

$$H(W) := \begin{bmatrix} H_{1,1} & H_{1,2} & \cdots & H_{1,d} \\ H_{2,1} & H_{2,2} & \cdots & H_{2,d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ H_{d,1} & H_{d,2} & \cdots & H_{d,d} \end{bmatrix},$$

and for each $k_1, k_2 \in [d]$, we have $H_{k_1, k_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as

$$[H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(W) := \frac{1}{m} x_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m \langle v_{k_1, r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot m \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2, r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot m \mathbf{S}_{j,r}.$$

For any timestamp τ , for simplicity, we denote $H(\tau) := H(W(\tau))$ and denote $H(0)$ as H^* .

E.1 Kernel Perturbation

The purpose of this section is to prove Lemma E.3. In the proof, we do not use concentration inequality. Please see Remark E.2 for more details.

Remark E.2. *In the proof of Lemma E.3, we do not use concentration bound as previous work [SY19, MOSW22, GMS23]. The reason is that we consider the worst case. In general, $\mathbb{E}[H(W) - H(\widetilde{W})] \neq \mathbf{0}_{nd \times nd}$. Thus, using the concentration bound may not gain any benefits.*

Lemma E.3. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $R \in (0, 0.01)$.
- Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$.
- Let $\widetilde{W} = [\widetilde{w}_1, \dots, \widetilde{w}_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, where $\widetilde{w}_1, \dots, \widetilde{w}_m$ are i.i.d. draw from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$.
- Let $W = [w_1, \dots, w_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and satisfy $\|\widetilde{w}_r - w_r\|_2 \leq R$ for any $r \in [m]$.
- Let $v_{k,r} = \beta_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$, for any $k \in [d]$ and for any $r \in [m]$. Note that $\beta_{k,r}$ is the r -th in β_k .
- Let $\alpha_i = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \exp(W^\top x_i) \rangle$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}_i = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \exp(\widetilde{W}^\top x_i) \rangle$, $\forall i \in [n]$.
- Let H be defined as Definition E.1.

Then, we have

- *Part 1.* Then with probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$,

$$|[H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(W) - [H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(\widetilde{W})| \leq 8R \cdot \exp(22B).$$

- *Part 2.* Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\|H(W) - H(\widetilde{W})\|_F \leq 8R\sqrt{nd} \cdot \exp(22B).$$

Proof. For simplicity, we give the following notations:

- Note that $\widetilde{S}_i := \exp(\widetilde{W}(\tau)^\top x_i) \cdot \widetilde{\alpha}_i^{-1}$.
- Note that $\widetilde{\beta}_k := \widetilde{W}_{k,*} \circ a$.
- Note that $\widetilde{v}_{k,r} := \widetilde{\beta}_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \widetilde{\beta}_k$.

Proof of Part 1. We have

$$|[H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(W) - [H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(\widetilde{W})| = mx_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m (B_{1,r} + B_{2,r} + B_{3,r} + B_{4,r} + B_{5,r} + B_{6,r})$$

here, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, S_j \rangle \cdot S_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, S_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \\ B_{2,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, S_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \\ B_{3,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \\ B_{4,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot S_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \\ B_{5,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, S_i \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, \widetilde{S}_i \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \\ B_{6,r} &:= \langle v_{k_1,r}, \widetilde{S}_i \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} - \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_1,r}, \widetilde{S}_i \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \widetilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \widetilde{S}_j \rangle \cdot \widetilde{S}_{j,r} \end{aligned}$$

Before we bound all terms, we provide a tool as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{k,r} - \widetilde{v}_{k,r}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{r_1=1}^m (v_{k,r,r_1} - \widetilde{v}_{k,r,r_1})^2 \\ &= \sum_{r_1=1}^m (\beta_{k,r} - \beta_{k,r_1} - \widetilde{\beta}_{k,r} + \widetilde{\beta}_{k,r_1})^2 \\ &= \sum_{r_1=1}^m (a_r W_{k,r} - a_{r_1} W_{k,r} - a_r \widetilde{W}_{k,r} + a_{r_1} \widetilde{W}_{k,r})^2 \\ &= \sum_{r_1=1}^m (a_r (W_{k,r} - \widetilde{W}_{k,r}) + a_{r_1} (\widetilde{W}_{k,r_1} - W_{k,r_1}))^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{r_1=1}^m (|W_{k,r} - \widetilde{W}_{k,r}| + |\widetilde{W}_{k,r_1} - W_{k,r_1}|)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{r_1=1}^m 4R^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq m4R^2 \tag{8}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of ℓ_2 norm, the second step follows from the definition of $v_{k,r}$, the third step follows from Definition C.5, the fourth and fifth steps follow from simple algebras, the sixth step follows from $\|w_r - v_r\|_\infty \leq \|w_r - v_r\|_2 \leq R$, the last step follows from simple algebras.

To bound $B_{1,r}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{1,r}| &:= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{j,r} - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r})| \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(15B)}{m} \cdot |\mathbf{S}_{j,r} - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &\leq \frac{R \exp(19B + 3R)}{m^2} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $B_{1,r}$, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Part 6 of Lemma I.2 and $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the last step follows from Part 12 of Lemma I.1.

To bound $B_{2,r}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{2,r}| &:= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &\leq \frac{2B \exp(12B)}{m^2} \cdot |\langle \frac{1}{2B} v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{2BR \exp(16B + 3R)}{m^2} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $B_{2,r}$, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Part 6 of Lemma I.2 and $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the last step follows from Part 13 of Lemma I.1 and $\|v_{k,r}\|_\infty \leq 2B$ by simple algebras.

To bound $B_{3,r}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{3,r}| &:= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r}, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r} - \langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle \tilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &= |\langle v_{k_1,r}, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \cdot \langle v_{k_2,r} - \tilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{j,r}| \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(12B)}{m^2} \cdot |\langle v_{k_2,r} - \tilde{v}_{k_2,r}, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{2R \exp(15B)}{m^2} \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $B_{3,r}$, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Part 6 of Lemma I.2 and $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the last step follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Eq. (8) and $\|\mathbf{S}_i\|_2 \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{\sqrt{m}}$.

The proof of bounding $B_{4,r}$ is similar to the proof of bounding $B_{1,r}$, we have $|B_{4,r}| \leq \frac{R \exp(19B+3R)}{m^2}$.

The proof of bounding $B_{5,r}$ is similar to the proof of bounding $B_{2,r}$, we have $|B_{5,r}| \leq \frac{2BR \exp(16B+3R)}{m^2}$.

The proof of bounding $B_{6,r}$ is similar to the proof of bounding $B_{3,r}$, we have $|B_{6,r}| \leq \frac{2R \exp(15B)}{m^2}$.

Now we combine all terms, we have

$$|[H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(W) - [H_{k_1, k_2}]_{i,j}(\tilde{W})| = m x_i^\top x_j \sum_{r=1}^m (B_{1,r} + B_{2,r} + B_{3,r} + B_{4,r} + B_{5,r} + B_{6,r})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq m \sum_{r=1}^m (B_{1,r} + B_{2,r} + B_{3,r} + B_{4,r} + B_{5,r} + B_{6,r}) \\
&\leq m \sum_{r=1}^m (|B_{1,r}| + |B_{2,r}| + |B_{3,r}| + |B_{4,r}| + |B_{5,r}| + |B_{6,r}|) \\
&\leq m \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{8R \exp(22B)}{m^2} \\
&\leq 8R \cdot \exp(22B)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$, the third step follows from simple algebras, the fourth step follows from $R \leq B$, $B \leq \exp(B)$ and the combination of all terms, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 2. This proof follows from Part 1 of this Lemma and the definition of Frobenius norm. \square

E.2 Kernel PSD during Training Process

Claim E.4. *If the following conditions hold:*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let timestamp $\tau \geq 0$ denotes as a integer.
- Denote H^* as $H(W)$ in Definition E.1.
- Denote $H(\tau)$ as $H(\widetilde{W})$ in Definition E.1.
- Let $D := 2\lambda^{-1} \cdot \exp(20B) \frac{\sqrt{nd}}{m} \|Y - F(0)\|_F$
- Let $\|w_r(t) - w_r(0)\|_2 \leq D < R = \lambda / \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$, $\forall r \in [m]$, $\forall t \geq 0$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(H(\tau)) \geq \lambda/2$$

Proof. By Lemma E.3, with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|H * - H(\tau)\|_F &\leq 8R\sqrt{nd} \exp(22B) \\
&\leq \lambda/2
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the first step follows from Part 2 of Lemma E.3, the second step follows by choice of R .

By eigenvalue perturbation theory, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\min}(H(\tau)) &\geq \lambda_{\min}(H^*) - \|H(\tau) - H^*\| \\
&\geq \lambda_{\min}(H^*) - \|H(\tau) - H^*\|_F \\
&\geq \lambda_{\min}(H^*) - \lambda/2 \\
&\geq \lambda/2
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step comes from triangle inequality, the second step is due to Frobenius norm, the third step is due to Eq. (9), the last step follows from $\lambda_{\min}(H^*) = 2$. \square

F Decompose Loss

In this section, we provide the lemma below to decompose it into five terms, and then we will give bounds to four terms.

Lemma F.1. *Assuming the following condition is met:*

- Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as Definition C.1.
- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- For $i, j \in [n]$ and $k_1, k_2 \in [d]$.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Denote $\mathbf{F}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta > 0$ denote the learning rate.
- Let scalar $v_{0,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$v_{0,k,i} := m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau+1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1)$$

- Let scalar $v_{1,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$v_{1,k,i} := m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot (-\eta \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle)$$

- Let scalar $v_{2,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$v_{2,k,i} := m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \eta^2 \cdot \Theta(1) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2$$

- **Gradient Property.** $\eta \|\Delta w_r(i)\|_2 \leq 0.01, \forall r \in [m], \forall i \in [\tau]$
- $C_0 = 2 \langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_0) \rangle$
- $C_1 = 2 \langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_1) \rangle$
- $C_2 = 2 \langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_2) \rangle$
- $C_3 = \|\mathbf{F}(\tau+1) - \mathbf{F}(\tau)\|_F^2$

Then, we can show

$$\|\mathbf{F}(\tau+1) - Y\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 + C_0 + C_1 + C_2 + C_3.$$

Proof. The expression $\|Y - F(\tau + 1)\|_F^2 = \|\text{vec}(Y - F(\tau + 1))\|_2^2$ can be rewritten in the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{vec}(Y - F(\tau + 1))\|_2^2 \\
&= \|\text{vec}(Y - F(\tau) - (F(\tau + 1) - F(\tau)))\|_2^2 \\
&= \|\text{vec}(Y - F(\tau))\|_2^2 - 2\text{vec}(Y - F(\tau))^\top \text{vec}(F(\tau + 1) - F(\tau)) \\
&\quad + \|\text{vec}(F(\tau + 1) - F(\tau))\|_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the first step follows from simple algebra, the last step follows from simple algebra.

Recall the update rule (Definition D.13),

$$w_r(\tau + 1) = w_r(\tau) - \eta \cdot \Delta w_r(\tau)$$

In the following manner, $\forall k \in [d]$, we can express $F_k(\tau + 1) - F_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_{k,i}(\tau + 1) - F_{k,i}(\tau) \\
&= m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau)) \\
&= + \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\
&\quad + m \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r} \cdot (\mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau)) \\
&= + \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\
&\quad + m \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot (\exp(-\eta \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle) - 1) \\
&= + \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\
&\quad + m \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot (-\eta \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle + \Theta(1) \eta^2 \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2) \\
&= v_{0,k,i} + v_{1,k,i} + v_{2,k,i}
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the first step is due to the definition of $F_{k,i}(\tau)$, the second step is from the simple algebra, the third step is due to $|\eta \Delta w_r(\tau)^\top x_i| \leq 0.01$ (due to **Gradient Property** and $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$), the fourth step follows from the Taylor series approximation, the last step follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{0,k,i} &:= m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\
v_{1,k,i} &:= m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot (-\eta \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle) \\
v_{2,k,i} &:= m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \eta^2 \cdot \Theta(1) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2
\end{aligned}$$

Here $v_{0,k,i}$ and $v_{1,k,i}$ are linear in η and $v_{2,k,i}$ is quadratic in η . Thus, $v_{0,k,i}$ and $v_{1,k,i}$ are the first order term, and $v_{2,k,i}$ is the second order term.

We can rewrite the second term in the Eq. (10) above as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \text{vec}(Y - F(\tau)), \text{vec}(F(\tau + 1) - F(\tau)) \rangle \\
&= \langle \text{vec}(Y - F(\tau)), \text{vec}(v_0 + v_1 + v_2) \rangle \\
&= \langle \text{vec}(Y - F(\tau)), \text{vec}(v_0) \rangle + \langle \text{vec}(Y - F(\tau)), \text{vec}(v_1) \rangle + \langle \text{vec}(Y - F(\tau)), \text{vec}(v_2) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq.(11), the second step follows from simple algebras.

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\|F(\tau + 1) - Y\|_F^2 = \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 + C_0 + C_1 + C_2 + C_3.$$

□

The below lemma analyzes the first-order term that is making progress.

Lemma F.2 (Progress terms). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2}n^2d^2 \exp(30B)\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_2 \in [d]$.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Let $\mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_{k,r} := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta > 0$ denote the learning rate.
- Let scalar $v_{1,1,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows (we omit (τ) in the following terms)

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{1,1,k,i} &= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot x_j^\top \right) x_i
\end{aligned}$$

- Let $C_{1,1} := 2\langle \text{vec}(F(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_{1,1}) \rangle$

Then, we have

- $C_{1,1} \leq -1.6m\eta \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{1,1,k,i} &= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i \\
&= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i \\
&= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i \\
&= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \langle \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i \\
&= m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} (\langle \mathbf{v}_{k,r}, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle + \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i \\
&= m^2 (Q_{1,1,k,i} + Q_{1,2,k,i})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $v_{1,1,k,i}$, the second step follows from Definition D.6, the third step follows from Definition D.7, the fourth step follows from $\langle \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle = \beta_{k,r}(\tau)$, the fifth step follows from the definition of v_k for $k \in [d]$ and simple algebras, the last step holds since we define

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{1,1,k,i} &:= \sum_{r \in [m]} \langle \mathbf{v}_{k,r}, \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i, \\
Q_{1,2,k,i} &:= \sum_{r \in [m]} \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot \left((\langle \mathbf{v}_{k_2,r}, \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \right) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right) x_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding first term. Then for the first term $Q_{1,1,k,i}$, we have its quantity

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{1,1,k,i} (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) = -\frac{1}{m} \eta \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)$$

where this step follows from Definition E.1.

Bounding second term. On the other hand, for the second term $Q_{1,2,k,i}$, we have its quantity,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{1,2,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
& \leq \eta \frac{\exp(9B)}{m^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{r=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{k_2=1}^d \sigma_r C_{k,k_2,r} (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i})(\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \\
& \leq \eta \frac{\exp(9B)}{m^3} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r} \right| \cdot \|(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y) \otimes (\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)\|_1 \\
& \leq \eta \frac{\exp(9B)}{m^3} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_1^2 \\
& \leq \eta \frac{nd \exp(9B)}{m^3} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \\
& \leq \eta \frac{\exp(9B)}{m^3 \lambda} \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r} \right| \cdot \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, $\|\mathbf{S}_i\|_2 \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{\sqrt{m}}$, $\|x_i\| \leq 1$ and

$$C_{k,k_2,r} := \|\beta_k(\tau)\|_2 \cdot \|v_{k_2,r}\|_2, \sigma_r \in \{+1, -1\}$$

the second and third steps follow from the definition of Kronecker product, the fourth step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd}\|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, the last step follows from $\text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y) \geq \lambda \|\mathbf{F} - Y\|_F^2$.

Thus, by following Part 2 and Part 3 of Lemma I.2, we have

$$C_{k,k_2,r} = \|\beta_k(\tau)\|_2 \cdot \|v_{k_2,r}\|_2 \leq 2mB^2.$$

Besides, we apply Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to all random variables $\sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r}$ for $r \in [m]$, especially $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{k,k_2 \in [d]} C_{k,k_2,r}] = 0$ due to the symmetry of a_r , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{1,2,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
& \leq C\eta \frac{nd \exp(9B)}{m^3 \lambda} \cdot \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y) \cdot mB^2 \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/\text{poly}(nd)$.

Note that by Lemma condition, we have

$$C \frac{nd \exp(9B)}{m^3 \lambda} \cdot mB^2 \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq 0.2 \frac{1}{m}.$$

Finally, we complete the proof with the result

$$C_{1,1} \leq -1.6m\eta \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)^\top H(\tau) \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)$$

□

Below, we prove all other terms are small when m is large enough compared to the progressive term.

Lemma F.3 (Minor effects on non-progress term). *If the following*

- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2}n^2d^2 \exp(30B)\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_2 \in [d]$
- Let scalar $v_{0,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$v_{0,k,i} := m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau+1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1)$$

- Let scalar $v_{1,2,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows (we omit (τ) in the following terms)

$$v_{1,2,k,i} = m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top\right) x_i$$

- Let scalar $v_{2,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$v_{2,k,i} := m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \eta^2 \cdot \Theta(1) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2$$

- Let $C_0 := 2\langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_0) \rangle$
- Let $C_{1,2} := 2\langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_{1,2}) \rangle$
- Let $C_2 := 2\langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_2) \rangle$
- Let $C_3 := \|\mathbf{F}(\tau+1) - \mathbf{F}(\tau)\|_F^2$

Then, we have

- $|C_0| \leq 0.1m\eta\lambda \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$
- $|C_{1,2}| \leq 0.1m\eta\lambda \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$
- $|C_2| \leq \eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B) \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$
- $|C_3| \leq \eta^2 m^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$

Proof. This proof follows from Lemma F.4, Lemma F.5, Lemma F.6 and Lemma F.7. □

F.1 Bounding C_0

Lemma F.4. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.

- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2} n^2 d^2 \exp(30B) \sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_1 \in [d]$.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Let $\mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_k := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- Denote $\mathbf{F}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta \in (0, 1/m)$ denote the learning rate.
- Let scalar $v_{0,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows (we omit (τ) in the following terms)

$$v_{0,k,i} = m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1)$$

- Let $C_0 := 2 \langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_0) \rangle$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

$$|C_0| \leq 0.1 \eta m \lambda \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2.$$

Proof. By Claim D.12, we have

$$\Delta w_r(\tau) = m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x_i + a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) e_k \right)$$

Then the k_1 -th entry $\Delta w_{r,k}(\tau)$ for $k_1 \in [d]$ should be

$$\Delta w_{r,k_1}(\tau) = m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot x_{i,k_1} + a_r \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) e_{k,k_1} \right) \quad (12)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{0,k,i} &= m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\theta_{k,i,r}(\tau + 1) - \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\ &= m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \alpha_i(\tau + 1)^{-1} - \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) \\ &= m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \alpha_i(\tau + 1)^{-1} - \beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \beta_{k,r}(\tau+1)\alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)\alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1) \\
= & m \sum_{r \in [m]} (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \\
& + (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1) \\
= & m(Q_{0,1,k,i} + Q_{0,2,k,i})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $v_{0,k,i}$, the second step follows from Definition D.6, the third and fourth steps follow from simple algebras, the last step hold since we define

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{0,1,k,i} & := \sum_{r \in [m]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1), \\
Q_{0,2,k,i} & := \sum_{r \in [m]} (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding first term. For the first term $Q_{0,1,k,i}$, we have its quantity

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{0,1,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
\leq & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1) (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
\leq & \exp(B) \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
\leq & B \exp(B) \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m a_r (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\
\leq & B \exp(B) \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \right| \cdot \sqrt{nd} \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $Q_{0,1,k,i}$, the second step follows from Part 4 of Lemma I.1 and Definition D.2, the third step follows from Part 1 of Lemma I.1 and $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd} \|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

By Part 2 of Lemma F.9, we have

$$\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(15B)}{m^3} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(27B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F.$$

Then we apply Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to random variables $a_r(\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1})$ for $r \in [m]$, and by $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m a_r(\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1})] = 0$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r(\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1}) \right| \leq \left(\eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(15B)}{m^3} + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(27B)}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)}. \tag{14}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

Through combining Eq. (14) and Eq.(13), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{0,1,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \left(\eta \frac{nd \exp(17B)}{m^3} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 + \eta^2 \frac{nd\sqrt{nd} \exp(29B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

Thus, by Lemma condition, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \frac{nd \exp(17B)}{m^3} \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq 0.01\eta\lambda, \\ & \eta^2 \frac{nd\sqrt{nd} \exp(29B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq \eta \frac{nd\sqrt{nd} \exp(29B)}{m} \cdot \sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)} \leq 0.01\eta\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding second term. On the other hand, for the second term $Q_{0,2,k,i}$, we have its quantity

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{0,2,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau+1) \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \exp(B) \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\exp(2B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\exp(2B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m (W_{k,r}(\tau+1) \cdot a_r - W_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot a_r) \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta \frac{\exp(2B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot m \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_1=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_1,j}(\tau) - y_{k_1,j}) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \left(\langle v_{k_1,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_{j,k} + a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_1,k} \right) \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \left. \right| \\ & \leq \eta \frac{\exp(5B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j,k,k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r} \right| \cdot \|(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y) \otimes (\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y)\|_1 \\ & \leq \eta \frac{\exp(5B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j,k,k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_1^2 \\ & \leq \eta \frac{nd \exp(5B)}{m} \cdot \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j,k,k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $Q_{0,2,k,i}$, the second and third steps follow from Part 4 of Lemma I.1, the fourth step follows from Definition C.5, the fifth step follows from Eq.(12), the sixth step follows from the definition of Kronecker product, $1 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ and defining

$$C_{j,k,k_1,r} := \langle \mathbf{S}_j, v_{k_1,r} \rangle + e_{k_1,k}, \sigma_r \in \{+1, -1\},$$

the seventh step follows from the definition of ℓ_1 norm, the last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd}\|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

Thus, by following Part 6 of Lemma I.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{j,k,k_1,r} &= \langle S_j, v_{k_1,r} \rangle + e_{k_1,k} \\ &\leq \exp(6B) + 1 \\ &\leq \exp(7B) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from simple algebras.

We apply Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to $\sigma_r \max_{j,k,k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r}$ for $r \in [m]$.

By $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j,k,k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r}] = 0$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Q_{0,2,k,i} (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \leq \eta \frac{nd \exp(5B)}{m} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \cdot \exp(6B) \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)}.$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

Then, by Lemma condition, we have

$$\eta \frac{nd \exp(5B)}{m} \cdot \exp(7B) \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq 0.01\eta\lambda.$$

Now we can complete the proof by combining all terms, we have

$$|C_0| \leq 0.1\eta m \lambda \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2.$$

□

F.2 Bounding $C_{1,2}$

Lemma F.5. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2}n^2d^2 \exp(30B)\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_1 \in [d]$.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Let $\mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_k := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$

- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta > 0$ denote the learning rate.
- Let scalar $v_{1,2,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows (we omit (τ) in the following terms)

$$v_{1,2,k,i} = m^2 \sum_{r \in [m]} \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top \right) x_i$$

- Let $C_{1,2} := 2 \langle \text{vec}(F(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_{1,2}) \rangle$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

$$|C_{1,2}| \leq 0.1 \eta m \lambda \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$$

Proof. We have the quantity of $v_{1,2,k,i}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d v_{1,2,k,i} (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top \right) x_i \cdot (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \left. \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top \right) x_i \cdot (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \left. \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \left(-\eta \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top \right) x_i \cdot (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \left. \right| \\ & \leq \eta m^2 \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \left(-\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_2=1}^d (F_{k_2,j}(\tau) - y_{k_2,j}) \cdot a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k_2}^\top \right) x_i \cdot (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \left. \right| \\ & \leq \eta \exp(6B) \sum_{r=1}^m |a_r \cdot \max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)| \cdot \|(F(\tau) - Y) \otimes (F(\tau) - Y)\|_1 \\ & \leq \eta \exp(6B) \sum_{r=1}^m |a_r \cdot \max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)| \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_1^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \eta nd \exp(6B) \sum_{r=1}^m |a_r \cdot \max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $v_{1,2,k,i}$, the second step follows from Definition D.6, the third step follows from Definition C.5, the fourth step follows from Definition D.7, the fifth step follows from simple algebras, the sixth step follows from $0 \leq S_{j,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$, $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ and the definition of Kronecker product, the seventh step follows from the definition of ℓ_1 norm, the last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd}\|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

Then by Part 1 of Lemma I.1, we have

$$|\max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)| \leq B$$

We apply Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to random variables $a_r \cdot \max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)$ for $r \in [m]$. By $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot \max_{k \in [d]} \beta_{k,r}(\tau)] = 0$, we have

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d v_{1,2,k,i}(\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i})| \leq \eta nd \exp(6B) B \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

By the Lemma condition, we have

$$nd \exp(6B) B \leq 0.1m\lambda$$

□

F.3 Bounding C_2

Lemma F.6. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2}n^2d^2 \exp(30B)\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_1 \in [d]$.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Let $S_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_k := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$

- Denote $\mathbf{F}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta > 0$ denote the learning rate.
- Let scalar $v_{2,k,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows (we omit (τ) in the following terms)

$$v_{2,k,i} := m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \eta^2 \cdot \Theta(1) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2$$

- Let $C_2 := 2\langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y), \text{vec}(v_2) \rangle$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

$$|C_2| \leq \eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B) \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \\ & \leq \left(m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_j^\top + a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_k^\top \right) x_i \right)^2 \\ & \leq \exp(12B) \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_1^2 \\ & \leq nd \exp(12B) \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the first step follows from Claim D.12, the second step follows from the definition of ℓ_1 norm, $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{j,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1 and Part 6 of Lemma I.2, last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd} \|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

Then, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d v_{2,k,i} (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \eta^2 \cdot \Theta(1) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m \sum_{r=1}^m \theta_{k,i,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \exp(3B) \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \exp(4B) \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \cdot (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \eta^2 \exp(4B) \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{i \in [n]} \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \right| \cdot \sqrt{nd} \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \\
&\leq \eta^2 \sqrt{mnd} \exp(4B) \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{i \in [n]} \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2 \right|
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $v_{2,k,i}$, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Definition D.6, the fourth step follows from Definition D.7, the fifth step follows from $0 \leq S_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the sixth step follows from Part 1 of Lemma I.1 and Definition C.5, the seventh step follows from definition of ℓ_1 norm and $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd} \|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, the last step follows from Lemma F.8.

Next, by Eq.(15), applying Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to $a_r \max_{i \in [n]} \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2$ for $r \in [m]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{i \in [n]} \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle^2] = 0$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d v_{2,k,i} (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \right| \leq \eta^2 \sqrt{mn^2 d^2} \exp(16B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)}$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

By the Lemma condition, we have

$$\eta^2 \sqrt{mn^2 d^2} \exp(16B) \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq \eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B)$$

Then we complete the proof. □

F.4 Bounding C_3

Lemma F.7. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2} n^2 d^2 \exp(30B) \sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_1 \in [d]$.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $\mathbf{u}_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.
- Let $S_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_k := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$
- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.

- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta > 0$ denote the learning rate.
- Let $C_3 := \|\mathbf{F}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{F}(\tau)\|_F^2$

Then, with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

$$|C_3| \leq \eta^2 m^2 \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F^2$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_3| &= \|\mathbf{F}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{F}(\tau)\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{F}_{k,i}(\tau))^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 (\langle \beta_k(\tau + 1), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau + 1) \rangle - \langle \beta_k(\tau), \mathbf{S}_i(\tau) \rangle)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \left(\sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \left(\sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \left(\sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau))) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 (Q_{3,1,i,k} + Q_{3,2,i,k})^2
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition C_2 , the second step follows from the definition of Frobenius norm, the third step follows from Definition D.8, the fourth, fifth and sixth steps follow from simple algebras, the last step follows from defining

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{3,1,i,k} &= \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)), \\
Q_{3,2,i,k} &= \sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding first term. For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_{3,1,i,k}| &= \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}(\tau + 1) \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot w_{r,k}(\tau + 1) \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau)) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |B \cdot \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot (\mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau+1) - \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau))| \\
&\leq |\exp(3B) \cdot \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1})|
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $Q_{3,1,i,k}$, the second step follows from Definition C.5, the third step follows from Part 1 of Lemma I.1, last step follows from Part 4 of Lemma I.1, Definition D.7 and $B \leq \exp(B)$.

Then by Part 2 of Lemma F.9, applying Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to the random variables $a_r \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1})$ for $r \in [m]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m a_r \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_i(\tau+1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1})] = 0$, we have

$$|Q_{3,1,i,k}| \leq \left(\eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(18B)}{m^3} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(30B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \right)$$

with a probability of at least $1 - \delta/\text{poly}(nd)$.

By the Lemma condition, we have

$$\left(\eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(18B)}{m^3} + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(30B)}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{nd}} \eta$$

Bounding second term. On the other hand, for the second term $Q_{3,2,k,i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_{3,2,k,i}| &= \left| \sum_{r=1}^m (\beta_{k,r}(\tau+1) - \beta_{k,r}(\tau)) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \right| \\
&= \eta \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \Delta w_{r,k}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,r}(\tau) \right| \\
&\leq \eta \frac{\exp(3B)}{m} \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \Delta w_{r,k}(\tau) \right| \\
&\leq \eta \exp(3B) \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_1=1}^d (\mathbf{F}_{k_1,j}(\tau) - y_{k_1,j}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left(\langle v_{k_1,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_{i,k} + a_r \mathbf{S}_{j,r}(\tau) e_{k,k_1} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \eta \frac{\exp(6B)}{m} \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{j \in [n], k, k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_1 \\
&\leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(6B)}{m} \left| \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{j \in [n], k, k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r} \right| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}(\tau) - Y\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of $Q_{3,2,k,i}$, the second step follows from Definition D.13, the third step follows from $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the fourth step follows from Claim D.12, the fifth step follows from $0 \leq \mathbf{S}_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ and defining

$$C_{j,k,k_1,r} := \langle v_{k_1,r}(\tau), \mathbf{S}_j(\tau) \rangle + e_{k,k_1},$$

the last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd}\|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

Now we follow from Part 6 of Lemma I.2, applying Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2) to random variables $a_r \max_{j \in [n], k, k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r}$ for $r \in [m]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{r=1}^m a_r \max_{j \in [n], k, k_1 \in [d]} C_{j,k,k_1,r}] = 0$, we have

$$|Q_{3,2,k,i}| \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(13B)}{m} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \cdot \sqrt{m \log(nd/\delta)} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{nd}} \eta$$

Finally, we combine all terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_3| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d m^2 \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{nd}} \eta + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{nd}} \eta \right) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \eta^2 m^2 \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

□

F.5 Bounding Loss during Training Process

Lemma F.8. *If the following conditions hold*

- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.

Then we have

$$\|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \leq O(\sqrt{nm d})$$

Proof. This proof follows from $\|y_i\| \leq 1$ for $i \in [n]$ and Definition D.8. □

F.6 Helpful Lemma

Lemma F.9. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$.
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant.
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2} n^2 d^2 \exp(30B) \sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_1 \in [d]$.
- Let $\alpha_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition C.3.
- Let $\beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.5.
- Let $\theta_{k,i}(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.6.
- Let $u_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.2.

- Let $S_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_k := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.
- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.

Then with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

- Part 1.

$$\alpha_i(\tau + 1) - \alpha_i(\tau) \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(9B)}{m} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 m^{1.5} \cdot nd \exp(21B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

- Part 2.

$$\alpha_i(\tau + 1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(15B)}{m^3} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(27B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

Proof. Proof of Part 1.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_i(\tau + 1) - \alpha_i(\tau) \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}_i(\tau + 1), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}_i(\tau), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}_i(\tau + 1) - \mathbf{u}_i(\tau), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &= \langle \exp(W(\tau + 1)^\top x_i) - \exp(W(\tau)^\top x_i), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &= \langle \exp(W(\tau)^\top x_i) \circ (\exp(-\eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i) - \mathbf{1}_m), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &= \langle \exp(W(\tau)^\top x_i) \circ (-\eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i + \Theta(1)\eta^2 \cdot (\Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i)^2), \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &= \langle -\eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i + \Theta(1)\eta^2 \cdot (\Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i)^2, \exp(W(\tau)^\top x_i) \rangle \\ &\leq \exp(B) \cdot \langle -\eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i + \Theta(1)\eta^2 \cdot (\Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i)^2, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle \\ &\leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(9B)}{m} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 m^{1.5} \cdot nd \exp(21B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition C.3, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Definition D.2, the fourth step follows from simple algebra, the fifth step follows from Fact A.1, the sixth step follows from simple algebras, the seventh step follows from Part 4 of Lemma I.1, last step follows from Part 1 and Part 2 of Lemma F.10.

Proof of Part 2. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i(\tau + 1)^{-1} - \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} &= \alpha_i(\tau + 1)^{-1} \alpha_i(\tau)^{-1} \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau + 1) - \alpha_i(\tau)) \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(6B)}{m^2} \cdot (\alpha_i(\tau + 1) - \alpha_i(\tau)) \\ &\leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(15B)}{m^3} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F + \eta^2 \frac{nd \exp(27B)}{\sqrt{m}} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from simple algebras, the second step follows from Part 4 of Lemma I.2, the last step follows from Part 1 of this Lemma. \square

Lemma F.10. *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*)$.
- Let $W(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be defined as Definition D.13, let $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.1.
- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant.
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$.
- Let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2}n^2d^2 \exp(30B)\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- Let $r \in [m]$, let $i, j \in [n]$, let $k, k_2 \in [d]$.
- Let $S_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition D.7.
- Let $v_{k,r} := \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.
- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.
- Let $\eta = \lambda/(m \cdot \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B)))$ denote the learning rate.

Then with a probability at least $1 - \delta/\text{poly}(nd)$, we have

- Part 1.

$$|\langle \eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle| \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(8B)}{m} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

- Part 2.

$$|\langle \eta^2 (\Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i)^2, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle| \leq \eta^2 m^{1.5} \cdot nd \exp(20B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

Proof. Proof of Part 1. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle| \\
&= \eta \left| \sum_{r=1}^m \langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \eta \left| \sum_{r=1}^m m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot S_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_j^\top + a_r S_{j,r}(\tau) e_k^\top \right) x_i \right| \\
&\leq \eta \left| \sum_{r=1}^m m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle \beta_{k,r}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot S_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_j^\top + a_r S_{j,r}(\tau) e_k^\top \right) x_i \right| \\
&\leq \eta \left| \sum_{r=1}^m m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(a_r w_{r,k} + \langle -a \circ W_{k,*}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot S_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_j^\top + a_r S_{j,r}(\tau) e_k^\top \right) x_i \right| \\
&\leq \eta \frac{\exp(3B)}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j \in [n], k \in [d]} C_{j,k,r} \|F(\tau) - Y\|_1
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(3B)}{m} \sum_{r=1}^m \sigma_r \max_{j \in [n], k \in [d]} C_{j,k,r} \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

where the first step follows from simple algebras, the second step follows from Claim D.12, the third step follows from the definition of $v_{k,r}$, the fourth step follows from Definition C.5 and simple algebras, the fifth step follows from $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$, $1 \leq S_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, definition of ℓ_1 norm and defining

$$C_{j,k,r} := |w_{r,k}| + |\langle -W_{k,*}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle| + \|e_k\|, \sigma_r \in \{+1, -1\},$$

the last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \sqrt{nd} \|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.

Thus, by following Part 1 and Part 11 of Lemma I.2 and Hoeffding inequality (Lemma B.2), we have

$$|\langle \eta \Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle| \leq \eta \frac{\sqrt{nd} \exp(8B)}{m} \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F$$

with a probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$.

Proof of Part 2. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \eta^2 (\Delta W(\tau)^\top x_i)^2, \mathbf{1}_m \rangle| \\ & \leq \eta^2 \sum_{r=1}^m (\langle \Delta w_r(\tau), x_i \rangle)^2 \\ & \leq \eta^2 \sum_{r=1}^m \left(m \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot S_{j,r}(\tau) \cdot x_j^\top + a_r S_{j,r}(\tau) e_k^\top \right) x_i \right)^2 \\ & \leq \eta^2 \exp(6B) \sum_{r=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(\tau) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \cdot x_j^\top + a_r e_k^\top \right) x_i \right)^2 \\ & \leq \eta^2 m \exp(20B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_1^2 \\ & \leq \eta^2 m \sqrt{nm} \exp(20B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_1 \\ & \leq \eta^2 m^{1.5} \cdot nd \exp(20B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from simple algebras, the second step follows from Claim D.12, the third step follows from $0 \leq S_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the fourth step follows from $\langle v_{k,r}(\tau), S_j(\tau) \rangle \leq \exp(6B)$ by Part 6 of Lemma I.2, $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$, $\exp(6B) + 1 \leq \exp(7B)$ and the definition of ℓ_1 norm, the fifth step follows from Lemma F.8, the last step follows from $\|U\|_1 \leq \|U\|_F$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. \square

G Induction

Here, we provide all the properties we need for math induction for NTK happening.

Definition G.1 (Properties). *We state the following properties*

- *General Condition 1.* Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^{\text{cts}}) > 0$
- *General Condition 2.* Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- *General Condition 3.* Let η be defined as

$$\eta := \lambda / (m \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))).$$

- *General Condition 4.* Let $D := 2\lambda^{-1} \cdot \exp(20B) \frac{\sqrt{nd}}{m} \|Y - F(0)\|_F$
- *General Condition 5.* Let w_r and a_r be defined as Definition C.1.
- *General Condition 6.* $D < R = \lambda / \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$
- *General Condition 7.* $m = \lambda^{-2} \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$
- **Weight Condition.** $\|w_r(t) - w_r(0)\|_2 \leq D < R, \forall r \in [m]$
- **Loss Condition.** $\|\text{vec}(F(i) - Y)\|_2^2 \leq \|\text{vec}(F(0) - Y)\|_2^2 \cdot (1 - m\eta\lambda/2)^i, \forall i \in [t]$
- **Gradient Condition.** $\eta \|\Delta w_r(i)\|_2 \leq 0.01 \forall r \in [m], \forall i \in [t]$

G.1 Main Result

Our main result is presented as follows.

Theorem G.2 (Main result, formal version of Theorem 3.10). *For any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 0.1)$, if the following conditions hold*

- *Let $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(H^*) > 0$*
- *Let $B = \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$*
- *Let $m = \lambda^{-2} \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B))$*
- *Let $\eta = \lambda / (m \text{poly}(n, d, \exp(B)))$*
- *Let $\hat{T} = \Omega((m\eta\lambda)^{-1} \log(nd/\epsilon))$*

Then, after \hat{T} iterations, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\|F(\hat{T}) - Y\|_F^2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. We have $\|F(0) - Y\|_F^2 \leq nd$ as Lemma G.6. Using the choice of \hat{T} , it follows directly from the alternative application of Lemma G.3 and Lemma G.4. \square

G.2 Induction Part 1. For Weights

In this section, we introduce the induction lemma for weights.

Lemma G.3 (Induction Part 1 for weights). *If the following conditions hold*

- *Suppose properties in Definition G.1 are true*

For $t + 1$ and $\forall r \in [m]$, it holds that:

$$\|w_r(t + 1) - w_r(0)\|_2 \leq D.$$

Proof. We have

$$\eta \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (1 - m\eta\lambda/2)^i \leq \eta \frac{4}{m\lambda} \tag{16}$$

where this step follows from Fact A.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_r(t + 1) - w_r(0)\|_2 &\leq \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^t \|\Delta w_r(\tau)\|_2 \\ &\leq \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^t \sqrt{nd} \exp(11B) \cdot \|F(\tau) - Y\|_F \\ &\leq \eta \sqrt{nd} \exp(11B) \cdot \sum_{\tau=0}^t (1 - m\eta\lambda/2)^\tau \cdot \|F(0) - Y\|_F \\ &\leq 2\eta \frac{1}{m\lambda} \sqrt{nd} \exp(11B) \cdot \|F(0) - Y\|_F \\ &\leq D \end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from the triangle inequality, the second step follows from Eq. (20), the third step follows from Lemma G.4, the fourth step follows from Eq. (16), the last step follows from *General Condition 4.* in Definition G.1. □

G.3 Induction Part 2. For Loss

Now, we present our next induction lemma.

Lemma G.4 (Induction Part 2 for loss). *Let t be a fixed integer.*

If the following conditions hold

- *Suppose properties in Definition G.1 are true*

Then we have

$$\|F(t + 1) - y\|_F^2 \leq (1 - m\eta\lambda/2)^{t+1} \cdot \|F(0) - y\|_F^2.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F(t+1) - y\|_F^2 \\
& \leq \|F(t) - y\|_F^2 + C_0 + C_1 + C_2 + C_3 \\
& = \|F(t) - y\|_F^2 + C_0 + C_{1,1} + C_{1,2} + C_2 + C_3 \\
& \leq \|F(t) - y\|_F^2 \cdot (1 + 0.1\eta m\lambda - 1.6\eta m\lambda + 0.1\eta m\lambda + \eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B) + \eta^2 m^2) \\
& \leq \|F(t) - y\|_F^2 \cdot (1 - 1.4\eta m\lambda + \eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B) + \eta^2 m^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the first step follows from Lemma F.1, the second step follows from the definitions of C_1 , $C_{1,1}$ and $C_{1,2}$, the third step follows from Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.3.

Choice of parameter. Here, we explain the condition setting in Definition G.1:

- To get our results in Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.3, we have to let $m \geq \Omega(\lambda^{-2} n^2 d^2 \cdot \exp(30B) \cdot \sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)})$.
- If we let $\eta \leq O(\lambda/(mn^2 d^2 \exp(16B)))$, we can have

$$\eta^2 m \cdot n^2 d^2 \exp(16B) + \eta^2 m^2 \leq 0.9\eta m\lambda. \tag{18}$$

Thus, combining Eq. (17) and Eq. (18), we have

$$\|F(t+1) - y\|_F^2 \leq (1 - m\eta\lambda/2) \cdot \|F(t) - y\|_F^2 \tag{19}$$

Then by Eq. (19), we conclude all $\|F(\tau) - y\|_F^2$ for $\tau \in [t]$, we have

$$\|F(t+1) - y\|_F^2 \leq (1 - m\eta\lambda/2)^{t+1} \cdot \|F(0) - y\|_F^2$$

□

G.4 Induction Part 3. For Gradient

In this section, we present the induction lemma for gradients.

Lemma G.5 (Induction Part 3 for gradient). *Let t be a fixed integer.*

If the following conditions hold

- *Suppose properties in Definition G.1 are true*

Then we have

$$\eta \|\Delta w_r(t)\|_2 \leq 0.01, \forall r \in [m]$$

Proof. Firstly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta w_r(t)\|_2 & \leq \|\Delta w_r(t)\|_1 \\
& \leq \sum_{k_1=1}^d \left| m \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d (F_{k,i}(t) - y_{k,i}) \cdot \left(\langle v_{k,r}(t), S_i(t) \rangle \cdot S_{i,r}(t) \cdot x_{i,k_1} + a_r S_{i,r}(t) e_{k,k_1} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \sqrt{nd} \exp(11B) \|F(t) - Y\|_F
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the first step follows from $\|U\|_F \leq \|U\|_1$ for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, the second step follows from Claim D.12, the last step follows from the definition of 4 ℓ_1 norm, $0 \leq S_{i,r} \leq \frac{\exp(3B)}{m}$ by Part 11 of Lemma I.1, $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ and Part 6 of Lemma I.2.

Then by the property of η in Definition G.1, we have

$$\eta \|\Delta w_r(t)\|_2 \leq 0.01, \forall r \in [m]$$

□

G.5 Bounding Loss at Initialization

Lemma G.6. *If the following conditions hold*

- Denote $F(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as Definition D.8.
- Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the labels.

Then we have

$$\|F(0) - Y\|_F \leq O(\sqrt{nd})$$

Proof. This proof follows from $\|y_i\| \leq 1$ for $i \in [n]$ and Definition D.8. \square

H NTK-Attention

In this section, we compute the error bound of our NTK-Attention in approximating prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. In Appendix H.1, we provide the formal definition of our NTK-Attention. In Appendix H.2, we give our main theorem of error bound. In Appendix H.3, we state tools from [AS23].

H.1 Definitions

Definition H.1. *If the following conditions hold:*

- Given input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, prefix matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$.
- Let $S := \begin{bmatrix} P \\ X \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$.
- Given projections $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$
- Let $Q := XW_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$.
- Let $K := SW_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$
- Let $V := SW_V \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+L) \times d}$
- Let $A := \exp(QK^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times (m+L)}$.
- Let $D := \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_{(m+L)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$.

We define:

$$\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) := D^{-1}AV.$$

H.2 Error Bound

Here, we provide our two statements about error bound.

Theorem H.2 (Formal version of Theorem 4.1). *Given an input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we denote $Q = XW_Q$, $K = XW_K$ and $V = XW_V$. If the condition $\|Q\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$, $\|K\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$, $\|V\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$ and $d = O(\log(m))$ holds, then Algorithm 1 outputs a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ that satisfies Eq.(5) with error $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(m)$ within time complexity of $O(L^2d)$.*

Proof. Following Definition H.1, we can have matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times (m+L)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= QK^\top \\ &= [\exp(XW_QW_K^\top X^\top) \quad \exp(XW_QW_K^\top P^\top)] \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from $K = SW_K$ and $S = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ X \end{bmatrix}$.

Our Algorithm 1 actually implement on using $Q = XW_Q$ and PW_K to approximate $\exp(XW_QW_K^\top P^\top)$ by Lemma H.7.

Trivially, this proof follows from Theorem H.5 and Lemma H.7. \square

Corollary H.3 (Informal version of Corollary 4.2). *Given an input matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, we denote $Q = XW_Q$, $K = XW_K$ and $V = XW_V$. If the condition $\|Q\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$, $\|K\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$, $\|V\|_\infty \leq o(\sqrt{\log(m)})$ and $d = O(\log(m))$ holds, then there exists an algorithm outputs a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ that satisfies Eq.(5) with error $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(m)$ within time complexity of $O(L^{1+o(1)}d)$.*

Proof. The algorithm and proof can trivially follow from Algorithm 1, 2, 3 and Theorem 1 in HyperAttention [HJK⁺24]. \square

H.3 Tools from Fast Attention

In this section, we introduce some tools from previous work which we have used.

Definition H.4 (Approximate Attention Computation $\text{AAttC}(n, d, B, \epsilon_a)$, Definition 1.2 in [AS23]). *Let $\epsilon_a > 0$ and $B > 0$ be parameters. Given three matrices $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, with the guarantees that $\|Q\|_\infty \leq B$, $\|K\|_\infty \leq B$, and $\|V\|_\infty \leq B$, output a matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ which is approximately equal to $D^{-1}AV$, meaning,*

$$\|T - D^{-1}AV\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_a.$$

Here, for a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we write $\|M\|_\infty := \max_{i,j} |M_{i,j}|$.

Theorem H.5 (Upper bound, Theorem 1.4 in [AS23]). *There is an algorithm that solves $\text{AAttC}(n, d = O(\log n), B = o(\sqrt{\log n}), \epsilon_a = 1/\text{poly}(n))$ in time $n^{1+o(1)}$.*

Definition H.6 (Definition 3.1 in [AS23]). *Let $r \geq 1$ denote a positive integer. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 0.1)$ denote an accuracy parameter. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$, we say $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$ is an (ϵ, r) -approximation of A if*

- $\tilde{A} = U_1 \cdot U_2^\top$ for some matrices $U_1, U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ (i.e., \tilde{A} has rank at most r), and
- $|\tilde{A}_{i,j} - A_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon \cdot A_{i,j}$ for all $(i, j) \in [n]^2$.

Lemma H.7 (Lemma 3.4 in [AS23]). *Suppose $Q, K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, with $\|Q\|_\infty \leq B$, and $\|K\|_\infty \leq B$. Let $A := \exp(QK^\top/d) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. For accuracy parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a positive integer g bounded above by*

$$g = O\left(\max\left\{\frac{\log(1/\epsilon)}{\log(\log(1/\epsilon)/B^2)}, B^2\right\}\right),$$

and a positive integer r bounded above by

$$r \leq \binom{2(g+d)}{2g}$$

such that: There is a matrix $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that is an (ϵ, r) -approximation (Definition H.6) of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Furthermore, we can construct the matrices $U_1 := \phi(Q)$ and $U_2 := \phi(K)$ through a function $\phi(\cdot)$ defining \tilde{A} can be computed in $O(n \cdot r)$ time.

I Taylor Series

In this section, we provide some perturbation analysis for NTK analysis.

Lemma I.1 (Lemma B.1 in [GLL⁺24a]). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant
- Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.
- Let $W = [w_1, \dots, w_m]$ and w_r be random Gaussian vectors from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$.
- Let $V = [v_1, \dots, v_m]$ and v_r denote the vector where $\|v_r - w_r\|_2 \leq R, \forall r \in [m]$.
- Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1, \forall i \in [n]$.
- Let $R \in (0, 0.01)$.
- Let S_i and \tilde{S}_i be the softmax function corresponding to W and V respectively.
- Let $\alpha_i = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \exp(W^\top x_i) \rangle$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i = \langle \mathbf{1}_m, \exp(V^\top x_i) \rangle, \forall i \in [n]$.

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta / \text{poly}(nd)$, we have

- Standard inner product
 - Part 1. $|\langle w_r, x_i \rangle| \leq B, \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 2. $|\langle v_r, x_i \rangle| \leq B + R, \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 3. $|\langle w_r - v_r, x_i + x_j \rangle| \leq 2R, \forall i, j \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
- exp function
 - Part 4. $\exp(-B) \leq \exp(\langle w_r, x_i \rangle) \leq \exp(B), \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 5. $\exp(-B - R) \leq \exp(\langle v_r, x_i \rangle) \leq \exp(B + R), \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 6. $|\exp(\langle w_r - v_r, x_i + x_j \rangle) - 1| \leq 4R, \forall i, j \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 7. $|\exp(\langle w_r, x_i \rangle) - \exp(\langle v_r, x_i \rangle)| \leq R \exp(B + R), \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
- softmax S function
 - Part 8. $|\alpha_i - \tilde{\alpha}_i| \leq mR \exp(B + R), \forall i \in [n]$
 - Part 9. $|\alpha_i^{-1} - \tilde{\alpha}_i^{-1}| \leq \frac{R}{m} \exp(3B + 2R), \forall i \in [n]$
 - Part 10. $|S_{i,r}| \leq \exp(2B)/m, \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 11. $|\tilde{S}_{i,r}| \leq \exp(2B + 2R)/m, \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 12. $|S_{i,r} - \tilde{S}_{i,r}| \leq \frac{R}{m} \exp(4B + 3R), \forall i \in [n], \forall r \in [m]$
 - Part 13. for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\|z\|_\infty \leq 1$, we have $|\langle z, S_i \rangle - \langle z, \tilde{S}_i \rangle| \leq R \exp(4B + 3R), \forall i \in [n]$

Lemma I.2. *If the following conditions hold*

- *Let $C > 10$ denote a sufficiently large constant*
- *Let $B := \max\{C\sigma\sqrt{\log(nd/\delta)}, 1\}$.*
- *Let $W = [w_1, \dots, w_m]$ and w_r be random Gaussian vectors from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$.*
- *w_r for $r \in [m]$ satisfies $\|w_r\|_2 \leq B$ with probability at least $1 - \delta/\text{poly}(nd)$ as in Lemma I.1.*
- *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be defined as Definition C.1.*
- *Define $\beta_k := W_{k,*} \circ a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for $k \in [d]$ as Definition C.5.*
- *Define $v_{k,r} := \beta_{k,r} \cdot \mathbf{1}_m - \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for $k \in [d]$ and $r \in [m]$ as Definition E.1.*
- *Define α_i for $i \in [n]$ as Definition C.3.*

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta/\text{poly}(nd)$, we have

- *Part 1. $|\beta_{k,r}| \leq B$*
- *Part 2. $\|\beta_k\|_2 \leq B\sqrt{m}$*
- *Part 3. $\|v_{k,r}\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{m}B$*
- *Part 4. $|\alpha^{-1}| \leq \exp(B)/m$*
- *Part 5. $\langle \beta_k, S_i \rangle \leq \exp(4B)$*
- *Part 6. $\langle v_{k,r}, S_i \rangle \leq \exp(6B)$*

*Proof. **Proof of Part 1.** We can get the proof by Gaussian tail bound.*

Proof of Part 2. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_k\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^m \beta_{k,r}^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^m B^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{m} \cdot B \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of ℓ_2 norm, the second step follows from Part 1 of this Lemma, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{k,r}\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{r_1=1}^m (\beta_{k,r} - \beta_{k,r_1})^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{r_1=1}^m \beta_{k,r}^2 + \beta_{k,r_1}^2 + |2\beta_{k,r}\beta_{k,r_1}|} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^m 4B^2} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{m} \cdot B
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of ℓ_2 norm, the second step follows from simple algebras, the third step follows from Part 1 of this Lemma, the last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 4. This proof follows from Part 4 of Lemma I.1 and Definition C.3.

Proof of Part 5. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \beta_k, \mathbf{S}_i \rangle &\leq \|\beta_k\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{S}_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{m}B \cdot \|\mathbf{S}_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{m}B \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^m \mathbf{S}_{i,r}^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{m}B \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^m \frac{\exp(6B)}{m^2}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{m}B \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\exp(6B)}{m}} \\
&\leq B \exp(3B) \\
&\leq \exp(4B)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the second step follows from Part 2 of this Lemma, the third step follows from the definition of ℓ_2 norm, the fourth step follows from Part 11 of Lemma I.1, the fifth step follows from triangle inequality, the sixth step follows from $B \leq \exp(B)$, last step follows from simple algebras.

Proof of Part 6. This proof follows from Part 3 of this Lemma, $B \leq \exp(B)$ and Part 11 of Lemma I.1. \square

J Gradient Computation

In this section, we provide additional gradient computation for our NTK-Attention.

J.1 Gradient of $f(x, P)$

Lemma J.1. Let function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as Definition 3.3, for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and an matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dP_s} f(x, P) = s(x, P_s) \frac{(v(P_s) - f(x, P)) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x + w_v}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)}$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{d}{dP_s} f(x, P) = \frac{d}{dP_s} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x)}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \cdot \frac{d}{dP_s} \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x) \right) \cdot \frac{d}{dP_s} \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \cdot \frac{d}{dP_s} (s(x, P_s) v(P_s)) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x) \right) \cdot \frac{d}{dP_s} \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \cdot (v(P_s) \frac{d}{dP_s} s(x, P_s) + s(x, P_s) \frac{d}{dP_s} v(P_s)) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x) \right) \cdot \frac{d}{dP_s} \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \cdot (v(P_s) \frac{d}{dP_s} s(x, P_s) + s(x, P_s) \frac{d}{dP_s} v(P_s)) \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x) \right) \cdot \frac{1}{(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x))^2} \frac{d}{dP_s} s(x, P_s) \\
&= \frac{v(P_s) s(x, P_s) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x + s(x, P_s) \cdot w_v}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) v(P_r) + s(x, x) v(x) \right) \cdot \frac{s(x, P_s) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x}{(\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x))^2} \\
&= \frac{v(P_s) s(x, P_s) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x + s(x, P_s) \cdot w_v}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} - f(x, P) \cdot \frac{s(x, P_s) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)} \\
&= s(x, P_s) \frac{(v(P_s) - f(x, P)) \cdot W_{qk}^\top x + w_v}{\sum_{r=1}^m s(x, P_r) + s(x, x)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition 3.3, the second step follows from chain rules, the third step follows from $\frac{d}{dP_s} s(x, P_r) = 0$ for $s \neq r$, the fourth and fifth steps follow from chain rules, the sixth step follows from Lemma J.2 and Lemma J.3, the seventh step follows from Definition 3.3 and the last step follows from simple algebra. \square

J.2 Gradient of $s(x, P_r)$

Lemma J.2. *Let function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as Definition 3.2, for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and an matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, we have*

$$\frac{d}{dP_r} s(x, P_r) = s(x, P_r) W_{qk}^\top x$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dP_r} s(x, P_r) &= \frac{d}{dP_r} \exp(x^\top W_{qk} P_r) \\
&= \exp(x^\top W_{qk} P_r) \frac{d}{dP_r} x^\top W_{qk} P_r
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp(x^\top W_{qk} P_r) W_{qk}^\top x \\
&= s(x, P_r) W_{qk}^\top x
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition 3.2, the second step follows from chain rules, the third step follows from differential rule and the last step follows from Definition 3.2. \square

J.3 Gradient of $v(x)$

Lemma J.3. *Let function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as Definition 3.1, for a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\frac{d}{dP_r} v(P_r) = w_v$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dP_r} v(P_r) &= \frac{d}{dP_r} \langle P_r, w_v \rangle \\
&= w_v
\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Definition 3.1, the second step follows from simple differential rules. \square

K Experimental Details

Here, we give the experimental details that are set up for experiments in Section 5.

- Learning rate $\eta = 0.001$ (default).
- Adam hyper-parameter $\beta_1 = 0.9$ (default).
- Adam hyper-parameter $\beta_2 = 0.999$ (default).
- Adam hyper-parameter $\epsilon = 1 \times 10^{-8}$ (default).
- Platform: PyTorch [PGM⁺19] and Huggingface [WDS⁺19].
- GPU device information: 8 V100 GPUs.
- Number of training epochs 30.
- Batch size for vision tasks: 256 (for best effort).
- Batch size for natural language task: 32 (for best effort).
- Max input length for natural language task: 128 for each feature, e.g. BoolQ has two dataset features: question and passage, for each data, we select the first 128 tokens in question and passage of the data respectively, and concatenate them as the input.
- Quantization: fp16.

L Discussion

Prior works [ADH⁺19, AWBB20, HBSDN20] had already given exact algorithms for computing the extension of NTK to neural nets and conducted experiments showing enhanced performance from adding NTK into models, while in this paper, our contributions are not limited to this. Our theory about NTK of attention with the infinite-long prefix provides advanced insights to us, accordingly we can answer the questions as follows:

Can LLMs master any advanced reasoning skill through self-planning and prompting? We will answer that it may be possible. Since an attention network can converge on any dataset with the infinite-long prefix, we can tell that for any advanced reasoning skill that is equivalent to training on a well-constructed dataset, there exists an ultra-long prefix matrix satisfying the training objective smaller than any positive value $\epsilon > 0$. It’s noteworthy that this conclusion is not only suitable for LLMs with outstanding performance but also can be worked on those small language models with common performance.

What does NTK-Attention use for? What is the meaning for proposing this method? The attention with infinite-long prefix is superior due to its over-parameterization property, whereas it is nearly impossible to implement practically, our NTK-Attention method gives a chance to approximate the infinite-long prefix and make it possible for us to study its empirical properties in experiments. Besides, any form of prefix learning can be formulated into the training of $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in NTK-Attention, we can compress prompts into Z and k if $\phi(\cdot)$ by utilizing Lemma H.7, hence, the approaches in Prefix Learning would be much more efficient.

M Limitations

This paper is lacking in its limited experimental analysis and results. The authors could have promoted their results in theory and enriched their conclusions by evaluating the fine-tuning performance of different models and comparing more comprehensive methods in real practice.

N Societal Impact

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the understanding of context-based fine-tuning methods (prefix learning) theoretically. There are many positive potential societal consequences of our work, such as inspiring new algorithm design. Since our work is theoretical in nature, we do not foresee any potential negative societal impacts which worth pointing out.

References

- [AAA⁺23] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [AAB⁺20] Raman Arora, Sanjeev Arora, Joan Bruna, Nadav Cohen, Simon Du, Rong Ge, Suriya Gunasekar, Chi Jin, Jason Lee, Tengyu Ma, et al. Theory of deep learning, 2020.
- [AAM22] Emmanuel Abbe, Enric Boix Adsera, and Theodor Misiakiewicz. The merged-staircase property: a necessary and nearly sufficient condition for sgd learning of sparse functions on two-layer neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4782–4887. PMLR, 2022.

- [ADH⁺19] Sanjeev Arora, Simon S Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Ruosong Wang. On exact computation with an infinitely wide neural net. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Aga18] Abien Fred Agarap. Deep learning using rectified linear units (relu). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08375*, 2018.
- [ALSY23] Raghav Addanki, Chenyang Li, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. One pass streaming algorithm for super long token attention approximation in sublinear space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14652*, 2023.
- [ANC⁺22] Simran Arora, Avanika Narayan, Mayee F Chen, Laurel Orr, Neel Guha, Kush Bhatia, Ines Chami, and Christopher Re. Ask me anything: A simple strategy for prompting language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [AS23] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. Fast attention requires bounded entries. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [AS24a] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. The fine-grained complexity of gradient computation for training large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04497*, 2024.
- [AS24b] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. How to capture higher-order correlations? generalizing matrix softmax attention to kronecker computation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [ASZ⁺24] Rishabh Agarwal, Avi Singh, Lei M Zhang, Bernd Bohnet, Stephanie Chan, Ankesh Anand, Zaheer Abbas, Azade Nova, John D Co-Reyes, Eric Chu, et al. Many-shot in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11018*, 2024.
- [AWBB20] Sina Alemohammad, Zichao Wang, Randall Balestriero, and Richard Baraniuk. The recurrent neural tangent kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10246*, 2020.
- [AZL23] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Backward feature correction: How deep learning performs deep (hierarchical) learning. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4598–4598. PMLR, 2023.
- [AZLS19] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 2019.
- [BCE⁺23] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- [Ber24] Sergei Bernstein. On a modification of chebyshev’s inequality and of the error formula of laplace. *Ann. Sci. Inst. Sav. Ukraine, Sect. Math*, 1(4):38–49, 1924.
- [BGVG14] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101 – mining discriminative components with random forests. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2014.

- [BLPL06] Yoshua Bengio, Pascal Lamblin, Dan Popovici, and Hugo Larochelle. Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19, 2006.
- [BM19] Alberto Bietti and Julien Mairal. On the inductive bias of neural tangent kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [BMR⁺20] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [CB20] Lenaic Chizat and Francis Bach. Implicit bias of gradient descent for wide two-layer neural networks trained with the logistic loss. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 1305–1338. PMLR, 2020.
- [Cha22] ChatGPT. Optimizing language models for dialogue. *OpenAI Blog*, November 2022.
- [Che52] Herman Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 493–507, 1952.
- [Cla24] Claude-3. Introducing the next generation of claude. *Anthropic News*, March 2024.
- [CMS⁺20] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2020.
- [CSY23] Timothy Chu, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. Fine-tune language models to approximate unbiased in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03331*, 2023.
- [CSY24] Timothy Chu, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. How to protect copyright data in optimization of large language models? In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 17871–17879, 2024.
- [DBK⁺20] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [DCLT18] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [DDS⁺09] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [DHZ⁺21] Ning Ding, Shengding Hu, Weilin Zhao, Yulin Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Maosong Sun. Openprompt: An open-source framework for prompt-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.01998*, 2021.

- [DLD⁺22] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022.
- [DLS23] Yichuan Deng, Zhihang Li, and Zhao Song. Attention scheme inspired softmax regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10411*, 2023.
- [DQL⁺22] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335, 2022.
- [DSXY23] Yichuan Deng, Zhao Song, Shenghao Xie, and Chiwun Yang. Unmasking transformers: A theoretical approach to data recovery via attention weights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12462*, 2023.
- [DSY24] Yichuan Deng, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. Attention is naturally sparse with gaussian distributed input. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02690*, 2024.
- [DZPS19] Simon S Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Póczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *ICLR*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02054, 2019.
- [FHR⁺21] Stanislav Frolov, Tobias Hinz, Federico Raue, Jörn Hees, and Andreas Dengel. Adversarial text-to-image synthesis: A review. *Neural Networks*, 144:187–209, 2021.
- [FKZ⁺11] Sergey Foss, Dmitry Korshunov, Stan Zachary, et al. *An introduction to heavy-tailed and subexponential distributions*, volume 6. Springer, 2011.
- [FPS⁺22] Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Ashish Sabharwal, Peter Clark, and Tushar Khot. Complexity-based prompting for multi-step reasoning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Gem24] Gemini. Welcome to the gemini era. *Google Deepmind Technologies*, May 2024.
- [GLL⁺24a] Jiuxiang Gu, Chenyang Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. Exploring the frontiers of softmax: Provable optimization, applications in diffusion model, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03251*, 2024.
- [GLL⁺24b] Jiuxiang Gu, Chenyang Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Tianyi Zhou. Fourier circuits in neural networks: Unlocking the potential of large language models in mathematical reasoning and modular arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09469*, 2024.
- [GLL⁺24c] Jiuxiang Gu, Yingyu Liang, Heshan Liu, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Junze Yin. Conv-basis: A new paradigm for efficient attention inference and gradient computation in transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05219*, 2024.
- [GLS⁺24] Jiuxiang Gu, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Tensor attention training: Provably efficient learning of higher-order transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16411*, 2024.

- [GMS⁺20] Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A Smith. Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10964*, 2020.
- [GMS23] Yeqi Gao, Sridhar Mahadevan, and Zhao Song. An over-parameterized exponential regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16504*, 2023.
- [GXG⁺23] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023.
- [Haa81] Uffe Haagerup. The best constants in the khintchine inequality. *Studia Mathematica*, 70(3):231–283, 1981.
- [HBB⁺20] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- [HBSDN20] Jiri Hron, Yasaman Bahri, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Roman Novak. Infinite attention: Nngp and ntk for deep attention networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4376–4386. PMLR, 2020.
- [HG16] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016.
- [HJK⁺24] Insu Han, Rajesh Jayaram, Amin Karbasi, Vahab Mirrokni, David Woodruff, and Amir Zandieh. Hyperattention: Long-context attention in near-linear time. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [HM95] Jun Han and Claudio Moraga. The influence of the sigmoid function parameters on the speed of backpropagation learning. In *International workshop on artificial neural networks*, pages 195–201. Springer, 1995.
- [Hoe94] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding*, pages 409–426, 1994.
- [HSK⁺24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Maojiang Su, En-Jui Kuo, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Computational limits of low-rank adaptation (lora) for transformer-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03136*, 2024.
- [HSW⁺21] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [HW71] David Lee Hanson and Farroll Tim Wright. A bound on tail probabilities for quadratic forms in independent random variables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42(3):1079–1083, 1971.
- [HZRS16] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.

- [JGH18] Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [JP20] Yibo Jiang and Cengiz Pehlevan. Associative memory in iterated overparameterized sigmoid autoencoders. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4828–4838. PMLR, 2020.
- [JXG⁺23] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983*, 2023.
- [KB14] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [KH⁺09] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [Khi23] Aleksandr Khintchine. Über dyadische brüche. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 18(1):109–116, 1923.
- [KMZ23] Praneeth Kacham, Vahab Mirrokni, and Peilin Zhong. Polysketchformer: Fast transformers via sketches for polynomial kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01655*, 2023.
- [KSH12] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
- [KSK⁺23] Enkelejda Kasneci, Kathrin Seßler, Stefan Küchemann, Maria Bannert, Daryna Dementieva, Frank Fischer, Urs Gasser, Georg Groh, Stephan Günemann, Eyke Hüllermeier, et al. Chatgpt for good? on opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and individual differences*, 103:102274, 2023.
- [KVPF20] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5156–5165. PMLR, 2020.
- [LARC21] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*, 2021.
- [LDFU13] Yichao Lu, Paramveer Dhillon, Dean P Foster, and Lyle Ungar. Faster ridge regression via the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- [LJF⁺21] Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Lam Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602*, 2021.
- [LL18] Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

- [LL21] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
- [LLSH23] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [LLXH22] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- [LM00] Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.
- [LOG⁺19] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [LPP⁺20] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [LSP⁺20] Jaehoon Lee, Samuel Schoenholz, Jeffrey Pennington, Ben Adlam, Lechao Xiao, Roman Novak, and Jascha Sohl-Dickstein. Finite versus infinite neural networks: an empirical study. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15156–15172, 2020.
- [LSWY23] Chenyang Li, Zhao Song, Weixin Wang, and Chiwun Yang. A theoretical insight into attack and defense of gradient leakage in transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13624*, 2023.
- [LTM⁺22] Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Mohammed Muqeeth, Jay Mohta, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin A Raffel. Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:1950–1965, 2022.
- [LWDC23] Yinheng Li, Shaofei Wang, Han Ding, and Hang Chen. Large language models in finance: A survey. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, pages 374–382, 2023.
- [LYF⁺21] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: a systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. arxiv. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*, 2021.
- [LZD⁺23] Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gpt understands, too. *AI Open*, 2023.
- [MGD⁺22] Sourab Mangrulkar, Sylvain Gugger, Lysandre Debut, Younes Belkada, Sayak Paul, and Benjamin Bossan. Peft: State-of-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods. <https://github.com/huggingface/peft>, 2022.

- [MOSW22] Alexander Munteanu, Simon Omlor, Zhao Song, and David Woodruff. Bounding the width of neural networks via coupled initialization a worst case analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 16083–16122. PMLR, 2022.
- [MRKK23] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023.
- [MWY⁺23] Sadhika Malladi, Alexander Wettig, Dingli Yu, Danqi Chen, and Sanjeev Arora. A kernel-based view of language model fine-tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 23610–23641. PMLR, 2023.
- [PGM⁺19] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [PTB24a] Aleksandar Petrov, Philip Torr, and Adel Bibi. When do prompting and prefix-tuning work? a theory of capabilities and limitations. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [PTB24b] Aleksandar Petrov, Philip HS Torr, and Adel Bibi. Prompting a pretrained transformer can be a universal approximator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14753*, 2024.
- [QZXT19] Tingting Qiao, Jing Zhang, Duanqing Xu, and Dacheng Tao. Mirrorgan: Learning text-to-image generation by redescription. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1505–1514, 2019.
- [RKH⁺21] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [RM21] Laria Reynolds and Kyle McDonell. Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–7, 2021.
- [RV13] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Hanson-wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. 2013.
- [RWC⁺19] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [SCL⁺22] Zhenmei Shi, Jiefeng Chen, Kunyang Li, Jayaram Raghuram, Xi Wu, Yingyu Liang, and Somesh Jha. The trade-off between universality and label efficiency of representations from contrastive learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [SCL⁺23] Kihyuk Sohn, Huiwen Chang, José Lezama, Luisa Polania, Han Zhang, Yuan Hao, Irfan Essa, and Lu Jiang. Visual prompt tuning for generative transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19840–19851, 2023.

- [SK22] Mariia Seleznova and Gitta Kutyniok. Neural tangent kernel beyond the infinite-width limit: Effects of depth and initialization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19522–19560. PMLR, 2022.
- [SMF⁺24] Zhenmei Shi, Yifei Ming, Ying Fan, Frederic Sala, and Yingyu Liang. Domain generalization via nuclear norm regularization. In *Conference on Parsimony and Learning*, pages 179–201. PMLR, 2024.
- [Sun23] Zhongxiang Sun. A short survey of viewing large language models in legal aspect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09136*, 2023.
- [SWL21] Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, and Yingyu Liang. A theoretical analysis on feature learning in neural networks: Emergence from inputs and advantage over fixed features. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [SWL24] Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, and Yingyu Liang. Provable guarantees for neural networks via gradient feature learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [SWXL23] Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, Zhuoyan Xu, and Yingyu Liang. Why larger language models do in-context learning differently? In *R0-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*, 2023.
- [SY19] Zhao Song and Xin Yang. Quadratic suffices for over-parametrization via matrix chernoff bound. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03593*, 2019.
- [SYZ24] Zhao Song, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. Solving attention kernel regression problem via pre-conditioner. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–216. PMLR, 2024.
- [SZ14] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [TBY⁺19] Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Makoto Yamada, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Transformer dissection: a unified understanding of transformer’s attention via the lens of kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11775*, 2019.
- [TLI⁺23] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [TMS⁺23] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [Tro11] Joel A Tropp. Improved analysis of the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. *Advances in Adaptive Data Analysis*, 3(01n02):115–126, 2011.
- [TSG⁺16] Nima Tajbakhsh, Jae Y Shin, Suryakanth R Gurudu, R Todd Hurst, Christopher B Kendall, Michael B Gotway, and Jianming Liang. Convolutional neural networks for

- medical image analysis: Full training or fine tuning? *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 35(5):1299–1312, 2016.
- [TTE⁺23] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.
- [VONR⁺23] Johannes Von Oswald, Eyvind Niklasson, Ettore Randazzo, João Sacramento, Alexander Mordvintsev, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Max Vladymyrov. Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35151–35174. PMLR, 2023.
- [VSP⁺17] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [WCWH23] Yihan Wang, Jatin Chauhan, Wei Wang, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Universality and limitations of prompt tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [WDS⁺19] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2019.
- [WLLM19] Colin Wei, Jason D Lee, Qiang Liu, and Tengyu Ma. Regularization matters: Generalization and optimization of neural nets vs their induced kernel. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [WPK⁺23] Zhen Wang, Rameswar Panda, Leonid Karlinsky, Rogerio Feris, Huan Sun, and Yoon Kim. Multitask prompt tuning enables parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02861*, 2023.
- [WPN⁺19] Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [WWS⁺22a] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.
- [WWS⁺22b] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [WZL⁺22] Zifeng Wang, Zizhao Zhang, Chen-Yu Lee, Han Zhang, Ruoxi Sun, Xiaoqi Ren, Guolong Su, Vincent Perot, Jennifer Dy, and Tomas Pfister. Learning to prompt for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 139–149, 2022.

- [XGDM23] Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian McAuley. Baize: An open-source chat model with parameter-efficient tuning on self-chat data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01196*, 2023.
- [XSL24] Zhuoyan Xu, Zhenmei Shi, and Yingyu Liang. Do large language models have compositional ability? an investigation into limitations and scalability. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*, 2024.
- [XSW⁺23] Zhuoyan Xu, Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, Fangzhou Mu, Yin Li, and Yingyu Liang. Towards few-shot adaptation of foundation models via multitask finetuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [XWCL15] Bing Xu, Naiyan Wang, Tianqi Chen, and Mu Li. Empirical evaluation of rectified activations in convolutional network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00853*, 2015.
- [YAH⁺24] Kai Yang, Jan Ackermann, Zhenyu He, Guhao Feng, Bohang Zhang, Yunzhen Feng, Qiwei Ye, Di He, and Liwei Wang. Do efficient transformers really save computation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13934*, 2024.
- [YJS⁺23] Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*, 2023.
- [YJT⁺24] Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 18(6):1–32, 2024.
- [YYZ⁺23] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [ZCS⁺24] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [ZF14] Matthew D Zeiler and Rob Fergus. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part I 13*, pages 818–833. Springer, 2014.
- [ZGJ21] Mo Zhou, Rong Ge, and Chi Jin. A local convergence theory for mildly over-parameterized two-layer neural network. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4577–4632. PMLR, 2021.
- [ZL23] Yuchen Zeng and Kangwook Lee. The expressive power of low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17513*, 2023.
- [ZLD⁺22] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*, 2022.

- [ZYLL22] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16816–16825, 2022.
- [ZZZK23] Chenshuang Zhang, Chaoning Zhang, Mengchun Zhang, and In So Kweon. Text-to-image diffusion model in generative ai: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07909*, 2023.