

# New advances in universal approximation with neural networks of minimal width

Dennis Rochau<sup>1</sup> Hanno Gottschalk<sup>1</sup> Robin Chan<sup>1</sup>  
 Institute of Mathematics  
 Technische Universität Berlin, Germany  
 {rochau,gottschalk,chan}@math.tu-berlin.de

November 14, 2024

Deep neural networks have achieved remarkable success in diverse applications, prompting the need for a solid theoretical foundation. Recent research has identified the minimal width  $\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$  required for neural networks with input dimensions  $d_x$  and output dimension  $d_y$  that use leaky ReLU activations to universally approximate  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  on compacta. Here, we present an alternative proof for the minimal width of such neural networks, by directly constructing approximating networks using a coding scheme that leverages the properties of leaky ReLUs and standard  $L^p$  results. The obtained construction has a minimal interior dimension of 1, independent of input and output dimensions, which allows us to show that autoencoders with leaky ReLU activations are universal approximators of  $L^p$  functions. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the normalizing flow LU-Net serves as a distributional universal approximator. We broaden our results to show that smooth invertible neural networks can approximate  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  on compacta when the dimension  $d \geq 2$ , which provides a constructive proof of a classical theorem of Brenier and Gangbo. In addition, we use a topological argument to establish that for FNNs with monotone Lipschitz continuous activations,  $d_x + 1$  is a lower bound on the minimal width required for the uniform universal approximation of continuous functions  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  on compacta when  $d_x \geq d_y$ .

## 1. Introduction

Feed-forward neural networks (FNNs) are compositions of affine transformations and activation functions, which are applied dimension-wise to their respective vector inputs. Their structure makes them adaptable to transform inputs of any given dimension into outputs of any desired dimension. As FNNs have achieved promising results in applications

across many different areas related to the approximation of multidimensional functions, the question arises whether these results are based on the strong theoretical approximation capabilities of the model structure.

Indeed, this turned out to be true: a rich set of mathematical theorems, called *universal approximation* (UAP) results, have been proven, demonstrating that FNNs with suitable activation functions can approximate key function classes used in practice, specifically continuous and  $L^p$  functions. Mathematically, universal approximation results characterize the closure of a function class, corresponding to the neural network architecture, with respect to a chosen norm. This is usually either an  $L^p$  norm with  $p \in [1, \infty)$  for classes of  $L^p$  integrable functions, or the supremum norm for continuous functions on bounded sets. Usually, the corresponding function classes are restricted to arbitrary compact subsets of the input space. For example, if a neural network architecture is a  $L^p$  *universal approximator*, then the closure of the function class with respect to the  $L^p$  norm describing all possible architecture configurations, restricted to a compact set  $\mathcal{K}$ , is a superset of all  $L^p$  functions restricted to  $\mathcal{K}$ . Similarly, we call a function class a *uniform universal approximator* if its closure, with respect to the supremum norm, contains the target function class of continuous functions. If the approximation holds not only on compact sets but on the entire input space, it is referred to as a *global universal approximation* result.

The classical results are the universal approximation theorems of Cybenko [8], Hornik et al. [17], and Pinkus [30]. They analyze the universal approximation properties of the so-called *shallow* FNNs, which typically have either a single hidden layer or a uniformly bounded number of hidden layers, and can have arbitrary width, i.e. they can contain any number of neurons in the hidden layers. In 1988, Hornik et al. [17] proved that shallow FNNs with non-decreasing sigmoidal functions universally approximate the set of continuous functions. Independently, Cybenko [8] showed in 1989 that shallow FNNs with continuous sigmoidal activation functions universally approximate continuous functions and  $L^1$  integrable functions on compact sets. Moreover, in 1999, Pinkus [30] proved that shallow FNNs with a continuous activation function, arbitrary width, and uniformly bounded depth are universal approximators of continuous functions if and only if the activation function is non-polynomial.

With the rise of deep neural networks, which have achieved even better results than classical shallow neural networks in various applications, universal approximation results for narrow FNNs have become a popular research topic. *Narrow* FNNs are neural networks of fixed width and arbitrary depth, i.e. they can have an arbitrary number of layers, but the number of neurons in each layer is upper bounded by the (*maximal*) *width*. In this context, for given activation functions, target function class, and chosen norm, the minimal (-maximal) width  $w_{\min}$  refers to the lower bound on the (maximal) width such that the corresponding FNNs, utilizing these activations, can have the universal approximation property for the desired function class. To align with literature conventions, we will refer to  $w_{\min}$  as *minimal width*. In this sense,  $w_{\min}$  determines the thinnest architecture of a

FNN with a given activation function to universally approximate the targeted function class. Additionally, for a fixed FNN, we introduce the *minimal interior dimension*  $d_{\min}$ , which is the minimal number of neurons in a layer over all layers of the neural network. In this regard, an FNN with  $d_{\min}$  smaller than the input and output dimension can be understood as an autoencoder as the network encodes all inputs into features of lower dimension until the layer where  $d_{\min}$  is reached and then decodes these features back to higher dimensional output.

Modern universal approximation results for narrow FNNs not only show that bounds for the width exist for the universal approximation property, but also specify concrete bounds on  $w_{\min}$ . It is important to note that to obtain an upper bound, approximations of arbitrary precision must be constructed for every function within the target function class. In contrast, proving a lower bound only requires finding a single function in the class that the FNN architecture cannot approximate if its width is below the bound. Consequently, proving upper bounds for the minimal width, is generally considered more challenging than proving lower bounds.

An interesting property of universal approximation theorems is achieved when the minimal width allows for the construction of narrow networks with an invertible architecture. Invertible neural networks form bijective mappings, which require squared weight matrices, resulting in fixed-width layers across the entire network architecture including the input and output layer. This invertible structure enables generative learning via maximum likelihood training, as e.g. implemented in normalizing flows [10, 20, 21]. Consequently, universal approximation results for narrow networks, if these bounds are sufficiently tight, can also implicitly demonstrate the universal approximation properties of normalizing flows through invertible neural network architectures. A suitable network architecture for this purpose is LU-Net [6], an invertible neural network specifically designed to resemble a “vanilla” design as closely as possible. In this way, LU-Net directly inherits the universal approximation properties established in theorems for narrow networks, while also retaining the generative capabilities of normalizing flows due to its invertible architecture.

In recent years, several important UAP results have been presented for narrow FNNs of arbitrary depth. We present the state of the art  $L^p$  universal approximation results for narrow FNNs in Table 1, omitting results that have already been surpassed. Additionally, in this paragraph, we discuss most  $L^p$  UAP results, including relevant older ones that have been outclassed. In 2017, Lu et al. [24] showed upper and lower bounds for the minimum width of ReLU FNNs for global universal approximation of functions in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , while, in 2020, Kidger and Lyons [19] proved an upper bound on the minimum width of ReLU FNNs for the global universal approximation of functions in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . Later in 2020, Park et al. [28] fully characterized the minimum width for FNNs with ReLU activations for global universal approximation of functions in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  and concluded  $w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$ , achieving tighter bounds than those shown by Lu et al. [24] and Kidger and Lyons [19]. In addition, Park et al. [28] derived an upper bound on the minimum width  $w_{\min} \leq \max\{d_x + 2, d_y + 1\}$  for FNNs with continuous non-polynomial

Reference	Function class	Activation	Minimal width	Minimal int. dim.
Park [28]	$L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU	$w_{\min} = \max\{d_x + 1, d_y\}$	$d_{\min} = 1$
	$L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	cont. non-poly.	$w_{\min} \leq \max\{d_x + 2, d_y + 1\}$	$d_{\min} = 1$
Cai [5]	$L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	Arbitrary	$w_{\min}^* := \max\{d_x, d_y\} \leq w_{\min}$	-
	$L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	LReLU+ABS	$w_{\min} = w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$	-
	$L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	LReLU	$w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$	-
<b>Ours</b>	$L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	LReLU	$w_{\min} \leq \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$	$d_{\min} = 1$

Table 1: Summary of known results for the minimal width and minimal interior dimension of FNNs with different activation functions for universal approximation of *Lebesgue-integrable functions* w.r.t to the  $L^p$  norms, where  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . We define  $w_{\min}^*$  as the lowest width required for UAP with arbitrary activation functions, which is the same for uniform and  $L^p$  UAP. We denote the input and output dimensions by  $d_x$  and  $d_y$ , respectively.  $\mathcal{K}$  is a placeholder for a non-empty compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . The upper bounds hold for all such compact sets and the lower bounds hold for at least one specific  $\mathcal{K}$ . LReLU denotes the leaky ReLU activations (see Definition 2.8), ABS the absolute value and "cont. non-poly." any continuous non-polynomial activation function.

activation functions with respect to the universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , where  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  is a compact set. Recently, in 2023, Cai [5] showed that the minimal width for universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  for compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  is lower bounded by  $\max\{d_x, d_y\}$ . Moreover, they showed that FNNs with leaky ReLU (LReLU) activations achieve  $w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$ , and hence attain the optimal minimal width over all classes of activations if  $\max\{d_x, d_y\} \geq 2$ . Additionally, Cai [5] considered FNNs with LReLU+ABS to obtain a minimum width of  $\max\{d_x, d_y\}$ , therefore achieving the optimal minimal width even in the one-dimensional case.

In Table 2, we provide an overview of state of the art for uniform universal approximation of continuous functions. In this regard, in 2018, Hanin and Sellke [15] derived lower and upper bounds for the minimal width required for universal approximation of continuous functions with ReLU FNNs. Moreover, in 2020, Kidger and Lyons [19] obtained uniform universal approximators for the continuous functions, using FNNs that utilize either continuous non-polynomial or non-affine polynomial activations. Later in 2020, Park et al. [28] showed that FNNs with ReLU+STEP activations achieve a minimal width of  $w_{\min} = \max\{d_x + 1, d_y\}$ . Furthermore, in 2023, Cai [5] established that the minimal width required for uniform universal approximation with FNNs, regardless of the activation function, is bounded from below by  $w_{\min}^* := \max\{d_x, d_y\}$ . Additionally, Cai [5] showed that FNNs with ReLU+FLOOR activations achieve  $w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$  for uniform universal approximation of continuous functions, making them optimal when  $\max\{d_x, d_y\} \geq 2$ . Furthermore, they concluded that FNNs using UOE+FLOOR activations attain the minimal width  $w_{\min} = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$  for universal approximation. It is worth noting that

Reference	Function class	Activation	Minimal width & Minimal int. dim.
Kidger [19]	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	cont. non-poly. <sup>1</sup>	$w_{\min} \leq d_x + d_y + 1$
	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	non-aff. poly.	$w_{\min} \leq d_x + d_y + 2$
Hanin [15]	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU	$d_x + 1 \leq w_{\min} \leq d_x + d_y$
Park [28]	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU+STEP	$w_{\min} = \max\{d_x + 1, d_y\}, d_{\min} = 1$
	$C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$	ReLU	$\max\{d_x + 1, d_y\} < w_{\min} = 3$
Cai [5]	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	Arbitrary	$w_{\min}^* := \max\{d_x, d_y\} \leq w_{\min}$
	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU+FLOOR	$w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$
	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	UOE + FLOOR	$w_{\min} = w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$
	$C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	UOE	$w_{\min} = w_{\min}^* = d_y$
Johnson [18]	$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$	unif. cont. <sup>2</sup>	$d_x + 1 \leq w_{\min}$
<b>Ours</b>	$\ddagger C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y}), d_x \geq d_y$	$C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})^\dagger$	$d_x + 1 \leq w_{\min}$

<sup>1</sup> Continuous non-polynomial functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are differentiable for at least one point  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $f'(z) \neq 0$ .

<sup>2</sup> Requires the existence of a sequence of bijective functions that uniformly approximate the activation.

<sup>‡</sup> The inequality only holds for compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  with non-empty interior, such that Proposition 10.5 is applicable.

<sup>†</sup> The set of activation functions needs to be a subset of  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , i.e. all activations are Lipschitz continuous and monotone (for details see Definition 2.35 and Theorem 5).

Table 2: Summary of known results for the minimal width of FNNs with different activation functions for universal approximation of *continuous functions* w.r.t. the supremum norm. The minimal interior dimension is only included in the table if it is non-trivial and smaller than the minimal width, i.e. if  $1 \leq d_{\min} < w_{\min}$ .  $\mathcal{K}$  is a placeholder for a non-empty compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . The upper bounds hold for all such compact sets and the lower bounds hold for at least one specific  $\mathcal{K}$ . FLOOR refers to the function that rounds a real number down to the nearest integer. UOE refers to the set of functions that exhibit universal ordering or extrema (see Definition 7 in Cai [5]).

while this result indicates that UOE+FLOOR FNNs are optimal across all input and output dimensions in theory, UOE activations are primarily a theoretical construct and not readily practical. Therefore, ReLU+FLOOR FNNs offer a more feasible choice for practical applications, while being theoretically optimal for most choices of dimensions.

Furthermore, in 2018, Johnson [18] derived the lower bound of  $d_x + 1$  for FNNs with uniformly continuous activations that can be uniformly approximated by bijective functions when the output dimension is  $d_y = 1$ . Our Theorem 5 shows that  $d_x + 1$  is a lower bound for uniform universal approximation of continuous functions for FNNs with monotone Lipschitz continuous functions, provided the output dimension satisfies  $d_x \geq d_y$ . This shows that a width of at least  $d_x + 1$  is required to achieve uniform universal approximation of continuous functions for almost all of the activation functions commonly used in practice [12, 9], when  $d_x \geq d_y$ . Therefore Theorem 5 can be seen as a generalization of the universal

approximation results from Johnson [18] to higher output dimensions  $d_y$  if they're smaller or equal than  $d_x$ . It is important to note that, in this case, the lower bound is tighter by one compared to the lower bound for arbitrary activations stated by Cai [5].

**Our main contributions** in this work are divided into four parts. In the first part, we prove [Theorem 1](#) in [Section 6](#), which shows the upper bound  $\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$  for the universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  on arbitrary compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  with FNNs equipped with leaky ReLU activations in [Theorem 1](#). To formally prove this, we present a coding scheme in [Section 3](#) to construct explicit approximations with leaky ReLU FNNs in [Section 4](#) and [Section 5](#). We note that the same result was originally established in [5], but by a different approach that exploits the strong approximation properties of flow maps for ordinary differential equations [22], and approximating them with leaky ReLU FNNs [11]. Therefore, the proof of Cai [5] essentially relies on the strong approximation capabilities of neuralODE [33] corresponding to Theorem 2.3 of Li et al. [22] that is similar to the well-known Theorem 2. (i) of Brenier and Gangbo [3], which shows that diffeomorphisms are  $L^p$  universal approximators. In contrast, our proof of [Theorem 1](#) relies only on basic results of analysis and also explicitly constructs the approximation sequences of neural networks via the coding scheme introduced by Park et al. [28].

In the second part, we show that LU decomposable neural networks with invertible leaky ReLU activations can universally approximate  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  on arbitrary compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , which we state formally in [Theorem 2](#) and prove in [Section 7](#). With this result, we then analyze the properties of LU-Net [6] as a normalizing flow. More specifically, we prove that LU-Net can transform an absolutely continuous source distribution into a sequence of distributions that converges in law to any predefined target distribution. We provide the latter statement in [Theorem 3](#) and give the formal proof in [Section 8](#). Similar results on distributional universal approximation have been obtained for other normalizing flows, in particular affine coupling flows [10] and NeuralODE [7], see also [35, 22, 33, 25].

In the third part we show that the set of smooth diffeomorphisms in the form of LU-decomposable almost leaky ReLU neural networks are universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  on any compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , which is the statement of [Theorem 4](#) that we prove in [Section 9](#). This means that for any compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $f \in L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  there exists an approximating sequence of  $f$  in  $L^p$  norm of smooth invertible LU-decomposable neural networks that are limits of sequences of LU-decomposable neural networks and whose inverses are also smooth LU-decomposable neural networks. In that sense, [Theorem 4](#) identifies a dense subset of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  consisting of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms that can be approximated arbitrarily by leaky ReLU FNNs. Moreover, our [Corollary 2.33](#) resulting from [Theorem 4](#), immediately implies the well-known Theorem 2.5 (i) of Brenier and Gangbo [3], which shows that the set of diffeomorphisms is dense in  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  for all compact sets  $\mathcal{K}$ .

In the fourth part, we present [Theorem 5](#), with the proof detailed in [Section 10](#). Here, we establish that  $d_x + 1$  is a lower bound for universal approximation of continuous functions

with FNNs that employ monotone Lipschitz continuous activation functions, whenever the input dimension  $d_x$  is greater or equal than the output dimension  $d_y$ . The key idea in this proof is to show that homeomorphisms are not uniform universal approximators for continuous functions — a well-known result that we revisit in [Section 10](#), though it is not among our primary contributions. [Theorem 5](#) has important implications for neural network design. It implies that FNNs with common activation functions [[13](#), [9](#)] — such as ReLU, LReLU, or sigmoid-like functions including hyperbolic tangent and the logistic sigmoid — cannot achieve uniform universal approximation of continuous functions if their width is restricted to the input dimension  $d_x$ , provided  $d_x \geq d_y$ .

**Structure of the paper.** [Section 2](#) is split into five subchapters corresponding to the five main theorems, which each introduce the relevant notation for one of the theorems, explain the relevancy of them and list some strong corollaries that follow from them. [Section 3](#) defines and motivates the coding scheme from Park et al. [[28](#)], which is essential for the proof of our main [Theorem 1](#), and shows it’s approximation capabilities. [Section 4](#) analyzes the capabilities of leaky ReLUs for the approximation of piecewise linear functions and [Section 5](#) gives several preliminary results that show how leaky ReLU FNNs can be used to approximate the parts of the coding scheme, which both is combined in [Section 6](#) to prove [Theorem 1](#). In [Section 7](#) we prove [Theorem 2](#) that generalizes [Theorem 1](#) to  $LU$  decomposable neural networks, which are INNs with  $LU$  decomposable linear transformations. We apply this in [Section 8](#) to obtain that the normalizing flow LU-Net has the distributional universal approximation property. [Section 9](#) further generalizes [Theorem 1](#) to obtain a set smooth diffeomorphisms in the form of INNs that universally approximate  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . In [Section 10](#) we give a formal proof of [Theorem 5](#), which shows that the minimal width for uniform universal approximation of the continuous functions  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with FNNs using Lipschitz continuous and monotone activations must be at least  $d_x + 1$  when the input dimension  $d_x$  is greater than or equal to the output dimension  $d_y$ . Furthermore, a comprehensive conclusion and outlook of the research on universal approximation for narrow neural networks is presented in [Section 11](#). In the beginning of the appendix [A](#) a list of most abbreviations and notations, used in this paper, is given and moreover auxiliary definitions, some well-known results and proofs, necessary for the main proofs, are presented in the rest of the appendix.

## 2. Notation and main results

### 2.1. Leaky ReLU neural networks as universal approximators

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $k \leq n$ , then  $[k, n] := \{k, \dots, n\}$  and  $[n] := [1, n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Note that we use this exclusively for denoting ranges of indices and we still use the notation  $[a, b]$  for intervals from  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  to  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus it should be clear by the context, which of both is meant.*

**Definition 2.2** (Affine transformations). *We define the set of affine transformation from*

$\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  as

$$\text{Aff}(d_x, d_y) = \{W : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}, W(x) = Ax + b \mid A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_x}, b \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}\},$$

and for  $d_x = d_y = d$  we define the shorthand  $\text{Aff}(d) := \text{Aff}(d, d)$ . Moreover we define the set of  $d$ -dimensional invertible affine transformations as

$$\text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d) = \{W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, W(x) = Ax + b \mid A \in \text{GL}(d), b \in \mathbb{R}^d\},$$

where  $\text{GL}(d)$  denotes the set of invertible  $d \times d$  matrices.

**Definition 2.3** (Feed-forward neural networks (FNNs)). *In the following we consider feed-forward neural networks, which are given by a composition of alternating affine transformations and activation functions. We denote  $\mathcal{A}$  as the set of activations functions. Then each FNN with activations in  $\mathcal{A}$  can be written as*

$$\phi = \varphi_n \circ W_n \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1,$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is the FNN's depth,  $W_i \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1}}, \mathbb{R}^{d_i})$ ,  $i \in [n]$  an affine transformation from  $\mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1}}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  and  $\varphi_i := (\sigma_1^{(i)}, \dots, \sigma_{d_i}^{(i)})^T$ ,  $i \in [n]$  the layer activation with  $\sigma_k^{(i)} \in \mathcal{A}$  for  $k \in [d_i]$ . Moreover,  $d_x := d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  is the input dimension,  $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \in [n-1]$  the dimensions of the hidden layers,  $d_y := d_n$  the output dimension, thus the FNN is a function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Moreover the (maximal) width of the FNN  $\phi$  is defined as  $w_{\max}^\phi := \max\{d_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$  and  $w_{\max}^\phi := \max\{d_x, d_y\}$  if  $n = 1$ . Additionally we define the smallest interior dimension of such a FNN  $\phi$  as  $d_{\min}^\phi := \min\{d_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$  if  $n > 1$  and  $d_{\min}^\phi := \min\{d_x, d_y\}$  if  $n = 1$ .

Then, we denote the set of all FNNs with input dimension  $d_x \in \mathbb{N}$ , output dimension  $d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ , activations in  $\mathcal{A}$  and of width  $w \in \mathbb{N}$  as  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(w)}(d_x, d_y)$ . Additionally we define the set of all FNNs  $\phi$  in  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(w)}(d_x, d_y)$  such that  $d_{\min}^\phi = k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  as  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(w,k)}(d_x, d_y)$ .

Autoencoders are a special type of FNN that use an encoder function to transform a high-dimensional input vector into a lower-dimensional feature vector. A decoder function is then used to transform the feature back to a high-dimensional representation in the input space that should be close to the value of a fixed function applied to the original input vector. Since encoders and decoders are usually given by FNNs, it makes sense to formally define autoencoders as FNNs, in the case  $d = d_x = d_y > 1$ , with an interior width less than  $d$ .

**Definition 2.4** (Autoencoders). *Let the the input and output dimension given by  $d = d_x = d_y$  with  $d \geq 2$ . Then, we define set of autoencoders of dimension  $d$  with feature dimension  $d_{\min} \leq d$  and activations in  $\mathcal{A} \subset \{f \mid f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  as*

$$\text{AE}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_{\min})}(d) := \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d, d_{\min})}(d, d).$$



Therefore any autoencoder of feature dimension  $d_{\min}$ , given by  $\phi \in \text{AE}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(d)$ , is a narrow neural network from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a width bounded by  $d$  and a minimal interior dimension  $d_{\min}^{\phi} = d_{\min}$ . Note that we overload the notation for  $d_{\min}$  here, which still makes sense as it coincides with the minimal interior dimension of the corresponding FNNs.

**Definition 2.5** (Norms). For  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  we define the supremum norm by and  $p$  vector norms by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{X}, \text{sup}} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|f(x)\|_{\max} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{i \in [d]} |f_i(x)|$$

and the  $L^p$  norm by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{X}, p} := \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|f(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|x\|_p := \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d_x} x_i^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}.$$

The next definition gives the formal definition of  $L^p$  and uniform universal approximators.

**Definition 2.6** ( $L^p$  and uniform universal approximator). For  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $d_x, d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}$  be sets of measurable functions from  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , which are subsets of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , namely the space of  $L^p$  (measurable and) integrable functions. Then we call  $\mathcal{M}$  an  $L^p$  universal approximator (UAP) of  $\mathcal{G}$  if for every  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , every compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\|f - g\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} = \left( \int_{\mathcal{K}} \|f(x) - g(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} < \epsilon.$$

If the same holds for the supremum norm instead, we call  $\mathcal{M}$  a uniform universal approximator of  $\mathcal{G}$ , or say that  $\mathcal{M}$  universally approximates  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to the supremum norm. When we say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $L^p$  universal approximator without specifying the function class to be universally approximated, then it holds that  $\mathcal{G} = L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . Similarly, if we say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a uniform universal approximator without specifying the function class to be universally approximated, then it holds that  $\mathcal{G} = C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ .

Having introduced the terms minimal width and minimal interior dimension for universal approximation in the introduction, we now give a formal mathematical definition for them for the proofs and theorems themselves.

**Definition 2.7** (Minimal width and minimal interior dimension for universal approximation). Let  $\mathcal{M}$  a set of FNNs that universally approximates  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t. a given norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , which is the  $L^p$  norm in the case of  $L^p$  UAP and the supremum norm in the case of uniform UAP. Then, we define the minimal width of  $\mathcal{M}$  for the universal approximation of  $\mathcal{G}$  in the considered norm as

$$w_{\min}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|) := w_{\min} := \min\{w_{\max}^{\phi} \mid \phi \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

and the minimal interior dimension of  $\mathcal{M}$  for the universal approximation of  $\mathcal{G}$  in the considered norm as

$$d_{\min}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|) := d_{\min} := \min\{d_{\min}^{\phi} \mid \phi \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

As it is usually clear from the context what  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  are, we mostly drop them and just write  $w_{\min}$  and  $d_{\min}$  instead.

We now introduce the set of activation functions that we consider in this paper, which is the set of invertible leaky rectified linear units (LReLU).

**Definition 2.8** (Leaky rectified linear unit (LReLU/leaky ReLU)). *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , then the corresponding leaky rectified linear unit is defined by*

$$\sigma_{\alpha} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \sigma_{\alpha}(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x & x < 0 \\ x & x \geq 0 \end{cases}.$$

Additionally we define  $\mathcal{F}_+ := \{\sigma_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in (0, 1]\}$  as the set of invertible leaky ReLUs and  $\mathcal{F} := \{\sigma_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  as the set of (invertible) true leaky ReLUs. Note that if we talk about leaky ReLUs in the texts, we usually mean invertible true leaky ReLUs  $\mathcal{F}$  as all main theorems are formulated for them and invertible leaky ReLUs  $\mathcal{F}_+$  are only considered in auxiliary lemmas for the proofs.

LReLU introduces an additional slope to the ReLU function, allowing for control of the magnitude for negative input values. In our first main result, we show that FNNs with invertible LReLU activations universally approximate  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . Since the LReLU is a bijective function, it can be used to build invertible neural networks (INNs), which are later used to generalize universal approximation results to general diffeomorphisms and LU-Net [6].

The following [Theorem 1](#) states that FNNs with true invertible leaky ReLU activations of width  $\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$  are dense in  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  for any compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $d_x, d_y \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{F} := \{\sigma_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  be the set of invertible true leaky ReLUs. Then  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}, 1)}(d_x, d_y)$  is an  $L^p$ -universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , i.e. for any compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $f \in L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a neural network  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}, 1)}(d_x, d_y)$  such that*

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon.$$

Thus, the minimal width and minimal interior dimension for universally approximating  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with leaky ReLU FNNs are given by  $w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$  and  $d_{\min} = 1$ , respectively.

We note that the upper bound for the minimal width corresponding to the previous result was first proven in 2023 by Cai [5] in his Theorem 2. His proof combines the strong approximation properties of flow maps of ODEs, namely that they can approximate any continuous function arbitrarily well in  $L^p$  norm [22], with the result that FNNs with leaky ReLU activations can approximate suitable flow maps arbitrarily well [11]. In contrast to that our Theorem 1 corresponds to an alternative proof for the upper bound of the minimum width, and it is based on approximating continuous functions on compact sets via a coding scheme approach as introduced by Park et al. [28]. Thus, our result directly constructs suitable approximations without relying on approximation results from the theory of ODEs and because of our explicit construction we also show that the approximating sequences are in  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\}, 1)}(d_x, d_y)$ , i.e. they are of width  $\max\{d_x, d_y, 2\}$  (as shown by Cai [5]), but additionally the neural networks have minimal interior dimension 1, independent of the input and output dimensions  $d_x, d_y$ .

As a direct consequence of Theorem 1, the following corollary shows that autoencoders with LReLU activations are universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  and thus proves that even autoencoders with feature dimension 1 can approximate any function in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  w.r.t. the  $L^p$  norm on any compact set up to arbitrary precision.

**Corollary 2.9.** *The set of autoencoders of feature dimension 1 with true leaky ReLU activations  $\mathcal{F} := \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  given by  $\text{AE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}(d)$ , where  $d \geq 2$ , is a  $L^p$  universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover, autoencoders with true leaky ReLU activations  $\text{AE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(d_{\min})}(d)$  of any feature dimension  $d_{\min} < d$  are  $L^p$  universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* Follows directly from Theorem 1 in the case  $d = d_x = d_y$  as  $\text{AE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}(d)$  with feature dimension 1 are defined by the set  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(d, 1)}(d, d)$  that has minimal interior width 1 for universal approximation. By filling up an autoencoder of feature dimension 1 with zero connections in the linear transformations without altering the activations, an autoencoder of feature dimension  $d_{\min} < d$  that expresses the same function can be obtained. Therefore  $\text{AE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(d_{\min})}(d)$  must be  $L^p$  universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  for any  $d_{\min} < d$ . ■

Note that we define autoencoders only in the case where the dimensions of the input and output spaces are equal, that is, when  $d = d_x = d_y$ . This is the most common case in practice. However, Corollary 2.9 can be extended to arbitrary input and output dimensions, since Theorem 1 is applicable to such cases.

**Remark 2.10.** *Corollary 2.9 implies the distributional universal approximation property for variational autoencoders (VAE) with leaky ReLU activation of arbitrary internal dimension  $d_{\min} \geq 2$ . As long as layers become more narrow with invertible activations, it is easy to see that continuous distributions are mapped to continuous distributions layer by layer. If starting with a continuous data distribution, we obtain a continuous distribution internally at the prescribed minimal layer size  $d_{\min}$ . We can then continue mapping this internal, continuous distribution to a Gaussian distribution, e.g. by approximating a continuous transport map which is known to exist, see [34, 36]. By Corollary 2.9,*

one approximately reaches an internal normal distribution in dimension  $d_{\min}$  with layers of width  $d_{\min}$  in the sense of weak convergence in law by approximating the transport map with leaky ReLU networks. This process can then be reversed, approximating the inverse transport map. If this module is inserted in the most narrow layer of an AE that approximates the identity function with a network of internal size  $d_{\min}$ , we reach distributional universal approximation with the VAE. We leave the details to the reader.

## 2.2. Leaky ReLU $LU$ -decomposable invertible neural networks as universal approximators

**Definition 2.11** ( $LU$ -decomposable matrix). *We say that an invertible matrix  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  is  $LU$ -decomposable if there exist a lower triangular matrix  $L$  with ones on the diagonal and an upper triangular matrix  $U$  such that  $A = LU$  holds.*

Note that  $LU$ -decompositions can also be obtained for singular matrices, but for our purposes in this paper it is sufficient to only consider  $LU$ -decompositions for invertible matrices. Furthermore, it can be shown that  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  has a unique  $LU$  decomposition if and only if its leading principle minors (see [Definition A.9](#)) are non-zero. For the interested reader, a proof of this result is given in [Theorem A.10](#) of the Appendix.

**Definition 2.12.** *We define  $\text{LU}(d)$  as the set of all invertible  $LU$ -decomposable matrices  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$ .*

**Remark 2.13.** *By [Theorem A.10](#) and [Lemma A.13](#) it holds that  $\text{LU}(d)$  is a dense subset of  $\text{GL}(d)$  w.r.t. the operator norm for matrices denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ .*

**Definition 2.14** (Affine  $LU$ -decomposable transformations). *We define the set of  $d$ -dimensional  $LU$ -decomposable affine transformations as*

$$\text{Aff}_{\text{LU}}(d) = \{W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, W(x) = Ax + b \mid A \in \text{LU}(d), b \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

With the set of affine  $LU$ -decomposable transformations, we now specify the [Definition 2.3](#) of general FNNs to  $LU$ -decomposable invertible neural networks.

**Definition 2.15** ( $LU$  decomposable neural networks). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of activation functions and let  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{M}}^{(w)}(d, d)$  be of the form*

$$\phi = \varphi_n \circ W_n \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1$$

*for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $W_i \in \text{Aff}_{\text{LU}}(d)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ , then we call  $\phi$  a  $d$ -dimensional  $LU$  decomposable neural network. The set of all  $d$ -dimensional  $LU$  decomposable neural networks of width  $w$  with activations in  $\mathcal{A}$  is denoted as  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(w)}(d)$ .*

**Remark 2.16.** *Note that if the set of activations  $\mathcal{A}$  is invertible, then each element of  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  is invertible as a composition of invertible functions by [Lemma A.5\(1\)](#). Thus  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  consists of invertible neural networks.*

We extend the universal approximation results for leaky ReLU FNNs from [Theorem 1](#) to  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks with leaky ReLU activations in the following [Theorem 2](#).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$  and  $\mathcal{F} := \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  be the set of (invertible) true leaky ReLUs. Then  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  is an  $L^p$  universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , i.e. for any compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $f \in L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , it exists  $\phi \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  such that*

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon .$$

[Theorem 2](#) gives us a helpful tool to conclude strong approximation results for the normalizing flow LU-Net (see [Definition 2.19](#)), whose elements take the form of  $LU$  decomposable invertible neural networks. Furthermore we use it as an important building block to generalize the  $L^p$  universal approximation result of [Theorem 1](#) to suitable classes of neural networks that are smooth diffeomorphism, which we do later in the proof of [Theorem 4](#).

### 2.3. LU-Net as universal distributional approximator

**Definition 2.17** (Diffeomorphisms). *A diffeomorphism from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is an invertible and continuously-differentiable function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with differentiable inverse  $f^{-1}$ . Similarly for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$  a  $C^k$ -diffeomorphism from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is an invertible and  $r$ -times continuously-differentiable function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with a  $r$ -times continuously-differentiable inverse  $f^{-1}$ . We call a  $C^\infty$ -diffeomorphism a smooth diffeomorphism and we define  $\mathcal{D}^\infty(d)$  as the set of all smooth diffeomorphisms from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .*

**Definition 2.18** (Normalizing flow). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a set of invertible functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The corresponding normalizing flow of dimension  $d$  is then defined by  $\text{NF}_{\mathcal{M}}(d) := \{(f, f^{-1}) \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$  and we call  $\mathcal{M}$  the set of normalizing directions and  $\mathcal{M}^{-1} := \{f^{-1} \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$  the set of generative directions of  $\text{NF}_{\mathcal{M}}(d)$ . Additionally the normalizing flow consists of  $C^k$  diffeomorphisms if  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of  $C^k$  diffeomorphisms.*

Note that although normalizing flows can be defined for invertible activations, it is usually required that the activations are also differentiable almost everywhere. This is necessary to be able to obtain the densities of the push-forward measures corresponding to the normalizing flow almost everywhere with the change of variables formula (see e.g. formula (1) in [\[6\]](#)).

**Definition 2.19** (LU-Net, Chan et al. [\[6\]](#)). *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  denote the dimension,  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of invertible activations  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  the corresponding set of  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks of dimension  $d$  with activations in  $\mathcal{A}$  as introduced in [Definition 2.15](#). Then we define the  $d$ -dimensional  $LU$ -Net with activations in  $\mathcal{A}$  to be the normalizing flow given by  $\text{NF}_{\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)}$ . Thus, the normalizing directions are elements of  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  and take the form of  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks with activations in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

**Remark 2.20.**

(1) One can initialize LU-Net with already LU-decomposed matrices, which allows efficient determinant computation of the normalizing directions (see equation (8) in Chan et al. [6]). This makes it possible to efficiently train the corresponding normalizing flow efficiently with the maximum likelihood method (see equation (9) in Chan et al. [6]).

(2) Note that if  $\text{Id} \in \mathcal{A}$  then the set of generative directions of  $\text{NF}_{\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)}$  coincides with  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$ , which we show in Lemma 8.3.

Since the normalizing and generative directions of LU-Net have the structure of LU-decomposable neural networks, they exploit the strong approximation properties of neural networks with expressive activations and incorporate them into a normalizing flow structure. This fact also allows us to show strong approximation properties for the LU-Net by using universal approximation results of neural networks.

**Definition 2.21** (Convergence in distribution). *Let  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{abs}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denote the set of all probability and absolutely continuous probability measures, respectively. We say that  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  converges to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  in distribution, or analogously we write  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mu$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , if*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu$$

continuous and bounded  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ .

**Definition 2.22** (Distributional universal approximator, c.f. [21]). *Let  $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a function class consisting of measurable mappings  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a distributional universal approximator, if for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{abs}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a sequence  $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}$  such that  $(g_i)_* \mu \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \nu$ .*

In the next definition we provide the most important property of expressiveness for normalizing flow methods, that is considered in this work.

**Definition 2.23** (DUAP of a normalizing flow method). *We say that a normalizing flow  $\text{NF}_{\mathcal{M}}$  has the distributional universal approximation property (DUAP) if the corresponding set of generative directions is a distributional universal approximator by the means of Definition 2.22.*

A function class is a distributional universal approximator if it can transform an absolutely continuous probability measure into a sequence of push-forward measures that converge to an arbitrary measure in distribution. This means that a normalizing flow with the DUAP can transform an absolutely continuous probability measure into any probability measure, w.r.t. the topology induced by convergence in distribution.

The following Theorem 3 states that LU-Net is a distributional universal approximator.

**Theorem 3.** Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  the dimension and again  $\mathcal{F} := \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  the set of invertible true leaky ReLUs. Then the normalizing directions  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  and the generative directions  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  are distributional universal approximators and therefore  $\text{NF}_{\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)}$  has the distributional universal approximation property (DUAP).

The above theorem is fundamentally based on the fact that each component of LU-Net takes the form of a LU-decomposable neural network and, according to [Theorem 2](#), these are universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ .

## 2.4. Smooth almost leaky ReLU neural networks are universal approximators

**Definition 2.24.** We call  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  locally  $L^p$ , or equivalently write  $f \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , if for all compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  it holds that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \infty$ .

**Definition 2.25** (Convolution operator). For  $f \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the convolution operator  $(\cdot * p_n)$  by

$$(f * p_n)(x) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y)p_n(y-x)dy .$$

The following definition of standard mollifiers is equivalent to Definition 4.1.27 in [\[27\]](#).

**Definition 2.26** (Standard mollifier). We define

$$p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p(x) := \begin{cases} c \cdot \exp(1/(|x|^2 - 1)) & , |x| < 1 \\ 0 & , |x| \geq 1 \end{cases} ,$$

as introduced on page 108 by Brezis [\[4\]](#), where the constant  $c > 0$  is chosen in a way that  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)dx = 1$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the standard mollifiers corresponding to  $p$  by  $p_n(x) := \frac{1}{n}p(nx)$

**Lemma 2.27** (Papageorgiou and Winkert [\[27\]](#)). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the operator  $(\cdot * p_n) : L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  is the set of smooth real-valued functions, is well-defined.

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Proposition 4.1.28 in [\[27\]](#). ■

**Definition 2.28** (Regularizing functions). For any function  $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  the regularizing functions of  $f$  are defined as  $f_n := f * p_n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We use their properties shown in [\[27\]](#) to regularize leaky ReLUs in the proof of [Theorem 4](#).

**Remark 2.29.** One can show that  $p$  is smooth, which also implies for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  that  $p_n$  is smooth as a concatenation of smooth functions. Moreover for  $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  it holds that the sequences  $(f_n) := (f * p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  consist of smooth functions by [Lemma 2.27](#). Additionally by definition  $\text{supp}(p) = [0, 1]$  and therefore  $\text{supp}(p_n) = [-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}]$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 2.30** (Papageorgiou and Winkert [27]). *For any compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $f \in C^0(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$  it holds that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - (f * p_n)\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Proposition 4.1.29 in [27]. ■

**Definition 2.31** (Smoothed LReLU). *Let  $p_n$  be the mollifiers from Definition 2.26 and define*

$$\mathcal{F}^\infty := \{\sigma_\alpha * p_n \mid \sigma_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

*as the set of all regularized leaky ReLUs. Note that by Lemma 2.27 it holds that  $\mathcal{F}^\infty \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .*

**Definition 2.32** (Almost leaky ReLU). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be some arbitrary set of activation functions and  $\mathcal{F}_+ := \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\}$  the set of true invertible leaky ReLUs. Then we call  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{M}}(d)$  a sequence of almost leaky ReLU networks if for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t. for all  $n \geq N$  there exists  $\phi^{(n)} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$  s.t.*

$$\phi_n = \varphi_L^{(n)} \circ W_L \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1^{(n)} \circ W_1, \quad \phi^{(n)} = \varphi_L \circ W_L \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1,$$

*with  $\|\varphi_j - \varphi_j^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}_j, \text{sup}} < \epsilon$  for  $\mathcal{K}_1 := \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{j+1} := \varphi_j \circ W_j(\mathcal{K}_j)$ ,  $j \in [L]$  and  $\|\phi^{(n)} - \psi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} < \epsilon$ .*

With this notation we can now introduce Theorem 4, which combines the knowledge of the previous main theorems to obtain a small subset of leaky ReLU networks that universally approximates  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . We construct it in such a way that the all elements are smooth diffeomorphisms (with smooth inverse), which are almost leaky ReLU networks, i.e. any of them can be approximated arbitrarily well by leaky ReLU neural networks.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}^\infty$  be the set of regularized leaky ReLUs from Definition 2.31. Then  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}^\infty}(d) \subset \mathcal{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and it is a  $L^p$ -universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . More precisely, for any  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and any compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists a sequence of almost leaky ReLU networks  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}^\infty}(d)$  s.t.  $\|f - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ .*

Note that Theorem 4 immediately implies the following corollary, since the elements in  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$  are smooth diffeomorphisms from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Corollary 2.33.** *The set of smooth diffeomorphisms from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  given by  $\mathcal{D}^\infty(d)$  is a  $L^p$  universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover the approximating sequence of diffeomorphisms can be chosen as elements of  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}^\infty}(d)$  for any  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

Note that Corollary 2.33 shows that (smooth) diffeomorphisms in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  are dense with respect to the  $L^p$  norm, which also implies the famous Theorem 2.5 (i) of Brenier and Gangbo [3]. Moreover, unlike Brenier and Gangbo [3], we actually obtain an explicit form for the approximating sequences of diffeomorphisms due to Theorem 4, namely that they are given by nearly leaky ReLU neural networks of the set  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}^\infty}(d)$ . This shows that neural networks are not only interesting for various applications due to their flexibility and strong results, but they are also a versatile theoretical tool to prove rigorous results in the field of mathematical approximation theory.



## 2.5. Minimal width for universal approximation of continuous functions with monotone Lipschitz continuous activations

[Corollary 2.33](#) demonstrates that diffeomorphisms serve as universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  with respect to the induced  $L^p$  norm. However, the following lemma shows that the set of continuous bijections, which is a superset of the set of diffeomorphisms, is not a universal approximator of continuous functions of class  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  with respect to the supremum norm. It follows that a result similar to that of [Theorem 4](#), which constructs a dense set of diffeomorphisms given by neural networks, cannot be true when examining the uniform universal approximation.

**Lemma 2.34.** *The set  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , which consists of all continuous bijections from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with continuous inverse, is not a universal approximator in  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  with respect to the supremum norm.*

Note that we give the proof of [Lemma 2.34](#) later in [Section 10](#). Building on the idea of [Lemma 2.34](#) we present a negative result in the next theorem that concludes choice of activation function makes uniform universal approximation Building on

**Definition 2.35.** *Let  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  the set of Lipschitz continuous and monotone functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

The following [Theorem 5](#) combines [Lemma 2.34](#) with auxiliary results of the activations in  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  to conclude that neural networks with Lipschitz continuous and monotone activations can't be uniform universal approximators of the continuous functions with a width less than or equal to the input dimension. For a detailed proof we refer to [Section 10](#).

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , if the dimensions satisfy  $d_x \geq d_y$ , then  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_y)$  does not universally approximate  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with respect to the supremum norm.*

Note that [Theorem 5](#) is applicable to many of the most important activation functions [[12](#), [9](#)]. These include the usual sigmoidal activation functions, i.e. the hyperbolic tangent and the logistic function, since they are all strictly increasing and smooth with bounded derivative, and thus naturally elements of  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ . It is applicable to the ReLU because it's increasing and continuous and moreover it can be applied to sets of activation functions consisting of finitely many of these activations. Furthermore, since the set of true leaky ReLUs with parameters in  $(0, 1)$  are also contained in  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , and they have the common Lipschitz constant 1, [Theorem 5](#) implies that the minimal width for the universal approximation of  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  w.r.t the supremum norm is greater than or equal to  $d_x + 1$ , when  $d_x \geq d_y$ . Hence the minimal width for  $L^p$  universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , which is  $\max\{2, d\}$  by [Theorem 1](#), is strictly less than the minimal width for uniform universal approximation of  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  if the dimension  $d_x \geq d_y$  and  $d_x \geq 2$ .

However, there are some important cases where the [Theorem 5](#) does not hold. One case is when the set of activations contains non-continuous activations, such as the floor function  $\text{FLOOR} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\text{FLOOR}(x) := n_x$ , where  $n_x := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \leq x\}$ . For example, Cai [5] showed that FNNs using ReLU+FLOOR activations can universally approximate  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with respect to the supremum norm with a width of  $\max\{d_x, d_y\}$ , which doesn't contradict [Theorem 5](#) because the floor function is not continuous. Other examples are non-monotone activations such as the swish function  $\text{swish}(x) := \frac{x}{1+\exp(-\beta x)}$  for  $\beta > 0$  or activations, which aren't Lipschitz continuous such as differentiable functions with unbounded derivative. Another example is the multidimensional softmax activation, which is often used in the last layer of neural networks to obtain probabilities as output values. First of all, since we only consider one-dimensional activations in the theorem, it couldn't be applied directly anyway. Nevertheless, the proof of [Theorem 5](#) could easily be generalized to multidimensional activation functions that are Lipschitz continuous and bijective. However, since the softmax is not injective, since adding a constant number in all components doesn't change the output, this generalization would not be applicable to the softmax activation.

### 3. Coding scheme

The idea of our proof of [Theorem 1](#) is based on a coding scheme, which was first presented by Park et al. [28] to show that FNNs with ReLU activations are global approximators of  $L^p$  functions (for details see Theorem 1 in [28]). In the following sections we construct the coding scheme accordingly to obtain the result that FNNs with leaky ReLU activations universally approximate  $L^p$  functions on compact sets in the following sections.

**Definition 3.1** (Coding scheme, section 3 in Park et al. [28]). *Let  $f^* : [0, 1]^{d_x} \rightarrow [0, 1]^{d_y}$  be a continuous function, which we want to approximate. In what follows, we define the coding scheme for such an arbitrary function with input dimension  $d_x \in \mathbb{N}$  and output dimension  $d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

1. **Encoder:** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $\mathcal{C}_n := \{0 \cdot 2^{-n}, 2^{-n}, 2 \cdot 2^{-n}, \dots, 1 - 2^{-n}\}$  and define quantization functions by  $q_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $q_n(x) := \max\{z \in \mathcal{C}_n | z \leq x\}$ . For  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  the encoder  $\mathbf{e}_K : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{Kd_x}$  is a function that, beginning at the  $(K + 1)$ -th bit, drops all bits of the binary representation of each component of a vector and then pushes all components into one-dimensional binary representation with a large amount of bits. It is defined by

$$\mathbf{e}_K(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{d_x} 2^{-(i-1)K} \cdot q_K(x_i). \quad (3.1)$$

2. **Memorizer:** The memorizer applies the continuous function  $f^*$  to the places of the encoded value corresponding to each dimension, quantizes the results and encodes it

again. Thus for  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  representing the places of quantization

$$\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*} : \mathcal{C}_{Kd_x} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{Md_y}, \quad \mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}(\mathbf{e}_K(x)) := \mathbf{e}_M(f^*(q_K(x))), \quad (3.2)$$

where  $q_K(x) := (q_K(x_1), \dots, q_K(x_{d_x}))$  is the component-wise application of the quantization. As any encoded value corresponds to an unique quantization  $q_K(x)$ , the memorizer is well-defined for each  $\mathbf{e}(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{Kd_x}$ .

3. **Decoder:** The decoder is used to transform the memorized message back to a quantized vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . For  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  it's given by

$$\mathfrak{d}_M : \mathcal{C}_{Md_y} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_M^{d_y}, \quad \mathfrak{d}_M(c) := \mathbf{e}_M^{-1}(c) \cap \mathcal{C}_M^{d_y}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}_M^{d_y} := \underbrace{\mathcal{C}_M \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_M}_{d_y\text{-times}}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_M^{-1}$  is the pre-image of the encoder.

Now we define the coding scheme by composing the three functions from above for a fixed continuous  $f^*$ , hence for  $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M} : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \quad \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(x) := \mathfrak{d}_M(\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}(\mathbf{e}_K(x))).$$




Figure 1: A visualization of the coding scheme on an explicit example: Note that the considered  $f^*$  fulfills  $f^*(q_4(x)) = (0.011, \dots, 0.110)^T$ , which leads to the shown output of the memorizer. Moreover the parameter of the encoder needs to coincide with the first parameter of the memorizer and the second parameter of the memorizer needs to coincide with the parameter of the decoder for the coding scheme to be well-defined. For details about the different parts of the coding scheme we refer the reader to Definition 3.1.

The general idea of the coding scheme can be broken down in several key parts, see [Figure 1](#). First we note that we can bijectively transform points on a multi-dimensional grid into points on a one-dimensional grid that has the same amount of grid points as the multi-dimensional grid, which is done by the *encoder*. Points that are not on the grid are usually transformed to suitable approximations of some grid point, which depends on the explicit construction of the encoder. By defining a function between the encoded points on the multi-dimensional grid and their corresponding encoded values under a target function  $f^* : [0, 1]^{d_x} \rightarrow [0, 1]^y$  one obtains the memorizer corresponding to  $f^*$  and the grids. Therefore the memorizer of  $f^*$  is a one-dimensional real-valued function that holds the information of all values of  $f^*$  on a multi-dimensional grid. The last part of the coding scheme is given by the decoder, which reconstructs the corresponding multi-dimensional function values of  $f^*$  given their corresponding encoded values as obtained by the memorizer. Choosing the multi-dimensional grids (thus also the one-dimensional) sufficiently fine, any such function  $f^* : [0, 1]^{d_x} \rightarrow [0, 1]^y$  can be approximated with arbitrary precision in terms of the  $L^p$  norm for any  $p \in [1, \infty)$  as we show shortly in [Lemma 3.4](#). This is possible as the function  $f^*$  is uniformly continuous and therefore the perfect reconstruction of  $f^*$  on the grids, achieved by the coding scheme is sufficient to approximate it well on the majority of the volume. Altogether this makes the coding scheme an enormously helpful tool for the approximation of multi-dimensional continuous functions w.r.t. the  $L^p$  norms for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Modulus of continuity). *Let  $\|\cdot\|_1$  be a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_2$  a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  a continuous function. Then we define the corresponding modulus of continuity  $\omega_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by  $\omega_f(r) = \sup_{\|x-y\|_1 \leq r} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_2$ .*

**Remark 3.3.** *It follows from the definition that the modulus of continuity is monotone and fulfills  $\omega_f(0) = 0$ . Moreover it is straight forward to show and that  $\omega_f$  is continuous at  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  if and only if  $f$  is uniformly continuous.*

The following lemma shows that the coding scheme is capable of approximating any continuous function up to arbitrary precision on multidimensional unit cubes. By considering suitable linear transformations the statement can be generalized to functions defined on and taking values in arbitrary compact sets, which we prove later in [Section 6](#).

**Lemma 3.4** (Accuracy of coding scheme). *For compactly-supported, continuous  $f^* : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , with support in  $[0, 1]^{d_x}$  it holds that*

$$\|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x},\text{sup}} \leq \omega_{f^*}(2^{-K}) + 2^{-M}, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\omega_f$  is the modulus of continuity, w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  and the maximum norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Thus for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , by choosing  $K, M$  sufficiently large, we find

$$\|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x},\text{sup}} < \epsilon.$$

This additionally implies that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , by choosing  $K, M$  sufficiently large, we find

$$\|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x},p} < \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , first we note that for  $x_i \in [0, 1]$  the quantizer  $q_K(x_i)$  discards all but the first  $K$  places of the binary representation, thus for  $K \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sup_{x_i \in [0,1]} |x_i - q_K(x_i)| \leq \sum_{i=K+1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-i} - \sum_{j=0}^K 2^{-j} = 2 - 2(1 - 2^{-K+1}) = 2^{-K}. \quad (3.5)$$

Hence by choosing  $K, M$  large enough s.t.  $\omega_{f^*}(2^{-K}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ ,  $2^{-M} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, \text{sup}} &\leq \|f^* - f^* \circ q_K\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, \text{sup}} + \|f^* \circ q_K - q_M \circ f^* \circ q_K\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, \text{sup}} \\ &= \sup_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \|f^*(x) - f^* \circ q_K(x)\|_{\max} + \sup_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \|f^* \circ q_K(x) - q_M \circ f^* \circ q_K(x)\|_{\max} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \underbrace{\omega_{f^*}(\|x - q_K(x)\|_{\max})}_{\leq 2^{-K} \text{ by 3.5}} + \sup_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \underbrace{\|f^* \circ q_K(x) - q_M \circ f^* \circ q_K(x)\|_{\max}}_{\leq 2^{-M} \text{ by 3.5}} \\ &\leq \omega_{f^*}(2^{-K}) + 2^{-M} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

In the proof of [Theorem 1](#) we show that leaky ReLU neural networks of width  $\max\{d_x, d_y, 2\}$  can be used to approximate the coding scheme with any parameters arbitrarily well in the  $L^p$  norm. Combining this with [Lemma 3.4](#) and the fact that  $C^0(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  is dense in  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  w.r.t. the  $L^p$  norm for compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , this then implies that leaky ReLU neural networks of width  $\max\{d_x, d_y, 2\}$  are  $L^p$ -universal approximators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ .

## 4. Expressing piecewise linear functions with leaky ReLUs

In this section, we show that one-dimensional FNNs with leaky ReLU activations can be used to express monotone piecewise linear continuous functions. Furthermore, any piecewise linear function can be decomposed into a sum of two strictly monotone, i.e. either strictly increasing or decreasing, piecewise linear functions. Therefore, we show that one can express arbitrary linear functions with two streams of one-dimensional leaky ReLU FNNs. These results are fundamental for obtaining suitable approximations of the coding schemes in the following sections.

**Definition 4.1** (PLC functions). *We define PLC as the set of all piecewise linear and continuous  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with finitely many slopes. Additionally for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\text{PLC}_n \subset \text{PLC}$  be the set of piecewise linear and continuous functions with  $n$  slopes. Thus for  $f_n \in \text{PLC}_n$  there are slopes  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$  for  $i \in [n-1]$  and  $\infty =: x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{n-1} < x_n := \infty \in \mathbb{R}$ , which we call kinks for  $i \in [n-1]$  that fulfill  $f|_{(x_{i-1}, x_i)}(x) = a_i x + b_i, i \in [n]$  with suitable  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $f$  is continuous. Thus by definition it holds that  $\text{PLC} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{PLC}_n$ .*

**Definition 4.2** (PLCSM functions). *We define  $\text{PLCSM} \subset \text{PLC}$  as the set of all piecewise linear, continuous and strictly monotone functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with finitely many slopes.*

Additionally for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\text{PLCSM}_n \subset \text{PLCSM}$  be the set of piecewise linear, continuous and strictly monotone functions with  $n$  different slopes. Thus for  $f_n \in \text{PLSIC}_n$  there are slopes  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , which are either all positive or all negative and  $\infty =: x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{n-1} < x_n := \infty \in \mathbb{R}$ , which we call kinks for  $i \in [n-1]$  that fulfill  $f|_{(x_{i-1}, x_i)}(x) = a_i x + b_i, i \in [n]$  with suitable  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $f$  is continuous. Hence by definition it holds that  $\text{PLCSM} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{PLCSM}_n$ .

**Remark 4.3.** Note that for each set of activation functions  $\mathcal{M}$  we have  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{M}}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, 1)$  by definition and  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{M}}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{M}}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ , as  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{M}}(1)$  corresponds to a FNN with width 1 and activations in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

In the first result of this section, we prove some of the most fundamental properties that leaky ReLUs satisfy. Conceptually, part (2) of the next lemma shows that leaky ReLUs can be rescaled with affine functions such that the slopes for positive and negative values can be arbitrary positive numbers. The reader should also note that leaky ReLUs with non-zero parameters are invertible functions, which is obvious from their structure, but conceptually important for the generalization of our results to diffeomorphisms in the later sections of this paper.

**Lemma 4.4** (Basic properties of LReLU). (1) LReLUs are homogenous, thus for  $a > 0, \alpha \in [0, 1]$  it holds that  $\sigma_{\alpha}(ax) = a\sigma_{\alpha}(x)$ .

(2) For  $a \neq b \in (0, \infty)$  and define

$$\sigma_{a,b}(x) := \begin{cases} ax & x < 0 \\ bx & x \geq 0 \end{cases},$$

then it holds that  $\sigma_{a,b} \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1, 1)$ .

*Proof. (Proof of (1)):* This is immediately clear as each linear function is homogenous and as  $\text{sgn}(ax) = \text{sgn}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*(Proof of (2)):* If  $a < b$ , then we choose  $\alpha = \frac{a}{b} \in (0, 1)$  and we obtain that

$$\sigma_{a,b} = b \cdot \sigma_{\alpha} = \sigma_0 \circ (b \cdot \text{Id}) \circ \sigma_{\alpha} \circ \text{Id} \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1),$$

where we used that  $\text{Id} = \sigma_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ . If otherwise  $a > b$ , then we set  $\alpha = \frac{b}{a}$  and observe that

$$\sigma_{\alpha}(-x) = \begin{cases} -x & x < 0 \\ -\frac{b}{a}x & x \geq 0 \end{cases},$$

thus

$$\sigma_{a,b} = -a \cdot \sigma_{\alpha}(-x) = \underbrace{\sigma_0}_{\in \mathcal{F}_+} \circ \underbrace{(-a \cdot \text{Id})}_{\in \text{Aff}(1)} \circ \underbrace{\sigma_{\alpha}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_+} \circ \underbrace{(-\text{Id})}_{\in \text{Aff}(1)} \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1).$$

■

In the following lemma, we obtain strong approximation results for affine concatenations of invertible leaky ReLUs for piecewise linear, continuous, strictly monotone functions by using the properties from [Lemma 4.4](#). This result helps us a lot in the further proofs, since it allows us to perfectly fit any function in PLCSM with a FNN of width 1 with invertible leaky ReLU activations. Note that by comparison, ReLUs can approximate any piecewise linear continuous function, but only with a FNN of width 2. This difference in the necessary width for fitting linear functions is the crucial reason that allows us to reduce the width of the considered FNNs with leaky ReLU activations by 1 in many cases vs. the similar Theorem 1 in [\[28\]](#), which considers only FNNs with ReLU activations.

**Lemma 4.5.** *For the set  $\mathcal{F}_+ = \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1]\}$  of invertible leaky ReLUs it holds that  $\text{PLCSM} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* We show by induction over  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , that for every strictly-increasing  $f_n \in \text{PLCSM}_n$  it holds that  $f_n \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$ . As for every strictly decreasing function  $f_n \in \text{PLCSM}_n$ ,  $-f_n$  is strictly increasing and as  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$  is closed under scalar multiplication, this implies that  $\text{PLCSM}_n \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$ . Because  $\text{PLCSM} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{PLCSM}_n$  and by definition  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  this then finishes the proof:

**( $\mathbf{n=1}$ ):**  $f \in \text{PLSIC}_1$  is given by  $f(x) = ax + b$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a > 0$ , hence choosing  $g(x) = ax + b \in \text{Aff}(1), \sigma_1 = \text{Id}$  we find that  $f(x) = g(x) \circ \sigma_1(x) \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$ .

**( $\mathbf{n \rightarrow n+1}$ ):** Let  $f_{n+1} \in \text{PLSIC}_{n+1}$  be strictly increasing, hence as written in [Definition 4.2](#), it has positive slopes  $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$  for  $i \in [n]$  and kinks  $x_1 < \dots < x_n$  with  $f_{n+1}|_{(x_{i-1}, x_i)}(x) = a_i x + b_i, i \in [n]$  for suitable  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $f_{n+1}$  is continuous. Then we define

$$f_n := \begin{cases} a_2(x - x_2) + f_{n+1}(x_2) = a_2x + b_2 & , x \in (-\infty, x_2) \\ f_{n+1}(x) & , x \in [x_2, \infty) \end{cases},$$

therefore  $f_n$  has  $n$  slopes  $a_2, \dots, a_{n+1}$  with corresponding kinks  $x_2 < \dots < x_n$ , thus  $f_n \subset \text{PLSIC}_n \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$ , where the last subset inequality follows from the induction assumption. We choose  $\sigma_{a_1, b_1}$ , which is an element of  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  by [Lemma 4.4](#) (2) and note that because  $f_n$  is strictly increasing, we know that  $f_n(x) - f_n(x_1) \geq 0$  if and only if  $x \geq x_1$ . Hence we obtain

$$g(x) := \left(\frac{1}{a_2} \cdot \text{Id}\right) \circ \sigma_{a_1, a_2} \circ (f_n(x) - f_n(x_1)) = \begin{cases} \frac{a_1}{a_2}(f_n(x) - f_n(x_1)) & , x \in (-\infty, x_1) \\ f_n(x) - f_n(x_1) & , x \in [x_1, \infty) \end{cases},$$

$g'|_{(-\infty, x_1)}(x) = \frac{a_1}{a_2} a_2 = a_1$ ,  $g'|_{(x_i, x_{i+1})}(x) = f_n'|_{(x_i, x_{i+1})}(x) = a_i, i \in [n-1]$ , meaning that  $g \in \text{PLSIC}_{n+1}$  has the same slopes as  $f_{n+1}$  and we observe that  $g \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ . Combining this with the continuity of  $f_{n+1}$ , we find that for all  $x \in (-\infty, x_1)$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) + f_n(x_1) &= \frac{a_1}{a_2}(f_n(x) - f_n(x_1)) + f_n(x_1) = \frac{a_1}{a_2}(a_2x + b_2 - a_2x_1 - b_2) + a_2x_1 + b_2 \\ &\stackrel{f_{n+1} \text{ continuous}}{=} a_1(x - x_1) + a_1x_1 + b_1 = a_1x + b_1 = f_{n+1}(x), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $g(x) + f_n(x_1) = f_{n+1}(x)$  altogether. As  $g \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  we obtain that also  $f_{n+1}(x) = g(x) + f_n(x_1) \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now use the previous lemma to show that any real-valued function defined on finitely many points can be expressed by a one-dimensional FNN with leaky ReLU activations.

**Lemma 4.6.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_n$  be a set of finitely many points and  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then there exists  $f \in \text{PLC}_n$  s.t.*

$$f(x) = g(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

*Additionally if  $g$  is either strictly decreasing or strictly increasing it can be chosen as  $f \in \text{PLCSM}_n \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{g(x_2)-g(x_1)}{x_2-x_1}(x-x_1) + g(x_1) & x \in (-\infty, x_2) \\ \frac{g(x_{i+1})-g(x_i)}{x_{i+1}-x_i}(x-x_i) + g(x_i) & x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}), \forall i \in [2, n-2], \\ \frac{g(x_n)-g(x_{n-1})}{x_n-x_{n-1}}(x-x_{n-1}) + g(x_{n-1}) & x \in (x_{n-1}, \infty) \end{cases}$$

which is piecewise-linear, continuous by definition, hence  $f \in \text{PLC}_n$  and it holds  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

If  $g$  is strictly decreasing or strictly increasing, then either  $\frac{g(x_{i+1})-g(x_i)}{x_{i+1}-x_i} < 0$  or  $\frac{g(x_{i+1})-g(x_i)}{x_{i+1}-x_i} > 0$  for all  $i \in [n-1]$ , thus  $f$  is also strictly decreasing or strictly increasing, respectively. Therefore  $f \in \text{PLCSM}_n$  and by Lemma 4.5 it follows that  $f \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1) \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Note that the memorizer  $\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}(\cdot)$  for fixed grid sizes  $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$  and a continuous  $f^* : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is itself a one-dimensional function that is defined on a finite set and therefore could be expressed exactly by an element in  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1, 1)$  by Lemma 4.5, if the memorizer were a monotone function.

However, since this is not the case for most non-monotone functions  $f^*$ , we need a way to express the memorizer in terms of strictly monotone functions, even if it is not monotone itself. For this, we introduce the monotone function decomposition for functions in PLC, which later allows us to express any piecewise linear continuous function with a FNN with leaky ReLU activations of width 2 by decomposing it into two monotone functions.

**Definition 4.7** (Monotone function decomposition). *We say that a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has a monotone function decomposition if there exist  $f_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  strictly decreasing and  $f_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  strictly increasing, such that  $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

**Lemma 4.8** (Monotone function decomposition for PLC). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in \text{PLC}$  be a piecewise-linear and continuous function. Then it has a monotone function decomposition with piecewise-linear, continuous, strictly decreasing  $f_1 \in \text{PLCSM}$  and piecewise-linear, continuous and strictly increasing  $f_2 \in \text{PLCSM}$ .*



*Proof.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a piecewise-linear and continuous function with  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  kinks  $x_0 = -\infty, x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}, x_{n+1} = \infty$  and slopes  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in [0, n]$ , i.e. where  $f'(x)|_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} = a_i$  for  $i \in [0, n+1]$ . Let  $J_1, J_2$  two disjoint index sets with  $J_1 \cup J_2 = [0, n]$  s.t.  $i \in J_1$  if  $a_i < 0$  and  $i \in J_2$  if  $a_i \geq 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$ , define the slopes  $a_{j,i} := a_i + (-1)^j \alpha$  if  $i \in J_j$  and  $a_{j,i} := (-1)^j \alpha$  if  $i \in [0, n] \setminus J_j$  for  $j \in [2]$ . Then we inductively define

$$f_j(x) = \begin{cases} a_{j,0}(x - x_1) + \frac{f(x_1)}{2} & x \in (-\infty, x_1] \\ a_{j,i}(x - x_i) + f_j(x_i) & x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}], \forall i \in [n-1] \\ a_{j,n}(x - x_n) + f_j(x_n) & x \in [x_n, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

for  $j \in [2]$ . Moreover we note that by definition of  $J_1, J_2$  the slopes satisfy  $a_{1,i} < 0$  and  $a_{2,i} > 0$  for all  $i \in [0, n]$ , thus  $f_1$  is strictly decreasing and  $f_2$  is strictly increasing. We show by induction over the intervals  $I_0 := (-\infty, x_1], I_i := [x_i, x_{i+1}], i \in [n-1], I_n := [x_n, \infty)$  that  $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For  $i = 0$  we directly compute that

$$f_1(x) + f_2(x) = (a_{1,0} + a_{2,0})(x - x_1) + \frac{2f(x_1)}{2} = a_1(x - x_1) + f(x_1) = f(x)$$

for all  $x \in I_0$ . For the induction step we assume that  $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$  for all  $i \in \bigcup_{i=0}^m I_i, m \in [0, n-1]$  is known and show that then also  $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$  on  $I_{m+1}$ . This holds as  $x_{m+1} \in I_m$  and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) + f_2(x) &= (a_{1,m+1} + a_{2,m+1})(x - x_{m+1}) + f_1(x_{m+1}) + f_2(x_{m+1}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Ind. assumption}}{=} a_{m+1}(x - x_{m+1}) + f(x_{m+1}) = f(x) \end{aligned}$$

for  $x \in I_{m+1}$ . ■

## 5. Approximating the coding scheme with leaky ReLU FNNs

In this section, we construct an approximation of the coding scheme for FNNs with leaky ReLU activations. We introduce lemmas with appropriate implementations of the three parts of the coding scheme, namely the encoder, the decoder, and the memorizer. Later, these can be combined with [Lemma 3.4](#), by which the coding scheme can approximate any continuous function arbitrarily well in the  $L^p$  norm, to show the universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ .

The following lemmas show that leaky ReLU FNNs of width 1 can approximate the quantizations while being exact on the set  $\mathcal{C}_{dK}$ . This is possible because FNNs with leaky ReLU activations of width 1 can exactly express functions in PLCSM, as proved in [Lemma 4.5](#). Note that when using only ReLU activations, the FNN in [Lemma 8](#) in [\[28\]](#) is of width 2, so our construction of quantizations with leaky ReLU FNNs achieves a strictly smaller width.

**Lemma 5.1** (Approximation of quantization (adjusted version of [Lemma 8](#) in [\[28\]](#))). *Let  $K \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon > 0$  and for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  consider the Borel-measurable set*

$D_\gamma := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^K} [i \cdot 2^{-K} - \beta, i \cdot 2^{-K})$  with  $\beta \in (0, \min\{2^{-K}, \frac{\gamma}{2^K}\})$ , which fulfills  $\lambda(D_\gamma) < \gamma$ . Then there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  such that

$$q_K(c) = \phi(c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_K, \quad \|q_K - \phi\|_{[0,1] \setminus D_\gamma, \text{sup}} < \epsilon,$$

$\phi([0, 1]) \subset [0, 1]$  and  $\phi([0, 1] \setminus D_\gamma) \subset [0, 1] \setminus D_\gamma$ .

*Proof.* We define piecewise linear, continuous functions approximating the quantizer  $q_K$ , for that let  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 2^{-K})$  and for all  $i \in [2^K]$  we piecewisely define

$$\phi_{\alpha, \beta}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{2^{-K} - \beta}(x - (i-1)2^{-K}) + (i-1)2^{-K} & x \in [(i-1)2^{-K}, i2^{-K} - \beta) \\ \frac{2^{-K} - \alpha}{\beta}(x - (i2^{-K} - \beta)) + (i-1)2^{-K} + \alpha & x \in [i2^{-K} - \beta, i2^{-K}) \end{cases},$$

which fulfills  $\phi([0, 1]) \subset [0, 1]$  and  $\phi_{\alpha, \beta}(c) = q_K(c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_K$ . Choose  $\beta < \frac{\gamma}{2^K}$ ,  $\alpha \leq \min\{\epsilon, 2^{-K} - \beta\}$  and set  $\phi := \phi_{\alpha, \beta}$ , defining  $D_\gamma := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^K} [i \cdot 2^{-K} - \beta, i \cdot 2^{-K})$  then yields  $\lambda(D_\gamma) = 2^K \beta < \gamma$ . Moreover we obtain

$$\|q_K - \phi\|_{[0,1] \setminus D_\gamma, \text{sup}} \leq \alpha < \epsilon$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi([0, 1] \setminus D_\gamma) &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^K} [(i-1)2^{-K}, (i-1)2^{-K} + \alpha) \\ &\subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^K} [(i-1)2^{-K}, i2^{-K} - \beta) = [0, 1] \setminus D_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

By definition we have  $\phi \in \text{PLSIC}_{2^K}$ , hence by [Lemma 4.5](#) it follows  $\phi \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

With [Lemma 5.1](#), we can construct our approximation of the first component of the coding scheme, given by the encoder, in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2** (Approximation of encoder (adjusted version of Lemma 11 in [28])). *For any  $d, K \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma > 0, \epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d, 1)$  of width  $d$  and  $S_\gamma \subset [0, 1]^{d_x}$  with  $\lambda(S_\gamma) < \gamma$  such that*

$$\mathbf{e}_K(c) = \phi(c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_K^d, \quad \|\mathbf{e}_K - \phi\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} < \epsilon,$$

$\phi([0, 1]^d) \subset [0, 2)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d, K \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon > 0, \gamma > 0$  be arbitrary and for  $\delta, \bar{\gamma} > 0$  choose  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  to be the approximation of  $q_K$  from [Lemma 5.1](#) s.t.

$$q_K(c) = \psi(c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_K, \quad \|q_K - \psi\|_{[0,1] \setminus D_{\bar{\gamma}}, \text{sup}} < \delta \tag{5.1}$$

and  $\psi([0, 1] \subset [0, 1])$ . Define  $\zeta := \underbrace{(\psi, \dots, \psi)}_{d\text{-times}}^T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , then it follows that  $\zeta \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d)}(d, d)$ . Moreover set

$$S_\gamma := [0, 1]^d \setminus ([0, 1] \setminus D_{\bar{\gamma}} \times \dots \times [0, 1] \setminus D_{\bar{\gamma}}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

and let  $\bar{\gamma} < d^{-1} \binom{d}{2}^{-1} \gamma$ , then

$$\lambda(S_\gamma) = 1 - (1 - \bar{\gamma})^d = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{d}{i} \bar{\gamma}^i = \sum_{i=1}^d \binom{d}{i} \bar{\gamma}^i \leq d \binom{d}{d/2} \bar{\gamma} < \gamma.$$

By choice of  $S_\gamma$  we know that for  $x \in [0, 1]^d \setminus S_\gamma$  it follows that  $x_i \in [0, 1] \setminus D_{\bar{\gamma}}, i \in [d]$  thus

$$\|q_K - \zeta\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} = \sup_{x \in [0,1]^d \setminus D_{\bar{\gamma}}} \max_{i \in [d]} |q_K(x_i) - \psi(x_i)| \stackrel{5.1}{<} \delta. \quad (5.2)$$

Consider  $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d 2^{-K(i-1)} \cdot x_i$ , which is linear and therefore Lipschitz-continuous with  $\mathcal{L} = \|A\|_{\text{op}}$  and let  $\delta < \frac{\epsilon}{\mathcal{L}}$ . Define  $\phi := A \circ \zeta \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d)}(d, 1)$ , then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}_K - \phi\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} &= \|A \circ q_K - A \circ \zeta\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} = \|A \circ (q_K - \zeta)\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{L} \|q_K - \zeta\|_{[0,1]^d \setminus S_\gamma, \text{sup}} \stackrel{5.2}{<} \mathcal{L} \delta < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore  $\mathbf{e}_K(c) = A \circ q_K(c) \stackrel{5.1}{=} A \circ \zeta(c) = \phi(c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}_K^d$  and as  $\psi([0, 1]) \subset [0, 1]$  we obtain

$$0 \leq A \circ q_K(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d 2^{-K(i-1)} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-iK} = \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-K}} < 2 \implies \phi([0, 1]^d) \subset [0, 2].$$

■

The following lemma shows that we can implement the memorizer with FNNs of width 2 with leaky ReLU activations. The proof is based on the idea that the memorizer, as a one-dimensional function defined on a finite set, can be extended to a continuous piecewise linear function on the real numbers. This function can then be written as a sum of continuous monotone piecewise linear functions by the monotone function decomposition of [Lemma 4.8](#), each of which can be expressed by a FNN of width 1 with leaky ReLU activations.

**Lemma 5.3** (Exact implementation of the memorizer for  $L^p$  on compact sets). *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f^* \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  and let  $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then it exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(2)}(1, 1)$  s.t.*

$$\phi(c) = \mathbf{m}_{K, M, f^*}(c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_{dK}.$$

*Proof.* For  $f^* \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  we apply Lemma 4.6 to  $\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}$  with  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}_{d_x K}$  and obtain  $\psi \in \text{PLC}$  s.t.

$$\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}(c) = \phi(c), \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_{d_x K}.$$

Moreover by Lemma 4.8 there are  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \text{PLCSM} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(1)}(1, 1)$  satisfying  $\psi(x) = \psi_1(x) + \psi_2(x)$ . Define  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(2)}(1, 1)$  as

$$\phi(x) = (1, 1) \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(x) \\ \psi_2(x) \end{pmatrix} = \psi_1(x) + \psi_2(x),$$

and note that it fulfills  $\phi(c) = \psi_1(c) + \psi_2(c) = \mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}(c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{d_x K}$ . ■

In their Lemma 10, Park et al. [28] obtained an exact implementation of the decoder by FNNs of width  $d_y$  with ReLU activations. Since invertible leaky ReLUs can uniformly approximate the ReLU function on compact sets, we can use their result to obtain an FNN of width  $d_y$  that approximates the decoder arbitrarily well. Moreover, Lemma 1 of Cai [5] shows that  $\max\{d_x, d_y\}$  is a lower bound on the minimum width for the universal approximation of  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  for compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . Note that this implies that it's already sufficient for our purposes to approximate the construction of the decoder from Park et al. [28], since it's not possible to achieve the universal approximation of  $L^p$  integrable functions on compact sets using a FNN with invertible leaky ReLU activations of width less than  $d_y$ .

Thus, for completeness, we present below the proof of Lemma 10 and the therein used Lemma 15 and Lemma 17 (Proposition 2 in Hanin and Sellke [15]) as introduced in [28] and use it together with our improved results for encoder and memorizer in the proof of our first main theorem.

**Definition 5.4** (Definition 1 in Hanin and Sellke [15]).

A function  $h : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is called a *max-min string* of length  $L$ , if there exist affine transformations  $h_i \in \text{Aff}(d_{i-1}, d_i), i \in [L]$  with  $d_0 = d_x, d_L = d_y, d_i \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $i \in [L-1]$  s.t.

$$h(x) = \tau_{L-1}(h_L(x), \tau_{L-2}(h_{L-1}(x), \tau_{L-3}(\dots, \tau_2(h_3(x), \tau_1(h_2(x), h_1(x))))))),$$

where each  $\tau_i, i \in [L-1]$  is either a coordinate-wise  $\max\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  or  $\min\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ .

**Lemma 5.5** (Hanin and Sellke [15]).

For any min-max string  $f^* : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  of length  $L$ , any compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ , there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{d_x+d_y}(d_x, d_x + d_y)$  of depth  $L$  such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{K}$ ,

$$\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \phi_2(x))^T, \quad \text{where } \phi_1(x) = x, \quad \text{and } \phi_2(x) = f^*(x).$$

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Proposition 2 in [15]. ■

**Lemma 5.6** (Park et al. [28]).

For any  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(2)}(1, 2)$  such that for all  $x \in [0, 1] \setminus P_{M, \delta}$ , with  $P_{M, \delta} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^M-1} (i2^{-M} - \delta, i2^{-M})$  it holds that

$$\phi(x) := (q_M(x), 2^M(x - q_M(x)))^T, \quad (5.3)$$

and furthermore it satisfies

$$\phi(\mathbb{R}) \subset [0, 1 - 2^{-M}] \times [0, 1].$$

*Proof.* The proof structure and idea is taken from the proof of Lemma 15 in [28]: We define

$$\zeta(x) = \min\{\max\{x, 0\}, 1\} = 1 - \sigma(1 - \sigma(x)) \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(1)}(1, 1),$$

to obtain only values in  $[0, 1]$  after applying  $\zeta$ . Moreover we define  $\psi_l : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$  by  $(\psi_l(x))_1 := x$ ,

$$(\psi_l(x))_2 := \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 2^{-M} - \delta] \\ \delta^{-1}2^{-M}(x - 2^{-M} + \delta) & x \in (2^{-M} - \delta, 2^{-M}) \\ 2^{-M} & x \in [2^{-M}, 2 \cdot 2^{-M} - \delta] \\ \delta^{-1}2^{-M}(x - 2^{-M} + \delta) & x \in (2 \cdot 2^{-M} - \delta, 2 \cdot 2^{-M}) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (l-1)2^{-M} & x \in [(l-1)2^{-M}, 1] \end{cases},$$

and note that  $q_M(x) = \psi_{2^M}(x)$  for  $x \in [0, 1] \setminus P_{K, \delta}$ . Moreover we observe that  $(\psi_1(x))_2 = 0$  and that we can rewrite

$$(\psi_{l+1}(x))_2 = \min\{l \cdot 2^{-M}, \max\{\delta^{-1}2^{-M}(x - l2^{-M} + \delta) + (l-1)2^{-M}, (\psi_l(x))_2\}\} \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N},$$

hence  $\psi_{2^M}(x)$  is a min-max string as introduced in Definition 5.4. Therefore by Lemma 5.6 it exists  $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(2)}(1, 2)$  satisfying

$$\tilde{\phi}(x) = (\psi_{2^M}(x))^T = (x, q_M(x))^T \quad \forall x \in [0, 1] \setminus P_{M, \delta}.$$

and we obtain

$$\phi(x) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -2^M & 2^M \end{pmatrix} \circ \tilde{\phi} \circ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \circ \zeta(x) = \begin{pmatrix} (\psi(\zeta(x)))_2 \\ 2^M((\psi(\zeta(x)))_1 - \psi(\zeta(x)))_2) \end{pmatrix},$$

with  $\phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} q_M(x) \\ 2^M(x - q_M(x)) \end{pmatrix} \quad \forall x \in [0, 1] \setminus P_{M, \delta}$  and  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(2)}(1, 2)$ .

Moreover we have  $\phi(\mathbb{R}) \subset [0, 1 - 2^{-M}] \times [0, 1]$  as

$$\max\{0, \zeta(x) - 2^{-M}\} \leq (\psi(\zeta(x)))_2 \leq \zeta(x) = (\psi(\zeta(x)))_1$$

and  $\zeta(\mathbb{R}) \subset [0, 1]$ . ■

**Lemma 5.7** (Exact implementation of the decoder with ReLUs (Lemma 10 in [28])).  
For any  $d, M \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a ReLU network  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(d)}(1, d)$  such that for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$  it holds

$$\phi(c) = \mathfrak{d}_M(c) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(\mathbb{R}) \subset [0, 1]^d .$$

*Proof.* The proof structure and idea is taken from the proof of Lemma 10 in [28]: We show the claim by iteratively applying Lemma 5.6. Thus for  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta < 2^{dM}$  let  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\text{ReLU}}^{(2)}(1, 2)$  be the FNN from Lemma 5.6 and note that it holds  $\mathcal{C}_{dM} \subset [0, 1] \setminus P_{M, \delta}$ . Hence formula 5.3 holds for  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$  and additionally  $\psi(\mathbb{R}) \subset [0, 1 - 2^{-M}] \times [0, 1]$ . We define  $\phi^{(0)} := \text{Id}$ ,  $\phi^{(1)}(x) := \psi(x)$ ,

$$\phi^{(i)} : \mathbb{R}^i \rightarrow [0, 1 - 2^{-M}]^i \times [0, 1], \quad (5.4)$$

$$\phi^{(i)}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_0((\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_1) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_0((\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_{i-1}) \\ \psi((\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_i) \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{\phi^{(i-1)}(x) \geq 0}{=} \begin{pmatrix} (\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_1 \\ \vdots \\ (\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_{i-1} \\ \psi((\phi^{(i-1)}(x))_i) \end{pmatrix} \quad \forall i \in [2, d-1], \quad (5.5)$$

where we used that  $\phi^{(i)}(x) \geq 0$  for  $i \in [d-1]$  and that the  $\sigma_0$  is equal to the identity on  $[0, \infty)$ . We set  $\phi := \phi^{(d-1)}$  and note that by definition and choice of  $\psi$  we know that  $\phi^{(i)} \in \text{FNN}_{\{\text{ReLU}\}}^{(i+1)}(i, i+1)$ . Moreover for  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$ ,  $i \in [d-1]$ ,  $(\psi(c))_2 = 2^M(c - q_M(c))$  is the number, where the first  $M$  bits of  $c$  were extracted and the remaining  $(i-1)M$  bits were shifted  $M$  places to the left. By construction  $\phi^{(i)}$  applies this procedure  $i$ -times to an input  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$ , hence  $(\phi^{(i)}(c))_{i+1}$  is the binary number one obtains, when extracting the first  $i \cdot M$  bits from  $c$  and shifting the remaining  $(d-i)M$  bits  $i \cdot M$  binary places to the left. By definition of the decoder this implies that for  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$  it holds

$$(\phi^{(i)}(c))_i = \psi(\phi^{(i-1)}(c))_2 = q_M(\phi^{(i-1)}(c)) = (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_i \quad \forall i \in [d-1]. \quad (5.6)$$

and as  $\phi^{(d-2)}(c) \in \mathcal{C}_{2M}$  it follows that

$$(\phi^{(d-1)}(c))_d = \psi(\phi^{(d-2)}(c))_2 = 2^M(\phi^{(d-2)}(c) - q_M(\phi^{(d-2)}(c))) = (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_d, \quad (5.7)$$

by our earlier observations. We combine 5.6, 5.7 and note that because of 5.5,  $\phi^{(i)}$  keeps the values of  $\phi^{(i-1)}$  in the first  $i$  coordinates unchanged, thus for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{dM}$  we obtain that

$$\phi(c) \stackrel{5.5, 5.6}{=} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_1 \\ \vdots \\ (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_{d-1} \\ \psi((\phi^{(i-1)}(c))_2) \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{5.7}{=} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_1 \\ \vdots \\ (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_{d-1} \\ (\mathfrak{d}_M(c))_d \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{d}_M(c) .$$

■

Since neural networks are given by compositions of functions, the question naturally arises under which conditions compositions of converging sequences converge to the composition of limit functions. The following [Lemma 5.8](#) classifies this and gives us a helpful tool for some of the upcoming proofs.

**Lemma 5.8** (Approximate function compositions). *Let  $d, L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  compact and  $f := h_L \circ \dots \circ h_1$ ,  $i \in [L]$ ,  $h_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1}}, \mathbb{R}^{d_i})$ . Set  $d := d_0 = d_L$ ,  $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \in [L]$  and define  $\mathcal{K}_1 := \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{i+1} := h_i(\mathcal{K}_i)$ ,  $i \in [L-1]$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $(\bar{h}_i^{(\delta)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  be sequences of Lipschitz-continuous functions that fulfill*

$$\|h_i - \bar{h}_i^{(\delta)}\|_{\mathcal{K}_i, \text{sup}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

w.r.t. any euclidean norm, that all have a common Lipschitz constant. Set  $f^{(n)} := h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_1^{(n)}$  then it holds that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$ . Moreover  $f^{(n)}$  converges to  $f$  in  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , i.e.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} = 0$ .

*Proof.* As all norms in euclidean spaces are equivalent, the sequences  $(\bar{h}_i^{(\delta)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  have a common Lipschitz constant  $\alpha \geq 0$  w.r.t. the maximum norm on definition and image space. For  $\delta := \frac{\epsilon}{L \max\{\alpha^{L-1}, 1\}}$  we choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|h_i - \bar{h}_i^{(\delta)}\|_{\mathcal{K}_i, \text{sup}} < \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $f_i^{(n)} := h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_i^{(n)} \circ h_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ h_1$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  and we set  $f_{L+1}^{(n)} := f$ ,  $f^{(n)} := f_1^{(n)}$ . Note that for  $i \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$  it holds that

$$\|h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)}(x) - h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)}(y)\|_{\text{max}} \quad (5.8)$$

$$\leq \alpha \|h_{L-1}^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)}(x) - h_{L-1}^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)}(y)\|_{\text{max}} \leq \dots \leq \alpha^{L-i} \|x - y\|_{\text{max}}. \quad (5.9)$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^L f_i^{(n)} - f_i^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \stackrel{\Delta\text{-ineq.}}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^L \|f_i^{(n)} - f_i^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^L \|h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_i^{(n)} \circ h_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ h_1 - h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)} \circ h_i \circ \dots \circ h_1\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^L \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_i} \|h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_i^{(n)}(x) - h_L^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ h_{i+1}^{(n)} \circ h_i(x)\|_{\text{max}} \\ &\stackrel{5.9}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^L \alpha^{L-i} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_i} \|h_i^{(n)}(x) - h_i(x)\|_{\text{max}} = \sum_{i=1}^L \alpha^{L-i} \|h_i^{(n)} - h_i\|_{\mathcal{K}_i, \text{sup}} \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{L \max\{\alpha^{L-1}, 1\}} \sum_{i=1}^L \alpha^{L-i} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{L \max\{\alpha^{L-1}, 1\}} \sum_{i=1}^L \max\{\alpha^{L-1}, 1\} \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is only left to show the convergence in  $L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . We note that  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a convergent sequence in the Banach-Space  $C^0(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  and therefore it exists an upper bound  $g \in C^0(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y}) \subset L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  for the sequence with  $|f_n(x)| \leq g(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{K}, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover as the uniform convergence of  $f_n$  to  $f$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  implies pointwise convergence, we can apply our [Theorem A.1](#) of dominated convergence with dominating function  $g$  to the sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  to obtain that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} = 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

Note that the set of activations  $\mathcal{F}_+$  doesn't include the ReLU activation, thus the following [Lemma 5.9](#) is necessary to show that the implementation of the decoder from [Lemma 5.7](#) can be approximated by FNNs with invertible leaky ReLU activations. In principle, this is possible since any ReLU can be uniformly approximated on compact sets by suitable sequences in  $\mathcal{F}_+$ .

**Lemma 5.9.** *For any  $d, M \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d)}(1, d)$  s.t.*

$$\|\phi - \mathfrak{D}_M\|_{\mathcal{C}_{dM}, \text{sup}} < \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\text{ReLU}}^{(d)}(1, d)$  the ReLU network of width  $d$ , fitting the decoder perfectly, given by [Lemma 5.7](#) and let its structure be given by

$$\psi = W_L \circ \varphi_{L-1} \circ W_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ W_2 \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1,$$

where  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $W_i \in \text{Aff}(d_{i-1}, d_i)$ ,  $\varphi_i := (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_0)^T =: (\text{ReLU}, \dots, \text{ReLU})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  with  $d_0 := 1, d_L := d$  for all  $i \in [L]$ . Note that for our leaky ReLU network we can use the same matrices and just exchange the ReLUs with leaky-ReLUs. For  $i \in [L]$  define  $\mathcal{K}_1 := W_1(\mathcal{C}_{dM})$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{i+1} := W_i \circ \varphi_{i-1}(\mathcal{K}_{i-1})$  and for  $k \leq d$  define  $P_k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x_1, \dots, x_d) \rightarrow x_k$  as the projection to the  $k$ -th component. The  $\mathcal{K}_i$  are again compact as the images of finitely many points under continuous functions, thus

$$r := \min_{i \in [L], j \in [d_i]} \{P_j(x) | x \in \mathcal{K}_i\},$$

exists. For  $\delta > 0$ , choose  $\alpha < \frac{\delta}{r}$  if  $r < 0$ , else  $\alpha > 0$  arbitrary and consider the corresponding leaky-ReLUs  $\sigma_\alpha$  with  $\bar{\varphi}_i := (\sigma_\alpha, \dots, \sigma_\alpha)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}, i \in [L]$ . We set

$$\phi_\delta := W_L \circ \bar{\varphi}_{L-1} \circ W_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ W_2 \circ \bar{\varphi}_1 \circ W_1,$$

and see that  $\phi_\delta \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d)}(1, d)$  as  $\psi$  is of width  $d$  by assumption. Then we have

$$\|\varphi_i - \bar{\varphi}_i\|_{\mathcal{K}_i, \text{sup}} := \max_{j \in [d_i]} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_i} |(\varphi_i)_j(x) - (\bar{\varphi}_i)_j(x)| \leq |\sigma_\alpha(r) - \sigma_0(r)| \leq |r|\alpha < \delta$$

for all  $i \in [L - 2]$ . Note that all participating functions of the compositions are Lipschitz-continuous on compact sets as (piecewise) linear functions, thus by [Lemma 5.8](#) we know that for a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\phi := \phi_\delta \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d)}(1, d)$  s.t.

$$\|\phi - \mathfrak{D}_M\|_{\mathcal{C}_{dM}, \text{sup}} = \|\phi - \psi\|_{\mathcal{C}_{dM}, \text{sup}} < \epsilon.$$

$\blacksquare$



## 6. Universal approximation of FNNs with LReLU activations

Now we are able to construct the coding scheme, by considering our constructions of the encoder, the memorizer and the decoder whose key properties were shown in the results of the last section. Therefore, we are now ready to present the proof of [Theorem 1](#).

*Proof of [Theorem 1](#).* (1) Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , we show that if for any  $f^* \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with compact support  $\text{supp}(f^*) \subset [0, 1]^{d_x}$  and  $f^*([0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_y}$  there exists

$\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\})}(d_x, d_y)$  s.t.  $\|f^* - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon$ , then also for arbitrary  $f^* \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\})}(d_x, d_y)$  s.t.  $\|f^* - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon$ . Therefore assume that the claim holds for all  $g^* \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with  $\text{supp}(g^*) \subset [0, 1]^{d_x}$ ,  $g^*([0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_y}$  and show that this implies the claim for arbitrary  $f^* \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with compact support  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ .

First note that the image of a compact set under a continuous mapping from  $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is compact, thus  $f^*(\mathcal{K} \cup [0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is a compact set. Hence there are invertible affine mappings  $V \in \text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d_x)$ ,  $Ax + b = W \in \text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d_y)$  with  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  s.t.  $V(\mathcal{K}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_x}$ ,  $f^*(V^{-1}([0, 1]^{d_x})) \subset W([0, 1]^{d_y})$ . We define

$$g^* := W^{-1} \circ f^* \circ V^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y},$$

then it holds that

$$g^*([0, 1]^{d_x}) = W^{-1} \circ f^* \circ V^{-1}([0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_y}$$

by the choice of  $W$ . Hence by assumption for all  $\epsilon > 0$  we find  $\psi_\epsilon \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  s.t.

$$\|g - \psi_\epsilon\|_{[0, 1]^{d_x}, p} < \frac{|\det(V)| \cdot \epsilon}{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}$$

Note that  $W(x) = Ax + b$  with  $A \in \text{GL}(d_y)$ , thus

$$\|W(x - y)\|_p = \|A(x - y)\|_p \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \|x - y\|_p, \quad (6.1)$$

where the operator norm of  $A$  is chosen w.r.t. the  $p$  norms. Moreover  $V$  is a  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphism, which makes [Theorem A.2](#) applicable to it. For  $\epsilon > 0$  define  $\phi_\epsilon := W \circ \psi_\epsilon \circ V \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$ , then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^* - \phi_\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} &= \left( \int_{\mathcal{K}} \|W \circ (g^* \circ V(x) - \psi_\epsilon \circ V(x))\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{K}} \|g^* \circ V(x) - \psi_\epsilon \circ V(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Theorem A.2}}{=} \frac{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}{|\det(V)|} \left( \int_{V(\mathcal{K})} \|g^*(x) - \psi_\epsilon(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\stackrel{V(\mathcal{K}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_x}}{\leq} \frac{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}{|\det(V)|} \|g^* - \psi_\epsilon\|_{[0, 1]^{d_x}, p} < \frac{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}{|\det(V)|} \frac{|\det(V)| \cdot \epsilon}{\|A\|_{\text{op}}} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

(2) By (1) it suffices to show that for  $f^* \in \mathcal{M}(d_x, d_y)$  with  $f^*([0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_y}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  s.t.  $\|f^* - \phi\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, p} < \epsilon$ .

For  $\delta > 0, \gamma > 0, K, M \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\mathbf{e}_K^\dagger \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d_x)}(d_x, 1)$  be our approximation of the encoder from [Lemma 5.2](#) that fulfills

$$\mathbf{e}_K(c) = \mathbf{e}_K^\dagger(c) \forall c \in \mathcal{C}_K^{d_x} \setminus \{0\}, \|\mathbf{e}_K - \mathbf{e}_K^\dagger\|_{[0,1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma, \infty} < \delta, \quad (6.2)$$

with  $\lambda(S_\gamma) < \gamma$ . Furthermore let  $\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(1, 1)$  be the exact implementation of the memorizer, which exists by assumption. Let  $\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(d_y)}(1, d_y)$  be the approximation of the decoder from [Lemma 5.9](#) s.t.

$$\|\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger - \mathfrak{d}_M\|_{\mathcal{C}_{d_y, M, \text{sup}}} < \delta. \quad (6.3)$$

We show that

$$\phi := \mathbf{e}_K^\dagger \circ \mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{d}_M \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y), \quad (6.4)$$

which is of width  $n := \max\{m, d_x, d_y\}$  is a suitable approximation for  $f^*$ .

(3) Let  $\mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}$  be the exact coding scheme from [Definition 3.1](#), we begin to show that for  $\delta \leq \min\{\bar{\delta}, \frac{\epsilon}{4d_y^{1/p}}\}$  the error can be estimated by

$$\|\phi - \mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x} \setminus D_{\gamma, p}} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \quad (6.5)$$

For this note that the function  $\psi := \mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is uniformly continuous on  $[0, 1]$  as a continuous function on a compact interval, thus there exists  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  s.t. for  $|x - y| < \bar{\delta}$  it holds

$$\|\psi(x) - \psi(y)\|_p < \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \quad (6.6)$$

For  $i_j \in [0, 2^K - 1], j \in [d_x]$  and  $i := (i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})$  define

$$S_{i, \gamma} := [i_1 \cdot 2^{-K}, (i_1 + 1) \cdot 2^{-K}) \times \dots \times [i_{d_x} \cdot 2^{-K}, (i_{d_x} + 1) \cdot 2^{-K}) \setminus S_\gamma \subset [0, 1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma, \\ c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}) := (i_1 \cdot 2^{-K}, i_2 \cdot 2^{-K}, \dots, i_{d_x} \cdot 2^{-K}) \in \mathcal{C}_K^{d_x}$$

and see that because of  $\bigcup_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^K-1} S_{i, \gamma} = [0, 1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma$ , the  $S_{i, \gamma}$ 's form an disjoint partition of  $[0, 1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma$ . Moreover we note that each  $c \in \mathcal{C}_K^{d_x}$  can be written as  $c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}), i_j \in [2^K - 1], j \in [d_x]$  and that it holds

$$\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathbf{e}_K^\dagger(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})) \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3}}{=} \mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*} \circ \mathbf{e}_K(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})), \quad (6.7)$$

as our implementations of encoder and memorizer are exact on  $\mathcal{C}_{d_x}^K$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{d_x K}$ . Furthermore by definition of the coding-scheme we know that

$$\mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})) = \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(x) \quad \forall x \in S_{i,\gamma} \quad (6.8)$$

and  $i_j \in [0, 2^K - 1]$ ,  $j \in [d_x]$ . For  $\delta \leq \min\{\bar{\delta}, \frac{\epsilon}{4d_x^{1/p}}\}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma, p} &= \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^K-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \|\phi(x) - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\stackrel{6.8}{=} \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^K-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \|\phi(x) - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}))\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^K-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \|\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger(x) - \mathfrak{d}_M \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*} \circ \mathfrak{e}_K((c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})))\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\stackrel{6.7}{=} \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^K-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \|\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger(x) - \mathfrak{d}_M \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger((c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})))\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^{d_x K}-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \|\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger(x) - \mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}))\|_p^p \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\mathfrak{d}_M^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*}^\dagger \circ \mathfrak{e}_K^\dagger(c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})) - \mathfrak{d}_M \circ \mathfrak{m}_{K,M,f^*} \circ \mathfrak{e}_K((c(i_1, \dots, i_{d_x})))\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\stackrel{6.6, 6.3}{<} \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^{d_x K}-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{4} \right)^p + d_y \left( \frac{\epsilon}{4d_y^{1/p}} \right)^p dx \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{d_x}=0}^{2^{d_x K}-1} \int_{S_{i,\gamma}} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{2} (1 - \lambda(D_\gamma)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(4) As  $f^*([0, 1]^{d_x}) \subset [0, 1]^{d_y}$  is continuous, by choosing  $M, K$  large enough, we can apply [Lemma 3.4](#) such that

$$\|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \quad (6.9)$$

Additionally set  $r_1 := \max_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \|\phi(x)\|_p < \infty$ , which exists as  $\phi$  is continuous and note that  $0 \leq (\mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M})_j(x) \leq 1$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]^{d_x}$ ,  $j \in [d_x]$ , hence

$$r_2 := \max_{x \in [0,1]^{d_x}} \|\mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}(x)\|_p \leq d_y^{1/p} < \infty.$$

Let  $M, K$  sufficiently large s.t. formula [6.6](#), [6.9](#) hold and let  $\gamma < \frac{\epsilon}{r_1+r_2}$ , then we obtain

that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f^* - \phi\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, p} &\leq \|f^* - \mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x}, p} + \|\phi - \mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}\|_{[0,1]^{d_x} \setminus S_\gamma, p} + \|\phi - \mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}\|_{S_\gamma, p} \\
&\stackrel{6.6, 6.9}{<} \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \left( \int_{S_\gamma} \|\phi(x) - \mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}(x)\|_p^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4} + \left( \int_{S_\gamma} (\|\phi(x)\|_p + \|\mathbf{c}_{f^*, K, M}(x)\|_p)^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4} + \left( \int_{S_\gamma} (r_1 + r_2)^p dx \right)^{1/p} \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4} + \lambda(S_\gamma)(r_1 + r_2) < \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

(5) For given  $\epsilon > 0$ , compact  $\mathcal{K}$ , let  $f \in {}^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , then there exists  $f^* \in C_c^0(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  such that  $\|f - f^*\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . Additionally (1)-(4) imply that there exists  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\max\{2, d_x, d_y\})}(d_x, d_y)$  fulfilling  $\|f^* - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , thus

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \leq \|f - f^*\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} + \|f^* - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

(6) Let  $f^* \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  compact, then by (5) we know that there exists  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}_+}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  such that  $\|f^* - \psi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . In this last step of the proof we show how to obtain  $\phi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  with  $\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p}$  can be obtained. We remind that

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1)\} \subset \{\sigma_\alpha \mid \alpha \in (0, 1]\} = \mathcal{F}_+.$$

Set  $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, 1)$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 1$ , for an arbitrary compact interval of the form  $[-c_1, c_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$  with  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in [-c_1, c_2]} |\sigma_1 - \sigma_{\alpha_n}| &= \sup \left\{ \sup_{x \in [-c_1, 0]} |\text{Id} - \alpha_n \text{Id}|, \sup_{x \in [0, c_2]} |\text{Id} - \text{Id}| \right\} \\
&= \sup \{ |-\alpha_n c_1|, 0 \} = \alpha_n c_1 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}$  be compact, then there exist  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  s.t.  $\mathcal{C} \subset [-c_1, c_2]$ , implying that  $\sigma_{\alpha_n}$  converges uniformly to  $\sigma_1 = \text{Id}$  on any such  $\mathcal{C}$ . We know that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.

$$\psi = \varphi_N \circ W_N \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1$$

with affine transformations  $W_i \in \text{Aff}(d_{i-1}, d_i)$ ,  $\varphi_i(x) = (\sigma_1^{(i)}(x_1), \dots, \sigma_{d_i}^{(i)}(x_{d_i}))^T$  and  $d_0 = d_x$ ,  $d_N = d_y$ ,  $d_i \leq n$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define  $\varphi_i^{(n)} : \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  component-wise by

$$\varphi_i^{(n)}(x)_j := \begin{cases} \sigma_j^{(i)}(x_j) & , \sigma_j^{(i)} \neq \text{Id} \\ \sigma_{\alpha_n}(x_j) & , \sigma_j^{(i)} = \text{Id} \end{cases}$$

and set  $\psi_n := \varphi_N^{(n)} \circ W_N \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1^{(n)} \circ W_1$ . Note that in  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  all activation equal to the identity have been exchanged with the approximators  $\sigma_{\alpha_n}$ . It follows from the uniform convergence of the components of  $\varphi_i^{(n)}$  that

$$\|\varphi_i(x) - \varphi_i^{(n)}(x)\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and as  $\psi_n$  is additionally a composition of uniformly convergent functions, which are Lipschitz continuous on any compact set, as leaky ReLUs and matrices have that property, it follows from [Lemma 5.8](#) that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi - \psi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} = 0$ . Thus there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\|\psi - \psi_{n_0}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , such that  $\phi := \psi_{n_0} \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(n)}(d_x, d_y)$  fulfills

$$\|f^* - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \leq \|f^* - \psi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} + \|\psi - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

■

## 7. $LU$ -decomposable neural networks with leaky ReLU activations are $L^p$ universal approximators

In this section we show how the universal approximation results for FNNs can be generalized to  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks. The main idea is based on the fact that (invertible)  $LU$ -decomposable matrices are dense in the set of all matrices, which is shown in [Lemma A.13](#) of the appendix.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact set,  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of Lipschitz continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with a common Lipschitz constant and  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(s)}(d, d)$  with  $s \in [d]$ . Then there exists  $\phi \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  with  $\|\psi - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} < \epsilon$ .*

*Proof.* The idea is to fill up the linear layers of the neural network with zeros to obtain matrices  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , for which we can find arbitrarily good  $LU$ -decomposable approximations. By exchanging the filled up matrices with corresponding  $LU$ -decomposable ones, we obtain the wanted  $L^p$ -approximation.

(1) Let  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(s)}(d, d)$  have the form from [Definition 2.3](#), thus there is  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d_0 = d = d_L$ ,  $d_i \in [s]$ ,  $W_i \in \text{Aff}(d_{i-1}, d_i)$ ,  $W_i(x) = A_i x + b_i$ ,  $i \in [L]$ ,  $\phi_j \in [L]$ ,  $\phi_i = (\sigma_1^{(i)}, \dots, \sigma_{d_i}^{(i)})$ ,  $\sigma_j^{(i)} \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $j \in [d_i]$ ,  $i \in [L]$  s.t.

$$\psi = \varphi_L \circ W_L \circ \dots \circ W_2 \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1.$$

Let  $0_{n,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  be the zero matrix and define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_i &:= \begin{pmatrix} A_i & \\ & 0_{d-d_{i-1}, d-d_i} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, i \in [L], \bar{W}_i(x) := \bar{A}_i x + b_i, \bar{b}_i := \begin{pmatrix} b_i \\ 0_{d-d_i, 1} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \bar{\varphi}_i &:= (\sigma_1^{(i)}, \dots, \sigma_{d_i}^{(i)}, \bar{\sigma}_{d_i+1}^{(i)}, \dots, \bar{\sigma}_d^{(i)}), i \in [L], \bar{\psi} := \bar{\varphi}_L \circ \bar{W}_L \circ \dots \circ \bar{W}_2 \circ \bar{\varphi}_1 \circ \bar{W}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\sigma}_{d_i+k}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{A}$  can be chosen arbitrarily for  $k \in [d - d_i]$  and we used that  $d_i \leq d$  as  $\phi$  is of width  $s$ . Note that by construction  $\psi = \bar{\psi}$  and that  $\bar{\psi} \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d)}(d, d)$  has layer dimensions  $\bar{d}_i = d$  for  $i \in [0, L]$ .

(2) Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary and  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  compact. By [Lemma A.13](#) we can find a sequences of matrices  $(B_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  such that  $\|A_i - B_i^{(n)}\|_{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  for  $j \in [L]$ , where the operator norm corresponds to the  $p$ -norm for vectors on the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then it holds that

$$\|A_i(x) - B_i^{(n)}(x)\|_{\max} = \|(A_i - B_i^{(n)})(x)\|_{\max} \leq \|A_i - B_i^{(n)}\|_{\text{op}} \|x\|_{\max} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , thus the matrices converge uniformly. We set  $V_i^{(n)}x := B_i^{(n)}x + \tilde{b}_i$  for any  $i \in [L]$  and define

$$\phi^{(n)} := \bar{\varphi}_L \circ V_L^{(n)} \circ \bar{\varphi}_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ V_2^{(n)} \circ \bar{\varphi}_1 \circ V_1^{(n)} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that the sequences of matrices converge in the operator norm, thus their operator norms are bounded, implying that they have a common Lipschitz constant and so have the affine transformations. As by assumption the elements in  $\mathcal{A}$  have a common Lipschitz constant, also the functions  $\varphi_i$  are Lipschitz continuous with a common Lipschitz constant. Thus we can apply [Lemma 5.8](#) to the differences  $(\bar{\psi} - \phi^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and as each of the composed sequences converges uniformly it follows that also

$$\|\psi - \phi^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} = \|\bar{\psi} - \phi^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which concludes the proof. ■

With [Lemma 7.1](#) we are now ready to prove [Theorem 2](#), which generalizes the universal approximation results of leaky ReLU FNNs to  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks with leaky ReLU activations.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and for  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  compact choose  $\psi \in \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(d)}(d)$  as the approximation from [Theorem 1](#) s.t.

$$\|f - \psi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By applying [Lemma 7.1](#) with  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}$ , which consists of continuous functions, which are also Lipschitz-continuous as piecewise linear functions on compact sets, we can find  $\phi \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  with  $\|\psi - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  and we obtain that

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \stackrel{\Delta\text{-ineq.}}{\leq} \|f - \psi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} + \|\psi - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon.$$

■

## 8. LU-Net has the distributional universal approximation property

In this section we show that the LU-Net has the DUAP, which is due to the strong approximation properties of the  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks with leaky ReLU activations.

**Definition 8.1** ( $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d)$ ): Smooth triangular transformations (Definition 5 in [35]).

1. A mapping  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_d)^T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is called increasing triangular if  $\tau_i$  only depends on the first  $i$  components  $x_{[i]}$  and is strictly increasing w.r.t.  $x_i$  for all  $i \in [d]$ .
2. We define  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d)$  as the open function class of all  $C^\infty$ -increasing triangular mappings from arbitrary open subsets  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  that can depend on  $f$ , which are  $C^2$ -diffeomorphisms on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

The following lemma, which is essentially Lemma 1 in [35], is necessary for us to show that function classes are distributional universal approximators in the sense of Definition 2.22. Essentially, as we obtain that the function classes of our interest can universally approximate  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , this already suffices to obtain that they are distributional universal approximators as obviously  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d) \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ .

**Theorem 8.2** (Teshima et al. [35]). *Let be a function class from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which is a  $L^p$  universal approximator of  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d)$  for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{M}$  is a distributional universal approximator.*

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Lemma 1 in [35]. ■

When considering LU-Net with invertible leaky ReLU activations, the following two lemmas conclude under which circumstances the generative directions have the distributional universal approximation property if the normalizing directions have the distributional universal approximation property.

**Lemma 8.3.** *Consider LU-Net with invertible leaky ReLU activations given by  $\mathcal{F}_+$ , as defined in last chapter, then it holds that*

$$(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1} := \{f^{-1} \mid f \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)\} = \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_+$  be a leaky ReLU denote its parameter by  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , then the inverse is given by  $\sigma_{1/\alpha} \in \text{PLCSM}$  with  $1/\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ . Now let  $f \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$ , then it is given by

$$f = \varphi_N \circ W_N \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1 \circ W_1,$$

where  $W_i \in \text{Aff}_{LU}(d)$ ,  $\varphi_i = (\sigma_{\alpha_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \sigma_{\alpha_d^{(i)}})^T$  for  $i \in [N]$ . Thus by Lemma 4.5 for  $i \in [N], j \in [d]$  there exist  $\phi_j^{(i)} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$  such that  $\phi_j^{(i)} = \sigma_{\alpha_j^{(i)}}$ . Thus, by concatenating

these  $LU$  decomposable networks along the  $d$  dimensions, and making each of them the same length, by filling them up with identity layers if necessary, which is possible as  $\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}} = \sigma_1 \in \mathcal{F}_+$ , for all  $i \in [N]$  we obtain  $\Phi^{(i)} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$  s.t.

$$\varphi_i^{-1} = (\sigma_{1/\alpha_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \sigma_{1/\alpha_d^{(i)}})^T \stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.5}}{=} (\phi_1^{(i)}, \dots, \phi_d^{(i)})^T = \phi^{(i)} .$$

Therefore by [Lemma A.5](#) (1) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= (W_1^{-1} \circ \varphi_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ W_N^{-1} \circ \varphi_N^{-1})^{-1} \\ &= \underbrace{((\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_1)^T \circ W_1^{-1} \circ \phi^{(1)} \circ \dots \circ W_N^{-1} \circ \phi^{(N)} \circ I)^{-1} \circ I}_{\in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)} \in (\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly by using the same notation than before and by applying [Lemma A.5](#) (1), we can write any  $f^{-1} \in (\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} g &= f^{-1} = W_1^{-1} \circ \varphi_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ W_N^{-1} \circ \varphi_N^{-1} \\ &= \underbrace{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_1)^T}_{=\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}} \circ W_1^{-1} \circ \phi^{(1)} \circ \dots \circ W_N^{-1} \circ \phi^{(N)} \circ I \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d) . \end{aligned}$$

Altogether this concludes that  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d) = (\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$ , hence the generative and normalizing directions of  $LU$ -Net with invertible leaky ReLU activations coincide.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 8.4.** *Consider  $LU$ -Net with invertible leaky ReLU activations given by  $\mathcal{F}$ , as defined in last chapter, then the set of generative directions, defined by*

$$(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1} := \{f^{-1} \mid f \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)\}$$

*is an universal approximator of a function class  $\mathcal{M}$  from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if and only if  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$  is an universal approximator of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Similarly  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  is an universal approximator of a function class  $\mathcal{M}$  from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if and only if  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$  is an universal approximator of  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

*Proof.* We only show the first equivalence, as the second one can be shown completely analogous. (" $\implies$ "): As  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1} \subset (\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$  this is clear.

(" $\impliedby$ "): We show that  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  is an universal approximator of  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$ , which then directly implies that  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  universally approximates  $\mathcal{M}$ : Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be compact,  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d)$  and consider a sequence of  $(\sigma_{\alpha_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_{\alpha_n}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$ . Equivalently to step (6) in the proof of [Theorem 1](#), let  $\phi_n \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$  be the neural network, where each activation  $\sigma_1 = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}$  of  $\phi$  is interchanged with  $\sigma_{\alpha_n}$  and all other activations are kept. Therefore all functions in the composition of  $\phi_n$  converge uniformly to the corresponding functions in the composition of  $\phi$ , thus [Lemma 5.8](#) implies that

$$\|\phi - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 ,$$

thus  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  is an universal approximator of  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1}$ .  $\blacksquare$



The next corollary shows how the universal approximation properties of  $LU$ -decomposable neural networks change when invertible leaky ReLU activations are exchanged with true leaky ReLU activations, i.e., when the ReLU function is excluded or included from the set of activations.

**Corollary 8.5.**  $LU_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  is an universal approximator of a function class  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $(LU_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  is an universal approximator of a function class  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* The following equivalence holds

$$\begin{aligned} LU_{\mathcal{F}}(d) \text{ universally approximates } \mathcal{M} &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 8.4}}{\iff} LU_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d) \text{ universally approximates } \mathcal{M} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 8.3}}{\iff} (LU_{\mathcal{F}_+}(d))^{-1} \text{ universally approximates } \mathcal{M} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 8.4}}{\iff} (LU_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1} \text{ universally approximates } \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Using the expressivity result from [Theorem 2](#) we can now show that LU-Net with leaky ReLU activations has the distributional universal approximation property. This shows that suitable generative directions of LU-Net can transform an arbitrary absolutely continuous probability measure into any probability measure, with respect to weak convergence of measures.

The next lemma shows that PLCSM universally approximates all monotonic functions w.r.t.  $p$ -norms on compact sets, which we need for the proof of the DUAP of LU-Net for dimension  $d = 1$ , since [Theorem 2](#) doesn't hold in the case  $d = 1$ .

**Lemma 8.6.** Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}$  open and  $f^* : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuous and strictly increasing. Then for  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{U}$  compact and any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $f \in \text{PLCSM}$  such that

$$\|f^* - f\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} < \epsilon,$$

*Proof.* W.l.o.g. we assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is convex, else it can be written as a countable union of intervals and the proof can easily be generalised. Then there exists an interval  $\mathcal{K} \subset [a, b]$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

$$f_n(x) := \begin{cases} n(f^*(a + \frac{1}{n}) - f^*(a))(x - a) + f^*(a) & x \in [a, a + \frac{1}{n}] \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ n(f^*(a + \frac{i+1}{n}) - f^*(a + \frac{i}{n}))(x - (a + \frac{i}{n})) + f^*(a + \frac{i}{n}) & x \in [a + \frac{i}{n}, a + \frac{i+1}{n}] \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{cases},$$

where  $i \in [0, (b - a)n - 1]$ , thus  $f_n \in \text{PLCSM}$ . As  $f^*$  is continuous, it's also uniformly continuous on  $[a, b]$ , thus there exists  $\delta > 0$  s.t. for  $|x - y| < \delta$  it follows that  $|f^*(x) -$

$f^*(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{b-a}$ . Choose  $n > \delta^{-1}$ , hence  $\frac{1}{n} < \delta$  and for  $f := f_n$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f^* - f\|_{\mathcal{K},p} &\leq \|f^* - f\|_{[a,b],p} \leq \left( \int_{[a,b]} |f^*(x) - f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{i=0}^{(b-a)n-1} \int_{a+\frac{i}{n}}^{a+\frac{i+1}{n}} |f^*(x) - f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{i=0}^{(b-a)n-1} \underbrace{\left( f^*\left(a + \frac{i+1}{n}\right) - f^*\left(a + \frac{i}{n}\right) \right)^p}_{< \epsilon/(b-a)} \int_{a+\frac{i}{n}}^{a+\frac{i+1}{n}} dx \right)^{1/p} \\
&< \frac{\epsilon}{b-a} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{(b-a)n-1} \frac{1}{n} \right)^{1/p} = \frac{\epsilon}{b-a} (b-a) = \epsilon .
\end{aligned}$$

■

Now we have all the tools to prove [Theorem 3](#), i.e. that LU-Net has the DUAP.

*Proof of Theorem 3.*

**(Case  $d = 1$ ):** Note that  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(1)$  is the set of all strictly increasing smooth functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Thus by [Lemma 8.6](#) PLCSM is an universal approximator of  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(1)$  and as  $\text{PLCSM} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}_+}(1)$  by [Lemma 4.5](#), applying [Lemma 8.4](#) shows that  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(1)$  is an universal approximator of  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(1)$ . Then [Corollary 8.5](#) implies that  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  is also an universal approximator of  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(1)$  and therefore [Theorem 8.2](#) concludes the claim.

**(Case  $d \geq 2$ ):** Let  $d \geq 2$ , then by [Theorem 2](#) it follows that  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  is an universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and by [Corollary 8.5](#) it follows that  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  is an universal approximator of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . As  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d) \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  this implies that  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  and  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  are universal approximators of  $\mathcal{T}^\infty(d)$ . Now it follows from [Theorem 8.2](#) that  $\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  and  $(\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d))^{-1}$  are distributional universal approximators, hence  $\text{NF}_{\text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)}$  has the DUAP. ■

## 9. Smooth diffeomorphisms in form of $LU$ -decomposable neural networks are universal approximators of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$

In this section we prove [Theorem 4](#), i.e. that smooth almost leaky ReLU diffeomorphisms universally approximate  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  by applying mollifiers to the approximating sequences obtained in [Theorem 2](#) in a suitable manner.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f \in L^p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , then it follows from [Theorem 2](#) that there exists a sequence  $((\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{F}}(d)$  that satisfies

$$\|f - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K},p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 . \quad (9.1)$$

Thus for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $N_n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.

$$\phi_n = \varphi_{N_n}^{(n)} \circ W_{N_n}^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1^{(n)} \circ W_1^{(n)},$$

where  $\varphi_j^{(m)}(x) = (\sigma_{1,j}^{(m)}(x_1), \dots, \sigma_{d,j}^{(m)}(x_d))$  with  $\sigma_{i,j}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $W_j^{(n)}(x) := A_j^{(n)}x + b_j^{(n)}$ ,  $A_j^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $b_j^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $m \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [N_n]$  and  $i \in [d]$ . We consider the mollifiers  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  from [Definition 2.26](#) and define the regularizing functions  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x) := (\sigma_{i,j}^{(n)} * p_k)(x)$  as in [Definition 2.28](#), which are in  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  by [Lemma 2.27](#). Thus  $\psi_{k,j}^{(n)}(x) = (\psi_{k,1,j}^{(n)}(x_1), \dots, \psi_{k,d,j}^{(n)}(x_d))$  is in  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and we set

$$\phi_{n,k} := \psi_{k,N_n}^{(n)} \circ W_{N_n}^{(n)} \circ \dots \circ \psi_{k,1}^{(n)} \circ W_1^{(n)}. \quad (9.2)$$

**(1)** Now we show that  $\phi_{n,k} \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ : First we obtain for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus [-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}]$  and any  $\sigma_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ , thus  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx}(\sigma_\alpha * p_n)(x) &= \frac{d}{dx} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} \sigma_\alpha(x-z)p_n(z)dz \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left( \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} \sigma_\alpha(x+h-z)p_n(z)dz - \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} \sigma_\alpha(x-z)p_n(z)dz \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} (\sigma_\alpha(x+h-z) - \sigma_\alpha(x-z))p_n(z)dz \\ &\stackrel{\text{Th. A.1}}{=} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} \frac{d}{dx} \sigma_\alpha(x-z)p_n(z)dz = \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(0)} (\alpha \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(x-z) + \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(x-z))p_n(z)dz \\ &= \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)} (\alpha \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(z) + \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(z))p_n(x-z)dz \\ &= \alpha \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_n(x-z)dz + (1-\alpha) \int_0^{\infty} p_n(x-z)dz = \alpha + \underbrace{(1-\alpha)}_{\geq 0} \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^x p_n(z)dz}_{\geq 0} \geq \alpha > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\frac{d}{dx}\sigma_\alpha(x)$  is well-defined outside of zero, and additionally as it holds that  $\frac{d}{dx}p_n(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in (-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$  we obtain that

$$\frac{d}{dx}(\sigma_\alpha * p_n)(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sigma_\alpha(z) \frac{d}{dx} p_n(x-z)dz \geq \int_{B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)} \sigma_\alpha(z) \frac{d}{dx} p_n(x-z)dz > 0. \quad (9.3)$$

Therefore we know that functions of the form  $(\sigma_\alpha * p_n)(x)$  have a strictly positive derivative, which implies that they are strictly monotonically increasing and thus  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x)$  is strictly monotonically increasing for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $m \in [n]$ ,  $j \in [N_n]$  and  $i \in [d]$ . Moreover by the

fundamental theorem of calculus we obtain for  $a \leq x$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x) &= \int_a^x \psi_{k,i,j}^{\prime(n)}(z)dz - \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a) \geq \int_{(a,x) \cap (-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})} \psi_{k,i,j}^{\prime(n)}(z)dz - \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a) \\ &\geq \int_{(a,x) \cap (-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})} \alpha dz - \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a) = \alpha(x - a - \frac{2}{n}) - \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a) \geq \alpha(x - a - 2) - \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a), \end{aligned}$$

which indicates that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x) = \infty$  as  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . An analogous computation shows that  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x) \leq \alpha(a - x - 2) + \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(a)$  for  $a > x$  and therefore  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(x) = -\infty$ .

By the intermediate value theorem, applicable because  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}$  is continuous, it follows that  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$ , thus  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a bijection, where we also used that it is monotonically increasing. It follows that  $\psi_{k,j} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a bijection as each component is and moreover also  $\phi_{n,k} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a bijection, as a concatenation of bijections from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . By [Lemma A.5\(1\)](#) the inverse is given by

$$\phi_{n,k}^{-1} = (W_1^{(n)})^{-1} \circ (\psi_{n,1}^{(n)})^{-1} \circ \dots \circ (W_{N_n}^{(n)})^{-1} \circ (\psi_{k,N_n}^{(n)})^{-1},$$

which is well defined because  $(W_i^{(n)})^{-1}(x) = (A_i^{(n)})^{-1}x - (A_i^{(n)})^{-1}b_i^{(n)}$  exists as  $A_i^{(n)} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d) \subset \text{GL}(d)$  for all  $i \in [N_n]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover as all composed functions of  $\phi_{n,k}$  are smooth, the inverse function rule implies that also their inverses are and therefore it follows that  $\phi_{n,k}^{-1}$  is smooth, hence  $\phi_{n,k}$  is a smooth diffeomorphism for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**(2)** Now we show how a sequence of smooth diffeomorphisms, converging to  $f$  w.r.t.  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K},p}$ , can be obtained: From before we know that for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}]$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx}(\sigma_\alpha * p_n)(x) &= \alpha \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_n(x-z)dz + (1-\alpha) \int_0^{\infty} p_n(x-z)dz \\ &= \alpha + (1-\alpha) \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^x p_n(z)dz}_{\leq 1} \leq \alpha + 1 - \alpha = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and for  $x \in (-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$  we find that

$$\frac{d}{dx}(\sigma_\alpha * p_n)(x) = (\sigma_\alpha * \frac{d}{dx}p_n)(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sigma_\alpha(z)p_n(x-z)dz \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_n(x-z)dz = 1,$$

thus the derivatives of all components of the  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}$  are bounded and therefore they are globally Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1 for all  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \in [d]$ ,  $j \in [N_n]$ . This implies that also  $\psi_{k,j}^{(n)}$  are globally Lipschitz continuous with common Lipschitz constant 1 for the maximums norm and for all  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \in [d]$ ,  $j \in [N_n]$ . Moreover it follows from [Lemma 2.30](#) that the functions  $\psi_{k,i,j}^{(n)}$  converge uniformly to  $\varphi_{i,j}^{(n)}$  on any

compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus also  $\psi_{k,j}^{(n)}$  converges uniformly to  $\varphi_j^{(n)}$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  on the compact sets  $\mathcal{K}_j$ ,  $j \in [0, N_n]$ , which are defined by  $\mathcal{K}_0 := \mathcal{K}$  and

$$\mathcal{K}_{j+1} := \varphi_j^{(n)} \circ W_j^{(n)}(\mathcal{K}_j).$$

Combining the uniform convergence with the global Lipschitz constant 1, w.r.t maximum norm, we can apply [Lemma 5.8](#) to the sequences  $(\psi_{k,j}^{(n)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  for all  $j \in [N_n]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  to obtain that

$$\|\phi_n - \phi_{n,k}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9.4)$$

Now [9.4](#) enables us to obtain an increasing subsequence  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \infty$  such that

$$\|\phi_n - \phi_{n,k_n}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (9.5)$$

and

$$\|\varphi_j^{(n)} - \phi_{k_n, j}^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (9.6)$$

The sequence  $(\phi_{n,k_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , which consists of smooth diffeomorphisms as we've shown in [\(1\)](#), fulfills

$$\|f - \phi_{n,k_n}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \leq \|f - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} + \|\phi_n - \phi_{n,k_n}\|_{\mathcal{K}, p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

because of [9.1](#) and [9.5](#). Moreover by construction of  $\phi_{n,k_n}$ , [9.5](#) and [9.6](#) shows that  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of almost leaky ReLU networks.  $\blacksquare$

## 10. $w_{\min} \geq d_x + 1$ for universal approximation of the continuous functions with FNNs using continuous monotone activations

**Definition 10.1.** We define  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  as the set of all continuous bijections from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that the inverse is in  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover we define  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  as the set of all Lipschitz continuous bijections from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

In the later proofs of this section we need that functions in  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  have a continuous inverse, for which we give a proof in the next lemma for completeness sake, even though it is well-known.

**Lemma 10.2.** Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , then then it holds that its inverse is continuous, i.e.  $\varphi^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof.* W.l.o.g. we can assume that  $\varphi$  is strictly increasing, thus also  $\varphi_n^{-1}$  is strictly increasing. For that let  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an increasing sequence converging to  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  from below, then the sequence  $z_k := \varphi^{-1}(x_k)$ ,  $z := \varphi^{-1}(x)$  is increasing and it holds  $z_k \leq z$  as  $\varphi_n^{-1}$  is strictly increasing. Therefore the sequence is bounded and there exists a convergent subsequence  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} z_{k_m} = z^*$ . As  $\varphi$  is continuous it follows that  $x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(z_{k_m}) = \varphi_n(z^*)$ , thus  $z^* = \varphi^{-1}(x)$ . Now let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary then there exists  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $z^* - z_{k_m} < \epsilon$  for all  $m \geq M$ . By choosing  $K \geq k_m$  we obtain

$$z^* - z_K \leq z^* - z_{k_m} < \epsilon$$

as the sequence is strictly increasing. This shows that the functions  $\varphi^{-1}$  is left-continuous and by an analogous argument for decreasing sequences it follows that it's also right-continuous and therefore continuous.  $\blacksquare$

The following two lemmas show some helpful properties regarding the set  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  of continuous bijections from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , which are essential tools for the proof of [Proposition 10.5](#).

**Lemma 10.3.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , i.e. it is a continuous bijective function with continuous inverse,  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  a sequence and we define the sequence  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $y_n := \phi(x_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then it holds that  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is unbounded if and only if  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is unbounded.*

*Proof.* By contraposition we can equivalently show that  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded if and only if  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded. Assume that  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, thus there exists  $r > 0$  s.t.  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset B_r(0)$ . However as  $\phi^{-1}$  is continuous the image of  $M := \phi^{-1}(B_r(0))$  must also be bounded, implying that also  $\phi^{-1}(\{y_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}) = \phi^{-1}(\{\phi(x_n) | n \in \mathbb{N}\}) = \{x_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is bounded. The other direction follows analogously by exchanging the roles of  $\phi, \phi^{-1}$  and  $x_n, y_n$ , respectively.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 10.4.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  be a diffeomorphism and define the level set corresponding to  $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and the first component of  $\phi$  by  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, \phi} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d | (\phi(x))_1 = y_1\}$ , where  $(\phi(x))_1$  denotes the first component of  $\phi(x)$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, \phi} \neq \emptyset$  for some  $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then for any  $x_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{y_1, \phi}$  there exists a continuous curve  $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{y_1, \phi}$  with  $\gamma(0) = x_0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma(t)\| = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption it holds that  $\phi(x_0) = (y_1, \bar{y}_1)$  for some  $\bar{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ . We define the curve  $\bar{\gamma} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  by  $\bar{\gamma}(t) = (y_1, \theta(t))$ , where  $\theta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  is a continuous curve starting at  $\theta(0) = \bar{y}_1$  with  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\theta(t)\| = \infty$ , e.g.  $\theta(t) := \bar{y}_1 + tw$  with  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus \{0\}$ . As  $\phi^{-1}$  is continuous,  $\gamma := \phi^{-1} \circ \bar{\gamma}$  is a continuous curve with  $\gamma(0) = \phi^{-1} \circ (y_1, \bar{y}_1) = \phi^{-1} \circ \phi(x_0) = x_0$  and  $\phi \circ \gamma(t) = \bar{\gamma}(t) = (y_1, \theta(t))$ , therefore  $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{y_1, \phi}$ . By the choice of  $\theta$  it holds that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{\gamma}(t)\| = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(y_1, \theta(t))\| = \infty$  and [Lemma 10.3](#) implies that then also  $\gamma = \phi^{-1} \circ \bar{\gamma}$  must be unbounded, i.e.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma(t)\| = \infty$ .  $\blacksquare$

The following proposition uses the fact that diffeomorphisms do not alter the topology of sets and therefore any level set of any component of the diffeomorphism must be unbounded. We use this to show that the set  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  does not universally approximate the continuous functions with respect to the supremum norm in dimension  $d \geq 2$ . Therefore it is essential to prove the corresponding [Lemma 2.34](#).

**Proposition 10.5.** *Let  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  with  $d_x \geq d_y$  such that there exist  $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  with a compact level set  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \neq \emptyset$  of the first component. Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  be a compact set that fulfills  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \subset \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \cap \partial\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$ . Then  $\epsilon := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{x \in \partial\mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - y_1|$  is positive and for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_x})$  it holds that*

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| \geq \epsilon .$$

*Proof. (Case:  $d = d_x = d_y$ ):* As  $\mathcal{K}$  is compact, the continuous function  $|(f(x))_1 - y_1|$  takes its minimum on  $\partial\mathcal{K}$  for some  $x^* \in \partial\mathcal{K}$ . Because of  $\mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \cap \partial\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$  it follows that  $(f(x^*))_1 \neq y_1$ , thus

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \min_{x \in \partial\mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - y_1| = \frac{1}{2} |(f(x^*))_1 - y_1| > 0 .$$

Now let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \neq \emptyset$  and for an arbitrary fixed  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  we set  $z := \phi(x_0)$  and denote its first component by  $z_1$ . If  $\|f(x_0) - z\| > \epsilon$  then the claim is true, otherwise  $\|f(x_0) - z\| \leq \epsilon$  holds and by [Lemma 10.4](#) there exists a continuous curve  $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{z_1, \phi}$  with  $\gamma(0) = x_0$  s.t.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma(t)\| = \infty$ . We define

$$t^* := \inf\{t > 0 \mid \gamma(t) \notin \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})\}$$

and proceed to show that  $t^* < \infty$  and  $\gamma(t^*) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$ , i.e. that the curve passes through  $\partial\mathcal{K}$ . First, we note that  $\gamma(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{y_1, f} \subset \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$ . Moreover as  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma(t)\| = \infty$  and as  $\text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$  is bounded as a subset of a compact set there exists  $t_1 > 0$  such that  $\gamma(t_1) \notin \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$ , implying that  $t^* \leq t_1 < \infty$ . Thus there exists a sequence  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converging from below to  $t^*$  and it holds that  $\gamma(t_n) \in \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the continuity of  $\gamma$  the sequence  $(\gamma(t_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$  converges to  $\gamma(t^*) \notin \text{interior}(\mathcal{K})$ , hence  $\gamma(t^*) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} &\geq \|f - \phi\|_{\partial\mathcal{K} \cup \{x_0\}, \text{sup}} \geq \sup_{x \in \partial\mathcal{K} \cup \{x_0\}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| \\ &= \sup \left( \{|(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| : x \in \partial\mathcal{K}\} \cup \{|(f(x_0))_1 - (\phi(x_0))_1|\} \right) \\ &\geq \sup \left( \{|(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| : x \in \partial\mathcal{K}\} \cup \{\epsilon\} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{|(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| : x \in \partial\mathcal{K}\} &\stackrel{\gamma(t^*) \in \partial\mathcal{K}}{\geq} |(f(\gamma(t^*)))_1 - (\phi(\gamma(t^*)))_1| \\ &\geq |(f(\gamma(t^*)))_1 - y_1| - |y_1 - (\phi(\gamma(t^*)))_1| \geq |(f(\gamma(t^*)))_1 - y_1| - |y_1 - z_1| \geq 2\epsilon - \epsilon = \epsilon , \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we obtain that  $\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| \geq \epsilon$ .

**(Case:  $d_x > d_y$ ):** Let  $f : C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  a function, as we constructed it in the first part and let  $f_i$  denote its components for  $i \in [d_x]$ . Then it immediately follows that also  $g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , defined by  $g(x) := (f_1(x), \dots, f_{d_y}(x))^T$  satisfies the inequality. ■

Now, we are ready to show [Lemma 2.34](#), which states that the set of continuous bijections with continuous inverse is not a uniform universal approximator of the continuous functions.

*Proof of [Lemma 2.34](#). (Case:  $d = 1$ ):* Let  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  defined by  $f(x) := x^2$ . Choose  $\epsilon := \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\mathcal{K} := [-1, 1]$  and assume that there exists  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} < \frac{1}{2}$ . Note that  $\phi$  must be strictly increasing or strictly decreasing as a continuous bijective function in dimension  $d = 1$ . Furthermore it must hold that  $|\phi(\pm 1) - f(\pm 1)| = |\phi(\pm 1) - 1| < \frac{1}{2}$  and additionally  $|\phi(0) - f(0)| = |\phi(0)| < \frac{1}{2}$ . If  $\phi$  is strictly increasing then  $\phi(-1) < \phi(0) < \frac{1}{2}$  implies  $|\phi(-1) - 1| = 1 - \phi(-1) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , which contradicts the assumption. If  $\phi$  is strictly decreasing then  $\phi(1) < \phi(0) < \frac{1}{2}$  implies  $|\phi(1) - 1| = 1 - \phi(1) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , which also contradicts the assumption.

**(Case  $d \geq 2$ ):** Let  $p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p(x) := (2\pi)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \cdot \exp(\frac{1}{2}x^T x)$  the density of a multivariate standard normal distribution with identity covariance matrix  $I$  and mean 0. Furthermore define  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  by  $f(x) = (p(x), x_2, \dots, x_d)$  and set  $\mathcal{K} = \overline{B_r(0)}$  for some  $r > 0$ . For  $c := (2\pi)^{-\frac{k}{2}}$  we have  $p(x) = c$  if and only if  $x = 1$  and  $p(x) < c$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  and it follows that  $\mathcal{L}_{c,f} = \{0\} \subset \text{interior}(B_r(0))$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{c,f} \cap \partial B_r(0) = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $f$  fulfills the assumptions of [Proposition 10.5](#) and thus there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  it follows that  $\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \geq \epsilon$ . and as  $\mathcal{K}$  is compact this shows that  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  is not a universal approximator of  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  w.r.t. the supremum norm. ■

The following definition introduces a pseudo-closure of the Lipschitz continuous function with bounded Lipschitz constant on arbitrary compact sets. Together with the following [Lemma 10.7](#) it is essential for the proof of [Theorem 5](#).

**Definition 10.6.** *We define the set*

$$\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) := \{\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \exists (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \forall \mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ compact} : \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi - \varphi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0, \text{ sequence } (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ has a uniform Lipschitz const.}\}$$

and moreover we define

$$C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) := \{f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ monotone and Lipschitz continuous}\},$$

where monotone means that the function is either increasing or decreasing.

In the next lemma we show that the set  $C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , that corresponds to the set of functions for that [Theorem 5](#) is applicable, coincides with  $\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .



**Lemma 10.7.** *It holds that  $\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) = C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .*

*Proof.* " $\supset$ ": First, we show that any Lipschitz continuous and monotone function is an element of  $\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ . W.l.o.g. we can consider a Lipschitz continuous and increasing function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L \geq 0$  and we define  $\varphi_n(x) := f(x) + \frac{x}{n}$ . The functions  $\varphi_n$  are Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constants  $L + \frac{1}{n}$  as a sum of Lipschitz continuous functions and therefore the sequence of Lipschitz constants is bounded by  $L + 1$ . Moreover  $\varphi_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  are strictly increasing as a sums of an increasing and a strictly increasing function, hence they are also bijective. Furthermore they fulfill

$$\|f - \varphi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = \left\| \frac{x}{n} \right\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = \frac{1}{n} \|x\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

for all compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}$ , therefore  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .

" $\subset$ ": For  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  we show that is is Lipschitz continuous and monotone. Let  $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{Lip}}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  a sequence converging uniformly to  $\varphi$  on all compact sets such that the sequence of Lipschitz constants  $(L_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded by some  $L \geq 0$ . Then it holds that

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y)| \leq |x - y| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n \leq L|x - y|,$$

and therefore  $\varphi$  is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant  $L$ . As  $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  consists of bijections from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , there exists a subsequence  $(\varphi_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , which consists either of strictly increasing or strictly decreasing functions. For  $x < y$  we choose  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}$  compact s.t.  $x, y \in \mathcal{K}$ . If the subsequence is strictly increasing then it follows that

$$\varphi(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n_k}(x) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n_k}(y) = \varphi(y)$$

and as this holds for any  $x < y$  it follows that  $\varphi$  is increasing. Otherwise, if the subsequence is strictly decreasing the direction of the inequality changes and it follows that  $\varphi$  is decreasing. Therefore  $\varphi$  is also monotone and all in all it follows  $\varphi \in C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Theorem 5. (Case  $d = d_x = d_y$ ):* We lead the proof by contradiction and assume the contrary, then for any  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  compact there exists a sequence  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d)}(d, d)$  such that

$$\|f - \psi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (10.1)$$

Moreover, as  $\mathcal{A}$  consists of Lipschitz continuous functions with a common Lipschitz constant, there exist sequences  $(\psi_n^{(m)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  converging uniformly to  $\psi_n$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By considering a suitable subsequence  $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  we can obtain a diagonal sequence  $\Phi_n := \psi_n^{(m_n)}$  with  $(\Phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi_n - \Phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi_n - \psi_n^{(m_n)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0. \quad (10.2)$$

Note that by [Lemma 10.7](#) it holds that  $\mathcal{A} \subset C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , thus for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$  we can find and fix a sequence  $(\varphi^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{Lip}}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  converging uniformly to  $\varphi$  on any compact set. Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  denote the set of all activation functions of the neural networks  $\Phi_n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and we define

$$\mathcal{A}_n^{(k)} := \{\varphi_n^{(k)} \mid \varphi_n \in \mathcal{A}_n\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_n^* := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n^{(k)},$$

i.e. the set containing the  $k$ -th element of all the sequences converging to activations used in  $\Phi_n$  and the set consisting of all elements in the chosen sequences converging to the activations in  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , respectively. An important observation is that  $\mathcal{A}_n$  consists of finitely many Lipschitz continuous functions  $\varphi_n$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , which therefore have a common Lipschitz constant and as the converging sequences  $(\varphi_n^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  have bounded Lipschitz constants by definition of  $\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ , all functions in  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  have a common Lipschitz constant for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the neural networks  $(\Phi_n^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}_n^{(k)}}(d) \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}_n^*}(d)$  that uses the same affine transformations as  $\Phi_n$  and where each activation  $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$  used in  $\Phi_n$  is exchanged by the corresponding element  $\varphi_n^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}_n^{(k)}$ . As the components of any activation layers of  $(\Phi_n^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  consists of elements in  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ , which are Lipschitz continuous and bijective, it follows that also

$$(\Phi_n^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}_n^*}(d) \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (10.3)$$

as compositions of Lipschitz continuous bijections and that they have a common Lipschitz constant. As the sequence is given by a composition of functions that converge uniformly on any compact set and that have a common Lipschitz constant we can apply [Lemma 5.8](#), which implies that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_n - \Phi_n^{(k)}\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$ . Moreover, we can choose a suitable subsequence  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that for  $\phi_n := \Phi_n^{(k_n)}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_n - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0. \quad (10.4)$$

Note that because of [10.3](#) it holds that  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , i.e. they are (Lipschitz) continuous bijections from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . By combining [10.1](#), [10.2](#) and [10.4](#) we find that  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  fulfills

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|f - \psi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} + \|\psi_n - \Phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} + \|\Phi_n - \phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}}) = 0.$$

However this would mean that  $\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  universally approximates  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , which contradicts [Lemma 2.34](#) and therefore the claim of [Theorem 5](#) must be true.

**(Case:  $d_x > d_y$ ):** By [Proposition 10.5](#) there exist  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_x})$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  compact such that for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_x})$  it holds

$$\|f - \phi\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi(x))_1| \geq \epsilon. \quad (10.5)$$

Assume that there exists a sequence  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_x)$  satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\psi_n(x))_1| = 0. \quad (10.6)$$

By using the same construction as in the case  $d = d_x = d_y$ , we then could obtain a sequence  $(\phi_n) \subset \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi_n(x))_1| = 0, \quad (10.7)$$

which contradicts 10.5, i.e. such a sequence can not exist. Define  $\tilde{f} := (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{d_y})^T \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , such that  $f_i$  is the  $i$ -th component of  $f$  for  $i \in [d_y]$ . Now, assume that for  $d_x > d_y$  there exists a sequence  $(\Phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_y)$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{f} - \Phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$ .

We fill up the neural networks  $(\Phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with zeros to obtain  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_y)$  such that a weight in  $\phi_n$  is zero if and only if the corresponding weight in  $\Phi_n$  is zero. Therefore it holds that  $(\Phi_n(x))_i = (\phi_n(x))_i$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  and all components  $i \in [d_y]$ , which implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(f(x))_1 - (\phi_n(x))_1| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} |(\tilde{f}(x))_1 - (\Phi_n(x))_1| = 0. \quad (10.8)$$

However, 10.8 contradicts 10.6, hence there is no sequence  $(\Phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_y)$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{f} - \Phi_n\|_{\mathcal{K}, \text{sup}} = 0$  and this implies that  $\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(d_x)}(d_x, d_y)$  is not a universal approximator of  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  w.r.t. the supremum norm. ■

## 11. Conclusion and outlook

The minimal widths of FNNs with ReLU or leaky ReLU activations for universal approximation properties have been specified exactly by Park et al. [28], Cai [5] and our Theorem 1. Note additionally that, due to the coding scheme construction and because the memorizer has dimension one, the universal approximation results of Park et al. [28] and ours have minimal interior dimension  $d_{\min} = 1$ . Therefore, while Cai [5] first proved the minimal width for leaky ReLU FNNs, our alternative proof of the upper bound of the minimal width in Theorem 1 constructs the approximating sequences explicitly, and shows that there always exists an approximating sequence of minimal interior dimension  $d_{\min} = 1$ . Moreover, Cai [5] use results, connected to the Theorem 2.5 (i) of Brenier and Gangbo [3], to infer the UAP in  $L^p$  with LReLU activations [11] from the UAP [22] with respect to flow maps for neuralODEs [26]. We, in contrast, directly prove the UAP in  $L^p$  and thereby provide a constructive proof of Brenier and Gangbo's result as a corollary of Theorem 4. For proving additional theoretical results regarding the approximation with FNNs with leaky ReLU activations, it might therefore be advantageous to consider the explicit construction obtained in the proof of our Theorem 1 and Theorem 4.

For example, as we constructed the memorizer as a leaky ReLU FNN of input dimension 1, it is clear that, in general, a neural network in our approximating sequences for  $L^p$  integrable functions has at least one hidden layer with one neuron, corresponding to a minimal interior dimension  $d_{\min} = 1$ , independent of the input and output dimension  $d_x, d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ , respectively. In particular, this allowed us to prove universal approximation for autoencoders with arbitrary interior feature dimension in [Corollary 2.9](#). In contrast, Cai [5] shows that for every  $L^p$  integrable function there exists an approximating sequence of LReLU FNNs of width  $\max\{d_x, d_y, 2\}$ , but more specifics of the FNNs, such as the minimal interior dimension they attain, are unclear.

Moreover, note that Cai [5] showed that the minimal width for universal approximation of FNNs with arbitrary activations is lower bounded by  $w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$ , which means that FNNs with leaky ReLU activations achieve the minimal width over all possible activation functions if  $\min\{d_x, d_y\} \geq 2$ . Thus, the leaky ReLU activation achieves the minimal width for all but infinitely many choices of input and output dimensions except for the three special cases  $(d_x, d_y) \in \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ . Moreover as the minimal width for universal approximation for FNNs with ReLU activations is given by  $\max\{d_x + 1, d_y\}$  by Park et al. [28] the ReLU fails to achieve this property in the infinitely many cases where  $d_x \geq d_y$ .

An interesting open question lies in exactly specifying the minimal width for universal approximation of continuous functions on Euclidean spaces with respect to the supremum norm for FNNs with the commonly used activation functions, such as ReLU or leaky ReLU. Cai [5] proved that  $w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$  is the lowest minimal width that any activation function can achieve, both for uniform and  $L^p$  universal approximation. Furthermore, our [Theorem 5](#) shows that  $d_x + 1$  is a lower bound for the minimal width for uniform universal approximation when  $d_x \geq d_y$ , for Lipschitz continuous monotone activations, thus including ReLU and leaky ReLU. Park et al. [28] showed that the minimal width for uniform universal approximation of functions in  $C^0([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$  with ReLU FNNs is  $w_{\min} = 3$ , hence the lower bound  $\max\{d_x, d_y\} = 2$  is not tight in this case. However, in general, even for ReLU and leaky ReLU activations, it is not known whether these bounds are tight, making it an important topic for further research to extract upper bounds for the universal approximation of continuous functions with respect to the supremum norm, especially for ReLU and leaky ReLU, but also for other activations of practical and theoretical interest.

Furthermore, our [Theorem 5](#) demonstrates that, in the case  $d_x \geq d_y$ , FNNs with leaky ReLU activations are unable to attain the smallest possible minimal width over all activation functions, given by  $w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\} = d_x$ , while they achieve it for  $L^p$  universal approximation of  $L^p$  integrable functions when  $d_x \geq 2$  and  $d_y \geq 2$ , as shown in [Theorem 1](#) and by Cai [5]. Moreover, it should be noted that Cai [5] proved that the minimal width for uniform universal approximation of continuous functions with FNNs with ReLU+FLOOR activations is given by  $w_{\min} = \max\{2, d_x, d_y\}$ . Nevertheless, despite this result being optimal for approximation in theory, it is difficult for practical

purposes, as using discontinuous activations in neural networks fundamentally breaks backpropagation and gradient descent. These methods are designed for smooth functions for computing gradients [2, 29], and while there are workarounds, they might be inefficient and impractical for training deep networks with discontinuous activations.

This motivates the question of whether there is another continuous (almost everywhere) smooth activation that achieves the minimal width for the uniform universal approximation of continuous functions. According to our [Theorem 5](#), such an activation cannot be Lipschitz continuous and monotone, which excludes most of the popular choices [12, 9], such as ReLU, LReLU, tangens hyperbolicus, logistic sigmoid and many other sigmoidal activations. Some possible candidates for relevant activation functions, as e.g. presented by Dubey et al. [12], that might still be able to achieve uniform UAP of continuous functions with a width of  $\max\{d_x, d_y\}$ , could include the swish activation given by  $\text{swish}(x) = \frac{x}{1+\exp(-x)}$  or the adaptive piecewise linear (APL) activation, which is more adaptive due to learnable parameters similar to LReLU, both of which are not monotone.

Additionally, as of now, the leaky ReLUs are the only known activation functions to achieve universal approximation for  $L^p$  integrable functions with the minimal width  $w_{\min}^*$  over all possible activation functions for all but three choices of input and output dimensions. Therefore another interesting open question for future work is whether there exist other activation functions, besides the leaky ReLU, which achieve the minimal width for  $L^p$  universal approximation for all but finitely many choices of the dimensions, or perhaps even for all input and output dimensions. Note that ReLU does not accomplish this, since Park et al. [28] showed that FNNs with ReLU activations for  $L^p$  universal approximation of the  $L^p$  integrable function have a minimal width of  $\max\{d_x + 1, d_y\}$  and therefore cannot achieve the smallest possible width of  $w_{\min}^* = \max\{d_x, d_y\}$  if  $d_x \geq d_y$ .

## References

- [1] H. Amann and J. Escher. *Analysis III*. Grundlehrer Mathematik. Birkhuser Basel, 2008. ISBN 9783764388843. URL <https://books.google.de/books?id=cVsiBAAAQBAJ>.
- [2] Y. Bengio. *Learning Deep Architectures for AI*. 2009. doi: 10.1561/2200000006.
- [3] Y. Brenier and W. Gangbo.  $l^p$  approximation of maps by diffeomorphisms. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 16:147–164, 02 2001. doi: 10.1007/s005260100144.
- [4] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Universitext. Springer New York, 2010. ISBN 9780387709130. URL <https://books.google.de/books?id=GAA2Xq0IIGoC>.
- [5] Y. Cai. Achieve the minimum width of neural networks for universal approximation, 2023.

- [6] R. Chan, S. Penquitt, and H. Gottschalk. Lu-net: Invertible neural networks based on matrix factorization, 2023.
- [7] R. T. Chen, Y. Rubanova, J. Bettencourt, and D. K. Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. Advances in neural information processing systems, 31, 2018.
- [8] G. Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems (MCSS), 2(4):303–314, Dec. 1989. ISSN 0932-4194. doi: 10.1007/BF02551274. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02551274>.
- [9] B. Ding, H. Qian, and J. Zhou. Activation functions and their characteristics in deep neural networks. In 2018 Chinese Control And Decision Conference (CCDC), pages 1836–1841, 2018. doi: 10.1109/CCDC.2018.8407425.
- [10] L. Dinh, J. Sohl-Dickstein, and S. Bengio. Density estimation using real NVP. In International Conference on Learning Representations, 2017.
- [11] Y. Duan, L. Li, G. Ji, and Y. Cai. Vanilla feedforward neural networks as a discretization of dynamical systems, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.10909>.
- [12] S. R. Dubey, S. K. Singh, and B. B. Chaudhuri. Activation functions in deep learning: A comprehensive survey and benchmark, 2022.
- [13] S. R. Dubey, S. K. Singh, and B. B. Chaudhuri. Activation functions in deep learning: A comprehensive survey and benchmark, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14545>.
- [14] D. B. Emmanuele. Real Analysis. 01 2016. ISBN 978-1-4939-4003-5. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4939-4005-9.
- [15] B. Hanin and M. Sellke. Approximating continuous functions by relu nets of minimal width, 2018.
- [16] S. Hildebrandt. Analysis 2. Springer-Lehrbuch. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. ISBN 9783642189722. URL <https://books.google.de/books?id=LZskBgAAQBAJ>.
- [17] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. Neural Networks, 2(5):359–366, 1989.
- [18] J. Johnson. Deep, skinny neural networks are not universal approximators, 2018.
- [19] P. Kidger and T. Lyons. Universal approximation with deep narrow networks, 2020.
- [20] D. P. Kingma and P. Dhariwal. Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions. Advances in neural information processing systems, 31, 2018.

- [21] I. Kobyzev, S. J. Prince, and M. A. Brubaker. Normalizing flows: An introduction and review of current methods. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 43(11):3964–3979, nov 2021. doi: 10.1109/tpami.2020.2992934. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109%2Ftpami.2020.2992934>.
- [22] Q. Li, T. Lin, and Z. Shen. Deep learning via dynamical systems: An approximation perspective, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.10382>.
- [23] J. Liesen and V. Mehrmann. Linear Algebra. Springer Undergraduate Mathematics Series. Springer International Publishing, 2015. ISBN 9783319243467. URL [https://books.google.de/books?id=d27\\_CgAAQBAJ](https://books.google.de/books?id=d27_CgAAQBAJ).
- [24] Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2017/file/32cbf687880eb1674a07bf717761dd3a-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/32cbf687880eb1674a07bf717761dd3a-Paper.pdf).
- [25] Y. Marzouk, Z. R. Ren, S. Wang, and J. Zech. Distribution learning via neural differential equations: a nonparametric statistical perspective. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 25(232):1–61, 2024.
- [26] M. A. Nielsen. Neural networks and deep learning, 2018. URL <http://neuralnetworksanddeeplearning.com/>.
- [27] N. S. Papageorgiou and P. Winkert. Applied Nonlinear Functional Analysis. De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2018. ISBN 9783110532982. doi: doi:10.1515/9783110532982. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110532982>.
- [28] S. Park, C. Yun, J. Lee, and J. Shin. Minimum width for universal approximation, 2020.
- [29] R. Pascanu, T. Mikolov, and Y. Bengio. On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 28, ICML’13, page III–1310–III–1318. JMLR.org, 2013.
- [30] A. Pinkus. Approximation theory of the mlp model in neural networks. Acta Numerica, 8:143–195, 1999. doi: 10.1017/S0962492900002919.
- [31] M. Protter and C. Morrey. Intermediate Calculus. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2012. ISBN 9781461210863. URL <https://books.google.de/books?id=3lTmBwAAQBAJ>.
- [32] M. Rosenblatt. Remarks on a Multivariate Transformation. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 23(3):470 – 472, 1952. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729394. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729394>.

- [33] D. Ruiz-Balet and E. Zuazua. Neural ode control for classification, approximation, and transport. *SIAM Review*, 65(3):735–773, 2023.
- [34] F. Santambrogio. Optimal transport for applied mathematicians. *Birkäuser, NY*, 55 (58-63):94, 2015.
- [35] T. Teshima, I. Ishikawa, K. Tojo, K. Oono, M. Ikeda, and M. Sugiyama. Coupling-based invertible neural networks are universal diffeomorphism approximators, 2020.
- [36] C. Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.



## A. Appendix

Here we list the different notations/abbreviations and their respective meaning used in this work. Note that if we remark "For indices" in the "Meaning" column, then the corresponding notations are used solely for indices in the natural numbers, which we usually denote by  $i, j, k, l, n, m, N$ .

List of general notations/abbreviations	
Notation	Meaning
$\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0$	$\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ , $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$
$[n_1, n_2]$	<b>For indices:</b> $[n_1, n_2] := \{n_1, n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2 - 1, n_2\}$ for $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$
$[n]$	<b>For indices:</b> $[n] := [1, n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$
$x_{[n_1, n_2]}$	For a row vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq N$ this is defined by $(x_{[n_1, n_2]}) := (x_{n_1}, x_{n_1+1}, \dots, x_{n_2})$ and analogously for column vectors.
$x_{[n]}$	For a row vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , $n \leq N$ this is defined by $x_{[n]} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and analogously for column vectors.
$[a, b]$	When <b>not initializing indices</b> , this defines the closed interval from $a$ to $b$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and the other types of intervals are denoted similarly with "(" or ")" as symbols for open borders.
$(f)_i$	Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , then $(f)_i$ denotes the $i$ -th component of $f$ for $i \in [n]$
$f_i$	Sometimes used to denote an element of a sequence of functions $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ with an index set $I$ . If only a function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and no function $f_i$ was explicitly defined, then we $f_i$ is just used as an abbreviation for the $i$ -th component $((f)_i)$ .
$\text{supp}(f)$	Denotes the support of a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined by $\text{supp}(f) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$ .
$D_x f(g(x))$	The Jacobian of the function $f$ w.r.t. the variables $x$ , evaluated at the point $g(x)$ .
$f * p_n$	This corresponds to the convolution (see Definition 2.25 of $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and a mollifier $p_n$ (see Definition 2.28).
$\omega_f$	Modulus of continuity of the (uniformly) continuous function $f$ (see Definition 3.2).
$\text{Id}$	The identity function $\text{Id} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $\text{Id}(x) = x$ .
$I$	Identity matrix, i.e. diagonal matrix with ones on the diagonal.
$\mathbb{1}_A$	Indicator function w.r.t. a set $A$ , i.e. $\mathbb{1}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A \\ 0 & x \notin A \end{cases}$
DUAP	Is used in text and stands for "distributional universal approximation property", which is introduced in detail in Definition 2.23.
$\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$	Convergence in distribution (see Definition 2.21).

Notations/abbreviations corresponding to function classes or functions	
Notation	Meaning
$\mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$	The set of matrices from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^r$ .
$\text{GL}(d)$	The set of invertible matrices from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
$\text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$	The set of invertible matrices from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ , which have a $LU$ -decomposition. For details see Definition A.11.
$\text{Aff}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of affine transformations from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ (see Definition 2.2).
$\text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of invertible affine transformations from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ (see Definition 2.2).
$\text{Aff}_{\text{LU}}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of affine transformations from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ whose linear transformations $LU$ decomposable (see Definition 2.14).
$C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	Continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , see Definition 2.17.
$C^k(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	$k$ -times continuously differentiable functions from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , where $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , see Definition 2.17.
$C_{\text{Lip}}^{\text{mon}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$	The set of Lipschitz continuous and monotone functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ (see Definition 2.35).
$L^p(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^r)$	The vector space of equivalence classes (with the usual almost everywhere equivalence relation) of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathbb{R}^r$ that are integrable w.r.t. $\ \cdot\ _{\mathcal{X}, p}$ .
$L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^r)$	Set of all functions in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^r)$ , that are integrable w.r.t. $\ \cdot\ _{\mathcal{K}, p}$ for all compact sets $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . For details see Definition 2.24.
$\mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$	The set of all $k$ times differentiable diffeomorphisms from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see Definition 2.17).
$\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$	The set of all continuous bijections from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that the inverse is in $C^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Definition 10.1).
$\mathcal{D}^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$	The set of all Lipschitz continuous bijections from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ (see Definition 10.1).
$\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$	A special set of (quasi) closures of $\mathcal{D}_*^{\text{Lip}}$ , necessary for the proof of Theorem 5 (see Definition 10.6).
$\text{NF}_{\mathcal{M}}(d)$	Set of normalizing flows in dimension $d$ with invertible transformations in $\mathcal{M}$ .
$\text{NF}_{\text{LU}}(d)$	The normalizing flow LU-Net in dimension $d$ (see Definition 2.19).
PLC	Set of piecewise linear continuous functions, for details see Definition 4.1.
PLCSM	Set of piecewise linear continuous strictly monotone functions, for details see Definition 4.2.
$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$	Probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
$\mathcal{P}_{\text{abs}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$	Absolutely continuous probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see Definition 2.21).
$\mathcal{T}^\infty(d)$	Open function class of smooth increasingly triangular transformations defined on open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for details see Definition 8.1.

Notations/abbreviations corresponding to neural networks and NF	
Notation	Meaning
$\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of feed-forward neural networks (FNNs) from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ with activations in $\mathcal{A}$ . For details see Definition 2.3.
$\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(m)}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of feed-forward neural networks (FNNs) from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ with activations in $\mathcal{A}$ that have width $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . For details see Definition 2.3.
$\text{FNN}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(m,k)}(d_x, d_y)$	Set of feed-forward neural networks (FNNs) from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ with activations in $\mathcal{A}$ that have width $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and minimal interior width $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . For details see Definition 2.3.
$\text{LU}_{\mathcal{A}}(d)$	Set of normalizing directions of LU-Net from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ with activations in $\mathcal{A}$ , which defines the corresponding normalizing flow LU-Net and is detailedly introduced in Definition 2.19.
$\text{AE}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}(d)$	Autoencoder of dimension $d$ with activations in $\mathcal{A}$ with feature dimension $k$ (see Definition 2.4).
$\mathcal{F}_+$	The set of invertible leaky ReLUs with parameters in $(0, 1]$ (see Definition 2.8).
$\mathcal{F}$	The set of true invertible leaky ReLUs with parameters in $(0, 1)$ (see Definition 2.8).
$\mathcal{F}^\infty$	The set of all smoothed leaky ReLUs (see Definition 2.31).
$w^\phi$	Minimal width for universal approximation of the neural network $\phi$ (see Definition 2.7).
$d_{\min}^\phi$	Minimal interior width of the neural network $\phi$ (see Definition 2.7).
$w_{\min}$	Minimal width for universal approximation of a function set (see Definition 2.7).
$d_{\min}$	Minimal interior dimension for universal approximation of a function set (see Definition 2.7).
$\mathcal{C}_n$	The set $\mathcal{C}_n = \{0, 2^{-n}, 2^{-n+1}, \dots, 1 - 2^{-n}\}$ of binary numbers in $[0, 1)$ with $n$ binary places behind the comma (see Definition 3.1).
$q_n$	Quantization function, that maps a real number in $[0, 1]$ to the biggest binary number in $\mathcal{C}_n$ smaller than it (see Definition 3.1).
$\mathbf{e}_K$	The encoder corresponding to the parameter $K \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Definition 3.1).
$\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*}$	The memorizer $\mathbf{m}_{K,M,f^*} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to the function $f^* \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ and the parameters $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Definition 3.1).
$\mathfrak{d}_M$	The decoder corresponding to the parameters $M \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Definition 3.1).
$\mathbf{c}_{f^*,K,M}$	The coding scheme corresponding to the function $f^* \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ and the parameters $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Definition 3.1).

## A.1. Results for convergences of different norms

**Theorem A.1** (Dominated convergence on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ ). *Let  $d_x, d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  be a sequence of itegrable functions that converges to  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  almost-everywhere w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$ . Let additionally  $g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  be a dominating function of  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , i.e. it holds that  $\|f_n(x)\|_p \leq \|g(x)\|_p$  almost everywhere. Then it holds that  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ ,  $\|f_n\|_p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f\|_p$  and additionally  $\|f_n - f\|_p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ .*

*Proof.* As all norms on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  are equivalent it holds that

$$\max_{i \in [d_y]} |(f_n(x))_i| = \|f_n(x)\|_{\max} \leq c \|f_n(x)\|_p \leq \|c \cdot g(x)\|_p,$$

hence all components of  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  have dominating functions for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . As the components also fulfill  $(f_n)_i \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R})$  by the integrability of  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we can apply the usual dominated convergence theorem, e.g. Theorem 10.1 in [14] and obtain that  $\|(f_n)_i\|_p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(f)_i\|_p$ . Note that again because of Theorem 10.1 in [14], all components of  $f$  are integrable, thus  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ . Moreover we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n\|_p^p &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \|f_n(x)\|_p^p dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} |(f_n)_i(x)|^p dx = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_x}} |(f_n)_i(x)|^p dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \|(f_n)_i\|_p^p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \|(f)_i\|_p^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} |(f)_i(x)|^p dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_x}} \|f(x)\|_p^p dx = \|f\|_p^p, \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\|f_n\|_p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f\|_p$ . By applying this convergence result to  $(f_n - f)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , which pointwisely converges to the zero function, we find that

$$\|f_n - f\|_p \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \|0\|_p = 0.$$

■

**Theorem A.2** (Change of variables formula (taken from Theorem 8.4 in [1])). *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be open and  $f : U \rightarrow f(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  a diffeomorphism. Then for a measurable function  $p : f(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we obtain that  $p \in \mathcal{L}^1(f(U))$  if and only if  $x \rightarrow p(f(x)) |\det(Df(x))| \in \mathcal{L}^1(U)$ . In this case the formula*

$$\int_{f(U)} p(x) dx = \int_U p(f(x)) |\det(Df(x))| dx \tag{A.1}$$

holds.

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Theorem 8.4 in [1].

■

## A.2. Determinants and Inverses

**Definition A.3.**  $L(d)$  is the set of all lower-triangular matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , i.e. matrices whose entries above the diagonal are zero. Similarly  $U(d)$  is the set of all upper-triangular matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , i.e. matrices whose entries under the diagonal are zero.  $\text{Diag}(d)$  are all matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , which only have non-zero entries on the diagonal.

**Lemma A.4** (Computation of the determinant). We give two formulas, which will be helpful for the efficient computation of determinants

(1) For matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $A = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_n$  it holds

$$\det A = \det(A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \det A_i .$$

(2) Let  $A \in L(d) \cup U(d) \cup \text{Diag}(d)$  with  $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in [d]}$ , then the determinant of  $A$  is given by

$$\det A = \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,i} .$$

*Proof. (Proof of 1.)* We refer to the proof of Theorem 7.15 in [23].

**(Proof of 2.)** As  $\text{Diag}(d) \subset L(d)$  it is sufficient to show the claim for  $L(d)$  and  $U(d)$ . Let  $S_d$  be the set of all permutations of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $\sigma \in S_d$ . We take a look at all products of the form  $\prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,\sigma(i)}$ , assume that  $\sigma$  is not the identity, then there exist  $i_1, i_2 \in [d]$  s.t.  $i_1 < \sigma(i_1), i_2 > \sigma(i_2)$ , thus  $a_{i_1,\sigma(i_1)}$  is above the diagonal and  $a_{i_2,\sigma(i_2)}$  is beneath the diagonal. Therefore we have that  $a_{i_1,\sigma(i_1)} = 0$  if  $A \in L(d)$  and  $a_{i_2,\sigma(i_2)} = 0$  if  $A \in U(d)$ , which implies that in both cases

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,\sigma(i)} = 0, \tag{1}$$

if  $\sigma \neq \text{Id}$ . By definition of the determinant of a matrix  $A \in L(d)$  or  $A \in U(d)$  it is given by

$$\det A = \sum_{\sigma \in S_d} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,\sigma(i)} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \text{sgn}(\text{Id}) \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,\text{Id}(i)} = \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,i} .$$

■

The following lemma gives a general formula for the inverse and the determinant of the Jacobian of a function given as a function composition. Therefore, it can be useful when we need to infer the form of inverse functions.

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  with  $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$  for some  $i \in [n]$  be  $C^r$ -diffeomorphisms for some  $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $i \in [0, n]$  and let  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$ ,  $f := f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1$ . Furthermore for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$  define  $x_0 := x$ ,  $x_{i+1} = f_i(x_i)$  for  $i \in [0, n]$ . Then it holds that:

(1)  $f$  is a  $C^r$ -diffeomorphism with inverse  $f^{-1} = f_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ f_n^{-1}$ .

(2) Let  $d_i = d$  for  $i \in [0, n]$ , then the determinant of the Jacobi matrix can be computed by the following formula

$$\det Df(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \det Df_i(x_i). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

*Proof. (Proof of (1)):* A direct computation yields that for the given  $f^{-1}$  and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ f^{-1}(x) &= f_n \circ \dots \circ f_1 \circ f_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ f_n^{-1}(x) \stackrel{f_1 \circ f_1^{-1} = Id}{=} f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2 \circ f_2^{-1} \circ \dots \circ f_n^{-1}(x) \\ &\stackrel{f_2 \circ f_2^{-1} = Id}{=} \dots \stackrel{f_{n-1} \circ f_{n-1}^{-1} = Id}{=} f_n \circ f_n^{-1}(x) \stackrel{f_n \circ f_n^{-1} = Id}{=} x \end{aligned}$$

and analogously it follows that  $f^{-1} \circ f(x) = (x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ , which shows that  $f$  is invertible with inverse  $f^{-1} = g_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_n^{-1}$ . By assumption  $f_i, f_i^{-1}$  are  $r$  time continuously differentiable functions, therefore also  $f, f^{-1}$  are  $r$  time continuously differentiable as compositions of such functions.

**(Proof of (2)):** By iteratively applying the chain-rule of calculus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Df(x) &= D(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2)(f_1(x)) \circ Df_1(x) = D(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3)(f_2(x_1)) \circ Df_2(x_1) \circ Df_1(x) \\ &= \dots = Df_n(x_n) \circ Df_{n-1}(x_{n-1}) \circ \dots \circ Df_1(x_1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $x_1 := x$ ,  $x_{i+1} := f_i(x_i)$  for  $i \in [n]$ . As by assumption  $d_i = d$  for all  $i \in [0, n]$ , we know that the Jacobi matrices  $Df_i(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , hence we can combine this with [Lemma A.4 \(2\)](#) to obtain

$$\det Df(x) = \det(Df_n(x_n) \circ Df_{n-1}(x_{n-1}) \circ \dots \circ Df_1(x_1)) \stackrel{\text{Lemma A.4}}{=} \prod_{i=1}^n \det Df_i(x_i).$$

■

**Theorem A.6** (Inverse function theorem (Satz 1.(ii)) in [\[16\]](#)). Let  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be open and  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  a  $C^1$ -function. If  $\det Df(x) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}$ , then  $f$  is a  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism, i.e.  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow f(\mathcal{O})$  and the inverse function  $f^{-1} : f(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  are both continuously differentiable bijections.

*Proof.* We refer to the proof of Satz 1.(ii) in [\[16\]](#).

■

### A.3. Definition and existence of the $LU$ -decomposition

**Definition A.7** ( $L_{1,\text{GL}}(d)$  and  $U_{\text{GL}}(d)$ ). We define  $U_{\text{GL}}(d) := \text{GL}(d) \cap U(d)$  as the set of all invertible upper-triangular matrices, i.e. upper triangular matrices s.t. all diagonal entries are non-zero. Moreover we define  $L_{1,\text{GL}}(d)$  as the set of all invertible lower-triangular matrices  $\text{GL}(d) \cap L(d)$  s.t. the diagonal entries are all given by 1.

**Definition A.8.** Let  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  be an invertible square matrix, then we say that  $A$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition if there are  $L \in L_{1,\text{GL}}(d), U_{\text{GL}} \in U(d)$ , hence

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, U = \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,1} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & u_{i,i} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & u_{d,d} \end{pmatrix},$$

such that  $A = LU$ . Note that because of the invertibility of  $L, U$  we know that for each  $LU$ -decomposition  $A = LU$  it holds that  $l_{j,j} = 1, u_{j,j} \neq 0$  for all  $j \in [d]$  for the diagonal entries of  $L$  and  $U$ .

We begin this subsection by characterizing under which circumstances a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition. Note that this decomposition can also be introduced for non-square matrices or non-regular matrices, but since we are specifically interested in  $LU$ -decompositions of regular matrices, we restrict the results in this chapter to this case.

**Definition A.9** (Leading principal minors). Let  $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in [d]} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , then for  $k \in [d]$  we define the  $k$ -th leading submatrix by  $A_k = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in [k]}$  and the  $k$ -th leading principal minor by  $\det(A_k)$ . If we say that all leading principal minors of  $A$  are non-zero, we mean that for all  $k \in [d]$  it holds that  $\det(A_k) \neq 0$ .

**Theorem A.10** (Existence and uniqueness of a  $LU$ -decomposition). An invertible square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition if and only if all leading principal minors of  $A$  are non-zero. In this case the  $LU$ -decomposition is unique.

*Proof. (Existence:)* " $\implies$ " : Assume that  $A$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition, thus  $A = LU$  and assume that there exists  $k \in [d]$  s.t. the leading principal minor  $\det(A_k) = 0$ . Let  $L_k, U_k$  be the  $k$ -th leading submatrices of  $L, U$  as in [Definition A.9](#), then

$$A_k = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in [k]} = \left( \sum_{n=1}^d l_{i,n} u_{n,j} \right)_{i,j \in [k]} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \left( \sum_{n=1}^k l_{i,n} u_{n,j} \right)_{i,j \in [k]} \stackrel{(1)}{=} L_k U_k, \quad (2)$$

where we used that  $l_{i,j} = 0 = u_{j,i}, \forall j \geq i$  by the triangular structure of  $L$  and  $U$ . By the definition of  $L$  it has only ones on the diagonal, hence this holds also for  $L_k$  and we find that

$$0 \stackrel{(\text{assumption})}{=} \det(A_k) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \det(L_k) \det(U_k) \stackrel{(2. \text{ in } \text{Lemma A.4})}{=} \prod_{i=1}^k l_{i,i} \prod_{i=1}^k u_{i,i} \stackrel{l_{i,i}=1}{=} \prod_{i=1}^k u_{i,i},$$

thus there is  $l \in [k]$  s.t.  $u_{l,l} = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $U$  is invertible and hence  $u_{i,i} \neq 0, i \in [d]$ .

”  $\Leftarrow$  ” : Let  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  be a matrix with all leading principal minors non-zero. We show the claim per induction, for  $d = 1$  it is obvious, that  $A = \alpha \neq 0$ , hence setting  $L = 1, U = \alpha$  suffices. Now assume that the claim holds for any matrix  $B \in \text{GL}(d)$ , let  $A \in \text{GL}(d + 1)$  with all principal minors non-zero. We search a  $LU$ -decomposition of the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1,1} & A_{1,2} \\ A_{2,1} & a_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} = LU = \begin{pmatrix} L_{1,1} & 0 \\ L_{2,1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_{1,1} & U_{1,2} \\ 0 & u_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} L_{1,1}U_{1,1} & L_{1,1}U_{1,2} \\ L_{2,1}U_{1,1} & L_{2,1}U_{1,2} + u_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $A_{1,1} = L_{1,1}U_{1,1}$  is the already known  $LU$ -decomposition of  $A_{1,1} \in \text{GL}(d)$ , which exists by the induction assumption.

**1. Case:** ( $A_{2,1} = (0, \dots, 0)$ ): Then  $(0, \dots, 0) = A_{2,1} = L_{2,1}U_{1,1}$  and as  $U_{1,1}$  is invertible, also  $L_{2,1} = (0, \dots, 0) \cdot U_{1,1}^{-1} = (0, \dots, 0)$ , thus  $a_{2,2} = L_{2,1}U_{1,2} + u_{2,2} = u_{2,2}$ . Moreover

$$A_{1,2} = L_{1,1}U_{1,2} \iff L_{1,1}^{-1}A_{1,2} = U_{1,2}$$

and with that we have obtained a  $LU$ -decomposition of  $A$ .

**2. Case:** ( $A_{2,1} \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ ): As by assumption  $A_{1,1}$  is invertible, its rows build a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , hence we can write the vector  $0 \neq A_{d+1,1:d} = A_{2,1} = y^T A_{1,1} \stackrel{\text{A.3}}{=} L_{2,1}U_{1,1}$  for some  $0 \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , which gives us

$$y^T L_{1,1}U_{1,1} = y^T A_{1,1} = L_{2,1}U_{1,1} \implies L_{2,1} = y^T L_{1,1}.$$

Moreover from the equation  $A_{1,2} \stackrel{\text{A.3}}{=} L_{1,1}U_{1,2}$  it follow that  $U_{1,2} = L_{1,1}^{-1}A_{1,2}$ . As  $L_{2,2} \in \mathbb{R}$  it must be  $L_{2,2} = 1$ , by substituting our other finding we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2,2} &= L_{2,1}U_{1,2} + u_{2,2} = y^T L_{1,1}L_{1,1}^{-1}A_{1,2} + u_{2,2} = y^T A_{1,2} + u_{2,2} \\ \implies u_{2,2} &= a_{2,2} - y^T A_{1,2} = a_{2,2} - y^T L_{1,1}U_{1,2} = a_{2,2} - L_{2,1}U_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that  $u_{2,2} = 0$ , meaning that  $U$  would be singular, then  $a_{2,2} \stackrel{\text{A.4}}{=} y^T A_{1,2}$ . But as already  $A_{2,1} = y^T A_{1,1}$  this would imply that

$$y^T A_{1:d,[d+1]} = (A_{2,1}, a_{2,2}) = A_{d+1,[d+1]},$$

which would imply that the rows of  $A$  are linearly dependent, contradicting the fact that  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$ . Therefore we have found a  $LU$ -decomposition

$$A = LU = \begin{pmatrix} L_{1,1} & 0 \\ y^T L_{1,1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_{1,1} & L_{1,1}^{-1}A_{1,2} \\ 0 & a_{2,2} - L_{2,1}U_{1,2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

**(Uniqueness:)** Let  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  be a  $LU$ -decomposable matrix and consider two  $LU$ -decompositions, hence  $A = L_1U_1 = L_2U_2$ . Define  $B := L_2^{-1}L_1$ , then  $BU_1 = L_2^{-1}L_1U_1 =$



$U_2$ . Moreover as the inverse and products of matrices in  $L_1(d)$  are again in  $L_1(d)$ , it follows that  $B \in L_1(d)$ . We show that  $B = I$ , for that assume the contrary, then it follows that there must be an entry  $1 \leq j < i \leq d$  with minimal  $j$  such that  $b_{i,j} \neq 0$ . Here with the minimality of  $j$  it's meant, that  $b_{i,k} = 0, k \in [j-1]$ . But then it follows

$$(u_2)_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^d b_{i,k}(u_1)_{k,j} \stackrel{U_1 \in U(d)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^j b_{i,k}(u_1)_{k,j} \stackrel{b_{i,k}=0, k \in [j-1]}{=} b_{i,j}(u_1)_{j,j} \neq 0,$$

which contradicts that  $U_2$  is upper-triangular, as  $j < i$ . Because this implies  $B = I$  we can also conclude

$$U_1 = BU_1 = L_2^{-1}L_1 = U_2,$$

thus the  $LU$ -decompositions coincide. As they were chosen arbitrarily, the  $LU$ -decomposition is unique for all matrices  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Definition A.11.** We define  $\text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  as the set of all invertible matrices  $A \in \text{GL}(d)$  s.t.  $A$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition and  $\text{Aff}_{LU}(d) = \{f(x) = Ax + b | A \in \text{Mat}_{LU}(d), b \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$  the set of all affine transformation where the matrix  $A$  has a  $LU$ -decomposition. Additionally we set  $\text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d) := \{f(x) = Ax + b | A \in \text{GL}(d), b \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$  and note that if the dimension  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  is fixed, we might also just write  $\text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}$  for  $\text{Aff}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  or  $\text{Aff}_{LU}$  for  $\text{Aff}_{LU}(d)$ .

**Remark A.12.** By [Theorem A.10](#) we know that  $\text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  are all invertible matrices s.t. all leading principal minors are non-zero. Define a matrix  $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in [d]} = A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with the leftmost entry  $a_{1,1} = 0$ , but  $\det(A) \neq 0$ . Then it holds that  $\det A_1 = 0$ , i.e. the first principal minor is zero, thus by [Theorem A.10](#) it has no  $LU$ -decomposition. Note that this shows that  $\text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d) \subsetneq \text{GL}(d)$ .

**Lemma A.13** ( $\text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  w.r.t. any operator-norm). Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and let  $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$  any operator norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , then it exists  $\tilde{A} \in \text{Mat}_{LU}(d)$  s.t.  $\|A - \tilde{A}\|_{\text{op}} < \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* **(1)** We begin with a supplementary result and show that for each  $k \in [0, d-1]$  and a singular matrix of the form

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} D & b_{[k],k+1} \\ b_{k+1,[k]} & b_{k+1,k+1} \end{pmatrix}, D \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k), B \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1},$$

we find a regular matrix  $B^{(\delta)}$  of the form

$$B^{(\delta)} = \begin{pmatrix} D & b_{[k],k+1} \\ b_{k+1,[k]}^{(\delta)} & b_{k+1,k+1}^{(\delta)} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k+1),$$

thus the upper left block  $D \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k)$  is still the same as the one of  $B$ , which satisfy  $\|b_{k+1}^T - (b_{k+1}^{(\delta)})^T\|_{\max} < \delta$ , where  $b_{k+1}, b_{k+1}^{(\delta)}$  denotes the  $k+1$  row of  $B$  and  $B^{(\delta)}$  respectively.

**(Proof of (1):)**

For  $k = 0$  it holds  $0 = B \in \mathbb{R}$  as  $B$  is singular and  $B^{(\delta)} := \delta$  finishes the claim. For

$k \in [d-1]$ , as  $D \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k)$  it's also regular, thus its rows are linearly independent and the first  $k$  rows  $b_k$  of  $B$  are linearly independent. Therefore by the basis-extension theorem and by scaling the vector that we obtain with it we can find  $v_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ ,  $(v_{k+1})_i \leq 1 \forall i \in [k+1]$  s.t.  $b_i = (d_i, b_{i,k+1})$ ,  $i \in [k]$ ,  $v_{k+1}$  are linearly independent. Moreover as the rows of  $B$  are linearly dependent, because its singular and as the first  $k$  rows are linearly independent there are  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ ,  $i \in [k]$  not all zero, s.t.

$$b_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i^{k+1} b_i$$

We define  $B^{(\delta)}$  row-wise by

$$b_i^{(\delta)} = b_i, i \in [k], b_{k+1}^{(\delta)} = b_{k+1} + \delta v_{k+1},$$

which we define later and show that all rows of  $B^{(\delta)}$  are linearly independent. Assume that the rows of  $B^{(\delta)}$  are linearly dependent, then because the first  $k$  rows of  $B^{(\delta)}$  are still linearly independent, there exist  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in [k+1]$ ,  $\exists j \in [k] : \alpha_j \neq 0, \alpha_{k+1} \neq 0$  s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i b_i^{(\delta)} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i b_i + \alpha_{k+1} (b_{k+1} + \delta v_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i b_i + \alpha_{k+1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i^{k+1} b_i + \delta v_{k+1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (\alpha_i + \alpha_{k+1} \alpha_i^{k+1}) b_i + \alpha_{k+1} \delta v_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the linear independence of  $b_i = (d_i, b_{i,k+1})$ ,  $i \in [k]$ ,  $v_{k+1}$  as not all factors are non-zero, thus  $B^{(\delta)} \in \text{GL}(k+1)$  is of the claimed structure and as  $D \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k)$  it follows also that  $B^{(\delta)} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k)$ .

**(2)** Now we are ready to show the claim of the lemma: If  $A \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$  then the claim is trivial with  $\tilde{A} := A$ , so we can assume that  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \setminus \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$ . Thus there exists a smallest  $k_1 + 1 \in [d]$  s.t. the leading minor is zero, i.e.  $\det A_{k_1+1} = 0$ , which implies that  $A_{k_1+1}$  is of the form of  $B$  in part (1) and we can obtain a  $A_{k_1+1}^{(\delta)} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(k_1 + 1)$ . We define the matrix  $\tilde{A}^{1,(\delta)}$  by

$$\tilde{A}^{1,(\delta)} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{k_1+1}^{(\delta)} & a_{[k_1+1],[k_1+2,d]} \\ a_{[k_1+2,d],[k_1+1]} & a_{[k_1+2,d],[k_1+2,d]} \end{pmatrix}$$

hence we obtain  $\tilde{A}^{1,(\delta)}$  by exchanging  $A_{k_1+1}$  in  $A$  by  $A_{k_1+1}^{(\delta)}$ . As long as for some  $i \in [d]$  the matrix  $\tilde{A}^{i,(\delta)} \notin \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$ , we iterate this procedure, obtaining a new smallest index  $k_{i+1} > k_i$  s.t.  $\tilde{A}_{k_{i+1}+1}^{i,(\delta)}$  is singular and finding  $\tilde{A}^{i+1,(\delta)} \in \text{GL}(k_{i+1} + 1)$ , or  $\tilde{A}^{i+1,(\delta)} \in \text{Mat}_{LU}(d)$  and the procedure terminates. Note that therefore after  $m \in [d]$  iterations the procedure delivers  $\tilde{A} := \tilde{A}^{i,(\delta)} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}(d)$ . Let  $\|A\|_{\max} := \max_{i,j \in [d]} |a_{i,j}|$  denote the maximums-norm for matrices and  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$  an arbitrary operator norm for matrices, then for

$\epsilon > 0$  it only remains to show that there exist  $\tilde{A} \in \text{LU}_{\text{GL}}$  s.t.  $\|\tilde{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} < \epsilon$ . Because  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \in \mathbb{N}$  is finite dimensional all matrix norms are equivalent and it follows that there is  $c > 0$  s.t.  $\|B\|_{\text{op}} \leq c\|B\|_{\text{max}} \forall B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Choose  $0 < \delta < \frac{\epsilon}{c}$ , then by (1) the entries of  $\tilde{A}^{m,(\delta)}$  only differ by  $\delta$  and we find that

$$\|\tilde{A} - A\| \leq c\|\tilde{A} - A\|_{\text{max}} = c \max_{i,j \in [d]} \{|\tilde{a}_{i,j} - a_{i,j}|\} \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} c\delta < \epsilon.$$

■

#### A.4. Rosenblatt transformation and convergence in distribution

**Lemma A.14** ( $\mathcal{P}_{\text{abs}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  dense in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ). *Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , then there exist a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of absolutely continuous probability measures, which converges to  $\mu$  in distribution.*

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , consider the mollifiers  $J_\epsilon$  and  $J, J_\epsilon$  with  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $J_\epsilon(x) := \epsilon^{-d} J(\frac{x}{\epsilon})$  from [Definition 2.26](#), which have the property  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_\epsilon = 1$  and is smooth by [Lemma 2.30](#). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  consider  $p_n(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_{\frac{1}{n}}(x - y) d\mu(y)$ , which is well-defined as  $J_{\frac{1}{n}}(x - \cdot)$  is continuous and thus  $\mu$ -measurable. Note that  $p_n$  defines a probability density as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_n(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_{\frac{1}{n}}(x - y) d\mu(y) dx \stackrel{\text{Fubini}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_{\frac{1}{n}}(x - y) dx}_{=1 \text{ by Def. 2.26}} d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu(y) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can set  $\mu_n$  to be the probability measure with density  $p_n$ , which makes it absolutely continuous by definition. Moreover by the change of variables formula from [Theorem A.2](#), applied to the diffeomorphism

$$\phi_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} y + \epsilon x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, |\det \phi(x, y)| = \prod_{i=1}^d \left| \frac{\partial \phi_i(x)}{\partial x_i} \right| \underbrace{\prod_{j=d+1}^{2d} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_j(x)}{\partial y_j} \right|}_{=1} = \epsilon^d. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Now for any  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$  bounded by  $c > 0$  in absolute value, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_n \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) J_{\frac{1}{n}}(x - y) d\mu(y) dx \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) n^d J(n(x - y)) d\mu(y) dx \right| \\ &\stackrel{\epsilon = \frac{1}{n} \text{ in A.14}}{=} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) \phi(x) dx d\mu(y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y + \frac{x}{n}) J(x) d\mu(y) dx \right| \\ &\stackrel{\text{Fubini}}{=} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(y) - f(y + \frac{x}{n})) J(x) dx d\mu(y) \right| \xrightarrow{\text{dom. convergence, } n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

as  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y + \frac{x}{n}) = f(y)$  by the continuity of  $f$  and where we could apply the Theorem of dominated convergence (see Theorem 10.1 in [14]), because  $2cJ$  is a dominating function that is integrable by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(y) - f(y + \frac{x}{n})) J(x) dx d\mu(y) &\stackrel{0 \leq J}{\leq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(y) - f(y + \frac{x}{n})| J(x) dx d\mu(y) \\ &\stackrel{|f| \leq c}{\leq} 2c \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J(x) dx d\mu(y)}_{=1} = 2c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\mu(y) \stackrel{\mu(y) \in P(\mathbb{R}^d)}{=} 2c. \end{aligned}$$

■

**Lemma A.15** (Lemma: Leibniz integral rule (adjusted version of Theorem 3 in chapter 8 of [31])). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuous s.t. also  $\frac{\partial f(x,t)}{\partial x}$  is continuous and let  $a, b : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuously differentiable, then it holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dx} \int_{a(x)}^{b(x)} f(x,t) dt = f(x, b(x)) \frac{db(x)}{dx} - f(x, a(x)) \frac{da(x)}{dx} + \int_{a(x)}^{b(x)} \frac{\partial f(x,t)}{\partial x} dt.$$

*Proof.* We reference to the proof of Theorem 3 in chapter 8 of [31], which is a generalization of this lemma. ■

**Lemma A.16** ((see Lemma 4 in [35])). *Let  $\mu$  be an absolutely continuous probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a smooth density function  $p$ . Let  $M := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : p(x) > 0\}$ . Then there exists a  $C^\infty$ -diffeomorphism  $T : M \rightarrow (0, 1)^d$  such that its Jacobian is upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal, i.e.  $T \in \mathcal{T}^\infty$  and  $T_*\mu = \mathcal{U}(0, 1)^d$ , where  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)^d$  is the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]^d$ .*

*Proof.* In this proof we follow the idea from [32]: Let  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  a tuple of real-valued random variables, w.r.t. a probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, P)$  with joint probability distribution given by  $\mu$ , which has the smooth density  $p$  and set

$$\begin{aligned} q_i : \mathbb{R}^i &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, q_i(x_1, \dots, x_i) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-i}} p(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_d) dy_{i+1} \dots dy_d \\ &= \mu(\{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_i\}) = P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_i = x_i), \end{aligned}$$

for  $i \in [d]$ . Moreover for  $i \in [d]$  we denote the distribution functions, conditioned on the first  $i - 1$  values of  $X$  being fixed, by  $F(x_i | y_{i-1}, \dots, y_1)$ . Now we define the Rosenblatt transformation  $T : M \rightarrow (0, 1)^d$  component-wise by

$$T : M \rightarrow (0, 1)^d, (T(x_1, \dots, x_d))_i := \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} \frac{q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} dy_i,$$

for  $i \in [d]$  and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
(T(x_1, \dots, x_d))_i &= \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} \frac{\mu(\{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}\} \times \{y_i\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-i})}{\mu(\{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-i+1})} dy \\
&= \frac{\mu(\{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}\} \times \{(-\infty, x_i]\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-i})}{\mu(\{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-i+1})} \\
&= \mu(\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_i \leq x_i | y_1 = x_1, \dots, y_{i-1} = x_{i-1}\}) \\
&= F(x_i | x_{i-1}, \dots, x_1) \stackrel{x \in M}{\in} (0, 1),
\end{aligned}$$

This clarifies that  $T$  takes values in  $(0, 1)^d$  and additionally we note that  $T$  is well-defined, as the denominator is greater than zero on  $M$  by definition. define the transformed random variables by

$$(Z_1, \dots, Z_d) = T(X_1, \dots, X_d),$$

which then follows the probability distribution  $T_*\mu$ . Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\{Z_i \leq z_i, i \in [d]\}) &= \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d | Z_i(x) \leq z_i \forall i \in [d]\}) \\
&= \mu(\{x_1 \in \mathbb{R} | F(x_1) \leq z_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_d \in \mathbb{R} | F(x_d | x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) \leq z_d\}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we inserted the form of  $Z_i$ , which we obtained earlier. For  $i \in [d]$ , fixed  $x_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{R}^{i-1}$  we define  $A_i := \{x_i \in \mathbb{R} | F(x_i | x_{i-1}, \dots, x_1) \leq z_i\}$ ,  $\tilde{x}_i := \max A_i$  and note that as the conditioned distribution functions are monoton it holds that

$$\int_{A_i} f(x_i | x_{i-1}, \dots, x_1) dx_i = F(\tilde{x}_i | x_{i-1}, \dots, x_1) = z_i \quad \forall i \in [d]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By combining this with our equation from earlier we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\{Z_i \leq z_i, i \in [d]\}) &= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_d} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) dx_d \dots dx_1 \\
&= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_d} \prod_{i=1}^d f(x_i | x_{i-1}, \dots, x_1) dx_d \dots dx_1 \\
&= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_d} f(x_d | x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) dx_d f(x_{d-1} | x_{d-2}, \dots, x_1) dx_{d-1} \dots dx_2 f(x_1) dx_1 \\
&= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_d} f(x_d | x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) dx_d f(x_{d-1} | x_{d-2}, \dots, x_1) dx_{d-1} \dots dx_2 f(x_1) dx_1 \\
&\stackrel{\text{A.5}}{=} \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_{d-1}} z_d f(x_{d-1} | x_{d-2}, \dots, x_1) dx_{d-1} \dots dx_2 f(x_1) dx_1 = \dots = \prod_{i=1}^d z_i,
\end{aligned}$$

which is the probability distribution function of the uniform distribution, which shows that  $T_*\mu \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)^d$ .

Now we show that  $T \in \mathcal{T}^\infty$  is a triangular transformation. By definition the  $i$ -th component of  $T$  only depends on the first  $i$  input components. For the multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in [d]^k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  it follows from the Leibniz rule in [Lemma A.15](#) that

$$\partial^\alpha q_i(x_1, \dots, x_i) = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-i}} \partial^\alpha p(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_d) dy_{i+1} \dots dy_d & \alpha_j \in [i] \forall j \in [k] \\ 0 & \exists j \in [k] : \alpha_j > i \end{cases},$$

which exists as  $p$  is smooth, thus  $q_i$  is also smooth for all  $i \in [d]$ . Because of the Leibniz rule we additionally conclude

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (T(x_1, \dots, x_d))_i = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} dy_i & j \in [i-1], \\ \frac{q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} & j = i, \\ 0 & j \in [i+1, d], \end{cases}$$

thus  $(T(x))_i$  is strictly increasing w.r.t.  $x_i$  as  $\frac{q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} > 0$  for all  $x \in M$ . We again consider a multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in [d]^k$ ,  $\alpha^{(j)} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{j-1}, \alpha_{j+1}, \dots, \alpha)$  and the iterative application of the Leibniz rule in [Lemma A.15](#) yields that

$$\partial^\alpha (T(x_1, \dots, x_d))_i = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} \frac{\partial^\alpha q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} dy_i & \forall j \in [k] : \alpha_j \in [i-1], \\ \frac{\partial^{\alpha^{(j)}} q_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i)}{q_{i-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})} & \exists j \in [k] : \alpha_j = i, \\ 0 & \exists j \in [k] : \alpha_j \in [i+1, d], \end{cases}$$

therefore  $T$  is smooth. Moreover we observe that the total derivative of  $T$  is lower triangular with positive values on the diagonal, thus it holds that  $\det(DT(x)) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This makes the inverse function [Theorem A.6](#) applicable and we obtain that  $T^{-1}$  is also smooth, which implies that  $T$  is a  $C^\infty$ -diffeomorphism, thus  $T \in \mathcal{T}^\infty$  altogether. ■