

Adversarially robust generalization theory via Jacobian regularization for deep neural networks

Dongya Wu^{a,*}, Xin Li^{b,**}

^a*School of Information Science and Technology, Northwest University, Xi'an, 710069, China*

^b*School of Mathematics, Northwest University, Xi'an, 710069, China*

Abstract

Powerful deep neural networks are vulnerable to adversarial attacks. To obtain adversarially robust models, researchers have separately developed adversarial training and Jacobian regularization techniques. There are abundant theoretical and empirical studies for adversarial training, but theoretical foundations for Jacobian regularization are still lacking. In this study, we show that Jacobian regularization is closely related to adversarial training in that ℓ_2 or ℓ_1 Jacobian regularized loss serves as an approximate upper bound on the adversarially robust loss under ℓ_2 or ℓ_∞ adversarial attack respectively. Further, we establish the robust generalization gap for Jacobian regularized risk minimizer via bounding the Rademacher complexity of both the standard loss function class and Jacobian regularization function class. Our theoretical results indicate that the norms of Jacobian are related to both standard and robust generalization. We also perform experiments on MNIST data classification to demonstrate that Jacobian regularized risk minimization indeed serves as a surrogate for adversarially robust risk minimization, and that reducing the norms of Jacobian can improve both standard and robust generalization. This study promotes both theoretical and empirical understandings to adversarially robust generalization via Jacobian regularization.

Keywords: deep neural networks, Jacobian regularization, adversarial attack, robust generalization, Rademacher complexity

*Corresponding author

**Corresponding author

Email addresses: wudongya@nwu.edu.cn (Dongya Wu), lixin@nwu.edu.cn (Xin Li)

1. Introduction

Deep neural networks have achieved the state-of-the-art performance in various tasks such as image classification, speech recognition, object recognition, natural language processing and so on (LeCun et al., 2015). However, deep neural networks are vulnerable to adversarial attacks (Szegedy et al., 2013; Goodfellow et al., 2014) and the generalization performance is dramatically impaired by these adversarial samples (Madry et al., 2017).

To obtain adversarially robust generalization for deep neural networks, adversarial training (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2015; Shaham et al., 2015; Madry et al., 2017; Gowal et al., 2020) has been developed as one of the most effective defense methods against adversarial attacks (Qian et al., 2022). Adversarial training aims to achieve robust generalization on each sample x within a small perturbation $\|x' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon$ via the empirical adversarial risk minimization

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\|x'_i - x_i\|_p \leq \epsilon} \ell(f(x'_i), y_i), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the hypothesis class, $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are n training examples drawn from distribution \mathcal{D} , $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the loss function. It is important to theoretically characterize the generalization of adversarial training by bounding the robust generalization gap between the expected adversarial risk and the empirical adversarial risk

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \max_{\|x' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon} \ell(f(x'), y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\|x'_i - x_i\|_p \leq \epsilon} \ell(f(x'_i), y_i). \quad (2)$$

In the standard setting without adversarial attacks, it is well known in statistical learning theory that the generalization gap can be bounded by the Rademacher complexity (Bartlett and Mendelson, 2002) and then the Rademacher complexity of deep neural networks has been established (Bartlett et al., 2017; Neyshabur et al., 2017; Golowich et al., 2018; Taheri et al., 2021). To bound the robust generalization gap in the adversarial setting, Khim and Loh (2018) and Yin et al. (2018) showed that the robust generalization gap can be bounded by the adversarial Rademacher complexity, which is an extending of

the Rademacher complexity. However, it is difficult to bound the adversarial Rademacher complexity of deep neural networks due to the max operation in the adversarially robust loss, i.e., $\max_{\|x'-x\|_p \leq \epsilon} \ell(f(x'), y)$. One type of studies designed surrogate losses of the adversarially robust loss and provided bounds on the surrogate losses, such as the tree-transformation surrogate loss (Khim and Loh, 2018), the SDP relaxation surrogate loss (Yin et al., 2018) and the FGSM surrogate loss (Gao and Wang, 2021). Another type of studies bounds the adversarial Rademacher complexity via calculating the covering number of adversarial function classes (Xiao et al., 2022; Mustafa et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2024).

Another way to achieve adversarially robust generalization is via Jacobian regularization (Sokolić et al., 2017; Varga et al., 2017; Hoffman et al., 2019; Jakubovitz and Giryas, 2018; Chan et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2024). Hoffman et al. (2019) showed that Jacobian regularization increases classification margins and outperforms an adversarial training defense to achieve lower adversarially robust generalization error. Liu et al. (2024) utilized Jacobian regularization to improve both robust generalization and prediction interpretability in the adversarial setting. There is also an empirical study which showed that the norm of Jacobian correlates well with generalization (Novak et al., 2018). Even though it is well known that Jacobian regularization can make the model more stable with respect to input perturbations (Hoffman et al., 2019), however, there is still no theoretical guarantee for the adversarially robust generalization gap achieved via Jacobian regularization.

The contributions of our study are summarized in the following aspects. Firstly, we show that Jacobian regularization is closely related to adversarial training in the sense that the Jacobian regularized loss serves as an approximate upper bound on the adversarially robust loss, while former researches only study adversarial training and Jacobian regularization separately. Secondly, we provide the first robust generalization bound for deep neural networks via Jacobian regularization. The key ingredients in obtaining the robust generalization bound are the control of the Rademacher complexity of the standard loss function class and the Jacobian regularization function class. Thirdly, unlike most results focusing on the Rademacher complexity of real-valued models, we bound the Rademacher complexity for widely-used vector-valued models, such as the multi-class classification in practice. We do not use the commonly-used vector-contraction inequality to bound the Rademacher complexity of vector-valued models, due to the disadvantage that the result may explicitly depend on the output dimension. Instead, the

covering number technique is adopted with no explicit dependence on the output dimension. In addition, the Rademacher complexity of the Jacobian regularization function class is novel to the best of our knowledge and has never been studied before. Beyond the adversarially robust generalization, this will also be interested in the field where gradient regularization is used, such as nonparametric sparse variable selection (Rosasco et al., 2013).

Notations. We end this section by introducing some useful notations. For a vector $x = (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define the ℓ_p -norm of x as $\|x\|_p = (\sum_{j=1}^d |x^j|^p)^{1/p}$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ with $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,d} |x^i|$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$, let A_{ij} ($i = 1, \dots, d_1, j = 1, 2, \dots, d_2$) denote its ij -th entry, $A_{i\cdot}$ ($i = 1, \dots, d_1$) denote its i -th row, $A_{\cdot j}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, d_2$) denote its j -th column. Let $\|A\|_F$ denote the Frobenius norm, $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$ denote the spectral norm, and $\|A\|_{1,1}$ denote the ℓ_1 -norm along all the entries of A .

2. Related works

Our study that establishes the robust generalization gap of Jacobian regularization is related to both the adversarial training and Jacobian or gradient regularization.

Adversarial training. Adversarial training is one of the most effective methods to achieve robust generalization and many studies have established the generalization property of adversarial training theoretically. The theoretical studies either adopt surrogate losses of the adversarially robust loss (Khim and Loh, 2018; Yin et al., 2018; Gao and Wang, 2021) or directly bound the adversarial Rademacher complexity via covering number (Xiao et al., 2022; Mustafa et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2024). The loss with Jacobian regularization in our study serves as an upper bound of the first order approximation of adversarially robust loss. Therefore, our study also belongs to the method of surrogate losses of adversarially robust loss. The main difference between our study and previous studies lies in that the theory in our study matches with practice perfectly. Specifically, previous studies still rely on projected gradient descent adversarial training (Madry et al., 2017) and thus there is a mismatch between the surrogate loss used in theory and the training objective used in practice. In our study, since Jacobian regularization can be easily optimized, we optimize the surrogate loss with Jacobian regularization to achieve robust generalization, in which way the practice is

guaranteed to match with our theoretical analysis on the surrogate loss with Jacobian regularization.

Jacobian or gradient regularization. Though there are a variety of related works which empirically show that Jacobian or gradient regularization can improve models’ robustness to adversarial attacks (Varga et al., 2017; Hoffman et al., 2019; Jakubovitz and Giryes, 2018; Chan et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2024; Lyu et al., 2015; Ororbia II et al., 2017; Ross and Doshi-Velez, 2017), theoretical analysis on the generalization is still lacking. We here establish the generalization gap of Jacobian regularization and demonstrate its ability to achieve robust generalization theoretically. The main difference between the Jacobian regularization in Hoffman et al. (2019) and that in our study lies in that we propose two Jacobian regularizations $\|\mathcal{J}\|_F^2$ and $\|\mathcal{J}\|_{1,1}$ against ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ attack respectively. And the Jacobian regularization in Hoffman et al. (2019) is developed separately with adversarial training, while we link Jacobian regularization to adversarial training via the first order approximation. Lyu et al. (2015) also link the gradient of the loss function to adversarial training via the first order approximation. The main difference is that Jacobian regularization regularize the gradient of the model. If we adopt the cross entropy loss or mean squared loss, the gradient of the loss function is small if the loss is small, but the gradient of the model can still be large.

3. Problem setup

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the input prediction variable and $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be the response variable. The pair (x, y) obeys a distribution $\mathcal{D}(x, y)$ on a sample space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, and the marginal distribution of x is $\mathcal{D}_x(x)$. To learn the relationship between x and y in the standard setting, the learning problem is to minimize the expected risk $R(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell(f(x), y)]$, where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the loss function and $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with \mathcal{F} being the hypothesis class of deep neural networks in this study. A deep neural network $f_\Theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with L layers can be represented as

$$f_\Theta(x) = \theta_L \sigma(\theta_{L-1} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots), \quad (3)$$

where $\theta_l \in \mathbb{R}^{d_l \times d_{l-1}}$ ($l = 1, \dots, L$, $d_0 = d$, $d_L = k$), $\Theta = \{\theta_L, \theta_{L-1}, \dots, \theta_1\}$, and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the activation function, which is assumed to be 1-Lipschitz and to satisfy $\sigma(0) = 0$. Then it follows that $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\Theta : f_\Theta \text{ satisfies (3)}\}$. Since the distribution \mathcal{D} is unknown, we can only get a finite dataset \mathbb{D} with n

independently and identically distributed samples $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ drawn from \mathcal{D} . We can thus minimize the empirical risk $R_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(x_i), y_i)$. The gap between the expected risk and the empirical risk is known as the generalization gap.

In the adversarial setting, define the adversarially robust loss as

$$\tilde{\ell}(f(x), y) = \max_{\|x' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon} \ell(f(x'), y), \quad (4)$$

which is the maximum loss within a perturbation ball centered at x . Define the adversarial expected risk as $\tilde{R}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\tilde{\ell}(f(x), y)]$ and the adversarial empirical risk as $\tilde{R}_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\ell}(f(x_i), y_i)$. To learn models robust to adversarial attacks, adversarial training minimizes the adversarial empirical risk. The gap between the adversarial expected risk and the adversarial empirical risk is known as the robust generalization gap.

Define the loss function class as $\ell_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\ell(f(x), y) | f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and the robust loss function class as $\tilde{\ell}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\tilde{\ell}(f(x), y) | f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then the generalization gap and robust generalization gap can be bounded by the Rademacher complexity of $\ell_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\tilde{\ell}_{\mathcal{F}}$ respectively.

Definition 1 (Rademacher complexity). *Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n be n independent Rademacher random variables that take values of 1 or -1 with probability $1/2$. Given a dataset $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with n independent samples drawn from $\mathcal{D}_x(x)$, the empirical Rademacher complexity of hypothesis class \mathcal{F} is defined as*

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f(x_i) \right].$$

Proposition 1. (Bartlett and Mendelson, 2002) *Suppose the loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is bounded between $[0, B]$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$R(f) \leq R_n(f) + 2\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}}) + 3B \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2n}}.$$

Proposition 2. (Yin et al., 2018) *Suppose the loss function $\tilde{\ell}(f(x), y)$ is bounded between $[0, B]$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$\tilde{R}(f) \leq \tilde{R}_n(f) + 2\mathcal{R}_S(\tilde{\ell}_{\mathcal{F}}) + 3B \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2n}}.$$

The above bounds hold uniformly for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, especially for the minimizer of the empirical risk or adversarial empirical risk. It is easy to see that the key ingredient of the generalization gap is the Rademacher complexity. In the standard setting with no adversarial attacks, the Rademacher complexity of the deep neural network has been relatively well developed. While in the adversarial setting, it is difficult to bound the adversarial Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_S(\tilde{\ell}_{\mathcal{F}})$ for the deep neural network due to the max operation in (4).

4. Main results

4.1. Surrogate robust loss with Jacobian regularization

Since solving the adversarially robust loss in (4) and bounding the adversarial Rademacher complexity are difficult, we approximate the adversarially robust loss via first order Taylor expansion. Assume that the solution of (4) is achieved at x^* , i.e., $\tilde{\ell}(f(x), y) = \ell(f(x^*), y)$, then the adversarially robust loss can be approximated as

$$\ell(f(x^*), y) \approx \ell(f(x), y) + \nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)^\top (x^* - x). \quad (5)$$

The following lemma shows the bound on the first order approximation for the ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ adversarial attacks, respectively.

Lemma 1. *Assume the loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is L_{ℓ_2} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ metric and is L_{ℓ_∞} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ metric. For the ℓ_2 adversarial attack $\|x' - x\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, the approximation of adversarially robust loss in (5) can be bounded by*

$$\ell(f(x), y) + \nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)^\top (x^* - x) \leq \ell(f(x), y) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2.$$

For the ℓ_∞ adversarial attack $\|x' - x\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$, the approximation (5) can be bounded by

$$\ell(f(x), y) + \nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)^\top (x^* - x) \leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}.$$

The term $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$ and $\epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}$ serve as the regularization, but since these terms are upper bounds, the regularization may be too

strong. Therefore, we add a flexible parameter λ on the Jacobian regularization and then define the Jacobian regularized loss which serves as a surrogate robust loss for the ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ adversarial attacks respectively as

$$\hat{\ell}_2(f(x), y) = \ell(f(x), y) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2,$$

$$\hat{\ell}_\infty(f(x), y) = \ell(f(x), y) + \lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}.$$

We show that Jacobian regularized loss serves as an approximate upper bound on the adversarially robust loss. Even though the upper bound is not precise because of the first-order approximation and parameter λ , we will show by experiments that Jacobian regularized loss indeed serves as a surrogate loss for the adversarially robust loss and that Jacobian regularized risk minimization can lead to adversarially robust risk minimization. The adversarially robust model against ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ adversarial attack is obtained by Jacobian regularized risk minimization respectively as

$$\hat{f}_2 = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F^2], \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{f}_\infty = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{1,1}]. \quad (7)$$

The above minimization procedure involves a standard empirical risk minimization and a Jacobian regularization term. The regularization coefficient depends on the adversarial attack intensity ϵ and the Lipschitz constants, which makes sense since one should also regularize with stronger intensity to achieve robustness when the adversarial attack intensity is large. The Lipschitz constants are well bounded for common loss functions and the Lipschitz constants of cross entropy loss function are given by the following Lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let $\ell(f(x), y)$ be the cross entropy loss function in classification tasks, then $\ell(f(x), y)$ is L_{ℓ_2} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ metric, with the Lipschitz constant $L_{\ell_2} \leq \sqrt{2}$, and $\ell(f(x), y)$ is L_{ℓ_∞} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ metric, with the Lipschitz constant $L_{\ell_\infty} \leq 1$.*

4.2. Generalization gap of surrogate robust loss

Define the empirical mean of the Jacobian norm as

$$P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F^2, \quad P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_{1,1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{1,1}.$$

By minimizing the Jacobian regularized empirical risk minimization objective in (6) and (7), the $P_n \|\nabla_x \hat{f}_2\|_F^2$ of the minimizer \hat{f}_2 or the $P_n \|\nabla_x \hat{f}_\infty\|_{1,1}$ of the minimizer \hat{f}_∞ can not be large and must be within some bounds. Therefore, for a given dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we assume that there exist positive numbers r_1 and r_2 such that, in the minimization process of (6) and (7), the empirical mean of the Jacobian norm $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 \leq r_2$ and $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_{1,1} \leq r_1$. Hence the minimization process of (6) and (7) can be done on the constrained hypothesis class $\mathcal{F}_{r_2} = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 \leq r_2\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{r_1} = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_{1,1} \leq r_1\}$ respectively as follows

$$\hat{f}_2 = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \epsilon L_\ell^2 \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F^2]. \quad (8)$$

$$\hat{f}_\infty = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{1,1}]. \quad (9)$$

The bounds r_2 or r_1 and the hypothesis classes \mathcal{F}_{r_2} or \mathcal{F}_{r_1} depends on the training dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and the training algorithm. The hypothesis classes \mathcal{F}_{r_2} or \mathcal{F}_{r_1} are the effective hypothesis classes explored by the training algorithm and are smaller than the original hypothesis class \mathcal{F} due to Jacobian regularization. Even though these bounds are difficult to be calculated directly in theory, in practice, we can still calculate the empirical mean of the Jacobian norm $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2$ or $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_{1,1}$ and show that such bounds indeed exist and are small in the experiments.

For ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ adversarial attacks, define the surrogate expected risk respectively as $\hat{R}_2(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\hat{\ell}_2(f(x), y)]$ and $\hat{R}_\infty(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\hat{\ell}_\infty(f(x), y)]$, and the surrogate empirical risk respectively as $\hat{R}_{2n}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_2(f(x_i), y_i)$ and $\hat{R}_{\infty n}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\ell}_\infty(f(x_i), y_i)$. Define the surrogate loss function class respectively as $\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}} = \{\hat{\ell}_2(f(x), y) | f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}\}$ and $\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}} = \{\hat{\ell}_\infty(f(x), y) | f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}\}$. We now bound the generalization gap of the surrogate robust loss by the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Suppose $\ell(f(x), y)$ is bounded between $[0, B]$, $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$ is bounded between $[0, B_2]$ and $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}$ is bounded between $[0, B_1]$. Denote $C_2 = B + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 B_2$ and $C_\infty = B + \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} B_1$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for the given dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, the following*

inequality holds for the minimizer \hat{f}_2 in (8),

$$\hat{R}_2(\hat{f}_2) \leq \hat{R}_{2n}(\hat{f}_2) + 2\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) + 3C_2\sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2n}},$$

the following inequality holds for the minimizer \hat{f}_∞ in (9),

$$\hat{R}_\infty(\hat{f}_\infty) \leq \hat{R}_{\infty n}(\hat{f}_\infty) + 2\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) + 3C_\infty\sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2n}}.$$

In standard statistical learning theory, the hypothesis class needs to be fixed, but the effective hypothesis class \mathcal{F}_{r_2} or \mathcal{F}_{r_1} depends on the training dataset. This is not a contradictory since we can conduct the proof as if \mathcal{F}_{r_2} or \mathcal{F}_{r_1} is fixed for the given dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, or we can choose the largest r_2 or r_1 when the training dataset varies. The key of the generalization gap is the Rademacher complexity of the surrogate loss $\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ which are shown by the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *For the ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ attacks, denote the function class of Jacobian regularization respectively as $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}} = \{\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2 : f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}} = \{\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} : f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}\}$, then the Rademacher complexity of the surrogate loss $\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ can be bounded respectively by*

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) \leq \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}),$$

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) \leq \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) + \lambda\epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}).$$

This proposition tells us that the Rademacher complexity of the surrogate loss can be upper bounded by the standard Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ and the Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ induced by Jacobian regularization, which suggests that the robust generalization gap is larger than the standard generalization gap given the same number of training samples. This result also coincides with the study which showed that adversarially robust generalization requires more data (Schmidt et al., 2018).

We next bound the Rademacher complexity via the covering number technique. First recall the definition of the covering number.

Definition 2 (Covering number). *The δ -covering number of set \mathcal{Q} with respect to metric ρ is defined as the minimum size of δ -cover \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{Q} , such that for each $v \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists $v' \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying $\rho(v, v') \leq \delta$:*

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{Q}, \rho) = \inf\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a } \delta\text{-cover of } \mathcal{Q} \text{ with respect to metric } \rho\}.$$

Then some norms and metrics on the function classes and the parameter space are given below.

For the loss function class $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ or $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$, we define the sample $L_1(P_n)$ -norm of a function $\ell(f(x), y)$ and the derived metric respectively as

$$\|\ell\|_{L_1(P_n)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\ell(f(x_i), y_i)| \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\ell, \ell') = \|\ell - \ell'\|_{L_1(P_n)}.$$

For the Jacobian regularization function class $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$, we define the sample $L_1(P_n)$ -norm of a function $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$ and the derived metric respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|\nabla_x f\|_F^2\|_{L_1(P_n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2\| \quad \text{and} \\ \rho(\|\nabla_x f\|_F^2, \|\nabla_x f'\|_F^2) &= \|\|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 - \|\nabla_x f'\|_F^2\|_{L_1(P_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the Jacobian regularization function class $\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$, the $L_1(P_n)$ -norm of a function $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}$ is defined in the same way with $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$. For the parameter set Θ , define the Frobenius-norm of parameter $\Theta \in \Theta$ and the derived metric respectively as

$$\|\|\Theta\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \|\theta_l\|_F^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^{d_l} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{l-1}} (\theta_l)_{kj}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\Theta, \Theta') = \|\|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F.$$

To link the covering number of the function space with the covering number of the parameter space, we need to characterize the Lipschitz property with respect to parameters by the following Lemmas.

Lemma 4. *Assume that the loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is L_{ℓ_2} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_2$ metric, the Frobenius-norm of parameter Θ is within R_Θ , i.e., $\|\|\Theta\|_F \leq R_\Theta$, and the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the rectified linear unit function $\text{Relu}(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$. For $\Theta, \Theta' \in \Theta$, it follows that*

$$\|\ell(f_\Theta(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta'}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq L_{1P_n}^\ell \|\|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F,$$

where

$$L_{1P_n}^\ell = \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2 \left(\frac{R_\Theta}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1}. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 5. *Assume that there are no pre-activations $h_{l_{pre}} = (\theta_1 \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$ which are exactly 0, the Frobenius-norm of parameter Θ is within R_Θ , i.e., $\|\Theta\|_F \leq R_\Theta$, and the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the rectified linear unit function $\text{Relu}(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$. For $\Theta, \Theta' \in \Theta$, it follows that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|\nabla_x f_\Theta(x)\|_F^2 - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_F^2\|_{L_1(P_n)} &\leq L_{1P_n}^F \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F \\ \|\|\nabla_x f_\Theta(x)\|_{1,1} - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_{1,1}\|_{L_1(P_n)} &\leq L_{1P_n}^1 \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$L_{1P_n}^F = 2\sqrt{L} \left(\frac{R_\Theta}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{2L-1}, \quad L_{1P_n}^1 = \sqrt{Lkd} \left(\frac{R_\Theta}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1} \quad (11)$$

There are some differences lying in the Lipschitz constants of the standard loss function and the Jacobian regularization. Specifically, $L_{1P_n}^\ell$ depends on the data term $1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2$ but $L_{1P_n}^F$ does not. If we assume that x obeys normal distribution, then $1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2$ scales with \sqrt{d} , where d is the input dimension. The term $(R_\Theta/\sqrt{L-1})^{L-1}$ in $L_{1P_n}^\ell$ and $L_{1P_n}^1$ shows an exponential dependence on the number of layers L and is due to the worst case Lipschitz property of deep neural networks. The term $(R_\Theta/\sqrt{L-1})^{2L-1}$ in $L_{1P_n}^F$ suggests that the Jacobian regularization $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$ behaves like a neural network with $2L$ layers. Note that $L_{1P_n}^1$ also explicitly depends on the output dimension k . Overall, compared with the Lipschitz constant of standard loss function, the Lipschitz constant of Jacobian regularization is also well controlled.

Before we bound the Rademacher complexity, we introduce some useful lemmas to bound the norm of model $f(x)$ and the norm of loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ via Jacobian norms.

Lemma 6. *Let the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ be the rectified linear unit function $\text{Relu}(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$. Then for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, it follows that*

$$f(x) = \nabla_x f(x)^\top x.$$

In fact, this property is not restricted to the $\text{Relu}(\cdot)$ activation function. Lemma 6 also holds when adopting activation functions such as LeakyRelu.

Lemma 7. Assume that the input space \mathcal{X} is bounded such that the ℓ_∞ -norm of each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is within R_x , i.e., $\sup\{\|x\|_\infty : x \in \mathcal{X}\} \leq R_x$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}$ such that $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 \leq r_2$, it follows that

$$P_n \|f\|_2 \leq \sqrt{r_2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2}.$$

For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}$ such that $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_{1,1} \leq r_1$, it follows that

$$P_n \|f\|_1 \leq r_1 R_x.$$

Lemma 8. Assume that $\sup\{\|x\|_\infty : x \in \mathcal{X}\} \leq R_x$, and that the loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is L_{ℓ_2} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$ metric and is L_{ℓ_∞} -Lipschitz on $f(x)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_1$ metric. Denote $\Theta_0 \in \Theta$ to be the parameters being zeros. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}$, it follows that

$$\|\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq L_{\ell_2} \sqrt{r_2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2}.$$

For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}$, it follows that

$$\|\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq L_{\ell_\infty} r_1 R_x.$$

With the above lemmas at hand, we are now ready to bound the Rademacher complexity by the following two theorems.

Theorem 1. Let the Frobenius-norm of parameter Θ is within R_Θ , i.e., $\|\Theta\|_F \leq R_\Theta$. Assume that the input space is bounded such that $\sup\{\|x\|_\infty : x \in \mathcal{X}\} \leq R_x$, and that the loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is the cross entropy loss in classification tasks. Denote the total number of parameters as P . Then the empirical Rademacher complexity of $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ and $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$ respectively satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) &\leq 12 \sqrt{\frac{2r_2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2} \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\sqrt{2r_2/n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right), \\ \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) &\leq 12r_1 R_x \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{r_1 R_x} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

One sees from Theorem 1 that the Rademacher complexity of the standard loss function class $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ depend on the Jacobian norms r_1 and r_2 , respectively. By restricting the Jacobian norms r_1 and r_2 through Jacobian regularization, one can effectively reduce the Rademacher complexity of the standard loss function class, and further reduce the generalization error in the standard setting without adversarial attacks. In addition, we focus on vector-valued models. Vector-contraction inequality is commonly used for transforming the Rademacher complexity of loss function class to the Rademacher complexity of vector-valued models (Maurer, 2016; Li et al., 2023). However, such technique results in an explicit linear dependence on the output dimension k . In Theorem 1, we directly bound the Rademacher complexity of loss function class via the covering number technique and there is no explicit dependence on the output dimension. This result is more preferable when the output dimension is large.

Theorem 2. *Let the Frobenius-norm of parameter Θ is within R_Θ , i.e., $\|\Theta\|_F \leq R_\Theta$. Assume that there are no pre-activations which are exactly 0. Denote the total number of parameters as P . Then the empirical Rademacher complexity of $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$ respectively satisfies that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) &\leq 12r_2\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\left| \log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{r_2} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right), \\ \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) &\leq 12r_1\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\left| \log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^1}{r_1} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Due to the fact that Jacobian regularization depends on the training samples, it is natural to ask whether Jacobian regularization is still effective beyond training samples. Comparing the Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ with $\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}})$ or $\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}})$ respectively, one can see that the Rademacher complexity of Jacobian regularization is well controlled relative to the Rademacher complexity of standard loss. Therefore, even though Jacobian regularization relies on sample points, it is still an effective regularization technique.

Combing the Rademacher complexity of the standard loss function in Theorem 1 and the Rademacher complexity of Jacobian regularization in Theorem 2, we obtain the Rademacher complexity of surrogate robust loss function

via Lemma 3, and further establish the robust generalization gap by virtue of Proposition 3. If the adversarial attack intensity ϵ is not large and the Jacobian norms r_1 or r_2 is well controlled, then the robust generalization gap can be well controlled. We will show in the following experiments that reducing Jacobian norms r_1 or r_2 can indeed improve robust generalization.

5. Experiments

In this section, we perform experiments to demonstrate that Jacobian regularization can lead to robust generalization. As have been discussed before, the Jacobian norms r_1 and r_2 are algorithm dependent, and we will show that r_1 and r_2 can be well controlled via Jacobian regularization in the experiments.

Dataset: We perform the experiments using the MNIST dataset. The MNIST dataset originally contains 60000 training and 10000 testing samples. We randomly select 1000 training samples for training and adopt all the testing samples for testing. We preprocess the data by normalizing the data between 0 and 1.

Neural network architecture: We adopt the multiple-layer fully connected neural network. The number of layers is 5. The number of hidden units in each layer is 100. We use Relu as the nonlinear activation function.

Adversarial attacks: To evaluate the robustness to adversarial attacks, we adopt the projected gradient descent (PGD) (Kurakin et al., 2016; Madry et al., 2017) method to generate adversarial samples. For the ℓ_2 PGD attack, we set the attack intensity ϵ as 0.5, the number of steps as 20, and the stepsize as 0.1. For the ℓ_∞ PGD attack, we set the attack intensity ϵ as 0.03, the number of steps as 20, and the stepsize as 0.01.

Training details: For the classification task on MNIST, we use the cross entropy function as the loss function. For the ℓ_2 PGD attack, we use the Frobenius norm of the Jacobian matrix for regularization. For the ℓ_∞ PGD attack, we use the ℓ_1 norm of the Jacobian matrix for regularization. We minimize the regularized cross entropy loss function via SGD. We perform SGD for 1000 epochs, with a batch size of 1000, a momentum of 0.9 and a learning rate of 0.1.

Experimental results: For simplicity, we define the effective regularization parameter $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda\epsilon$ (effective lambda for short) which represents the effective Jacobian regularization strength on Jacobian norms. In the theoretical analysis, we show that Jacobian regularized loss serves as an approximate




Figure 1: Comparison of Jacobian regularized loss and adversarially robust loss. We use the PGD attack loss to estimate the adversarially robust loss. In the figure legend, the losses represents the Jacobian regularized loss and the adv losses represents the adversarially robust loss.

upper bound on the adversarially robust loss. Now we conduct experiments to corroborate this theoretical analysis. We plot the curves of both Jacobian regularized loss and adversarially robust loss (estimated by the PGD attack loss) in Figure 1. On both the training and testing data, the adversarially robust losses are well bounded by the Jacobian regularized losses during the training process. Moreover, as we minimize the Jacobian regularized losses during training, the adversarially robust losses also decrease. Therefore, we demonstrate that Jacobian regularized loss indeed serves as a surrogate adversarially robust loss and that Jacobian regularized risk minimization can lead to adversarially robust risk minimization. Note that we only show the result for one choice of effective lambda, but similar results can also be obtained for other choices. In practice, the attack intensity ϵ is usually unknown and λ should be chosen via an additional validation dataset.

More experimental results for ℓ_2 PGD attack are shown in Table 1, and the experimental results for ℓ_∞ PGD attack are shown in Table 2. When the effective regularization parameter equals 0, it is just the standard empirical risk minimization without regularizations. When we increase the effective regularization parameter, the Jacobian norms $\|\mathcal{J}\|_F^2$ and $\|\mathcal{J}\|_{1,1}$ can be controlled within relatively small values. Therefore, the bounds r_1 and r_2 used in previous theoretical results can indeed be well controlled under Jacobian regularization, a fact which further implies our assumption made on r_1 and

r_2 is rational.

Effective Lambda	0		0.01		0.1	
Jacobian Norm	1280		10.3		3.1	
Types	Standard	Robust	Standard	Robust	Standard	Robust
Training	100%	81.8%	100%	100%	99.4%	98.9%
Testing	89.5%	69.2%	93.3%	86.7%	93.6%	87.6%
Gap	10.5%	12.6%	6.7%	13.3%	5.8%	11.3%

Table 1: Experimental results for ℓ_2 PGD attack. The ℓ_2 attack intensity ϵ is 0.5.

Effective Lambda	0		0.001		0.005	
Jacobian Norm	2289		138.9		76.7	
Types	Standard	Robust	Standard	Robust	Standard	Robust
Training	100%	84.7%	100%	100%	100%	99.7%
Testing	89.5%	70.3%	92.7%	87.2%	92.8%	88.7%
Gap	10.5%	14.4%	7.3%	12.8%	7.2%	11.0%

Table 2: Experimental results for ℓ_∞ PGD attack. The ℓ_∞ attack intensity ϵ is 0.03.

From Table 1 and Table 2, overall, Jacobian regularization can indeed decrease generalization gap and improve robust generalization against both ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ attacks. In Table 1, the robust generalization gap for standard training with effective regularization parameter being 0 is 12.6%, even a bit lower than that of effective regularization parameter being 0.01. This is not contradictory because in the standard training, the robust training accuracy can be low. In addition, as pointed by Theorem 1, we can also observe from the results that reducing the Jacobian norms can also improve the standard generalization. In the standard training, the Jacobian norms can be very large while the standard generalization is not so bad, this phenomenon is because that models unstable to perturbation can also generalize in the standard setting.

Robust generalization also has relations with standard generalization. Even in the standard setting, the data contain random noise. Improving robustness to adversarial attacks via Jacobian regularization can make model more resistant to the random noise in the standard setting. In general, the random noise in standard setting is less than the adversarial perturbations, and thus Jacobian regularization is more effective for the robust generalization. This phenomenon can also be observed from the results that the standard

generalization barely increases while the robust generalization still increases when we increase the effective regularization parameter.

6. Conclusion

In this study, we demonstrate that standard empirical risk minimization with Jacobian regularization can serve as a surrogate for robust adversarial training. We show that Jacobian regularization can improve both standard generalization and robust generalization from theoretical and empirical aspects. Our results can motivate both the theoretical and empirical research to understand the adversarially robust generalization.

Acknowledgments

Dongya Wu's work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62103329). Xin Li's work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12201496).

Appendix A. Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. For the ℓ_2 adversarial attack $\|x' - x\|_2 \leq \epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(f(x), y) + \nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)^\top (x^* - x) &\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \|\nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)\|_2 \|x^* - x\|_2 \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)\|_2 \\
&= \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x f(x) \nabla_f \ell(f(x), y)\|_2 \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{\text{op}} \|\nabla_f \ell(f(x), y)\|_2 \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon L_{\ell_2} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the ℓ_∞ adversarial attack $\|x' - x\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(f(x), y) + \nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)^\top (x^* - x) &\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \|\nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)\|_1 \|x^* - x\|_\infty \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x \ell(f(x), y)\|_1 \\
&= \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x f(x) \nabla_f \ell(f(x), y)\|_1 \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} \|\nabla_f \ell(f(x), y)\|_\infty \\
&\leq \ell(f(x), y) + \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for ℓ_2 adversarial attack. For ℓ_∞ adversarial attack, we use the Hölder's inequality with $p = \infty, q = 1$. We also bound the spectral norm of Jacobian matrix by the Frobenius norm of Jacobian matrix, since the spectral norm involves a computationally expensive singular value decomposition when the dimension d and k are high. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Since the indicator function $\mathbb{1}(y = j)$ equals 1 when the sample belongs to the j -th class and otherwise equals 0, and recall that f_j is the j -th component of $f(x)$, the cross entropy loss function $\ell(f(x), y)$ is defined as

$$\ell(f(x), y) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}(y = i) \log \frac{\exp(f_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^k \exp(f_j)}.$$

Denote $\partial\ell/\partial f = [\partial\ell/\partial f_1, \dots, \partial\ell/\partial f_k]$, then it follows that $L_{\ell_2} = \sup\{\|\partial\ell/\partial f\|_2\}$. Denote \sum_j to be the sum from indexes 1 to k and $\sum_{j \neq i}$ to be the sum from indexes 1 to k without i . One has that the gradient of $\ell(f(x), y)$ with respect to f_i is

$$\partial\ell/\partial f_i = \mathbb{1}(y = i) \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \exp(f_j)}{\sum_j \exp(f_j)} + \sum_{l \neq i} \mathbb{1}(y = l) \frac{-\exp(f_i)}{\sum_j \exp(f_j)}.$$

Since $\|\partial\ell/\partial f\|_2 = \sqrt{(\partial\ell/\partial f_1)^2 + \dots + (\partial\ell/\partial f_k)^2}$, then for each class c , when $y = c$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j (\partial\ell/\partial f_j)^2 &= \frac{(\sum_{j \neq c} \exp(f_j))^2}{(\sum_j \exp(f_j))^2} + \frac{\sum_{l \neq c} (\exp(f_l))^2}{(\sum_j \exp(f_j))^2} \\ &\leq \frac{(\sum_{j \neq c} \exp(f_j))^2}{(\sum_j \exp(f_j))^2} + \frac{(\sum_{l \neq c} \exp(f_l))^2}{(\sum_j \exp(f_j))^2} \\ &= 2 \frac{(\sum_{j \neq c} \exp(f_j))^2}{(\sum_j \exp(f_j))^2} \\ &\leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, one sees that $L_{\ell_2} = \sup\{\|\partial\ell/\partial f\|_2\} \leq \sqrt{2}$. Similarly, one sees that $L_{\ell_\infty} = \sup\{\|\partial\ell/\partial f\|_\infty\} \leq 1$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) &= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \hat{\ell}_2(f(x_i), y_i) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i (\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell(f(x_i), y_i) \right] + \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \frac{1}{2} \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2 \right] \\
&= \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_2}^2 \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_S(\hat{\ell}_{\infty\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) &= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \hat{\ell}_\infty(f(x_i), y_i) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i (\ell(f(x_i), y_i) + \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell(f(x_i), y_i) \right] + \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} \right] \\
&= \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) + \lambda \epsilon L_{\ell_\infty} \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4. Denote

$$\nabla_\theta \ell(f_\Theta(x), y) = \left(\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_1} \Big|_{\text{vec}}^\top, \dots, \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_L} \Big|_{\text{vec}}^\top \right)^\top,$$

where for $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$, $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\text{vec}}$ is the vectorized form of the matrix $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_i}$. Since the Lipschitz constant equals to $\sup\{\|\nabla_\theta \ell(f_\Theta(x), y)\|_2 : \Theta \in \Theta\}$, it suffice to analyze the ℓ_2 -norm of $\nabla_\theta \ell(f_\Theta(x), y)$ defined as

$$\|\nabla_\theta \ell(f_\Theta(x), y)\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2}.$$

For a deep neural network $f_{\Theta}(x) = \theta_L \sigma(\theta_{L-1} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$, denote the activations of the l -th hidden layer as $h_l = \sigma(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$ with $h_0 = x$. Then the derivatives of the l -th hidden layer is $h'_l = \sigma'(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$, where $\sigma'(\cdot)$ is the derivative of the activation function. Denote $\text{diag}(h'_l)$ as the diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements being h'_l , according to the chain rule, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_l} = \left(\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^\top \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial f} \right) h_{l-1}^\top.$$

For the Relu activation function $\sigma(x) = \max\{0, x\}$, the derivative $\sigma'(\cdot)$ is the Step function, thus $\sigma'(\cdot) \in [0, 1]$ and $h'_l \in [0, 1]$. The Frobenius-norm of gradients is bounded layer by layer as:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F &= \sqrt{\text{trace} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_l} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta_l}^\top \right)} \\ &= \left\| \text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^\top \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial f} \right\|_2 \|h_{l-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^\top \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial f} \right\|_2 \|h_{l-1}\|_2 \quad (\because h'_i \in [0, 1]) \\ &\leq \|\theta_{l+1}\|_F \left\| \text{diag}(h'_{l+1}) \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^\top \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial f} \right\|_2 \|h_{l-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|h_{l-1}\|_2 \left\| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial f} \right\|_2 \prod_{k=l+1}^L \|\theta_k\|_F \\ &\leq L \ell_2 \|h_{l-1}\|_2 \prod_{k=l+1}^L \|\theta_k\|_F. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The term $\|h_{l-1}\|_2$ is also bounded layer by layer as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{l-1}\|_2 &= \|\sigma(\theta_{l-1} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta_{l-1} \sigma(\theta_{l-2} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta_{l-1}\|_F \|\sigma(\theta_{l-2} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|x\|_2 \prod_{k=1}^{l-1} \|\theta_k\|_F, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where the first inequality is due to the 1-Lipschitz property of $\sigma(\cdot)$ and fact that $\sigma(0) = 0$, and the last inequality is by iteration. Combining (A.1) and

(A.2) yields that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F \leq L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \prod_{k=1, k \neq l}^L \|\theta_k\|_F.$$

Combining the Frobenius-norm of gradients of all layers, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2} &\leq L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \prod_{k=1, k \neq l}^L \|\theta_k\|_F^2} \\ &\leq L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \sqrt{L \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \prod_{k=1, k \neq l}^L \|\theta_k\|_F^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \sqrt{\max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{k=1, k \neq l}^L \|\theta_k\|_F^2 \right)^{L-1}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{k=1}^L \|\theta_k\|_F^2 \right)^{L-1}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{L-1} R_{\Theta}^2 \right)^{L-1}} \\ &= \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \|x\|_2 \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\ell(f_{\Theta}(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta'}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\ell(f_{\Theta}(x_i), y_i) - \ell(f_{\Theta'}(x_i), y_i)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \|x_i\|_2 \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1} \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F \\ &= \sqrt{L} L_{\ell_2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2 \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1} \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. Recall that the derivatives of the l -th hidden layer is $h'_l = \sigma'(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$, then it follows from the chain rule that the gradients

with respect to inputs are equal to

$$\nabla_x f(x) = \theta_1^\top \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^\top.$$

The gradients of the j -th output of $f(x)$ is

$$\nabla_x f_j(x) = \theta_1^\top \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{Lj}^\top,$$

where we use θ_{Lj} to denote the j -th row of θ_L . Then it holds that

$$\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} = \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_1.$$

We firstly calculate the derivatives of $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$. Since $\nabla_x f_j(x)$ is a column vector, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_2^2 &= \nabla_x f_j^\top(x) \nabla_x f_j(x) \\ &= \theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{Lj}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we calculate the derivatives of $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2$ with respect to parameters to characterize the Lipschitz property with respect to parameters. For parameter θ_L , since θ_{Lj} only exists in $\nabla_x f_j(x)$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} &= \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_2^2}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \\ &= 2\theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the norm of derivatives with respect to parameter θ_{Lj} is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \right\|_2 &= 2 \|\theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{L-1})\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 \|\theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{L-1}^\top\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 \|\theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{L-2})\|_2 \|\theta_{L-1}\|_F \\ &\leq 2 \|\theta_{Lj}\|_2 \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus it follows directly that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_L} \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_2^2}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k 4 \|\theta_{Lj}\|_2^2 \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F^4 = 4 \|\theta_L\|_F^2 \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F^4. \end{aligned}$$

It is worth noting that other parameters $\theta_{L-1}, \dots, \theta_1$ also exist in $\text{diag}(h'_{L-1}), \dots, \text{diag}(h'_1)$. Since we assume that there are no pre-activations $h_{l_{pre}} = (\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$ which are exactly 0, the second derivatives $h''_l = \sigma''(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$ is 0 for Relu activation function, and thus the derivatives $\partial \text{diag}(h'_l) / \partial \theta_j = 0$. Then the derivatives of other parameters satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_l} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_2^2}{\partial \theta_l} \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^k \text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_{Lj}^\top \theta_{Lj} \cdot \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1}) \\ &= 2 \text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the norm of derivatives with respect to parameter θ_l satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F &= 2 \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1})\|_F \\ &\leq 2 \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top\|_F \|\text{diag}(h'_{l-1})\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq 2 \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top\|_F \\ &\leq 2 \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{l-2})\|_F \|\theta_{l-1}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq 2 \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \theta_L \cdots \theta_1 \theta_1^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{l-2})\|_F \|\theta_{l-1}\|_F \\ &\leq 2 \|\theta_l\|_F \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $l = 1, \dots, L$, it follows that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2 \leq 4 \|\theta_l\|_F^2 \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^4.$$

Similarly, denote the vectorized form of derivatives as

$$\nabla_\theta \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2 = \left(\left. \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_1} \right|_{\text{vec}}, \dots, \left. \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_L} \right|_{\text{vec}} \right)^\top.$$

Then the Lipschitz property with respect to parameters can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\theta}\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_F^2}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L 4\|\theta_l\|_F^2 \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^4} \\
&\leq \sqrt{L \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} 4\|\theta_l\|_F^2 \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^4} \\
&\leq \sqrt{4L \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \left(\frac{1}{2L-1} (\|\theta_l\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^L 2\|\theta_j\|_F^2) \right)^{2L-1}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{4L \left(\frac{1}{2L-1} (2\|\theta_l\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^L 2\|\theta_j\|_F^2) \right)^{2L-1}} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{L} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{2L-1}} R_{\Theta}^2 \right)^{2L-1} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{L} \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{2L-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta}(x)\|_F^2 - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_F^2 \|_{L_1(P_n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n | \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta}(x_i)\|_F^2 - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x_i)\|_F^2 | \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{L} \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{2L-1} \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we calculate the derivatives of $\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}$. Recall that the gradients of the j -th output of $f(x)$ is

$$\nabla_x f_j(x) = \theta_1^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^{\top} \cdots \theta_{L-1}^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{Lj}^{\top}.$$

Then it holds that

$$\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} = \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k \|\theta_1^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^{\top} \cdots \theta_{L-1}^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{Lj}^{\top}\|_1.$$

For parameter θ_L , since θ_{Lj} only exists in $\nabla_x f_j(x)$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} &= \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_1}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \\ &= \text{diag}(h'_{L-1})\theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1)\theta_1 \text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the norm of derivatives with respect to parameter θ_{Lj} is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \right\|_2 &= \|\text{diag}(h'_{L-1})\theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1)\theta_1 \text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x))\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1)\theta_1 \text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x))\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\theta_{L-1}\|_F \|\text{diag}(h'_{L-2}) \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1)\theta_1 \text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x))\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x))\|_2 \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F \\ &= \sqrt{d} \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

and thus it follows directly that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_L} \right\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_{Lj}} \right\|_2^2 \leq kd \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \|\theta_l\|_F^2.$$

For other parameters $\theta_{L-1}, \dots, \theta_1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_l} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f_j(x)\|_1}{\partial \theta_l} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \text{diag}(h'_l)\theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{L-1})\theta_{Lj}^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f_j(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1}) \\ &= \text{diag}(h'_l)\theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{L-1})\theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F &= \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top \text{diag}(h'_{l-1})\|_F \\
&\leq \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top\|_F \|\text{diag}(h'_{l-1})\|_{\text{op}} \\
&\leq \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \theta_{l-1}^\top\|_F \\
&\leq \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{l-2})\|_F \|\theta_{l-1}^\top\|_{\text{op}} \\
&\leq \|\text{diag}(h'_l) \theta_{l+1}^\top \cdots \theta_L^\top \text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))^\top \theta_1^\top \cdots \text{diag}(h'_{l-2})\|_F \|\theta_{l-1}^\top\|_F \\
&\leq \|\text{sign}(\nabla_x f(x))\|_F \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F \\
&\leq \sqrt{kd} \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence one has that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2 \leq kd \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2.$$

Similarly, denote the vectorized form of derivatives as

$$\nabla_\theta \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1} = \left(\frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_1} \Big|_{\text{vec}}^\top, \dots, \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_L} \Big|_{\text{vec}}^\top \right)^\top.$$

Then the Lipschitzness with respect to parameters can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\theta}\|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \frac{\partial \|\nabla_x f(x)\|_{1,1}}{\partial \theta_l} \right\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^L kd \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{Lkd \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \prod_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{Lkd \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2 \right)^{L-1}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{Lkd \left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{j=1}^L \|\theta_j\|_F^2 \right)^{L-1}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{Lkd} \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta}(x)\|_{1,1} - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_{1,1} \|_{L_1(P_n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \| \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta}(x_i)\|_{1,1} - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x_i)\|_{1,1} \| \\
&\leq \sqrt{Lkd} \left(\frac{R_{\Theta}}{\sqrt{L-1}} \right)^{L-1} \| \Theta - \Theta' \|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. For a deep neural network $f(x) = \theta_L \sigma(\theta_{L-1} \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$, denote the activations of the l -th hidden layer as $h_l = \sigma(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$ with $h_0 = x$. Then the derivatives of the l -th hidden layer is $h'_l = \sigma'(\theta_l \cdots \sigma(\theta_1 x) \cdots)$, where $\sigma'(\cdot)$ is the derivative of the activation function. When $\sigma(x) = \text{Relu}(x)$, the derivative is the step function $\sigma'(x) = \text{Step}(x)$, where $\text{Step}(x) = 1$ when $x > 0$ and $\text{Step}(x) = 0$ when $x \leq 0$. Denote $\text{diag}(h'_l)$ as the diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements being h'_l , then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_x f(x) &= \theta_1^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_2^{\top} \cdots \theta_{L-1}^{\top} \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_L^{\top}, \\
\nabla_x f(x)^{\top} x &= \theta_L \text{diag}(h'_{L-1}) \theta_{L-1} \cdots \theta_2 \text{diag}(h'_1) \theta_1 x.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{diag}(h'_1)\theta_1x = \text{diag}(\sigma'(\theta_1x))\theta_1x = \sigma(\theta_1x)$. Applying this rule recursively, we obtain that $f(x) = \nabla_x f(x)^\top x$. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. It follows from Lemma 6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n \|f\|_2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)^\top x_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{\text{op}} \|x_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F \|x_i\|_2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{r_2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n \|f\|_1 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k |f_j(x_i)| = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k |\nabla_x f_j(x_i)^\top x_i| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k \|\nabla_x f_j(x_i)\|_1 \|x_i\|_\infty \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{1,1} \|x_i\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_{1,1} R_x \\
&\leq r_1 R_x.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Lemma 8. Since when all the parameters are zeros, the outputs of

the function $f_{\Theta_0}(x)$ are also zeros. Then for $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_2}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)| &\leq L_{\ell_2} \|f(x) - f_{\Theta_0}(x)\|_2 = L_{\ell_2} \|f(x)\|_2, \\ \|\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} &\leq L_{\ell_2} P_n \|f\|_2 \leq L_{\ell_2} \sqrt{r_2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)| &\leq L_{\ell_\infty} \|f(x) - f_{\Theta_0}(x)\|_1 = L_{\ell_\infty} \|f(x)\|_1, \\ \|\ell(f(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta_0}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} &\leq L_{\ell_\infty} P_n \|f\|_1 \leq L_{\ell_\infty} r_1 R_x. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. For the loss function class $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$, the empirical Rademacher complexity can be bounded via Dudley's integral as

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) \leq 12 \int_0^{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \sqrt{\frac{\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n))}{n}} d\delta. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We here use the $L_1(P_n)$ metric instead of the $L_2(P_n)$ metric in Dudley's integral. The proofs of Dudley's integral are similar except that one should use Hölder's inequality with $p = \infty, q = 1$ under the $L_1(P_n)$ metric and use Cauchy-Schwartz inequality under the $L_2(P_n)$ metric. By Lemma 8 and Lemma 2, one sees that the integral can be terminated at $\delta_{\text{sup}} = \sqrt{2r_2} \sqrt{1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2}$. The covering number of the loss function space $\mathcal{N}(\delta, \ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n))$ can be bounded by the covering number of the parameter space $\mathcal{N}(\delta_\theta, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_F)$ via the Lipschitz property with respect to parameters. Specifically, let \mathcal{C}_Θ be a δ_θ -cover of Θ , such that for each $\Theta \in \Theta$, there exists $\Theta' \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$ satisfying $\|\Theta' - \Theta\|_F \leq \delta_\theta$. According to Lemma 4, one has that

$$\|\ell(f_\Theta(x), y) - \ell(f_{\Theta'}(x), y)\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq L_{1P_n}^\ell \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F \leq \delta_\theta L_{1P_n}^\ell.$$

Thus the function set $\mathcal{C}_{\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}} = \{\ell(f_{\Theta'}(x), y) : \Theta' \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta\}$ is a δ -cover of $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ with $\delta = \delta_\theta L_{1P_n}^\ell$ and it holds that

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta, \ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n)) \leq \mathcal{N}(\delta/L_{1P_n}^\ell, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_F).$$

On the other hand, for the parameter set $\Theta \in \Theta$, let Θ_{vec} denote the vector formed by the vectorized form of each parameter matrix arranging one by

one. Denote the total number of parameters as P . By assumption, $\|\Theta_{\text{vec}}\|_2 = \|\Theta\|_F \leq R_\Theta$, the transformed parameter set is $\mathbb{B}_{2, R_\Theta}^P = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^P : \|\theta\|_2 \leq R_\Theta\}$ and

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta_\theta, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_F) = \mathcal{N}(\delta_\theta, \mathbb{B}_{2, R_\Theta}^P, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq \left(\frac{3R_\Theta}{\delta_\theta}\right)^P.$$

Then the Dudley's integral (A.3) is bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) &\leq 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \sqrt{\log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\delta}} d\delta \\ &= 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \sqrt{\log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\delta_{\text{sup}}} + \log \frac{\delta_{\text{sup}}}{\delta}} d\delta \\ &\leq 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \right|} + \sqrt{\log \frac{\delta_{\text{sup}}}{\delta}} \right) d\delta \\ &= 12\delta_{\text{sup}} \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\delta_{\text{sup}}} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right) \\ &= 12\sqrt{\frac{2r_2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2} \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{\sqrt{2r_2/n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the loss function class $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$, the empirical Rademacher complexity can be bounded similarly, except that the integral can be terminated at $\delta_{\text{sup}} = r_1 R_x$. The final result is that

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\ell_{\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) \leq 12r_1 R_x \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\log \left| \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^\ell}{r_1 R_x} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. For the function class $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$, the empirical Rademacher complexity of $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ can also be bounded via Dudley's integral as

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) \leq 12 \int_0^{r_2} \sqrt{\frac{\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n))}{n}} d\delta. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The integral can be terminated at r_2 , since for $\|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 \in \mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$, it holds that $P_n \|\nabla_x f\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla_x f(x_i)\|_F^2 \leq r$, and thus the δ -covering number of $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ under the $L_1(P_n)$ metric is 1 when $\delta \geq r_2$. The covering number $\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n))$ can be bounded by the covering number of the parameter space $\mathcal{N}(\delta_\theta, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_F)$. Specifically, let \mathcal{C}_Θ be a δ_θ -cover of Θ , such that for each $\Theta \in \Theta$, there exists $\Theta' \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$ satisfying $\|\Theta' - \Theta\|_F \leq \delta_\theta$. According to Lemma 5, one has that

$$\|\|\nabla_x f_\Theta(x)\|_F^2 - \|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_F^2\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq L_{1P_n}^F \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F \leq \delta_\theta L_{1P_n}^F.$$

Thus the function set $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}} = \{\|\nabla_x f_{\Theta'}(x)\|_F^2 : \Theta' \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta\}$ is a δ -cover of $\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}$ with $\delta = \delta_\theta L_{1P_n}^F$ and it holds that

$$\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}, L_1(P_n)) \leq \mathcal{N}(\delta/L_{1P_n}^F, \Theta, \|\cdot\|_F) \leq \left(\frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{\delta}\right)^P.$$

Then the Dudley's integral (A.4) is bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{2\mathcal{F}_{r_2}}) &\leq 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{r_2} \sqrt{\log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{\delta}} d\delta \\ &= 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{r_2} \sqrt{\log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{r_2} + \log \frac{r_2}{\delta}} d\delta \\ &\leq 12\sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \int_0^{r_2} \left(\sqrt{\left| \log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{r_2} \right|} + \sqrt{\log \frac{r_2}{\delta}} \right) d\delta \\ &= 12r_2 \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\left| \log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^F}{r_2} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the function class $\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}$, the empirical Rademacher complexity can also be bounded similarly, except that the integral can be terminated at r_1 and the Lipschitz constant is $L_{1P_n}^1$. The final result is that

$$\mathcal{R}_S(\mathcal{J}_{1\mathcal{F}_{r_1}}) \leq 12r_1 \sqrt{\frac{P}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\left| \log \frac{3R_\Theta L_{1P_n}^1}{r_1} \right|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right).$$

□

References

- Bartlett, P.L., Foster, D.J., Telgarsky, M., 2017. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks, in: *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Bartlett, P.L., Mendelson, S., 2002. Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3, 463–482.
- Chan, A., Tay, Y., Ong, Y.S., Fu, J., 2019. Jacobian adversarially regularized networks for robustness. *arXiv 1912.10185*.
- Gao, Q., Wang, X., 2021. Theoretical investigation of generalization bounds for adversarial learning of deep neural networks. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice* 15.
- Golowich, N., Rakhlin, A., Shamir, O., 2018. Size-independent sample complexity of neural networks, in: *Annual Conference Computational Learning Theory*, pp. 297–299.
- Goodfellow, I.J., Shlens, J., Szegedy, C., 2014. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv 1412.6572*.
- Gowal, S., Qin, C., Uesato, J., Mann, T.A., Kohli, P., 2020. Uncovering the limits of adversarial training against norm-bounded adversarial examples. *arXiv 2010.03593*.
- Hoffman, J., Roberts, D.A., Yaida, S., 2019. Robust learning with jacobian regularization. *arXiv 1908.02729*.
- Huang, R., Xu, B., Schuurmans, D., Szepesvari, C., 2015. Learning with a strong adversary. *arXiv 1511.03034*.
- Jakubovitz, D., Giryes, R., 2018. Improving dnn robustness to adversarial attacks using jacobian regularization, in: *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Khim, J., Loh, P.L., 2018. Adversarial risk bounds for binary classification via function transformation. *arXiv 1810.09519*.

- Kurakin, A., Goodfellow, I.J., Bengio, S., 2016. Adversarial examples in the physical world. arXiv 1607.02533.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., Hinton, G., 2015. Deep learning. *nature* 521, 436–444.
- Li, J., Liu, Y., Wang, W., 2023. Semi-supervised vector-valued learning: Improved bounds and algorithms. *Pattern Recognition* 138, 109356.
- Liu, D., Wu, L.Y., Li, B., Boussaid, F., Bennamoun, M., Xie, X., Liang, C., 2024. Jacobian norm with selective input gradient regularization for interpretable adversarial defense. *Pattern Recognition* 145, 109902. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2023.109902>.
- Lyu, C., Huang, K., Liang, H.N., 2015. A unified gradient regularization family for adversarial examples. 2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining , 301–309.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., Vladu, A., 2017. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. arXiv 1706.06083.
- Maurer, A., 2016. A vector-contraction inequality for rademacher complexities. ArXiv 1605.00251.
- Mustafa, W., Lei, Y., Kloft, M., 2022. On the generalization analysis of adversarial learning, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Neyshabur, B., Bhojanapalli, S., McAllester, D.A., Srebro, N., 2017. A pac-bayesian approach to spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. arXiv 1707.09564.
- Novak, R., Bahri, Y., Abolafia, D.A., Pennington, J., Sohl-Dickstein, J.N., 2018. Sensitivity and generalization in neural networks: an empirical study. arXiv 1802.08760.
- Ororbis II, A.G., Kifer, D., Giles, C.L., 2017. Unifying Adversarial Training Algorithms with Data Gradient Regularization. *Neural Computation* 29, 867–887.
- Qian, Z., Huang, K., Wang, Q., Zhang, X.Y., 2022. A survey of robust adversarial training in pattern recognition: Fundamental, theory, and methodologies. *Pattern Recognition* 131, 108889.

- Rosasco, L., Villa, S., Mosci, S., Santoro, M., Verri, A., 2013. Nonparametric sparsity and regularization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 14, 1665–1714.
- Ross, A.S., Doshi-Velez, F., 2017. Improving the adversarial robustness and interpretability of deep neural networks by regularizing their input gradients, in: *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Schmidt, L., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Talwar, K., Madry, A., 2018. Adversarially robust generalization requires more data. *ArXiv* 1804.11285.
- Shaham, U., Yamada, Y., Negahban, S.N., 2015. Understanding adversarial training: Increasing local stability of supervised models through robust optimization. *Neurocomputing* 307, 195–204.
- Sokolić, J., Giryes, R., Sapiro, G., Rodrigues, M.R.D., 2017. Robust large margin deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 65, 4265–4280. doi:10.1109/TSP.2017.2708039.
- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I.J., Fergus, R., 2013. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv* 1312.6199.
- Taheri, M., Xie, F., Lederer, J., 2021. Statistical guarantees for regularized neural networks. *Neural networks* 142, 148–161.
- Varga, D., Csiszárík, A., Zombori, Z., 2017. Gradient regularization improves accuracy of discriminative models. *arXiv* 1712.09936.
- Xiao, J., Fan, Y., Sun, R., Luo, Z., 2022. Adversarial rademacher complexity of deep neural networks. *arXiv* 2211.14966.
- Xiao, J., Sun, R., Long, Q., Su, W.J., 2024. Bridging the gap: Rademacher complexity in robust and standard generalization. *arXiv* 2406.05372.
- Yin, D., Ramchandran, K., Bartlett, P.L., 2018. Rademacher complexity for adversarially robust generalization, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*.