

Disentangling Feature Structure: A Mathematically Provable Two-Stage Training Dynamics in Transformers

Zixuan Gong

Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence
Renmin University of China
zxcgong@ruc.edu.cn

Jiaye Teng*

School of Statistics and Management
Shanghai University of Finance and Economics
tengjiaye@sufe.edu.cn

Yong Liu*

Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence
Renmin University of China
liuyonggsai@ruc.edu.cn

Abstract

Transformers may exhibit two-stage training dynamics during the real-world training process. For instance, when training GPT-2 on the Counterfact dataset, the answers progress from syntactically incorrect to syntactically correct to semantically correct. However, existing theoretical analyses hardly account for this two-stage phenomenon. In this paper, we theoretically demonstrate how such two-stage training dynamics occur in transformers. Specifically, we analyze the dynamics of transformers using feature learning techniques under in-context learning regimes, based on a disentangled two-type feature structure. Such disentanglement of feature structure is general in practice, *e.g.*, natural languages contain syntax and semantics, and proteins contain primary and secondary structures. To our best known, this is the first rigorous result regarding a two-stage optimization process in transformers. Additionally, a corollary indicates that such a two-stage process is closely related to the spectral properties of the attention weights, which accords well with empirical findings¹.

1 Introduction

Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) have emerged as foundational architectures with broad applications across multiple research domains, such as natural language processing (Kenton and Toutanova, 2019; Radford et al., 2019), computer vision (Liu et al., 2021; He et al., 2022), *etc.* Recently, large language models (LLM) based on decoder-only transformer architectures further demonstrate impressive capabilities, excelling in various downstream tasks (Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023). However, it remains an essential issue to delve into why LLMs exhibit

*Corresponding author.

¹Our code is available at <https://github.com/zx-gong/Two-Stage-Dynamics>.




Figure 1: Two-stage Learning of Syntactic and Semantic Information on Counterfact Dataset.

such remarkable performance. Fortunately, exploring the optimization dynamics in transformers presents a promising approach for investigating the possible factors that contribute to this behavior.

Many scholars have theoretically delved into the optimization dynamics in supervised learning or language tasks by studying gradient flow or attention maps (Deora et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Tian et al., 2023a,b; Zhang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024). However, there is less consideration of feature structure, which might be crucial to inducing a realistic optimization process. Surprisingly, we observe that transformers may exhibit two-stage training dynamics during practical learning, induced by a two-type feature structure.

For instance, when fine-tuning GPT-2 on the Counterfact dataset in Figure 1 (more details in Appendix B.2), we observe the following phenomenon: at the initial time (epoch 1), most predictions are both syntactically and semantically incorrect. By epoch 5, we observe a significant decrease in training loss; all predictions meet syntactic requirements, but most remain semantically incorrect and inconsistent with the true answers. By epoch 100, all predictions are syntactically correct, with most being semantically correct and achieving a small training loss. Overall, the model’s answers progress *from syntactically incorrect to syntactically correct to semantically correct*, exhibiting two-stage training dynamics for syntactic and semantic information.

Motivated by this phenomenon, for various tasks like language tasks, protein structure prediction tasks, or classic supervised learning tasks, we can disentangle feature structure into two types: *elementary knowledge* (like syntactic information), and *specialized knowledge* (like semantic information). Such disentanglement and the corresponding two-stage learning process are empirically general in both NLP (Bao et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019a; Huang et al., 2021) and biological research, such as AlphaFold (AlQuraishi, 2019; Jumper et al., 2021).

Based on the above discussion, it is natural to infer that knowledge may be acquired following *elementary-then-specialized* principles. However, this leaves a critical theoretical question:

How does the disentangled two-type feature structure induce two-stage training dynamics in transformers?

To demystify the training dynamics of transformers, we adopt in-context learning (ICL) regimes, constructing training prompts with independently and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) in-context samples to study supervised classification tasks. As is well-known, ICL (Brown et al., 2020) has emerged as a remarkable ability in LLMs, where the model solves new tasks based on prompts without further parameter fine-tuning (Black et al., 2022; Rae et al., 2021). This ability has served as the foundation for developing more advanced prompting techniques to tackle complex problems (Huang and Chang, 2022). Recent theoretical studies mainly focus on the setting where the training and test prompts are embedded as sequences of labeled training samples and an unlabeled query, where transformers can mimic the behavior of *supervised learning* algorithms (Akyürek et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024). This prompt-embedding method, the so-called ICL regime, enables theoretical analysis of attention mechanisms in supervised learning tasks.

In this paper, we derive a rigorous two-stage optimization process where transformers first master elementary knowledge and then unlock specialized knowledge. Simultaneously, we investigate how transformer weights evolve over time, explore the convergence theory, and examine the spectral characteristics of attention weights. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

(a) Feature Disentangling with Feature Learning. Based on the above discussion, we disentangle the feature structure into two key types: elementary knowledge, and specialized knowledge. Furthermore, we proceed with theoretical abstraction in Section 3, presenting a general framework that might potentially contribute to further explorations in transformer-based learning paradigms.

(b) Mathematical Proof for Two-Stage Learning. Based on the underlying feature structure, to our best knowledge, this is the first paper presenting rigorous proofs for the two-stage learning process in transformers, distinguishing between the initial stage of mastering elementary knowledge and the subsequent stage of acquiring specialized knowledge (Detailed proof in Section D.3 ~ D.6).

(c) Optimization Trajectory and Convergence Analysis. We present optimization trajectory and finite-time convergence analysis in Section 4, providing deeper insights into the two-stage learning process. Specifically, by adopting feature learning and signal-noise decomposition techniques, we give key propositions and lemmas in Appendix D.2, discussing the impact of signal or noise weights on network output computations.

(d) Extensions in Spectral Characteristics of Attention Weights. We further discuss spectral characteristics of attention weights in Section 4.3, highlighting the close relationship with the two-stage process. This theoretical finding aligns with experimental observations, demonstrating that smaller eigenvalues preserve elementary knowledge, while larger eigenvalues allow the model to progressively acquire specialized knowledge.

2 Related work

Optimization Analysis under ICL Regimes. The optimization analysis under ICL regimes can be roughly split into two branches. The first branch examines whether the global minimum of ICL loss can be reached through gradient flow across different models and tasks (Zhang et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2024). However, this branch focuses less on how the model weights are optimized and updated throughout training. Additionally, this line hardly addresses finite-time convergence or the distinct stages of learning various types of information. The second branch further analyzes the optimization properties during training (Huang et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024; Kim and Suzuki, 2024). Of the most relevance here is Huang et al. (2023) which derives stage-wise learning of attention maps under linear regression tasks with unbalanced features. Our work differs from Huang et al. (2023) in two aspects: (a) the stage-wise phenomenon comes from the disentangled feature structure; (b) we focus on nonlinear classification tasks. In summary, finite-time training dynamics of transformers remain relatively unexplored, especially when attempting to illustrate the optimization process induced by the disentangled two-type feature structure (elementary knowledge and specialized knowledge).

Optimization Analysis of Transformers without ICL Regimes. There is a line of work analyzing the training dynamics of transformers without ICL regimes, *e.g.*, multi-head attention layer under binary classification regimes (Deora et al., 2023), ViT under classification regimes (Li et al., 2023b), one-layer transformers (Tian et al., 2023a,b).

Feature Learning. Feature learning is among the most popular approaches in optimization theory (Allen-Zhu and Li, 2020, 2022; Wen and Li, 2021; Li et al., 2023a), which aims to analyze the training behavior under specific data generation models. Compared to other techniques like Neural Tangent Kernels (Jacot et al., 2018; Li and Liang, 2018; Allen-Zhu et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019b; Du et al., 2019), feature learning approaches go beyond the lazy training regimes and allow capturing the intrinsic interaction between different features and neural network dynamics.

3 Problem Setup

This section presents the details of the data, model, and training procedure. Concretely, Section 3.1 designs the individual token feature structure and constructs training prompts following ICL regimes. Section 3.2 introduces a one-layer attention-based model and two virtual networks. Finally, Section 3.3 describes the corresponding loss function and optimization algorithm used for classification tasks.

Notations. Let $\|A\|_F$ be the Frobenius norm for matrix A and $\|x\|_2$ be the 2-norm for vector x . For vector x , $\text{ReLU}(x) = \max\{x, 0\}$ denotes the standard ReLU activation function, and $\mathbb{1}(x)$ denotes a binary vector that takes entries 1 when $x_i \geq 0$. The indicator function $\mathbb{I}(\cdot) \in \{-1, 1\}$ is defined such that it takes value 1 if the condition is satisfied, and -1 otherwise. For order analysis, $\text{Poly}(\cdot)$ represents polynomial order, $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$ indicates that $f(n)$ is asymptotically bounded above by $g(n)$, and $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ means that $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are of the same asymptotic order. Additionally, throughout the paper, let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ denote a weight matrix, and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ denote the principal submatrices of U which will be defined later.




Figure 2: Overview of Disentangled Feature Structure.

3.1 Disentangled Feature Structure

In this section, we mainly discuss the disentangled token feature structure, starting from the well-established ICL regimes (Garg et al., 2022). Under ICL regimes, a collection of samples and their corresponding labels are organized in a sequence, commonly referred to as a prompt.

Training Prompt Structure. Following the regimes in Garg et al. (2022), ICL is trained on N random training prompts, denoted by $\{P^n\}_{n \in [N]}$. The n -th training prompt is constructed as $P^n = (x_1^n, y_1^n, \dots, x_{L-1}^n, y_{L-1}^n, x_L^n)$ with prompt length L , where $x_i^n, i \in [L-1]$ denotes the input samples, $y_i^n, i \in [L-1]$ denotes the corresponding labels, and x_L^n denotes the query. Assume that $x_i^n, i \in [L-1]$ are *i.i.d.* drawn, and consider a binary classification setting with $y_i^n = y(x_i^n) \in \{-1, 1\}$. The goal of the ICL learner is to train a model $f(\cdot)$, such that the output approximates the label of the query x_L^n , namely,

$$f(P^n) \approx y_L^n = y(x_L^n).$$

Individual Token Feature Structure. As illustrated in Figure 2, each individual token x_i^n in the prompt P^n is disentangled into two types: \mathcal{P} component represents elementary knowledge (e.g., syntactic information in natural languages, primary structure in protein), and \mathcal{Q} component represents specialized knowledge (e.g., semantic information in natural languages, secondary structure in protein).

Specifically, consider a disentangled feature structure $x_i^n = [x_{i,1}^n, x_{i,2}^n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, where $x_{i,1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the elementary knowledge drawn from distribution \mathcal{P} and $x_{i,2}^n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the specialized knowledge drawn from distribution \mathcal{Q} . We construct the distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} as follows, drawing inspirations from Li et al. (2019):

- For distribution \mathcal{P} , given a fixed vector w^* and a random vector $e_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{I_{d \times d}}{d}\right)$, the data $(x_{i,1}^n, y_{i,1}^n)$ is constructed by

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,1}^n &= \mathbb{I}(\langle w^*, e_i \rangle \geq 0) \in \{-1, 1\}; \\ x_{i,1}^n &= y_{i,1}^n \gamma_0 w^* + e_i. \end{aligned}$$

Such construction guarantees its linear separability with the classifier w^* with a margin of $2\gamma_0 \|w^*\|^2$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\|w^*\|_2 = 1$ and $\gamma_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$.

- For distribution \mathcal{Q} , given the label $y_{i,1}^n \in \{-1, 1\}$ a scalar $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and two vectors $\zeta, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the data $(x_{i,2}^n, y_{i,2}^n)$ is constructed by

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i,2}^n &= y_{i,1}^n; \\ x_{i,2}^n &= \alpha z \text{ if } y_{i,2}^n = 1; \\ x_{i,2}^n &\sim \text{Unif}(\{\alpha(z - \zeta), \alpha(z + \zeta)\}) \text{ if } y_{i,2}^n = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Different from distribution \mathcal{P} , this distribution is not linear separable due to the construction of $x_{i,2}^n$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha = 1$, $\|z\|_2 = u$, $\|\zeta\|_2 = r \ll u$ and $\langle z, \zeta \rangle = 0$.

Overall, distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} represent two types of components. \mathcal{P} represents the elementary knowledge, *e.g.*, the knowledge required to master syntax; and \mathcal{Q} represents the specialized knowledge, *e.g.*, the knowledge required to unlock semantics. Notably, mastering syntax is typically much easier than unlocking semantics. Fortunately, the above construction implies this in the sense that fitting the elementary distribution \mathcal{P} (linear separable) is easier than fitting the specialized distribution \mathcal{Q} (not linear separable). We finally remark that this data construction remains a highly complex non-linear task, despite the simple concatenation. Figure 8 in Appendix C.1 intuitively illustrates the complexity of the task utilizing two-dimensional data.

Embeddings. To simplify the presentation, we denote the embedding matrix by stacking x_i^n or y_i^n . Specifically, for the feature embedding, denote

$$\begin{aligned} X_1^n &= [x_{1,1}^n \quad x_{2,1}^n \quad \cdots \quad x_{L,1}^n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}, \\ X_2^n &= [x_{1,2}^n \quad x_{2,2}^n \quad \cdots \quad x_{L,2}^n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, to ensure the model output is linearly decomposable, we combine X_1 and X_2 to form the complete feature embedding matrix as $X^n = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^n & 0 \\ 0 & X_2^n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$. Similarly, define the label embedding as

$$Y_1^n = Y_2^n \triangleq Y^n = [y_1^n \quad y_2^n \quad \cdots \quad 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L},$$

and the complete label embedding as $\tilde{Y}^n = [Y^n \quad Y^n] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2L}$.

3.2 One-Layer Transformer Architecture

This section introduces the notations of the one-layer transformer, including the normalized ReLU self-attention layer and transformer weight structure.

Normalized ReLU Self-Attention Layer. A self-attention layer (Vaswani et al., 2017) in the single-head case includes parameters θ : key, query, and value matrices $W_K, W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, $W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{2L \times 2L}$. Given the feature embedding matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$, we use a normalized ReLU activation in place of standard softmax activation as Bai et al. (2024). Then the prediction for query x_L using a one-layer transformer is given by

$$f(U; X, \tilde{Y}) = \tilde{Y} W_V \cdot \frac{1}{2L} \text{ReLU}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) = \tilde{Y} / 2L \cdot \text{ReLU}(X^\top U x_L), \quad (1)$$

where $\frac{1}{2L}$ is the normalization factor. To simplify, we reparameterize $W_K^\top W_Q \triangleq U \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ and assume the value matrix is the identity transformation, *i.e.*, $W_V = I$.

Notably, transformers with sequence-length normalized ReLU activations have been experimentally studied in Wortsman et al. (2023); Shen et al. (2023), achieving faster speed while demonstrating comparable performances to standard softmax activation in many vision and NLP tasks.

Transformer Weight Structure. Given that individual samples x_i^n can be characterized by two specific types of features, we abstract the real training network into two virtual networks, with the weight matrix composed of two distinct parts. To simplify our analysis, we consider the simplest structure of weight U as a block diagonal matrix:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d},$$

where weight W operates only on X_1 and V operates only on X_2 . This structure exhibits a strong property of linear decomposability over the model output, *i.e.*, by disentangling, the two new predictions with features X_1 and X_2 maintain a similar formulation to the original ones:

$$\underbrace{f(U; X, \tilde{Y})}_{N_U(U; X, \tilde{Y})} = \underbrace{1/2 \cdot Y/L \cdot \text{ReLU}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1})}_{N_W(W; X_1, Y) \text{ or } h(X_1)} + \underbrace{1/2 \cdot Y/L \cdot \text{ReLU}(X_2^\top V x_{L,2})}_{N_V(V; X_2, Y) \text{ or } g(X_2)}. \quad (2)$$

In summary, we naturally abstract two virtual networks: network $h(X_1)$ with parameter W operates on X_1 part to learn component \mathcal{P} , and network $g(X_2)$ with parameter V operates on X_2 part to learn component \mathcal{Q} . The overview is shown in Figure 2.

3.3 Training Procedure

Loss Function. To train the transformer model on binary classification tasks, we consider the regularized empirical loss over N training prompts. Denote the logistic loss for each prompt as $l(f(U; X^n, \tilde{Y}^n)) = \log(1 + e^{-y_L^n f(U; X^n, \tilde{Y}^n)})$, then

$$\hat{L}(U) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N l(f(U; X^n, \tilde{Y}^n)), \quad (3)$$

and the regularized loss is denoted as $\widehat{L}_\lambda(U) = \widehat{L}(U) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|U\|_F^2$, where λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient.

Optimization Algorithm. Consider stochastic gradient descent with spherical Gaussian noise, which is a simplification of minibatch SGD. Taking initial weight $[U_0]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2)$ and noise $[\xi_t]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_\xi^2)$, then the update of U with time is represented as

$$U_{t+1} = U_t - \gamma_t \nabla_U (\widehat{L}_\lambda(U_t) + \xi_t) = (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) U_t - \gamma_t \xi_t - \gamma_t \nabla_U \widehat{L}(U_t). \quad (4)$$

Signal-noise Decomposition. With noise in SGD optimization, we take signal-noise decomposition for weight U , *i.e.*, $U = \bar{U} + \tilde{U}$ (Allen-Zhu et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019). The signal weight is defined as the weights related to the gradient part, *i.e.*, $\bar{U}_{t+1} \triangleq (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) \bar{U}_t - \gamma_t \nabla_U \widehat{L}(U_t)$. And the noise weight is defined as the weights related to the noise part, *i.e.*, $\tilde{U}_{t+1} \triangleq (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) \tilde{U}_t - \gamma_t \xi_t$. Note that due to Equation 4, such decomposition is always valid.

Notably, the noise component \tilde{U} follows a Gaussian distribution since it is a linear combination of Gaussian random variables. By setting a relatively small variance τ_ξ^2 , the signal component always dominates the noise component (Li et al., 2019). Therefore, one can always rewrite the weight $U = \bar{U} + \tilde{U}$ as a signal part \bar{U} with a small Gaussian random noise \tilde{U} . Based on this observation, we define the training loss $K(\bar{U})$ which depends solely on the signal weight:

$$K(\bar{U}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N l \left(N_U(\bar{U} + \tilde{U}; X^n, \tilde{Y}^n) \right). \quad (5)$$

Based on the above discussions, minimizing Equation 5 is almost equivalent to minimizing Equation 3. Similarly, we take signal-noise decomposition for $W = \bar{W} + \tilde{W}$ and $V = \bar{V} + \tilde{V}$, then define the training loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} over signal weight as $K^1(\bar{W})$, and the training loss of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} over signal weight as $K^2(\bar{V})$:

$$K^1(\bar{W}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N l \left(N_W(\bar{W} + \tilde{W}; X_1^n, Y^n) \right), K^2(\bar{V}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N l \left(N_V(\bar{V} + \tilde{V}; X_2^n, Y^n) \right). \quad (6)$$

4 Two-stage Optimization of Transformers

Based on the data characteristics and the different learning complexity of component \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} , we split the entire training process into two stages: the Elementary Stage (in Section 4.1, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3), and the Specialized Stage (in Section 4.2, Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5). We establish the weight trajectory and analyze the finite-time convergence in the two stages. The main theorems are summarized in Figure 3. Before diving into the details, we introduce the fundamental settings of two stages, including the learning rate and training iterations. Specially,

- **Elementary Stage.** Constant learning rate $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$; Containing $0 \leq t \leq t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ where λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient.
- **Specialized Stage.** Annealing learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ will be introduced later, and $r \triangleq \|\zeta\|_2$ represents the hardness of specialized knowledge (See Section 3.1); Containing $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$ where $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$.




Figure 3: Summary of Two-stage Learning.

The annealing learning rate is widely adopted in practical training procedures. Besides, we present the same choices of hyperparameters for two stages in Assumption 4.1.

Assumption 4.1. Throughout the Theorems, set the variance of initialization parameter $\tau_0 = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, regularization coefficient $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log d})$ and prompt length $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$ where d denotes the input dimension. We defer more discussions to Appendix C.2.

4.1 Elementary Stage

This section aims to analyze the regime with $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$ and $t \leq t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$. Our goal is to prove that the weights are optimized from $\bar{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_0 \end{bmatrix}$ to $\bar{U}_{t_1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{t_1} \rightarrow W^* & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{t_1} \approx \bar{V}_0 \end{bmatrix}$. This means that \bar{W}_{t_1} approaches the optimal weights W^* , while \bar{V}_{t_1} remains close to \bar{V}_0 . We split the derivation into two theorems: Theorem 4.2 demonstrates that the component \mathcal{Q} (specialized knowledge) is not effectively learned by network g , and Theorem 4.3 demonstrates that the network h successfully learns the component \mathcal{P} (elementary knowledge). We start from Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.2. *In the elementary stage with $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$ and $t_1 = \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ where λ denotes regularization coefficients. With Assumption 4.1, initial weights $V_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$ and N training prompts, it holds that*

(a.1) *For the model parameter V of network g , through gradient descent, $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F$ satisfies*

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right).$$

(a.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) at iteration t_1 satisfies*

$$K_{t_1}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1}) \gtrsim \log 2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}.$$

Namely, the nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} is not efficiently learned by the network g within t_1 iterations.

Messages Behind Theorem 4.2. Theorem 4.2 demonstrates that the component \mathcal{Q} cannot be effectively learned by the corresponding network g defined in Equation 2. **In (a.1)**, within t_1 iterations, the weight $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F$ is approximately in order $\frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$, which implies that the model weight V is almost not optimized since $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F \approx \|\bar{V}_0\|_F$. **In (a.2)**, we provide the lower bound for the training loss of component \mathcal{Q} . The value is close to $\log 2$ with a large dimension d and training prompts N . Overall, the above discussions exhibit that specialized knowledge like \mathcal{Q} is not effectively learned by the network g . We defer the proof to Appendix D.3 and the proof sketch in Remark D.22.

Theorem 4.3. *In the elementary stage with $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$ and $t_1 = \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ where λ denotes regularization coefficients. With Assumption 4.1 and initial weights $W_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$, it holds that there exist $\epsilon_{W,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 16) such that*

(b.1) *The model parameter W of network h is optimized by gradient descent within t_1 iterations,*

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F = \Theta(d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})) \gg \|\bar{W}_0\|_F.$$

(b.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) at iteration t_1 satisfies*

$$K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1}) \lesssim \exp(-d \log d) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network h learns the linear separable component \mathcal{P} within t_1 iterations.

Messages Behind Theorem 4.3. Theorem 4.3 describes how the linear separable component \mathcal{P} is learned by the corresponding network h defined in Equation 2. **In (b.1)**, within t_1 iterations, $\|\bar{W}\|_F$ significantly grows from the order $\|\bar{W}_0\|_F \approx \sqrt{d}$ to the order $\|\bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F \approx d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})$, indicating that the knowledge might be learned. In comparison, \bar{V}_{t_1} for the component \mathcal{Q} changes small since $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F \approx \|\bar{V}_0\|_F \approx \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$ (See Theorem 4.2 (a.1)). **In (b.2)**, it shows that the loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} is upper bounded by an $o(1)$ term which converges to zero as the dimension d goes to infinity. In comparison, the loss of component \mathcal{Q} is lower bounded by a constant close to $\log 2$ (See Theorem 4.2 (a.2)). In summary, the above discussions imply that **the network h learns elementary knowledge like \mathcal{P} , marking the so-called elementary stage.** We defer the proof to Appendix D.4 and proof sketch to Remark D.26.

4.2 Specialized Stage

This section aims to analyze the regime with $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ is defined in Equation 17, $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ and $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$. Our goal is to prove that the

weights are optimized from $\bar{U}_{t_1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{t_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{t_1} \end{bmatrix}$ to $\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} \approx \bar{W}_{t_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{t_1+t_2} \rightarrow \bar{V}_{t_1} + V^* \end{bmatrix}$.

In total, we split the derivation into two theorems: Theorem 4.4 demonstrates that the network g learns specialized knowledge like component \mathcal{Q} , and Theorem 4.5 demonstrates that the network h continues to preserve elementary knowledge like component \mathcal{P} . We start from Theorem 4.4.

Theorem 4.4. *In the specialized stage with annealing learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 17), $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient and data noise $\|\zeta\|_2 = r$ (See Section 3.1). With Assumption 4.1, it holds that*

(c.1) *The model parameter V of network g is optimized by gradient descent within t_2 iterations,*

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right) \gg \|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F.$$

(c.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) satisfies*

$$K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}) \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network g learns nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} within t_2 iterations.

Messages Behind Theorem 4.4. Theorem 4.4 illustrates the optimization in the specialized stage. **Statement (c.1)** implies that within t_2 iterations, $\|\bar{V}\|_F$ grows from the order $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F \approx \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$ to the order $\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F \approx \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \approx \text{Poly}(d) \log \text{Poly}(d) + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$ (derivation based on Assumption 4.1). **Statement (c.2)** implies that the loss is upper bounded by $o(1)$ which converges to zero as d goes to infinity. Notably, the upper bound given by the order $\exp(-\text{Poly}(d) \log(\text{Poly}(d))) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$. Compared to Theorem 4.2 with constant lower bound, we conclude that **with a small learning rate, the network g learns specialized knowledge, marking the so-called specialized stage.** We defer the proof to Appendix D.5 and the proof sketch in Remark D.28.

Discussion on Parameter Orders. We first focus on the learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$. Given the choices in Assumption 4.1, $\eta_2 \approx \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log d}{(\text{Poly}(d))^2 \eta_1}\right)$. It usually follows that $\eta_2 < \eta_1$, which accords with practical training. Additionally, the current learning keeps $t_2 = \mathcal{O}(\text{Poly}(d)(\log d)^{7/2}/\eta_1)$, which is significantly longer than $t_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d}/\eta_1)$, coming from the fact that learning specialized components is harder than learning elementary components.

Theorem 4.5. *In the specialized stage with annealing learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 17), $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient and data noise $\|\zeta\|_2 = r$ (See Section 3.1). With Assumption 4.1 and number of training prompts $N = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, it holds that*

(d.1) *For the model parameter W of network h , through gradient descent optimization from iteration t_1 to $t_1 + t_2$, $\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F$ satisfies*

$$\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

(d.2) With random and small noise weight, the training loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 2) satisfies

$$|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1})| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network h continues to preserve the elementary knowledge like \mathcal{P} within t_2 iterations.

Messages Behind Theorem 4.5. Theorem 4.5 demonstrates the optimization process on the linear separable part \mathcal{P} in the specialized stage, annealing the learning rate from η_1 to η_2 . **Statement (d.1)** demonstrates that the signal weight \overline{W} does not change significantly in the specialized stage, given the upper bound $o(1)$. Concretely, the upper bound of the weight difference between two moments is $\frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})\sqrt{\log d}}$, with the order of $\frac{1}{(\text{Poly}(d))^2(\log d)^{5/2}}$. **Statement (d.2)** demonstrates that the loss also does not change much from iteration t_1 to $t_1 + t_2$, ensuring that the model remains low training loss on linear separable component \mathcal{P} . In detail, the small changes in loss have an order of $\frac{1}{(\text{Poly}(d))^2(\log d)^{5/2}}$. In summary, **in the specialized stage, the network h continues to preserve the knowledge \mathcal{P} acquired during the elementary stage.** Given that both the changes in signal weight \overline{W} and the loss are minimal, we also conclude that the specialized stage is dedicated exclusively to the learning of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} . We defer the proof to Appendix D.6 and the proof sketch to Remark D.31.

Experiments Verifying Two-Stage Learning on Theoretical Synthetic Dataset. As shown in Figure 4, experimental results on the synthetic dataset verify our theoretical findings, where the training dynamics exhibit a clear two-stage phenomenon. We defer more details to Appendix B.

4.3 Extensions in Spectral Characteristics of Attention Weights

In this section, we further explore the two-stage phenomenon on the spectral characteristics of attention weights $\text{Tr}(W)$ and $\text{Tr}(V)$ in Corollary 4.6, based on Theorem 4.2 ~ 4.5. Experimental results in Figure 5 accord with the theoretical findings.

Corollary 4.6. Under the assumptions in Theorem 4.2 ~ Theorem 4.5, it holds that

(a) In the elementary stage within $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ iterations, the spectral dynamics satisfy

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1}) > \text{Tr}(V_{t_1}).$$




Figure 4: Two-stage Learning of Component \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} on Theoretical Synthetic Data. *Note:* The light lines represent the original accuracy curve, while the dark lines show the smoothed accuracy.




Figure 5: Spectral Characteristics in Attention Weights on Counterfact Dataset.

(b) In the specialized stage within $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$ iterations, the spectral dynamics satisfy

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1+t_2}) < \text{Tr}(V_{t_1+t_2}).$$

Messages Behind Corollary 4.6. Corollary 4.6 implies that when the model is sufficiently trained (at time $t_1 + t_2$), *relatively small eigenvalues of attention weights store elementary knowledge and large ones store specialized knowledge*. This will be further verified through experiments on real-world language datasets. We defer the proof and further discussions to Appendix D.7.

Experiments Verifying Spectral Characteristics on Language Datasets. We verify the above insight empirically on Counterfact dataset in Figure 5 by preserving different eigenvalues and observing the model performances. Concretely, at time $T = 5$ (fully syntactically correct) and $T = 100$ (fully syntactically correct, nearly fully semantically correct), we set the rank preservation ρ ranging from 0.1 to 1.0, to obtain edited matrices with different eigenvalues using SVD for comparing predictions. For the left figure, we find that the model’s predictions become more semantically similar and accurate, as rank preservation ρ increases (maintaining more *large* eigenvalues). For the right figure, we find that the model gradually grasps correct syntax as ρ increases (maintaining more *small* eigenvalues). In addition, in the middle figure, the number of correct predictions increases with larger rank preservation, which accords with intuition. In total, we find that the two-stage learning process is closely related to the spectral characteristics in attention weights. We defer more experimental details on Counterfact and HotpotQA Datasets to Appendix B.

5 Conclusion

This paper provides rigorous proof for the two-stage learning of transformers in ICL tasks. We disentangle token feature structure into two types: *elementary knowledge*, and *specialized knowledge*. By employing feature learning and signal-noise decomposition techniques, we analyze the optimization trajectory, finite-time convergence, and spectral characteristics under ICL regimes, offering deeper insights into the optimization process. Our work potentially provides a new perspective and a theoretical framework for understanding the optimization dynamics of transformers.

References

- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need.(nips), 2017. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*, 10:S0140525X16001837, 2017.
- Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, volume 1, page 2, 2019.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16000–16009, 2022.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240): 1–113, 2023.
- R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2(5), 2023.
- Puneesh Deora, Rouzbeh Ghaderi, Hossein Taheri, and Christos Thrampoulidis. On the optimization and generalization of multi-head attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12680*, 2023.
- Yuchen Li, Yuanzhi Li, and Andrej Risteski. How do transformers learn topic structure: Towards a mechanistic understanding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19689–19729. PMLR, 2023a.
- Yuandong Tian, Yiping Wang, Beidi Chen, and Simon S Du. Scan and snap: Understanding training dynamics and token composition in 1-layer transformer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:71911–71947, 2023a.
- Yuandong Tian, Yiping Wang, Zhenyu Zhang, Beidi Chen, and Simon Du. Joma: Demystifying multilayer transformers via joint dynamics of mlp and attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00535*, 2023b.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Spencer Frei, and Peter L Bartlett. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09927*, 2023.

- Yu Huang, Yuan Cheng, and Yingbin Liang. In-context convergence of transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05249*, 2023.
- Xiang Cheng, Yuxin Chen, and Suvrit Sra. Transformers implement functional gradient descent to learn non-linear functions in context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06528*, 2023.
- Siyu Chen, Heejune Sheen, Tianhao Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. Training dynamics of multi-head softmax attention for in-context learning: Emergence, convergence, and optimality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19442*, 2024.
- Yu Bao, Hao Zhou, Shujian Huang, Lei Li, Lili Mou, Olga Vechtomova, Xinyu Dai, and Jiajun Chen. Generating sentences from disentangled syntactic and semantic spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.05789*, 2019.
- Mingda Chen, Qingming Tang, Sam Wiseman, and Kevin Gimpel. A multi-task approach for disentangling syntax and semantics in sentence representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01173*, 2019a.
- James Y Huang, Kuan-Hao Huang, and Kai-Wei Chang. Disentangling semantics and syntax in sentence embeddings with pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05115*, 2021.
- Mohammed AlQuraishi. Alphafold at casp13. *Bioinformatics*, 35(22):4862–4865, 2019.
- John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Židek, Anna Potapenko, et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- Sid Black, Stella Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, et al. Gpt-neox-20b: An open-source autoregressive language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06745*, 2022.
- Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*, 2021.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10403*, 2022.
- Ekin Akyürek, Dale Schuurmans, Jacob Andreas, Tengyu Ma, and Denny Zhou. What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15661*, 2022.
- Chenyu Zheng, Wei Huang, Rongzhen Wang, Guoqiang Wu, Jun Zhu, and Chongxuan Li. On mesa-optimization in autoregressively trained transformers: Emergence and capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16845*, 2024.
- Wei Shen, Ruida Zhou, Jing Yang, and Cong Shen. On the training convergence of transformers for in-context classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11778*, 2024.

- Juno Kim and Taiji Suzuki. Transformers learn nonlinear features in context: Nonconvex mean-field dynamics on the attention landscape. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01258*, 2024.
- Hongkang Li, Meng Wang, Sijia Liu, and Pin-Yu Chen. A theoretical understanding of shallow vision transformers: Learning, generalization, and sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06015*, 2023b.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Towards understanding ensemble, knowledge distillation and self-distillation in deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09816*, 2020.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Feature purification: How adversarial training performs robust deep learning. In *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 977–988. IEEE, 2022.
- Zixin Wen and Yuanzhi Li. Toward understanding the feature learning process of self-supervised contrastive learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11112–11122. PMLR, 2021.
- Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Yuanzhi Li and Yingyu Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 2019.
- Zixiang Chen, Yuan Cao, Difan Zou, and Quanquan Gu. How much over-parameterization is sufficient to learn deep relu networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12360*, 2019b.
- Simon Du, Jason Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1675–1685. PMLR, 2019.
- Shivam Garg, Dimitris Tsipras, Percy S Liang, and Gregory Valiant. What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30583–30598, 2022.
- Yuanzhi Li, Colin Wei, and Tengyu Ma. Towards explaining the regularization effect of initial large learning rate in training neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Yu Bai, Fan Chen, Huan Wang, Caiming Xiong, and Song Mei. Transformers as statisticians: Provable in-context learning with in-context algorithm selection. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- Mitchell Wortsman, Jaehoon Lee, Justin Gilmer, and Simon Kornblith. Replacing softmax with relu in vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08586*, 2023.

Kai Shen, Junliang Guo, Xu Tan, Siliang Tang, Rui Wang, and Jiang Bian. A study on relu and softmax in transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06461*, 2023.

Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.

Pratyusha Sharma, Jordan T Ash, and Dipendra Misra. The truth is in there: Improving reasoning in language models with layer-selective rank reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13558*, 2023.

Appendix

A	Table of Notations	19
B	Additional Experimental Details	20
B.1	Experiments Verifying Two-Stage Learning on Theoretical Synthetic Dataset. . . .	20
B.2	Experiments on Counterfact Dataset.	20
B.3	Experiments on HotpotQA Dataset.	21
C	Additional Discussions	23
C.1	Additional Discussions on Feature Structure	23
C.2	Additional Discussions on Assumption 4.1	23
D	Proofs for Theorems and Corollary	25
D.1	Useful Probability Concentration Inequalities	25
D.2	Propositions, Lemmas and Corollaries	26
D.3	Proof for the Elementary Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.2	38
D.4	Proof for the Elementary Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.3	54
D.5	Proof for the Specialized Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.4	58
D.6	Proof for the Specialized Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.5	65
D.7	Proof for Spectral Characteristics: Proof of Corollary 4.6	69

A Table of Notations

Table 1: Table of Notations.

Notation	Description
t_1	Total iterations of the elementary stage
t_2	Total iterations of the specialized stage
N	Number of training prompts
L	Training prompt length (the last token is a query)
$x_i^n = [x_{i,1}^n, x_{i,2}^n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$	Divide the i -th token of n -th training prompts into two parts
$x_{i,1}^n \sim \mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^d$	The elementary knowledge in a token
$x_{i,2}^n \sim \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$	The specialized knowledge in a token
$X_1^n = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1}^n & x_{2,1}^n & \cdots & x_{L,1}^n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$	Stack of $x_{i,1}^n$
$X_2^n = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,2}^n & x_{2,2}^n & \cdots & x_{L,2}^n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$	Stack of $x_{i,2}^n$
$X^n = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^n & 0 \\ 0 & X_2^n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$	Stack of X_1^n and X_2^n
$y_i^n \in \{-1, 1\}$	Binary classification label
$Y^n = [y_1^n \ y_2^n \ \cdots \ 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L}$	Stack of y_i^n
$\tilde{Y}^n = [Y^n \ Y^n] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2L}$	Stack of Y_1^n and Y_2^n
$f(U; X, \tilde{Y})$	Normalized ReLU self-attention output, see in Equation 1
$h(X_1)$	Virtual network operates on X_1 , see in Equation 2
$g(X_2)$	Virtual network operates on X_2 , see in Equation 2
$U = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$	Model parameter of normalized ReLU self-attention network
$U = \bar{U} + \tilde{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$	Signal-noise decomposition of weight U
$W = \bar{W} + \tilde{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$	Model parameter of virtual network h , signal-noise decomposition of weight W
$V = \bar{V} + \tilde{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$	Model parameter of virtual network g , signal-noise decomposition of weight V
$\hat{L}(U)$	The empirical loss over weight U , see in Equation 3
$K(\bar{U})$	The training loss over signal weight \bar{U} , see in Equation 5
$K^1(\bar{W})$	The training loss over signal weight \bar{W} , see in Equation 6
$K^2(\bar{V})$	The training loss over signal weight \bar{V} , see in Equation 6

B Additional Experimental Details

In this section, we provide additional experimental details, including experiments that verify two-stage learning on synthetic dataset (in Section B.1), as well as experiments conducted on language datasets such as Counterfact (in Section B.2) and HotpotQA (in Section B.3).

B.1 Experiments Verifying Two-Stage Learning on Theoretical Synthetic Dataset.

Based on our theoretical construction of component \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} and model setting in Section 3, we conduct experiments on the synthetic dataset with the following hyperparameters: data dimension $d = 10$, $r \triangleq \|\zeta\|_2 = 10^{-7}$, $u \triangleq \|z\|_2 = 7$, prompt length $L = 128$ and $N = 128$ training prompts. We train the one-layer normalized ReLU self-attention model for 400 epochs, using SGD optimizer with the learning rate annealed from 1.5 to 0.015 at epoch 20. As shown in Figure 4, the training dynamics of linear separable component \mathcal{P} and nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} exhibit a clear two-stage phenomenon, closely aligning with our theoretical results.

B.2 Experiments on Counterfact Dataset.

Datasets, Model and Hyperparameter Settings. Counterfact (Meng et al., 2022) is a question-answering dataset consisting of knowledge tuples in the form of (subject, relation, answer). These tuples are constructed using entities from Wikidata. Additionally, there are three paraphrased prompts for each question, resulting in a total of 65,757 examples for the entire dataset. We fine-tune the GPT-2 model with a batch size of 32 for 200 epochs, using the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of $5e-6$. Notably, we adopt some experiment code from Sharma et al. (2023). All experiments are conducted using a single 24GB NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090.

Observation (1): Verify Two-stage Learning of Disentangled Two-type Feature Structure.

In Figure 1, we present the training loss over 200 epochs, highlighting three key moments with representative samples, including questions, gold answers and the model’s predictions. At the initial time $T = 1$, many predictions are both syntactically and semantically incorrect. By $T = 5$, we observe a significant decrease in training loss; all predictions meet syntactic requirements, but most are remain semantically incorrect and inconsistent with the true answers. Thus, the period from $T = 1$ to $T = 5$ corresponds to our theoretical Elementary Stage. By $T = 100$, all predictions are syntactically correct, with most being semantically correct and achieving a very low loss value. Therefore, the period from $T = 6$ to $T = 100$ represents our theoretical Specialized Stage. Overall, this experiment on language dataset supports our theory of two-stage learning for the disentangled two-type feature structure, *i.e.*, syntax and semantics in languages.

Observation (2): Verify Spectral Characteristics. From Theorems 4.3 ~ 4.5, based on the relationship of F-norm and trace, it’s straightforward to get $Tr(W_{t_1+t_2}) < Tr(V_{t_1+t_2})$ at convergence time $t_1 + t_2$ (Detailed Corollary 4.6 is shown in Section 4.3). We know that weight W of network h operates on the elementary knowledge and weight V of network g operates on the specialized

knowledge. Then the corollary of $Tr(W_{t_1+t_2}) < Tr(V_{t_1+t_2})$ hints that, *relatively small eigenvalues of attention weights store elementary knowledge and large ones store specialized knowledge.*

Thus in Figure 5, we perform model editing on the attention layer weights of the model to analyze the impact of large or small eigenvalues. Concretely, we edit attention weights at time $T = 5$ (fully syntactically correct) and $T = 100$ (fully syntactically correct, nearly fully semantically correct). Using SVD, we sort the eigenvalues of attention weights and set rank preservation coefficient ρ , ranging from 0.1 to 1.0. As shown in Figure 5, the numbers in matrices represent the rank preservation coefficient ρ of the current matrix.

- **For the left figure**, we first edit attention weights at $T = 100$. Eigenvalues are sorted from largest to smallest and matrices preserve the top ρ proportion of the largest eigenvalues. When $\rho = 0.1$, it means maintaining 10% of the largest eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors. The figure displays 10 weight matrices, with ρ ranging from 0.1 to 1.0 from left to right. As ρ increases, more large eigenvalues are preserved, and the model’s predictions become more semantically similar and accurate.
- **For the right figure**, we further edit attention weights at $T = 5$. Eigenvalues are sorted from smallest to largest and matrices preserve the top ρ proportion of the smallest eigenvalues. From right to left, more small eigenvalues are included. As more eigenvalues of the full matrix are used, the model gradually grasps correct syntactic information.
- **For the middle figure**, it shows that the number of correct predictions increases with larger rank preservation, which is intuitive. In summary, the spectral characteristics insights drawn from our theory are also empirically reasonable.

B.3 Experiments on HotpotQA Dataset.

Datasets, Model and Hyperparameter Settings. HotpotQA is a question-answering dataset that involves natural, multi-hop questions and provides supervision for the supporting facts, aiming to enhance the explainability of question-answering systems. We choose the HotPotQA dataset available on HuggingFace, with a small size 13,530 (Meng et al., 2022). We fine-tune the GPT-2 model with a batch size of 32 for 200 epochs, using the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of $5e-6$. Notably, we adopt some experiment code from Sharma et al. (2023). All experiments are conducted using a single 24GB NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090.

Observation (1): Verify Two-stage Learning of Disentangled Two-type Feature Structure.

In Figure 6, we present the training loss over 60 epochs, highlighting three key moments with representative samples, including questions, gold answers and the model’s predictions. At the initial time $T = 1$, many predictions are both syntactically and semantically incorrect. By $T = 8$, we observe a significant decrease in training loss; all predictions meet syntactic requirements, but most are remain semantically incorrect and inconsistent with the true answers. Thus, the period from $T = 1$ to $T = 8$ corresponds to our theoretical Elementary Stage. By $T = 40$, all predictions are syntactically correct, with most being semantically correct and achieving a very low loss value. Therefore, the period from $T = 9$ to $T = 40$ represents our theoretical Specialized Stage. Overall,




Figure 6: Two-stage Learning of Syntactic and Semantic Information on Hotpot Dataset.

this experiment on language dataset supports our theory of two-stage learning for the disentangled two-type feature structure, *i.e.*, syntax and semantics in languages.

Observation (2): Verify Spectral Characteristics. In Figure 7, we perform model editing on the attention layer weights of the model to analyze the impact of large or small eigenvalues. Concretely, we edit attention weights at time $T = 8$ (fully syntactically correct) and $T = 40$ (fully syntactically correct, nearly fully semantically correct). Using SVD, we sort the eigenvalues of attention weights and set rank preservation coefficient ρ , ranging from 0.1 to 1.0. As shown in Figure 5, the numbers in matrices represent the rank preservation coefficient ρ of the current matrix.

- **For the left figure**, we first edit attention weights at $T = 40$. Eigenvalues are sorted from largest to smallest and matrices preserve the top ρ proportion of the largest eigenvalues. When $\rho = 0.1$, it means maintaining 10% of the largest eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors. The figure displays 10 weight matrices, with ρ ranging from 0.1 to 1.0 from left to right. As ρ increases, more large eigenvalues are preserved, and the model's predictions become more semantically similar and accurate.
- **For the right figure**, we further edit attention weights at $T = 8$. Eigenvalues are sorted from smallest to largest and matrices preserve the top ρ proportion of the smallest eigenvalues. From right to left, more small eigenvalues are included. As more eigenvalues of the full matrix are used, the model gradually grasps correct syntactic information.
- **For the middle figure**, it shows that the number of correct predictions increases with larger rank preservation, which is intuitive. In summary, the spectral characteristics insights drawn from our theory are also empirically reasonable.




Figure 7: Spectral Characteristics of Attention Weights on Hotpot Dataset.

C Additional Discussions

In this section, we provide additional discussions on disentangled feature structure (in Section C.1) and Assumption 4.1 (in Section C.2).

C.1 Additional Discussions on Feature Structure

In Figure 8, we utilize two-dimensional data to intuitively illustrate the roles of two components \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} based on the distribution, in learning both linear and nonlinear classifiers. By concatenating these two components, individual sample x_i^n in a prompt is employed to tackle a more complex composite nonlinear classification task. Despite the data composition, the task’s difficulty is significantly increased rather than being a simple combination.

C.2 Additional Discussions on Assumption 4.1

Assumption 4.1. Throughout the Theorems, set the variance of initialization parameter $\tau_0 = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, regularization coefficient $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log d})$ and prompt length $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$ where d denotes the input dimension. We defer more discussions to Appendix C.2.

We next validate the hyperparameter orders in Assumption 4.1.

(1) τ_0 denotes the variance of the initialization parameter. The requirement $\tau_0 = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$ suggests that, as dimension d increases and the data complexity grows, the variance should be adaptively decreased. This aligns with practical training methodologies, as a higher variance might result in a significant shift of the initial weights in high-dimensional spaces, leading to unstable training and potentially impeding convergence.

(2) λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient in the loss function. The requirement $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log d})$ suggests that, as dimension d increases, λ should be adjusted to be correspondingly smaller. This is




Figure 8: Composite nonlinear classification.

a practical consideration because, in high-dimensional scenarios, a large λ may overly constrain the model, potentially causing underfitting. Furthermore, $t_1 \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1 \lambda}$ implies that there might be a longer period during which the model may struggle to effectively learn from the higher-dimensional feature Q , which accords with the empirical intuition.

(3) L denotes the prompt length. The requirement $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$ suggests that the model anticipates longer input sequences for learning high-dimensional data, which accords with reality.

D Proofs for Theorems and Corollary

In this section, we present detailed proofs for the Theorems and Corollary discussed in Section 4. Prior to the proofs, we first introduce useful probability concentration inequalities (in Section D.1), followed by some propositions, lemmas, and corollaries (in Section D.2). The proofs of Theorem 4.2 and 4.3 are provided in Section D.3 and D.4, respectively, while the proofs of Theorem 4.4 and 4.5 are provided in Section D.5 and D.6. Finally, we discuss Corollary 4.6 with its proof directly derived from the main theorems.

D.1 Useful Probability Concentration Inequalities

Lemma D.1 (Hoeffding's Inequality for General Bounded Random Variables, cite HDP p16). *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be independent random variables. Assume that $X_i \in [m_i, M_i]$ for every i . Then, for any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) \geq t \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_i - m_i)^2} \right)$$

Lemma D.2 (Bernstein's Inequality for Bounded Random Variables, cite concentration.pdf, lemma 7.37). *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be i.i.d. and suppose that $|X_i| \leq c$, $\mathbb{E}(X_i) = \mu$, $\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}(X_i)$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N X_i - \mu \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2c \log(1/\delta)}{3n}$$

Lemma D.3 (Norm of Matrix with Gaussian Entries, cite HDP p85). *Let A be an $n \times n$ random matrix whose entries A_{ij} are independent gaussian random variables with $N(0, \sigma^2)$. Then for any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\|A\| \lesssim \sigma\sqrt{n}$$

Lemma D.4 (Standard Gaussian Concentration Inequality). *Suppose that $X = X_1, \dots, X_N$ are i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian variables, and suppose $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a 1-Lipschitz function with respect to the Euclidean metric. Then $\mathbb{E}[X] < \infty$ and for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr(X - \mathbb{E}[X] > t) \leq e^{-t^2}$$

Lemma D.5 (Chernoff Bound for Gaussian Variables). *Let $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, then $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] = \exp(\mu\lambda + \sigma^2\lambda^2/2)$ and for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr(|X - \mu| > t) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)$$

$$\Pr \left(\left| \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \right| > t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2} \right)$$

D.2 Propositions, Lemmas and Corollaries

Assumption D.6. For $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$ that satisfies the data structure, let i be i -th row, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|[X_1^\top]_i\|_2 &\leq u + \gamma_0, \|X_1^\top\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + \gamma_0) \\ \|[X_2^\top]_i\|_2 &\leq u + r, \|X_2^\top\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + r) \\ \|[X^\top]_i\|_2 &\leq \max\{u + \gamma_0, u + r\}, \|X^\top\|_F \leq \sqrt{L(u + \gamma_0)^2 + L(u + r)^2}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For X_1 , we have

$$\|w^*\|_2 = 1, \|[X^\top]_i\|_2 \leq u + \gamma_0, \|X^\top\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + \gamma_0)$$

For X_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle z, \zeta \rangle &= 0, \|z\|_2 = u, \|\zeta\|_2 = r \\ \|[X^\top]_i\|_2 &\leq u + r, \|X^\top\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + r)\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition D.7. By signal-noise decomposition, we have the updating rules for signal weight and noise weight:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{U}_t &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-s} \nabla_{U_{s-1}} \hat{L}(U_{s-1}), \\ \tilde{U}_t &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^t U_0 - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-s} \xi_{s-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Decoupling the signal and noise, signal weight \bar{U} is affected by the gradient updates, and noise weight \tilde{U} is affected by noise ξ . With $U_{t+1} = (1 - \gamma_t\lambda)U_t - \gamma_t(\nabla_U \hat{L}(U_t) + \xi_t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{U}_t &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma_{s-1} \left(\prod_{i=s}^{t-1} (1 - \gamma_i\lambda) \right) \nabla_{U_{s-1}} \hat{L}(U_{s-1}) \\ \tilde{U}_t &= \left(\prod_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - \gamma_i\lambda) \right) U_0 - \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma_{s-1} \left(\prod_{i=s}^{t-1} (1 - \gamma_i\lambda) \right) \xi_{s-1}\end{aligned}$$

When constant learning rate $\gamma_t = \eta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{U}_t &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-s} \nabla_{U_{s-1}} \hat{L}(U_{s-1}) \\ \tilde{U}_t &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^t U_0 - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-s} \xi_{s-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Since $U = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{bmatrix}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} W_{t+1} & 0 \\ 0 & V_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} &= (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) \begin{bmatrix} W_t & 0 \\ 0 & V_t \end{bmatrix} - \gamma_t (\nabla_U \widehat{L}(U_t) + \xi_t) \\ W_{t+1} &= (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) W_t - \gamma_t (\nabla_{W_t} \widehat{L}(U_t) + \xi_t) \\ V_{t+1} &= (1 - \gamma_t \lambda) V_t - \gamma_t (\nabla_{V_t} \widehat{L}(U_t) + \xi_t) \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the signal-noise decomposition of U with learning rate $\gamma_t = \eta$, we naturally have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_t &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta \lambda)^{t-s} \nabla_{W_{s-1}} \widehat{L}(U_{s-1}) \\ \widetilde{W}_t &= (1 - \eta \lambda)^t W_0 - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta \lambda)^{t-s} \xi_{s-1} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{V}_t &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta \lambda)^{t-s} \nabla_{V_{s-1}} \widehat{L}(U_{s-1}) \\ \widetilde{V}_t &= (1 - \eta \lambda)^t V_0 - \sum_{s=1}^t \eta (1 - \eta \lambda)^{t-s} \xi_{s-1} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

□

Proposition D.8. For any $U \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, $W, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$, $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $\widetilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2L}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L}$, then we have the derivative over weight U of empirical loss, i.e. $\nabla \widehat{L}(U)$ and its component $[\nabla \widehat{L}(U)]_i$ is the i -th row of $\nabla \widehat{L}(U)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \widehat{L}(U) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right] \\ [\nabla \widehat{L}(U)]_i &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U x_L) [X^\top]_i x_L^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for the derivative over weight W ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_W \widehat{L}(U) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) X_1 \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1}) \right) x_{L,1}^\top \right] \\ [\nabla_W \widehat{L}(U)]_i &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i W x_{L,1}) [X_1]_i x_{L,1}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

for the derivative over weight V ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_V \widehat{L}(U) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) X_2 \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V x_{L,2}) \right) x_{L,2}^\top \right] \\ [\nabla_V \widehat{L}(U)]_i &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i V x_{L,2}) [X_2]_i x_{L,2}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

Proof. According to the definition of training objective, define

$$l(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) = -\log \sigma \left(y_L f \left(U; X, \tilde{Y} \right) \right)$$

then we have the derivative of empirical loss with weight U ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \hat{L}(U) &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \nabla (y_L f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \nabla \left(\tilde{Y} / 2L \cdot \text{ReLU} (X^\top U x_L) \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \nabla \text{ReLU} ([X^\top]_i U x_L) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U x_L) [X^\top]_i x_L^\top \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) X \cdot \text{diag} (\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L)) x_L^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } [\nabla \hat{L}(U)]_i = \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U x_L) [X^\top]_i x_L^\top \right].$$

Furthermore, when taking derivative over W ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_W \hat{L}(U) &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \nabla_W \left(y_L f(U; X, \tilde{Y}) \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \nabla_W \left(\tilde{Y} / 2L \cdot \text{ReLU} (X^\top U x_L) \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^L [y_i \quad y_i] \nabla_W \text{ReLU} \left(\begin{bmatrix} [X_1^\top]_i W x_{L,1} \\ [X_2^\top]_i V x_{L,2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^L y_i \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i W x_{L,1}) [X_1]_i x_{L,1}^\top \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) X_1 \cdot \text{diag} (\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1})) x_{L,1}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

and $[\nabla_W \hat{L}(U)]_i = \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i W x_{L,1}) [X_1]_i x_{L,1}^\top \right]$. Similarly, when taking derivative over V , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_V \hat{L}(U) &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) X_2 \cdot \text{diag} (\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V x_{L,2})) x_{L,2}^\top \right] \\ [\nabla_V \hat{L}(U)]_i &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i V x_{L,2}) [X_2]_i x_{L,2}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition D.9. Assume that \hat{L} is K -Lipschitz continuous, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\hat{L}(U)\|_F &\lesssim K, \|\nabla\hat{L}(U)_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\sqrt{2d}} \\ \|\nabla_W\hat{L}(U)\|_F &\lesssim K, \|\nabla_W\hat{L}(U)_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\sqrt{d}} \\ \|\nabla_V\hat{L}(U)\|_F &\lesssim K, \|\nabla_V\hat{L}(U)_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\sqrt{d}}\end{aligned}$$

Proposition D.10. With Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.9, we have that signal weight norm satisfies, for X_1

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{U}_t\|_F &\lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda}, \|\bar{U}_t\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{2d}} \\ \|\bar{W}_t\|_F &\lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda}, \|\bar{W}_t\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{d}} \\ \|\bar{V}_t\|_F &\lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda}, \|\bar{V}_t\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{d}}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Equation 7, 8 and 9, when $0 < 1 - \eta\lambda < 1$, i.e., $0 < \eta\lambda < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{U}_t\|_F &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})\|_F \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda} \\ \|\bar{U}_t\|_2 &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{2d}} \\ \|\bar{W}_t\|_F &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla_W\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})\|_F \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda} \\ \|\bar{W}_t\|_2 &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla_W\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{d}} \\ \|\bar{V}_t\|_F &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla_V\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})\|_F \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda} \\ \|\bar{V}_t\|_2 &= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta(1-\eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \|\nabla_V\hat{L}(U_{\tau-1})_i\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K}{\lambda\sqrt{d}}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|[X^\top\bar{U}]_i x_L\|_2 &\leq \|[X]_i\|_2 \|\bar{U}\|_F \|x_L\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K(u+m)^2}{\lambda} \\ \|[X_1^\top\bar{W}]_i x_{L,1}\|_2 &\leq \|[X_1]_i\|_2 \|\bar{W}\|_F \|x_{L,1}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K(u+\gamma_0)^2}{\lambda} \\ \|[X_2^\top\bar{V}]_i x_{L,2}\|_2 &\leq \|[X_2]_i\|_2 \|\bar{V}\|_F \|x_{L,2}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{K(u+r)^2}{\lambda}\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition D.11. For time $\tau \leq t$, we have

Proof. For $\tau \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{U}_t &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \tilde{U}_\tau - \sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} \eta(1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} \zeta_{\tau+t'-1} \\ &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \tilde{U}_\tau + \Xi_{t,\tau}\end{aligned}$$

where $\Xi_{t,\tau} = - \sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} \eta(1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} \zeta_{\tau+t'-1}$. □

Lemma D.12 (Refer to Lemma A.8 in Li et al. (2019), Lemma 8.2 of Allen-Zhu et al. (2019)). Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$, $x_L \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be a fixed example, with $\|x_L\|_2 \leq B$ and $\|X\|_F \leq \sqrt{2L}B$. With Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10, for every $\tau > 0$, let $U = \bar{U} + \tilde{U}$ where $\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ is a random variable whose columns have i.i.d distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2 I_{2d \times 2d})$ and $\tilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{2L}$ such that each entry of \tilde{Y} is i.i.d. uniform in $\{-1, 1\}$. We have that, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{U} and \tilde{Y} , $\forall \bar{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, we have that

$$\|\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L)\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_U$$

Furthermore,

$$\left| N_U(\bar{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{\tilde{U}}(\bar{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| \lesssim (u + m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3}$$

Proof. With Lemma A.8 of Li, we can compute the difference of activation patterns.

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L)\|_1 &\lesssim \|X^\top \bar{U}\|_F^{4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \\ &\lesssim ((2L)^{1/2} B)^{4/3} \|\bar{U}\|_F^{4/3} (\tau_0 (2L)^{1/2} B)^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \\ &\lesssim \|\bar{U}\|_F^{4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3}\end{aligned}$$

With Assumption D.6, $B = u + m$, and Proposition D.10, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L)\|_1 &\lesssim \|\bar{U}\|_F^{4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \\ &\lesssim \|\bar{U}\|_F^{4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \\ &\lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \\ &= \left(\frac{LK^2}{\lambda^2 \tau_0^2} \right)^{2/3}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| N_U(\bar{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{\tilde{U}}(\bar{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| &= \left\| \tilde{Y}/2L \cdot \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L) \right) \odot (X^\top \bar{U} x_L) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{i \in [2L]} \left| [\tilde{Y}]_i \right| \left| \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U x_L) - \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L) \right| \left| [X^\top]_i \bar{U} x_L \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2L} \left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L) \right\|_1 \max_i \left| [X^\top \bar{U}]_i x_L \right| \\
&\lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} \frac{K(u+m)^2}{\lambda} \\
&\lesssim (u+m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary D.13. *Let $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10, $\|x_{L,1}\|_2 \leq u + \gamma_0$ and $\|X_1\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + \gamma_0)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{W} and Y , $\forall \bar{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \bar{W} x_{L,1}) - \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \tilde{W} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_W \quad (10)$$

Furthermore,

$$\left| N_W(\bar{W}; X_1, Y) - N_{\tilde{W}}(\bar{W}; X_1, Y) \right| \lesssim (u + \gamma_0)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3}$$

Note. In ϵ_W , K is the Lipschitz constant, λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient, τ_0 denotes the variance of initialization parameter and L is prompt length. When with choices in Assumption 4.1, we have $\epsilon_W = (\text{Poly}(d))^{2/3}$.

Corollary D.14. *Let $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10, $\|x_{L,2}\|_2 \leq u + r$ and $\|X_2\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + r)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{V} and Y , $\forall \bar{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \bar{V} x_{L,2}) - \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_V$$

Furthermore,

$$\left| N_V(\bar{V}; X_2, Y) - N_{\tilde{V}}(\bar{V}; X_2, Y) \right| \lesssim (u + r)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3}$$

Lemma D.15. *Under the same setting as Lemma D.12, we have*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2} x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1} x_L) \right\|_1 \lesssim \epsilon_U + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d}$$

where $\epsilon_U = K^{4/3}\lambda^{-4/3}\tau_0^{-4/3}L^{2/3}$. Furthermore,

$$\left| N_{U_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{U_{t_1}}(\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| \lesssim \left(\epsilon_U + L\sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u+m)^2}{L\lambda}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| N_{U_{t_1+t_2}}(U_{t_1+t_2}; X, Y) - N_{U_{t_1}}(\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}; X, Y) \right| \\ & \lesssim \frac{\epsilon(u+r)^4\sqrt{d}}{\lambda L} + \frac{(u+r)^4\sqrt{Ld\eta_2/\eta_1}}{\lambda} + (u+r)^4\sqrt{d \log d} \\ & \lesssim \left(\epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}}L + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{(u+r)^4\sqrt{d}}{\lambda L} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To analysis that how the sign of $U_{t_1+t_2}$ correlates to U_{t_1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1}x_L) \right\|_1 \\ & = \left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}x_L) + \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1}x_L) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1}x_L) \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \underbrace{\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}x_L) \right\|_1}_A + \underbrace{\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1}x_L) \right\|_1}_B \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1}x_L) \right\|_1}_C \end{aligned}$$

For term A and term C , With Lemma D.12, we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}x_L) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3}\lambda^{-4/3}\tau_0^{-4/3}L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_U \quad (11)$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U_{t_1}x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1}x_L) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3}\lambda^{-4/3}\tau_0^{-4/3}L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_U \quad (12)$$

For term B , we first analysis the relationship between $\tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2}$ and \tilde{U}_{t_1} . With Proposition D.11, for $\tau \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_t &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \tilde{V}_\tau - \sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} \eta(1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} \zeta_{\tau+t'-1} \\ &= (1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau} \tilde{V}_\tau + \Xi_{t,\tau} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Xi_{t,\tau} = -\sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} \eta(1 - \eta\lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} \zeta_{\tau+t'-1}$. Assume that there are t_1 iterations in the first stage, let $\tau = t_1$, $t = t_1 + t_2$, and $t - \tau = t_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} &= (1 - \eta_2\lambda)^{t_2} \tilde{U}_{t_1} - \sum_{t'=1}^{t_2} \eta_2(1 - \eta_2\lambda)^{t_2-t'} \zeta_{t_1+t'-1} \\ &= (1 - \eta_2\lambda)^{t_2} \tilde{U}_{t_1} + \Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1} = -\sum_{t'=1}^{t_2} \eta_2(1-\eta_2\lambda)^{t_2-t'} \zeta_{t_1+t'-1}$.

Consider $[\Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1}]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{t_1+t_2, t_1}^2)$, for $0 < 1 - \eta_2\lambda < 1$, with a technical assumption that $\tau_\zeta^2 = \frac{\tau_0^2 - (1-\eta_1\lambda)^2\tau_0^2}{\eta_1^2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{t_1+t_2, t_1}^2 &= \sum_{t'=1}^{t_2} \eta_2^2(1-\eta_2\lambda)^{2(t_2-t')} \tau_\zeta^2 = \eta_2^2 \tau_\zeta^2 \frac{1 - (1-\eta_2\lambda)^{2t_2-1}}{\eta_2\lambda} \\ &\leq \eta_2^2 \tau_\zeta^2 \frac{1}{\eta_2\lambda} = \eta_2^2 \frac{\tau_0^2 - (1-\eta_1\lambda)^2\tau_0^2}{\eta_1^2} \frac{1}{\eta_2\lambda} \leq \eta_2^2 \frac{2\eta_1\lambda\tau_0^2}{\eta_1^2} \frac{1}{\eta_2\lambda} \\ &= \frac{2\eta_2\tau_0^2}{\eta_1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta_2 \ll \eta_1$, then $\sigma_{t_1+t_2, t_1} \ll \tau_0$. This implies that additional noise in the second stage is small.

With Equation 13, we have

$$X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L = (1-\eta_2\lambda)^{t_2} X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1} x_L + X^\top \Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1} x_L$$

since $[\tilde{U}_{t_1}]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2)$ and $[\Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1}]_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{t_1+t_2, t_1}^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) &\gtrsim \tau_0^2 \|X\|_F^2 \|x_L\|_2^2 \\ \text{Var} \left(X^\top \Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1} x_L \right) &\lesssim \frac{\eta_2\tau_0^2}{\eta_1} \|X\|_F^2 \|x_L\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

then naturally we have

$$\Pr \left[\mathbb{1} \left(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) \neq \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top \Xi_{t_1+t_2, t_1} x_L \right) \right] \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2\tau_0^2 \|X\|_F^2 \|x\|^2 / \eta_1}{\tau_0^2 \|X\|_F^2 \|x\|^2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) - \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i \tilde{U}_{t_1} x_L \right) \right| \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) \neq \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i \tilde{U}_{t_1} x_L \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} \end{aligned}$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top \tilde{U}_{t_1} x_L \right) \right\|_1 &\lesssim 2L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{4L \log d} \\ &\lesssim L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Combine term A, B, C , Finally, with Equation 11, 12 and 15, we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top U_{t_1} x_L \right) \right\|_1 \lesssim \epsilon_U + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d}$$

where $\epsilon_U = K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3}$.

Furthermore, with Proposition D.10,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| N_{U_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{U_{t_1}}(\bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in [L]} |[Y]_i| \left| \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i U_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) - \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_i U_{t_1} x_L \right) \right| \left| [X^\top]_i \bar{U}_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \left\| \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top U_{t_1+t_2} x_L \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(X^\top U_{t_1} x_L \right) \right\|_1 \max_i |[X^\top \bar{U}_{t_1+t_2}]_i x_L| \\ &\lesssim \left(\epsilon_U + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u+m)^2}{L\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary D.16. *Let $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10, $\|x_{L,1}\|_2 \leq u + \gamma_0$ and $\|X_1\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + \gamma_0)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{W} and Y , $\forall \tilde{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1} \left(X_1^\top W_{t_1+t_2} x_{L,1} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(X_1^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1 \lesssim \epsilon_W + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d}$$

where $\epsilon_W = K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3}$. Furthermore,

$$\left| N_{W_{t_1+t_2}}(\tilde{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1, Y) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\tilde{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1, Y) \right| \lesssim \left(\epsilon_W + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u + \gamma_0)^2}{L\lambda}$$

Corollary D.17. *Let $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10, $\|x_{L,2}\|_2 \leq u + r$ and $\|X_2\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + r)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{V} and Y , $\forall \tilde{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top V_{t_1+t_2} x_{L,2} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2} \right) \right\|_1 \lesssim \epsilon_V + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d}$$

where $\epsilon_V = K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3}$. Furthermore,

$$\left| N_{V_{t_1+t_2}}(\tilde{V}_{t_1+t_2}; X_2, Y) - N_{V_{t_1}}(\tilde{V}_{t_1+t_2}; X_2, Y) \right| \lesssim \left(\epsilon_V + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u+r)^2}{L\lambda}$$

Proposition D.18. *Under the same setting as Lemma D.12, we have w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{U} ,*

$$\left| N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, Y) \right| \lesssim \tau_0(u+m)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

Proof. We have

$$N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) = \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{i \in [2L]} [\tilde{Y}]_i \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+$$

With Lemma D.3, we have $\|\tilde{U}\| \lesssim \tau_0 \sqrt{d}$. Then

$$\left\| \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right\|_2 \leq \left\| [X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right\|_2 \lesssim \tau_0 \sqrt{d} \|x\|_2^2$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1, since $[Y]_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, $m_i = -\frac{1}{2L} \left\| \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right\|_2$, $M_i = \frac{1}{2L} \left\| \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right\|_2$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\left| \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{i \in [2L]} [Y]_i \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right| \geq t \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i \in [2L]} \left(2 \cdot \frac{1}{2L} \left\| \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right\|_2 \right)^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i \in [2L]} \left\| \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right\|_2^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim 2 \exp \left(- \frac{t^2}{\frac{1}{L} (\tau_0 \sqrt{d} \|x\|_2^2)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta = 2 \exp \left(- \frac{t^2}{\frac{1}{L} (\tau_0 \sqrt{d} \|x\|_2^2)^2} \right)$, then with $\delta = \frac{1}{d}$

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{L} (\tau_0 \sqrt{d} \|x\|_2^2)^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}} \\ &\lesssim \tau_0 \sqrt{d} \|x\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{L} \log \frac{2}{\delta}} \\ &= \tau_0 \|x\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with $1 - \delta$ prob, we get

$$\left| N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, Y) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{i \in [2L]} [Y]_i \left[[X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right]_+ \right| \lesssim \tau_0 \|x\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

Since $\|x\|_2 \leq u + m$, then

$$\left| N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, Y) \right| \lesssim \tau_0 (u + m)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

□

Proposition D.19. *Under the same setting as Lemma D.12, with Proposition D.18, we have w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{U} , $\forall \bar{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$,*

$$\left| N_U(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| \lesssim (u + m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3}$$

and

$$\left| N_U(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| \lesssim (u + m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + \tau_0 (u + m)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

Proof. For every i , $\mathbb{1}([X^\top U]_i x_L) \neq \mathbb{1}([X^\top \tilde{U}]_i x_L)$, it holds that $|\mathbb{1}([X^\top \tilde{U}]_i x_L)| \leq |\mathbb{1}([X^\top \bar{U}]_i x_L)|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| N_U(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) - N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| &= \left\| \tilde{Y}/2L \cdot \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L) \right) \odot (X^\top \tilde{U} x_L) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{i \in [2L]} \left| [\tilde{Y}]_i \right| \left| \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U x_L) - \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L) \right| \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{U} x_L \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2L} \left\| \mathbb{1}(X^\top U x_L) - \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{U} x_L) \right\|_1 \max_i |\mathbb{1}([X^\top \bar{U}]_i x_L)| \\ &\lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} \frac{K(u + m)^2}{\lambda} \\ &\lesssim (u + m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} \end{aligned}$$

With Proposition D.18, using triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| N_U(\tilde{U}; X, \tilde{Y}) \right| &\lesssim (u + m)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + \tau_0 (u + m)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \\ &= K(u + m)^2 \lambda^{-1} \epsilon_U + \tau_0 (u + m)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary D.20. *Let $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.19, $\|x_{L,1}\|_2 \leq u + \gamma_0$ and $\|X_1\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + \gamma_0)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{W} and Y , $\forall \bar{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,*

$$\left| N_W(\tilde{W}; X_1, Y) \right| \lesssim (u + \gamma_0)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + \tau_0 (u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

With choice of small u, r , $\tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, then

$$\left| N_W(\tilde{W}; X_1, Y) \right| \lesssim \tau_0 (u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \triangleq \epsilon_{W,1} \quad (16)$$

Note. In $\epsilon_{W,1}$, τ_0 denotes the variance of initialization parameter, L is prompt length and d represents the input dimension. When with choices in Assumption 4.1, we have $\epsilon_{W,1} = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right)$.

Corollary D.21. Let $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$, $x_{L,2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a fixed example, with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.19, $\|x_{L,2}\|_2 \leq u + r$ and $\|X_2\|_F \leq \sqrt{L}(u + r)$. Then, w.h.p over the randomness of \tilde{V} and Y , $\forall \bar{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$\left| N_V(\tilde{V}; X_2, Y) \right| \lesssim (u + r)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + \tau_0 (u + r)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}$$

With choice of small u, r , $\tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, then

$$\left| N_V(\tilde{V}; X_1, Y) \right| \lesssim \tau_0 (u + r)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \triangleq \epsilon_{V,1} \quad (17)$$

Note. In $\epsilon_{V,1}$, τ_0 denotes the variance of initialization parameter, L is prompt length and d represents the input dimension. When with choices in Assumption 4.1, we have $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right)$.

D.3 Proof for the Elementary Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.2

Theorem 4.2. *In the elementary stage with $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$ and $t_1 = \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ where λ denotes regularization coefficients. With Assumption 4.1, initial weights $V_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$ and N training prompts, it holds that*

(a.1) *For the model parameter V of network g , through gradient descent, $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F$ satisfies*

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right).$$

(a.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) at iteration t_1 satisfies*

$$K_{t_1}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1}) \gtrsim \log 2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}.$$

Namely, the nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} is not efficiently learned by the network g within t_1 iterations.

Remark D.22 (Proof Sketch). We summarize the proof sketch and main techniques in Proof of Theorem 4.2. **At the starting point**, using signal-noise decomposition technique, we assume that the approximate output \tilde{g} uses noise part to compute activation and signal part as the weight to compute attention score. We show that \tilde{g} is very close to g primarily through Corollary D.14 and D.21. Relevant corollaries are crucial for describing the differences in activation and network output under various activation and weight schemes. In the following analysis, we turn to focus on the approximation \tilde{g} . **As a key step**, we focus on the network g 's ability to distinguish between positive and negative class samples by examining the differences in their respective outputs, i.e. $|\tilde{g}_t(X_2, z - \zeta) + \tilde{g}_t(X_2, z + \zeta) - 2\tilde{g}_t(X_2, z)|$. Decompose it into two parts Φ and Ψ , where each part separately contains z and ζ . Then, give the upper bound of Φ and Ψ by applying concentration inequalities like Chernoff, Bernstein and complex probability analysis like Gaussian integrals. Combining the above, we show that the prediction difference of the network for positive and negative samples is upper bounded by a small value, $1/\sqrt{\log d}$. Consequently, we derive a straightforward lower bound $2 - 1/\sqrt{\log d}$, demonstrating that the network g cannot simultaneously make accurate predictions for both positive and negative samples.

From the network output, we further derive the changes in weight and loss. **For (a.1) and (a.2): At an initial step**, to compute the high-probability proportions for query $x_{L,2} = z' = \{z - \zeta, z + \zeta\}$ and $x_{L,2} = z$, we express the training loss in terms of the network outputs for positive and negative class samples based on the proportion, dividing it into two parts with terms $g_{t_1}(X_2, z')$ and $g_{t_1}(X_2, z)$ respectively. **As an essential step**, by leveraging the convexity and Lipschitz properties of the logistic loss, we derive a lower bound for the training loss in (a.2). Using Taylor expansion techniques in combination with this lower bound, we further deduce a corollary of Theorem 4.2, which states: $|g_{t_1}(X_2, z)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}}$. By utilizing the expression of normalized ReLU self-attention, this corollary can be further extended to give (a.1).

Proof. Using noise part to compute activation and signal part as weight.

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_t(X_2) &= N_{\tilde{V}_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) \\ &= Y \left(\mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_t x_{L,2} \right) \odot \left(X_2^\top \bar{V}_t x_{L,2} \right) \right)\end{aligned}$$

Using triangle inequality, with Corollary D.14 and D.21,

$$\begin{aligned}& |g_t(X_2) - \tilde{g}_t(X_2)| \\ &= |N_{V_t}(V_t; X_2, Y) - N_{\tilde{V}_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y)| \\ &= \left| N_{V_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) + N_{V_t}(\tilde{V}_t; X_2, Y) - N_{\tilde{V}_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) \right| \\ &\leq \left| N_{V_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) - N_{\tilde{V}_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) \right| + \left| N_{V_t}(\tilde{V}_t; X_2, Y) \right| \\ &\lesssim (u+r)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + (u+r)^2 K^{7/3} \lambda^{-7/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{-1/3} + \tau_0 (u+r)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}}\end{aligned}$$

With choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$,

$$\begin{aligned}|g_t(X_2) - \tilde{g}_t(X_2)| &\lesssim \frac{(\sqrt{\log d})^{11/3}}{(\text{Poly}(d))^{1/3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{\text{Poly}(d)}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we focus on $\tilde{g}_t(X_2)$.

Definition D.23. For any time t , input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$ with query $x_L \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define $\epsilon_t^{X, x_L} \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t x_L \geq 0\}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_t^{X, x_L} \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t x_L < 0\}$. Note that X aligns with X_2 and x_L aligns with $x_{L,2}$. Then $\mathbb{1}(\epsilon) \subset \{0, 1\}^L$. Naturally, we have

$$\mathbb{1}(\epsilon_t^{X, x_L}) = \mathbb{1}(X^\top \tilde{V}_t x_L).$$

Let $Q_t = \text{diag}(Y^\top) X_2^\top \bar{V}_t$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_t(X_2) &= N_{\tilde{V}_t}(\bar{V}_t; X_2, Y) \\ &= Y/L \left(\mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_t x_{L,2} \right) \odot \left(X_2^\top \bar{V}_t x_{L,2} \right) \right) \\ &= 1/L \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_t x_{L,2} \right)^\top \left(\text{diag}(Y^\top) X_2^\top \bar{V}_t \right) x_{L,2} \\ &= 1/L \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_t x_{L,2} \right)^\top Q_t x_{L,2}\end{aligned}$$

To simplify, we use X that represents X_2 and x_L represents $x_{L,2}$, in this Lemma, if there are no confusion.

Define $\tilde{g}_t(X, z - \zeta)$ as sequence X with $x_L = z - \zeta$, similarly for $\tilde{g}_t(X, z + \zeta)$ and $\tilde{g}_t(X, z)$. Then with Definition D.23,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\tilde{g}_t(X, z - \zeta) + \tilde{g}_t(X, z + \zeta) - 2\tilde{g}_t(X, z)| \\ &= 1/L \cdot \left| \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right)^\top Q_t(z - \zeta) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right)^\top Q_t(z + \zeta) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right)^\top Q_t z \right| \\ &\leq 1/L \cdot \underbrace{\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z \right|}_{\Phi} + 1/L \cdot \underbrace{\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \zeta \right|}_{\Psi} \end{aligned}$$

Deal with term Ψ . First, consider the second term $\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \zeta \right|$. With Assumption D.6 that $\|\zeta\|_2 = r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \zeta \right| &\leq \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \right\|_2 \|\zeta\|_2 \\ &\leq r \left| \epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta} \right| \cdot \max \| [Q_t]_i \|_2 \end{aligned}$$

For $\epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta}$ in term Ψ . For $i \in \epsilon_t^{X, z + \zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z - \zeta}$, with $[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t(z + \zeta) \geq 0$ and $[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t(z - \zeta) \leq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} -[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta &\leq [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z \leq [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta \\ \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z \right| &\leq \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta \right| \end{aligned}$$

Using chernoff bound for Gaussian variable in Lemma D.5, let $\delta = 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) = \frac{1}{d}$, then $t = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}} = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log 2d}$. Substitute \tilde{V}_t , given that it is a Gaussian vector with each component $[\tilde{V}_t]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2)$, we have w.h.p $1 - \delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta \right| &\leq r(u + r) |\tilde{V}_t| \leq \tau_0 r(u + r) \sqrt{\log d} \\ \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z \right| &\leq \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta \right| \leq \tau_0 r(u + r) \sqrt{\log d} \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\Pr \left(\left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z \right| \leq \tau_0 r(u + r) \sqrt{\log d} \right) \gtrsim 1 - \frac{1}{d}$.

In the following, we try to give the upper bound of $\Pr \left(\left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z \right| \leq \tau_0 r(u + r) \sqrt{\log d} \right)$. Define the standardized variable $\frac{[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_{iz} z}{\tau_0 u(u+r)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. We have $\Pr(|X| \leq a) = 2\Phi(a) - 1$ where Φ is CDF of standard Gaussian random variable. Substituting $\frac{[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_{iz} z}{\tau_0 u(u+r)}$ and $a = \frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}$, then with large d (i.e.

large a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left(\left|[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_i z\right| \leq \tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d}\right) &= \Pr\left(\left|\frac{[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_i z}{\tau_0 u(u+r)}\right| \leq \frac{\tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d}}{\tau_0 u(u+r)}\right) \\
&= 2\Phi\left(\frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}\right) - 1 \\
&\approx \frac{2 \cdot \frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \lesssim \frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\Pr\left(\left|[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z\right| \leq \tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d}\right) \lesssim \frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}$.

With Bernstein inequality in Lemma D.2, define new random variable $R_i = \mathbb{I}(\left|[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_i z\right| \leq \tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d})$ where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, $\mathbb{E}[R_i] = \Pr(\left|[X^\top \tilde{V}_t]_i z\right| \leq \tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d}) \lesssim \frac{r\sqrt{\log d}}{u}$. Then w.h.p. $1 - \delta = 1 - \frac{1}{d}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L R_i - \mathbb{E}[R_i] &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(1/\delta)}{L}} + \frac{2c \log(1/\delta)}{3L} \\
\sum_{i=1}^L R_i &\leq L\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(1/\delta)}{L}} + L\frac{2c \log(1/\delta)}{3L} + \frac{rL\sqrt{\log d}}{u} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} + \log d + \frac{rL\sqrt{\log d}}{u}
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $|\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta}| \lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} + \log d + \frac{rL\sqrt{\log d}}{u}$. For sufficiently large L ,

$$|\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta}| \lesssim \frac{rL\sqrt{\log d}}{u} \quad (18)$$

For $[Q_t]_i$ in term Ψ . For $Q_t = \text{diag}(Y^\top) X^\top \bar{V}_t$, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|[Q_t]_i\|_2 &= \|[Y^\top]_i [X^\top \bar{V}_t]_i\|_2 = \left\| y_i \sum_{j=1}^d [X^\top]_{ij} [\bar{V}_t]_j \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \|[X]_i\|_2 \|\bar{V}_t\|_F \\
&\lesssim \frac{K(u+r)}{\lambda}
\end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Combine Equation 18 and 19. For term B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \zeta \right| &\leq \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \right\|_2 \|\zeta\|_2 \\
&\leq r \left| \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \oplus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right| \cdot \max \| [Q_t]_i \|_2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{rL\sqrt{\log d}}{u} \cdot \frac{K(u+r)}{\lambda} \\
&\lesssim \frac{r(u+r)KL\sqrt{\log d}}{u\lambda}
\end{aligned}$$

Since then, we have completed term Ψ in Equation.

Deal with term Φ . Consider term $\Phi = \left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z \right|$ in this part. Let $a = \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top$, then

$$\left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z = a^\top Q_t z$$

According to the definition of Q_t and \bar{V}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a^\top Q_t &= a^\top \text{diag}(Y^\top) X^\top \bar{V}_t \\
&= a^\top \text{diag}(Y^\top) X^\top \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta_1 (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau} \nabla_{V_{\tau-1}} \widehat{L}(U_{\tau-1}) \\
&= a^\top \sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta_1 (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau} \Delta Q_{\tau-1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta Q_\tau = \text{diag}(Y^\top) X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z \right| \\
&\leq \eta_1 u \sum_{\tau=1}^t \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top \Delta Q_{\tau-1} \right\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

For ΔQ_τ in term Φ .

Definition D.24. For any time t , input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$ with query $x_L \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define $\mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, x_L} \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i V_\tau x_L \geq 0\}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_\tau^{X, x_L} \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i V_\tau x_L < 0\}$. Similar to Definition D.23, note that X aligns with X_2 and x_L aligns with $x_{L,2}$.

Suppose i, j satisfy that, for input $x_L = z - \zeta$ and $x_L = z + \zeta$ have the same activation pattern, then with Definition D.24 we have

$$i, j \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta} \text{ or } i, j \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$$

Consider the relationship between $[\Delta Q_\tau]_i$ and $[\Delta Q_\tau]_j$ for the above i, j . We have $\Delta Q_\tau = \text{diag}(Y^\top) X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= [\text{diag}(Y^\top)]_i \left[X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau) \right]_i = y_i \left[X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau) \right]_i \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_j &= [\text{diag}(Y^\top)]_j \left[X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau) \right]_j = y_j \left[X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau) \right]_j \end{aligned}$$

With Proposition D.8, then

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= y_i [X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)]_i = y_i [X^\top]_i \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U_\tau; X, Y)) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U_\tau x_L) [X]_i x_L^\top \right] \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_j &= y_j [X^\top \nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)]_j = y_j [X^\top]_j \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U_\tau; X, Y)) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j U_\tau x_L) [X]_j x_L^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $x_L \in \{0, z, z - \zeta, z + \zeta\}$. If $x_L = 0$, $[\Delta Q_\tau]_i = [\Delta Q_\tau]_j$. For all $x_L \in \{z, z - \zeta, z + \zeta\}$, $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$, and then $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i V_\tau x_L) = \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j V_\tau x_L) = 1$$

For fixed X , $[\nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)]_i = [\nabla_{V_\tau} \widehat{L}(U_\tau)]_j$. If $[X]_i = [X]_j$, then $y_i = y_j$,

$$[\Delta Q_\tau]_i = [\Delta Q_\tau]_j$$

If $[X]_i, [X]_j = z - \zeta, z + \zeta$, then $y_i = y_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= (z - \zeta)C, [\Delta Q_\tau]_j = (z + \zeta)C \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= (z + \zeta)C, [\Delta Q_\tau]_j = (z - \zeta)C \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - [\Delta Q_\tau]_j &= \pm 2\zeta C \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U_\tau; X, Y)) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U_\tau x_L) (z \pm \zeta) x_L^\top \right]$. If $[X_2]_i, [X_2]_j = z \pm \zeta, z$, then $y_i = -y_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= (z \pm \zeta)C, [\Delta Q_\tau]_j = zC \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_i &= zC, [\Delta Q_\tau]_j = (z \pm \zeta)C \\ [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - [\Delta Q_\tau]_j &= (-2z \pm \zeta)C, \pm \zeta C \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U_\tau; X, Y)) \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i U_\tau x_L) (z(\pm \zeta)) x_L^\top \right]$.

For $\left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top \Delta Q_\tau$ **in term** Φ . With Definition D.23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \cap \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \cap \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \cap \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right)}_{\text{Part I}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right)}_{\text{Part II}} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that Part I and Part II are similar, and we deal with Part I first. Let $A = \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z}$ and $B = \epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta}$. Similar to Definition D.23, we give the following definition to divide sets A and B , based on the above high probability results that is $\left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z \right| \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}$.

Definition D.25. For any time τ , input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$ with query $x_L = z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define $\mathcal{F}_\tau^+ \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z \gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}\}$, $\mathcal{F}_\tau^- \triangleq \{i \in [L] : [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z \lesssim -\tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\tau^c \triangleq \{i \in [L] : \left| [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z \right| \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}\}$. Similar to Definition D.23, note that X aligns with X_2 .

With Definition D.25,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) \right)^\top \Delta Q_\tau \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i \in A} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 + \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

We have introduced the relationship between $[\Delta Q_\tau]_i$ and $[\Delta Q_\tau]_j$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$. In the following, we show that if $k, l \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+$ (similar for \mathcal{F}_τ^- and \mathcal{F}_τ^c) then $k, l \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$, thus we have the same conclusion for $[\Delta Q_\tau]_k$ and $[\Delta Q_\tau]_l$.

Suppose k, l satisfy that, when $x \in \{z - \zeta, z + \zeta\}$

$$\begin{aligned} [X^\top]_k \tilde{V}_\tau x &\gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d} \\ [X^\top]_l \tilde{V}_\tau x &\gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d} \end{aligned}$$

Naturally, we have $[X^\top]_k \tilde{V}_\tau z \gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}$ and $[X^\top]_l \tilde{V}_\tau z \gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}$, i.e., $k, l \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+$. Then

$$-|[X^\top]_k \bar{V}_\tau z| \leq [X^\top]_k \bar{V}_\tau z = [X^\top]_k (V_\tau - \tilde{V}_\tau) z \leq |[X^\top]_k \bar{V}_\tau z|$$

and with Assumption D.6 and Proposition D.10,

$$\begin{aligned} [X^\top]_k V_\tau z &\geq [X^\top]_k \tilde{V}_\tau z - |[X^\top]_k \bar{V}_\tau z| \\ &\geq \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d} - \frac{u(u+r)K}{\lambda} \\ &\gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$. Since $\{[X^\top]_k V_\tau z \gtrsim \tau_0 r(u+r) \sqrt{\log d}\} \subset \{[X^\top]_k V_\tau z \geq 0\} \subset \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$, then we have $k, l \in \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z-\zeta} \cap \mathcal{G}_\tau^{X, z+\zeta}$. Thus, if $k, l \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+, \mathcal{F}_\tau^-, \mathcal{F}_\tau^c$, $[\Delta Q_\tau]_k$ and $[\Delta Q_\tau]_l$ hold the same conclusion as $[\Delta Q_\tau]_i$ and $[\Delta Q_\tau]_j$.

Therefore, with the definition of data structure, assume that the probability of $[X]_i = [X]_j$, i.e. $[\Delta Q_\tau]_i = [\Delta Q_\tau]_j$, is P , then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \setminus \epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) \right)^\top \Delta Q_\tau \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \sum_{i \in A} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 + \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \\
&\quad + \left\| \sum_{i \in A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i - \sum_{i \in B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c} [\Delta Q_\tau]_i \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \max \|\Delta Q_\tau\|_2 (|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| + |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| + |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c|) \\
&\leq (u+r)K \left(P \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right| + P \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| \right| + (1-P) (|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1-P) (|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-|) + |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c| \right)
\end{aligned}$$

For $|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|, |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|$ and $\left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right|$. It is related to $[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z, [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta, [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z$. At time $\tau \leq t$, we can establish the relationship of $[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z, [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z$. With Proposition D.11 and $\eta = \eta_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z &= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau} [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z - \sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} [X^\top]_i \zeta_{\tau+t'-1} z \\
&= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau} [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z + [X^\top]_i \Xi_{t,\tau} z
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Xi_{t,\tau} = -\sum_{t'=1}^{t-\tau} \eta_1 (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau-t'} \zeta_{\tau+t'-1}$. Let $Y_1 = [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t z, Y_2 = [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z, Y_3 = [X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_t \zeta, Y_4 = [X^\top]_i \Xi_{t,\tau} z, \beta = (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{t-\tau} \lesssim 1$, we have $Y_1 = Y_4 + \beta Y_2$.

Consider Y_1 , given that $[\tilde{V}_\tau]_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2)$, then

$$\text{Var}([X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z) = \tau_0^2 \|z\|_2^2 \sum_j X_{ji}^2 = \tau_0^2 \|z\|_2^2 \| [X]_i \|_2^2$$

With Assumption D.6, we have $Y_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2 u^2 (u+r)^2)$. Similarly, $Y_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2 u^2 (u+r)^2)$, $Y_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2)$

Consider Y_4 , denote its variance as $\sigma_{t,\tau}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}([X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z) &= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{2(t-\tau)} \text{Var}([X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_\tau z) + \text{Var}([X^\top]_i \Xi_{t,\tau} z) \\
\tau_0^2 u^2 (u+r)^2 &= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{2(t-\tau)} \tau_0^2 u^2 (u+r)^2 + \sigma_{t,\tau}^2 \\
\sigma_{t,\tau} &= \sqrt{\tau_0^2 u^2 (u+r)^2 (1 - (1 - \eta_1 \lambda)^{2(t-\tau)})} \gtrsim \tau_0 u (u+r) \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\kappa = \tau_0 r(u+r)\sqrt{\log d}$, with Chernoff bound for Gaussian Variable in Lemma D.5, and we have Gaussian Integral that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ax^2} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+) &= \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^{x, z}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] \\
&= \Pr[Y_2 + Y_3 \geq 0, Y_2 \leq 0, Y_1 \geq \kappa] \\
&= \Pr[Y_2 + Y_3 \geq 0, Y_2 \leq 0, Y_4 \geq \kappa - \beta Y_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} [\Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2, Y_2 \leq 0, Y_4 \geq \kappa - \beta Y_2 \mid Y_2]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} [\Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2] \mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) \Pr[Y_4 \geq \kappa - \beta Y_2 \mid Y_2]] \\
&\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} e^{-\frac{(\kappa - \beta z)^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}} dz \lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\left(-\frac{1}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2} - \frac{\beta^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}\right) z^2} dz \\
&\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\sqrt{\frac{1}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2} + \frac{\beta^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}}} \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+) &= \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^z, i \notin \epsilon_t^{z-\zeta}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] \\
&= \Pr[Y_2 \geq 0, Y_2 - Y_3 \leq 0, Y_1 \geq \kappa] \\
&= \Pr[-Y_2 \geq 0, -Y_2 - Y_3 \leq 0, -Y_1 \geq \kappa] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} [\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) \Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2] \Pr[Y_4 \leq -\kappa - \beta Y_2 \mid Y_2]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} [\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) \Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2] \Pr[Y_4 \geq \kappa + \beta Y_2 \mid Y_2]] \\
&\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} e^{-\frac{(\kappa + \beta z)^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}} dz \lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\left(-\frac{1}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2} - \frac{\beta^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}\right) z^2} dz \\
&\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\sqrt{\frac{1}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2} + \frac{\beta^2}{2\sigma_{t,\tau}^2}}} \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r)
\end{aligned}$$

Using Bernstein inequality in Lemma D.2, to bound $|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|$ and $|B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|$. Suppose $M_i = \mathbf{1}(i \in \epsilon_t^{z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^z, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+)$ and $N_i = \mathbf{1}(i \in \epsilon_t^z, i \notin \epsilon_t^{z-\zeta}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| &= \sum_{i=1}^L M_i, |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| = \sum_{i=1}^L N_i \\
\mathbb{E}[|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|] &= \mathbb{E}[M_i] = \Pr(M_i) \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r), \\
\mathbb{E}[|B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+|] &= \mathbb{E}[N_i] = \Pr(N_i) \lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r)
\end{aligned}$$

Then with high probability at least $1 - \delta$, and let $\delta = \frac{1}{d}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^L M_i &\lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} + \log d + \tau_0 r(u+r)L \\
\sum_{i=1}^L N_i &\lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} + \log d + \tau_0 r(u+r)L
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| &\lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r)L \\ |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| &\lesssim \tau_0 r(u+r)L \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Pr(A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+) - \Pr(B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+)| \\ &= \left| \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^{z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^z, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] - \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^z, i \notin \epsilon_t^{z-\zeta}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} [\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) \Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2] \Pr[\kappa - \beta Y_2 \leq Y_4 \leq \kappa + \beta Y_2 \mid Y_2]] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) e^{-\frac{|Y_2|^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} \frac{|Y_2|}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} \right] \\ &\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} \frac{|z|}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} dz \lesssim \frac{1}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} \int_0^\infty z e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} dz \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} \int_0^\infty e^{-v} dv \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} \lesssim \frac{\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}{\tau_0 u (u+r) \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}} \lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)}{u \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

Using Bernstein inequality in Lemma D.2, to bound $\| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \|$. Suppose $M_i = \mathbf{1}(i \in \epsilon_t^{z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^z, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+)$ and $N_i = \mathbf{1}(i \in \epsilon_t^z, i \notin \epsilon_t^{z-\zeta}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^L (M_i - N_i) \right| \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right| \right] &= \mathbb{E} [M_i - N_i] \\ &= |\Pr(M_i) - \Pr(N_i)| \\ &= \left| \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^{z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^z, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] - \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^z, i \notin \epsilon_t^{z-\zeta}, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau^+] \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)}{u \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

Then with high probability at least $1 - \delta$, and let $\delta = \frac{1}{d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L (M_i - N_i) - \mathbb{E} [M_i - N_i] &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(1/\delta)}{L}} + \frac{2c \log(1/\delta)}{3L} \\ \sum_{i=1}^L (M_i - N_i) &\leq L \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \log(1/\delta)}{L}} + L \frac{2c \log(1/\delta)}{3L} + \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L}{u \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}} \\ \sum_{i=1}^L (M_i - N_i) &\lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} + \log d + \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L}{u \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda (t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, we get that

$$\left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right| \lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}}$$

For $|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-|, |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-|$ and $\left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| \right|$. Similar to the above part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| &\lesssim \tau_0 r (u+r)L \\ |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| &\lesssim \tau_0 r (u+r)L \\ \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| \right| &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

For $|A \cap \mathcal{F}_s^c|$ and $|B \cap \mathcal{F}_s^c|$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[i \in \epsilon_t^{z+\zeta}, i \notin \epsilon_t^z, i \in \mathcal{F}_s^c] &= \Pr[Y_2 + Y_3 \geq 0, Y_2 \leq 0, |Y_1| \leq \kappa] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Pr[Y_2 + Y_3 \geq 0, Y_2 \leq 0, |Y_4 - \beta Y_2| \leq \kappa]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) \Pr[Y_3 \geq -Y_2 \mid Y_2] \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\sigma_{s,t}} \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{Y_2} \left[\mathbf{1}(Y_2 \leq 0) e^{-\frac{|Y_2|^2}{2\tau_0^2 r^2 (u+r)^2}} \frac{\kappa}{\sigma_{t,\tau}} \right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r (u+r) \kappa \sqrt{2\pi}}{\sigma_{t,\tau} 2} \lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r (u+r) \tau_0 r (u+r) \sqrt{\log d}}{\tau_0 u (u+r) \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r) \sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using Bernstein inequality in Lemma D.2, $|A \cap \mathcal{F}_s^c| \lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L\sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}}$, and $|B \cap \mathcal{F}_s^c| \lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L\sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}}$.

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left(\mathbb{1}(\epsilon_t^{X,z-\zeta}) + \mathbb{1}(\epsilon_t^{X,z+\zeta}) - 2\mathbb{1}(\epsilon_t^{X,z}) \right)^\top \Delta Q_\tau \right\|_2 \\ &\leq (u+r)K \left(P \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right| + P \left| |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| - |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| \right| + (1-P) \left(|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^+| \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1-P) \left(|A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^-| \right) + |A \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c| + |B \cap \mathcal{F}_\tau^c| \right) \\ &\lesssim (u+r)K \left(2P \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} + (1-2P)\tau_0 r (u+r)L + \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L\sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \right) \\ &\lesssim (u+r)K \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)L\sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)^2 K L \sqrt{\log d}}{u\sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda(t-\tau)}} \end{aligned}$$

When $t \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1 \lambda}$, we conclude that term Φ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z \right| \\
& \leq \eta_1 u \sum_{\tau=1}^t \left\| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top \Delta Q_{\tau-1} \right\|_2 \\
& \lesssim \eta_1 u \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\tau_0 r^2 (u+r)^2 K L \sqrt{\log d}}{u \sqrt{\eta_1 \lambda} (t-\tau)} \\
& \lesssim \tau_0 r^2 (u+r)^2 K L \sqrt{\log d} \sqrt{\frac{t \eta_1}{\lambda}} \\
& \lesssim \tau_0 \lambda^{-1} r^2 (u+r)^2 K L \sqrt{\log d}
\end{aligned}$$

Combine term Ψ and term Φ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{g}_t(X, z - \zeta) + \tilde{g}_t(X, z + \zeta) - 2\tilde{g}_t(X, z)| \\
& = 1/L \cdot \left| \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right)^\top Q_t (z - \zeta) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right)^\top Q_t (z + \zeta) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right)^\top Q_t z \right| \\
& \leq 1/L \cdot \underbrace{\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) + \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - 2\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z} \right) \right)^\top Q_t z \right|}_{\Phi} + 1/L \cdot \underbrace{\left| \left(\mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z+\zeta} \right) - \mathbb{1} \left(\epsilon_t^{X, z-\zeta} \right) \right)^\top Q_t \zeta \right|}_{\Psi} \\
& \lesssim \tau_0 \lambda^{-1} r^2 (u+r)^2 K \sqrt{\log d} + \lambda^{-1} r u^{-1} (u+r) K \sqrt{\log d}
\end{aligned}$$

with choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\log d} \right)$ and $L = \Theta \left(\text{Poly}(d) \right)$, therefore, we conclude that

$$|\tilde{g}_t(X, z - \zeta) + \tilde{g}_t(X, z + \zeta) - 2\tilde{g}_t(X, z)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \sqrt{\log d} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$$

Deal with $|g_{t_1}(X_2)|$. Assume that $|g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta) + g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta) - 2g_{t_1}(X_2, z)| \lesssim \xi$ and from Theorem 4.2 we have $\xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$. We would first like to analysis $|g_{t_1}(X_2, z)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)|$. Naturally, we have

$$g_{t_1}(X_2, z) = \frac{1}{2} (g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta) + g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) + \gamma$$

where $|\gamma| \leq \xi$.

Then consider the proportion of $x_{L,2} = \{z - \zeta, z + \zeta, z\}$ in N training sequences with high probability. For $x_{L,2} = \{z - \zeta, z + \zeta\}$, its expected proportion is $\frac{1}{4}$ and for $x_{L,2} = z$, its expected proportion $\frac{1}{2}$. Using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1, for example $x_{L,2} = z - \zeta$, define random variables,

$$X_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_{L,2}^n = z - \zeta, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Since X_n are i.i.d. and $E[X_n] = \frac{1}{4}$,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N X_n - \frac{1}{4} \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-2Nt^2)$$

Let $\delta = 2 \exp(-2Nt^2)$, then $t = \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2N}}$. If $1 - \delta = 1 - \frac{1}{d}$, $t = \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the proportion of $x_{L,2} = z - \zeta$ is $\frac{1}{4} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}$, Naturally, the proportion of $x_{L,2} = z + \zeta$ is $\frac{1}{4} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}$, and the proportion of $x_{L,2} = z$ is $\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}$.

With the definition of empirical loss, l is the logistic loss, and $l(f(V; \cdot); X_2, Y) = \log(1 + e^{-yL f(V; X_2, Y)})$. Then w.h.p. at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}(V_{t_1}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} l(f(V_{t_1}; \cdot); X_2, Y) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{4} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)) + \left(\frac{1}{4} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z)) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{4} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)) + l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) + 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z))) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{4} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) \underbrace{(l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)) + l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) - 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma))}_A \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma) + 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z))}_B \end{aligned}$$

For term A , since l is convex, then

$$\begin{aligned} A &= l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)) + l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) - 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma) \\ &= l(g_{t_1}(X, z + \zeta)) + l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)) - 2l \left(\frac{g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta) + g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)}{2} \right) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Further since l is a 2-Lipschitz function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |l(g_t(X, z)) - l(g_t(X, z) - \gamma)| &\leq 2\gamma \\ B &= 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma) + 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z)) \\ &\geq 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma) + 2l(g_{t_1}(X_2, z) - \gamma) - 4\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Finally, from Theorem 4.2 we have $\xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$, we have the lower bound of $\widehat{L}(V_{t_1})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{L}(V_{t_1}) &= \left(\frac{1}{4} \pm \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (A + B) \\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (4 \log 2 - 4\gamma) \\
&\geq \log 2 - \mathcal{O}(\xi) - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \\
&\geq \log 2 - \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \right) - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of training loss of component \mathcal{Q} on signal weight, i.e. $K^1(\bar{V})$, we have

$$K_{t_1}^1(\bar{V}_{t_1}) \gtrsim \log 2 - \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} \right) - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right)$$

Naturally, assume that $\widehat{L}(V_{t_1}) \leq \log 2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi')$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{L}(V_{t_1}) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (A + 4 \log 2 - 4\gamma) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (A + 4 \log 2 - \mathcal{O}(\xi)) \\
\widehat{L}(V_{t_1}) &\leq \log 2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi')
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) A &\leq \log 2 + \mathcal{O}(\xi') - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) (4 \log 2 - \mathcal{O}(\xi)) \\
\left(\frac{1}{4} - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right) \right) A &\leq \mathcal{O}(\xi) + \mathcal{O}(\xi') \\
A &\leq \frac{\mathcal{O}(\xi') + \mathcal{O}(\xi)}{1 - \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}} \right)}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the Taylor expression of A , including the 2nd order, and $u = g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta), v =$

$g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \log 2 + \frac{u}{2} + \frac{u^2}{8} + \log 2 + \frac{v}{2} + \frac{v^2}{8} - 2 \left(\log 2 + \frac{u+v}{4} + \frac{(u+v)^2}{32} \right) \\ &= \frac{u^2}{8} + \frac{v^2}{8} - \frac{(u+v)^2}{16} = \frac{(u+v)^2}{16} \\ &\leq A \leq \frac{\mathcal{O}(\xi') + \mathcal{O}(\xi)}{1 - \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}\right)} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$|g_{t_1}(X, z)|, |g_{t_1}(X, z - \zeta)|, |g_{t_1}(X, z + \zeta)| \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\xi' + \xi}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}}} \right)$$

then we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta) + g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta) - 2g_{t_1}(X_2, z)| &\leq |g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)| + |g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)| + 2|g_{t_1}(X_2, z)| \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\xi' + \xi}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}}} \lesssim \xi \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 4.2 we have $\xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$, thus $\xi' = \frac{1}{\log d}$.

Finally, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{t_1}(X_2, z)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z - \zeta)|, |g_{t_1}(X_2, z + \zeta)| &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\xi' + \xi}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}}} \lesssim \sqrt{(\xi' + \xi) \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}\right)} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{1}{\log d} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N \log d}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} \end{aligned}$$

Deal with $\|V_{t_1}\|_F$. Through $|g_{t_1}(X_2)|$, we then analysis $\|V_{t_1}\|_F$. With Corollary D.21,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{t_1}(X_2)| &= N_{V_{t_1}}(V_{t_1}; X_2, Y) \\ &= N_{V_{t_1}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y) + N_{V_{t_1}}(\tilde{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L y_i \mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \cdot ([X_2^\top]_i \bar{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) + \epsilon_{V,1} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{L} \|\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2})\|_1 \max([X_2^\top]_i \bar{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) + \epsilon_{V,1} \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

For $\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1$, using Corollary D.14,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) - \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_V$$

thus further consider $\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 = \sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2})$$

where $\mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2})$ is Bernoulli r.v., then using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1,

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \tilde{W}_t x_{L,1}) \geq t \right) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$$

Let $\delta = e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$, with $\delta = \frac{1}{d}$, $t = \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} = \sqrt{2 \log d}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (i.e., $1 - \frac{1}{d}$),

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 \lesssim \sqrt{\log d}$$

Using triangle inequality, we know that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top \tilde{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 + \epsilon_V \lesssim \sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_V$$

Substitute into Equation 20, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{t_1}(X_2)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{L} \left\| \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \right\|_1 \max([X_2^\top]_i \bar{V}_{t_1} x_{L,2}) + \epsilon_{V,1} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{L} \left(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_V \right) (u+r)^2 \|V_{t_1}\|_F + \epsilon_{V,1} \\ &\lesssim \|V_{t_1}\|_F \left(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_V \right) \frac{(u+r)^2}{L} + \epsilon_{V,1} \\ &\lesssim \|V_{t_1}\|_F \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \end{aligned}$$

with $|g_{t_1}(X_2)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}}$, we have

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F \leq \|V_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$$

D.4 Proof for the Elementary Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.3

Theorem 4.3. *In the elementary stage with $\eta_1 = \Theta(1)$ and $t_1 = \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ where λ denotes regularization coefficients. With Assumption 4.1 and initial weights $W_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$, it holds that there exist $\epsilon_{W,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 16) such that*

(b.1) *The model parameter W of network h is optimized by gradient descent within t_1 iterations,*

$$\|\overline{W}_{t_1}\|_F = \Theta(d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})) \gg \|\overline{W}_0\|_F.$$

(b.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) at iteration t_1 satisfies*

$$K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1}) \lesssim \exp(-d \log d) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network h learns the linear separable component \mathcal{P} within t_1 iterations.

Remark D.26 (Proof Sketch). We summarize the proof sketch and main techniques in Proof of Theorem 4.3. **For (b.1) and (b.2): In the beginning**, we first analyze the network h 's output under the optimal weight, with signal-noise decomposition, separating it into the outputs under the optimal signal weight and small random noise weights, respectively. The upper bound of the latter relies on the key Proposition D.18, D.19 and Corollary D.20, where the calculation of activations and attention scores is explicitly written out, leveraging the differences in activation patterns. The upper bound analysis of the former utilizes the properties of W^* and the data construction attributes of component \mathcal{P} . **Moving forward**, we use this network output to represent the upper bound of the optimal loss. Furthermore, through gradient descent analysis, we measure $\|\overline{W}_{t_1} - W^*\|$ and $\|K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1}) - K_{t_1}^1(W^*)\|$. We use proof by contradiction to give (b.1) and (b.2), showing that there exists a fixed target signal matrix which will classify \mathcal{P} correctly no matter the small noise weight.

Proof. According to Theorem 4.2, we conclude that the large learning rate creates too much noise to learn Q . Also, from above we conclude that in the first stage, the network weight V_{t_1} on Q changes small.

Definition D.27. In the elementary stage, denote the optimal weight as $U_1^* = \begin{bmatrix} W^* & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{V}_{t_1} = \Delta V \end{bmatrix}$ with initial $W_0 = V_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times d}$, where $W^* \triangleq d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) w^*(w^*)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and $\|\overline{V}_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$.

In this section, we primarily focus on the process of optimizing from W_0 to W^* . With the decomposition of signal and noise weight, consider random and small noise, we will prove that \overline{W}_0 can be optimized to \overline{W}_{t_1} , which is close to W^* , at the end of this section through gradient descent analysis.

Since f_t is the function of signal weight with random noise weight, then we first consider the decomposition of $f_t(W^*; X_1, Y)$

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(W^*; X_1, Y) &= N_{W_t}(W^* + \widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y) \\ &= N_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y) + N_{W_t}(\widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y) \end{aligned}$$

Deal with term $N_{W_t}(\widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y)$. With Corollary D.20, and choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \text{Poly}(d)$, then we have

$$N_{W_t}(\widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y) \lesssim \tau_0(u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \triangleq \epsilon_{W,1} \quad (21)$$

Deal with term $N_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y)$. For the term $N_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y)$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} N_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y) &= Y/L \cdot (\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1}) \odot (X_1^\top W^* x_{L,1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L y_i \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i W_t x_{L,1}) \cdot ([X_1^\top]_i W^* x_{L,1}) \end{aligned}$$

According to the data structure of X_1 , assume that $\gamma_0 = 1/\sqrt{d}$, with Definition D.27 and Assumption D.6 that $(w^*)^2 = 1$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|W^*\|_F^2 &= (d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}))^2 \|w^*(w^*)^\top\|_F^2 \\ &= d^2 \log^2(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We consider that

$$\begin{aligned} y N_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y) &= y \cdot Y/L \cdot (\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1}) \odot (X_1^\top W^* x_{L,1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i W_t x_{L,1}) \cdot ([X_1^\top]_i W^* x_{L,1}) \\ &= d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) [X_1^\top]_i w^*(w^*)^\top x_{L,1} \|\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1})\|_1 / L \end{aligned}$$

For $d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) [X_1^\top]_i w^*(w^*)^\top x_{L,1}$, with $\epsilon_{W,1} = \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) [X_1^\top]_i w^*(w^*)^\top x_{L,1} &= d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) \left(\text{sign}(\langle w^*, e \rangle) \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} + \langle w^*, e \rangle \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim d \log(\text{Poly}(d)) \end{aligned}$$

For $\|\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1})\|_1$, using Corollary D.13,

$$\|\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1}) - \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W} x_{L,1})\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_W$$

Using triangle inequality, we have $\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1}) \gtrsim \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W} x_{L,1}) - \epsilon_W$, thus further consider $\|\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1})\|_1$,

$$\|\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1})\|_1 = \sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1})$$

where $\mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1})$ is Bernoulli r.v., then using Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1}) \leq (L-t)p \right) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2Lp(1-p)}}$$

For Bernoulli r.v., we have $p = 1/2$, then let $\delta = e^{-\frac{t^2}{2Lp(1-p)}} = e^{-2t^2/L}$, with $\delta = \frac{1}{d}$, $t = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}L \log \frac{1}{\delta}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}L \log d}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (i.e., $1 - \frac{1}{d}$),

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 \gtrsim L - \sqrt{L \log d}$$

Using triangle inequality, we know that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 \geq \left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_t x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 - \epsilon_W \gtrsim L - \sqrt{L \log d} - \epsilon_W$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} yN_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y) &= d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) [X_1^\top]_i w^*(w^*)^\top x_{L,1} \left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_t x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 / L \\ &\gtrsim d \log d \left(L - \sqrt{L \log d} - \epsilon_W \right) \cdot 1/L \\ &\gtrsim d \log d \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} - \frac{\epsilon_W}{L} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Combine Equation 21 and Equation 23. Combine Equation 21 and Equation 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} yf_t^1(W^*; X_1, Y) &= yN_{W_t}(W^* + \widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y) \\ &\geq yN_{W_t}(W^*; X_1, Y) - \left| yN_{W_t}(\widetilde{W}_t; X_1, Y) \right| \\ &\gtrsim d \log d \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} - \frac{\epsilon_W}{L} \right) - \tau_0(u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \end{aligned}$$

with choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \text{Poly}(d)$, consider the loss with signal weight $\overline{W}_t = W^*$ and random noise weight \widetilde{W}_t at time t ,

$$\begin{aligned} K_t^1(W^*) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N l(yf_t^1(W^*; X_1^n, Y^n)) \\ &\lesssim \log \left(1 + \exp \left(-d \log d \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} - \frac{\epsilon_W}{L} \right) + \tau_0(u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \right) \right) \\ &\lesssim \log(1 + \exp(-d \log d)) \lesssim \exp(-d \log d) \end{aligned}$$

which comes from $d \log d \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} = \frac{d(\log d)^{3/2}}{\text{Poly}(d)}$, $d \log d \frac{\epsilon_W}{L} = \frac{d \log d}{(\text{Poly}(d))^{1/3}}$, $\tau_0(u + \gamma_0)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log d}{L}} \triangleq \epsilon_{W,1} = \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$.

Deal with gradient descent to find W^* . Consider the gradient descent of signal \bar{W} ,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{W}_{t+1} &= \bar{W}_t - \eta_1 \nabla K_t(\bar{W}_t) - \eta_1 \lambda W_t \\ &= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \bar{W}_t - \eta_1 \nabla K_t(\bar{W}_t)\end{aligned}$$

With $\|W^*\|_F = d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) \triangleq B$ from Equation 22, loss K_t is K -Lipschitz, i.e. $\|\nabla K_t(\bar{W}_t)\|_F \leq K$, assume that $\|\bar{W}_t - W^*\|_F \leq R = \Theta(1) \ll B$, then we can measure the distance of W_t and W^* .

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{W}_{t+1} - W^*\|_2^2 &= \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \bar{W}_t - \eta_1 \nabla K_t - W^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(\bar{W}_t - W^*) - \eta_1(\lambda W^* + \nabla K_t)\|_2^2 \\ &= \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + \eta_1^2 \|\lambda W^* + \nabla K_t\|_2^2 - 2\eta_1(1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \langle \bar{W}_t - W^*, \lambda W^* \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\eta_1(1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \langle \bar{W}_t - W^*, \nabla K_t \rangle \\ &= \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + \eta_1^2 \|\lambda W^* + \nabla K_t\|_2^2 - 2\eta_1 \lambda(1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \langle \bar{W}_t, W^* \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\eta_1 \lambda(1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \langle W^*, W^* \rangle - 2\eta_1(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(K_t(\bar{W}_t) - K_t(W^*)) \\ &\leq \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + 2\eta_1^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + K^2) - 2\eta_1 \lambda(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(R + B)B \\ &\quad + 2\eta_1 \lambda(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)B^2 - 2\eta_1(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(K_t(\bar{W}_t) - K_t(W^*)) \\ &\leq \|(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + 2\eta_1^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + K^2) - 2\eta_1 \lambda(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)RB \\ &\quad - 2\eta_1(1 - \eta_1 \lambda)(K_t(\bar{W}_t) - K_t(W^*))\end{aligned}$$

For the sake of contradiction, assume that $K_t^1(\bar{W}_t) - K_t^1(W^*) \geq C$, let $0 < 1 - \eta_1 \lambda < 1$, and $\eta_1 \ll \frac{\lambda BR + C}{\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 BR + K^2 + \lambda C}$, and $\lambda R^2 \sim C$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{W}_{t+1} - W^*\|_2^2 &\leq \|(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + 2\eta_1^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 BR + K^2 + \lambda C) - 2\eta_1(\lambda BR + C) \\ &\leq \|(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 - 2\eta_1(\lambda BR + C) \\ &\leq \|(\bar{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 - 4\eta_1 \lambda R^2\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in the elementary stage with t_1 iterations, $t \leq t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$,

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1} - W^*\|_2^2 \leq \|(\bar{W}_0 - W^*)\|_2^2 - 4t_1 \eta_1 \lambda R^2 < 0$$

which is a contradiction, i.e., $K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1}) - K_{t_1}^1(W^*) \leq C$.

Therefore, in the elementary stage within t_1 iterations, $t_1 \leq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$, through gradient descent optimization, $\|\bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F$ satisfies $\|\bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F \leq B + R$, then

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F = \Theta(d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}))$$

and the training loss satisfies

$$K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1}) \leq K_{t_1}^1(W^*) + C \lesssim \exp(-d \log d) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$$

D.5 Proof for the Specialized Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.4

Theorem 4.4. *In the specialized stage with annealing learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 17), $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient and data noise $\|\zeta\|_2 = r$ (See Section 3.1). With Assumption 4.1, it holds that*

(c.1) *The model parameter V of network g is optimized by gradient descent within t_2 iterations,*

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right) \gg \|\bar{V}_{t_1}\|_F.$$

(c.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 6) satisfies*

$$K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}) \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network g learns nonlinear separable component \mathcal{Q} within t_2 iterations.

Remark D.28 (Proof Sketch). We summarize the proof sketch and main techniques in Proof of Theorem 4.4. **To begin with**, we explore the properties of optimal weight $\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*$ and analyze the network g 's output under the optimal weight at timepoint $t_1 + t_2$. Using triangle inequality, we need to handle three parts A, B, C separately. Part A exploits the characteristics of V^* in detail. Part B uses the key Lemma D.15 and Corollary D.17 to analyze the relationship between the network output at time $t_1 + t_2$ and at time t_1 , taking into account the signal weight update formula. Part C utilizes the properties of the network output at time t_1 to facilitate the analysis. **Thereafter**, we use this network output to represent the upper bound of the optimal loss. Furthermore, through gradient descent analysis, we measure $\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2} - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|$ and $\|K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|$. We use proof by contradiction to give (a) and (b), showing that there exists a fixed target signal matrix which will classify \mathcal{Q} correctly no matter the small noise weight.

Proof.

Definition D.29. For time t_1 , input $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times L}$ with query $x_L = z - \zeta, z, z + \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 &\triangleq \{i \in [L] \mid [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z - \zeta) \geq 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1} z \geq 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z + \zeta) < 0\} \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &\triangleq \{i \in [L] \mid [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z - \zeta) \geq 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1} z < 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z + \zeta) < 0\} \\ \mathcal{H}_3 &\triangleq \{i \in [L] \mid [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z - \zeta) < 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1} z < 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z + \zeta) \geq 0\} \\ \mathcal{H}_4 &\triangleq \{i \in [L] \mid [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z - \zeta) < 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1} z \geq 0, [X^\top]_i V_{t_1}(z + \zeta) \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Similar to Definition D.23, note that X aligns with X_2 and x_L aligns with $x_{L,2}$.

We first try to analyze the probability of $i \in \mathcal{H}_i$. With Assumption D.6, we can compute the cosine

of $z - \zeta$ and z ,

$$\begin{aligned}\cos \theta &= \frac{\langle z - \zeta, z \rangle}{\|z - \zeta\|_2 \|z\|_2} = \frac{u^2 - \langle \zeta, z \rangle}{u\sqrt{u^2 - 2\langle \zeta, z \rangle + r^2}} = \frac{u^2 - ur \cos \theta_0}{u\sqrt{u^2 + r^2 - 2ur \cos \theta_0}} \\ \sin \theta &= \sqrt{1 - \cos^2 \theta} = \frac{r \sin \theta_0}{\sqrt{u^2 + r^2 - 2ur \cos \theta_0}}\end{aligned}$$

For small r , with Taylor expansion of $\arcsin \theta$, we have that the angle of $z - \zeta$ and z is $\theta = \frac{r}{u} + \mathcal{O}(r^2)$.

For \mathcal{H}_1 , when $[X^\top]_i \tilde{V}_{t_1}$ fall into the middle of $z - \zeta$ and z , as well as not in the positive half space of $z + \zeta$, its probability is approximately the proportion of the spherical surface area corresponding to the angle $\frac{r}{u} + \mathcal{O}(r^2)$. Using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1 and further consider Corollary D.14, let $X_i = 1\{i \in \mathcal{H}_1\}$, then $|\mathcal{H}_1| = \sum_{i=1}^L X_i$

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{H}_1|] = L \cdot \Pr(i \in \mathcal{H}_1) \approx L \cdot \frac{r}{2\pi u} + \epsilon_V$$

Then, let $\delta = 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{L}\right)$, $t = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}L \log \frac{2}{\delta}}$, and $1 - \delta = 1 - \frac{1}{d}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left||\mathcal{H}_1| - \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{H}_1|]\right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}L \log \frac{2}{\delta}} \lesssim \sqrt{L \log d} \\ |\mathcal{H}_1| &\lesssim \frac{rL}{2\pi u} + \epsilon_V + \sqrt{L \log d}\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$|\mathcal{H}_1|, |\mathcal{H}_2|, |\mathcal{H}_3|, |\mathcal{H}_4| \lesssim \frac{rL}{2\pi u} + \epsilon_V + \sqrt{L \log d}$$

Definition D.30. In the second stage, denote the optimal weight as $U_2^* = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{t_1} + \Delta W & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{t_1} + V^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{t_1+t} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{t_1} + V^* \end{bmatrix}$, $\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t}\|_F \lesssim d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})$, and $V^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ satisfies

$$[X_2^\top V^*]_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{H}_1; \\ -\frac{2\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{H}_2; \\ \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{H}_3; \\ -\frac{2\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{H}_4; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

We have that $\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t} - \bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F \ll \|\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^* - V_{t_1}\| = \|V^*\|_F$, and we still have $\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t}\|_F \lesssim d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})$ from Theorem 4.3. In this section, we primarily focus on the process of optimizing

from \bar{V}_{t_1} to $\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*$. To calculate the Frobenius norm $\|V^*\|_F$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|X_2^\top V^*\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_1} \left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} \right)^2 \|z^\top\|_2^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_2} \left(-\frac{2\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} \right)^2 \|z^\top\|_2^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_3} \left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} \right)^2 \|z^\top\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_4} \left(-\frac{2\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} \right)^2 \|z^\top\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim u^2 |\mathcal{H}| \left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r\epsilon_{V,1}} \right)^2 \lesssim u^2 \left(\frac{rL}{2\pi u} + \epsilon_V + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2} \\
&\lesssim \frac{uL \log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r \epsilon_{V,1}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

and then $\|V^*\|_F = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right)$, where c is a constant.

In the following, we focus on the empirical loss with optimal weight $\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*$.

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{t_1+t}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) &= \widehat{L}(N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2, Y)) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \log(1 + \exp(-y_L^n N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2^n, Y^n)))
\end{aligned}$$

and then consider $y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2, Y)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2, Y) \\
&\geq y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(V^*; X_2, Y) - y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y) \\
&\geq \underbrace{y N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)}_A - \underbrace{|y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(V^*; X_2, Y) - y N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)|}_B - \underbrace{y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)}_C
\end{aligned}$$

Deal with term A. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
y N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y) &= y \cdot Y/L \cdot (\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \odot (X_2^\top V^* x_{L,2})) \\
&= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L (\mathbb{1}([X_2^\top]_i V_{t_1} x_{L,2}) \odot ([X_2^\top]_i V^* x_{L,2}))
\end{aligned}$$

For $x_{L,2} = z - \zeta$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y, x_{L,2} = z - \zeta) &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{H}_1| \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top (z - \zeta) - \frac{|\mathcal{H}_2| 2 \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top (z - \zeta) \\
&\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) u (u+r)}{r \epsilon_{V,1}} \left(\frac{r}{2\pi u} + \frac{\epsilon_V}{L} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} \right) \\
&\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) (u+r)}{\epsilon_{V,1}}
\end{aligned}$$

and for $x_{L,2} = z + \zeta$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} N_{V_{i_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y, x_{L,2} = z + \zeta) &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{H}_3| \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top (z + \zeta) - \frac{|\mathcal{H}_4| 2 \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top (z + \zeta) \\ &\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) u(u+r)}{r \epsilon_{V,1}} \left(\frac{r}{2\pi u} + \frac{\epsilon_V}{L} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} \right) \\ &\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) (u+r)}{\epsilon_{V,1}} \end{aligned}$$

and for $x_{L,2} = z$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} N_{V_{i_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y, x_{L,2} = z + \zeta) &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{H}_1| \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top z - \frac{|\mathcal{H}_4| 2 \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{L r \epsilon_{V,1}} z^\top z \\ &\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) u^2}{r \epsilon_{V,1}} \left(\frac{r}{2\pi u} + \frac{\epsilon_V}{L} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{L}} \right) \\ &\lesssim -\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) u}{\epsilon_{V,1}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, with small $r \ll u$, for $x_{L,2} \in \{z - \zeta, z, z + \zeta\}$, we have

$$y N_{V_{i_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y) \gtrsim \frac{u \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}$$

Deal with term B. With the definition of $\|X_2^\top V^*\|_F^2$, and $\|X_2^\top V^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{uL \log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{r \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |[X_2^\top V^*]_i| &\lesssim \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} \sqrt{\frac{u}{r}} \\ |[X_2^\top V^*]_{i x_{L,2}}| &\lesssim \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} \sqrt{\frac{u(u+r)^2}{r}} \end{aligned}$$

With Corollary D.17,

$$\begin{aligned} |y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(V^*; X_2, Y) - y N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)| &\lesssim \left(\epsilon_V + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1} L} \sqrt{\frac{u(u+r)^2}{r}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1} L \sqrt{r}} L \cdot (\lambda \epsilon_{V,1} \sqrt{r}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step satisfies when with choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, and $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$. Finally,

$$|y N_{V_{t_1+t}}(V^*; X_2, Y) - y N_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)| \lesssim \lambda \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})$$

Deal with term C. Before, we have

$$|g_{t_1}(X, z)|, |g_{t_1}(X, z - \zeta)|, |g_{t_1}(X, z + \zeta)| \lesssim \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\zeta' + \zeta}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{N}}}} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}}$$

Then, combine with Corollary D.21,

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{V_{t_1}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)| &\leq |g_{t_1}(X_2)| + |N_{V_{t_1}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y) - N_{V_{t_1}}(V_{t_1}; X_2, Y)| \\ &\leq |g_{t_1}(X_2)| + |N_{V_{t_1}}(\tilde{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} + \epsilon_{V,1} \end{aligned}$$

With Corollary D.17 and $\|\bar{V}_{t_1}\| \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$

$$\begin{aligned} |yN_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y) - yN_{V_{t_1}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)| &\lesssim \left(\epsilon_V + L\sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{1}{L \cdot \text{Poly}(d)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |yN_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} + \epsilon_{V,1} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} + \epsilon_{V,1} + \frac{\lambda \epsilon_{V,1}}{\sqrt{\log d}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} + \epsilon_{V,1} \end{aligned}$$

when with choice of $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$.

Combine term A, B and C.

$$\begin{aligned} &yN_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2, Y) \\ &\geq \underbrace{yN_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)}_A - \underbrace{|yN_{V_{t_1+t}}(V^*; X_2, Y) - yN_{V_{t_1}}(V^*; X_2, Y)|}_B - \underbrace{|yN_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1}; X_2, Y)|}_C \\ &\gtrsim \frac{u \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} - \lambda \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) - \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} - \epsilon_{V,1} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, with choice of small u, r , $\tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right)$, $\frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \text{Poly}(d)$, then for the

training loss of component \mathcal{Q} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{t_1+t}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) &= \widehat{L}(N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2, Y)) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \log(1 + \exp(-y_L^n N_{V_{t_1+t}}(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*; X_2^n, Y^n))) \\
&\lesssim \log\left(1 + \exp\left(-\frac{u \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \lambda \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) + \frac{1}{(\log d)^{1/4}} + \epsilon_{V,1}\right)\right) \\
&\lesssim \log\left(1 + \exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right)\right) \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

which comes from $\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} = \text{Poly}(d) \log d$, $\lambda \log(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) = \sqrt{\log d}$, $\epsilon_{V,1} = \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$.

Deal with gradient descent to find $\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*$. Consider the gradient descent of signal \bar{V} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{V}_{t+1} &= \bar{V}_t - \eta_1 \nabla K_t(\bar{V}_t) - \eta_1 \lambda V_t \\
&= (1 - \eta_1 \lambda) \bar{V}_t - \eta_1 \nabla K_t(\bar{V}_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to gradient descent of \bar{W} , let $\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*$ be W^* , then $\|\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right) \triangleq B$. Let $\|\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|_F \leq R = \Theta(1) \ll B$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar{V}_{t+1} - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \bar{V}_t - \eta_2 \nabla K_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)) - \eta_2(\lambda(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) + \nabla K_t)\|_2^2 \\
&= \|(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 + \eta_2^2 \|\lambda(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) + \nabla K_t\|_2^2 \\
&\quad - 2\eta_2(1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \langle \bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*), \lambda(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) \rangle \\
&\quad - 2\eta_2(1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \langle \bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*), \nabla K_t \rangle \\
&\leq \|(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 + 2\eta_2^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + K^2) - 2\eta_2 \lambda(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(R + B)B \\
&\quad + 2\eta_2 \lambda(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)B^2 - 2\eta_2(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(K_t(\bar{V}_t) - K_t(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)) \\
&\leq \|(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 + 2\eta_2^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + K^2) - 2\eta_2 \lambda(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)RB \\
&\quad - 2\eta_2(1 - \eta_2 \lambda)(K_t(\bar{V}_t) - K_t(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))
\end{aligned}$$

For the sake of contradiction, assume that $(K_t^2(\bar{V}_t) - K_t^2(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)) \geq C$, let $0 < 1 - \eta_2 \lambda < 1$, and $\eta_2 \ll \frac{\lambda BR + C}{\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 BR + K^2 + \lambda C}$, and $\lambda R^2 \sim C$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{V}_{t+1} - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|_2^2 &\leq \|(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 + 2\eta_2^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 BR + K^2 + \lambda C) - 2\eta_2(\lambda BR + C) \\
&\leq \|(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 - 2\eta_2(\lambda BR + C) \\
&\leq \|(\bar{V}_t - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 - 4\eta_2 \lambda R^2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in the specialized stage within $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$ iterations, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$,

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2} - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*)\|_2^2 \leq \|(\bar{V}_{t_1} - (\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*))\|_2^2 - 4t_2\eta_2\lambda R^2 \leq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}^2} - 4t_2\eta_2\lambda R^2 < 0$$

which is a contradiction.

Finally, we conclude that, in the specialized stage within t_2 iterations, $t_2 \leq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, $t_1 \leq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$, through gradient descent optimization, $\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F$ satisfies $\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F \leq B + R$, then

$$\|\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}\|_F = \Theta\left(\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\right)$$

and the training loss satisfies

$$K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1+t_2}) \leq K_{t_1+t_2}^2(\bar{V}_{t_1} + V^*) + C \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}$$

D.6 Proof for the Specialized Stage: Proof of Theorem 4.5

Theorem 4.5. *In the specialized stage with annealing learning rate $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + t_2$, where $\epsilon_{V,1} = \Theta(1/\text{Poly}(d))$ (See Definition in Equation 17), $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1 \lambda}$, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, λ denotes the L_2 regularization coefficient and data noise $\|\zeta\|_2 = r$ (See Section 3.1). With Assumption 4.1 and number of training prompts $N = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, it holds that*

(d.1) *For the model parameter W of network h , through gradient descent optimization from iteration t_1 to $t_1 + t_2$, $\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|_F$ satisfies*

$$\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}}.$$

(d.2) *With random and small noise weight, the training loss of linear separable component \mathcal{P} over signal weight (Definition in Equation 2) satisfies*

$$|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1})| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Namely, the network h continues to preserve the elementary knowledge like \mathcal{P} within t_2 iterations.

Remark D.31 (Proof Sketch). We summarize the proof sketch and main techniques in Proof of Theorem 4.5. **At the first step**, based on the expression for the training loss of component \mathcal{P} over signal weight, we use the triangle and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to transform the difference in training loss at times $t_1 + t_2$ and t_1 , i.e. $\|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1})\|$, into the difference in model weights at the two times, i.e. $\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|$. **Following that**, through gradient descent analysis, similar to the analysis of $\|\overline{W}_{t_1} - W^*\|$ in Theorem 4.3, we derive $\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - W^*\|$ and combine these to conclude $\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|$ in (a). Naturally utilizing the relationship between $\|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\overline{W}_{t_1})\|$ and $\|\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1}\|$ from the first step to derive (b). In total, we demonstrate that the model weight W and training loss of \mathcal{P} are almost stable.

Proof. Deal with gradient descent from \overline{W}_{t_1} to $\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}$. Similar to the optimization from \overline{W}_0 to W^* in Appendix D.4, we consider the gradient descent of signal \overline{W}_{t_1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{t+1} &= \overline{W}_t - \eta_2 \nabla K_t(\overline{W}_t) - \eta_2 \lambda W_t \\ &= (1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \overline{W}_t - \eta_2 \nabla K_t(\overline{W}_t) \end{aligned}$$

With $\|W^*\|_F = d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) \triangleq B$ from Equation 22, loss K_t is K -Lipschitz, i.e. $\|\nabla K_t(\overline{W}_t)\|_F \leq K$. For $t_1 < t \leq t_1 + t_2$, assume that $\|\overline{W}_t - W^*\|_F \leq R_2 \ll B$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that $K_t^1(\overline{W}_t) - K_t^1(W^*) \geq C_2$, let $0 < 1 - \eta_2 \lambda < 1$, and $\eta_2 \ll \frac{\lambda B R_2 + C_2}{\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 B R_2 + K^2 + \lambda C_2}$, and $\lambda R_2^2 \ll C_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\overline{W}_{t+1} - W^*\|_2^2 &\leq \|(\overline{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 + 2\eta_2^2(\lambda^2 B^2 + \lambda^2 B R_2 + K^2 + \lambda C_2) - 2\eta_2(\lambda B R_2 + C_2) \\ &\leq \|(\overline{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 - 2\eta_2(\lambda B R_2 + C_2) \\ &\leq \|(\overline{W}_t - W^*)\|_2^2 - 2\eta_2 C_2 \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 4.4, in the specialized stage within t_2 iterations, $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$, $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{\eta_1 \lambda}$. From the gradient descent in Appendix D.4, we have $\|\bar{W}_{t_1} - W^*\|_F \leq R \ll B = d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1})$, then

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} - W^*\|_2^2 \leq \|(\bar{W}_{t_1} - W^*)\|_2^2 - 2t_2\eta_2 C \leq R^2 - 2t_2\eta_2 C_2 < 0$$

which is a contradiction. We naturally have $R < \frac{R_2 \epsilon_{V,1}}{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}$, then we can derive that $\lambda R^2 < \frac{\lambda R_2^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})} \ll C_2$. Thus, at iteration $t_1 + t_2$, the training loss of component \mathcal{P} over signal weight satisfies

$$K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) \leq K_{t_1+t_2}^1(W^*) + C_2 \lesssim \epsilon_{W,1} + \frac{\sqrt{d} \log d}{L} \epsilon_W + \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}}$$

Combining the conclusion in Theorem 4.3, we have that the difference of loss between iteration t_1 and $t_1 + t_2$ is

$$|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}} \quad (25)$$

In the following, we would like to show that the changes in W is also small. With 1-Lipschitzness of logistic loss, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} (l(N_{W_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n)) - l(N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \underbrace{|N_{W_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n)|}_A \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Deal with Term A. With Corollary D.16 and Corollary D.20, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &|N_{W_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n)| \\ &\leq |N_{W_{t_1+t_2}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n)| \\ &\quad + |N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n)| \\ &\lesssim \left(\epsilon_W + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u + \gamma_0)^2}{L\lambda} + |N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n)| \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

(28)

Substitute Equation 28 into Equation 26, and use Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} |N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n)| + \left(\epsilon_W + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u + \gamma_0)^2}{L\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\sum_{n \in [N]} (N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))^2} + \left(\epsilon_W + L \sqrt{\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1}} + \sqrt{L \log d} \right) \frac{K(u + \gamma_0)^2}{L\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\sum_{n \in [N]} \underbrace{(N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))^2}_B} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step comes with choice of small $u, r, \tau_0 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log d}}\right), \frac{1}{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log d})$ and $L = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$, and $\eta_2 = \eta_1 \lambda^2 \epsilon_{V,1}^2 r$. **Deal with term B.** With Assumption D.6, We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (N_{W_{t_1}}(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\overline{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))^2 \\
&= \left(Y^n/L \left(\mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \odot \left([X_1^n]^\top \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} x_{L,1} \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - Y^n/L \left(\mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \odot \left([X_1^n]^\top \overline{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L^2} \max |Y_i^n|_2^2 \left\| \mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1^2 \left\| [X_1^n]^\top \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} x_{L,1} - [X_1^n]^\top \overline{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L^2} \left\| \mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1^2 \left\| [X_1^n]^\top \right\|_F^2 \left\| \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1} \right\|_F^2 \|x_{L,1}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L^2} \left\| \mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1^2 L(u + \gamma_0)^4 \left\| \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1} \right\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

For term $\left\| \mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1^2$. Using Corollary D.13,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W x_{L,1}) - \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 \lesssim K^{4/3} \lambda^{-4/3} \tau_0^{-4/3} L^{2/3} \triangleq \epsilon_W$$

thus further consider $\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 = \sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1})$$

where $\mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1})$ is Bernoulli r.v., then using Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma D.1,

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{i \in [L]} \mathbb{1}([X_1^\top]_i \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \geq t \right) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$$

Let $\delta = e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$, with $\delta = \frac{1}{d}, t = \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} = \sqrt{2 \log d}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (i.e., $1 - \frac{1}{d}$),

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 \lesssim \sqrt{\log d}$$

Using triangle inequality, we know that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1^2 \lesssim \left(\left\| \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top \widetilde{W}_{t_1} x_{L,1}) \right\|_1 + \epsilon_W \right)^2 \lesssim \left(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_W \right)^2$$

Thus, for term B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (N_{W_{t_1}}(\overline{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\overline{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L^2} \left\| \mathbb{1} \left([X_1^n]^\top W_{t_1} x_{L,1} \right) \right\|_1^2 L(u + \gamma_0)^4 \left\| \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1} \right\|_F^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{(u + \gamma_0)^2}{L} \left(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_W \right)^2 \left\| \overline{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \overline{W}_{t_1} \right\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

and then for $|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})|$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})| \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\sum_{n \in [N]} \underbrace{(N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}; X_1^n, Y^n) - N_{W_{t_1}}(\bar{W}_{t_1}; X_1^n, Y^n))^2}_B} + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \\ & \lesssim \frac{u + \gamma_0}{\sqrt{LN}} \left(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_W \right) \|\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F + \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} \end{aligned}$$

Combining with Equation 25, we can derive that

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}} - \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$$

when $\sqrt{LN} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log d} + \epsilon_W)$, i.e. $N = \Theta(\text{Poly}(d))$.

Therefore, we conclude that in the specialized stage, the changes in W and the loss in the h network are both small, and the loss remains very low.

$$\|\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2} - \bar{W}_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}} - \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}$$

and

$$|K_{t_1+t_2}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1+t_2}) - K_{t_1}^1(\bar{W}_{t_1})| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_{V,1}^2}{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1}) \sqrt{\log d}}$$

□

D.7 Proof for Spectral Characteristics: Proof of Corollary 4.6

Corollary 4.6. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 4.2 ~ Theorem 4.5, it holds that*

(a) *In the elementary stage within $t_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{4\eta_1\lambda}$ iterations, the spectral dynamics satisfy*

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1}) > \text{Tr}(V_{t_1}).$$

(b) *In the specialized stage within $t_2 \triangleq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{4\eta_2\lambda\epsilon_{V,1}^2}$ iterations, the spectral dynamics satisfy*

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1+t_2}) < \text{Tr}(V_{t_1+t_2}).$$

Proof. Compute the gradient of weight W_K and W_Q . With one normalized Relu self-attention layer, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(U; X, \tilde{Y}) &= \tilde{Y} \cdot \frac{1}{2L} \text{ReLU}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \\ &= \tilde{Y}/2L \cdot \text{ReLU}(X^\top U x_L) \end{aligned}$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2L}$, $U = W_K^\top W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$. Consider the gradient of weight W_K and W_Q ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{W_K} \hat{L}(U) &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \nabla(y_L f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \nabla \left(\tilde{Y}/2L \cdot \text{ReLU}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \nabla \text{ReLU}([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) W_Q x_L [X^\top]_i \right] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) W_Q (X \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top)^\top \right] \\ [\nabla_{W_K} \hat{L}(U)]_i &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L y_i \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) [W_Q]_i x_L [X^\top]_i \right] \\ [\nabla_{W_K} \hat{L}(U)]_j &= \hat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \tilde{Y})) y_L y_j \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j W_K^\top W_Q x_L) [W_Q]_j x_L [X^\top]_j \right] \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{W_Q} \widehat{L}(U) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) \nabla (y_L f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) \right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) y_L \nabla \left(\widetilde{Y} / 2L \cdot \text{ReLU} (X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) \right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \nabla \text{ReLU} ([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) y_L \sum_{i=1}^{2L} y_i \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) W_K X_i x_L^\top \right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) W_K X \cdot \text{diag} (\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top \right] \\
[\nabla_{W_Q} \widehat{L}(U_t)]_i &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U_t; X, \widetilde{Y})) y_L y_i \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_i W_K^\top W_Q x_L) [W_K]_i X_i x_L^\top \right] \\
[\nabla_{W_Q} \widehat{L}(U_t)]_j &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/2L \cdot l'(f(U_t; X, \widetilde{Y})) y_L y_j \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j W_K^\top W_Q x_L) [W_K]_j X_j x_L^\top \right]
\end{aligned}$$

With $l = -\log \sigma (y_L f(U; X, \widetilde{Y}))$, we have $l' \triangleq l'(f(U; X, \widetilde{Y})) = \frac{-y_L \exp(-y_L f(U; X, \widetilde{Y}))}{1 + \exp(-y_L f(U; X, \widetilde{Y}))}$. According to $\nabla_{W_K} \widehat{L}(U)$ and $\nabla_{W_Q} \widehat{L}(U)$, let $A = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [l' X \cdot \text{diag} (\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{K,t+1} &= W_{K,t} - \eta \nabla_{W_{K,t}} \widehat{L}(U_t) - \eta \lambda W_{K,t} \\
&= (1 - \eta \lambda) W_{K,t} - \eta \nabla_{W_{K,t}} \widehat{L}(U_t) \\
&= (1 - \eta \lambda) W_{K,t} - \eta / 2L \cdot W_{Q,t} A_t^\top
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{Q,t+1} &= W_{Q,t} - \eta \nabla_{W_{Q,t}} \widehat{L}(U_t) - \eta \lambda W_{Q,t} \\
&= (1 - \eta \lambda) W_{Q,t} - \eta \nabla_{W_{Q,t}} \widehat{L}(U_t) \\
&= (1 - \eta \lambda) W_{Q,t} - \eta / 2L \cdot W_{K,t} A_t
\end{aligned}$$

Eigen decomposition and the gradient descent of eigenvalues. Assume that $W_K \simeq W_Q$ and simultaneous diagonalizability,

$$\begin{aligned}
W_K &= M \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_K)) \Phi^\top \\
W_Q &= M \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_Q)) \Phi^\top
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{K,t+1} &= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{K,t} - \eta/2L \cdot W_{Q,t}[A_t]^\top \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{K,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{Q,t}))\Phi_t^\top[A_t]^\top \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{K,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{Q,t}))\Phi_t^\top[A_t]^\top\Phi_t\Phi_t^\top \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{K,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{Q,t}))(\Phi_t^\top A_t \Phi_t)^\top \Phi_t^\top \\
W_{Q,t+1} &= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{Q,t} - \eta/2L \cdot W_{K,t}A_t \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{Q,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{K,t}))\Phi_t^\top A_t \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{Q,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{K,t}))\Phi_t^\top A_t \Phi_t \Phi_t^\top \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)W_{Q,t} - \eta/2L \cdot M_t \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_{K,t}))(\Phi_t^\top A_t \Phi_t) \Phi_t^\top
\end{aligned}$$

If we have A is symmetric and $\Phi^\top A \Phi$ is diagonal, then for the eigenvalues of W_K and W_Q , i.e. $\sigma(W_K)$ and $\sigma(W_Q)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(W_{K,t+1}) &= (1 - \eta\lambda)\sigma(W_{K,t}) - \eta/2L \cdot \sigma(W_{Q,t}) \odot \sigma([A_t]^\top) \\
\sigma(W_{Q,t+1}) &= (1 - \eta\lambda)\sigma(W_{Q,t}) - \eta/2L \cdot \sigma(W_{K,t}) \odot \sigma(A_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\sqrt{w} = \sigma(W_K) = \sigma(W_Q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $w = \sigma(U) = \sigma(W_K) \odot \sigma(W_Q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha = \sigma(A)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma(W_{K,t+1}) \odot \sigma(W_{Q,t+1}) \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)(\sigma(W_{K,t}) \odot \sigma(W_{Q,t})) - \eta/2L \cdot (\sigma(W_{K,t})^{\odot 2}) \odot \sigma(A_t) \\
&\quad - \eta/2L \cdot (\sigma(W_{Q,t})^{\odot 2}) \odot \sigma([A_t]^\top) \\
&= (1 - \eta\lambda)(\sigma(W_{K,t}) \odot \sigma(W_{Q,t})) - \eta/2L (\sigma(W_{K,t})^{\odot 2} + \sigma(W_{Q,t})^{\odot 2}) \odot \sigma(A_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$w^{t+1} = (1 - \eta\lambda)w^t - \eta/2L \cdot 2w^t \odot \alpha^t$$

Analysis the relationship of $\bar{\alpha} = \text{Tr}(A)$ and $\bar{w} = \text{Tr}(U)$. In the following, we analysis the relationship of $\bar{\alpha}$ and \bar{w} . To Compute trace of matrix A ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(A) &= \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{\mathbb{E}} [l'X \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top] \right) \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [\text{Tr}(l'X \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top)] \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[\underbrace{l' \text{Tr}(X \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L)) x_L^\top)}_M \right]
\end{aligned}$$

For term M ,

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \text{Tr} \left(X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sum_{j=1}^L X_{ij} \left[\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right]_j \right) x_{Li} \\
&\leq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^L \left[\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right]_j}_Z
\end{aligned}$$

For term Z ,

$$\begin{aligned}
W_K &= M \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_K)) \Phi^\top \\
W_Q &= M \cdot \text{diag}(\sigma(W_Q)) \Phi^\top \\
X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L &= X^\top \Phi \cdot \text{diag}(\sqrt{w}) M^\top M \cdot \text{diag}(\sqrt{w}) \Phi^\top x_L \\
&= X^\top \Phi \cdot \text{diag}(w) \Phi^\top x_L
\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right]_j &= \left[\mathbb{1}(X^\top \Phi \cdot \text{diag}(w) \Phi^\top x_L) \right]_j \\
&= \left[\left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top \Phi) \mathbb{1}(\text{diag}(w)) \mathbb{1}(\Phi^\top x_L) \right) \right]_j \\
&= \mathbb{1} \left([X^\top]_j \Phi \right) \mathbb{1}(\text{diag}(w)) \mathbb{1}(\Phi^\top x_L) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j \Phi) \mathbb{1}(\Phi^\top x_L) \mathbb{1}(w_k) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j x_L) \mathbb{1}(w_k)
\end{aligned}$$

Combine term M and term Z , and assume that almost $\forall w_i > 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{\alpha} = \text{Tr}(A) \\
&= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l' \text{Tr} \left(X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right) \right] \\
&= p_- \mathbb{E} \left[l'_- \text{Tr} \left(X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right) \right] + p_+ \mathbb{E} \left[l'_+ \text{Tr} \left(X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right) \right] \\
&\geq p \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'_- \max(\|x\|_2^2) \sum_{j=1}^L \left[\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right]_j \right] + (1-p) \mathbb{E} \left[l'_+ \text{Tr} \left(X \cdot \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{1}(X^\top W_K^\top W_Q x_L) \right) x_L^\top \right) \right] \\
&= p \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'_- \max(\|x\|_2^2) \sum_{j=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j x_L) \mathbb{1}(w_k) \right] \\
&= p \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'_- \sum_{j=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{1}([X^\top]_j x_L) \mathbb{1}(w_k) \right] \\
&= p \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[l'_- \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X^\top x_L) \right] \triangleq -pk
\end{aligned}$$

where p is the proportion of negative logistic loss, $k = \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|\ell'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X^\top x_L)] > 0$. We conclude that the lower bound of $\bar{\alpha}$ is independent with \bar{w} , naturally,

$$\bar{w}_{t+1} \leq (1 - \eta\lambda)\bar{w}_t + \eta/2L \cdot 2pk\bar{w}_t$$

Analysis W_t and V_t . By similar proof, for $W = [W_K^1]^\top W_Q^1$:

Let $A^1 = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [l' X_1 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top [W_K^1]^\top W_Q^1 x_{L,1})) x_{L,1}^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $w^1 = \sigma(W_K^1) \odot \sigma(W_Q^1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha^1 = \sigma(A^1)$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{W_K^1} \widehat{L}(W) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/L \cdot l'(f(W; X_1, Y)) W_Q^1 (X_1 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top [W_K^1]^\top W_Q^1 x_{L,1})) x_{L,1}^\top)^\top \right] \\ \nabla_{W_Q^1} \widehat{L}(W) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/L \cdot l'(f(W; X_1, Y)) W_K^1 X_1 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top [W_K^1]^\top W_Q^1 x_{L,1})) x_{L,1}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

and p_1 is the proportion of the negative derivative of logistic loss $l'(f(W; X_1, Y)) < 0$

$$\bar{w}_{t+1}^1 = (1 - \eta\lambda)\bar{w}_t^1 + 2p_1 k_1 \eta/L \cdot \bar{w}_t^1, \quad k_1 \triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|\ell'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top x_{L,1})]$$

For $V = [W_K^2]^\top W_Q^2$, let $A^2 = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [l' X_2 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top [W_K^2]^\top W_Q^2 x_{L,2})) x_{L,2}^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $w^2 = \sigma(W_K^2) \odot \sigma(W_Q^2) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha^2 = \sigma(A^2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{W_K^2} \widehat{L}(V) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/L \cdot l'(f(V; X_2, Y)) W_Q^2 (X_2 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top [W_K^2]^\top W_Q^2 x_{L,2})) x_{L,2}^\top)^\top \right] \\ \nabla_{W_Q^2} \widehat{L}(V) &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[1/L \cdot l'(f(V; X_2, Y)) W_K^2 X_2 \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbb{1}(X_2^\top [W_K^2]^\top W_Q^2 x_{L,2})) x_{L,2}^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

and p_2 is the proportion of the negative derivative of logistic loss $l'(f(V; X_2, Y)) < 0$

$$\bar{w}_{t+1}^2 = (1 - \eta\lambda)\bar{w}_t^2 + 2p_2 k_2 \eta/L \cdot \bar{w}_t^2, \quad k_2 \triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|\ell'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top x_{L,2})]$$

In the elementary stage. With learning rate η_1 , $\text{Tr}(W_t) \triangleq \bar{w}_t^1$, and $\text{Tr}(V_t) \triangleq \bar{w}_t^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{t+1}^1 &= (1 - \eta_1\lambda)\bar{w}_t^1 + 2p_1 k_1 \eta_1/L \cdot \bar{w}_t^1, \quad k_1 \triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|\ell'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top x_{L,1})] \\ \bar{w}_{t+1}^2 &= (1 - \eta_1\lambda)\bar{w}_t^2 + 2p_2 k_2 \eta_1/L \cdot \bar{w}_t^2, \quad k_2 \triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|\ell'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top x_{L,2})] \end{aligned}$$

then through $t_1 \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1\lambda}$ iterations, according to the dynamic of the trace of W and V ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{t_1}^1 &= (1 - \eta_1\lambda + 2p_1 k_1 \eta_1/L)^{t_1} \bar{w}_0^1 \\ \bar{w}_{t_1}^2 &= (1 - \eta_1\lambda + 2p_2 k_2 \eta_1/L)^{t_1} \bar{w}_0^2 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\text{Tr}(W_t)$ and $\text{Tr}(V_t)$ have similar update rules where the rate of exponential growth over time mainly depends on three factors: (1) The learning rate η_1 . (2) The proportion of the negative derivative of logistic loss p . (3) The negative derivative of the logistic loss is selected based on the similarity between query x_L and sequence X , i.e. $\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top x_{L,1})$. Further compute k with the mean absolute value of the selected negative derivative.

Combine Theorem 4.3 with small and random noise, $\|W_{t_1}\|_F \approx \|\overline{W}_{t_1}\|_F$ and $\|V_{t_1}\|_F \approx \|\overline{V}_{t_1}\|_F$, we conclude the following corollary that at time t_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{w}_{t_1}^1 &= \text{Tr}(W_{t_1}) \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(W_{t_1}^\top W_{t_1})} = \|W_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) \\ \overline{w}_{t_1}^2 &= \text{Tr}(V_{t_1}) \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(V_{t_1}^\top V_{t_1})} = \|V_{t_1}\|_F \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)}\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1}) > \text{Tr}(V_{t_1})$$

In the specialized stage. With learning rate η_2 , $\text{Tr}(W_t) \triangleq \overline{w}_t^1$, and $\text{Tr}(V_t) \triangleq \overline{w}_t^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{w}_{t+1}^1 &= (1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \overline{w}_t^1 + 2p_1 k_1 \eta_2 / L \cdot \overline{w}_t^1, & k_1 &\triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|l'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_1^\top x_{L,1})] \\ \overline{w}_{t+1}^2 &= (1 - \eta_2 \lambda) \overline{w}_t^2 + 2p_2 k_2 \eta_2 / L \cdot \overline{w}_t^2, & k_2 &\triangleq \max(\|x\|_2^2) \widehat{\mathbb{E}} [|l'_-| \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbb{1}(X_2^\top x_{L,2})]\end{aligned}$$

Through $t_2 \leq \frac{\log^2(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\eta_2 \lambda \epsilon_{V,1}^2}$ iterations, according to the dynamic of the trace of W and V ,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{w}_{t_1+t_2}^1 &= (1 - \eta_2 \lambda + 2p_1 k_1 \eta_2 / L)^{t_2} \overline{w}_{t_1}^1 \\ \overline{w}_{t_1+t_2}^2 &= (1 - \eta_2 \lambda + 2p_2 k_2 \eta_2 / L)^{t_2} \overline{w}_{t_1}^2\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the elementary stage, we conclude that $\text{Tr}(W_t)$ and $\text{Tr}(V_t)$ still have similar update rules where the rate of exponential growth over time mainly depends on three factors.

Combine with Theorem 4.4 and 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{w}_{t_1+t_2}^1 &= \text{Tr}(W_{t_1+t_2}) \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(W_{t_1+t_2}^\top W_{t_1+t_2})} = \|W_{t_1+t_2}\|_F \lesssim d \log(1/\epsilon_{W,1}) + \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\lambda^{3/2} \epsilon_{V,1}^2} \\ \overline{w}_{t_1+t_2}^2 &= \text{Tr}(V_{t_1+t_2}) \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(V_{t_1+t_2}^\top V_{t_1+t_2})} = \|V_{t_1+t_2}\|_F \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Poly}(d)} + \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_{V,1})}{\epsilon_{V,1}}\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\text{Tr}(W_{t_1+t_2}) < \text{Tr}(V_{t_1+t_2})$$

In summary, by applying spectral analysis techniques, such as SVD and gradient descent on eigenvalues, we conclude that whether in the elementary stage or specialize stage, $\text{Tr}(W_t)$ and $\text{Tr}(V_t)$ follow similar update rules. The rate of exponential growth over time primarily depends on three factors: (1) the learning rate η_1 or η_2 ; (2) the proportion p_1 or p_2 of the negative derivative of logistic loss; and (3) k_1 or k_2 represents the mean absolute value of the selected negative derivative. By the way, the negative derivative of the logistic loss is selected based on the similarity between query x_L and sequence X , i.e. $\mathbb{1}(X_1^\top x_{L,1})$. When comparing the updating rules for the traces of weights in the two stages, we find that the three factors differ and vary with training. However, the overall exponential growth trend remains consistent.

Additionally, from Theorems 4.3 ~ 4.5, it's straightforward to compare the relationship of $\text{Tr}(W)$ and $\text{Tr}(V)$ at iteration t_1 and $t_1 + t_2$, which demonstrates that **relatively small eigenvalues of attention weights store elementary knowledge and large ones store specialized knowledge**.