

ARCHITECTURE INDEPENDENT GENERALIZATION BOUNDS FOR OVERPARAMETRIZED DEEP RELU NETWORKS

THOMAS CHEN, CHUN-KAI KEVIN CHIEN, PATRICIA MUÑOZ EWALD,
AND ANDREW G. MOORE

ABSTRACT. We prove that overparametrized neural networks are able to generalize with a test error that is independent of the level of overparametrization, and independent of the Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension. We prove explicit bounds that only depend on the metric geometry of the test and training sets, on the regularity properties of the activation function, and on the operator norms of the weights and norms of biases. For overparametrized deep ReLU networks with a training sample size bounded by the input space dimension, we explicitly construct zero loss minimizers without use of gradient descent, and prove that the generalization error is independent of the network architecture.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

We consider a neural network with input space $\mathcal{L}_0 \cong \mathbb{R}^{M_0}$, hidden layers $\mathcal{L}_\ell \cong \mathbb{R}^{M_\ell}$ with $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, and output layer $\mathcal{L}_{L+1} \cong \mathbb{R}^Q$. Given $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{L}_0$, we recursively define

$$x^{(\ell)} = \sigma(W_\ell x^{(\ell-1)} + b_\ell) \quad (1.1)$$

with weight matrix $W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{M_\ell \times M_{\ell-1}}$ and bias vector $b_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{M_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$. We assume that the activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \text{ran}(\sigma) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ is Lipschitz continuous, and satisfies a growth bound

$$|\sigma(x)| \leq a_0 + a_1|x| \quad (1.2)$$

for some constants $a_0 \geq 0$, and $a_1 > 0$. In the output layer,

$$x^{(L+1)} = W_{L+1}x^{(L)} + b_{L+1} \quad (1.3)$$

we assume no activation to be present.

Let $\underline{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denote the vector of parameters, containing the components of all weights and biases, so that

$$K = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} (M_\ell M_{\ell-1} + M_\ell). \quad (1.4)$$

We will assume architectures with $M_0 \geq M_1 \geq \dots \geq M_L \geq Q$. For every $\underline{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^K$, the network defines the map

$$f_{\underline{\theta}} : \mathcal{L}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{L+1} \quad , \quad x^{(0)} \mapsto x^{(L+1)} = f_{\underline{\theta}}(x^{(0)}) \quad (1.5)$$

from input to output layer.

We consider a problem in supervised learning in which we are given Q equivalence classes, labeled by $y_j \in \mathcal{L}_{L+1}$ with $j = 1, \dots, Q$. In the input layer, we assume to be given an *a priori sample set*

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(x_i^{(0)}, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \quad (1.6)$$

where $x_i^{(0)} \in \mathcal{L}_0 \cong \mathbb{R}^{M_0}$ and $y_i \in \mathcal{L}_{L+1} \cong \mathbb{R}^Q$.

We extract a subset of \mathcal{S} which we refer to as the *training set*

$$\mathcal{S}^{train} := \{(x_{i_\alpha}^{(0)}, y_{i_\alpha})\}_{\alpha=1}^n \quad (1.7)$$

Moreover, we extract another subset of \mathcal{S} , typically disjoint from \mathcal{S}^{train} , which we refer to as the *test set*

$$\mathcal{S}^{test} := \{(x_{i_\beta}^{(0)}, y_{i_\beta})\}_{\beta=1}^m. \quad (1.8)$$

For notational brevity, we will denote the elements of these sets by

$$\mathcal{S}^{train} = \{(x_i^{(0)}, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}^{test} = \{(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}, \tilde{y}_j)\}_{j=1}^m, \quad (1.10)$$

upon appropriate relabeling.

Then, the network is trained by minimizing the cost (or loss) function

$$\mathcal{C} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_{\underline{\theta}}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 \quad (1.11)$$

with respect to $\underline{\theta}$. Let $\underline{\theta}_*$ denote a global minimizer of \mathcal{C} with fixed training set \mathcal{S}^{train} . Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 \quad (1.12)$$

is the *training error*. It is zero if zero loss is attainable.

The test error is determined by evaluating \mathcal{S}^{test} on the trained cost function,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2. \quad (1.13)$$

In the work at hand, we will not assume that the probability distributions of \mathcal{S}^{train} and \mathcal{S}^{test} are a priori known, see the remarks in Section 1.1.

Definition 1.1. *We call a network strongly overparametrized if the training sample size is bounded by the dimension of input space, $n \leq M_0$.*

The difference between $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train}$ is accounted for by the generalization error. We obtain the following bounds.

Theorem 1.2. *Given \mathcal{S}^{train} and \mathcal{S}^{test} , the generalization error satisfies*

$$|\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} - \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train}| = \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{S}^{test}, \mathcal{S}^{train}], \quad (1.14)$$

where we refer to

$$\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{S}^{test}, \mathcal{S}^{train}] := \frac{1}{nm} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 - |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 \right) \right| \quad (1.15)$$

as the cost discrepancy between \mathcal{S}^{test} , \mathcal{S}^{train} .

In particular,

$$\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{S}^{test}, \mathcal{S}^{train}] = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \mathcal{S}^{test} = \mathcal{S}^{train}, \quad (1.16)$$

and more generally, it vanishes whenever $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} = \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train}$.

The cost discrepancy satisfies the a priori bound

$$\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{S}^{test}, \mathcal{S}^{train}] \leq C_0(1 + R) \text{diam}(\mathcal{S}^{test} \cup \mathcal{S}^{train}) \quad (1.17)$$

where R is the radius of the smallest ball centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{M_0} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$ containing $\mathcal{S}^{test} \cup \mathcal{S}^{train}$, and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{S}^{test} \cup \mathcal{S}^{train})$ is the diameter of $\mathcal{S}^{test} \cup \mathcal{S}^{train}$.

The constant

$$C_0 = C_0(a_0, a_1, c_\sigma, \{\|W_\ell^*\|_{op}, |b_\ell^*|\}_{\ell=1}^{L+1}) \quad (1.18)$$

depends on the operator norms of the trained weights and the Euclidean norms of the trained biases. Moreover, it depends on the parameters a_0, a_1 controlling the growth of σ in (1.2), and its Lipschitz constant c_σ .

Assume in addition that training is achieved with zero loss. Then, it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} < C_0(1 + R) d_C(\mathcal{S}^{test} | \mathcal{S}^{train}) \quad (1.19)$$

in terms of the unidirectional Chamfer pseudodistance for point clouds,

$$d_C(\mathcal{S}^{test} | \mathcal{S}^{train}) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \min_{(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sqrt{|\tilde{x} - x|^2 + |\tilde{y} - y|^2}. \quad (1.20)$$

For strongly overparametrized deep ReLU networks, zero training loss is attainable with explicitly constructible minimizers, and C_0 in (1.19) is independent of the network architecture, see Theorem 4.1.

Using b_1 , the origin in input space can be translated to minimize R . By Jung's theorem, one then obtains $R \leq \sqrt{\frac{M_0}{2(M_0+1)}} \text{diam}(\mathcal{S}^{test} \cup \mathcal{S}^{train})$.

The unidirectional Chamfer pseudodistance does *not* satisfy the axioms of a metric. Along with its symmetrized version, it is widely used in computer vision, [13]. It measures the approximability of \mathcal{S}^{test} by subsets of \mathcal{S}^{train} , but not vice versa. In particular, $d_C(\mathcal{S}^{test} | \mathcal{S}^{train}) = 0$ implies that $\mathcal{S}^{test} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{train}$.

1.1. Probabilistic setting. If it is assumed that the probability distributions for the training set \mathcal{S}^{train} and test set \mathcal{S}^{test} are known, and determined by probability measures μ_{train} and μ_{test} on $\mathbb{R}^{M_0} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$, respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train} &= \int d\mu_{train}(x, y) |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x) - y|^2 \\ \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} &= \int d\mu_{test}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{y}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.21)$$

The generalization error is usually analyzed by controlling the probability of their difference being small. Probabilistic bounds on the generalization error in this context are studied extensively in the literature, see for instance [1, 15, 16, 18] and the references therein. We point out two crucial difficulties with this setting:

- (1) In practice, the probability distributions for the test and training sets are typically not a priori known.
- (2) It is usually assumed that \mathcal{S}^{train} and \mathcal{S}^{test} are sampled from the same set, and distributed identically, which suggests proximity of $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test}$.

Point (2) introduces an extra constraint. In practice, μ_{train} and μ_{test} might not be identically distributed. For example, a network could be trained to distinguish apples from oranges with a training set \mathcal{S}^{train} from country A. It should then be expected to have the ability to distinguish apples and oranges in a set \mathcal{S}^{test} originating from country B that is not identically distributed to \mathcal{S}^{train} .

Because of point (1), concrete implementations commonly employ a similar, practicable version of generalization error as in Theorem 1.2. We point out that Theorem 1.2 holds for arbitrary but fixed \mathcal{S}^{train} and \mathcal{S}^{test} , without any assumptions on their probability distributions. In Theorem 4.1, we will prove for strongly overparametrized ReLU networks that zero loss is attainable and that the generalization error then is independent of the network architecture, only depending on how well \mathcal{S}^{test} can be approximated with subsets of \mathcal{S}^{train} of equal cardinality.

2. BOUNDS BASED ON THE VAPNIK-CHEVONENKIS DIMENSION

The bound on the generalization error most widely used in the literature is an expression involving the Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension d_{VC} of the network. The statement is that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\theta_*}^{test} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\theta_*}^{train} + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{VC}}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\right) \quad (2.1)$$

holds for identically distributed \mathcal{S}^{train} and \mathcal{S}^{test} . d_{VC} accounts for the maximum size of a point set allowing for all of its subsets to be distinguishable by the network.

2.1. Overparametrized networks. For neural networks, d_{VC} has been determined in [2]. In particular, d_{VC} typically increases with the level of overparametrization of the problem; that is, with the amount by which K exceeds the overall output dimension nQ .

The bound (2.1) deteriorates with the increase of overparametrization and thus of d_{VC} ; however, computational evidence shows that the generalization error remains bounded. This conundrum is a key open problem in Machine Learning, see the discussion of the double descent phenomenon in [3, 4]. The error term in (2.1) decreases as the number of training data n increases, but this in turn lowers the level of overparametrization; in particular, in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, the problem becomes underparametrized. Therefore, the bound (2.1) is not effective in the overparametrized regime where control of the generalization error is most desired.

In this paper, we offer the following explanation to this phenomenon: The VC dimension describes the capacity of the network to accommodate any given set of input data. However, the bound does not account for the specific data determining the problem, and is independent of both \mathcal{S}^{test} and \mathcal{S}^{train} . In Theorem 4.1 of this paper, we verify that the true generalization error for strongly overparametrized deep ReLU networks is determined by metric properties of the data distribution independent of the parameter count, and of the network architecture. For a discussion related to ours, we refer to [15].

Some intuition about the situation at hand can perhaps be gained from the following analogy: 1 liter of fluid can be filled into a 1 liter bottle, a 2 liter bottle, or a 50 liter bottle; however, in all cases, the amount of fluid remains the same. The size of the bottle corresponds to the VC dimension of the network, it grows as the overparametrization level increases. The amount of fluid corresponds to the test and training data sets, which are independent of the network architecture.

2.2. Zero loss in underparametrized regime. For generic training data, underparametrized networks are not able to admit zero loss. This is because the map from parameter space to output space (for given training data) is an embedding, and the zero loss minimizer is generically not contained in its range. However, training with zero loss in underparametrized networks is possible if \mathcal{S}^{train} is sufficiently clustered, and therefore not generic, [7, 10].

In [6, 8], zero loss minimizers are explicitly constructed for underparametrized deep ReLU networks with sufficiently clustered training data. It is assumed that there are Q disjoint clusters corresponding to Q equivalence classes, and the depth of the network is required to be at least Q . The weights and biases of the trained network are explicitly determined in [6, 8], without invoking gradient descent. Each layer acts by collapsing one of the clusters of training data to a point, and in the output layer, the resulting Q disjoint points are matched to the vectors y_i , $i = 1, \dots, Q$ that label the classes. Thereby, zero loss training is achieved.

A crucial question arises: The generalization error in this network is controlled by the bound (2.1), based on its VC dimension. The training error is zero, hence

$$\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{VC}}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\right). \quad (2.2)$$

Therefore, taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ of infinite training sample size, (2.2) predicts that the test error must be zero, too.

However, with the construction presented in [6, 8], it is easy to create full measure sets of test data in the input layer (sufficiently separated from the training clusters) that do *not* produce zero loss. This might seem like a contradiction.

However, there is no contradiction; the resolution of this conundrum is that for (2.1) to hold, it is required that the test sample set \mathcal{S}^{test} and training data set \mathcal{S}^{train} are *identically distributed*. Therefore, to apply (2.2), test samples are only admissible if they are clustered with identical distribution as the training data; but then, the trained network maps them to output vectors with zero loss, as well.

To summarize, the discussion in Section 2.1 suggests that the effectiveness of (2.1) in the overparametrized regime is limited. On the other hand, (2.1) is effective in the underparametrized regime, where identical distribution of test and sample data is a necessary condition. If the latter is not satisfied, one can construct examples violating (2.1).

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

To begin with, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train} - \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 - |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where we used $1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1$ to pass to the second line, and $1 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m 1$ to pass to the third line. Thus, (1.14) follows.

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2 - |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left((f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})) + (\tilde{y}_j - y_i) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left((f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) + f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})) - (\tilde{y}_j + y_i) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})| + |\tilde{y}_j - y_i| \right) \\
&\quad \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) + f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})| + |\tilde{y}_j + y_i| \right) \tag{3.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Using $\frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m 1 = 1$, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x})| + |\tilde{y} - y| \right) \\
&\quad \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x)| + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x})| + |\tilde{y}| + |y| \right) \tag{3.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, by Lipschitz continuity of $f_{\underline{\theta}_*}$, there exists a constant c_0 such that

$$|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x})| \leq c_0|x - \tilde{x}| \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| \leq c_0|x| \tag{3.5}$$

so that

$$|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x)| \leq |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0|x|. \tag{3.6}$$

Hence, the above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(c_0|x - \tilde{x}| + |\tilde{y} - y| \right) \\
&\quad \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(2|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0(|x| + |\tilde{x}|) + |\tilde{y}| + |y| \right) \\
&\leq (1 + c_0) \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(|x - \tilde{x}| + |\tilde{y} - y| \right) \\
&\quad 2(1 + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0) \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \left(1 + |x| + |\tilde{x}| + |\tilde{y}| + |y| \right) \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{2}(1 + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0)^2(1 + 2R) \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} \sup_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}} \sqrt{|x - \tilde{x}|^2 + |\tilde{y} - y|^2} \\
&\leq C_0(1 + R) \text{diam}(\mathcal{S}^{train} \cup \mathcal{S}^{test}) \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where R is the radius of the smallest ball centered at the origin of $\mathbb{R}^{M_0} \times \mathbb{R}^Q$ that contains $\mathcal{S}^{train} \cup \mathcal{S}^{test}$.

We infer from the above steps that the constant C_0 is bounded by

$$C_0 \leq 8(1 + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0)^2 \tag{3.8}$$

where c_0 is the Lipschitz constant of $f_{\underline{\theta}_*}$. Control of C_0 in (3.8) is obtained from Lemma 3.1, below.

If in addition, training is achieved with zero loss, then

$$f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.9)$$

Consequently, it follows from (3.1) and $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{train} = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}_*}^{test} &= \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 - \underbrace{|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_i^{(0)}) - y_i|^2}_{=0} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)}) - \tilde{y}_j|^2 - \underbrace{|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_{i(j)}^{(0)}) - y_{i(j)}|^2}_{=0} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $(x_{i(j)}, y_{i(j)}) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}$ is the nearest neighbor of $(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_j) \in \mathcal{S}^{test}$; that is,

$$|\tilde{x}_j - x_{i(j)}| + |\tilde{y}_j - y_{i(j)}| = \min_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}^{train}} (|\tilde{x}_j - x| + |\tilde{y}_j - y|). \quad (3.11)$$

Then, using similar estimates as in (3.7),

$$\begin{aligned} (3.10) &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_{i(j)}^{(0)}) - f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})| + |\tilde{y}_j - y_{i(j)}| \right) \\ &\quad \left(|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(x_{i(j)}^{(0)})| + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(\tilde{x}_j^{(0)})| + |\tilde{y}_j| + |y_{i(j)}| \right) \\ &\leq 4(1 + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0)^2 (1 + R) \frac{1}{m} \sum_j \left(|\tilde{x}_j - x_{i(j)}| + |\tilde{y}_j - y_{i(j)}| \right) \\ &\leq C_0(1 + R) d_C(\mathcal{S}^{train} | \mathcal{S}^{test}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where $d_C(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the unidirectional Chamfer pseudodistance. \square

Lemma 3.1. *The Lipschitz constant c_0 of $f_{\underline{\theta}_*}$ is bounded by*

$$c_0 \leq c_\sigma^L \prod_{\ell=1}^{L+1} \|W_\ell^*\|_{op} \quad (3.13)$$

where c_σ is the Lipschitz constant of σ , $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the matrix operator norm, and $(W_\ell^*)_\ell$ are the minimizing weights for the training loss.

Moreover, recalling the bounds (1.2) on σ ,

$$|f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| \leq C_1(a_0, a_1, \{\|W_\ell^*\|_{op}, |b_\ell^*|\}_{\ell=1}^{L+1}) \quad (3.14)$$

is bounded by a constant depending on the operator norms of the trained weights, and the Euclidean norms of the trained biases.

Proof. The map (1.1) in the ℓ -th layer is Lipschitz continuous,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma(W_\ell^* x_1^{(\ell-1)} + b_\ell^*) - \sigma(W_\ell^* x_2^{(\ell-1)} + b_\ell^*)| \\ &\leq c_\sigma |W_\ell^* x_1^{(\ell-1)} - W_\ell^* x_2^{(\ell-1)}| \\ &\leq c_\sigma \|W_\ell^*\|_{op} |x_1^{(\ell-1)} - x_2^{(\ell-1)}| \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

with Lipschitz constant $c_\sigma \|W_\ell^*\|_{op}$. We also recall the basic fact that if a pair of functions f_1, f_2 has Lipschitz constants c_1, c_2 and the composition $f_1 \circ f_2$ is well defined, then $f_1 \circ f_2$ has a Lipschitz constant bounded by $c_1 c_2$. By recursion in $\ell = 1, \dots, L + 1$, we arrive at the assertion.

Finally, recalling (1.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |x^{(\ell)}| &\leq |\sigma(W_\ell^* x^{(\ell-1)} + b_\ell^*)| \\ &\leq a_0 + a_1 |W_\ell^* x^{(\ell-1)} + b_\ell^*| \\ &\leq a_0 + a_1 (\|W_\ell^*\|_{op} |x^{(\ell-1)}| + |b_\ell^*|). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Using $x^{(0)} = 0$, recursion implies that (recalling that the output layer contains no activation function)

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| &= |x^{(L+1)}| \\ &\leq \|W_{L+1}^*\|_{op} |x^{(L)}| + |b_{L+1}^*| \\ &\leq \|W_{L+1}^*\|_{op} (a_0 + a_1 (\|W_L^*\|_{op} |x^{(L-1)}| + |b_L^*|)) + |b_{L+1}^*| \\ &\leq \dots \leq C_1(a_0, a_1, \{\|W_\ell^*\|_{op}, |b_\ell^*|\}_{\ell=1}^{L+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

is bounded by a constant depending on the operator norms of the trained weights, and the norms of the trained biases. \square

Remark 3.2. *The bounds proven in Lemma 3.1 are consistent with the experimental observation that smaller weights increase generalization performance, through the decrease of the constants c_0 and C_1 in the current setting. In machine learning, training often aims to minimize both the loss and a term proportional to the L^2 norm of all parameters. This can be achieved through weight decay, where this term is added to the loss function. Additionally, gradient-based methods are known to introduce this term as an implicit regularizer in some cases, [12, 17].*

Remark 3.3. *Generalization bounds involving the spectral norms of weights and Lipschitz constants of the activation have also been obtained in the context of probabilistic estimates, see for instance [1, 15, 16] and the references therein.*

4. ARCHITECTURE INDEPENDENT GENERALIZATION ERRORS

We will determine how the constant C_0 in Theorem 1.2 depends on the network architecture for an important class of cases.

For notational convenience, we define the matrices associated to \mathcal{S}^{train} ,

$$X^{(\ell)} := [x_1^{(\ell)} \dots x_n^{(\ell)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{M_\ell \times n} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$B_\ell := [b_\ell \dots b_\ell] \in \mathbb{R}^{M_\ell \times n} \quad (4.2)$$

for $\ell = 1 \dots, L+1$, with $M_{L+1} = Q$. Moreover,

$$Y := [y_1 \dots y_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times n} \quad (4.3)$$

is the matrix of reference output vectors $y_i \in \mathcal{L}_{L+1} \cong \mathbb{R}^Q$ in output space.

We obtain the following bound for strongly overparametrized ReLU networks with non-increasing layer dimensions, yielding a generalization error which only depends on the training input data and reference output vectors. In particular, it is independent of the layer dimensions and of the number of layers, and is therefore independent of the network architecture.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider a strongly overparametrized network with $M_0 \geq M_1 \geq \dots \geq M_L \geq Q$ and training sample size $n \leq M_0$. Assume that the matrix of training inputs $X^{(0)}$ has full rank n , and that σ is ReLU. Then, zero loss training is attainable with explicitly constructible minimizer.*

Therefore, the generalization bound

$$\mathcal{E}_{\underline{\theta}^*}^{test} < C_0(1+R) d_C(\mathcal{S}^{train} | \mathcal{S}^{test}) \quad (4.4)$$

in (1.19) holds with a constant

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &\leq 8(1+2\alpha + \|(Y - B_{L+1}^*)(X^{(0)})^+\|_{op})^2 \\ b_{L+1}^* &= -2\alpha(1, \dots, 1)^T, \quad \alpha = \max_i |y_i| \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $(Y - B_{L+1}^*)(X^{(0)})^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times M_0}$, and

$$(X^{(0)})^+ = ((X^{(0)})^T X^{(0)})^{-1} (X^{(0)})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times M_0} \quad (4.6)$$

is the generalized inverse of the matrix $X^{(0)}$ of training inputs. In particular, C_0 is independent of the network architecture.

We remark that in various classification problems, y_i are chosen as unit vectors, whereby $\alpha = 1$.

With straightforward modifications, we expect that a similar result can be proven for the same architecture, but for an activation given by a diffeomorphism

$$\sigma : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^M \quad (4.7)$$

(for instance, a suitable mollification of ReLU), as studied in [10].

Notably, the zero loss minimizers are not unique, see also [9, 10, 11, 14, 19].

We now prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof. We first construct zero training loss minimizers for the L^2 cost function, using a similar argument as first presented in [10]. Recalling the notations (4.2), zero loss is attained if and only if in the output layer,

$$W_{L+1} X^{(L)} = Y - B_{L+1} \quad (4.8)$$

where Y is the matrix of reference output vectors $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^Q$. We choose

$$b_{L+1} = -2\alpha(1, \dots, 1)^T, \quad \alpha = \max_i |y_i|, \quad (4.9)$$

so that

$$Y - B_{L+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{Q \times n} \quad (4.10)$$

has non-negative matrix components.

In general, we may choose an arbitrary

$$W_{L+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{Q \times M_L}, \quad \text{rank}(W_{L+1}) = Q \quad (4.11)$$

of full rank, so that $W_{L+1} W_{L+1}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times Q}$ is invertible, with non-negative matrix components. Then, denoting the generalized inverse of W_{L+1} by

$$W_{L+1}^+ := W_{L+1}^T (W_{L+1} W_{L+1}^T)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_L \times Q} \quad (4.12)$$

we obtain that

$$X^{(L)} = W_{L+1}^+ (Y - B_{L+1}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_L \times n} \quad (4.13)$$

satisfies (4.8), and is guaranteed to have non-negative matrix components.

In the case at hand, it is convenient to make the explicit choice

$$W_{L+1} = [\mathbf{1}_{Q \times Q} \ 0_{Q \times (M_L - Q)}] \quad (4.14)$$

with generalized inverse

$$W_{L+1}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{Q \times Q} \\ 0_{(M_L - Q) \times Q} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.15)$$

where $0_{p \times q} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ consists of zeros. We then find for (4.13)

$$X^{(L)} = W_{L+1}^+(Y - B_{L+1}) = \begin{bmatrix} Y - B_{L+1} \\ 0_{(M_L - Q) \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_L \times n}. \quad (4.16)$$

In particular, W_{L+1} and W_{L+1}^+ have operator norms

$$\|W_{L+1}\|_{op} = \|W_{L+1}^+\|_{op} = 1. \quad (4.17)$$

The subsequent steps are the same for this specific choice of W_{L+1} , or for an arbitrary choice of the form (4.11).

In the next higher, L -th layer, we have

$$X^{(L)} = \sigma(W_L X^{(L-1)} + B_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_L \times n} \quad (4.18)$$

and choose

$$\begin{aligned} W_L &= [\mathbf{1}_{M_L \times M_L} \ 0_{(M_{L-1} - M_L) \times M_L}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_L \times M_{L-1}} \\ b_L &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

and we let

$$X^{(L-1)} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(L)} \\ 0_{(M_{L-1} - M_L) \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_{L-1} \times n}. \quad (4.20)$$

By recursion, we choose

$$\begin{aligned} W_\ell &= [\mathbf{1}_{M_\ell \times M_\ell} \ 0_{(M_{\ell-1} - M_\ell) \times M_\ell}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_\ell \times M_{\ell-1}} \\ b_\ell &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

for $\ell = 2, \dots, L$, so that

$$X^{(\ell)} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(L)} \\ 0_{(M_\ell - M_L) \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_\ell \times n}. \quad (4.22)$$

Hence, in the layer $\ell = 1$, we arrive at

$$X^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(L)} \\ 0_{(M_1 - M_L) \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_1 \times n}. \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$X^{(1)} = \sigma(W_1 X^{(0)} + B_1). \quad (4.24)$$

Here, we note that since $X^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_0 \times n}$ has full rank n , it follows that the matrix $(X^{(0)})^T X^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible, and we solve (4.24) with

$$W_1 = X^{(1)}(X^{(0)})^+ \quad , \quad b_1 = 0, \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$(X^{(0)})^+ = ((X^{(0)})^T X^{(0)})^{-1} (X^{(0)})^T \quad (4.26)$$

denotes the generalized inverse of $X^{(0)}$. Recalling (4.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} W_{L+1}^+(Y - B_{L+1})(X^{(0)})^+ \\ 0_{(M_1 - M_L) \times M_0} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (Y - B_{L+1})(X^{(0)})^+ \\ 0_{(M_1 - Q) \times M_0} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_1 \times M_0} \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

by collecting rows of zeros. While W_1 has entries of indefinite sign, the product

$$W_1 X^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} Y - B_{L+1} \\ 0_{(M_1 - Q) \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M_1 \times n} \quad (4.28)$$

has non-negative components. Therefore, σ acts on the latter as the identity, and we indeed verify that (4.24) is satisfied with (4.23) and $b_1 = 0$.

Therefore, we arrive at the explicit zero loss minimizer $\underline{\theta}_* \in \mathbb{R}^K$ consisting of

$$\begin{aligned} W_1^* &= \begin{bmatrix} (Y - B_{L+1}^*)(X^{(0)})^+ \\ 0_{(M_1 - Q) \times M_0} \end{bmatrix} \\ W_\ell^* &= [\mathbf{1}_{M_\ell \times M_\ell} \quad 0_{(M_{\ell-1} - M_\ell) \times M_L}] \quad , \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L \\ W_{L+1}^* &= [\mathbf{1}_{Q \times Q} \quad 0_{Q \times (M_L - Q)}] \\ b_\ell^* &= 0 \quad , \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L \\ b_{L+1}^* &= -2\alpha(1, \dots, 1)^T \quad , \quad \alpha = \max_i |y_i|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Then, Lemma 3.1 yields that the Lipschitz constant c_0 of $f_{\underline{\theta}_*}$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &\leq c_\sigma^L \prod_{\ell=1}^{L+1} \|W_\ell^*\|_{op} \\ &= \|W_1^*\|_{op} \|W_{L+1}^*\|_{op} \\ &\leq \|(Y - B_{L+1}^*)(X^{(0)})^+\|_{op} \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

where we used (4.17), and the fact that the Lipschitz constant for ReLU is $c_\sigma = 1$.

For the trained network, we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| &= |W_{L+1}^* W_L^* \cdots W_1^* 0 + b_{L+1}^*| \\ &= |b_{L+1}^*| = 2\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Therefore, the constant C_0 in (3.8) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &\leq 8(1 + |f_{\underline{\theta}_*}(0)| + c_0)^2 \\ &\leq 8(1 + 2\alpha + \|(Y - B_{L+1}^*)(X^{(0)})^+\|_{op})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

This proves the claim. \square

Acknowledgments: T.C. thanks Adam Klivans and Vardan Papayan for inspiring discussions, and gratefully acknowledges support by the NSF through the grant DMS-2009800, and the RTG Grant DMS-1840314. P.M.E. was supported by the NSF through T.C. with the grant DMS-2009800.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.L. Bartlett, D.J. Foster, M.J. Telgarsky, *Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks*. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **30**: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017 (2017).
- [2] P.L. Bartlett, W. Maass, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis Dimension of Neural Nets*, The Handbook of Brain Theory and Neural Networks, MIT Press, pp. 1188-1192, 2nd ed. (2003).
- [3] M. Belkin *Fit without fear: remarkable mathematical phenomena of deep learning through the prism of interpolation*. Acta Numerica. **30**, 203-248 (2021).
- [4] M. Belkin, D. Hsu, S. Ma, S. Mandal, *Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias-variance trade-off*, PNAS **116** (32) 15849-15854 (2019).
- [5] T. Chen, P. Muñoz Ewald, *Geometric structure of shallow neural networks and constructive \mathcal{L}^2 cost minimization*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10370>
- [6] T. Chen, P. Muñoz Ewald, *Geometric structure of Deep Learning networks and construction of global \mathcal{L}^2 minimizers*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10639>
- [7] T. Chen, P. Muñoz Ewald, *On non-approximability of zero loss global \mathcal{L}^2 minimizers by gradient descent in Deep Learning*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07065>
- [8] T. Chen, P. Muñoz Ewald, *Interpretable global minima of deep ReLU neural networks on sequentially separable data*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07098>
- [9] T. Chen, P. Muñoz Ewald, *Gradient flow in parameter space is equivalent to linear interpolation in output space*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.01517>
- [10] T. Chen, A.G. Moore, *Zero loss guarantees and explicit minimizers for generic overparametrized Deep Learning networks*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14114>
- [11] Y. Cooper, *The loss landscape of overparameterized neural networks*. SIAM J. Math. Data Sci. **3** (2), 676 - 691, (2021).
- [12] T. Galanti, Z.S. Siegel, A. Gupte, T.A. Poggio, *SGD with Weight Decay Secretly Minimizes the Ranks of Your Neural Networks*, The Second Conference on Parsimony and Learning (Proceedings Track), (2025).
- [13] L. Härenstam-Nielsen, L. Sang, A. Saroha, N. Araslanov, D. Cremers, *DiffCD: A Symmetric Differentiable Chamfer Distance for Neural Implicit Surface Fitting*, European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) (2024).
- [14] D. Li, T. Ding, R. Sun, *On the benefit of width for neural networks: Disappearance of basins*. SIAM Journal on Optimization **32.3** (2022): 1728-1758.
- [15] V. Nagarajan, J.Z. Kolter, *Uniform convergence may be unable to explain generalization in deep learning*, Adv. NeurIPS, **32**, (2019). Appendix in <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.04742>
- [16] B. Neyshabur, S. Bhojanapalli, D. McAllester, N. Srebro, *A PAC-Bayesian approach to spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks*. ICLR (2018).
- [17] G. Vardi *On the implicit bias in deep-learning algorithms*, Commun. ACM **66** (6), 86 - 93 (2023).
- [18] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, O. Vinyals, *Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization*, Commun. ACM, **64** (3), 107 - 115 (2021).
- [19] J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, M. Hong, R. Sun, Z.-Q. Luo, *When expressivity meets trainability: Fewer than n neurons can work*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **34** (2021): 9167–9180.

(T. Chen) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, USA
 Email address: tc@math.utexas.edu

(C.-K. Chien) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, CANADA
 Email address: ckchien@math.toronto.edu

(P.M. Ewald) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, USA
 Email address: ewald@utexas.edu

(A.G. Moore) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, USA
 Email address: agmoore@utexas.edu