

# EQUIVALENCE OF APPROXIMATION BY CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS AND FULLY-CONNECTED NETWORKS

PHILIPP PETERSEN<sup>†</sup> AND FELIX VOIGTLAENDER<sup>†</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** Convolutional neural networks are the most widely used type of neural networks in applications. In mathematical analysis, however, mostly fully-connected networks are studied. In this paper, we establish a connection between both network architectures. Using this connection, we show that all upper and lower bounds concerning approximation rates of fully-connected neural networks for functions  $f \in \mathcal{C}$ —for an arbitrary function class  $\mathcal{C}$ —translate to essentially the same bounds concerning approximation rates of *convolutional* neural networks for functions  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\text{equi}}$ , with the class  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{equi}}$  consisting of all translation equivariant functions whose first coordinate belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ . All presented results consider exclusively the case of convolutional neural networks without any pooling operation and with circular convolutions, i.e., not based on zero-padding.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The recent overwhelming success of machine learning techniques such as *deep learning* [5, 7, 17] has prompted many theoretical works trying to provide a mathematical explanation for this extraordinary performance. One line of research focuses on analysing the underlying computational architecture that is given by a neural network. In the context of approximation theory, it is possible to describe the capabilities of this architecture meaningfully. First and foremost, the universal approximation theorem (see [4, 6, 9]) shows that any continuous function on a compact domain can be approximated arbitrarily well by neural networks. Besides, more refined approximation results relate the size (in terms of number of neurons or number of free parameters) of an approximating neural network to its approximation fidelity; see for instance [1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19]. These results include upper bounds on the sufficient size of a network, but also establish lower bounds on the necessary size of a network which is required for certain approximation tasks.

While offering valuable insight into the functionality and capability of neural networks, the practical relevance of these results is limited. Indeed, all mentioned results consider so-called *fully-connected neural networks* (FNNs). In most applications, however, so-called *convolutional neural networks* (CNNs), [8], are employed.

We establish a transference result between CNNs and FNNs. Concretely, we demonstrate that every FNN can be transformed into a CNN with a comparable number of free parameters and vice versa. This demonstrates that—at least from an approximation theoretical point of view—FNNs and CNNs can be considered equivalent.

**1.1. Our contribution.** Let us give a simplified but honest description of our results for the special setting of CNNs acting on images. In this setting, we think of the inputs of our networks as being square matrices, i.e., living in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Convolutions and the relation to groups.* At least in the mathematical literature, the convolution on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is typically defined by

$$(1) \quad (X * Y)_j := \sum_{i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}^2} X_i Y_{(j-i) \bmod d}$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 41A25, Secondary: 44A35, 41A46.

*Key words and phrases.* Neural networks, convolutional neural networks, function approximation, rate of convergence.

<sup>†</sup> Both authors contributed equally to this work.

for  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}^2$ . This convolution is induced by the group structure of  $(\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^2$ . Precisely, if we identify an “image”  $X = (X_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}}$  with the function  $F_X : (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(i + d\mathbb{Z}, j + d\mathbb{Z}) \mapsto X_{i,j}$ , then we have  $F_X * F_Y = F_{X * Y}$ , where

$$(F * G)(g) = \sum_{h \in (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^2} F(h) G(g - h) \quad \text{for } g \in (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^2 \text{ and } F, G : (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

We remark that in the computer science literature, also other conventions for the convolution are commonly used; for instance, one can use *zero padding* instead of the periodic boundary handling in Equation (1).

In the main body of the paper, we will state our results for convolutions stemming from general finite groups, which has the advantage that the results apply to arbitrary input dimensions, and thus also for sound signals or videos in addition to images. Second, working on general groups simplifies the notation.

*Fully connected and convolutional neural networks.* We define FNNs as certain functions that result from repeatedly applying affine-linear maps and a non-linear componentwise operation. More precisely, an FNN  $\Phi$  with  $L$  layers is of the form  $\Phi(x) = (F_L \circ \dots \circ F_1)(x)$ , where each  $F_i$  is given by  $F_i(x) = \varrho(A_i x + b_i)$ ; here, the non-linearity  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is applied componentwise. The number of *active parameters* of an FNN is the number of active parameters of the involved affine-linear maps; that is, the total number of nonzero entries of the matrices  $A_i$  and the bias vectors  $b_i$ .

For CNNs, we use the same definition as in [20], which formalizes the more intuitive description in [5, Chapter 9.5, Equation (9.7)]. As for FNNs, a CNN  $\Phi$  with  $L$  layers is of the form  $\Phi(X) = (F_L \circ \dots \circ F_1)(X)$ , where the computation of each layer  $F_\ell$  is as shown in Figure 1. More formally, each layer takes as input a “stack of images”  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ , where each image  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is called an *input channel*. The output of the layer is again a “stack of images”  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_M)$  which is computed as follows:

- (1) Several convolution kernels  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are applied to the individual input channels; this results in

$$(V_{i,\ell})_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}} = (c_i * X_\ell)_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}}.$$

- (2) Different linear combinations of the channels  $V_{i,\ell}$  are formed; this results in the “stack of images”  $(W_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, M\}}$ , where  $W_j = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{\ell=1}^N A_{j,(i,\ell)} V_{i,\ell}$  for certain coefficients  $A_{j,(i,\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (3) The individual channels  $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  of the output of the layer are given by  $Y_j = \varrho(W_j + b_j)$ , where  $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$ , and where the addition  $W_j + b_j$  as well as the application of the *activation function*  $\varrho$  are componentwise.

Overall, a CNN  $\Phi$  thus computes a function  $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{C_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{C_{\text{out}}}$ , where  $C_{\text{in}}$  and  $C_{\text{out}}$  denote the number of input or output channels, respectively.

The number of *active parameters* of a CNN is the total number of all non-zero entries of the convolution kernels plus the total number of non-zero coefficients used for forming the linear combination of the channels.

*Translation equivariant maps.* Convolutions are closely related to *translations*. Precisely, for  $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}^2$  and  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we denote by  $S_i X$  the translation of  $X$  by  $i$ , given by  $(S_i X)_j = X_{j-i \bmod d}$ ; that is, the boundaries are treated periodically. We then have  $S_i(X * Y) = (S_i X) * Y = X * (S_i Y)$  for all  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ .

Now, given a stack of images  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ , write  $S_i X = (S_i X_1, \dots, S_i X_N)$ . We say that a function  $F : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^M$  is *translation equivariant* if it commutes with translations, that is, if  $F(S_i X) = S_i[F(X)]$  for all  $X \in (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N$ . It is not hard to see that every CNN defines a translation equivariant map.

An important property of translation equivariant maps is that they are uniquely determined by each of their *components*. Indeed, for  $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}^2$  and  $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(N)}) \in (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N$ , let us write  $\pi_i(X) = (X_i^{(1)}, \dots, X_i^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  for the projection of (each channel of)  $X$  onto the  $i$ -th component. Note that  $\pi_i(X) = \pi_0(S_{-i} X)$ . Therefore, if  $F : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^M$  is translation equivariant, then

$$\pi_i(F(X)) = \pi_0(S_{-i}[F(X)]) = \pi_0(F(S_{-i} X)).$$

Thus, if the component  $\pi_0 \circ F$  is known, then so are all other components  $\pi_i \circ F$ .




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the computation performed by each layer of a CNN. In the middle two rows, positive values are shown in turquoise, while negative values are shown in purple. The first convolution kernel picks up vertical edges, while the second picks up horizontal edges. In the notation of the text, we have  $N = 2$ ,  $k = 2$ , and  $M = 3$ .

*The equivalence between approximation properties of FNNs and CNNs.* We next state our main results, Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.2, in the simplified setting of CNNs acting on images  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . This result holds for any measurable activation function  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $F : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be translation equivariant. Furthermore, let  $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N \subset \mathbb{R}$  be measurable, and set  $\Omega := \Omega_1^{d \times d} \times \dots \times \Omega_N^{d \times d} \subset (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N$ . Then, the following hold for each  $p \in (0, \infty]$ , each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and in fact also for  $\varepsilon = 0$ :*

- (1) *If there is an FNN  $\Phi$  with  $W \in \mathbb{N}$  active parameters and  $L$  layers satisfying  $\|\Phi - \pi_0 \circ F\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$ , then there is a CNN  $\Psi$  with  $L$  layers and at most  $2W$  active parameters and such that  $\|\Psi - F\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq d^{2/p} \varepsilon$ .*
- (2) *If there exists a CNN  $\Psi$  with  $W$  active parameters and  $L$  layers satisfying  $\|\Psi - F\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$ , then there exists an FNN  $\Phi$  with  $L$  layers and at most  $d^4 W$  weights and such that  $\|\Phi - \pi_0 \circ F\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$ .*

**Remark.** 1) *For simplicity, we here only consider functions  $F$  with one output channel. The theorem also holds in greater generality.*

2) *In addition to the bounds regarding the number of active parameters, Theorem 4.1 also provides bounds on the number of neurons.*

*The proof idea.* Part (2) of Theorem 1.1 is almost immediate, because convolutions are special linear maps and therefore every CNN is also an FNN. The increase from  $W$  active parameters to  $d^4 W$  active parameters is due to the distinct way in which the number of active parameters are counted for CNNs and FNNs. For instance, a convolution  $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \mapsto x * a \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with a vector  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$  has at most  $d$  active parameters, while the matrix  $A_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  representing the map  $x \mapsto x * a$  has up to  $d^2$  active parameters. This is explained in more detail in Remark 4.2.

The first part of Theorem 1.1, on the other hand, is more intricate. The proof idea is as follows: The FNN  $\Phi$  is of the form  $\Phi = T_L \circ \varrho \circ T_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ \varrho \circ T_2 \circ \varrho \circ T_1$ , where  $\varrho$  is applied componentwise, and where  $T_1 : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$  and  $T_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$  ( $2 \leq \ell \leq L$ ) are affine-linear; here,  $N_\ell$  is the number of neurons in the  $\ell$ -th layer of  $\Phi$ . The general idea is to construct from this a “lifted” CNN  $\Psi$  in which each neuron

(representing a real number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ) of the FNN  $\Phi$  is replaced by a full *channel* (representing an image  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ). This needs to be done in such a way that the lifted CNN  $\Psi$  computes a “translation equivariant version” of the FNN  $\Phi$ .

Formally, we will construct affine-linear maps  $A_1 : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{N_1}$  and  $A_\ell : (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{N_{\ell-1}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})^{N_\ell}$  ( $2 \leq \ell \leq L$ ) which have two important properties. First, all of the maps  $A_\ell$  ( $1 \leq \ell \leq L$ ) are convolutional (corresponding to the first two steps in Figure 1). Second, we have

$$(2) \quad \pi_0 \circ A_1 = T_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_i \circ A_\ell = T_\ell \circ \pi_i \quad \text{for all } i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}^2.$$

This means that projecting each channel of  $A_\ell(X)$  onto the  $i$ -th component is the same as projecting each channel of  $X$  onto the  $i$ -th component and then applying  $T_\ell$ . Denoting by  $\Psi$  the CNN defined by the maps  $A_1, \dots, A_L$ , Equation (2) shows

$$\pi_0 \circ \Psi = \pi_0 \circ A_L \circ \varrho \circ A_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ \varrho \circ A_1 = T_L \circ \varrho \circ T_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ \varrho \circ T_1 = \Phi.$$

Now, since  $\pi_0 \circ \Psi = \Phi$  is close to  $\pi_0 \circ F$ , and since both  $F$  and  $\Psi$  are translation equivariant, it follows that  $\Psi$  is close to  $F$ . We refer to the proof of Theorem 4.1 for the precise construction of the maps  $A_1, \dots, A_L$ .

**1.2. Related work.** The findings in [22, 21] are closely related to the results presented in this paper. The focus in [22, 21], however, is specifically on CNNs that employ 1-dimensional convolutions *with very short convolution kernels* of a fixed length  $2 \leq s \leq d$ . For convolutional networks of this type, [22, Theorem A] establishes a universal approximation result: Given a compact set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , a sparsity parameter  $2 \leq s \leq d$ , an error bound  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and an arbitrary continuous function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there is a depth  $J = J(f, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$  and a CNN  $\Phi_{f, \varepsilon}$  as just described and of depth  $J$  such that  $\|f - \Phi_{f, \varepsilon}\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$ .

The main differences between our results and the findings in [22] are the following: First, the emphasis in [22] is on CNNs using convolution kernels with small support, while we put no restriction on the size of the convolution kernels. Second, the type of networks considered in [22] is quite different from the ones considered by us: In [22], each layer of the network performs *a single convolution* before the non-linearity. In contrast, each layer in our CNNs performs multiple convolutions and can have multiple input- and output channels. Further, the networks in [22] do *not* produce translation equivariant functions, since the last layer is allowed to be non-convolutional, and since the networks employ *bias vectors* instead of one constant bias for each channel of the network. For this reason, the networks considered in [22] can be universal in the class of *all* continuous functions, not just in the class of translation-equivariant ones. Third, the universality results and the approximation rates in [22] *require the number of layers to grow unboundedly*. In contrast, we consider networks of a fixed depth. Finally, [22] only considers *one-dimensional convolutions* (corresponding to data like sound signals), while our results apply for arbitrary dimensions, and thus to input signals like images or videos.

In [20, Proposition 3.1], a universal approximation theorem for CNNs is established. Specifically, it is shown there that every equivariant continuous function can be approximated arbitrarily well by a CNN with one hidden layer. The definition of CNNs in [20] uses convolutions based on general (compact, abelian) groups and coincides with the one in the present paper, when specialised to finite groups. In contrast to the present work, [20] does not study rates of approximation, but universality only. In addition, in [20, Section 3], Yarotsky establishes a range of more abstract universality results for networks that take as inputs functions  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  instead of the discrete inputs that are considered in the present paper. For these types of networks, the role of pooling is analysed in [20, Section 4].

We would also like to mention the paper [11] which—while not concerned with approximation properties—is one of the first rigorous investigations of the mathematical properties of CNNs.

**1.3. Pooling.** The convolutional networks used in practice often employ a form of *pooling* after each layer (see [5, Section 9.3]); besides, the convolutions are sometimes *zero-padded* (see [5, Section 9.5]) instead of periodic. However, both of these techniques destroy the translation equivariance. For this reason—and for the sake of mathematical simplicity—we restrict ourselves to the case of periodic convolutions without pooling in this short note.

**Structure of the paper.** The paper is structured as follows: We begin by introducing FNNs and CNNs in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. The aforementioned equivalence of approximation rates is then demonstrated in Section 4.

## 2. FULLY-CONNECTED NEURAL NETWORKS

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group of cardinality  $|\mathcal{G}| \in \mathbb{N}$ . For a finite set  $I$ , we denote the set of real-valued sequences with index set  $I$  by  $\mathbb{R}^I = \{(x_i)_{i \in I} \mid x_i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in I\}$ . In this note, we consider neural network functions the input of which are elements of  $\mathbb{R}^{\llbracket M \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ , where  $\llbracket M \rrbracket := \{1, \dots, M\}$ . In Section 4, we will compare the expressivity of such FNNs with that of CNNs. Even though the group structure of  $\mathcal{G}$  is not used in the present section, it will be essential for defining CNNs in the next section.

The following definition of FNNs is standard in the mathematical literature on neural networks; only the restriction to inputs in  $\mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$  is slightly unusual.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group, let  $C_0, L \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $N_1, \dots, N_L \in \mathbb{N}$ . A fully-connected neural network  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$  is a sequence of affine-linear maps, where  $V_1 : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$  and  $V_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$  for  $1 < \ell \leq L$ . The architecture  $\mathcal{A}(\Phi)$  is given by  $\mathcal{A}(\Phi) := (C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|, N_1, \dots, N_L)$ . For an arbitrary function  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (called the activation function), we define the  $\varrho$ -realisation of the network  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$  as*

$$R_\varrho(\Phi) : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_L}, \quad x \mapsto x_L,$$

where  $x_0 := x$  and  $x_{\ell+1} := \varrho(V_{\ell+1}(x_\ell))$  for  $0 \leq \ell \leq L-2$ , while  $x_L := V_L(x_{L-1})$ . Here,  $\varrho$  is applied component-wise, that is,  $\varrho((x_1, \dots, x_n)) = (\varrho(x_1), \dots, \varrho(x_n))$ .

For an affine-linear map  $V : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$ , there is a uniquely determined vector  $b \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and a linear map  $A : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  such that  $V(x) = Ax + b$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^I$ . We then set  $\|V\|_{\ell^0} := \|b\|_{\ell^0} + \|A\|_{\ell^0}$ , where  $\|b\|_{\ell^0} = |\{j \in J \mid b_j \neq 0\}|$  denotes the number of non-zero entries of  $b$ , and where  $\|A\|_{\ell^0} := \sum_{i \in I} \|A \delta_i\|_{\ell^0}$ , with  $(\delta_i)_{i \in I}$  denoting the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^I$ . With this notation, we define the number of weights  $W(\Phi)$  and the number of neurons  $N(\Phi)$  as

$$W(\Phi) := \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} \quad \text{and} \quad N(\Phi) := C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}| + \sum_{\ell=1}^L N_\ell.$$

## 3. CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS

For a finite group  $\mathcal{G}$  and functions  $a, b : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $a * b$  the *convolution* of  $a$  and  $b$ , defined by

$$(3) \quad a * b : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad g \mapsto \sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} a(h) b(h^{-1}g).$$

The first step in computing the output of a CNN is to convolve the input with different convolution kernels. This leads to different channels, each of which has the same dimension. Each layer of the network thus has a *spatial dimension* (the number of elements  $|\mathcal{G}|$  of the group  $\mathcal{G}$ ) and a *channel dimension* (the number of channels). After the convolution step, the different channels are combined in an affine-linear fashion, but only along fixed spatial coordinates (see Figure 1). Finally, the activation function is applied component-wise, and the whole procedure is repeated on the next layer, with input given by the output of the present layer.

We shall now turn this informal description into a formal definition. The definitions might appear to be overly technical, but these technicalities will be important later to estimate the number of parameters of a CNN. Before stating that definition, we introduce notation allowing for more succinct expressions. For  $x = (x_{i,g})_{i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket, g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket M \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ , we write  $x_i := (x_{i,g})_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  for  $i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$ . Likewise, we will identify a family  $(x_i)_{i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket}$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$ , with the family  $(x_i(g))_{i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket, g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket M \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ .

Finally, if  $I, J$  are sets, and if  $F : \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I$ , then we define the *lifting* of  $F$  as the map  $F^\uparrow : \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}$  that results from applying  $F$  along fixed spatial coordinates. Formally, this means

$$(4) \quad F^\uparrow : \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}, \quad (x_{j,g})_{j \in J, g \in \mathcal{G}} \mapsto ([F((x_{j,g})_{j \in J})]_i)_{i \in I, g \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

It is not hard to verify  $(F \circ G)^\uparrow = F^\uparrow \circ G^\uparrow$  for  $F : \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$ .

Given these notations, we can state two final preparatory definitions. We start by defining the maps that perform the convolutional steps in a CNN.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group and  $B : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ , where  $k, C_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that  $B$  is filtering, with  $k$  filters, if there are  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  such that

$$(5) \quad B((x_i)_{i \in \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket}) = (x_j * a_r)_{(r,j) \in \llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \quad \forall (x_i)_{i \in \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}.$$

In this case, we write  $B \in \text{filter}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1)$ , and set  $\|B\|_{\text{filter}}^{\ell^0} := \sum_{r=1}^k \|a_r\|_{\ell^0}$ . This is well-defined, since the filters  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  are uniquely determined by  $B$ .

The following definition formalises the first two steps in Figure 1.

**Definition 3.2.** Given  $k, C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that a map  $T : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$  is a spatially-convolutional, semi-connected map with  $k$  filters, if  $T$  can be written as  $T = A^\uparrow \circ B$  for  $B \in \text{filter}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1)$  and an affine-linear map  $A : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket}$ . In this case, we write  $T \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1, C_2)$ , and define

$$\|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0} := \min \left\{ \|A\|_{\ell^0} + \|B\|_{\text{filter}}^{\ell^0} \mid \begin{array}{l} A : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket} \text{ affine-linear} \\ \text{and } B \in \text{filter}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1) \text{ with } T = A^\uparrow \circ B \end{array} \right\}.$$

**Remark 3.3.** Every  $T \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1, C_2)$  is affine-linear. Furthermore, the number of weights of  $T$  as an ‘‘ordinary’’ affine-linear map can be estimated up to a multiplicative constant by  $\|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0}$ ; in fact, we have

$$(6) \quad \|T\|_{\ell^0} \leq |\mathcal{G}|^2 \cdot \|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0}.$$

To see this, choose an affine-linear map  $A : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket}$  and a filtering map  $B \in \text{filter}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1)$  such that  $T = A^\uparrow \circ B$  and  $\|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0} = \|A\|_{\ell^0} + \|B\|_{\text{filter}}^{\ell^0}$ . Furthermore, choose  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  such that  $B$  satisfies Equation (5), and let  $A_{\text{lin}} : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket}$  be linear and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket}$  such that  $A(\cdot) = b + A_{\text{lin}}(\cdot)$ .

Now, define  $b^\uparrow := (b_j)_{j \in \llbracket C_2 \rrbracket, g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ . It is not hard to see  $T = b^\uparrow + A_{\text{lin}}^\uparrow \circ B$ , where the map  $A_{\text{lin}}^\uparrow \circ B : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_2 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$  is linear. Furthermore, for arbitrary  $i_0 \in \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket C_2 \rrbracket$  and  $h_0, g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \left[ A_{\text{lin}}^\uparrow \circ B \right]_{\delta_{i_0, h_0}} \right)_{j, g} &= \left[ \left( A_{\text{lin}}(\delta_{i_0, i} \cdot (\delta_{h_0} * a_r)_g)_{r \in \llbracket k \rrbracket, i \in \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \right) \right]_j \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^k (A_{\text{lin}})_{j, (r, i_0)} \cdot a_r(h_0^{-1}g), \end{aligned}$$

where we identified the linear map  $A_{\text{lin}}$  with the matrix associated to it (by virtue of the standard basis). The above identity implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|_{\ell^0} &= \|b^\uparrow\|_{\ell^0} + \|A_{\text{lin}}^\uparrow \circ B\|_{\ell^0} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{C_2} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{1}_{b_j \neq 0} + \sum_{j=1}^{C_2} \sum_{i_0=1}^{C_1} \sum_{h_0, g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{r=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{(A_{\text{lin}})_{j, (r, i_0)} \neq 0} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{a_r(h_0^{-1}g) \neq 0} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \|b\|_{\ell^0} + |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \left( \max_{r=1, \dots, k} \|a_r\|_{\ell^0} \right) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{C_2} \sum_{i_0=1}^{C_1} \sum_{r=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{(A_{\text{lin}})_{j, (r, i_0)} \neq 0} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \|b\|_{\ell^0} + |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \left( \max_{r=1, \dots, k} \|a_r\|_{\ell^0} \right) \cdot \|A_{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} \leq |\mathcal{G}|^2 \cdot \|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the identity  $\sum_{h_0, g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{1}_{a_r(h_0^{-1}g) \neq 0} = \sum_{h_0 \in \mathcal{G}} \|a_r\|_{\ell^0} = |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \|a_r\|_{\ell^0}$  follows from the change of variables  $h = h_0^{-1}g$ . Furthermore, we used in the last step that  $\|b\|_{\ell^0} + \|A_{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} = \|A\|_{\ell^0} \leq \|T\|_{\text{conv}}^{\ell^0}$ , and that  $\|a_r\|_{\ell^0} \leq |\mathcal{G}|$ , since  $a_r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$ .

We now define CNNs similarly to FNNs, with the modification that the affine-linear maps in the definition of the network are required to be spatially-convolutional, semi-connected.

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group, let  $C_0, C_1, \dots, C_L \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $k_1, \dots, k_L \in \mathbb{N}$ . A convolutional neural network  $\Phi$  with  $L$  layers, channel counts  $(C_0, C_1, \dots, C_L)$ , and filter counts  $(k_1, \dots, k_L)$  is a tuple  $\Phi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$  where  $T_\ell \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k_\ell, C_{\ell-1}, C_\ell)$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ .

For a convolutional neural network  $\Phi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$  and an activation function  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the  $\varrho$ -realisation of  $\Phi$  as

$$R_\varrho(\Phi) : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_L \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}, \quad x \mapsto x_L,$$

where  $x_0 := x$ ,  $x_{\ell+1} := \varrho(T_{\ell+1}(x_\ell))$  for  $0 \leq \ell \leq L-2$ , and  $x_L := T_L(x_{L-1})$ . Here, we again apply  $\varrho$  component-wise.

The number of channels of  $\Phi$  is  $C(\Phi) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L C_\ell$ . The number  $C_0 = C_0(\Phi) \in \mathbb{N}$  is called the number of input channels of  $\Phi$ , while  $C_L = C_L(\Phi) \in \mathbb{N}$  is the number of output channels. Finally,  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Phi) := \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|T_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{conv}}^0}$  is the number of weights.

**Remark.** It could be more natural to call  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Phi)$  the number of free parameters, instead of “the number of weights”. We chose the present terminology primarily to be consistent with the established terminology for FNNs.

**Remark 3.5.** With the identification  $\mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_\ell \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{C_\ell \cdot |\mathcal{G}|}$ , each CNN  $\Phi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$  is also an FNN, simply because each of the maps  $T_\ell \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k_\ell, C_{\ell-1}, C_\ell)$  is an affine-linear map  $T_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_{\ell-1} \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_\ell \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ . When interpreting  $\Phi$  as an FNN, it has architecture  $\mathcal{A}(\Phi) = (C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|, C_1 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|, \dots, C_L \cdot |\mathcal{G}|)$ , and thus  $N(\Phi) \leq |\mathcal{G}| \cdot C(\Phi)$ . Furthermore, as a consequence of Remark 3.3, we see

$$(7) \quad W(\Phi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|T_\ell\|_{\ell^0} \leq |\mathcal{G}|^2 \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|T_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{conv}}^0} = |\mathcal{G}|^2 \cdot W_{\text{conv}}(\Phi).$$

As just seen, CNNs are special FNNs. Hence, it is natural to ask to what extent these networks can achieve the same approximation properties as FNNs. It turns out that the restriction to CNNs is significant, since CNNs can only approximate so-called translation equivariant functions. To make the concept of translation equivariance more precise, and, in particular, meaningful for functions with different input and output dimensions, we first introduce the notion of vectorisation: For a set  $I$  and a function  $H : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  we define the  $I$ -vectorisation  $H^{\text{vec}, I}$  of  $H$  as

$$(8) \quad H^{\text{vec}, I} : \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}, \quad (x_i)_{i \in I} \mapsto (H(x_i))_{i \in I}.$$

Next, we define the concept of translation equivariance.

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group,  $I, J$  index sets, and  $F : \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}}$ . We say that  $F$  is translation equivariant, if  $F \circ S_g^{\text{vec}, I} = S_g^{\text{vec}, J} \circ F$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , where  $S_g^{\text{vec}, I}$  and  $S_g^{\text{vec}, J}$  are, respectively, the  $I$ -vectorisation and the  $J$ -vectorisation of the shift operator

$$S_g : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}, \quad (x_h)_{h \in \mathcal{G}} \mapsto (x_{g^{-1}h})_{h \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

As previously announced, every realisation of a CNN is translation equivariant, as the following proposition demonstrates.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group, let  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any function, and let  $\Phi$  be a CNN. Then the  $\varrho$ -realisation  $R_\varrho(\Phi)$  is translation equivariant.

*Proof.* Directly from the definition of the convolution in Equation (3), we see that convolutions are translation equivariant; that is,  $S_g(x * a) = (S_g x) * a$  for  $a, x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . Thus,  $S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \circ B = B \circ S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket}$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and any filtering map  $B$  as in Equation (5).

Now, for a permutation  $\pi$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , let us write  $C_\pi : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}, (x_g)_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mapsto (x_{\pi(g)})_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ . A direct computation shows for any  $F : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  that  $F^\uparrow \circ C_\pi^{\text{vec}, I} = C_\pi^{\text{vec}, J} \circ F^\uparrow$ . Clearly,  $S_g = C_\pi$  for a suitable permutation  $\pi = \pi_g$ . Overall, we thus see for any  $T = A^\uparrow \circ B \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1, C_2)$  that

$$T \circ S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} = A^\uparrow \circ S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket k \rrbracket \times \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} \circ B = S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_2 \rrbracket} \circ A^\uparrow \circ B = S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_2 \rrbracket} \circ T \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Since the activation function  $\varrho$  is applied component-wise, it immediately follows that  $\varrho(T(S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_1 \rrbracket} x)) = S_g^{\text{vec}, \llbracket C_2 \rrbracket}(\varrho(Tx))$  for every  $T \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, k, C_1, C_2)$  and all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_1 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ . By iterating this observation, we get the claim.  $\square$

The proposition shows that all realisations of CNNs are translation equivariant. We note that the approximation theory of CNNs has been studied before, for instance in the works [3, 22]. The CNNs considered in these works, however, are different from the definition used in the present paper. For the CNNs studied in the present paper, their universality for the class of continuous translation equivariant functions has been established in [20, Theorem 3.1]. Nevertheless, until now it was not known what kind of *approximation rates* these CNNs yield. In the next section, we show that there is in fact a fundamental connection between the approximation capabilities of FNNs and these CNNs.

#### 4. APPROXIMATION RATES OF CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS FOR TRANSLATION EQUIVARIANT FUNCTIONS

We start by demonstrating in Subsection 4.1 how one can associate to each FNN a CNN, such that the first coordinate of the realisation of the CNN coincides with the realisation of the FNN. In addition, in Remark 4.2 we show the converse statement, i.e., that each CNN can be transformed into an associated FNN.

Afterwards, we demonstrate in Section 4.2 how this yields an equivalence between the approximation rates of CNNs and FNNs. We close with a concrete example showing how our results can be used to translate approximation results for FNNs into approximation results for CNNs.

**4.1. The transference principle.** We will measure approximation rates with respect to  $L^p$  norms of vector-valued functions. For these (quasi)-norms, we use the following convention: For any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , any finite index set  $J$ , any measurable subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , any  $p \in (0, \infty]$ , and any measurable function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$ , we define

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^J)} := \|x \mapsto \|f(x)\|_{\ell^p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Note that this implies for  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}}$  and  $p < \infty$  that

$$(9) \quad \|F\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}})}^p = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|F_g\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^J)}^p,$$

where  $F_g := (F)_g := \pi_g^J \circ F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  denotes the  $g$ -th component of  $F$ . Here, the function  $\pi_g^J$  is the projection onto the  $g$ -th component, given by

$$(10) \quad \pi_g^J : \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J, (x_{j,h})_{j \in J, h \in \mathcal{G}} \mapsto (x_{j,g})_{j \in J}.$$

**Remark.** One could also define  $\|F\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^J)}$  as  $\||F|\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ , where  $|F|(x) = |F(x)|$  denotes the Euclidean norm of  $F(x)$ . It is not hard to see that both (quasi)-norms are equivalent since  $J$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are finite; furthermore, the constant of the norm equivalence only depends on  $|J|$ ,  $|\mathcal{G}|$ , and  $p$ .

We denote the identity element of  $\mathcal{G}$  by 1 and observe that if  $F, G : \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}}$  are translation equivariant and  $(F)_1 = (G)_1$  then  $F = G$ ; indeed, it suffices to show for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  that  $(F)_g = (G)_g$ . This holds since we have

$$(11) \quad (F)_g = \pi_1^J \circ S_{g^{-1}}^{\text{vec}, J} \circ F = \pi_1^J \circ F \circ S_{g^{-1}}^{\text{vec}, I} = (F)_1 \circ S_{g^{-1}}^{\text{vec}, I}$$

for every translation equivariant function  $F : \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}}$ .

Given a finite index set  $I \neq \emptyset$ , we say that a subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant, if  $S_g^{\text{vec}, I}(\Omega) \subset \Omega$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . An example of such a set is  $\prod_{i \in I} \Omega_i^{\mathcal{G}}$ , where the sets  $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}$  for  $i \in I$  can be chosen arbitrarily. Since  $S_g^{\text{vec}, I}x = P_g x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}$  and a suitable permutation matrix  $P_g$ , Equations (9) and (11) show for any  $p \in (0, \infty)$ , any measurable  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}}$  and any two translation equivariant functions  $F, G : \mathbb{R}^{I \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}}$  that

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F - G\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{J \times \mathcal{G}})} &= \left( \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|(F)_g - (G)_g\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^J)}^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &= |\mathcal{G}|^{1/p} \cdot \|(F)_1 - (G)_1\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^J)}, \end{aligned}$$

and this clearly remains true for  $p = \infty$ .

We can now state the transference principle between FNNs and CNNs.



**Theorem 4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group, let  $\varepsilon \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $p \in (0, \infty]$ , and  $C_0, N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}$  be  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant and measurable, and let  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable.

Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}$  be measurable and translation equivariant, and let  $\Phi$  be an FNN of architecture  $\mathcal{A}(\Phi) = (C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|, N_1, \dots, N_{L-1}, N)$  satisfying  $\|(F)_1 - R_\varrho(\Phi)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \varepsilon$ .

Then there is a CNN  $\Psi$  with channel counts  $(C_0, N_1, \dots, N_{L-1}, N)$ , with filter counts  $(N_1 \cdot C_0, 1, \dots, 1)$ , and such that  $\|F - R_\varrho(\Psi)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}})} \leq |\mathcal{G}|^{1/p} \cdot \varepsilon$  and  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi) \leq 2 \cdot W(\Phi)$ . Here, we use the convention  $|\mathcal{G}|^{1/\infty} = 1$ .

**Remark.** 1) The proof shows that the network  $\Psi$  can be chosen independently of the activation function  $\varrho$ , unless  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$  with  $V_\ell = 0$  for some  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ .

2) Since we can choose  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}$ , the theorem shows in particular that if  $(F)_1 = R_\varrho(\Phi)$  for an FNN  $\Phi$  of architecture  $(C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|, N_1, \dots, N_{L-1}, N)$ , then  $F = R_\varrho(\Psi)$  for a CNN  $\Psi$  with channel counts  $(C_0, N_1, \dots, N_{L-1}, N)$ , with filter counts  $(N_1 \cdot C_0, 1, \dots, 1)$ , and with  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi) \leq 2 \cdot W(\Phi)$ .

3) In addition to the number of layers and weights, the complexity of the individual weights can also be relevant. Given a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ , we say that an affine-linear map  $V : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  has weights in  $\Lambda$  if  $V(x) = b + Ax$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^I$  and certain  $b \in \Lambda^J$  and  $A \in \Lambda^{J \times I}$ . Likewise, we say that an FNN  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$  has weights in  $\Lambda$  if all  $V_\ell$  have weights in  $\Lambda$ .

The proof of the theorem shows that if the FNN  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$  has weights in  $\Lambda$ , and if  $V_\ell \neq 0$  for some  $\ell$ , then the CNN  $\Psi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$  constructed in the theorem satisfies  $T_\ell = A_\ell^\uparrow \circ B_\ell$  where all  $A_\ell, B_\ell$  have weights in  $\Lambda \cup \{0, 1\}$ .

*Proof.* In view of Equation (12) and since  $R_\varrho(\Psi)$  is translation equivariant (see Proposition 3.7), we need only show that there is a CNN  $\Psi$  with the asserted channel counts, filter counts, and number of weights, and such that  $(R_\varrho(\Psi))_1 = R_\varrho(\Phi)$ .

Let  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$ . For brevity, set  $N_0 := C_0$  and  $N_L := N$ , and furthermore  $k_1 := N_1 \cdot C_0$  and  $k_\ell := 1$  for  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ .

We first handle a few special cases, in order to avoid tedious case distinctions later on. First, if  $\|V_L\|_{\ell^0} = 0$ , then  $R_\varrho(\Phi) \equiv 0$ . Then, let  $\Psi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$ , where  $T_\ell = A_\ell^\uparrow \circ B_\ell$  with  $A_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor k_\ell \rfloor \times \lfloor N_{\ell-1} \rfloor} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N_\ell \rfloor}$ ,  $x \mapsto 0$ , and with

$$B_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N_{\ell-1} \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor k_\ell \rfloor \times \lfloor N_{\ell-1} \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}, (x_i)_{i \in \lfloor N_{\ell-1} \rfloor} \mapsto (x_i * 0)_{r \in \lfloor k_\ell \rfloor, i \in \lfloor N_{\ell-1} \rfloor}$$

for all  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ . It is then trivial to verify that  $\Psi$  has the desired number of filters and channels, that  $(R_\varrho(\Psi))_1 \equiv 0$ , and that  $\|T_\ell\|_{\ell^0}^{\text{conv}} = 0$  for all  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , so that  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi) = 0 \leq 2 \cdot W(\Phi)$ .

Next, if  $\|V_L\|_{\ell^0} > 0$ , but  $\|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} = 0$  for some  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$ , then there is some  $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $\|c\|_{\ell^0} \leq W(\Phi)$  and  $R_\varrho(\Phi) \equiv c$ . Indeed,  $c = V_L c_0$  for some  $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{L-1}}$ . Besides, for any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , we have  $(Ax + b)_j = b_j + \sum_{\ell=1}^k A_{j,\ell} x_\ell$ , which shows that  $\mathbb{1}_{(Ax+b)_j \neq 0} \leq \mathbb{1}_{b_j \neq 0} + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{A_{j,\ell} \neq 0}$ , and hence

$$\|Ax + b\|_{\ell^0} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{(Ax+b)_j \neq 0} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{b_j \neq 0} + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{A_{j,\ell} \neq 0} = \|A(\cdot) + b\|_{\ell^0}.$$

Therefore,  $\|c\|_{\ell^0} = \|V_L c_0\|_{\ell^0} \leq \|V_L\|_{\ell^0} \leq W(\Phi)$ .

Given such a vector  $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $R_\varrho(\Phi) \equiv c$  and  $\|c\|_{\ell^0} \leq W(\Phi)$ , we define  $\Psi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$ , where  $T_\ell = A_\ell^\uparrow \circ B_\ell$ , and where  $B_1, \dots, B_L$  and  $A_1, \dots, A_{L-1}$  are defined as in the previous case, and where  $A_L : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor k_L \rfloor \times \lfloor N_{L-1} \rfloor} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N_L \rfloor}$ ,  $x \mapsto c$ . This is well-defined, since  $N_L = N$ , whence  $c \in \mathbb{R}^N \cong \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N_L \rfloor}$ . It is not hard to see that  $(R_\varrho(\Psi))_1 \equiv c \equiv R_\varrho(\Phi)$ , that  $\Psi$  has the right number of filters and channels, and that  $W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi) = \|A_L\|_{\ell^0} = \|c\|_{\ell^0} \leq W(\Phi)$ .

In the following, we can thus assume  $\|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} > 0$  for all  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ . Below, we will repeatedly make use of the following fact: If  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$ , and if we define  $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  by  $v_g^* := v_{g^{-1}}$  for  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , then

$$(13) \quad (x * v^*)_1 = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} x_h v_{h^{-1}}^* = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} x_h v_h = \langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Furthermore,  $x * \delta_1 = x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$ , where  $(\delta_1)_1 = 1$  and  $(\delta_1)_g = 0$  for  $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{1\}$ . We remark that this way of expressing an inner product as a convolution has also been used in [22] to analyse the expressivity of CNNs.

Recall that  $\Phi = (V_1, \dots, V_L)$ . Since  $V_1 : \mathbb{R}^{[C_0] \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_1]}$  is affine-linear, there are  $v_j^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$  (for  $j \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket$  and  $i \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket$ ) such that  $V_1(\cdot) = b + V_1^{\text{lin}}(\cdot)$ , where  $b = (b_j)_{j \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket}$  and

$$V_1^{\text{lin}} : \mathbb{R}^{[C_0] \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_1]}, \quad (x_i)_{i \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket} \mapsto \left( \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \langle x_i, v_j^i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}} \right)_{j \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket}.$$

We now define  $T_1 := A_1^\uparrow \circ B_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, C_0 \cdot N_1, C_0, N_1)$ , where

$$B_1 : \mathbb{R}^{[C_0] \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_1] \times [C_0] \times [C_0] \times \mathcal{G}}, \quad (x_i)_{i \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket} \mapsto (x_\iota * (v_j^i)^*)_{j \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket, i, \iota \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket}$$

and  $A_1 : \mathbb{R}^{[N_1] \times [C_0] \times [C_0]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_1]}$ ,  $y \mapsto b + A_1^{\text{lin}} y$ , where

$$A_1^{\text{lin}} : \mathbb{R}^{[N_1] \times [C_0] \times [C_0]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_1]}, \quad (y_{j,i,\iota})_{j \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket, i, \iota \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket} \mapsto \left( \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \mathbb{1}_{v_\ell^i \neq 0} \cdot y_{\ell, i, i} \right)_{\ell \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket}.$$

As a consequence of these definitions, we see for  $x = (x_{j,g})_{j \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket, g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{[C_0] \times \mathcal{G}}$  and  $\ell \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket$  that

$$\begin{aligned} ((A_1^\uparrow \circ B_1)x)_{\ell,1} &= \left( A_1 \left[ (B_1 x)_{j,i,\iota,1} \right]_{(j,i,\iota) \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket \times [C_0] \times [C_0]} \right)_\ell \\ &= \left( A_1 \left[ (x_\iota * (v_j^i)^*)_{j,i,\iota} \right]_{(j,i,\iota) \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket \times [C_0] \times [C_0]} \right)_\ell \\ &\stackrel{(\text{Def. of } A_1 \text{ and Eq. (13))}}{=} b_\ell + \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} [\langle x_i, v_\ell^i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{v_\ell^i \neq 0}] = b_\ell + \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \langle x_i, v_\ell^i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}} = (V_1 x)_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, with the projection map  $\pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket}$  defined in Equation (10), we have

$$(14) \quad \pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket} \circ T_1 = \pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket} \circ A_1^\uparrow \circ B_1 = V_1.$$

Furthermore, we see directly from the definition of  $A_1^{\text{lin}}$  that

$$(A_1^{\text{lin}} \delta_{j,i,\iota})_\ell = \sum_{n=1}^{C_0} (\mathbb{1}_{v_\ell^n \neq 0} \cdot \delta_{j,i,\iota})_{\ell,n,n} = \delta_{i,\iota} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{v_j^i \neq 0} \cdot \delta_{j,\ell}$$

for all  $j, \ell \in \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket$  and  $i, \iota \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket$ . Therefore,

$$\|A_1^{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_1} \sum_{i,\iota \in \llbracket C_0 \rrbracket} \mathbb{1}_{(A_1^{\text{lin}} \delta_{j,i,\iota})_\ell \neq 0} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \mathbb{1}_{v_j^i \neq 0} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \|v_j^i\|_{\ell^0} = \|V_1^{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0},$$

and hence  $\|A_1\|_{\ell^0} = \|b\|_{\ell^0} + \|A_1^{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} \leq \|b\|_{\ell^0} + \|V_1^{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} = \|V_1\|_{\ell^0}$ . Next, note

$$\|B_1\|_{\ell_{\text{filter}}^0} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{C_0} \|(v_j^i)^*\|_{\ell^0} = \|V_1^{\text{lin}}\|_{\ell^0} \leq \|V_1\|_{\ell^0},$$

which finally implies  $\|T_1\|_{\ell_{\text{conv}}^0} \leq \|A_1\|_{\ell^0} + \|B_1\|_{\ell_{\text{filter}}^0} \leq 2 \cdot \|V_1\|_{\ell^0}$ .

Next, for  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ , we define  $T_\ell := V_\ell^\uparrow \circ B_\ell \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{G}, 1, N_{\ell-1}, N_\ell)$ , where

$$B_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{[N_{\ell-1}] \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{[N_{\ell-1}] \times \mathcal{G}}, \quad x = (x_i)_{i \in \llbracket N_{\ell-1} \rrbracket} \mapsto (x_i * \delta_1)_{i \in \llbracket N_{\ell-1} \rrbracket} = x.$$

Note because of  $B_\ell x = x$  that  $T_\ell = V_\ell^\uparrow$ . Furthermore, since we excluded the case  $\|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} = 0$  at the beginning of the proof, we have  $\|B_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{filter}}^0} = \|\delta_1\|_{\ell^0} = 1 \leq \|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0}$ . Therefore,

$$\|T_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{conv}}^0} \leq \|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} + \|B_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{filter}}^0} \leq 2 \cdot \|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0}.$$

We now define the CNN  $\Psi := (T_1, \dots, T_L)$ , noting that this network indeed has the required number of channels and filters, and that

$$W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|T_\ell\|_{\ell_{\text{conv}}^0} \leq 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|V_\ell\|_{\ell^0} = 2 \cdot W(\Phi).$$

By Proposition 3.7,  $R_\varrho(\Psi)$  is translation equivariant. Since  $F$  is also translation equivariant, Equation (12) shows that we only need to verify  $[R_\varrho(\Psi)]_1 = R_\varrho(\Phi)$ . But this is easy to see: We saw above that  $T_\ell = V_\ell^\uparrow$  for  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ , which easily implies  $\pi_1^{\llbracket N_\ell \rrbracket} \circ T_\ell = V_\ell \circ \pi_1^{\llbracket N_{\ell-1} \rrbracket}$ . Since the activation function  $\varrho$  is applied component-wise, we conclude as desired that

$$\begin{aligned} [R_\varrho(\Psi)]_1 &= \pi_1^{\llbracket N_L \rrbracket} \circ R_\varrho(\Psi) = (V_L \circ \varrho \circ V_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ \varrho \circ V_2) \circ \pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket} \circ \varrho \circ T_1 \\ (\text{Eq. (14) and } \pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket} \circ \varrho &= \varrho \circ \pi_1^{\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket}) = (V_L \circ \varrho \circ V_{L-1} \circ \dots \circ \varrho \circ V_2) \circ \varrho \circ V_1 \\ &= R_\varrho(V_1, \dots, V_L) = R_\varrho(\Phi). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following remark contains the (easier) converse of Theorem 4.1, showing that to each CNN  $\Psi$  one can construct an associated FNN  $\Phi$  such that  $R_\varrho(\Phi) = [R_\varrho(\Psi)]_1$ .

**Remark 4.2.** *Let  $\Psi = (T_1, \dots, T_L)$  be a CNN with channel counts  $(C_0, C_1, \dots, C_L)$  and filter counts  $(k_1, \dots, k_L)$ . The FNN associated to  $\Psi$  is  $\Phi^\Psi := (T_1, \dots, T_{L-1}, T_L^1)$ , where  $T_L^1 := \pi_1^{\llbracket C_L \rrbracket} \circ T_L$ .*

*The properties of the network  $\Phi^\Psi$  are closely related to those of  $\Psi$ ; in particular, the following holds:*

- $R_\varrho(\Phi^\Psi) = [R_\varrho(\Psi)]_1$ ;
- if  $\|F - R_\varrho(\Psi)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_L \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}})} \leq \varepsilon$  for some  $p \in (0, \infty]$  and some measurable function  $F : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_L \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}$ , then  $\|(F)_1 - R_\varrho(\Phi^\Psi)\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{C_L})} \leq \varepsilon$ ;
- $\Phi^\Psi$  has architecture  $\mathcal{A}(\Phi^\Psi) = (|\mathcal{G}| \cdot C_0, |\mathcal{G}| \cdot C_1, \dots, |\mathcal{G}| \cdot C_{L-1}, C_L)$ , and hence  $N(\Phi^\Psi) \leq |\mathcal{G}| \cdot C(\Psi)$ ; and
- $W(\Phi^\Psi) \leq |\mathcal{G}|^2 \cdot W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi)$ .

*The very last property is a consequence of Equation (6), combined with the estimate  $\|\pi_1^{\llbracket C_L \rrbracket} \circ T_L\|_{\ell^0} \leq \|T_L\|_{\ell^0}$ .*

**4.2. Equivalence of approximation rates.** For  $C_0, N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a given function class  $\mathcal{C} \subset \{F : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket N \rrbracket}\}$ , we call

$$\mathcal{C}^{\text{equiv}} := \left\{ G : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket N \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \mid G \text{ translation equivariant and } (G)_1 \in \mathcal{C} \right\}$$

the *equivariant function class associated to  $\mathcal{C}$* .

In combination, Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.2 imply that for any function class  $\mathcal{C} \subset \{F : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket N \rrbracket}\}$  consisting of measurable functions, the approximation rate of FNNs in terms of the number of neurons (or number of weights) is equivalent (up to multiplicative constants that depend only on  $|\mathcal{G}|$  and  $p$ ) to the approximation rate of CNNs in terms of the number of channels (or number of weights) for the associated equivariant function class  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{equiv}}$ .

As a result, all upper and lower approximation bounds established for FNNs (such as for instance [1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19]) directly imply the same bounds for CNNs for the corresponding translation equivariant function classes. As a concrete example of this, we now state the approximation theorem for CNNs that corresponds to [15, Theorem 3.1].

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite group, let  $C_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\beta, p \in (0, \infty)$ . There exists a  $c = c(C_0, |\mathcal{G}|, \beta, p) > 0$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  and every translation equivariant function  $F : \mathbb{R}^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}}$  such that  $\|(F)_1\|_{C^\beta([-1/2, 1/2]^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}})} \leq 1$ , there is a CNN  $\Psi_\varepsilon^F$  with at most  $(2 + \lceil \log_2 \beta \rceil_+) \cdot (11 + \beta/(C_0|\mathcal{G}|))$  layers and such that*

$$W_{\text{conv}}(\Psi_\varepsilon^F) \leq c \cdot \varepsilon^{-C_0|\mathcal{G}|/\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_\varrho(\Psi_\varepsilon^F) - F\|_{L^p([-1/2, 1/2]^{\llbracket C_0 \rrbracket \times \mathcal{G}}; \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Here,  $\varrho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto x_+ := \max\{0, x\}$  is the ReLU.

**Remark.** 1) For the precise definition of  $\|f\|_{C^\beta}$ , we refer to [15, Section 3.1].

2) Note that the exponent  $C_0|\mathcal{G}|/\beta$  is of the form “input dimension/smoothness”, as usual for such approximation results.

3) Under a certain encodability assumption (see [15, Section 4]) on the weights of the approximating networks, one can show using Remark 4.2 that the approximation rate from above is optimal up to a factor

that is logarithmic in  $1/\varepsilon$ . Since this encodability condition is quite technical, however, we do not state this result in detail.

*Proof.* Let  $f := (F)_1 : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $L := (2 + \lceil \log_2 \beta \rceil_+) \cdot (11 + \beta/D)$ , where  $D := C_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|$ . With the constant  $c_0 = c_0(D, \beta) > 0$  provided by [15, Theorem 3.1], we see that there is an FNN  $\Phi_\varepsilon^f$  with at most  $L$  layers, and such that  $W(\Phi_\varepsilon^f) \leq c_0 \cdot (|\mathcal{G}|^{-1/p} \cdot \varepsilon)^{-D/\beta}$  and  $\|R_\varrho(\Phi_\varepsilon^f) - f\|_{L^p([-1/2, 1/2]^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}})} \leq |\mathcal{G}|^{-1/p} \cdot \varepsilon$ .

Thus, setting  $c := 2c_0 \cdot |\mathcal{G}|^{D/(\beta p)}$ , Theorem 4.1 yields a CNN  $\Psi_\varepsilon^F$  satisfying all the stated properties.  $\square$

For the sake of brevity, we refrain from explicitly stating the CNN versions of the results in [1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 13, 19].

Finally, we remark that Theorem 4.1 yields a new proof of the *universal approximation theorem for CNNs* that was originally derived by Yarotsky [20]. This theorem states that if  $F : \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor N \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}$  is continuous and translation equivariant, and if  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{\lfloor C_0 \rfloor \times \mathcal{G}}$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant and compact, then  $F$  can be uniformly approximated on  $\Omega$  by  $\varrho$ -realisations of CNNs of any fixed depth  $L \geq 2$ , as long as  $\varrho$  is continuous, but not a polynomial.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

P.P. is grateful for the hospitality of the Katholische Universität Eichstätt–Ingolstadt where this problem was formulated and solved during his visit. P.P. is supported by a DFG research fellowship.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Barron. Universal approximation bounds for superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 39(3):930–945, 1993.
- [2] H. Bölcskei, P. Grohs, G. Kutyniok, and P. Petersen. Optimal approximation with sparsely connected deep neural networks. *SIAM J. Math. Data Sci.*, 1(1):8–45, 2019.
- [3] N. Cohen, O. Sharir, and A. Shashua. On the expressive power of deep learning: A tensor analysis. In *COLT*, pages 698–728, 2016.
- [4] G. Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Math. Control Signal*, 2(4):303–314, 1989.
- [5] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016. <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- [6] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Netw.*, 2(5):359–366, 1989.
- [7] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [8] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, Nov. 1998.
- [9] M. Leshno, V. Y. Lin, A. Pinkus, and S. Schocken. Multilayer feedforward networks with a nonpolynomial activation function can approximate any function. *Neural Netw.*, 6(6):861–867, 1993.
- [10] V. Maiorov and A. Pinkus. Lower bounds for approximation by MLP neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 25(1-3):81–91, 1999.
- [11] S. Mallat. Understanding deep convolutional networks. *Philos. Trans. Royal Soc.*, 374(2065):20150203, 2016.
- [12] H. Mhaskar. Neural networks for optimal approximation of smooth and analytic functions. *Neural Comput.*, 8(1):164–177, 1996.
- [13] H. N. Mhaskar. Approximation properties of a multilayered feedforward artificial neural network. *Adv. Comput. Math*, 1(1):61–80, Feb. 1993.
- [14] H. N. Mhaskar and C. Micchelli. Approximation by superposition of sigmoidal and radial basis functions. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 13:350–373, 1992.
- [15] P. Petersen and F. Voigtlaender. Optimal approximation of piecewise smooth functions using deep ReLU neural networks. *Neural Netw.*, 108:296–330, 2018.
- [16] A. Pinkus. Approximation theory of the MLP model in neural networks. *Acta Numer.*, 8:143–195, 1999.
- [17] J. Schmidhuber. Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Netw.*, 61:85–117, 2015.
- [18] U. Shaham, A. Cloninger, and R. R. Coifman. Provable approximation properties for deep neural networks. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 44(3):537–557, May 2018.
- [19] D. Yarotsky. Error bounds for approximations with deep ReLU networks. *Neural Netw.*, 94:103–114, 2017.
- [20] D. Yarotsky. Universal approximations of invariant maps by neural networks. *arXiv:1804.10306v1*, 2018.
- [21] D.-X. Zhou. Deep distributed convolutional neural networks: Universality. *Anal. Appl.*, 16(06):895–919, 2018.
- [22] D.-X. Zhou. Universality of deep convolutional neural networks. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 2019.

(P. Petersen) MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, ANDREW WILES BUILDING, OXFORD, UK  
*Email address:* `Philipp.Petersen@maths.ox.ac.uk`

(F. Voigtlaender) LEHRSTUHL WISSENSCHAFTLICHES RECHNEN, KATHOLISCHE UNIVERSITÄT EICHSTÄTT-INGOLSTADT, OSTEN-  
STRASSE 26, 85072 EICHSTÄTT, GERMANY  
*Email address:* `felix@voigtlaender.xyz`