

How to induce regularization in linear models: A guide to reparametrizing gradient flow

Hung-Hsu Chou^{*,†}, Johannes Maly^{**†}, and Dominik Stöger[‡]

^{*}School of Computation, Information and Technology, TU Munich, Germany

^{**}Department of Mathematics, LMU Munich, Germany

[†]Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML)

[‡]Mathematical Institute for Machine Learning and Data Science (MIDS), KU Eichstätt-Ingolstadt

Abstract

In this work, we analyze the relation between reparametrizations of gradient flow and the induced implicit bias in linear models, which encompass various basic regression tasks. In particular, we aim at understanding the influence of the model parameters — reparametrization, loss, and link function — on the convergence behavior of gradient flow. Our results provide conditions under which the implicit bias can be well-described and convergence of the flow is guaranteed. We furthermore show how to use these insights for designing reparametrization functions that lead to specific implicit biases which are closely connected to ℓ_p - or trigonometric regularizers.

Keywords — Gradient flow, implicit bias, linear models, overparameterization, Bregman divergence

1 Introduction

Modern machine models are often highly overparameterized, i.e., the number of parameters is much larger than the number of samples and typically trained via first-order methods such as (stochastic) gradient descent. Due to overparameterization, multiple local minimia of the loss function exist and many of them might generalize poorly to new data. However, (stochastic) gradient descent tends to converge towards parameter configurations that generalize well, even when no regularization is applied at all [54]. This tendency of (stochastic) gradient descent to prefer certain minimizers over others is commonly called implicit bias/regularization and appears to be a key for developing a theoretical understanding of modern machine learning models such as deep neural networks. However, a rigorous mathematical analysis of the implicit bias in general neural network models seems not within the reach of current techniques. Thus, in the past few years, many works have focused on simplified settings like overparameterized linear models and matrix factorization/sensing, cf. Section 1.2. Interestingly, many of the puzzling empirical phenomena observed while training neural networks are observed in these simpler models as well. However, these models have the advantage that they are more amenable to theoretical analysis. What is more, all of these works demonstrate an implicit bias of vanilla gradient flow/descent towards solutions of simple and well-understood structures like sparsity or low rank.

Let us make this precise in the exemplary case of sparse recovery. The problem is about recovering an unknown vector $\mathbf{w}_\star \in \mathbb{R}^N$ from few linear observations

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}_\star \in \mathbb{R}^M, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$. A basic approach to solve (1) via gradient descent is to compute solutions to

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2. \quad (2)$$

For sufficiently small step-sizes, the gradient descent trajectory $\mathbf{w}(t)$ initialized at $\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ converges to the least-square fit $\mathbf{w}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(t) = \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{y}$, which minimizes the ℓ_2 -norm among all solutions of (2). Here the matrix $\mathbf{A}^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of \mathbf{A} . On the one hand, we know that in general $\mathbf{w}_\infty \neq \mathbf{w}_\star$ if $M \ll N$. On the other hand, if \mathbf{w}_\star is s -sparse¹ and \mathbf{A} behaves sufficiently well with $M \gtrsim s \log(N/s)$, signal processing theory [7, 14, 16] shows that \mathbf{w}_\star can be uniquely identified from (1) by solving the constrained ℓ_1 -minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y}, \quad (3)$$

where the ℓ_1 -norm serves as an explicit regularizer for sparsity. Recent works [46, 48, 9, 30] proved that instead of solving (3), which is convex but non-differentiable due to the ℓ_1 -norm, one can recover \mathbf{w}_\star by solving the overparametrized but unregularized least-squares problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{(L)} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left\| \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{z}^{(L)}) - \mathbf{y} \right\|_2^2 \quad (4)$$

via vanilla gradient flow/descent, where \odot denotes the (entry-wise) Hadamard product. Indeed, several works [9, 30, 48] guarantee that if all Hadamard factors are initialized close to the origin, then gradient flow/descent $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}(t), \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(L)}(t))$ converges to $(\mathbf{w}_\infty^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_\infty^{(L)})$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty := \mathbf{w}_\infty^{(1)} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{w}_\infty^{(L)}$ being an approximate ℓ_1 -minimizer among all possible solutions of (1), and thus $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty \approx \mathbf{w}_\star$. Such phenomena led to the conclusion that the (artificially) introduced overparametrization allows gradient descent to implicitly identify the underlying structure of the problem, i.e., sparsity of \mathbf{w}_\star . Interestingly, the formulation in (4) is equivalent to the training of deep linear networks with diagonal weight matrices [48] by viewing $\mathbf{z}^{(\ell)}$ as the diagonal of the ℓ -th layer weight matrix.

It is important to note that several works [48, 17, 9] make use of a simple observation in their analysis: if all $\mathbf{z}^{(k)}$ are initialized with the same vector \mathbf{w}_0 and gradient flow is applied to (4), then the iterates $\mathbf{w}^{(k)}$ stay identical over time and (4) is equivalent to solving

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}^{\odot L} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \quad (5)$$

via gradient flow with initialization \mathbf{w}_0 , where $\mathbf{z}^{\odot L} = \mathbf{z} \odot \dots \odot \mathbf{z}$ denotes the L -th Hadamard power of \mathbf{z} , see e.g. [9, Lemma 12]. In other words, the implicit bias of overparametrized gradient flow in (4) is linked to the implicit bias of *reparametrized gradient flow* in (5). The only difference between (2) and (5) lies in a reparametrization of the input space via the univariate non-linear map $z \mapsto z^L$ that is applied entry-wise. A related reduction technique appears in the analysis of deep *linear* networks under the name *balanced initialization* [22, 4]. Therefore, to analyze the implicit bias of gradient descent in general neural network training, it seems necessary to fully understand the relation between over- and reparametrization of the input space in simplified settings first.

¹A vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is called s -sparse if at most s of its entries are non-zero.

1.1 Contribution

In this work, we consider the setting of linear models as outlined above and focus on two central questions. *Which implicit regularization other than ℓ_1 -norm minimization can be induced via reparametrized gradient flow/descent? How does the choice of the loss function influence gradient flow?* We approach these questions on a class of linear models which is related to general linear models as used in statistics [13, 21, 34, 23]. Generalized linear models are linear regression models in which the underlying linear model may be related to the response variables by a (non-linear) link function. We only consider link functions that act entry-wise on vectors. Under this restriction the training of such models corresponds to the training of a single neuron.

Definition 1.1. *Let $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Let $\rho_{link}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a link function acting entry-wise on vectors and let $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a general loss function. We consider the minimization problem*

$$\min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N} L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y}). \quad (6)$$

For any reparametrization function $\rho_{rp}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ acting entry-wise on vectors, a reparametrized gradient flow $\mathbf{w}: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ on (6) is any solution to the dynamics

$$\mathbf{w}'(t) = -\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}(t)), \quad \mathbf{w}(0) = \mathbf{w}_0, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}) := L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{A}\rho_{rp}(\mathbf{z})), \mathbf{y}). \quad (8)$$

We say that the reparametrized flow $\mathbf{w}: (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is regular if we have that

$$|\{t \geq 0: \rho'_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t)_i) = 0 \text{ for some } i \in [N]\}| < \infty.$$

Remark 1.2. Let us briefly comment on Definition 1.1:

- (i) Note that (8) reduces to (5) if we set $\rho_{link}(z) = z$, $\rho_{rp}(z) = z^L$, and $L(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|_2^2$.
- (ii) **Existence and uniqueness:** In the following, we will make only mild assumptions on the regularity of the functions ρ_{rp} , ρ_{link} , and L , see Section 2. More precisely, we will only require these functions to be continuously differentiable. Since it follows from equation (7) and (8) that

$$\mathbf{w}'(t) = -\left[\mathbf{A}^T \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t))}\right] \odot \rho'_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t)), \quad (9)$$

this will not necessarily suffice to guarantee uniqueness of the solution on (7). The right-hand side of equation (9) is not Lipschitz continuous in general and the classical Picard-Lindelöf theorem is not applicable. Only the existence of at least one solution to the ODE is guaranteed by Peano's theorem as the right-hand side of (9) is continuous in \mathbf{w} . These mild assumptions allow us to analyze a wider class of reparametrizations, which is the main purpose of the paper at hand.

- (iii) **Regular flows:** As we will see later on, the assumption that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is regular will be critical when characterizing the implicit bias of gradient flow. In particular, note that if $\rho'_{rp}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, any flow \mathbf{w} defined by (7) is regular by definition.

Our contribution: Our results show that the implicit bias of gradient flow in (7) is governed by the choice of the reparametrization ρ_{rp} and the initialization \mathbf{w}_0 , whereas the convergence behavior depends in addition on the regularity of the link function ρ_{link} and the loss L . Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- **Theorem 2.4:** For a wide class of reparametrizations ρ_{rp} , we explicitly characterize the implicit bias of \mathbf{w} in terms of a Bregman divergence D_F with a potential function F which depends on ρ_{rp} . In contrast to previous work [18, 1, 50], which already described a connection between the implicit bias of gradient flow and particular Bregman divergences, our assumptions on ρ_{rp} allow us to easily calculate the Bregman divergence D_F from the reparametrization ρ_{rp} . An analogous relation appeared recently in [33]. Due to the more general setting considered therein, the results however require more restrictive assumptions. Whereas we assume ρ_{rp} to be once differentiable, the authors of [33] assume twice continuous differentiability.
- **Theorem 2.7:** By setting $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$, we provide conditions under which a solution $\mathbf{w}: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ can be extended and convergence of \mathbf{w} to a global minimizer of the loss can be guaranteed. We furthermore describe the convergence rates in dependence on the properties of L . Many existing works on implicit regularization explicitly assume $T = \infty$ and convergence of \mathbf{w} , cf. Section 1.2. Note that parts of the proof techniques we use for the convergence rate analysis are conceptually close to the ones used in [45] which appeared recently and analyzes mirror flow. However, the authors of [45] consider a simpler setting in which the objective function is strictly convex and, in particular, the global minimizer is unique. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, the sufficient condition for boundedness of the gradient flow trajectory that we describe in Theorem 2.7 (v) has not appeared in previous work.

With this work we aim to unify various existing partial results on implicit bias of gradient flow on regression models (resp. diagonal linear networks) into a coherent theme and make them easily accessible. Especially the latter goal motivates the title of our paper. Apart from deepening the understanding of the influence of over-/reparametrization on gradient flow, we provide a practicable approach to design reparametrizations in regression models that implicitly encode specific regularizers into (vanilla) gradient flow/descent. Before diving into the technical details, we would like to showcase two special instances of such implicit biases, which can be easily designed from our results. They shall serve as a blueprint for further adaptations. To keep the presentation concise in Section 1, we restrict ourselves to $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$, only consider vanishing initialization, and do not discuss convergence rates. Those details can be found in Section 2. Let us summarize the assumptions that we use in both showcase theorems.

Assumption 1.3. *For the remainder of Section 1.1, we assume the following simplified setting:*

- $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$.
- L is continuously differentiable, convex in the first argument, and satisfies $\min L = 0$ with $L(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{R}^M} L(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}')$ if and only if $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}'$.

Our first showcase result illustrates how to induce ℓ_p -regularization for $p \in (1, 2)$.

Theorem 1.4. *Under Assumption 1.3, let $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \text{sign}(z)|z|^{\frac{2}{p}}$, for $p \in (1, 2)$, and let $\mathbf{w}: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be any regular solution to (7) with $\mathbf{w}_0 = \rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}(\alpha \mathbf{1})$, for $\alpha > 0$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, and $\mathbf{y} \in \text{im}(\mathbf{A})$, i.e., the column span of the matrix \mathbf{A} .*




Figure 1: Implicit regularization of gradient descent for $\rho_{rp}(z) = \text{sign}(z)|z|^{\frac{2}{p}}$ with learning rate 10^{-4} initialized at $(10^{-4}, 10^{-4})^T$. In Figure 1a, we set $\mathbf{A} = (-0.7, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}$, $\mathbf{y} = 2$, and $L(z, y) = |z - y|^{1.1}$. In Figure 1b, we set $\mathbf{A} = (-0.7, -1) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}$, $\mathbf{y} = 2$, and $L(z, y) = |z - y|^2$. The depicted ℓ_p -ball is scaled to the final GD iterate.

Then, \mathbf{w} is not maximal. Furthermore, if \mathbf{w} can be extended to a maximal regular solution $\mathbf{w} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,² then $\mathbf{w}_{\infty, \alpha} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ exists and is a global minimizer of \mathcal{L} . Set $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\infty, \alpha} := \rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}_{\infty, \alpha})$ and

$$\mu := \min_{\substack{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y})=0}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p,$$

and assume that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2^{1/(p-1)} N^{1/p}} \mu.$$

Then it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\infty, \alpha}\|_p \leq \left(1 + 4N^{1-1/p} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mu} \right)^{p-1} \right) \cdot \mu. \quad (10)$$

In other words, for small α , the reparametrized flow $\rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ approximately minimizes the ℓ_p -norm among all (reparametrized) global minimizers $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \rho_{rp}(\mathbf{z})$ of $L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y})$.

Theorem 1.4 is a direct consequence of Corollaries 2.8 and 2.9 below. It interpolates between established results for implicit ℓ_1 -minimization [46, 48, 9] and the implicit ℓ_2 -minimization in (2) which corresponds to the case $p = 2$. Note that Theorem 1.4 extends the reparametrizations in (5) by setting $p = \frac{2}{L}$, for $L < 2$, and recovers the implicit bias characterization in [1, Theorem 4], which needed to explicitly assume convergence of the flow. Finally, existing results like [48, 50] change the initialization scale or a mirror map parameter to obtain ℓ_1 -regularization for very small and ℓ_2 -regularization for very large initialization/mirror map parameters, but do not guarantee ℓ_p -minimization for $p \in (1, 2)$. Theorem 1.4, in contrast, covers all ℓ_p -norms between $p = 1$ and $p = 2$ by varying the reparametrization ρ_{rp} . This is illustrated in Figure 1, where one can observe that for $p = 1.2$, respectively $p = 1.8$, gradient descent with sufficiently small initialization converges towards the respective ℓ_p -minimizers.

²In the following we will slightly abuse notation and not relabel solutions of (7) when we consider extensions to larger intervals.

The second showcase result applies our insights to trigonometric reparametrizations.

Theorem 1.5. *Under Assumption 1.3, let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be any solution to (7) with $\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, and $\mathbf{y} \in \text{im}(\mathbf{A})$. Then, the following statements hold:*

1. Let $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sinh(\mathbf{z})$. Then, \mathbf{w} can be extended to a maximal solution $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the limit $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ exists, and

$$g_{\text{sinh}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = \min_{\substack{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y})=0}} g_{\text{sinh}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (11)$$

where

$$g_{\text{sinh}}(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{z}, \arctan(\mathbf{z}) \rangle - \langle \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{2} \log(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{z}^{\odot 2}) \rangle. \quad (12)$$

2. Let $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \tanh(\mathbf{z})$. If there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}^N$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y}$,³ \mathbf{w} can be extended to a maximal solution $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the limit $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \in [-1, 1]^N$ exists, and

$$g_{\text{tanh}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = \min_{\substack{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in [-1, 1]^N, \\ L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y})=0}} g_{\text{tanh}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (13)$$

where

$$g_{\text{tanh}}(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{z}, \text{artanh}(\mathbf{z}) \rangle. \quad (14)$$

Theorem 1.5 is a direct consequence of Corollaries 2.10 and 2.11. Whereas in Theorem 1.4 we could not set $\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ since this is a saddle point of the loss function, in Theorem 1.5 we can do so. Observing furthermore that $\arctan(z) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \text{sign}(z)$ for $|z| \gg 1$ and $\arctan(z) \approx z$ for $|z| \ll 1$, we note that

$$(\langle \mathbf{z}, \arctan(\mathbf{z}) \rangle)_i \approx \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{2} |z_i| & \text{if } |z_i| \gg 1 \\ |z_i|^2 & \text{if } |z_i| \ll 1 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which has the property that it behaves globally like the ℓ_1 -norm but is smooth around 0. Since the additional log-term in g_{sinh} is almost neglectable in comparison, the regularizer g_{sinh} can be viewed as an alternative to the Huber loss without additional hyper-parameter, cf. Figure 2.

Remark 1.6. The theory we present in the following is based on Definition 1.1 which strongly restricts the choice of ρ_{rp} and ρ_{link} to univariate functions. Let us mention that all results can be generalized in a straight-forward way to cover *any* pair of entry-wise defined link and reparametrization functions, i.e., all functions $\rho_{\text{link}} : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\rho_{\text{rp}} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{z}) &= (\rho_{\text{link}}^{(1)}(z_1), \dots, \rho_{\text{link}}^{(M)}(z_M))^T, \\ \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) &= (\rho_{\text{rp}}^{(1)}(z_1), \dots, \rho_{\text{rp}}^{(N)}(z_N))^T, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_{\text{link}}^{(1)}, \dots, \rho_{\text{link}}^{(M)}, \rho_{\text{rp}}^{(1)}, \dots, \rho_{\text{rp}}^{(N)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are real-valued functions. For the sake of conciseness, we refrain from presenting the results in full generality. Also note that the recent work [33] allows even more general choices of ρ_{rp} but requires twice continuous differentiability.

³The set $\mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}^N$ contains all vectors with non-zero coordinates. If \mathbf{A} is generated at random with, e.g., iid Gaussian entries, this additional requirement holds with probability one.




Figure 2: Comparison between g_{\sinh} and the Huber function [24] with parameter $\frac{\pi}{2}$.

1.2 Related work

Before turning to the mathematical details of our work, let us review the recent progress in the field. Since modern machine learning models such as neural networks are typically highly over-parameterized [54], it is important to understand to which minimizer gradient descent converges. *Algorithmic/implicit regularization* refers to the phenomenon that gradient descent tends to pick minima with low intrinsic complexity even when no regularization is explicitly enforced. Indeed, empirically it has been observed that the weights of trained (deep) neural networks are often approximately low-rank [25]. However, a precise theoretical explanation does not seem to be within reach of current techniques.

Nonetheless, the deep learning theory community has made progress in understanding the implicit regularization phenomenon by studying simplified models. For example, implicit regularization has been observed in classification tasks, see e.g., [43, 36, 35, 26, 27], where gradient-based methods favor max-margin solutions.

For regression tasks, the implicit regularization on reparameterized loss functions has been studied in [46, 48, 1, 2, 53, 6, 30, 9]. A key insight of this line of research is that gradient flow on the reparameterized function can be interpreted as mirror flow on the original function and that mirror flow converges to the solution which is closest to the initialization with respect to the Bregman divergence induced by the mirror map. Recent work aims to characterize whether gradient flow for a particular reparameterization can be written as an equivalent mirror flow [19, 33]. In a more general setting but under stronger assumptions on the reparameterization map (including higher order differentiability), the authors of [33] derive convergence guarantees and a relation between reparameterization and implicit bias that is analogous to (17) below.

Building on these insights in linear regression, the authors of [10] use the reparameterization in (5) to encode convex constraints into the optimization landscape. In [29], the authors discuss how to use Hadamard product reparameterization to replace non-smooth $\ell_{p,q}$ -regularized problems by smooth ℓ_2 -regularized counterparts. In the context of sparse phase retrieval, mirror flow with hypentropy mirror map and the closely related quadratically reparameterized Wirtinger flow have been studied

in [49, 51].

Moving beyond vector-valued problems, implicit regularization has also been studied in overparameterized low-rank matrix recovery. In the influential work [20] it has been observed that factorized gradient descent converges to a solution with low-rank when the initialization is chosen sufficiently small. A number of works investigated both the symmetric setting [31, 32, 44, 52, 12, 28] and the asymmetric setting [42]. In [5, 8] the authors studied the scenario with more than two factors, which sometimes is referred to as *deep matrix factorization*. In [50], it has been shown that mirror descent with sufficiently small initialization converges to the solution with lowest nuclear norm. In [39] an example was presented, in which factorized gradient descent with small initialization converges to a low-rank solution which is not the nuclear norm minimizer. In the setting of low-rank tensor recovery, [40] investigated the bias of gradient descent towards low-rank tensors.

This paper, along with most of the aforementioned works, focuses on how implicit regularization is influenced by a combination of reparametrization and scale of initialization. It is worth to note that there are other mechanisms which induce algorithmic regularization such as weight normalization [11] or label noise [37, 47]. In [3, 15] an intriguing connection regarding implicit regularization induced by large step sizes coupled with SGD noise has been discussed.

1.3 Outline and Notation

The remaining paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we will present our results in full generality and discuss how to derive Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 from them. Parts of the proofs are deferred to Section 3.

We briefly introduce the notation we use in the rest of the work. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. We abbreviate the sets of non-negative, positive, and non-zero real numbers by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}$, respectively. Boldface lower-case letters such as \mathbf{z} represent vectors with entries z_n , while boldface upper-case letters such as \mathbf{A} represent matrices with entries A_{mn} . We denote by $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ the smallest non-zero singular value of \mathbf{A} . For vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{v}$ means that $u_n \geq v_n$ for all $n \in [N]$. In addition, $\mathbf{u} \geq 0$ means that $u_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in [N]$. The operator diag can be applied to matrices and vectors. In the former case, it extracts the diagonal of the input as a vector; in the latter case, it embeds the input as diagonal into a square matrix. We will use $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ to denote the all-zero and all-ones vector. The dimensions of both will always be clear from the context.

Reparametrized quantities: Since our work considers reparametrizations of the input space \mathbb{R}^N , we will use tilde-symbols to distinguish a plain vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ from its reparametrization $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which is usually only compared to other reparametrized vectors. In a similar way, the reparametrized version of the gradient flow $\mathbf{w}(t)$ with domain \mathbb{R}^N will be abbreviated by $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ with (reparametrized) domain $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^N$.

Hadamard calculus: We use \odot to denote Hadamard products and powers, e.g., $(\mathbf{z} \odot \mathbf{y})_n = z_n y_n$ and $(\mathbf{z}^{\odot L})_n = z_n^L$. We denote the closed positive orthant by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^N$. For any $S \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\text{int}(S)$ is the interior of S and ∂S the boundary of S . If $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real-valued function, it acts entry-wise on vectors, i.e., $h(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $[h(\mathbf{z})]_n = h(z_n)$. If $h : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is a decoupled function, i.e.

$$h(\mathbf{z}) = (h_1(z_1), \dots, h_N(z_N))$$

for functions $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_N : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write its entry-wise derivative as $h' : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ where

$$h'(\mathbf{z}) = (h'_1(z_1), \dots, h'_N(z_N)).$$

2 Reparametrizing gradient flow on GLMs

In this section, we present our results in full detail and explain how to derive Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 from them. All omitted proofs can be found in Section 3 below.

2.1 General framework and main result

First, we describe our general framework and state our main result in full generality.

Assumption 2.1. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. We will use the following set of assumptions.

(A1) Properties of ρ_{link} : $\rho_{link}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and injective, and $\mathbf{y} \in \rho_{link}(\mathbb{R}^M)$.

(A2) Properties of ρ_{rp} : For $\mathcal{D}_{rp} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\rho_{rp}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{rp}$ is a continuously differentiable and invertible function such that $\rho'_{rp}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (x_i, x_{i+1})$, where $-\infty = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_m < x_{m+1} = \infty$, and

$$([\rho_{rp}^{-1}]')^2 \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{rp}) = \{f: \mathcal{D}_{rp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f|_C \in L_1(C) \text{ for any compact set } C \subset \mathcal{D}_{rp}\}.$$

(A3) Properties of L : $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable, convex in the first argument, and satisfies $\min L = 0$ with $L(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{R}^M} L(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}')$ if and only if $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}'$.

Parts of the results will require the strengthened assumptions that

(B1) $\rho_{link} = \text{Id}$.

(B2) there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$ with $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 = \mathbf{y}$.⁴

Remark 2.2. It is possible to extend our results to cover reparametrization functions $\rho_{rp}: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{rp}$, where $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open interval, e.g., $\rho_{rp}(x) = \tan(x)$ and $\mathcal{D} = (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$. Assumption (A2) then only needs to hold on \mathcal{D} . To make use of our insights in such cases, one however has to restrict the trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ to $(0, T_*)$, where $T_* := \inf\{t \geq 0: \mathbf{w}(t) \notin \mathcal{D}\}$.

Assuming convergence of (7) to global optimality in (8), Theorem 2.4 below characterizes to which minimizer the flow converges. In particular, among all global minimizers of \mathcal{L} the limit of gradient flow minimizes the distance to the initialization \mathbf{w}_0 measured in terms of a Bregman divergence that only depends on the choice of ρ_{rp} . Let us briefly recall the definition of Bregman divergences.

Definition 2.3 (Bregman Divergence). Let $F: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable, strictly convex function defined on a closed convex set Ω . The Bregman divergence associated with F for points $p \in \Omega$ and $q \in \text{int}(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$D_F(p, q) = F(p) - F(q) - \langle \nabla F(q), p - q \rangle. \quad (16)$$

Theorem 2.4 only requires that the reparametrization ρ_{rp} has one continuous derivative whereas existing work [33] requires that ρ_{rp} has two continuous derivatives.

⁴Note that this assumption together with Assumptions (A2) and (A3) implies that \mathcal{L} attains its minimum at zero.

Theorem 2.4 (Implicit Bias). *Let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\rho_{rp} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\rho_{link} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $L : \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define the reparametrized flow and loss-function*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) := \rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = L(\rho_{link}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y}),$$

for all $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Let Assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3) hold and assume that \mathbf{w} is regular.

We denote by $h : \mathcal{D}_{rp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a continuous antiderivative of

$$h'(\tilde{z}) := ([\rho_{rp}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2, \quad (17)$$

where ρ_{rp}^{-1} denotes the inverse function of ρ_{rp} and we denote by $H : \mathcal{D}_{rp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a continuous antiderivative of h .⁵ If the limit $\mathbf{w}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathbf{w}(t)$ exists and satisfies $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_T) = 0$, and if at least one of the following two conditions holds

- $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$ or
- the continuous extensions of h and H to $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}}$ are well-defined and finite-valued,

then

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})=0}{\arg \min} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle. \quad (18)$$

Denote by $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)$ the Bregman divergence defined on \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N with respect to $F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) := \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \rangle$ and extended to $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}^N}$ by continuity (including $+\infty$ as admissible objective value).⁶ Then minimizing the objective in (18) is equivalent to minimizing the Bregman divergence $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)$ in the sense that the set of global minimizers is the same.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is provided in Section 3.1. The specific shape of ρ_{rp} assumed in (A2) is crucial for allowing a concise representation of $H'' = h'$. Let us highlight some more points before moving on:

- (i) **Dependence on data (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{y}) :** Note that Theorem 2.4 makes an implicit assumption on \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{y} . Indeed, in light of (A3) the assumption that there exists \mathbf{w}_∞ with $L(\mathbf{w}_\infty) = 0$ implicitly implies existence of a solution \mathbf{z} of $\mathbf{A}\rho_{rp}(\mathbf{z}) = \rho_{link}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})$.
- (ii) **Dependence on initialization $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$:** The implicit regularization in (18) not only depends on the choice of ρ_{rp} but also on the initialization $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$. Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 assumed that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ is close to the origin. Note, however, that other initialization regimes can be considered as well, cf. [48].
- (iii) **Strictly convex loss functions:** If \mathcal{L} is strictly convex, one can remove the assumption that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_\infty) = 0$ and replace (18) by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})=\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T)}{\arg \min} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle,$$

i.e., Theorem 2.4 also applies to settings in which the loss function is not globally minimized.

⁵By (A2), we know that h' is integrable and thus has a continuous antiderivative.

⁶It is easy to verify in Definition 2.3 that D_F is invariant under adding affine functions to F and thus independent of the particular choices of h and H .

- (iv) **More general reparametrizations:** To cover the more general setting described in Remark 1.6, in which $\rho_{\text{rp}}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ may vary on different entries of input vectors, one only has to replace $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ in Theorem 2.4 with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = (\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})_1 \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})_N$, for $(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})_1, \dots, (\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})_N \subset \mathbb{R}$, require that Assumption (A2) holds for each marginal of ρ_{rp} , and define $h: \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ accordingly. However, to keep the presentation concise, we will restrict our presentation to the scenario where all marginals are the same.

Whereas ρ_{rp} heavily influences the characterization of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty$ in (18) via F , the specific choices of ρ_{link} and L play no role, i.e., the implicit bias of gradient flow on (8) is solely determined by ρ_{rp} and \mathbf{w}_0 . The following result however shows that ρ_{link} and L strongly influence the convergence behavior of gradient flow. In particular, if L satisfies the so-called *Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality* we derive a linear rate.

Definition 2.5. [38, Condition C] *A differentiable function $f: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with minimum f_\star satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with $\mu > 0$ if, for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, it holds that*

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z})\|_2^2 \geq 2\mu(f(\mathbf{z}) - f_\star).$$

Remark 2.6. Let us recall two useful facts:

- (i) Any μ -strongly convex function f , i.e., for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$f(\mathbf{v}) \geq f(\mathbf{u}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_2^2,$$

satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with μ .

- (ii) If $f(\mathbf{z}) = g(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z})$, for some matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $g: \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with μ , then f satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with $(\sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{A}) \mu)$, where $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the smallest non-zero singular value of \mathbf{A} .

Theorem 2.7 (Convergence). *Let $\mathbf{w}: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\rho_{\text{rp}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\rho_{\text{link}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define the reparametrized flow $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ and loss function $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ via*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) := \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \mathbf{y})$$

for all $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Let Assumptions (B1), (A2), (A3), and (B2) hold and assume that \mathbf{w} is regular.

Recall from Theorem 2.4 the function h defined in (17) and the Bregman divergence D_F . Then, the following claims hold:

- (i) General convergence rate: For all $t \in [0, T)$, it holds that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq \frac{D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)}{t},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0$ has been defined in Assumption (B2) and $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) < \infty$. If $T = \infty$, this implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) = 0$.

- (ii) Linear convergence rate: If, in addition, $L(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality for $\mu > 0$ and if there exists $r > 0$ such that $(h')^{\circ -1}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \geq r$, for every $t \in [0, T)$, then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) e^{-2r\mu\sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{A})t},$$

where $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ is the smallest non-zero singular value of \mathbf{A} .

(iii) Extending a bounded trajectory: If $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ exists.

Moreover, either $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \partial \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$ and the trajectory is maximal or there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that \mathbf{w} can be extended to a solution $\mathbf{w}: [0, T + \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ of (7),

(iv) Convergence of bounded trajectory: If $T = \infty$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$, then

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}^N} \quad \text{exists with} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = 0. \quad (19)$$

If \mathcal{D}_{rp} is unbounded, which means that boundedness of the trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ does not trivially hold, we furthermore have the following:

(v) Boundedness of trajectory: If the Bregman balls $B_{D_F, r}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N : D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq r\}$ are bounded with respect to the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$ and $r \geq 0$, then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty.$$

In particular, the Bregman balls $B_{D_F, r}(\mathbf{x})$ are bounded if the univariate function $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})$ is in the function class

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{rp}} = \left\{ f \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{rp}) : \left| \int_z^b f(x) dx \right| = \infty, \text{ for any } z \in \mathcal{D}_{rp} \text{ and } b \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^{lim} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where $L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{rp}) = \{f \in L_1(C) \text{ for any compact } C \subset \mathcal{D}_{rp}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{rp}^{lim} := \{\inf \mathcal{D}_{rp}, \sup \mathcal{D}_{rp}\} \cap \{-\infty, \infty\}$.

The proof of Theorem 2.7 can be found in Section 3.2. For $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$, the theorem sheds some light on the influence that the different components of our model in (8) have on the expected convergence behaviour of gradient flow. First, the objective value of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ decays along the trajectory with rate $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{t})$ independent of whether $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ converges or not. If L satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition, this rate is improved to $\mathcal{O}(e^{-ct})$. Let us however mention that the constant $c > 0$ can be close to zero, in particular for small scales of initialization. Second, although ρ_{rp} has no influence on the rate of convergence in a qualitative sense (the choice of ρ_{rp} only affects the quantities $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)$ and r in Theorem 2.7 (i) and (ii) via F and h), it determines whether $[z \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})] \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{rp}}$ and thus whether one can expect boundedness/convergence of the trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$. Whereas an analog to Claim (i) for mirror descent with spectral hypentropy mirror map previously appeared in [50] and analogs to Claims (i) and (ii) were observed for mirror flow on strictly convex objectives in [45], the sufficient condition (20) for boundedness of the trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is novel to the best of our knowledge.

2.2 How to induce specific regularization

With Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.7 in hand, we now discuss how the specific instances of implicit regularization in Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 can be derived from them. We restrict ourselves to the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \alpha \mathbf{1}$, for $\alpha > 0$ being small, a common setting studied in many related works, e.g. [4, 6, 9, 15]. Let us begin with the setting of Theorem 1.4 and apply Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.8 (Polynomial Regularization). *Let $\rho_{rp}(z) = \text{sign}(z)|z|^{\frac{2}{p}}$, for $p \in (1, 2)$, and let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any regular solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $\rho_{\text{link}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Assumptions (A1) and (A3). Define $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}_0) = \alpha \mathbf{1}$, for $\alpha > 0$ and set*

$$\mu := \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p.$$

If $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha} := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \rho_{rp}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha}) = 0$ exists and

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2^{1/(p-1)} N^{1/p}} \mu,$$

then it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha}\|_p \leq \left(1 + 4N^{1-1/p} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mu}\right)^{p-1}\right) \cdot \mu. \quad (21)$$

For the sake of conciseness, we defer the proof of Corollary 2.8 to Section 3.3 and only provide a sketch of the argument here.

Proof sketch: To use Theorem 2.4, we just have to verify Assumption (A2) for $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$ since $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ by existence of the limit, i.e., the additional conditions of Theorem 2.4 are automatically satisfied. For $p \in (1, 2)$, the function ρ_{rp} is continuously differentiable and invertible, and the derivative $\rho'_{rp}(z) = \frac{2}{p}|z|^{\frac{2-p}{p}}$ vanishes only for $z = 0$. Consequently, the function

$$[\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z})^2 = \frac{p^2}{4} |\tilde{z}|^{p-2}, \quad (22)$$

is defined on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and is in $L^c_1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Now applying Theorem 2.4 yields that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha} \in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle, \quad (23)$$

where H and h have been defined in the theorem statement. One computes that

$$\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = \frac{p}{4(p-1)} (\langle \mathbf{1}, |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}|^{\odot p} \rangle - p \langle \mathbf{1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0^{\odot (p-1)} \rangle). \quad (24)$$

Let us now *informally* take the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ for $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \alpha \mathbf{1}$. Since $p > 1$, the factor $\frac{p}{p-1}$ is positive and the term $\langle \mathbf{1}, |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}|^{\odot p} \rangle$ dominates. Hence, (23) becomes equivalent to minimizing the ℓ_p -norm over all global minimizers of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

By setting $p = \frac{2}{L}$, Corollary 2.8 extends the results of [9] from $L \geq 2$ to $L \in (1, 2)$, cf. Equation (5) above. To obtain Theorem 1.4 in full, we still need to apply Theorem 2.7 to $\rho_{rp}(z) = \text{sign}(z)|z|^{\frac{2}{p}}$.

Corollary 2.9 (Polynomial Regularization — Convergence). *Let $\rho_{rp}(z) = \text{sign}(z)|z|^{\frac{2}{p}}$, for $p \in (1, 2)$, and let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any regular solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ satisfying Assumption (B2), and $\rho_{\text{link}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Assumptions (B1) and (A3). Then the following claims hold:*

- If $T < +\infty$, then the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathbf{w}(t)$ exists and \mathbf{w} is not a maximal solution.

- Suppose that either $T = +\infty$, or $T < +\infty$ and \mathbf{w} can be extended to a regular solution $\mathbf{w}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ (without relabeling the flow). Then $\mathbf{w}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ converges to $\mathbf{w}_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{w}_\infty) = 0$ and with the rate described in Theorem 2.7 (i).

Proof. To apply Theorem 2.7, we only need to verify Assumption (A2) for $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$. This has already been done in the proof of Corollary 2.8. Since we assume that \mathbf{w} is regular we can apply Theorem 2.7.

We first check that the function $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})$ lies in the function class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$, where

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2 = \frac{p^2}{4} |\tilde{z}|^{p-2}$$

and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$ was defined in (20). For $p \in (1, 2)$, one has by continuity that $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z}) = \frac{p^2}{4} \text{sign}(\tilde{z}) |\tilde{z}|^{p-1} \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})$. Moreover, for $p \in (1, 2)$ and any $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\tilde{z}}^{\infty} \frac{p^2}{4} \text{sign}(\tau) |\tau|^{p-1} d\tau = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\tilde{z}}^{-\infty} \frac{p^2}{4} \text{sign}(\tau) |\tau|^{p-1} d\tau = -\infty$$

such that $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$.

Theorem 2.7 (v) now yields that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$. Thus, the first claim holds by Theorem 2.7 (iii) since $\partial \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \emptyset$. To show the second claim we first note that as before we can argue that the (possibly extended) function $\mathbf{w}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ has the property that $\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$. Then the claim follows from Theorem 2.7 (iv). This concludes the proof. \square

After having derived Corollaries 2.8 and 2.9, which induce Theorem 1.4, let us now turn to the analogous results for trigonometric reparametrizations as considered in Theorem 1.5. In contrast to Corollary 2.8, we set the initialization magnitude α directly to zero in order to simplify the statement. In the polynomial case this was not possible since the origin is a saddle-point of the respective loss function.

Corollary 2.10 (Trigonometric Regularization). *Let $\mathbf{w}: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $\rho_{\text{link}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Assumptions (A1) and (A3). Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) *For $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sinh(\mathbf{z})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}_0) = \mathbf{0}$, we have that if $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) = 0$ exists, then*

$$g_{\sinh}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) = \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} g_{\sinh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (25)$$

where

$$g_{\sinh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \arctan(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \rangle - \langle \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{2} \log(\mathbf{1} + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{\odot 2}) \rangle. \quad (26)$$

- (ii) *Assume in addition that (B1) holds and that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0$ in (B2) can be chosen such that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}^N$.⁷ For $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \tanh(\mathbf{z})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}_0) = \mathbf{0}$, we have that if $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) = 0$ exists, then*

$$g_{\tanh}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) = \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in [-1, 1]^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} g_{\tanh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (27)$$

⁷As already mentioned in Theorem 1.5, this property holds with probability one if \mathbf{A} is generated at random with, e.g., iid Gaussian entries.

where

$$g_{\tanh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \rangle. \quad (28)$$

For the sake of conciseness, we defer the proof of Corollary 2.10 to Section 3.3 and only provide a sketch of the argument here.

Proof sketch: The proof idea of Corollary 2.10 is very similar to the proof sketch of Corollary 2.8. The main difference is that we may pick $\alpha = 0$ and have

$$\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = g_{\sinh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \arctan(\alpha) \langle \mathbf{1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \rangle,$$

for $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sinh(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$, and

$$\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (g_{\tanh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - (\operatorname{artanh}(\alpha) + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha^2}) \langle \mathbf{1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \rangle),$$

for $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \tanh(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = [-1, 1]^N$, where H and h have been defined in Theorem 2.4. The claim follows by inserting $\alpha = 0$ into the equations above. \square

Just as in the polynomial case, we can use Theorem 2.7 to analyze the convergence behaviour of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ for $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sinh(\mathbf{z})$ and $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \tanh(\mathbf{z})$.

Corollary 2.11 (Trigonometric Regularization — Convergence). *Let $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \sinh(z)$ or $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \tanh(z)$. Let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ satisfying Assumption (B2), and $\rho_{\text{link}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L : \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Assumptions (B1) and (A3). For $\rho_{\text{rp}} = \tanh$ furthermore assume that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0$ in (B2) can be chosen such that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}^N$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *The trajectory \mathbf{w} can be extended to $\mathbf{w} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))$ converges to a limit $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = 0$ with the rate characterized in Theorem 2.7 (i). Here, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$ for $\rho_{\text{rp}} = \sinh$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = (-1, 1)^N$ for $\rho_{\text{rp}} = \tanh$.*
- (ii) *If $L(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with $\mu > 0$, then there exists a constant $c > 0$, which is made explicit in the proof and only depends on μ , $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0$, $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)$, and $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$, such that*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) e^{-ct}.$$

Proof. We already checked in the proof of Corollary 2.10 that (A2) holds. We furthermore verified that $\rho'_{\text{rp}}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ in both cases which implies that any flow is regular. All assumptions of Theorem 2.7 are thus fulfilled. Recall the definition of h from Theorem 2.4 and let us split the cases:

Case $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \sinh(z)$: If $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \sinh(z)$, we have that

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2 = (1 + \tilde{z}^2)^{-1},$$

for $\tilde{z} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(z)$, cf. proof of Corollary 2.10. We first check that the function $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})$ lies in the function class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$ was defined in (20). By continuity $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z}) \in L^c_1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, for any $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| \int_{\tilde{z}}^{\pm\infty} \frac{\tau}{1+\tau^2} d\tau \right| = +\infty$$

such that $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$.

Now extend \mathbf{w} to a maximal interval $[0, \tilde{T})$. (Again, we slightly abuse notation and we do not relabel \mathbf{w} .) Note that this extension is well-defined since the solution of the gradient flow is unique which follows from the fact that ρ'_{rp} is continuously differentiable and, thus, \mathbf{w}' is a locally Lipschitz continuous function of \mathbf{w} , cf. the right-hand side of (38) below. Now we assume by contradiction that $\tilde{T} < +\infty$. In this case, Theorem 2.7 (v) yields that $\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{T})} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$. By applying Theorem

2.7 (iii) we can extend \mathbf{w} to a gradient flow solution $\mathbf{w} : [0, \tilde{T} + \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. This is a contradiction to the assumption that $\tilde{T} < +\infty$ was chosen maximal. Thus, \mathbf{w} can be extended to a function $\mathbf{w} : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The remaining part of Claim (i) follows directly from Theorem 2.7 (i) and (iv).

To see why Claim (ii) holds, note that $h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))^{\odot -1} = \mathbf{1} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)^{\odot 2} \geq \mathbf{1}$. If we assume in addition that $L(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with $\mu > 0$, the claim follows from Theorem 2.7 (ii) with $c = 2\mu\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^2$.

Case $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \tanh(z)$: If $\rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \tanh(z)$, one can compute that

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2 = (1 - \tilde{z}^2)^{-2},$$

for $\tilde{z} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(z)$. We can extend \mathbf{w} to a maximal interval $[0, \tilde{T})$. (Note that this extension is unique and well-defined since \tanh' is locally Lipschitz continuous, which implies that \mathbf{w}' is a locally Lipschitz continuous function of \mathbf{w} , cf. the right-hand side of (38) below.) Again, we assume by contradiction that $\tilde{T} < +\infty$. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = (-1, 1)^N$ is bounded, Theorem 2.7 (iii) yields that we must have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tilde{T}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \in \partial \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ since \mathbf{w} cannot be extended to a larger interval $[0, \tilde{T} + \varepsilon)$ by assuming that \tilde{T} is maximal. However, this contradicts the fact that $|\tilde{w}_i(t)| \leq \gamma < 1$, for any $i \in N$ and $t \in [0, \tilde{T})$, where γ only depends on $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0$ and $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.2 and the shape of $H(\tilde{z}) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{z} \operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{z})$, which we computed in the proof of Corollary 2.10, we easily get that

$$\begin{aligned} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) &\geq D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \geq D_H((\tilde{z}_0)_i, \tilde{w}_i(t)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left((\tilde{z}_0)_i \operatorname{artanh}((\tilde{z}_0)_i) - \operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{w}_i(t)) + \frac{(\tilde{z}_0)_i \tilde{w}_i(t)}{1 - (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2} - \frac{(\tilde{z}_0)_i^2}{1 - (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $i \in [N]$. Together with the fact that $|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)| \leq 1$ and our additional assumption that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}^N$, this implies that

$$\tilde{w}_i(t) \geq \tanh \left(\operatorname{artanh}((\tilde{z}_0)_i) - \frac{1}{(\tilde{z}_0)_i} \left(2D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) + \frac{(\tilde{z}_0)_i + (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2}{1 - (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2} \right) \right) =: \gamma_- > -1. \quad (29)$$

Similarly, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) = D_H((\tilde{z}_0)_i, \tilde{w}_i(t)) + \sum_{j \neq i} D_H((\tilde{z}_0)_j, \tilde{w}_j(t)) \\ &\leq D_H((\tilde{z}_0)_i, \tilde{w}_i(t)) + D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0), \end{aligned}$$

for any $i \in [N]$, implying that

$$\tilde{w}_i(t) \leq \tanh \left(\operatorname{artanh}((\tilde{z}_0)_i) + \frac{1}{(\tilde{z}_0)_i} \left(2D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) + \frac{(\tilde{z}_0)_i - (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2}{1 - (\tilde{z}_0)_i^2} \right) \right) =: \gamma_+ < 1 \quad (30)$$

and thus $|\tilde{w}_i(t)| \leq \gamma := \max\{|\gamma_-|, |\gamma_+|\} < 1$, for any $i \in N$ and $t \in [0, \tilde{T}]$. Since this yields $\tilde{T} = \infty$ by contradiction, Theorem 2.7 (i) and (iv) conclude the proof of Claim (i).

To deduce Claim (ii) from Theorem 2.7 (ii), note that $h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))^{\odot -1} = (\mathbf{1} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)^{\odot 2})^{\odot 2} \geq (1 - \gamma^2)^2$ such that we can set $c = 2(1 - \gamma^2)^2 \mu \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^2$. \square

3 Proofs

In this section, we provide the proofs of our main results.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.4

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is based on the following technical observation.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, and let $\mathcal{D}_{rp} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open, convex interval. Suppose that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$, for $T \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, is continuously differentiable on $(0, T)$ such that*

1. *the limit $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ exists,*
2. $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}$.

Furthermore, assume that there exist continuous functions $g : \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $h : \mathcal{D}_{rp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $R_o \subset \mathcal{D}_{rp}, T_o \subset [0, T)$ with $|R_o|, |T_o| < \infty$ such that the following properties hold:

3. *$h \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is continuously differentiable on any open interval in $[0, T) \setminus T_o$,*
4. *for all $t \in [0, T) \setminus T_o$,*

$$h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \odot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \quad (31)$$
5. *h' is well-defined on $\mathcal{D}_{rp} \setminus R_o$ and strictly positive,*

6. *$g(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \in \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp$ for all $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$.*

Let $H : \mathcal{D}_{rp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an antiderivative of h , i.e., $H' = h$. Then both H and h can be extended to continuous functions $\bar{H} : \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $\bar{h} : \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty; +\infty\}$.⁸ If any of the following two conditions is satisfied

(i) $|\bar{h}(x)| < \infty$ and $\bar{H}(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}}$,

(ii) $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{rp}^N$,

then

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}^N} : \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \langle \mathbf{1}, \bar{H}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot \bar{h}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)) \rangle. \quad (32)$$

⁸On $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty; +\infty\}$ we consider the closure with respect to the usual topology that is homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$. By $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{rp}}$ we denote the (topological) closure of \mathcal{D}_{rp} in \mathbb{R} .

Proof. We abbreviate $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)$. First, note that $H : \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex due to Assumption 5. This implies that it can be extended continuously to $\bar{H} : \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Again using Assumption 5 we observe that the function $h : \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotonically increasing. This implies that it can be extended to a continuous function $\bar{h} : \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty; +\infty\}$.

The proof is based on validating the KKT-conditions of (32) for the limit $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T$. Let us first consider the case that (i) holds, i.e., that $|h(x)| < \infty$ and $H(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}}$. Recalling Assumption 4 and writing $T_\circ = \{t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}\}$ with $t_0 = 0$ and $t_m = t'$, we have for any $t' \in (0, T)$ that

$$\int_0^{t'} g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) dt = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{t_{k-1}+\varepsilon}^{t_k-\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) \odot h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) dt = h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t')) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0), \quad (33)$$

where we use that $h \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is continuous on $[0, T)$ and continuously differentiable on open intervals in $[0, T) \setminus T_\circ$ by Assumption 3. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$, for $t \in (0, T)$, we obtain by Assumption 6 for any $t' \in [0, T)$ that

$$h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t')) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \in \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp.$$

Using Assumption 1 together with continuity of h , we can take the limit $t' \rightarrow T$ to obtain that

$$h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \in \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp.$$

Together with Assumption 2, we hence have that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T$ satisfies the following conditions

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}}^N, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T - \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}, \quad (35)$$

$$h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \in \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp. \quad (36)$$

We now examine (32) and derive its KKT conditions. Since $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}}^N$ is a convex polytope, there exist $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times N}$, $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^J$, for $J \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{rp}}^N = \{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{0}\}$. Consequently, the Lagrangian of (32) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{d} \rangle,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^J$. The KKT conditions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} &= h(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) + \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\mu} && \text{(stationarity)} \\ \mathbf{0} &= \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v} && \text{(primal feasibility)} \\ \mathbf{0} &\geq \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{0} &\leq \boldsymbol{\mu} && \text{(dual feasibility)} \\ 0 &= \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{d} \rangle && \text{(complementary slackness).} \end{aligned}$$

Since the constraints of the optimization problem in (32) are affine functions, the KKT-conditions are necessarily fulfilled by solutions of the problem. Furthermore, since the objective in (32) is convex (due to Assumption 5), any $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ satisfying the KKT-conditions provides a solution $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ of (32), see, e.g., [41, Theorem 28.3]. Hence, all that remains is to show that there exist $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ such that $(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ satisfies the KKT-conditions.

By conditions (34) and (35), we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty$ obeys the primal feasibility. Moreover, by choosing $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$, we automatically satisfy dual feasibility and complementary slackness. Now note that, in this case, stationarity reduces to

$$\mathbf{0} = h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) + \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\lambda}.$$

Since $h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \in \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp = \text{range}(\mathbf{A}^T)$ by (36) we can find a $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that the above equation holds. Just note that \mathbf{A}^T is invertible if restricted to $\text{range}(\mathbf{A})$.

Let us now consider the case that (i) does not hold, which implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ must hold by (ii). In this setting, we may choose an open and convex interval $\mathcal{D}_\circ \subsetneq \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_\circ^N$ and such that both $\bar{h}|_{\overline{\mathcal{D}_\circ}}$ and $\bar{H}|_{\overline{\mathcal{D}_\circ}}$ take only values in \mathbb{R} . Then, Assumptions 1-6 hold if \mathcal{D}_{rp} is replaced by \mathcal{D}_\circ and our previous KKT argument shows that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_\circ^N: \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}}{\text{arg min}} \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{1}, \bar{H}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot \bar{h}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)) \rangle}_{=: F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})}, \quad (37)$$

such that the claim (32) follows from the convexity of the function F . Indeed, assume by contradiction that there were a $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N \setminus \mathcal{D}_\circ$ such that $F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) < F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T)$ and $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}$. Then, by choosing $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small we had that $(1 - \lambda)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T + \lambda\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_\circ^N$. However, since

$$F((1 - \lambda)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T + \lambda\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \leq (1 - \lambda)F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) + \lambda F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) < F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T)$$

and since $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}((1 - \lambda)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T + \lambda\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}$, this would contradict (37). \square

With Lemma 3.1 at hand, we can now prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. By definition, the derivative of \mathbf{w} on $(0, T)$ is

$$\mathbf{w}'(t) = -\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}(t)) = -\left[\mathbf{A}^T \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))} \right] \odot \rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)), \quad (38)$$

where we used the chain rule in the second equality. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) &= \rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \odot \mathbf{w}'(t) = \rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t)) \odot [-\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}(t))] \\ &= [\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))^{\odot 2}] \odot \left[-\mathbf{A}^T \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

By definition, we know that the trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\cdot)$ stays in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ such that we can write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) = [\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))^{\odot 2}] \odot \underbrace{\left[-\mathbf{A}^T \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)} \right]}_{=: g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))}, \quad (40)$$

where $g: \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is continuous by Assumptions (A1) and (A3). It is important to note that if $\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))_i \neq 0$ for some $t \in (0, T)$ and some $i \in [N]$, then

$$[h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))]_i = [\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))_i^2 = \frac{1}{[\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))]_i^2} \quad (41)$$

is well-defined, where h' has been defined in (17). By assuming \mathbf{w} to be regular, we know that there are at most finitely many $t \in (0, T)$ such that $[\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))]_i = 0$ for some $i \in [N]$. Together with (40) this implies that the equation

$$h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \odot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \quad (42)$$

holds for all but finitely many $t \in (0, T)$, as required in Assumption 4 of Lemma 3.1. Furthermore note that g is continuous by Assumptions (A1) and (A3), that h is continuous by Assumption (A2),

cf. Footnote 5, and that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is continuously differentiable on $(0, T)$ by (40) and (A1)-(A3). Denoting the set on which (42) holds by $[0, T) \setminus T_0$, we deduce from $g \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ being continuous and (42) that $h \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is continuously differentiable on any open interval in $[0, T) \setminus T_0$, as required in Assumption 3 of Lemma 3.1.

Recall that we assume $\mathbf{w}_T := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathbf{w}(t)$ with $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_T) = 0$ exists and that (i) $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T := \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}_T) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ or (ii) the continuous extensions of h and H to $\overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$ are finite valued. Set $\mathbf{v} = \rho_{\text{link}}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})$, which is well-defined by Assumption (A1). We wish to apply Lemma 3.1 to $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w})$. We already verified that $g : \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $h : \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions, that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is continuously differentiable on $(0, T)$, and that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold. Let us now check the remaining Assumptions 1-2 and 5-6 of Lemma 3.1.

Assumption 1 of Lemma 3.1 is clearly satisfied. To validate Assumption 2, recall (A1) and (A3) which yield that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_T) = 0$ if and only if $\rho_{\text{link}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T) = \mathbf{y}$ which in turn is equivalent to $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T = \mathbf{v}$ by injectivity of ρ_{link} . By (17) and Assumption (A2), the function h' is well-defined in all but finitely many points and is strictly positive whenever it exists which yields Assumption 5. Finally, Assumption 6 holds since $g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \in \text{range}(\mathbf{A}^T) = \ker(\mathbf{A})^\perp$.

Applying Lemma 3.1 and using that $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{v}\} \subset \{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{v}\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T &\in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N, \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{v}} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle \\ &= \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we recalled from above that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{v}$. This yields (18). To conclude, we only need to subtract from the right-hand side the quantity $(\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0, h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle)$, which is independent of $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$. For $F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) \rangle$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle \\ &= \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle - \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle + \langle \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0, h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle \\ &= \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - H(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle - \langle h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0), \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 \rangle \\ &= \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0). \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

□

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.7

Let us begin by collecting some useful observations:

- The initial considerations in the proof of Theorem 2.4 are valid for $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$ and (40) yields

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) = [\rho'_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{w}(t))^{\odot 2}] \odot \left[-\mathbf{A}^T \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)} \right] =: h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))^{\odot -1} \odot g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)). \tag{44}$$

As argued in the proof of Theorem 2.4, $h' \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is well-defined and continuously differentiable on any open interval in $[0, T) \setminus T_\circ$, where $T_\circ \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $|T_\circ| < \infty$ by regularity of \mathbf{w} . In particular,

$$h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \odot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \tag{45}$$

holds for any $t \in [0, T) \setminus T_\circ$.

- By Assumption (B2), there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ with $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 = \mathbf{y}$ such that Assumption (A3) implies $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0) = 0$.
- Let D_F be the Bregman divergence associated with $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\mathbf{z}) \rangle$, where H is an antiderivative of h . (The Bregman divergence is invariant under affine transformation and, thus, it does not matter which antiderivatives we choose, see also Footnote 6). Then, the function $t \mapsto D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ is decreasing and $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ converges for $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The last point is formalized in the lemma below which can be seen as a generalization of [9, Lemma 8].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{w} : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any regular solution to the differential equation (7) in Definition 1.1, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\rho_{\text{rp}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\rho_{\text{link}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $L: \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that (B1), (A2), and (A3) hold, and let $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\mathbf{z}) \rangle$, where H is an antiderivative of h as defined in Theorem 2.4. Then, for any $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ and every $t \in (0, T) \setminus T_\circ$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)).$$

Here, T_\circ is the finite set of times at which $h' \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is not well-defined, cf. discussion after (44). In particular, if $T = \infty$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ exists.

Proof. Let $t \in (0, T) \setminus T_\circ$. As discussed below (40), the function $h' \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is well-defined and continuously differentiable on a neighbourhood of t , and (45) holds. Applying now the chain rule, we compute the time derivative of $t \mapsto D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) &= -\langle \nabla F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) \rangle - \langle \partial_t \nabla F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \rangle + \langle \nabla F(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) \rangle \\ &= -\langle h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \odot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t), \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}^T \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} L(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}) \Big|_{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)}, \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \rangle \\ &\leq L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{y}) - L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where we used in the second line (45) and in the fourth line the convexity of L according to (A3). We further know that $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)) < +\infty$ due to H being the anti-derivative of a continuous function. For $T = \infty$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) = 0$, this immediately implies that $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ converges for $t \rightarrow +\infty$ since $\frac{d}{dt} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq 0$, for all $t \in (0, T) \setminus T_\circ$, by (46) and Assumption (A3) and $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \geq 0$ by strict convexity of F . The latter follows from $\nabla^2 F(\mathbf{z}) = \text{diag}(h'(z))$ and the fact that $h'(z)$ is strictly positive for all but finitely many $z \in \mathbb{R}$ by (17) and Assumption (A2). \square

We can now proceed with proving Claims (i)-(v) of Theorem 2.7. Let us abbreviate $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)$.

Proof of (i): We use Lemma 3.2 to show that (i) holds. Let $T_\circ \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the finite set defined in Lemma 3.2. Recall that D_F is non-negative, that $t \mapsto D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ is continuous on $[0, T)$ and continuously differentiable on any open interval in $[0, T) \setminus T_\circ$, and that $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) < \infty$ (as argued in the proof of Lemma 3.2). We thus get for any $t \in (0, T) \setminus T_\circ$ that

$$\begin{aligned} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) &\geq D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0)) - D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) = - \int_0^t \partial_t D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\tau)) d\tau \\ &\geq \int_0^t \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\tau)) d\tau \geq t \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that $t \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ is non-increasing by the definition of \mathbf{w} in (7). Rearranging the inequality yields the claim. If $T = \infty$, we furthermore see that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) = 0$ since $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) < +\infty$.

Proof of (ii): The just observed sublinear convergence rate can be improved if we assume in addition that $(h')^{\circ -1}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \geq r$, for some $r > 0$ and every $t \in [0, T]$,⁹ and that $L(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality with $\mu > 0$. In this case, Equation (44) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) &= \partial_t L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}) = \left\langle \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}} L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}), \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t) \right\rangle \\ &= -\left\langle \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}} L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}), h'(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))^{\circ -1} \circ \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}} L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}) \right\rangle \\ &\leq -r \left\| \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}} L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}) \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq -2\mu\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^2 r (L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t), \mathbf{y}) - L(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \mathbf{y})) \\ &= -2\mu\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^2 r \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

for every $t \in (0, T)$, where the penultimate step follows from the Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality together with Remark 2.6 (ii), and the last equality uses that $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0 = \mathbf{y}$. Applying Grönwall's inequality, we obtain that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) e^{-2r\mu\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^2 t}$$

and thus the claimed estimate.

Proof of (iii): Since we assume that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$, we know by (44) that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(t)\|_2 < +\infty$. Just note that by Assumptions (B1), (A2), and (A3), the right-hand side of (44) is a continuous function of \mathbf{w} . Hence,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(T) := \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(0) + \int_0^t \tilde{\mathbf{w}}'(s) ds \right]$$

exists. We thus have one of the following two cases: (i) $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(T) \in \partial \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))\|_2 = \infty$$

and the trajectory ends, or (ii) $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(T) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathbf{w}(t) = \rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(T))$ and \mathbf{w} can be extended by Peano's theorem and continuity of $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ in (7).

Proof of (iv): Let us now assume that $T = \infty$. We show that if $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = 0$. The argument is along the lines of [9] and is repeated here in a simplified form for the reader's convenience. Let us assume $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is bounded, i.e., $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty$. By Assumption (B2), there exists a sufficiently large compact ball B around the origin such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) \in B$, for all $t \geq 0$, and $B \cap \{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{y}\} \neq \emptyset$. Since $\{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) : t \geq 0\} \subset B$ and B is compact, there exists a sequence of times $t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t_k) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star \in B$. By continuity of D_F , we thus get that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t_k)) = 0$. From (i) we furthermore know that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \mathbf{y}$ which implies

⁹In contrast to $h' \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$, which is only defined on $[0, T] \setminus T_0$, one can deduce from (41) and (A2) that $(h')^{\circ -1} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is well-defined for all $t \in [0, T]$.

that $\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star = \mathbf{y}$. Applying Lemma 3.2 to $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star$ now yields that the function $t \mapsto D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ is non-increasing. Since $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) \geq 0$, we obtain that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)) = 0$. Let now $t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ be any sequence of times such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t_k)$ converges to a limit $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Continuity of D_F implies that $D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ which yields $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star$ by strict convexity of F . Since $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star$ is the only accumulation point of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\}_{t \geq 0} \subset B$ and B is compact, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\star$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_\infty) = 0$.

Proof of (v): Since $0 \leq D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) < \infty$ by (i) and $t \mapsto D_F(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t))$ is non-increasing according to Lemma 3.2, the boundedness of $B_{D_F, r}(\mathbf{x})$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$, implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(t)\|_2 < +\infty.$$

As it might be of independent interest, we prove the second claim of (v) in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\mathbf{z}) \rangle$, where H is an antiderivative of h as defined in Theorem 2.4. Assume that Assumption (A2) holds and that the univariate function $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})$ is in the function class*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}} = \left\{ f \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}) : \left| \int_z^b f(x) dx \right| = \infty, \text{ for any } z \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \text{ and } b \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^{\text{lim}} \right\}, \quad (47)$$

where $L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}) = \{f : \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f|_C \in L_1(C) \text{ for any compact } C \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^{\text{lim}} := \{\inf \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}, \sup \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}\} \cap \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Then, the Bregman ball

$$B_{D_F, r}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N : D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq r\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

is bounded in the Euclidean metric, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ and $r \geq 0$.

Proof. We assume that $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^{\text{lim}} \neq \emptyset$ since otherwise $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ is bounded and the claim is fulfilled. First note that, due to $F(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\mathbf{z}) \rangle$, we have $D_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^N D_H(x_i, z_i)$. By (A2), $h'(\tilde{z})$ in (17) is well-defined and strictly positive for all $\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \setminus R_\circ$, for some $R_\circ \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $|R_\circ| < \infty$, which implies that H is strictly convex. Hence, D_H is a nonnegative function and the set $B_{D_F, r}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is unbounded if and only if there exists an index $i \in [N]$ such that the set $B_{D_H, r}(x_i) = \{z \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} : D_H(x_i, z) \leq r\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is unbounded.

For $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$, we have that

$$\frac{d}{dq} D_H(p, q) = \frac{d}{dq} [H(p) - H(q) - h(q)(p - q)] = h'(q)(q - p).$$

Let us assume that, for fixed $p \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}$, the sequence $(q_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}} \setminus R_\circ$ is monotone and diverges. We first consider the scenario $q_j \rightarrow +\infty \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^{\text{lim}}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_H(p, q_j) &= D_H(p, q_0) + \int_{q_0}^{q_j} \left(\frac{d}{d\xi} D_H(p, \xi) \right) d\xi \\ &= D_H(p, q_0) + \int_{q_0}^{q_j} h'(\xi)(\xi - p) d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Since $\frac{h'(\xi)(\xi - p)}{h'(\xi)\xi} \rightarrow 1$, for $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, and the terms $h'(\xi)(\xi - p)$ and $h'(\xi)\xi$ are both positive for sufficiently large ξ , there exists ξ_0 such that $\frac{1}{2}h'(\xi)\xi \leq h'(\xi)(\xi - p) \leq 2h'(\xi)\xi$, for $\xi \geq \xi_0$. Note that

$\int_{q_0}^{\xi_0} h'(\xi)(\xi - p)d\xi$ is finite as $h' \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})$ by (A2). Since $\tilde{z} \mapsto \tilde{z} \cdot h'(\tilde{z})$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$ and $h' \in L_1^c(\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}})$ is positive, we know by definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}}$ that $\int_{\xi_0}^{\infty} h'(\xi)\xi d\xi$ is equal to $+\infty$. Hence,

$$\int_{q_0}^{q_j} h'(\xi)(\xi - p)d\xi \geq \int_{q_0}^{\xi_0} h'(\xi)(\xi - p)d\xi + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\xi_0}^{q_j} h'(\xi)\xi d\xi \rightarrow +\infty,$$

for $j \rightarrow \infty$, which in turn implies that $D_H(p, q_j) \rightarrow +\infty$. For $q_j \rightarrow -\infty \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^{\text{lim}}$ an analogous argument shows that $D_H(p, q_j) \rightarrow +\infty$, for $j \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $B_{D_H, r}(x_i)$ is bounded, for any $x_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}$ and $r > 0$, and the claim follows. \square

3.3 Proofs of Corollaries 2.8 and 2.10

In this section we present the proofs of Corollaries 2.8 and 2.10.

Proof of Corollary 2.8. We will apply Theorem 2.4 with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$. Since we already checked in the proof sketch of Corollary 2.8 that Assumption (A2) holds and that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$, we know that (18) holds, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha} \in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})=0} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle. \quad (49)$$

where h and H have been defined in Theorem 2.4 as antiderivatives of $h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2$ in (22).

Let us calculate the explicit form of (49). Since the functions H and h are acting entry-wise, we can restrict our derivation to single entries, i.e., $\tilde{w}_0 = \alpha > 0$. Recalling $p > 1$ we compute that $h(\tilde{z}) = \frac{p^2}{4(p-1)} \text{sign}(\tilde{z})|\tilde{z}|^{p-1}$ and $H(\tilde{z}) = \frac{p}{4(p-1)}|\tilde{z}|^p$. Consequently,

$$H(\tilde{z}) - \tilde{z}h(\tilde{w}_0) = \frac{p}{4(p-1)}(|\tilde{z}|^p - p\tilde{z}\alpha^{p-1}). \quad (50)$$

Hence, $\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = \frac{p}{4(p-1)} \langle \mathbf{1}, |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}|^{\odot p} - p\alpha^{p-1}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \rangle$ in this case.

Now let $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_*$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_*\|_p = \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})=0} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p$. By (49), we obtain for any $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ that

$$\langle \mathbf{1}, |\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}|^{\odot p} - p\alpha^{p-1}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\infty} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{1}, |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}|^{\odot p} - p\alpha^{p-1}\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \rangle.$$

Rearranging the terms we have for any $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p^p - \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^p &\leq p\alpha^{p-1}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\infty}\|_1 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_1) \leq p\alpha^{p-1}N^{1-1/p}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p) \\ &\leq 2p\alpha^{p-1}N^{1-1/p}\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, note that it follows from convexity of the univariate function $x \mapsto x^p$ that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p^p - \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^p \geq p\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^{p-1}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p - \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p).$$

By combining the last two inequalities we obtain for any $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\infty}\|_p$ that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p - \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p \leq \frac{2\alpha^{p-1}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^{p-1}}N^{1-1/p}\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T, \alpha}\|_p.$$

Rearranging terms yields

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{T,\alpha}\|_p \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2\alpha^{p-1}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^{p-1}} N^{1-1/p}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p \leq \left(1 + \frac{4\alpha^{p-1}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p^{p-1}} N^{1-1/p}\right) \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|_p,$$

where in the second inequality we used the elementary estimate $\frac{1}{1-x} \leq 1 + 2x$ for $0 < x \leq 1/2$ and our assumption on α . By setting $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_*$ the claim follows. \square

Finally, let us present the formal proof of Corollary 2.10.

Proof of Corollary 2.10. As in the proof of Corollary 2.8, we will apply Theorem 2.4. Again, we only need to verify Assumption (A2). If in addition $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$, which trivially holds for $\rho_{\text{rp}} = \sinh$ but needs to additionally be verified for $\rho_{\text{rp}} = \tanh$, Theorem 2.4 may be applied and yields that (18) holds, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})=0}{\arg \min} \langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle, \quad (51)$$

where h and H have been defined in Theorem 2.4 as antiderivatives of

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2.$$

Proof of (i): We first consider $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sinh(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = \mathbb{R}^N$. In this case, $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N$ is trivially satisfied by existence of the limit. Since the function ρ_{rp} is defined entry-wise, both H and h will be defined entry-wise and we can restrict our derivation to single entries. For $\tilde{z} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \sinh(z)$, we have that

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2 = \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{rp}}'(z)^2} = \frac{1}{\cosh(z)^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \sinh(z)^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{z}^2}. \quad (52)$$

Since ρ_{rp} is continuously differentiable and invertible, the derivative ρ_{rp}' never vanishes, and $h' \in L_1^c(\mathbb{R}^N)$, Assumption (A2) holds. As $\rho_{\text{rp}}'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, any solution of (7) is regular and Theorem 2.4 can be applied to obtain (51) with $h(\tilde{z}) = \arctan(\tilde{z})$, $H(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{z} \arctan(\tilde{z}) - \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \tilde{z}^2)$, and

$$H(\tilde{z}) - \tilde{z}h(\tilde{w}_0) = \tilde{z}(\arctan(\tilde{z}) - \arctan(\tilde{w}_0)) - \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \tilde{z}^2).$$

Observing that $\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = g_{\sinh}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$, for $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, concludes the proof of (i).

Proof of (ii): We now consider $\rho_{\text{rp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \tanh(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rp}}^N = (-1, 1)^N$, and assume in addition that $\rho_{\text{link}} = \text{Id}$. First note that, for $\tilde{z} = \rho_{\text{rp}}(z) = \tanh(z)$,

$$h'(\tilde{z}) = ([\rho_{\text{rp}}^{-1}]'(\tilde{z}))^2 = \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{rp}}'(z)^2} = \frac{1}{(1 - \tanh(z)^2)^2} = \frac{1}{(1 - \tilde{z}^2)^2}.$$

By partial fraction decomposition, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} h(\tilde{z}) &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\log(1 + \tilde{z}) - \log(1 - \tilde{z}) + \frac{2\tilde{z}}{1 - \tilde{z}^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{artanh}(\tilde{z}) + \frac{\tilde{z}}{1 - \tilde{z}^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H(\tilde{z}) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{z} \operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{z}).$$

Consequently,

$$H(\tilde{z}) - \tilde{z}h(\tilde{w}_0) = \frac{\tilde{z}}{2} \left(\operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{z}) - \operatorname{artanh}(\tilde{w}_0) - \frac{\tilde{w}_0}{1 - \tilde{w}_0^2} \right), \quad (53)$$

which shows that $\langle \mathbf{1}, H(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \odot h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0) \rangle = \frac{1}{2}g_{\operatorname{tanh}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$ for $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$.

To apply Theorem 2.4, we have to verify that (A2) holds, that \mathbf{w} is regular, and that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\operatorname{rp}}^N$. Since ρ_{rp} is continuously differentiable, invertible and the derivative $\rho'_{\operatorname{rp}}$ never vanishes, and since $h' \in L^c_1([-1, 1]^N)$, we have that Assumption (A2) holds. As $\rho'_{\operatorname{rp}}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, any solution of (7) is regular. Finally, from Corollary 2.11 we know that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\operatorname{rp}}^N$ and Theorem 2.4 can be applied. This concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank Axel Böhm for helpful comments. H.C. acknowledges the funding from Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML).

References

- [1] E. Amid and M. K. Warmuth. Reparameterizing mirror descent as gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 8430–8439, 2020.
- [2] E. Amid and M. K. Warmuth. Winnowing with gradient descent. In *Proceedings of 33rd Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125, pages 163–182. PMLR, 2020.
- [3] M. Andriushchenko, A. V. Varre, L. Pillaud-Vivien, and N. Flammarion. SGD with large step sizes learns sparse features. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202, pages 903–925. PMLR, 2023.
- [4] S. Arora, N. Cohen, and E. Hazan. On the optimization of deep networks: Implicit acceleration by overparameterization. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pages 244–253. PMLR, 2018.
- [5] S. Arora, N. Cohen, W. Hu, and Y. Luo. Implicit regularization in deep matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 7413–7424, 2019.
- [6] S. Azulay, E. Moroshko, M. S. Nacson, B. E. Woodworth, N. Srebro, A. Globerson, and D. Soudry. On the implicit bias of initialization shape: Beyond infinitesimal mirror descent. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 468–477. PMLR, 2021.
- [7] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(2):489–509, 2006.

- [8] H. Chou, C. Gieshoff, J. Maly, and H. Rauhut. Gradient descent for deep matrix factorization: Dynamics and implicit bias towards low rank. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2024.
- [9] H.-H. Chou, J. Maly, and H. Rauhut. More is less: Inducing sparsity via overparameterization. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(3):iaad012, 04 2023.
- [10] H.-H. Chou, J. Maly, and C. M. Verdun. Non-negative least squares via overparametrization. *arXiv preprint:2207.08437*, 2022.
- [11] H.-H. Chou, H. Rauhut, and R. Ward. Robust implicit regularization via weight normalization. *arXiv preprint:2305.05448*, 2023.
- [12] L. Ding, Z. Qin, L. Jiang, J. Zhou, and Z. Zhu. A validation approach to over-parameterized matrix and image recovery. *arXiv preprint:2209.10675*, 2022.
- [13] A. J. Dobson and A. G. Barnett. *An introduction to generalized linear models*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- [14] D. L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.
- [15] M. Even, S. Pesme, S. Gunasekar, and N. Flammarion. (S)GD over diagonal linear networks: Implicit regularisation, large stepsizes and edge of stability. *arXiv preprint:2302.08982*, 2023.
- [16] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut. *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*. Birkhäuser, New York, NY, 2013.
- [17] D. Gissin, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and A. Daniely. The implicit bias of depth: How incremental learning drives generalization. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [18] S. Gunasekar, J. Lee, D. Soudry, and N. Srebro. Characterizing implicit bias in terms of optimization geometry. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pages 1832–1841. PMLR, 2018.
- [19] S. Gunasekar, B. Woodworth, and N. Srebro. Mirrorless mirror descent: A natural derivation of mirror descent. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130, pages 2305–2313. PMLR, 2021.
- [20] S. Gunasekar, B. E. Woodworth, S. Bhojanapalli, B. Neyshabur, and N. Srebro. Implicit regularization in matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, pages 6151–6159, 2017.
- [21] J. W. Hardin, J. W. Hardin, J. M. Hilbe, and J. Hilbe. *Generalized linear models and extensions*. Stata press, 2007.
- [22] M. Hardt and T. Ma. Identity matters in deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [23] T. J. Hastie. Generalized additive models. In *Statistical models in S*, pages 249–307. Routledge, 2017.

- [24] P. J. Huber. Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73 – 101, 1964.
- [25] M. Huh, H. Mobahi, R. Zhang, B. Cheung, P. Agrawal, and P. Isola. The low-rank simplicity bias in deep networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [26] Z. Ji and M. Telgarsky. The implicit bias of gradient descent on nonseparable data. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99, pages 1772–1798. PMLR, 2019.
- [27] Z. Ji and M. Telgarsky. Characterizing the implicit bias via a primal-dual analysis. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 132, pages 772–804. PMLR, 2021.
- [28] J. Jin, Z. Li, K. Lyu, S. S. Du, and J. D. Lee. Understanding incremental learning of gradient descent: A fine-grained analysis of matrix sensing. In *Proceedings of the international Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202, pages 15200–15238. PMLR, 2023.
- [29] C. Kolb, C. L. Müller, B. Bischl, and D. Rügamer. Smoothing the edges: A general framework for smooth optimization in sparse regularization using hadamard overparametrization. *arXiv preprint:2307.03571*, 2023.
- [30] J. Li, T. V. Nguyen, C. Hegde, and K. W. Wong. Implicit sparse regularization: The impact of depth and early stopping. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 28298–28309, 2021.
- [31] Y. Li, T. Ma, and H. Zhang. Algorithmic regularization in over-parameterized matrix sensing and neural networks with quadratic activations. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75, pages 2–47. PMLR, 2018.
- [32] Z. Li, Y. Luo, and K. Lyu. Towards resolving the implicit bias of gradient descent for matrix factorization: Greedy low-rank learning. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [33] Z. Li, T. Wang, J. D. Lee, and S. Arora. Implicit bias of gradient descent on reparametrized models: On equivalence to mirror descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, 2022.
- [34] P. McCullagh and J. A. Nelder. *Generalized linear models*. Routledge, 2019.
- [35] E. Moroshko, B. E. Woodworth, S. Gunasekar, J. D. Lee, N. Srebro, and D. Soudry. Implicit bias in deep linear classification: Initialization scale vs training accuracy. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 22182–22193, 2020.
- [36] M. S. Nacson, J. Lee, S. Gunasekar, P. H. P. Savarese, N. Srebro, and D. Soudry. Convergence of gradient descent on separable data. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89, pages 3420–3428. PMLR, 2019.
- [37] S. Pesme, L. Pillaud-Vivien, and N. Flammarion. Implicit bias of SGD for diagonal linear networks: a provable benefit of stochasticity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 29218–29230, 2021.
- [38] B. T. Polyak. Gradient methods for the minimisation of functionals. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 3(4):864–878, 1963.

- [39] N. Razin and N. Cohen. Implicit regularization in deep learning may not be explainable by norms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 21174–21187, 2020.
- [40] N. Razin, A. Maman, and N. Cohen. Implicit regularization in tensor factorization. *arXiv preprint: 2102.09972*, 2021.
- [41] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*, volume 18 of *Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [42] M. Soltanolkotabi, D. Stöger, and C. Xie. Implicit balancing and regularization: Generalization and convergence guarantees for overparameterized asymmetric matrix sensing. In *In Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 195, pages 5140–5142. PMLR, 2023.
- [43] D. Soudry, E. Hoffer, M. S. Nacson, S. Gunasekar, and N. Srebro. The implicit bias of gradient descent on separable data. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):2822–2878, 2018.
- [44] D. Stöger and M. Soltanolkotabi. Small random initialization is akin to spectral learning: Optimization and generalization guarantees for overparameterized low-rank matrix reconstruction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 23831–23843, 2021.
- [45] B. Tzen, A. Raj, M. Raginsky, and F. Bach. Variational principles for mirror descent and mirror langevin dynamics. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:1542–1547, 2023.
- [46] T. Vaskevicius, V. Kanade, and P. Rebeschini. Implicit regularization for optimal sparse recovery. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 2972–2983, 2019.
- [47] L. P. Vivien, J. Reygner, and N. Flammarion. Label noise (stochastic) gradient descent implicitly solves the LASSO for quadratic parametrisation. In *Proceedings of Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 178, pages 2127–2159. PMLR, 2022.
- [48] B. Woodworth, S. Gunasekar, J. D. Lee, E. Moroshko, P. Savarese, I. Golan, D. Soudry, and N. Srebro. Kernel and rich regimes in overparametrized models. In *Proceedings of 33rd Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125, pages 3635–3673. PMLR, 2020.
- [49] F. Wu and P. Rebeschini. A continuous-time mirror descent approach to sparse phase retrieval. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 20192–20203, 2020.
- [50] F. Wu and P. Rebeschini. Implicit regularization in matrix sensing via mirror descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 20558–20570, 2021.
- [51] F. Wu and P. Rebeschini. Nearly minimax-optimal rates for noisy sparse phase retrieval via early-stopped mirror descent. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(2):633–713, 2023.
- [52] X. Xu, Y. Shen, Y. Chi, and C. Ma. The power of preconditioning in overparameterized low-rank matrix sensing. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202. PMLR, 2023.
- [53] C. Yun, S. Krishnan, and H. Mobahi. A unifying view on implicit bias in training linear neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [54] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.