

On Generalization Bounds for Deep Compound Gaussian Neural Networks

Carter Lyons, Raghu G. Raj, and Margaret Cheney

Abstract—Algorithm unfolding or unrolling is the technique of constructing a deep neural network (DNN) from an iterative algorithm. Unrolled DNNs often provide better interpretability and superior empirical performance over standard DNNs in signal estimation tasks. An important theoretical question, which has only recently received attention, is the development of generalization error bounds for unrolled DNNs. These bounds deliver theoretical and practical insights into the performance of a DNN on empirical datasets that are distinct from, but sampled from, the probability density generating the DNN training data. In this paper, we develop novel generalization error bounds for a class of unrolled DNNs that are informed by a compound Gaussian prior. These compound Gaussian networks have been shown to outperform comparative standard and unfolded deep neural networks in compressive sensing and tomographic imaging problems. The generalization error bound is formulated by bounding the Rademacher complexity of the class of compound Gaussian network estimates with Dudley’s integral. Under realistic conditions, we show that, at worst, the generalization error scales $\mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{\ln(n)})$ in the signal dimension and $\mathcal{O}(\text{Network Size})^{3/2}$ in network size.

Index Terms—Deep neural networks, generalization error, inverse problems, non-convex optimization, algorithm unrolling

NOTATION AND NOMENCLATURE

\mathbb{R}	Set of real numbers.
\mathbf{v}	$= [v_i] \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Boldface characters are vectors.
$(\cdot)^T$	Transpose of vector or matrix (\cdot) .
\odot	Hadamard product.
$f(\mathbf{v})$	$= [f(v_i)]$ for componentwise function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.
$\mathbb{N}[d]$	$= \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ is set of first d natural numbers.
$\mathcal{P}_{a,b}(x)$	$= a + \text{ReLU}(x - a) - \text{ReLU}(x - b)$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, is a modified ReLU (mReLU) activation function.
$\rho_b(\mathbf{v})$	$= \mathbf{v} / \max\{1, b^{-1}\ \mathbf{v}\ _2\}$ for $b > 0$, is the projection onto the Euclidean ball of radius b .
A	$\in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a measurement, observation, or sensing matrix.
$A_{\mathbf{z}}$	$= \text{ADiag}(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ for any vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z})$	$\equiv \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}; P_u) := (A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P_u^{-1})^{-1} A_{\mathbf{z}}^T \mathbf{y}$.
$\mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(i)}$	Hypothesis class for G-CG-Net, CG-Net, and DR-CG-Net when $i = 1$, $i = 2$, and $i = 3$, respectively.

Carter Lyons is with the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC 20375 USA and also with Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523 USA (e-mail: carter.lyons@colostate.edu)

Raghu G. Raj is with the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC 20375 USA (e-mail: raghu.g.raj@ieee.org)

Margaret Cheney is with Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523 USA (e-mail: margaret.cheney@colostate.edu)

This work was sponsored in part by the Office of Naval Research via the NRL base program and under award numbers N00014-21-1-2145 and N0001423WX01875. Furthermore, this work was sponsored in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-21-1-0169.

I. INTRODUCTION

MACHINE learning success in image classification has recently spurred its application, in particular with deep neural networks (DNN), in signal estimation tasks. Signal estimation is one example of an inverse problem where we desire a reconstructed signal from some undersampled measurements. Particular applications of interest include X-Ray computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and compressive sensing.

While DNNs have been shown to outperform iterative approaches in estimated signal quality and computational time [1]–[6], this typically requires a significant amount of training data and training time. Certain problems of interest, such as MRI, do not have large training datasets readily available and thus DNN performance can falter on these problems. Additionally, standard DNNs, e.g. convolutional neural networks, do not incorporate any outside prior information into the estimation model as is included in iterative approaches.

Algorithm unfolding or unrolling is a technique, introduced by Gregor and LeCun [1], which combines the iterative approaches and deep-learning methods by structuring the layers of a DNN such that they correspond to an iteration from the iterative algorithm. While a standard DNN acts as a black-box process, we have an understanding of the inner workings of an unrolled DNN from understanding the original iterative algorithm. Furthermore, algorithm unrolling allows for the incorporation of prior information into the deep-learning framework. Example iterative algorithms that have been unrolled into DNNs include: iterative shrinkage and thresholding algorithm (ISTA) [1, 3, 4, 7]–[10] and proximal gradient descent [11, 12]. These unrolled DNNs have shown excellent performance in image estimation while offering simple interpretability of the network layers [2]. However, these unrolled DNNs still require large training datasets.

Recently, two compound Gaussian (CG) informed DNNs were developed through the use of algorithm unrolling. These unrolled CG-based DNNs have empirically produced superior estimated signals over comparative iterative and DNN methods, especially in scenarios of low training data [5, 6, 13, 14]. While this success was shown empirically, no generalization guarantees have been provided, a gap that this paper fills. Specifically, we:

- 1) Establish and prove a Lipschitz property of the outputs from unrolled, CG-informed DNNs with respect to (w.r.t.) the DNN parameters.
- 2) Develop an encompassing generalization error bound (GEB) for unrolled, CG-informed DNNs by bounding

Rademacher complexities with covering numbers.

- 3) Apply the developed GEB and provide asymptotic forms in terms of DNN size and signal dimension for two distinct formulations of unrolled, CG-based DNNs named compound Gaussian network (CG-Net) [5] and deep regularized compound Gaussian network (DR-CG-Net) [6]. We theoretically demonstrate that DR-CG-Net exhibits a tighter GEB than CG-Net, which was empirically observed in [5, 6].

The GEB we develop is formulated using techniques informed by those discussed in [15], which produces a GEB for an ISTA unrolled DNN with learned sparsity transformation. Such techniques are similarly used in [16] for an unrolled DNN employing a learned analysis sparsity transformation and in [17] for a ℓ_1 - ℓ_1 unrolled recurrent neural network.

A. Generalization Error

A DNN can be viewed as a collection of ordered layers, denoted $\mathbf{L}_0, \mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_K$ for $K > 1$, where layers feed into one another from the input layer, \mathbf{L}_0 , to the output layer, \mathbf{L}_K . Intermediate layers $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{K-1}$ are known as hidden layers. Each layer \mathbf{L}_k contains d_k hidden units [18] that are assigned a computed value when transmitting a signal through the DNN.

A function, $\mathbf{f}_k : \mathbb{R}^{d_{i_1(k)}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_{i_j(k)}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_k}$, that is parameterized by some $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ defines the computation, i.e. signal transmission, at layer \mathbf{L}_k where $\mathcal{I}_k := \{i_1(k), \dots, i_j(k)\} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ are the indices of layers that feed into \mathbf{L}_k . That is, given an input signal, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$, assigned to \mathbf{L}_0 , a DNN is the composition of parameterized vector input and vector output functions where

$$\mathbf{L}_k \equiv \mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{L}_{i_1(k)}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j(k)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_k).$$

Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{Y} be the set of possible signals of interest, e.g. images, and possible signal measurements, e.g. image measurements, respectively. Further, let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}_c, \mathcal{D}_c)$ be a probability space where \mathcal{A}_c and \mathcal{D}_c are a σ -algebra and unknown probability density on \mathcal{C} , respectively. Similarly, define the probability space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}_y, \mathcal{D}_y)$. Now, consider the probability space $(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}_y \otimes \mathcal{A}_c, \mathcal{D})$ where \mathcal{D} is an unknown joint probability density with marginal distributions \mathcal{D}_c and \mathcal{D}_y . Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]}$ be a training dataset where each pair $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)$ is drawn i.i.d. from \mathcal{D} . We denote the network parameters as $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_K)$, and let Ω_k be the space of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ that can be learned by the DNN. Further, we write the network output, i.e. signal at \mathbf{L}_K , that is dependent on network parameters and input measurements \mathbf{y} , as $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta})$.

The **hypothesis space**, \mathcal{H} , of a DNN is given by

$$\mathcal{H} := \{\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_K\}.$$

For a loss function, $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$, that measures a discrepancy between $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_K}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_K}$, the **empirical loss** of a hypothesis $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}$, over a training dataset \mathcal{S} , is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} L(\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i).$$

Mean-squared error or mean-absolute error are common loss functions [19]. The **actual loss** of a hypothesis $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}$ is

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{c}) \sim \mathcal{D}} [L(\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \mathbf{c})].$$

Finally, the **generalization error** ($\text{GE}_{\mathcal{S}}$) of a hypothesis $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}$ is the difference in the empirical and actual loss. That is,

$$\text{GE}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) = |\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})|.$$

A DNN learns its parameters $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ by minimizing the empirical loss, i.e. by choosing a hypothesis $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}$ that minimizes $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})$. It is critical in applications, however, for a DNN to similarly generate excellent results when provided any new data sample drawn from \mathcal{D} that is not contained in the training dataset. This is tantamount to minimizing the generalization error, and thus, obtaining an estimate or bound on $\text{GE}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for a DNN is of significant interest.

II. GENERALIZED COMPOUND GAUSSIAN NETWORK

The generalized compound Gaussian network (G-CG-Net) shown in Fig. 1 is an unrolled, CG-based DNN for solving linear inverse problems. Note, the use of “generalized” in the naming of G-CG-Net denotes the fact that this network encompasses the compound Gaussian network (CG-Net) [5, 13] and deep regularized compound Gaussian network (DR-CG-Net) [6, 14] as special cases. In contrast, the use of “generalized” in terms of network error denotes a DNNs ability to transfer from training data to testing data.

Through the study of image statistics, it has been shown that sparsity coefficients of natural images exhibit self-similarity, heavy-tailed marginal distributions, and self-reinforcement among local coefficients [20]. These properties are encompassed by the class of CG densities [20]–[22]. Thus, the CG prior better captures statistical properties of natural images as well as images from other modalities such as radar [23, 24]. A useful formulation of the CG prior is modeling a signal as the Hadamard product $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{z} \odot \mathbf{u}$ such that $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_u)$, $\mathbf{z} \sim p_{\mathbf{z}}$, and \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{z} are independent random variables [20, 25]. We call \mathbf{z} the scale variable and \mathbf{u} the Gaussian variable. The linear measurement model we consider is

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \equiv \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z} \odot \mathbf{u}) + \boldsymbol{\nu}. \quad (1)$$

G-CG-Net is a method that recovers \mathbf{c} , by estimating \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{u} , when given \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{A} .

A. Iterative Algorithm

Algorithm 1 provides pseudocode for the iterative algorithm generalized compound Gaussian least squares (G-CG-LS) to be unrolled into G-CG-Net. Consider the cost function

$$F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z} \odot \mathbf{u})\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{P}_u^{-1} \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z}). \quad (2)$$

A maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) estimate of \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{u} from (1) is a special case of (2) when $\mathbf{P}_u \propto \Sigma_u$ and $\mathcal{R} \propto \log(p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}))$.

Using block coordinate descent [26], G-CG-LS alternatively minimizes (2) over \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{u} . The minimum of (2) in \mathbf{u} is a Tikhonov solution, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}) \equiv \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{P}_u)$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}) &:= (\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}} + \mathbf{P}_u^{-1})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}}^T \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{P}_u \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}}^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{P}_u \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{z}}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{y} \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1 Generalized Compound Gaussian Least Squares

Input: Measurement \mathbf{y} . Initial estimate $\mathbf{z}_1^{(0)}$.

- 1: Choose a \mathbf{u}_0 (e.g. $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}_1^{(0)})$)
- 2: **for** $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 3: \mathbf{z} ESTIMATION:
- 4: **for** $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ **do**
- 5: $\mathbf{z}_k^{(j)} = g(\mathbf{z}_k^{(j-1)}, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}) \equiv g(\mathbf{z}_k^{(j-1)}, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}; \mathbf{y})$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{(0)} = \mathbf{z}_k^{(J)}$
- 8: \mathbf{u} ESTIMATION:
- 9: $\mathbf{u}_k = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}_k^{(J)})$
- 10: **end for**

Output: $\mathbf{c}^* = \mathbf{z}_K^{(J)} \odot \mathbf{u}_K$

where the second equality results from using the Woodbury matrix identity.

As the minimum of (2) in \mathbf{z} does not have a closed form solution, for general regularization $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z})$, we iteratively minimize by performing J descent steps on \mathbf{z} . That is, for $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ a scale-variable-descent update, the estimate of \mathbf{z} on descent step j of iteration k , denoted as $\mathbf{z}_k^{(j)}$, is given by $\mathbf{z}_k^{(j)} = g(\mathbf{z}_k^{(j-1)}, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}; \mathbf{y})$ where $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}^{(0)} = \mathbf{z}_k^{(J)}$. For instance, [5, 13, 14] take g as a steepest descent step and [6] uses a ISTA step.

B. Unrolled Deep Neural Network (G-CG-Net)

Applying algorithm unrolling to Algorithm 1, we create G-CG-Net with end-to-end structure shown in Fig. 1. Each layer k of G-CG-Net, shown in the dashed box of Fig. 1b, corresponds to iteration k of Algorithm 1 and implements a complete scale variable mapping, \mathcal{Z}_k , shown in Fig. 1c, that updates \mathbf{z} and a Tikhonov update of \mathbf{u} . Each \mathcal{Z}_k consists of J scale variable updates $Z_k^{(1)}, \dots, Z_k^{(J)}$ where every $Z_k^{(j)}$ updates \mathbf{z} once and is the output of a scale-variable-descent update, denoted $g_k^{(j)}$, as given in line 5 of Algorithm 1.

Mathematically detailing the G-CG-Net blocks we have:

$\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathbf{y}$ is the input measurements to the network

$\mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{P}_{0,b}(\hat{A}^T \mathbf{y})$, for $\hat{A} = \frac{A}{\|A\|_2}$, is an initial estimate of \mathbf{z} .

$\mathcal{U}_k = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(Z_k^{(J)})$ is the Tikhonov estimate of \mathbf{u} corresponding to line 1 and 9 of Algorithm 1.

The k th complete scale variable mapping, \mathcal{Z}_k , contains:

$\mathcal{Z}_k^{(j)} = \mathcal{P}_{0,z_\infty}(g_k^{(j)}(Z_k^{(j-1)}, U_{k-1}))$ is the scale variable update corresponding to line 5 in Algorithm 1.

$\mathcal{O} = \rho_{c_{\max}}(\mathcal{Z}_K \odot U_K)$ is the estimated signal output.

Note that $\rho_{c_{\max}}$ and \mathcal{P}_{0,z_∞} , for $c_{\max} \geq 0$ and $z_\infty \geq 0$, are applied for technical reasons discussed in Section III-A. Furthermore, to simplify notation, we let $Z_{k+1}^{(0)} = Z_k^{(J)}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K-1\}$ and $Z_1^{(0)} = \mathcal{Z}_0$.

Every U_k layer is parameterized by the same covariance matrix P_u and each $Z_k^{(j)}$ we assume, generally, to be parameterized by D weights $\theta_{k,1}^{(j)}, \dots, \theta_{k,D}^{(j)}$. We additionally assume that $\theta_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \Omega_d$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}[K]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}[J]$, and some finite-dimensional vector space Ω_d . For instance, if a fully-connected

layer, mapping from $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, is implemented in each $g_k^{(j)}$, then every $\theta_{k,1}^{(j)}$ could be the weight matrix from the layer while $\theta_{k,2}^{(j)}$ could be the additive bias of the layer. Hence, the G-CG-Net parameters are

$$\Theta = \{P_u\} \cup \{\theta_{k,d}^{(j)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}[K], j \in \mathbb{N}[J], d \in \mathbb{N}[D]}. \quad (3)$$

We remark that a structured form can be imposed on P_u . In particular, to ensure that P_u is symmetric and positive definite (SPD), we consider, for $\epsilon > 0$ a small fixed real number,

$$P_u = \begin{cases} \max\{\lambda, \epsilon\}I & \text{Scaled Identity} \\ \text{diag}([\max\{\lambda_i, \epsilon\}]_{i=1}^n) & \text{Diagonal} \\ L_{\text{tri}}L_{\text{tri}}^T + \epsilon I & \text{Tridiagonal} \\ LL^T + \epsilon I & \text{Full.} \end{cases}$$

In the scaled identity case, only a constant λ is learned. In the diagonal case, a vector $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i=1}^n$ is learned. In the tridiagonal case, two vectors $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ are learned such that the lower triangular matrix component L_{tri} is formed by placing λ_1 on the diagonal and λ_2 on the first subdiagonal. Finally, in the case of a full covariance matrix, an entire lower triangular matrix L is learned.

C. Realizations

Two specific forms of G-CG-Net are detailed here.

1) *Compound Gaussian Network (CG-Net)* [13]: For this method, the scale variable is formulated as $\mathbf{z} = h(\mathcal{X})$ for $\mathcal{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I)$ and h is a componentwise, non-linear, twice continuously differentiable, and invertible function. Accordingly, the scale variable regularization is $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z}) = \mu \|h^{-1}(\mathbf{z})\|_2^2$, for a scalar constant $\mu > 0$, to enforce normality of $\mathcal{X} = h^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$.

The scale-variable-descent update, g , is a projected steepest descent step based on a learned quadratic norm. We consider a slightly adjusted update, to assist in the analysis, given as

$$g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{P}_{a,b}(\mathbf{z} - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}; \mu_k^{(j)}))) \quad (4)$$


where $a, b, \xi > 0$ are fixed real-valued scalars, $B_k^{(j)}$ is a learned $n \times n$ positive definite matrix, and

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}; \mu_k^{(j)}) = A_{\mathbf{u}}^T (A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) + \mu_k^{(j)} [h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$$

for $\mu_k^{(j)}$ a learned scalar. Note, the application of ρ_ξ ensures a sufficiently small step size is used in each gradient update for numerical stability.

For parameters, P_u is structured as a scaled identity matrix and $D = 2$ where $\theta_{k,1}^{(j)} = B_k^{(j)}$ and $\theta_{k,2}^{(j)} = \mu_k^{(j)}$. A structural similarity index measure (SSIM) loss function is used to train CG-Net. For two images or matrices I_1 and I_2 of equivalent size, the SSIM loss function is given by $L(I_1, I_2) = 1 - \text{SSIM}(I_1, I_2)$.

2) *Deep Regularized Compound Gaussian Network (DR-CG-Net)* [14]: In this method, the scale variable regularization is left as an implicit function that is learned, through its gradient, in the unrolled deep neural network. In DR-CG-Net, a projected gradient descent (PGD) or ISTA step are employed as scale-variable-descent updates. Due to similar analyses of



(a) End-to-end network structure of G-CG-Net.


(b) Layer k analogous to iteration k in Algorithm 1. (c) Complete scale variable mapping, \mathcal{Z}_k , producing estimate $z_k^{(j)}$ in Algorithm 1.

Fig. 1: End-to-end network structure for G-CG-Net, the unrolled deep neural network of Algorithm 1, is shown in (1a). G-CG-Net consists of an input block, L_0 , initialization block, \mathcal{Z}_0 , $K + 1$ Tikhonov blocks, U_k , output block, O , and K complete scale variable mappings, \mathcal{Z}_k , with structure in (1c). Each \mathcal{Z}_k consists of J scale variable updates $Z_k^{(j)}$.

both scale-variable-descent updates, we focus on the PGD scale update method given by

$$g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}) = v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}; \delta_k^{(j)}) + \mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}) \quad (5)$$

where, for a step size $\delta_k^{(j)} > 0$ and fixed real number $\xi > 0$,

$$v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}; \delta_k^{(j)}) = \mathbf{z} - \delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi (A_{\mathbf{u}}^T (A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y})) \quad (6)$$

is a gradient update of \mathbf{z} over the data fidelity term of (2) and $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ an embedded subnetwork. We remark that the update in (5) is a gradient descent step on (2) w.r.t. \mathbf{z} when $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)} = \nabla \mathcal{R}$. Hence, in training $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}$, the regularization, or equivalently prior distribution, for the scale variable is learned. Finally, ρ_ξ is applied for numerical stability as in CG-Net.

Each subnetwork, $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}$, consists of L_c convolutional layers using ReLU activation functions. That is, layer ℓ consists of f_ℓ convolutions, i.e. filter channels, using kernel size $k_\ell \times k_\ell$ with unit stride. Note, zero padding is applied to each filter channel of the input such that the output, at any filter channel, is the same size as the input to any filter channel. Furthermore, we take $f_{L_c} = 1$ so that given a single channel image input to $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}$ the output is also a single channel image of equivalent dimension. For our analysis, we assume, without loss of generality, that convolutional layer ℓ of $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}$ is implemented as a matrix-vector product with weight matrix $W_{k,\ell}^{(j)}$.

For parameters, P_u is structured as a tridiagonal matrix and $D = L_c + 1$ where $\theta_{k,\ell}^{(j)} = W_{k,\ell}^{(j)}$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq L_c$ and $\theta_{k,L_c+1}^{(j)} = \delta_k^{(j)}$. A mean-absolute error loss function, $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_1$, is used to train DR-CG-Net.

III. GENERALIZATION ERROR BOUNDS

In order to estimate the generalization error we, similarly to [15]–[17], derive an upper bound on $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathcal{C}})$ in terms of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}})$ and a Dudley's inequality bound of the Rademacher complexity for the hypothesis space generated by G-CG-Net. The Dudley's inequality bound is evaluated using a covering number argument dependent on a Lipschitz property

for G-CG-Net outputs w.r.t. G-CG-Net parameters. Our key contribution here is showing the G-CG-Net outputs are indeed Lipschitz w.r.t. to the network parameters and applying our derived GEB to the specific CG-Net and DR-CG-Net structures.

The remainder of this section is structured as follows. Section III-A explicates boundedness assumptions that underlie our GEBs for deep compound Gaussian networks. We detail a GEB for G-CG-Net in section III-B, which is subsequently refined for the CG-Net and DR-CG-Net structures in sections III-C and III-D, respectively.

A. Boundedness Assumptions

A common assumption in machine learning literature and implementation is that the input data to a DNN is bounded. Specific bounds are often guaranteed through preprocessing of the data, which has been shown to assist in the performance of DNN models [27]. For instance, in [13, 14], which use images as the signals of interest, each image is scaled down to be bounded in the Euclidean unit ball. Furthermore, bounded data implies that the possible parameters to be learned by a DNN are similarly bounded as DNNs are trained only for a finite number of epochs using a small learning rate to estimate bounded signals from bounded inputs.

Assumption 1. *The following bounds hold almost surely:*

- 1) *Original signals, $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfy $\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 \leq c_{\max}$.*
- 2) *Scale variables, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfy $\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq z_{\max}$.*
- 3) *Covariance matrices, P_u , satisfy $P_u \in \mathcal{P}$ where, for bounding scalars $0 < p_{\min} \leq p_{\max}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \{n \times n \text{ SPD matrices with bounded spectrum}\} \\ &= \{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : \text{SPD}, \|P\|_2 \leq p_{\max}, \|P^{-1}\|_2 \leq p_{\min}^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

- 4) *Each scale variable update parameter, $\theta_{k,d}^{(j)}$, satisfies $\|\theta_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \leq \omega_d$ for scalar $\omega_d \geq 0$ and some norm $\|\cdot\|_{(d)}$.*

Note that we assume the scale variables are bounded since the original signals are bounded. This is enforced by the

mReLU activation function, \mathcal{P}_{0,z_∞} , in each scale variable update layer $Z_k^{(j)}$. Finally, as the original signals are bounded, we force the G-CG-Net estimates to be equivalently bounded by applying the projection operator, $\rho_{c_{\max}}$, to $\mathcal{Z}_K \odot U_K$.

B. G-CG-Net

To derive a GEB for G-CG-Net, we require the an assumption on the loss function and scale-variable-descent update.

Assumption 2. For a vector space V , the loss function $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies:

1. Bounded: $|L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)| \leq c$
2. τ -Lipschitz: $\|L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}) - L(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x})\|_2 \leq \tau \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2$

for $c \geq 0$, $\tau \geq 0$ and all $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x} \in V$.

Assumption 3. For every $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$ and $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathcal{T}_y(\mathbf{z}_i; P_i)$ where $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$, each $g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})$, parameterized by $\vartheta_k^{(j)} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,1}^{(j)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,D}^{(j)})$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \vartheta_k^{(j)}) - g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\vartheta}_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ & \leq r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{d=1}^D r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \end{aligned}$$

for non-negative scalar constants $r_{k,1}^{(j-1)}, r_{k,2}^{(j-1)}, r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)}$, and norms $\{\|\cdot\|_{(d)}\}_{d=1}^D$.

While the Lipschitz property of Assumption 3 may seem arbitrarily restrictive, we show it holds for CG-Net and DR-CG-Net in Appendix VIII and Appendix IX, respectively.

Next, define $\mathcal{P}_{\text{const}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{diag}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{tri}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}$ to be the options for \mathcal{P} corresponding to the vector spaces of constant, diagonal, tridiagonal, and full covariance matrices with bounded spectrum, respectively. Additionally, let each scale variable update parameter, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)}$, be of dimension $\alpha_d \geq 0$ (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\alpha_d}$) and define the sets

$$\Omega_d = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\alpha_d} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_{(d)} \leq \omega_d\}. \quad (7)$$

Then the hypothesis class for G-CG-Net is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)} = \left\{ \hat{c} \left(\cdot; \left\{ P_u, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} \right\}_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N}[J] \\ k \in \mathbb{N}[K] \\ d \in \mathbb{N}[D]}} \right) : P_u \in \mathcal{P}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \Omega_d \right\}.$$

Theorem 1 (Generalization Error Bound for G-CG-Net). Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ be a training dataset where each $(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i)$ is given by (1) and define $y_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2$. If Assumption 1, 2, and 3 hold then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$, for all $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$, the generalization error of G-CG-Net is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\hat{c}) & \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{c}) + \\ & \frac{8\tau c_{\max}}{\sqrt{N_s}} \left(\sqrt{\dim(\mathcal{P})} \sqrt{\ln \left(e \left(1 + \frac{4p_{\max}(KJD + 1)\kappa}{c_{\max}} \right) \right)} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \sqrt{\alpha_d \ln \left(e \left(1 + \frac{4\omega_d(KJD + 1)\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}}{c_{\max}} \right) \right)} \right) \\ & + 4c\sqrt{2 \ln(4/\varepsilon)/N_s} \end{aligned}$$

for $\dim(\mathcal{P}) = 1, n, 2n - 1$, or $n(n + 1)/2$ when $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{const}}, \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{diag}}, \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{tri}}$, or $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}$, respectively. Additionally,

$$\kappa = z_\infty (c_1 + p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_\infty) \hat{c}_1^{(K,J)} + z_\infty c_2 \quad (8)$$

$$\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)} = z_\infty (c_1 + p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_\infty) \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)} \quad (9)$$

where

$$c_1 = p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_2 \left(1 + 2z_\infty^2 p_{\max} \|A\|_2^2 \right)$$

$$c_2 = z_\infty y_{\max} \|A\|_2 \left(p_{\max}/p_{\min} \right)^2$$

$$\hat{c}_1^{(K,J)} = c_2 \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1)$$

$$\hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)} = \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1)$$

for $\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = \prod_{j=1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j-1)}$, $\hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} = \sum_{j=1}^J r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)}$, and

$$\hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)}.$$

A proof of Theorem 1 is provided in Appendix VII, which broadly employs Dudley's inequality to bound the Rademacher complexity of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$. Ideally, through training G-CG-Net, a hypothesis $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$ is chosen such that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{c})$ is minimized, but any \hat{c} possibly generated by G-CG-Net could be used in the Theorem 1 bound. For instance, if early stopping is implemented in training then Theorem 1 still applies to the generated \hat{c} despite \hat{c} not optimizing $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Lastly, we remark for noiseless measurements, that is $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i = A\bar{\mathbf{c}}_i$, that $y_{\max} \leq c_{\max} \|A\|_2$ for any set of training data. For white noise measurements, that is $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i = A\bar{\mathbf{c}}_i + \boldsymbol{\nu}$ where $\boldsymbol{\nu} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, then $y_{\max} \leq c_{\max} \|A\|_2 + z_p \sigma$ with high probability for large z_p . For instance, using the quantile function of a normal distribution, $y_{\max} \leq c_{\max} \|A\|_2 + 6.11\sigma$ with probability $(1 - 2 \times 10^{-9})^{mN_s} \approx 1 - 2mN_s \times 10^{-9}$.

C. CG-Net

For CG-Net, the scale variable update parameter spaces, Ω_d from (7), are $\Omega_1 = \mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}$ and $\Omega_2 = [-\mu, \mu]$ for constant $\mu > 0$. Thus, the hypothesis class for CG-Net is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(2)} = \left\{ \hat{c} \left(\cdot; \left\{ P_u, B_k^{(j)}, \mu_k^{(j)} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}[K]} \right) : P_u \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{const}}, \right. \\ \left. B_k^{(j)} \in \Omega_1, \mu_k^{(j)} \in \Omega_2 \right\}.$$

Theorem 2 (Generalization Error Bound for CG-Net). Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ be a training dataset where each $(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i)$ is given by (1) and define $y_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2$. If Assumption 1 holds then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$, for all $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(2)}$, the generalization error of CG-Net is bounded as in Theorem 1 for τ a Lipschitz constant of the SSIM loss function, $\dim(\mathcal{P}) = 1$, $c = 2$, $D = 2$,

$$(\alpha_d, \omega_d) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2}, p_{\max} \right) & d = 1 \\ (1, \mu) & d = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} &= r_1^J, & \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} &= r_2 \frac{1 - r_1^J}{1 - r_1}, \text{ and} \\ \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} &= r_1^{J-j} \begin{cases} \xi & d = 1 \\ p_{\max} h_{\max} & d = 2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= 1 + p_{\max} ((z_{\infty} p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_2 \|A\|_{\infty})^2 + \mu \tau_h) \\ r_2 &= p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_2 (1 + z_{\infty}^2 p_{\max} \|A\|_2 (\|A\|_2 + \|A\|_{\infty})) \\ h_{\max} &= \max_{z \in [a,b]} [h^{-1}]'(z) h^{-1}(z), \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } \tau_h = \max_{z \in [a,b]} [h^{-1}]''(z) h^{-1}(z) + [h^{-1}]'(z)^2.$$

We remark that in Theorem 2 we only state a Lipschitz constant for the SSIM loss function exists as deriving one is space consuming and not illuminating. This is, in part, due to the fact that $\text{SSIM}(I_1, I_2)$, from the SSIM loss function, is implemented as the average structural similarity over a set of patches from the input images where in each patch a Gaussian weighting filter is used [19].

In all numerical experiments in [13, 14], $h(z) = \exp(z)$ on $[a, b] = [1, \exp(3)]$ and $\xi = 1$. Thus, $h_{\max} = \exp(-1)$, $\tau_h = 1$, and $z_{\infty} = \exp(3)$. Furthermore, preprocessing is used such that $c_{\max} = 1$ and for $\epsilon > 0$, a small stabilizing parameter, $p_{\max} = 1/\epsilon$, $p_{\min} = \epsilon$, and $|\mu| \leq 1/\epsilon$. The remaining constants $\|A\|_2$, $\|A\|_{\infty}$, and y_{\max} can be calculated given the measurement model and training dataset.

Let $a \lesssim b$ imply $a \leq s_c b$ for some $s_c > 0$ and define

$$r = \ln(y_{\max}) + \ln(\|A\|_2) + \ln(\|A\|_{\infty}). \quad (11)$$

Corollary 3. *The generalization error for CG-Net scales as*

$$|\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})| \lesssim n \sqrt{\frac{(KJ)^3 r}{N_s}}.$$

Furthermore, as, $y_{\max} \lesssim \sqrt{m}$, $\|A\|_2 \lesssim n\sqrt{m}$, and $\|A\|_{\infty} \lesssim n$ then the CG-Net generalization error scales at most as

$$|\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})| \lesssim n \sqrt{\frac{(KJ)^3 (\ln(m) + \ln(n))}{N_s}}.$$

Corollary 3 results by ignoring constants in the GEB from Theorem 2 to consider how this GEB scales in network size and signal dimension. From Corollary 3, once the amount of training data satisfies $N_s \sim n^2 (KJ)^3 (\ln(m) + \ln(n))$ then the GEB of CG-Net will be small with high probability.

D. DR-CG-Net

For DR-CG-Net, the scale variable parameter spaces are

$$\Omega_d = \begin{cases} \{W \in \mathbb{R}^{n f_d \times n f_{d-1}} : \|W\|_2 \leq w_d\} & d \in \mathbb{N}[L_c] \\ [-\delta, \delta] & d = L_c + 1. \end{cases}$$

for real value constants $w_d, \delta > 0$. Note, each $W \in \Omega_d$, for $d \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]$, corresponds to a convolutional layer mapping from f_{d-1} to f_d filter channels using convolutional kernels of size $k_d \times k_d$. Thus, the hypothesis class for DR-CG-Net is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(3)} &= \left\{ \mathbf{c} \left(\cdot; \{P_u, \delta_k^{(j)}, W_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\}_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N}[J] \\ k \in \mathbb{N}[K] \\ \ell \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]}} \right) : P_u \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{tri}}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. W_{k,\ell}^{(j)} \in \Omega_{\ell}, \delta_k^{(j)} \in \Omega_{L_c+1} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4 (Generalization Error Bound for DR-CG-Net). *Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ be a training dataset where each $(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i)$ is given by (1) and define $y_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2$. If Assumption 1 holds then with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, for all $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(3)}$, the generalization error of DR-CG-Net is bounded as in Theorem 1 with $\tau = 1/\sqrt{n}$, $\dim(\mathcal{P}) = 2n - 1$, $c = c_{\max}/\sqrt{n}$, $D = L_c + 1$,*

$$(\alpha_d, \omega_d) = \begin{cases} (f_{d-1} f_d k_d^2, w_d) & d = 1, 2, \dots, L_c \\ (1, \delta) & d = L_c + 1, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$$\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = r_1^J, \quad \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} = r_2 \frac{1 - r_1^J}{1 - r_1}, \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} = r_1^{J-j} \begin{cases} \left(\sqrt{n} z_{\infty} \prod_{\ell \neq d}^{L_c} w_{\ell} \right) & d = 1, 2, \dots, L_c \\ \xi & d = L_c + 1 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= 1 + \delta (z_{\infty} p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_2 \|A\|_{\infty})^2 + \prod_{\ell=1}^{L_c} w_{\ell} \\ r_2 &= \delta y_{\max} \|A\|_2 (1 + z_{\infty}^2 p_{\max} \|A\|_2 (\|A\|_2 + \|A\|_{\infty})). \end{aligned}$$

Ignoring constants, the GEB of DR-CG-Net scales as in the following Corollary.

Corollary 5. *The GEB for DR-CG-Net scales as*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})| &\lesssim K J r_f(L_c) \sqrt{\frac{\ln(n)}{n N_s}} + \\ &(\sqrt{n} + K J (1 + r_f(L_c))) \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K J L_c) + K J (r + \ln(1 + \prod_{\ell=1}^{L_c} w_{\ell}))}{n N_s}} \end{aligned}$$

for $r_f(L_c) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_c} \sqrt{f_{\ell-1} f_{\ell} k_{\ell}^2}$ and r given in (11).

Furthermore, bounding each w_{ℓ} , f_{ℓ} , and k_{ℓ} respectively by the maximums $w_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_c} w_{\ell}$, $f_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_c} f_{\ell}$, and $k_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_c} k_{\ell}$ and noting that $y_{\max} \lesssim \sqrt{m}$, $\|A\|_2 \lesssim n\sqrt{m}$, and $\|A\|_{\infty} \lesssim n$ then the GEB of DR-CG-Net scales at most as

$$|\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}})| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{(K J L_c)^3 (\ln(m) + \ln(n))}{N_s}}.$$

Observation: The CG-Net network size is $\approx KJ$ and DR-CG-Net network size is $\approx K J L_c$. Thus, the GEB of CG-Net further simplifies to $|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}| \lesssim n \sqrt{\frac{(\text{Network Size})^3 (\ln(m) + \ln(n))}{N_s}}$ while the GEB of DR-CG-Net further simplifies to $|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{(\text{Network Size})^3 (\ln(m) + \ln(n))}{N_s}}$. Hence, constraining CG-Net and DR-CG-Net to an equivalent network size, the discrepancy in the GEBs is only the signal dimension where CG-Net scales as $\mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{\ln(n)})$ and DR-CG-Net scales as $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ln(n)})$. Therefore, DR-CG-Net produces a tighter GEB, which is supported by the numerical experiments of [5, 6] that show DR-CG-Net produces test reconstructions of superior quality as compared to those produced by CG-Net.

IV. LIPSCHITZ PROPERTY OF G-CG-NET

In this section, we show that G-CG-Net is Lipschitz w.r.t. its parameters Θ in (3). This result is a cornerstone of proving Theorem 1 and is dependent on a Lipschitz and bounded property of the Tikhonov solution along with Assumption 3.

A. Lipschitz of Complete Scale Variable Mappings

For notation we write $\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}$ as the complete scale variable mapping consisting of J scale variable updates. That is $\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)} = Z_k^{(J)} \circ \dots \circ Z_k^{(1)}$.

Proposition 6. *Let Assumption 3 hold. Then the complete scale variable mapping $\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})$, which is parameterized by some $\Theta_k^{(J)} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,1}^{(j)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,D}^{(j)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}[J]}$, satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \Theta_k^{(J)}) - \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\Theta}_k^{(J)})\|_2 &\leq \hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ &+ \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \end{aligned}$$

for $\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = \prod_{j=1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j-1)}$, $\hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} = \sum_{j=1}^J r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)}$, and $\hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)}$.

Proof. Using induction on J , the base case, $J = 1$, holds by Assumption 3 where we set $\prod_{j=J+1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j)} = 1$. Let the induction hypothesis hold for fixed $J > 1$. Using Assumption 3, the induction hypothesis, and that \mathcal{P}_{0,z_∞} is 1-Lipschitz

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J+1)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \Theta_k^{(J+1)}) - \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J+1)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\Theta}_k^{(J+1)})\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \mathcal{P}_{0,z_\infty}(g_k^{(J+1)}(\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \Theta_k^{(J)}), \mathbf{u}_1; \vartheta_k^{(J+1)})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathcal{P}_{0,z_\infty}(g_k^{(J+1)}(\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\Theta}_k^{(J)}), \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\vartheta}_k^{(J+1)})) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq r_{k,1}^{(J)} \|\mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \Theta_k^{(J)}) - \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{\Theta}_k^{(J)})\|_2 \\ &\quad + r_{k,2}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 + \sum_{d=1}^D r_{k,d,3}^{(J)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(J+1)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(J+1)}\|_{(d)} \\ &\leq r_{k,1}^{(J)} \left(\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + r_{k,1}^{(J)} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} + r_{k,2}^{(J)} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{d=1}^D r_{k,d,3}^{(J)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(J+1)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(J+1)}\|_{(d)}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

First note $r_{k,1}^{(J)} \hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = r_{k,1}^{(J)} \prod_{j=1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = \prod_{j=1}^{J+1} r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = \hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J+1)}$.

Second note

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k,1}^{(J)} \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} + r_{k,2}^{(J)} &= r_{k,1}^{(J)} \sum_{j=1}^J r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} + r_{k,2}^{(J)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{J+1} r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^J r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} = \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J+1)} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $r_{k,1}^{(J)} \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} = \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J+1)}$ and $r_{k,d,3}^{(J)} = \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(J+1,J+1)}$.

Combining these two notes with (14) gives the desired induction result. \square

B. Properties of the Tikhonov Solution

Recall, for square matrix, M , the spectral norm, $\|M\|_2$, is the largest absolute eigenvalue of the matrix. First, we provide a few lemmas necessary to derive a Lipschitz condition for the Tikhonov solution.

Lemma 7. *For any invertible symmetric matrix P and scale variable \mathbf{z} it holds that $\|(A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|P\|_2$.*

Proof. Let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P^{-1}$, $0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \dots \leq \gamma_n$ be the eigenvalues of $A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}}$, and $0 < \kappa_1 \leq \dots \leq \kappa_n$ the eigenvalues of P . Note these eigenvalues are all non-negative as $A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}}$, P , and $A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P^{-1}$ are real, symmetric matrices. Then $0 < \lambda_n^{-1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_1^{-1}$ are the eigenvalues of $(A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P^{-1})^{-1}$ and $0 < \kappa_n^{-1} \leq \dots \leq \kappa_1^{-1}$ are the eigenvalues of P^{-1} . From Weyl's inequality

$$\gamma_1 + \kappa_n^{-1} \leq \lambda_1$$

and thus

$$\|(A_{\mathbf{z}}^T A_{\mathbf{z}} + P^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 = \lambda_1^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_1 + \kappa_n^{-1}} \leq \kappa_n = \|P\|_2. \quad \square$$

Lemma 8. *Let \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 satisfy $\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$. Then*

$$\|A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_2} - A_{\mathbf{z}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1}\|_2 \leq 2z_\infty \|A\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty.$$

Proof. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_2} - A_{\mathbf{z}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1}\|_2 \\ &= \|A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_2} - A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1} + A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1} - A_{\mathbf{z}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T (A_{\mathbf{z}_2} - A_{\mathbf{z}_1})\|_2 + \|(A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T - A_{\mathbf{z}_1}^T) A_{\mathbf{z}_1}\|_2 \\ &\leq (\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty) \|A^T A\|_2 \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2z_\infty \|A\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 9. *For any invertible matrices P and \tilde{P}*

$$\|\tilde{P}^{-1} - P^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|P^{-1}\|_2 \|\tilde{P}^{-1}\|_2 \|P - \tilde{P}\|_2.$$

Proof. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{P}^{-1} - P^{-1}\|_2 &= \|\tilde{P}^{-1} (P - \tilde{P}) P^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|P^{-1}\|_2 \|\tilde{P}^{-1}\|_2 \|P - \tilde{P}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Next, we bound the spectral norm on the difference of two invertible portions of the Tikhonov solution. For an invertible matrix, M , recall that the condition number of M is

$$\text{Cond}(M) = \|M\|_2 \|M^{-1}\|_2.$$

Corollary 10. *For any invertible symmetric matrices P and \tilde{P} and any \mathbf{z}_1 and \mathbf{z}_2 satisfying $\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(A_{\mathbf{z}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} - (A_{\mathbf{z}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{z}_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq 2z_\infty \|A\|_2^2 \|P\|_2 \|\tilde{P}\|_2 \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \text{Cond}(P) \text{Cond}(\tilde{P}) \|P - \tilde{P}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using Lemma 9 and then Lemma 7 note

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1} \|_2 \\ & \leq \|P\|_2 \|\tilde{P}\|_2 \|A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1} - A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} - P^{-1}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, using Lemma 8 and Lemma 9 observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1} - A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} - P^{-1}\|_2 \\ & \leq \|A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} - A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1}\|_2 + \|\tilde{P}^{-1} - P^{-1}\|_2 \\ & \leq 2z_\infty \|A\|_2^2 \|z_1 - z_2\|_\infty + \|P^{-1}\|_2 \|\tilde{P}^{-1} - P^{-1}\|_2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now, we prove the Tikhonov solution is Lipschitz.

Proposition 11. *Let z_1 and z_2 satisfy $\|z_1\|_\infty, \|z_2\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$. Then the Tikhonov solution \mathcal{T}_y , which is parameterized by a SPD matrix P , satisfies*

$$\|\mathcal{T}_y(z_1; P) - \mathcal{T}_y(z_2; \tilde{P})\|_2 \leq c_1(\mathbf{y}) \|z_1 - z_2\|_\infty + c_2(\mathbf{y}) \|P - \tilde{P}\|_2$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathbf{y}) &= \|P\|_2 \|A\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \left(1 + 2z_\infty^2 \|\tilde{P}\|_2 \|A\|_2^2\right) \\ c_2(\mathbf{y}) &= z_\infty \|A\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \text{Cond}(P) \text{Cond}(\tilde{P}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{T}_y(z_1; P) - \mathcal{T}_y(z_2; \tilde{P})\|_2 \\ &= \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_1}^T \mathbf{y} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_2}^T \mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &= \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_1}^T \mathbf{y} - (A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_2}^T \mathbf{y} \\ & \quad + (A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_2}^T \mathbf{y} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1} A_{z_2}^T \mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &= \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} (A_{z_1}^T - A_{z_2}^T) \mathbf{y} \\ & \quad + \left[(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1} \right] A_{z_2}^T \mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \|A_{z_1}^T - A_{z_2}^T\|_2 + \\ & z_\infty \|A\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|P\|_2 \|A\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \|z_1 - z_2\|_\infty + \\ & z_\infty \|A\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \|(A_{z_1}^T A_{z_1} + P^{-1})^{-1} - (A_{z_2}^T A_{z_2} + \tilde{P}^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Lemma 7. Combining the above inequality with Corollary 10 produces the desired result. \square

Lastly, we derive a bound on the Tikhonov solution

Proposition 12. *For any SPD matrix P , any z , \mathbf{y} , and $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ it holds that $\|\mathcal{T}_y(z; P)\|_p \leq \|z\|_\infty \|P\|_2 \|A\|_p \|\mathbf{y}\|_p$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 7 observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_y(z; P)\|_p &= \|(A_z^T A_z + P^{-1})^{-1} A_z^T \mathbf{y}\|_p \\ &\leq \|(A_z^T A_z + P^{-1})^{-1}\|_p \|\text{Diag}(z)\|_p \|A\|_p \|\mathbf{y}\|_p \\ &\leq \|(A_z^T A_z + P^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 \|\text{Diag}(z)\|_2 \|A\|_p \|\mathbf{y}\|_p \\ &\leq \|z\|_\infty \|P\|_2 \|A\|_p \|\mathbf{y}\|_p. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

C. Lipschitz Property of Network Outputs

In this section, we define ζ_k and $\tilde{\zeta}_k$ as the G-CG-Net scale variable estimates on iteration k when G-CG-Net is parameterized by Θ or $\tilde{\Theta}$, from (3), respectively. That is, ζ_k is recursively defined by $\zeta_k = \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\zeta_{k-1}, \mathcal{T}_y(\zeta_{k-1}; P_u); \Theta_k^{(J)})$

First, we show a Lipschitz property of the final scale variable estimate in the following proposition.

Proposition 13. *If Assumption 3 holds then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_K - \tilde{\zeta}_K\|_2 &\leq \hat{c}_1^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}) \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}) \|\theta_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \end{aligned}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c}_1^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}) &= c_2(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\ \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}) &= \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)}$, $\hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)}$, and $\hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)}$ are given in Proposition 6 and $c_1(\mathbf{y})$ and $c_2(\mathbf{y})$ are given in Proposition 11.

Proof. Combining Proposition 6 and 11 it holds for any k

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\zeta_k - \tilde{\zeta}_k\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\zeta_{k-1}, \mathcal{T}_y(\zeta_{k-1}; P_u); \Theta_k^{(J)}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathcal{Z}_k^{(J)}(\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}, \mathcal{T}_y(\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}; \tilde{P}_u); \tilde{\Theta}_k^{(J)}) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq (\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \|\zeta_{k-1} - \tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}\|_2 + \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} \|\theta_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)}. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use induction on K . The base case $K = 1$ holds by (15) as $\zeta_0 = \tilde{\zeta}_0 \equiv \mathcal{Z}_0$ and $\prod_{\ell=K+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) = 1$. Assume the induction hypothesis holds for fixed $K - 1$ where $K > 2$. By (15) and the induction hypothesis observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_K - \tilde{\zeta}_K\|_2 &\leq (\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \|\zeta_{K-1} - \tilde{\zeta}_{K-1}\|_2 \\ & \quad + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{r}_{K,d,3}^{(j,J)} \|\theta_{K,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{K,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \\ &\leq \left[(\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \hat{c}_1^{(K-1,J)}(\mathbf{y}) + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \right] \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 \\ & \quad + (\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K-1,J)}(\mathbf{y}) \|\theta_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)} \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \hat{r}_{K,d,3}^{(j,J)} \|\theta_{K,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{K,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)}. \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

First note,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \hat{c}_1^{(K-1,J)}(\mathbf{y}) + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \\
&= (\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) c_2(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^{K-1} (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\
&\quad + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \\
&= c_2(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\
&\quad + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_2(\mathbf{y}) \prod_{\ell=K+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\
&= c_2(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} \prod_{\ell=k+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\
&= \hat{c}_1^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, note

$$(\hat{r}_{K,1}^{(J)} + \hat{r}_{K,2}^{(J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \hat{c}_1^{(K-1,J)}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{r}_{K,d,3}^{(j,J)} &= \hat{r}_{K,d,3}^{(j,J)} \prod_{\ell=K+1}^K (\hat{r}_{\ell,1}^{(j,J)} + \hat{r}_{\ell,2}^{(j,J)} c_1(\mathbf{y})) \\
&= \hat{c}_{K,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two notes with (16) produces the desired result. \square

Finally, we show that G-CG-Net estimates, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \Theta)$, are Lipschitz w.r.t. the G-CG-Net parameters.

Theorem 14. *Let Assumption 3 hold. Then for any parameterizations Θ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ of G-CG-Net, the G-CG-Net estimates satisfy the following Lipschitz property:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \Theta) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \tilde{\Theta})\|_2 \\
& \leq \kappa(\mathbf{y}) \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}(\mathbf{y}) \|\theta_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_d
\end{aligned}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa(\mathbf{y}) &= z_\infty (c_1(\mathbf{y}) + \|P_u\|_2 \|A\|_\infty \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty) \hat{c}_1^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y}) + z_\infty c_2(\mathbf{y}) \\
\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}(\mathbf{y}) &= z_\infty (c_1(\mathbf{y}) + \|P_u\|_2 \|A\|_\infty \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty) \hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{c}_1^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y})$, $\hat{c}_{k,j,d,2}^{(K,J)}(\mathbf{y})$ are given in Proposition 13 and $c_1(\mathbf{y})$, $c_2(\mathbf{y})$ are given in Proposition 11.

Proof. As $\rho_{c_{\max}}$ is 1-Lipschitz observe

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \Theta) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{y}; \tilde{\Theta})\|_2 \\
&= \|\rho_{c_{\max}}(\zeta_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\zeta_K; P_u)) - \rho_{c_{\max}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K; \tilde{P}_u))\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \zeta_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\zeta_K; P_u) - \tilde{\zeta}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K; P_u) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \tilde{\zeta}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K; P_u) - \tilde{\zeta}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K; \tilde{P}_u) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\zeta_K; P_u)\|_\infty \|\zeta_K - \tilde{\zeta}_K\|_2 \\
&\quad + z_\infty \|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\zeta_K; P_u) - \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\zeta}_K; \tilde{P}_u)\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 11, 12, and 13 produces the final result. \square

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

For a class of compound Gaussian prior based DNNs that solve linear inverse problems, a generalization error bound was derived. Subsequently, this generalization error bound was applied to two realizations, namely, CG-Net and DR-CG-Net, showing bounds for these cases. The developed generalization error bound was produced by bounding the Rademacher complexity of the network hypothesis class by Dudley's inequality, which is further bounded using a Lipschitz property to estimate covering numbers of the network hypothesis class. A key contribution was in showing the parameters of compound Gaussian DNNs satisfy a Lipschitz condition under reasonable assumptions thereby allowing us to produce generalization bounds for CG-based DNNs.

While the derived generalization error shows with sufficient training data, roughly scaling quadratically in signal dimension and cubically in network size, small generalization guarantees can be met, it still remains to be shown that such a property is true for small training datasets. This is desirable as CG-Net and DR-CG-Net significantly outperform comparative methods in image estimation problems when trained only on a small dataset. Likely, aspects of the iterative algorithm, in particular the Tikhonov solution, would need to be further leveraged to provide insight into a small training generalization error bound. Furthermore, PAC-Bayes generalization bounds [28] for CG-based DNNs, extending the derived bounds in this paper, is another open question that can provide greater insights into the generalization for low training scenarios.

VI. APPENDIX: PRELIMINARIES

A. Rademacher Complexity

Recall a Rademacher variable is a discrete random variable γ taking values ± 1 with equal probability.

Definition 15. *Let \mathcal{G} be a set of functions $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The **empirical Rademacher complexity** is*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \gamma_i g(\mathbf{x}_i) \right]$$

for $\gamma = [\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{N_s}]$ a vector of i.i.d. Rademacher variables.

For a DNN with hypothesis space \mathcal{H} and using loss function L , we are interested in the Rademacher complexity of the real-valued set of functions $\mathcal{G} = L \circ \mathcal{H} = \{L \circ h : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$.

Theorem 16 ([29], Theorem 26.5). *Let \mathcal{H} be a set of functions, $\mathcal{S} = \{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ a training set drawn i.i.d. from \mathcal{D} , and L a real-valued loss function satisfying $|L(h(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{c})| \leq c$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{c}) \sim \mathcal{D}$. Then, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ we have for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$*

$$\mathcal{L}(h) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(h) + 2\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}(L \circ \mathcal{H}) + 4c\sqrt{2\ln(4/\varepsilon)/N_s}.$$

Next, we provide a contraction lemma allowing us to ignore the loss function and only consider the hypothesis class.

Lemma 17 ([30], Corollary 4). *Let \mathcal{H} be a set of functions $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Then for any τ -Lipschitz functions $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \gamma_i g_i \circ h(\mathbf{x}_i) \right] \leq \sqrt{2\tau} \mathbb{E}_\Gamma \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^d \gamma_{ik} h_k(\mathbf{x}_i) \right]$$

where $\gamma = [\gamma_i]_{i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]}$ and $\Gamma = [\gamma_{ik}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s], k \in \mathbb{N}[d]}$ are collections of i.i.d. Rademacher variables.

B. Dudley's Inequality

To define Dudley's inequality, which is employed to obtain a bound on $\mathcal{R}_S(L \circ \mathcal{H})$ in Theorem 16, we require some terminology from [31, 32]. First, for a metric space (M, d) , let $C_M(\epsilon) \subseteq M$ denote an ϵ -covering of M . That is, for every $x \in M$ there exists a $c \in C_M(\epsilon)$ such that $d(x, c) \leq \epsilon$. Second, let $\mathcal{N}(M, d, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the ϵ -covering number of M . That is, $\mathcal{N}(M, d, \epsilon)$ is the minimum cardinality of all $C_M(\epsilon)$ or, equivalently, the minimum number of ϵ radius balls as measured by d , to contain M . Third, a real-valued stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \in T}$ is called a **subgaussian process** if $\mathbb{E}(X_t) = 0$ and for all $s \in T, t \in T$ and $\theta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta(X_s - X_t))] \leq \exp\left(\theta^2 \tilde{d}(X_s, X_t)^2 / 2\right)$$

where $\tilde{d}(X_s, X_t) = (\mathbb{E}|X_s - X_t|^2)^{1/2}$ is a pseudo-metric. Fourth, the radius of T is $\Delta(T) = \sup_{t \in T} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X_t|^2}$.

Lemma 18 (Dudley's Inequality, [31], Theorem 8.23 [32]). *For a subgaussian stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \in T}$ with pseudo-metric \tilde{d}*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in T} X_t \right) \leq 4\sqrt{2} \int_0^{\Delta(T)/2} \sqrt{\ln(\mathcal{N}(T, \tilde{d}, \epsilon))} d\epsilon.$$

C. Rademacher Process

Let V be a vector space and $\mathcal{X} = V^T = \{f : T \rightarrow V\}$. A **Rademacher process**, $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$, is a stochastic process of the form $Y_t = \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k x_k(t)$ where $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\gamma = [\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]$ are i.i.d. Rademacher variables. As $\mathbb{E}(\gamma_k) = 0$, $\gamma_k^2 = 1$, and γ_k, γ_j are independent for $k \neq j$, then for real-valued Rademacher processes, i.e. $V = \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\gamma |Y_t|^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\gamma (\gamma_k^2 x_k(t)^2) + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^n \mathbb{E}_\gamma (\gamma_j \gamma_k x_j(t) x_k(t)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n x_k(t)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{d}(Y_s, Y_t)^2 = \mathbb{E}_\gamma |Y_s - Y_t|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n (x_k(s) - x_k(t))^2. \quad (18)$$

Finally, we remark that real-valued Rademacher processes are subgaussian [32] and thus satisfy Lemma 18.

D. Covering Number Bounds

First, a covering number bound on a subset of the unit ball.

Lemma 19 ([31], Proposition C.3 [32]). *For any norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n and subset $U \subseteq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1\}$ it holds*

$$\mathcal{N}(U, \|\cdot\|, \epsilon) \leq (1 + 2/\epsilon)^n.$$

Second, a covering number bound on a space of parametric functions satisfying a Lipschitz criterion.

Lemma 20. *Let $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$ be a non-empty, bounded, and normed vector space. Define $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$ and let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ be any norm on \mathcal{F} . Assume that for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$*

$$\|f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\tilde{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \Gamma(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\|_\Theta$$

and let $\Gamma = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(\mathbf{x})$. Then

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}, \epsilon) \leq \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta, \epsilon/\Gamma).$$

Proof. Let C_Θ be any ϵ/Γ -covering of Θ and $C_{\mathcal{F}} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in C_\Theta\}$. Note $|C_{\mathcal{F}}| \leq |C_\Theta|$ as, at most, every $\theta \in C_\Theta$ uniquely defines a function $f_\theta \in C_{\mathcal{F}}$. Further, for any $f_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists a $c \in C_\Theta$ such that $\|\theta - c\| \leq \epsilon/\Gamma$. Thus $f_c \in C_{\mathcal{F}}$ satisfies

$$\|f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - f_c(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \Gamma(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta - c\|_\Theta \leq \Gamma \|\theta - c\|_\Theta \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence, every ϵ/Γ -covering of Θ generates an ϵ -covering of \mathcal{F} . Take C_Θ to be the minimal cardinality ϵ/Γ -covering of Θ , then $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}, \epsilon) \leq |C_{\mathcal{F}}| = |C_\Theta| = \mathcal{N}(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta, \epsilon/\Gamma)$. \square

Finally, we generalize Lemma 20 to a class of functions parameterized by a sequence of parameters.

Corollary 21. *Let $(\Theta_i, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta_i})$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}[n]$, be a sequence of non-empty, bounded, and normed vector spaces. Define $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \mid \theta_i \in \Theta_i\}$ and let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ be a norm on \mathcal{F} . Assume that*

$$\|f_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_n}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i\|_{\Theta_i}$$

and let $\Gamma_i = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma_i(\mathbf{x})$. Then

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}, \epsilon) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}(\Theta_i, \|\cdot\|_{\Theta_i}, \epsilon/(n\Gamma_i)).$$

Proof. Let (S_k, d_k) , for $k \in \mathbb{N}[n]$, be metric spaces and define the product metric space (\mathcal{S}, d) where $\mathcal{S} := S_1 \times \dots \times S_n$ and $d(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{c}) := \sum_{k=1}^n a_k d_k(s_k, c_k)$ for $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{S}$ and fixed $a_k \in (0, \infty)$. Let C_k be any $\epsilon/(a_k n)$ -covering of S_k and define $\mathcal{C} := C_1 \times \dots \times C_n$. Then for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists a $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $d(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{c}) = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k d_k(s_k, c_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \epsilon/(na_k) = \epsilon$, which implies that \mathcal{C} is an ϵ -covering of \mathcal{S} . Take every C_k to be the minimal cardinality $\epsilon/(a_k n)$ -covering of S_k then

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}, d, \epsilon) \leq |\mathcal{C}| = \prod_{k=1}^n |C_k| = \prod_{k=1}^n \mathcal{N}\left(S_k, d_k, \frac{\epsilon}{a_k n}\right). \quad (19)$$

Next, let $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\Theta)$ be the normed vector space where $\Theta = \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_n$ and for $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \in \Theta$ we define

$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_{\Theta} = \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_{\vartheta_i}$. Then for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Theta$ where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_n)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_n}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathcal{F}} \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i\|_{\vartheta_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \|\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i\|_{\vartheta_i} = \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_{\Theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this Lipschitz property with Lemma 20 and then applying (19) produces the covering number bound. \square

VII. APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proving Theorem 1 consists of the following steps: **Step (1)**, we establish a Rademacher process generated by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$. **Step (2)**, using Lemma 17, we express the Rademacher complexity of $L \circ \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$ as the expected supremum of Step (1). **Step (3)**, invoking Dudley's inequality we bound Step (2) by an integral of some covering numbers. **Step (4)**, we use Theorem 14 and Corollary 21 to bound the covering numbers from Dudley's inequality by covering numbers of the G-CG-Net parameter spaces. **Step (5)**, we use Lemma 19 to bound the covering numbers of the G-CG-Net parameter spaces. **Step (6)**, with the Step (5) bounds, we bound Dudley's inequality by evaluable integrals where evaluation, simplification, and using Theorem 16 produces the desired GEB for G-CG-Net.

Proof of Theorem 1. Step (1). Let $\bar{Y} := [\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{N_s}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times N_s}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)} & := \{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}} = [\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{N_s})] : \hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}\} \\ & = \left\{ \hat{\mathbf{c}} \left(\bar{Y}; \left\{ P, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} \right\}_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N}[J] \\ k \in \mathbb{N}[K] \\ d \in \mathbb{N}[D]}} \right) : P \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \Omega_d \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) := [\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1; \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{N_s}; \boldsymbol{\Theta})] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_s}$. Now, define the Rademacher process $(X_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}})_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}}$ as

$$X_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}} := \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_{ik} [M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}]_{ki} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_{ik} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_k(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i) \quad (20)$$

for Rademacher variables $\Gamma = [\gamma_{ik}]_{i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s], k \in \mathbb{N}[n]}$.

Step (2). Using Lemma 17 with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$ and each $g_i = L$, for L a τ -Lipschitz loss function of G-CG-Net, e.g. SSIM loss or mean-absolute error, satisfying Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}(L \circ \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}) & \leq \sqrt{2\tau} \mathbb{E}_{\Gamma} \left[\sup_{\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}} \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_{ik} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_k(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i) \right] \\ & = \frac{\sqrt{2\tau}}{N_s} \mathbb{E}_{\Gamma} \left(\sup_{\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}} X_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}} \right). \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

Step (3). By equation (18), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(X_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1}}, X_{M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_2}})^2 & = \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^n ([M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1}]_{ki} - [M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_2}]_{ki})^2 \\ & = \|M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1} - M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}_2}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $\|\cdot\|_F$ the Frobenius norm. Observe for any $M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}$

$$\|M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}\|_F = \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta})\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \boldsymbol{\Theta})\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{N_s} c_{\text{max}}$$

where we used that any output from G-CG-Net is bounded, in Euclidean norm, by c_{max} . Hence, by equation (17)

$$\Delta(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}) = \sup_{\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}} \|M_{\hat{\mathbf{c}}}\|_F \leq \sqrt{N_s} c_{\text{max}}.$$

Therefore, using Dudley's Inequality in Lemma 18 and (21)

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}(L \circ \mathcal{H}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}) \leq \frac{8\tau}{N_s} \int_0^{\sqrt{N_s} c_{\text{max}}} \sqrt{\ln \left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon) \right)} d\epsilon. \quad (22)$$

Step (4). By Theorem 14 for any $i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})\|_2 \\ & \leq \kappa \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \kappa_{k,d}^{(j)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)}. \end{aligned}$$

As κ and $\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}$, given respectively in (8) and (9), are independent of $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$ then

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})\|_F \leq \sqrt{N_s} \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})\|_2$$

for any $i \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \hat{\mathbf{c}}(\bar{Y}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})\|_F \leq \sqrt{N_s} \kappa \|P_u - \tilde{P}_u\|_2 + \\ & \sqrt{N_s} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \kappa_{k,d}^{(j)} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,d}^{(j)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_{(d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from Corollary 21

$$\begin{aligned} & \ln \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon \right) \right) \\ & \leq \ln \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\mathcal{P}, \|\cdot\|_2, \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{N_s} \kappa (KJD + 1)} \right) \right) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \ln \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\Omega_d, \|\cdot\|_{(d)}, \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{N_s} \kappa_{k,d}^{(j)} (KJD + 1)} \right) \right). \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

Step (5). As \mathcal{P} contains symmetric $n \times n$ matrices, then for $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}$ only $n(n+1)/2$ entries are required to uniquely define a matrix and $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{\text{full}}) = n(n+1)/2$. Similarly, $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{\text{tri}}) = 2n-1$, $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{\text{diag}}) = n$, and $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{\text{const}}) = 1$. Furthermore, as $\mathcal{P}/p_{\text{max}} = \{P/p_{\text{max}} : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ is contained in the unit $\|\cdot\|_2$ ball, then, using Lemma 19, observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}, \|\cdot\|_2, \epsilon) & = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}/p_{\text{max}}, \|\cdot\|_2, \epsilon/p_{\text{max}}) \\ & \leq (1 + 2p_{\text{max}}/\epsilon)^{\dim(\mathcal{P})}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as Ω_d/ω_d is contained in the unit $\|\cdot\|_{(d)}$ ball, observe

$$\mathcal{N}(\Omega_d, \|\cdot\|_{(d)}, \epsilon) \leq (1 + 2\omega_d/\epsilon)^{\alpha_d}.$$

Combining these two observations with (23) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \ln \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon \right) \right) \\ & \leq \dim(\mathcal{P}) \ln \left(1 + \frac{2p_{\text{max}} \sqrt{N_s} \kappa (KJD + 1)}{\epsilon} \right) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \alpha_d \ln \left(1 + \frac{2\omega_d \sqrt{N_s} \kappa_{k,d}^{(j)} (KJD + 1)}{\epsilon} \right). \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

Step (6). For any $\nu, \beta > 0$, note that from [15]

$$\int_0^\beta \sqrt{\ln(1 + \nu/\epsilon)} d\epsilon \leq \beta \sqrt{\ln(e(1 + \nu/\beta))}. \quad (25)$$

Combining (24), (25), and using subadditivity of square roots

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\beta \sqrt{\ln\left(\mathcal{N}\left(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CG}}^{(1)}, \|\cdot\|_F, \epsilon\right)\right)} d\epsilon \\ & \leq \sqrt{\dim(\mathcal{P})} \int_0^\beta \sqrt{\ln\left(1 + \frac{2p_{\max}\sqrt{N_s}\kappa(KJD+1)}{\epsilon}\right)} d\epsilon \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \sqrt{\alpha_d} \int_0^\beta \sqrt{\ln\left(1 + \frac{2\omega_d\sqrt{N_s}\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}(KJD+1)}{\epsilon}\right)} d\epsilon \\ & \leq \sqrt{\dim(\mathcal{P})}\beta \sqrt{\ln\left(e\left(1 + \frac{2p_{\max}\sqrt{N_s}\kappa(KJD+1)}{\beta}\right)\right)} \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{d=1}^D \sqrt{\alpha_d}\beta \sqrt{\ln\left(e\left(1 + \frac{2\omega_d\sqrt{N_s}\kappa_{k,d}^{(j)}(KJD+1)}{\beta}\right)\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Combining (26) and (22), for $\beta = \sqrt{N_s}c_{\max}/2$, with Theorem 16 produces the desired generalization error bound. \square

VIII. APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 2

First, we require a Lipschitz condition on the gradient of the data fidelity term in (2) that depends on Proposition 12.

Lemma 22. For every $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$ and $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}_i; P_i)$ where $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{y}) - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{y})\|_2 \\ & \leq (z_\infty p_{\max}\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\|A\|_2\|A\|_\infty)^2\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ & + \|\mathbf{y}\|_2\|A\|_2(1 + z_\infty^2 p_{\max}\|A\|_2(\|A\|_2 + \|A\|_\infty))\|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{y}) - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{y})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + \|(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T)\mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ & \leq \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + \|A\|_2\|\mathbf{y}\|_2\|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By Proposition 12 and the triangle inequality note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ & = \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_1 + A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_1 \\ & \quad + A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_1 - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ & \leq z_\infty^2 p_{\max}\|A\|_2^2\|\mathbf{y}\|_2(\|A\|_2 + \|A\|_\infty)\|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 \\ & \quad + (z_\infty p_{\max}\|A\|_2\|A\|_\infty\|\mathbf{y}\|_2)^2\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Combining (27) and (28) produces the desired result. \square

As an overview, proving Theorem 2 consists of the following steps: First, we show Assumption 2 holds for the SSIM loss function used in CG-Net. Second, we invoke Lemma 22 to show that the Lipschitz condition of Assumption 3 holds for each CG-Net scale-variable-descent update in (4). Finally, we apply Theorem 1 to produce Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. As SSIM returns a value in $[-1, 1]$ then the SSIM loss function is bounded by 2. From [19], SSIM is

a differentiable function and thus continuous. As the CG-Net outputs are bounded, in the $\|\cdot\|_2$ ball of radius c_{\max} , then the gradient of the SSIM loss function is bounded. Hence, by the mean value theorem [33], there exists a Lipschitz constant for the SSIM loss function, on the $\|\cdot\|_2$ ball of radius c_{\max} , which we denote by τ . Therefore, Assumption 2 holds.

Next, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$ and $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}_p}(\mathbf{z}_i; P_i)$ for some $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{const}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]$. As $\mathcal{P}_{a,b}$ is 1-Lipschitz, then the CG-Net scale-variable-update method, $g_k^{(j)}$, in (4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; B_k^{(j)}, \mu_k^{(j)}) - g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \tilde{B}_k^{(j)}, \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ & = \left\| \mathcal{P}_{a,b}(\mathbf{z}_1 - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)}))) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathcal{P}_{a,b}(\mathbf{z}_2 - \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}))) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{z}_1 - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)}))\|_2 \\ & \quad - \|\mathbf{z}_2 + \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}))\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + \left\| \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)})) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})) \right\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where in the final line we used the triangle inequality. First, as ρ_ξ is 1-Lipschitz and bounded by ξ , note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)})) - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)}))\|_2 \\ & = \left\| \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)})) - \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \tilde{B}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})) - B_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq p_{\max}\|\rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)})) - \rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)}))\|_2 \\ & \quad + \|\rho_\xi(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)}))\|_2 \|\tilde{B}_k^{(j)} - B_k^{(j)}\|_2 \\ & \leq p_{\max}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ & \quad + \xi \|\tilde{B}_k^{(j)} - B_k^{(j)}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Second, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_2; \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} F(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{z}_1; \mu_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p) - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p)\|_2 \\ & \quad + \|\mu_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_1) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_1) - \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_2) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_2)\|_2 \\ & = \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p) - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p)\|_2 + \\ & \quad \left\| \mu_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_1) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_1) - \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_1) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_1) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_1) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_1) - \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}[h^{-1}]'(\mathbf{z}_2) \odot h^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_2) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \|A_{\mathbf{u}_1}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathbf{z}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p) - A_{\mathbf{u}_2}^T(A_{\mathbf{u}_2}\mathbf{z}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p)\|_2 \\ & \quad + h_{\max}|\mu_k^{(j)} - \tilde{\mu}_k^{(j)}| + \mu\tau_h\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Combining Lemma 22 with (31), (30), (29) and the fact that $\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_p\|_2 \leq y_{\max}$, then Assumption 3 holds specifically with $r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = r_1, r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} = r_2$ and

$$\left(\theta_{k,d}^{(j)}, r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)}, \|\cdot\|_{(d)}\right) = \begin{cases} (B_k^{(j)}, \xi, \|\cdot\|_2) & d = 1 \\ (\mu_k^{(j)}, p_{\max}h_{\max}, |\cdot|) & d = 2. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by Proposition 6, $\widehat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = \prod_{j=1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = r_1^J$,

$$\widehat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} = \sum_{j=1}^J r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} = r_2 \sum_{j=1}^J r_1^{J-j} = r_2 \frac{1-r_1^J}{1-r_1},$$

and similarly $\widehat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j,J)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} r_1^{J-j}$ is as given in (10). Therefore, applying Theorem 1 produces the GEB of CG-Net in Theorem 2. \square

IX. APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 4

We first require a bounded and Lipschitz property for fully-connected networks. Let $\mathcal{G}_t^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}) := W_t^{(i)}\mathbf{x}$, for $W_t^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{t+1} \times d_t}$, denote a fully-connected layer. For componentwise activation function σ , define a fully-connected network $\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}$ as

$$\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{G}_T^{(i)} \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{G}_{T-1}^{(i)} \circ \dots \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{G}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (32)$$

Lemma 23. *Let σ be a componentwise activation function satisfying $\|\sigma(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}$ be given as in (32). If $\|W_t^{(i)}\|_2 \leq \varpi_t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}[T]$, then*

$$\|\sigma(\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}(\mathbf{x}))\|_2 \leq \prod_{t=1}^T \varpi_t \|\mathbf{x}\|_2.$$

Proof. We use induction on T . The base case $T = 1$ holds trivially. Assume the induction hypothesis holds for fixed T where $T > 1$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\mathcal{G}^{(i,T+1)}(\mathbf{x}))\|_2 &= \|\sigma(W_{T+1}^{(i)}\sigma(\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}(\mathbf{x}))\|_2 \\ &\leq \varpi_{T+1} \|\sigma(\mathcal{G}^{(i,T)}(\mathbf{x}))\|_2 \leq \prod_{t=1}^{T+1} \varpi_t \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that fully-connected networks are Lipschitz.

Lemma 24. *In addition to the assumptions of Lemma 23, assume σ is τ -Lipschitz. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}^{(1,T)}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{G}^{(2,T)}(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_2 &\leq \tau^{T-1} \prod_{t=1}^T \varpi_t \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2 \\ &+ \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\tau^{T-t} \prod_{t'=1}^T \varpi_{t'} \|\mathbf{x}_1\|_2 \right) \|W_t^{(1)} - W_t^{(2)}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe for any t

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}_t^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{G}_t^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_2 &= \|W_t^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_1 - W_t^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_2\|_2 \\ &= \|W_t^{(1)}\mathbf{x}_1 - W_t^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_1 + W_t^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_1 - W_t^{(2)}\mathbf{x}_2\|_2 \\ &\leq \varpi_t \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|_2 \|W_t^{(1)} - W_t^{(2)}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}^{(1,t)}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{G}^{(2,t)}(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_2 &\leq \tau \varpi_t \|\mathcal{G}^{(1,t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{G}^{(2,t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_2 \\ &+ \|\sigma(\mathcal{G}^{(1,t-1)}(\mathbf{x}_1))\|_2 \|W_t^{(1)} - W_t^{(2)}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 23 and induction on T similar to that of Proposition 6 produces the desired result. \square

As an overview, proving Theorem 4 consists of the following steps: First, we show Assumption 2 holds for the mean-absolute error loss function used in DR-CG-Net. Second, we use invoke Lemma 22 and Lemma 24 to show that the Lipschitz condition of Assumption 3 holds for each DR-CG-Net scale-variable-descent update in (5). Finally, we apply Theorem 1 to produce Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. As DR-CG-Net employs the mean absolute loss function, $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_1$, for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by Hölder's and the reverse triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}) - L(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x})| &\leq L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2 \leq \frac{c_{\max}}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Assumption 2 holds for $c = c_{\max}/\sqrt{n}$ and $\tau = 1/\sqrt{n}$.

Next, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|_\infty \leq z_\infty$ and $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}_p}(\mathbf{z}_i; P_i)$ for some $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{tri}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}[N_s]$. Let $\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_k^{(j)}$ be convolutional subnetworks of DR-CG-Net that are parameterized by $\{W_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]}$ and $\{\widetilde{W}_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]}$, respectively. The DR-CG-Net scale-variable-update method, $g_k^{(j)}$, in (5) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \{\delta_k^{(j)}, W_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - g_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \{\widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)}, \widetilde{W}_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \delta_k^{(j)}) + \mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \|v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \delta_k^{(j)}) - v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1) - \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2)\|_2. \quad (33) \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathbf{d}_i = A_{\mathbf{u}_i}^T (A_{\mathbf{u}_i} \mathbf{z}_i - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Using (6) note

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \delta_k^{(j)}) - v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)})\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 + \|\delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_1) - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2)\|_2. \quad (34) \end{aligned}$$

As ρ_ξ is 1-Lipschitz and bounded, in norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, by ξ then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_1) - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2)\|_2 \\ &= \|\delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_1) - \delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2) + \delta_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2) - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)} \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2)\|_2 \\ &\leq |\delta_k^{(j)}| \|\rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_1) - \rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2)\|_2 + \|\rho_\xi(\mathbf{d}_2)\|_2 |\delta_k^{(j)} - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)}| \\ &\leq \delta \|\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2\|_2 + \xi |\delta_k^{(j)} - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)}|. \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

Now, combining Lemma 22 with (35), (34), and the fact that $\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_p\|_2 \leq y_{\max}$ produces

$$\begin{aligned} &\|v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{u}_1; \delta_k^{(j)}) - v_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{u}_2; \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)})\|_2 \\ &\leq (1 + \delta(z_\infty p_{\max} y_{\max} \|A\|_2 \|A\|_\infty)^2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ &\quad + r_2 \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_2 + \xi |\delta_k^{(j)} - \widetilde{\delta}_k^{(j)}|. \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

As $W_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \Omega_d$ and $\widetilde{W}_{k,d}^{(j)} \in \Omega_d$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}[L_c]$, then $W_{k,d}^{(j)}$ and $\widetilde{W}_{k,d}^{(j)}$ are defined by $f_{d-1} f_d k_d^2$ parameters and satisfy $\|W_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_2 \leq w_d$ and $\|\widetilde{W}_{k,d}^{(j)}\|_2 \leq w_d$. Additionally, $\delta_k^{(j)} \in \Omega_{L_c+1}$ is a positive real number satisfying $|\delta_k^{(j)}| \leq \delta$.

Hence, the dimension of the parameter spaces, α_d , and bounds on the parameter spaces, ω_d , are given by (12).

As the ReLU activation function is 1-Lipschitz and $\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}z_\infty$ then using Lemma 24

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{V}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_1) - \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{z}_2)\|_2 &\leq \prod_{\ell=1}^{L_c} w_\ell \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|_2 \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_c} \left(\sqrt{n}z_\infty \prod_{\substack{\ell'=1 \\ \ell' \neq \ell}}^{L_c} w_{\ell'} \right) \|W_{k,\ell}^{(j)} - \tilde{W}_{k,\ell}^{(j)}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Combining (37) and (36) with (33) then Assumption 3 holds with $r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = r_1$, $r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} = r_2$, and

$$\left(\theta_{k,d}^{(j)}, r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)}, \|\cdot\|_{(d)} \right) = \begin{cases} \left(W_{k,d}^{(j)}, \sqrt{n}z_\infty \prod_{\substack{\ell=1 \\ \ell \neq d}}^{L_c} w_\ell, \|\cdot\|_2 \right) & d = 1, \dots, L_c \\ \left(\delta_{k,d}^{(j)}, \xi, |\cdot| \right) & d = L_c + 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by Proposition 6, $\hat{r}_{k,1}^{(J)} = \prod_{j=1}^J r_{k,1}^{(j-1)} = r_1^J$,

$$\hat{r}_{k,2}^{(J)} = \sum_{j=1}^J r_{k,2}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} = r_2 \sum_{j=1}^J r_1^{J-j} = r_2 \frac{1 - r_1^J}{1 - r_1},$$

and similarly $\hat{r}_{k,d,3}^{(j)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{J-1} r_{k,1}^{(\ell)} = r_{k,d,3}^{(j-1)} r_1^{J-j}$ is given as in (13). Therefore, applying Theorem 1 produces the GEB of DR-CG-Net in Theorem 4. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Gregor and Y. LeCun, "Learning fast approximations of sparse coding," in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2010, pp. 399–406.
- [2] V. Monga, Y. Li, and Y. C. Eldar, "Algorithm Unrolling: Interpretable, efficient deep learning for signal and image processing," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 18–44, Mar 2021.
- [3] J. Zhang and B. Ghanem, "ISTA-Net: Interpretable Optimization-Inspired Deep Network for Image Compressive Sensing," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 1828–1837.
- [4] J. Song, B. Chen, and J. Zhang, "Memory-Augmented Deep Unfolding Network for Compressive Sensing," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, Oct 2021, pp. 4249–4258.
- [5] C. Lyons, R. G. Raj, and M. Cheney, "A Compound Gaussian Least Squares Algorithm and Unrolled Network for Linear Inverse Problems," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 71, pp. 4303–4316, 2023.
- [6] C. Lyons, R. G. Raj, and M. Cheney, "Deep Regularized Compound Gaussian Network for Solving Linear Inverse Problems," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging*, 2024, inpress.
- [7] J. Song, B. Chen, and J. Zhang, "Deep Memory-Augmented Proximal Unrolling Network for Compressive Sensing," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 131, no. 6, pp. 1477–1496, Jun 2023.
- [8] K. H. Jin, M. T. McCann, E. Froustey, and M. Unser, "Deep Convolutional Neural Network for Inverse Problems in Imaging," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 4509–4522, 2017.
- [9] D. You, J. Xie, and J. Zhang, "ISTA-Net++: Flexible Deep Unfolding Network for Compressive Sensing," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [10] J. Xiang, Y. Dong, and Y. Yang, "FISTA-Net: Learning a Fast Iterative Shrinkage Thresholding Network for Inverse Problems in Imaging," *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1329–1339, May 2021.
- [11] T. Meinhardt, M. Moller, C. Hazirbas, and D. Cremers, "Learning Proximal Operators: Using Denoising Networks for Regularizing Inverse Imaging Problems," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 1781–1790.
- [12] S. Diamond, V. Sitzmann, F. Heide, and G. Wetzstein, "Unrolled Optimization with Deep Priors," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08041*, 2019.
- [13] C. Lyons, R. G. Raj, and M. Cheney, "CG-Net: A Compound Gaussian Prior Based Unrolled Imaging Network," in *2022 IEEE Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference*, 2022, pp. 623–629.
- [14] C. Lyons, R. G. Raj, and M. Cheney, "A Deep Compound Gaussian Regularized Unfolded Imaging Network," in *2022 56th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, 2022, pp. 940–947.
- [15] A. Behboodi, H. Rauhut, and E. Schnoor, "Compressive Sensing and Neural Networks from a Statistical Learning Perspective," in *Compressed Sensing in Information Processing*. Springer, 2022, pp. 247–277.
- [16] V. Kouni and Y. Panagakis, "DECONET: An Unfolding Network for Analysis-Based Compressed Sensing With Generalization Error Bounds," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 71, pp. 1938–1951, 2023.
- [17] B. Joukovsky, T. Mukherjee, H. Van Luong, and N. Deligiannis, "Generalization Error Bounds for Deep Unfolding RNNs," in *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1515–1524.
- [18] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- [19] H. Zhao, O. Gallo, I. Frosio, and J. Kautz, "Loss Functions for Image Restoration With Neural Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 47–57, Mar 2017.
- [20] M. J. Wainwright, E. P. Simoncelli, and A. S. Willsky, "Random Cascades on Wavelet Trees and Their Use in Analyzing and Modeling Natural Images," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 89–123, 2001.
- [21] M. J. Wainwright and E. P. Simoncelli, "Scale Mixtures of Gaussians and the Statistics of Natural Images," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 12. MIT Press, 1999, pp. 855–861.
- [22] J. Wang, A. Dogandžić, and A. Nehorai, "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Compound-Gaussian Clutter and Target Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 3884–3898, 2006.
- [23] Z. Chance, R. G. Raj, and D. J. Love, "Information-theoretic structure of multistatic radar imaging," in *IEEE RadarCon (RADAR)*, 2011, pp. 853–858.
- [24] Z. Idriss, R. G. Raj, and R. M. Narayanan, "Waveform Optimization for Multistatic Radar Imaging Using Mutual Information," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronics Systems*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 2410–2425, Aug 2021.
- [25] R. G. Raj, "A hierarchical Bayesian-MAP approach to inverse problems in imaging," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 32, no. 7, p. 075003, Jul 2016.
- [26] S. J. Wright, "Coordinate descent algorithms," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 151, no. 1, pp. 3–34, Jun 2015.
- [27] J. Sola and J. Sevilla, "Importance of input data normalization for the application of neural networks to complex industrial problems," *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 1464–1468, 1997.
- [28] P. Alquier, "User-friendly introduction to pac-bayes bounds," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11216*, 2021.
- [29] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [30] A. Maurer, "A vector-contraction inequality for Rademacher complexities," in *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*. Springer, 2016, pp. 3–17.
- [31] L. Devroye, L. Györfi, and G. Lugosi, *A probabilistic theory of pattern recognition*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 31.
- [32] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut, *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*. Springer New York, 2013.
- [33] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw Hill Education, 1953.