

GRAPH EXPANSIONS OF DEEP NEURAL NETWORKS AND THEIR UNIVERSAL SCALING LIMITS

NICOLA MUÇA CIRONE, JAD HAMDAN, AND CRISTOPHER SALVI

ABSTRACT. We present a unified approach to obtain scaling limits of neural networks using the genus expansion technique from random matrix theory. This approach begins with a novel expansion of neural networks which is reminiscent of Butcher series for ODEs, and is obtained through a generalisation of Faà di Bruno's formula to an arbitrary number of compositions. In this expansion, the role of monomials is played by random multilinear maps indexed by directed graphs whose edges correspond to random matrices, which we call *operator graphs*. This expansion linearises the effect of the activation functions, allowing for the direct application of *Wick's principle* to compute the expectation of each of its terms. We then determine the leading contribution to each term by embedding the corresponding graphs onto surfaces, and computing their Euler characteristic. Furthermore, by developing a correspondence between analytic and graphical operations, we obtain similar graph expansions for the *neural tangent kernel* as well as the *input-output Jacobian* of the original neural network, and derive their infinite-width limits with relative ease. Notably, we find explicit formulae for the moments of the limiting singular value distribution of the Jacobian. We then show that all of these results hold for networks with more general weights, such as general matrices with i.i.d. entries satisfying moment assumptions, complex matrices and sparse matrices.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Scaling limits of neural networks	2
1.2. Overview of our method.	3
1.3. Main results	5
1.4. Notation	8
2. Graphical descriptions of analytic operations	8
2.1. Product graphs	8
2.2. Operator graphs and their associated linear map	10
2.3. Operations on graphs.	12
3. Neural network expansions	16
3.1. Tree expansion for feed-forward neural networks.	17
3.2. Expansions for related quantities	20
4. Genus expansion and limit theorems	22
4.1. Wick expansion for product graphs with random inputs	23
4.2. Genus expansion	26
5. Applications to feed-forward networks	30
5.1. Gaussian process limit	30
5.2. Convergence of the Neural Tangent Kernel	32

5.3. Distribution of the squared singular values of the Jacobian	34
6. Extensions to complex, non-Gaussian and sparse weights.	42
6.1. Non-Gaussian weights	42
6.2. Sparse weights	44
6.3. The complex case	47
7. Further extensions	47
7.1. Random biases	48
7.2. Residual networks and other neural network architectures	48
7.3. Non-polynomial activations	48
7.4. Spectrum of the Hessian matrix	49
References	49
Appendix A. Proofs of auxiliary combinatorial results	52
A.1. Atomic pairings of trees	52
A.2. Results in Section 5.1	53
A.3. Results in Section 5.2	54
A.4. Results in Section 5.3	56
Appendix B. Technical Lemmas	57
Appendix C. Numerical study of the Jacobian spectral distribution	64
Appendix D. Map of Results	67
Appendix E. Table of Symbols	68

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Scaling limits of neural networks. Deep neural networks (NNs) whose weights' and biases' entries are initialised as appropriately rescaled, independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian random variables converge to Gaussian processes (GPs) as their width tends to infinity. This well-known fact was originally observed by Neal [27] for shallow feedforward networks and more recently by Matthews et al. [24] for multi-layer feedforward networks, by Novak et al. [30] and [13] for deep convolutional networks, and by Yang [38] for more general architectures, including recurrent and attention-based networks.

Albeit these results hold for untrained neural networks at initialisation, similar scaling limits have been derived in recent years to study the training dynamics of NNs in the infinite-width limit. Different scalings/parametrisations when passing to the limit (i.e. choices, as functions of the width, of the variance of the random initialisation and of the learning rates for each layer) produce fundamentally different limiting behaviours of the gradient descent (GD) dynamics of wide NNs. Notable examples include the so-called *neural tangent kernel* (NTK) by Du et al. [10], Jacot et al. [21], the *mean field parameterisation* studied by Chizat and Bach [4], Mei et al. [26], Sirignano and Spiliopoulos [36] for two-layer NNs, or the more recent *maximal update parameterisation* (μ P) by Yang and Hu [40], Yang et al. [41]. Beside, the input-output Jacobian singular value distribution, or *spectrum*, of a wide neural network is an important indicator of its architectural soundness, particularly when one is interested in preventing exponential explosion or vanishing of gradients [14, 35, 32].

Although of similar nature, these results have been derived using diverse mathematical techniques across different works, including from classical probability theory, and random matrix theory (particularly free probability), resulting in a lack of unified treatment of the various scaling limits. Furthermore, the vast majority of studies have concentrated on the case of dense Gaussian weights and biases.

In this paper, we propose a unified framework to express these scaling limits which leverages on the *genus expansion technique* from random matrix theory.

This technique has its roots in connection between matrix integrals and the enumeration of maps, which was first discovered in the context of quantum field theory (see [12, 37, 3], as well as [42] for an accessible introduction to the subject). The link to random matrix theory was later made by Harer and Zagier [19] in a seminal work investigating moduli spaces of curves, and has since been used to study various matrix ensembles and their asymptotic first and second-order freeness (we do not attempt to survey such results here, and instead refer the reader to the recent work of Dubach and Peled [11] and the references therein). Roughly speaking, the technique consists in expanding the trace of random matrix products and evaluating the resulting sum using Wick’s principle. The resulting terms turn out to be in bijection with a set of graphs, and one determines which terms are of leading order by embedding their corresponding graphs into surfaces and computing its Euler characteristic.

To the best of our knowledge, this technique has yet to be used in the context of deep learning. This is likely due to the presence of non-linear activations, which often prohibit one from being able to apply it directly. We circumvent this problem by first developing a graphical language to express a large class of matrix/vector products, and then deriving an expansion for neural networks in terms of this language. This expansion linearises the effect of the activation functions, allowing for the use of Wick’s formula and the connection to the enumeration of maps to be made. A high-level overview of our approach is given below.

1.2. Overview of our method.

1.2.1. *A graphical language for neural network computations.* The idea of using a graphical language to simplify computations involving multilinear maps is not entirely new, dating back to at least the 1970s with the introduction of Penrose diagrams [33], which have more recently been applied in the context of machine learning (see [1, 6]). As discussed earlier, graphs have also been used to evaluate expectations of products of Gaussian variables, and this forms the basis of the genus expansion technique.

The graphs that we introduce are novel and accomplish both of these tasks at once. On the one hand, they can be used to express deterministic products and operations involving multilinear maps. On the other, when dealing with tensors with Gaussian entries, the expectation of these operations can once again be expressed in terms of graphs (in the sense of equation (2)). We explain this briefly below, deferring to Section 2 for more details.

In what we call a *product* graph $G = (V, E)$, edges will correspond to matrices and vertices to vectors, which we call the inputs of their respective edge/vertex. The graph’s structure then dictates a well-defined product involving these inputs, the result of which we call the *value* of the graph and denote by \mathbf{W}_G . For instance, a path of length k can be used to express an (ordinary) product of k matrices, while

trees can be used to express Hadamard (entrywise) products (this is depicted in Figures 1 and 2).

If we omit inputs for some vertices and edges of the graph and view them as variables, then the resulting graph corresponds to a (multi)linear map and we call it an *operator graph*. Differentiation, composition and other operations involving these maps then turn out to be easily expressible using simple manipulations of their corresponding graph (composition, for instance, reduces to attaching graphs by a vertex), as explained in Section 2.2 and the figures therein.

1.2.2. *Graph expansions of neural networks.* The connection to neural networks is made by expanding their output at a given input \mathbf{x} as a linear combination of product graphs

$$(1) \quad \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{F}} c(G) \mathbf{W}_G$$

for some family of graphs \mathcal{F} and combinatorial factors $c(G)$.

This is achieved in Theorem 4, which essentially generalizes Faà di Bruno's formula (see [8, 22]) to the case of an arbitrary number of compositions. In similar tasks, trees have been shown to be a natural combinatorial tool to keep track of terms (see the literature on Butcher series [25, 16], and, more generally, on Runge-Kutta methods for ordinary differential equations [17]), and this is reflected here in the fact that \mathcal{F} (in Eq. (1)) turns out to be a set of rooted trees.

By applying our previously mentioned graphical rules to each term in this sum, we derive similar expansions for various related quantities, namely the k -th coordinate of $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$, the neural tangent kernel, and the trace of the input-output Jacobian of Φ times its transpose, raised to an arbitrary power. This reduces the task of obtaining scaling limits to that evaluating $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{W}_G$ for various graphs G .

1.2.3. *Wick's principle and genus expansion.* When G is a product graph whose edge inputs have Gaussian entries, our main tool to evaluate $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{W}_G$ is Wick's principle, which reduces the expectation of products of Gaussian variables to the sum of their pairwise covariances. Applied to \mathbf{W}_G , it yields the following simple identity

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E} \mathbf{W}_G = \sum_{\phi} \mathbf{W}_{G_{\phi}},$$

(see Theorem 6), where the sum is taken over *admissible* pairings ϕ of the edges of G (see Def. 13), and G_{ϕ} is the graph obtained from G after identifying edges paired by ϕ (meaning that we consider such edges to be the same edge in G_{ϕ}). Under additional assumptions on G (see Assumption 2), we find that $\mathbf{W}_{G_{\phi}} = \sigma_G N^{|V(G_{\phi})|}$ for every ϕ (where $|V(G_{\phi})|$ is the number of vertices in G_{ϕ} and σ_G is a variance parameter) and the asymptotic order of \mathbf{W}_G is thus determined by the pairings for which $|V(G_{\phi})|$ is maximised.

Instead of counting this quantity directly, it turns out to be much simpler to embed the graph onto a surface S_{ϕ} (as defined in Equation 35) and to then compute $|V(G_{\phi})|$ using the *Euler characteristic formula*

$$|V(G_{\phi})| - |E(G_{\phi})| + f(G_{\phi} : S_{\phi}) = 2 - 2g(S_{\phi}),$$

where $|E(G_{\phi})|$ is the number of edges of G_{ϕ} , $f(G_{\phi} : S_{\phi})$ the number of faces of G_{ϕ} in S_{ϕ} and $g(S_{\phi})$ the genus of S_{ϕ} . This formula allows us to identify which ϕ

give rise to leading and sub-leading order terms in Eq. (2), which we call *fully-atomic* and *bi-atomic* pairings, respectively, following [11]. We use this to give a more explicit version of equation (2), and to extend it to centred mixed moments $\mathbb{E}\{\prod_G(\mathbf{W}_G - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_G)\}$ as well (see Lemma 1). Lastly, we combine these results to obtain a limit theorem for the joint moments of product graphs (Theorem 7), reminiscent of a celebrated result of Diaconis and Shahshahani [9] for traces of powers of random unitary matrices and its recent extension generalisation in [11] (Thm. 1.2).

When the edge inputs in G are complex, non-Gaussian or sparse matrices (or any combination of the three), we show that all of these results still hold up to an $o(1)$ error term (see sections 6.3, 6.1, 6.2, respectively). This allows us to extend all our main results to NNs with such weight matrices.

1.2.4. *A pipeline for scaling limits.* With the graph expansion in (1), the dictionary between analytic and graphical operations and the genus expansion to compute each \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} in (2), we propose the following pipeline to study neural network scaling limits.

- (I) Express the desired quantity in terms of values of product graphs G .
- (II) Apply genus formula (2) to derive the scaling limits for the \mathbf{W}_G .
- (III) Evaluate these terms using combinatorial arguments, usually leveraging the symmetries present in the graph G .
- (IV) Substitute these quantities back into the expression from the first step.

To the best of our knowledge, the only unifying framework currently proposed in the literature is that of so-called *tensor programs* (developed by Yang [39]). Our pipeline can be seen as an alternative to the latter which is built on first principles, and yields universal results that also hold for finite dimensional weights. As remarked in Section 5, it also sheds new light on classical results, by, for instance, recovering mainstream parameterizations as canonical choices.

More importantly, this pipeline provides a clear path to tackle more complex settings (e.g. other architectures), and *applies just as well to the training regime*. For instance, we believe that it can be used directly to study discrete stochastic gradient descent, generalising the arguments in [5] which study the scaling limits of NNs under μP initialisation). We survey other possible extensions in Section 7.

1.3. **Main results.** Fix sequences $(\varphi_\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0})$ of polynomial *activation functions*, $(N_\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ of *layer dimensions* and $(W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ of weight matrices. We define a *feed-forward neural network* Φ_L of depth L by the recursion

$$(3) \quad \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = W_0\mathbf{x}, \quad \Phi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}) = W_{\ell+1}\varphi_{\ell+1}(\Phi_\ell(\mathbf{x})),$$

where each φ_ℓ is applied entry-wise.

We omit bias terms and restrict ourselves to polynomial activations for simplicity here, and discuss the requisite modifications to remove these restrictions in Section 7.

To demonstrate our pipeline, we obtain simple and insightful proofs of some previously mentioned, fundamental results. The first of these is the following universal Gaussian process limit, which holds under ‘‘GP limit parameterisation’’ for a large class of neural networks with sparse random weights.

Theorem 1 (Gaussian process limit of neural networks). *Let $N_\ell = N$ when $\ell > 0$, and assume that each W_ℓ has i.i.d. entries drawn from a symmetric, centred distribution with finite moments and variance $\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{1}(\ell > 0) + \mathbf{1}(\ell = 0)$.*

Then for any $M, L \geq 1$ we have

$$(4) \quad ([\Phi_L]_1, \dots, [\Phi_L]_M) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{GP}(0, K_L \otimes \mathbf{I}_M)$$

where the right hand side is a Gaussian Process indexed on \mathbb{R}^{N_0} , with diagonal covariance function defined by

$$(5) \quad K_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}, \quad K_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\ell+1}(X_\ell)\varphi_{\ell+1}(Y_\ell)]$$

$$(6) \quad (X_\ell, Y_\ell) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) & K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ K_\ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) & K_\ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

Furthermore, the same result holds if the weight matrices are of the form $\tilde{W}_\ell := W_\ell \odot \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} B_\ell$, where W_ℓ are as above and the B_ℓ are independent matrices with i.i.d., Bernoulli distributed entries with parameter p_N satisfying $Np_N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 8 and the corollaries in sections 6.3, 6.1, and 6.2. \square

This adds to the growing list of generalisations of the result of Matthews et al. [24] to non-Gaussian settings, such as that of Huang [20] to orthogonal weights, and Hanin [18] to weights with i.i.d. entries satisfying finite moment assumptions. More recently, Nait-Saada, Naderi and Tanner [34] encompassed both of these results by showing that one can relax the i.i.d. assumption to a class of weights which they call PSEUDO-IID. In particular, this class includes *structured sparse* weights, making this work the first to rigorously show that the Gaussian process limit holds in a sparse setting. That said, while their result holds for more general activations than the ones considered here, they only deal with sparsification using a fixed binary mask B , whereas we allow for masks B_ℓ whose expected proportion of ones can decrease as N_ℓ tends to infinity.

Our second result concerns the NTK ([10, 21]), which is defined by

$$(7) \quad \Theta_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \lambda_\ell (\mathrm{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x})) (\mathrm{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{L+1} \times N_{L+1}},$$

for a choice of so-called *layer-wise learning rates* $(\lambda_\ell)_\ell$. We show that at initialisation and under ‘‘NTK parametrisation’’, Θ_L converges in L^2 to a deterministic kernel. As with the previous result, this convergence holds for non-Gaussian and sparse matrices as well.

Theorem 2 (Convergence in L^2 of the NTK at intialisation). *For each $\ell > 0$, let $N_\ell = N$ and assume that W_ℓ has i.i.d. entries drawn from a symmetric, centered distribution with finite moments and variance $\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{1}(\ell > 0) + \mathbf{1}(\ell = 0)$. Moreover, assume that the layer-wise learning rates $\lambda_\ell = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathbf{1}(\ell > 0) + \mathbf{1}(\ell = 0)$.*

Then

$$(8) \quad \Theta_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^2} \Theta_L^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{N_{L+1}}$$

where,

$$(9) \quad \Theta_0^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}, \quad \Theta_L^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = K_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \dot{K}_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \Theta_{L-1}^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

and \tilde{K}_ℓ is defined in the same way as K_ℓ but substituting φ_ℓ for φ'_ℓ in (5).

The same result holds if the weight matrices are of the form $\tilde{W}_\ell := W_\ell \odot \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} B_\ell$, where W_ℓ are as above and the B_ℓ are independent matrices with i.i.d., Bernoulli distributed entries with parameter p_N satisfying $Np_N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 9 and the corollaries in sections 6.3, 6.1, and 6.2. \square

Previous results regarding the NTK at initialization have only been shown for Gaussian and orthogonal weights [21, 20], and only achieve convergence in probability. With the caveat of only holding for polynomial activations, our result is an improvement on both fronts.

Having proved these theorems as a warm-up, we move on to the more difficult problem of analysing the Jacobian spectrum of Φ . Defining the input-output Jacobian of Φ_L as $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} := d(\varphi_L \circ \Phi_{L-1})_{\mathbf{x}}$, we're interested in the macroscopic behaviour of the squared singular values of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$, and study the empirical spectral distribution of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top$, defined as

$$\rho_L := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{I=1}^N \delta_{\xi_i}$$

where $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\}$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top$ and δ_{ξ_i} denotes a Dirac mass on ξ_i . Our main result establishes the weak convergence in probability of this measure to a deterministic limiting measure $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(\mathbf{x}, (\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \leq L})$, which we dub the *non-linear Fuss-Catalan* distribution (in this case, with parameter L and non-linearities φ_ℓ). We go further and find an explicit formula for the moments of this measure as a sum over non-crossing partitions.

Theorem 3 (Weak convergence of ρ_L in probability). *For each $\ell \geq 0$, assume that $N_\ell = N$ and that W_ℓ has i.i.d. entries drawn from a symmetric, centred distribution with finite moments and variance $1/N$. Then ρ_L converges weakly in probability to a deterministic limiting measure $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(\mathbf{x}, (\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \leq L})$, whose moments can be evaluated explicitly by the recursion in Equation (60).*

Furthermore, the same result holds if the weight matrices are of the form $\tilde{W}_\ell := W_\ell \odot \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} B_\ell$, where W_ℓ are as above and the B_ℓ are independent matrices with i.i.d., Bernoulli distributed entries with parameter p_N satisfying $Np_N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 10 and the corollaries in sections 6.3, 6.1, and 6.2. \square

Indeed, the moments of $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(\mathbf{x}, (\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \leq L})$ can be seen as a generalization of the Fuss-Catalan numbers (see, e.g., [28]) which is obtained by inserting activation-dependent coefficients in their defining recursion. As such, $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(\mathbf{x}, (\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \leq L})$ generalizes the Fuss-Catalan distribution, which is known to be the universal first-order limit of squared singular values for products of Ginibre matrices (in the language of free probability, it is the L -fold free multiplicative convolution of the Marchenko-Pastur law). We prove this theorem deriving an exact expression for the moments of ρ_L , which are then shown to converge in L^2 to those of $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(\mathbf{x}, (\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \leq L})$ (see Proposition 5). Weak convergence in probability of the empirical spectral measure then follows from the method of moments.

Under an asymptotic freeness assumption which was later proved in [7], the limiting distribution in Proposition 5 was computed by Pennington et al. [32] for

Gaussian and orthogonal weights using the analytic machinery of free probability. To be precise, they derived an implicit functional equation for the moment generating function of this distribution, from which they are able to determine the first two moments $m_{1,L}$ and $m_{2,L}$ by expanding and solving for coefficients (which breaks down for higher moments). Note that they only identify the limiting distribution, and do not concern themselves with the convergence of the empirical measure. By contrast, we show convergence in probability, find an explicit formula for the moments of the limiting distribution, and show that the same conclusions hold for non-Gaussian and sparse weights.

1.4. Notation. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ and a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we write $[A]_{ij}$ and $[v]_j$ for their i, j and j -th coordinate, respectively. More generally, we will use square brackets with subscripts to denote coordinates of tensors. We use the notation $\mathbf{I}_{M,N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$, $\mathbf{1}_M \in \mathbb{R}^M$ to denote the matrix and vector having all entries equal to 1 (omitting the subscripts whenever it does not hurt comprehension), $\mathbf{E}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to denote the canonical basis matrices/vectors in \mathbb{R}^N . $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ will denote the standard inner product, with the space in subscript when it is not clear from the context. If A is a matrix with complex entries, we use \bar{A} to denote its conjugate and A^* its Hermitian transpose. $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ will denote a Gaussian with mean μ and variance σ^2 , and similarly $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ will denote a standard complex Gaussian.

We will use standard asymptotic notation, writing $f(T) = o(g(T))$ to mean that $|f(T)/g(T)| \rightarrow_{T \rightarrow \infty} 0$ and $f(T) = O(g(T))$ to mean that $\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} |f(T)/g(T)|$ is bounded. We will often write $W[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ to denote the evaluation of a k -linear function W at some input (x_1, \dots, x_k) ; this is not different from $W(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ but will be used to stress the linear nature of the map.

For any positive integer N , we will use $[N]$ to denote the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Whenever $e = (u, v)$ is an edge in a directed graph, we will call u the *head* and v the *tail* of e , and we say that e is adjacent to u, v and vice versa.

A table compiling the notation that we introduce throughout the paper can be found in Appendix E together with a dependency graph for all the main results in Appendix D.

Acknowledgements. N.C. thanks William Turner for pointing him to [11] and J.H. thanks Adam Jones for helpful discussions. C.S. is supported by Innovate UK (Proj ID 10073285). N.C. and J.H. are supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Mathematics of Random Systems: Analysis, Modelling and Simulation (EP/S023925/1).

2. GRAPHICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF ANALYTIC OPERATIONS

In this section we explain how various matrix-vector can be expressed by means of directed graphs.

2.1. Product graphs. Consider a directed graph $G = (V, E)$. We associate a vector $\mathbf{X}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(v)}$ to each vertex $v \in V$ and a matrix $\mathbf{X}_e \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(u) \times \mathfrak{d}(v)}$ to each edge $e = (u, v) \in E$, calling \mathbf{X}_e and \mathbf{X}_v the *inputs* of the edge e and vertex v respectively. Here, $\mathfrak{d}(v)$ is a positive integer which call the *dimension* of the vertex v , and we extend \mathfrak{d} to edges by using the shorthand $\mathfrak{d}(e) = (\mathfrak{d}(u), \mathfrak{d}(v))$ for $e = (u, v) \in E$ (in which case $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(e)} := \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(u) \times \mathfrak{d}(v)}$).

As we are often going to talk about vertices and edges simultaneously, it will be useful to have a single term to refer to both types of objects. For this purpose we will use the term *cells*, as is customary in algebraic topology, noting that this fits in with possible generalizations of the tools developed here (e.g. by considering simplicial complexes instead of graphs, see Section 7.2). Every cell in $C := V \cup E$ will thus have a dimension assigned to it by \mathfrak{d} , noting that this map is entirely determined by the values that it takes on vertices.

As we will soon make precise, G can be seen as describing a type of product of its inputs. This motivates the naming in the following definition, which summarizes what we have introduced so far.

Definition 1 (Product graph). *A product graph is a triple $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{C})$, where*

- $G = (V, E)$ is a directed graph with vertex set V and edge set $E \subseteq V \times V$.
- \mathfrak{d} assigns a dimension to each vertex in V , and thus to each cell of G .
- $\mathfrak{C} = \{\mathbf{X}_c \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} : c \in C = V \cup E\}$ is a collection of inputs (vectors/matrices) associated to the cells C of G .

When $\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{C}$ are clear or implied from the context, we will omit them and simply use G to denote the product graph $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{C})$. To a product graph G we can uniquely associate the following *value*.

Definition 2. *The value $\mathbf{W}_G \in \mathbb{R}$ of a product graph $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{C})$ is defined as the following scalar*

$$(10) \quad \mathbf{W}_G := \sum_{(i_v)_{v \in V}} \prod_{(u,v) \in E} [\mathbf{X}_{(u,v)}]_{i_u i_v} \prod_{w \in V} [\mathbf{X}_w]_{i_w} = \sum_{\mathbf{i}_V} \prod_{c \in C} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \in \mathbb{R}$$

where the sum on the right hand side is taken over all indexations $\mathbf{i}_V = (i_v)_{v \in V} \in \prod_{v \in V} \{1, \dots, N_v\}$ and where for $c = (u, v) \in E$ we define $i_c := i_u i_v$.

Remark. *Note that the way we have defined \mathfrak{C} in a product graph of Definition 1 ensures that this product is well-defined. Furthermore, if G is disconnected and has connected components $\{G_i\}_i$, then $\mathbf{W}_G = \prod_i \mathbf{W}_{G_i}$. In the event that some of its inputs are random, \mathbf{W}_G then becomes a random variable.*

We illustrate this definition with some examples.

Example. *If G is the product graph in Figure 1, then $\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{x}_a^\top W_3 W_2 W_1 \mathbf{x}_d$ since*

$$\mathbf{x}_a^\top W_3 W_2 W_1 \mathbf{x}_d = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(a)} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(b)} \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} \sum_{\delta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(d)} [W_3]_{\alpha, \beta} [W_2]_{\beta, \gamma} [W_1]_{\gamma, \delta} [\mathbf{x}_a]_{\alpha} [\mathbf{x}_d]_{\delta}.$$




FIGURE 1. A product graph giving rise to a word of matrices multiplied by vectors on either side. $\mathbf{1}_N$ is the $N \times 1$ vector of 1s.

Example. *If G is a tree, then the corresponding value \mathbf{W}_G is defined by means of Hadamard products of matrices. For instance, taking G to be the product graph in Figure 2 gives*

$$\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{x}_a^\top W_2 (\mathbf{x}_b \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_d) \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_c))$$

where $A \odot B$ denotes the Hadamard product of A and B . In fact, entry-wise the product is given by

$$\mathbf{W}_G := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(a)} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(b)} \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} \sum_{\delta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}(d)} [W_2]_{\alpha,\beta} [W_1]_{\beta,\gamma} [W_1]_{\beta,\delta} [\mathbf{x}_a]_{\alpha} [\mathbf{x}_b]_{\beta} [\mathbf{x}_c]_{\gamma} [\mathbf{x}_d]_{\delta}.$$




FIGURE 2. A product graph G with a tree structure whose value \mathbf{W}_G is realised by Hadamard products.

Note that while the examples above can be described in terms of ordinary matrix/vector multiplication and entry-wise products, this isn't necessarily the case. For instance, taking G to be the product graph in Figure 3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_G &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} [W_1]_{\alpha,\beta} [W_2]_{\beta,\alpha} [W_3]_{\beta,\gamma} [\mathbf{x}_a]_{\alpha} [\mathbf{x}_b]_{\beta} [\mathbf{x}_c]_{\gamma} \\ &= \text{Tr} \left\{ [\mathbf{x}_a \mathbf{1}^T \odot W_1] [(\mathbf{x}_b \odot W_3 \mathbf{x}_c) \mathbf{1}^T \odot W_2] \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{x}_c^T W_3^T [\mathbf{x}_b \odot \text{diag}(W_2 [\mathbf{x}_a \mathbf{1}^T \odot W_1])]. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 3. A simple product graph leading to a complicated analytical expression for its value.

As this example shows, simple graphs can be used to express much more complicated analytic expressions. Graphs of the type depicted in Figure 3 will be the central object of study in Section 5.3.

2.2. Operator graphs and their associated linear map. So far, we have associated a vector/matrix to each cell in our graphs. By *freeing* some of these cells, meaning that we consider their inputs as variables, we can use graphs to define more general linear maps between tensors.

Consider for example the product graph $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{C})$ in Figure 2, noting how the product defining \mathbf{W}_G is linear in \mathbf{x}_a . If we consider \mathbf{x}_a to be a variable, this yields a well-defined linear map $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(a)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, or equivalently a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(a)}$. In this particular case, the linear map in question would be $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x}^T W_2 (\mathbf{x}_b \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_d) \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_c))$, and its vector representation is $W_2 (\mathbf{x}_b \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_d) \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x}_c))$.

More generally, let G be a directed graph with dimensions assigned by \mathfrak{d} , and let \mathcal{F} be an (ordered) sequence of free cells of G (meaning vertices and edges which are considered as variables), assuming that the remaining cells c which do not belong to \mathcal{F} are each *fixed* to some input \mathbf{X}_c . Then for any input sequence $(\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in \mathcal{F}}$, the product defining $\mathbf{W}_{(G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C})} = \mathbf{W}_G$ is $|\mathcal{F}|$ -linear in these inputs, or equivalently, linear in $\otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbf{X}_c$ by the universal property of tensor products.

Furthermore, given any a partition of \mathcal{F} into two subsequences \mathcal{F}_{in} and \mathcal{F}_{out} , we can consider the linear map

$$(11) \quad \otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{X}_c \mapsto \left(\otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{X}_c \mapsto \mathbf{W}_G \right).$$

This is equivalent to considering the linear map

$$(12) \quad \otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{X}_c \mapsto \mathbf{Y}, \quad \langle \mathbf{Y}, \otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{X}_c \rangle = \mathbf{W}_G \text{ for any } (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}}$$

where $\mathbf{Y} \in \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$ is the Riesz representation of $\left(\otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{X}_c \mapsto \mathbf{W}_G \right)$.

The input and output dimensions of this map depend on the partition of \mathcal{F} that is being taken. We refer to it as the *operator associated to G* , as defined below. Note that in what follows, we use $c \notin \mathcal{F}$ to mean $c \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}$.

Definition 3 (Operator associated to a graph). *Let G and \mathfrak{d} be as in Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}})$ be a sequence of free cells of C .*

Then, we define the operator associated to $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \mathcal{F}, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \notin \mathcal{F}})$ as follows

$$\mathbf{W}_G : \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}, \quad \mathbf{W}_G[\otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{X}_c] = \mathbf{Y}$$

where $\mathbf{Y} \in \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$ is the unique vector satisfying

$$\langle \mathbf{Y}, \otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{X}_c \rangle = \mathbf{W}_{(G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C})}.$$

Further, we let $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G$ denote the unique multilinear map satisfying

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G[(\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}] = \mathbf{W}_G[\otimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{X}_c]$$

for all $(\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}$, which exists by the universal property of tensor products.

Note that we used the same notation for the operator associated to a graph as for the value of a product graph. This is to reflect the fact that operator graphs essentially reduce to the latter when $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$, recalling that the empty tensor product is defined as the base field \mathbb{R} . Indeed, the operator associated to $(G, \mathfrak{d}, \emptyset, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C})$ is

$$z \mapsto \mathbf{W}_{(G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C})} z, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Just as we did for product graphs, we will abuse notation and just use G to denote an operator graph when $\mathcal{F}, (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \notin \mathcal{F}}$ and \mathfrak{d} are clear from the context. As a result, \mathbf{W}_G can denote both an operator (when G is an operator graph) and a scalar (when G is a product graph).

Some examples to illustrate these definitions might be in order, and are given below. When depicting a graph, a free vertex is drawn as a circle (e.g. \circ) and is depicted in blue if it is in the set of outputs \mathcal{F}_{out} , while a vertex fixed to \mathbf{x} is drawn as a black dot labeled by said vector (e.g. $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}$). Similarly, we draw free edges with dotted directed lines (e.g. \dashrightarrow) and in blue if they are in the set \mathcal{F}_{out} of output cells, while fixed edges are drawn as solid lines labeled by their input matrix (e.g. \xrightarrow{W}).

For simplicity, we will omit labels from vertices (resp. edges) whose input is $\mathbf{1}$ (resp. \mathbf{I}) when drawing them. We will also not indicate dimensions given by \mathfrak{d} nor the order of the sequence \mathcal{F} on the graph itself.

Example. Let G be the graph in Figure 4 (left). To turn this into an operator graph, let a, b, c, d refer to its vertices from bottom to top/ left to right and let $\mathfrak{d} : \{a, b, c, d\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any fixed dimension map. Then if we consider $\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} = (d, (a, b))$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{out}} = (a)$ and fix the remaining cells as (cf. Figure 4)

$$b \mapsto \mathbf{x}_b, \quad c \mapsto \mathbf{1}, \quad (b, d) \mapsto \mathbf{I}, \quad (b, c) \mapsto W_1,$$

we obtain the linear map $\mathbf{x}_d \otimes W_{(a,b)} \mapsto W_{(a,b)}(\mathbf{x}_b \odot (W_1 \mathbf{1}) \odot (\mathbf{I} \mathbf{x}_d)) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(a)}$.




FIGURE 4. Example of an operator graph (right) obtained from a graph (left) by a choice of \mathcal{F}_{in} , \mathcal{F}_{out} , \mathfrak{d} and $(\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \notin \mathcal{F}}$. Note how on the right, we omit labels from vertices and edges whose inputs are $\mathbf{1}$ or \mathbf{I} respectively.

2.3. Operations on graphs. Having outlined the correspondence between graphs and operators, we can now go further and show how various analytic operations can be expressed as binary operations on graphs. In what follows, we show how to graphically depict evaluation and composition of operators, as well as transposition and taking the trace when said operators are bilinear (thus corresponding to matrices).

Definition 4 (Fixing an in-cell). Let $(G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}), (\mathbf{Y}_c)_{c \notin \mathcal{F}})$ be an operator graph, \mathbf{W}_G its associated map and $c_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}$ be a free cell of G . Then if $G[\mathbf{X}_{c_0}]$ is the graph obtained by fixing c_0 's input to some $\mathbf{X}_{c_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c_0)}$, we have

$$\mathbf{W}_{G[\mathbf{X}_{c_0}]} : \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} \setminus c_0} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{G[\mathbf{X}_{c_0}]}[\bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} \setminus c_0} \mathbf{X}_c] = \mathbf{W}_G[\bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{X}_c]$$

Fixing an input cell to a vector thus corresponds to the (partial) evaluation of the operator.

For example, let G be the operator graph on the left in Figure 5 below, and let v denote its top-right vertex, noting that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} = (v)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{out}} = \emptyset$. Ignoring dimensions for the sake of this example,

$$\mathbf{W}_G : \mathbf{x} \mapsto W_2[(W_1 \mathbf{1}) \odot (W_1 \mathbf{x})],$$

and fixing the unique in-vertex's input to \mathbf{X}_v (c.f. Figure 5, right) gives $W_2[(W_1 \mathbf{1}) \odot (W_1 \mathbf{X}_v)]$.

For any operator graph $(G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \notin \mathcal{F}})$, recall that \mathbf{W}_G is a linear map from $\bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}} \setminus c_0} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$ to $\bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$ and thus corresponds to a vector in




FIGURE 5. Fixing a free in-vertex (middle) or in-edge (right) of a graph.

$\prod_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)} \times \prod_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$. It will therefore make sense to talk about coordinates of \mathbf{W}_G , and to take Hadamard products between \mathbf{W}_{G_1} and \mathbf{W}_{G_2} , for instance.

Definition 5 (Identifying free out-vertices). *Let $G_1 = (G_1, \mathfrak{d}_1, (\emptyset, (v_1)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_1 \setminus \{v_1\}})$ and $G_2 = (G_2, \mathfrak{d}_2, (\emptyset, (v_2)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_2 \setminus \{v_2\}})$ be operator graphs with unique free out-vertices $v_1 \in V(G_1)$ and $v_2 \in V(G_2)$ respectively. Assume that $\mathfrak{d}_1(v_1) = \mathfrak{d}_2(v_2)$. We define $G_1 \wedge G_2$ as the graph obtained by identifying v_1 and v_2 , meaning that we consider them as the same vertex.*

We then have that $\mathbf{W}_{G_1 \wedge G_2} = \mathbf{W}_{G_1} \odot \mathbf{W}_{G_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(v_1)}$, noting that since G_1 and G_2 have only one free cell, \mathbf{W}_{G_1} , \mathbf{W}_{G_2} and $\mathbf{W}_{G_1 \wedge G_2}$ all correspond to unique vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}_1(v_1)}$.




FIGURE 6. Identifying two graphs by their unique free vertex corresponds to taking a Hadamard product of their associated operators. Here, the fixed vertices of G_1 and G_2 are all assumed to have input $\mathbf{1}$.

This operation can straightforwardly be extended for generic operator graphs which have more than one free cell, in which case one should specify the cells being identified. This will not be needed for our purposes, and we thus opt for the definition above in an effort to keep notation simple.

Note that the graph operation \wedge is associative and symmetric much like its analytic counterpart \odot , meaning that there is no confusion in writing $G_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge G_n = \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} G_i$.

Definition 6 (Transposition). *Let $G = (G, \mathfrak{d}, ((u), (v)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus \{u, v\}})$ be an operator graph with exactly two free vertices u and v , one of which is an out-vertex. Note that in this case, \mathbf{W}_G is a $\mathfrak{d}(u) \times \mathfrak{d}(v)$ matrix.*

Then if

$$G^\top := (G, \mathfrak{d}, ((v), (u)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus \{u, v\}}),$$

it is easy to see that $\mathbf{W}_G^\top = \mathbf{W}_{G^\top}$.




FIGURE 7. Transpose of an operator graph.

Once again, one can make this definition more general by considering any choice of \mathcal{F}_{in} and \mathcal{F}_{out} , and swapping any element of one set with an element of the other. We chose to highlight a much simpler situation in the previous example, as it will be of particular use to us in later sections.

Definition 7 (Composition). *Let $G_1 = (G_1, \mathfrak{d}_1, (\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}^{(1)}, (c_1)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1})$ and $G_2 = (G_2, \mathfrak{d}_2, ((c_2), \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}}^{(2)}), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_2})$ be operator graphs, c_1, c_2 a pair of edges or of vertices satisfying $\mathfrak{d}_1(c_1) = \mathfrak{d}_2(c_2)$. Then the composition $G_2 \circ G_1$ of these graphs is the graph obtained by identifying c_1 and c_2 and fixing the resulting cell's input to $\mathbf{1}$ or \mathbf{I} accordingly. Note if any vertices v_1, v_2 are identified as a result (e.g., when c_1, c_2 are edges), the resulting vertex is given input $\mathbf{x}_1 \odot \mathbf{x}_2$ where $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ are the respective inputs of v_1 and v_2 . Then we have*

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_2 \circ G_1} = \mathbf{W}_{G_2} \circ \mathbf{W}_{G_1}$$

where on the right hand side, \circ denotes composition of linear maps.

To illustrate, consider two operator graphs

$$G_1 = (G_1, \mathfrak{d}_1, ((a), (b)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_1 \setminus \{a, b\}}), G_2 = (G_2, \mathfrak{d}_2, ((b'), (c)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C_2 \setminus \{b', c\}}),$$


and assume that $\mathfrak{d}_1(b) = \mathfrak{d}_2(b') = N$ for some $N > 0$. Then the product $\mathbf{W}_{G_1} \mathbf{W}_{G_2}$ is a matrix with coordinates

$$[\mathbf{W}_{G_2} \mathbf{W}_{G_1}]_{\gamma, \alpha} = \sum_{\beta=1}^N [\mathbf{W}_{G_2}]_{\gamma, \beta} [\mathbf{W}_{G_1}]_{\beta, \alpha} = \sum_{\beta=1}^N [\mathbf{W}_{G_2}]_{\gamma, \beta} [\mathbf{W}_{G_1}]_{\beta, \alpha} [\mathbf{1}]_{\beta}$$

and the right hand side is exactly $\mathbf{W}_{G_2 \circ G_1}$ as depicted in Figure 8.

A concrete example of the case in which the two cells are edges e, e' will be given in Section 5.2 when computing the neural tangent kernel.

Definition 8 (Trace). *Let $G = (G, \mathfrak{d}, ((c_1), (c_2)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus \{c_1, c_2\}})$ be an operator graph with exactly two free cells c_1 and c_2 , one of which is an out-vertex, and such that $\mathfrak{d}(c_1) = \mathfrak{d}(c_2)$. Then the trace $\text{Tr}(G)$ of G is the graph obtained by identifying c_1 with c_2 and fixing the resulting cell to $\mathbf{1}$ or \mathbf{I} accordingly. Again, if any vertices*


 FIGURE 8. Two graphs being composed in the vertex b .

v_1, v_2 are identified as a result (e.g., when c_1, c_2 are edges), the resulting vertex is given input $\mathbf{x}_1 \odot \mathbf{x}_2$ where $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ are the respective inputs of v_1 and v_2 . Then we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_G) = \mathbf{W}_{\mathrm{Tr}(G)}.$$

For instance consider $G = (G, \mathfrak{d}, ((a), (b)), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus \{a, b\}})$ in Figure 9, assuming $\mathfrak{d}(a) = \mathfrak{d}(b) = N$. Then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_G) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\mathbf{W}_G]_{\alpha, \alpha} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\mathbf{W}_G]_{\alpha, \alpha} [\mathbf{1}]_{\alpha} = \mathbf{W}_{\mathrm{Tr}(G)}.$$

Note how the trace can be seen as composition which is “internal to a graph”.




FIGURE 9. Trace of a graph.

In what follows, if G_1 and G_2 are operator graphs with the same number of in and out cells, we will write $G_1 + G_2$ to denote the graph whose associated operator equals $\mathbf{W}_{G_1} + \mathbf{W}_{G_2}$.

Definition 9 (Differential). *Let $G = (G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{out}}), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus \mathcal{F}})$ be an operator graph. Fix a sequence $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}$ of possible inputs. Then the differential of G with respect to $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}$ is given by*

$$(\mathrm{d}G)_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}} := \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}|} (\mathrm{d}_i G)_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}}$$

where $(\mathrm{d}_i G)_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}} := (G, \mathfrak{d}, ((c_i), \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{out}}), (\mathbf{X}_c)_{c \in C \setminus (\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{out}} \cup \{c_i\})})$ has only c_i as in-cell, all other cells of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}(G)$ have been fixed to the corresponding elements from $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}}$.

Recall that by the universal property, \mathbf{W}_G corresponds to a multilinear map

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G : \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{in}}|} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c_i)} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{c \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{out}}} \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}.$$

Under this identification, we have by definition of the total derivative that

$$(d\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}|} (d_i \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}|} \mathbf{W}_{(d_i G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}} = \mathbf{W}_{(dG)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}}$$




FIGURE 10. An operator graph (left) and its differential with respect to $(\mathbf{x}_a, \mathbf{x}_b, W)$ (right).

Consider as a final example the graph G in Figure 11 (left) with its specification of in/out vertices and edges. Let a, b, c, d denote its vertices from bottom to top/left to right. This defines a bi-linear map $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G : \mathbb{R}^{d(d)} \times \mathbb{R}^{d(a) \times d(b)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d(c)}$. Given an input sequence $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}} := (\mathbf{x}, W)$, the differential at that point can be written as

$$(d\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} = (d_1 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} + (d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} = \mathbf{W}_{(d_1 G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}} + \mathbf{W}_{(d_2 G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}}$$

cf. Figure 11 (middle).




FIGURE 11. Some operations on graphs.

Let us, for instance, compute the squared Hilbert-Schmidt norm of $(d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}$ which in coordinates is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} \right\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \text{Tr} \left((d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}}^\top (d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \langle \mathbf{e}_\gamma, (d_2 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_G)_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}}} [\mathbf{E}_{\alpha, \beta}] \rangle^2. \end{aligned}$$

This is given by the product graph in Figure 11 (right).

3. NEURAL NETWORK EXPANSIONS

Having outlined our correspondence between analytic and graphical operations, we now show how to express neural networks and related quantities using these graphs.

3.1. Tree expansion for feed-forward neural networks. Fix sequences $(\varphi_\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0})$ of polynomial *activation functions*, $(N_\ell \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ of *layer dimensions* and $(W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ of weight matrices. Recall that a *feed-forward neural network* Φ_L of depth L with no bias term is defined by the recursion

$$(13) \quad \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = W_0 x, \quad \Phi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}) = W_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}(\Phi_\ell(\mathbf{x})).$$

As explained in the introduction, we aim to derive an expansion for $\Phi_L(\mathbf{x})$ that linearizes the effect of the activation functions.

This is achieved in the main result of the section (Theorem 4), in which we expand Φ_L as a sum of operator graphs which are rooted trees (see Definition 10). Some examples of the trees arising in this expansion are plotted in Figure 12: they all have weight matrices as edge inputs, basis vectors as leaf inputs and their internal nodes all have input $\mathbf{1}$. Each of these trees has a unique free vertex (its root) which is an out-vertex, and the latter always has out-degree one.




FIGURE 12. Examples of trees arising in the expansion of Φ_3

Consider k such trees τ_1, \dots, τ_k (along with the data required to make them operator graphs), assuming that their respective root edges are all fixed to the same W_ℓ for some $\ell > 0$ (which implies that the dimension assigned to each of the root vertices is $N_{\ell+1}$). We define $[\tau_1 \cdots \tau_k]_\ell$ to be the tree $(\bullet \xrightarrow{W_\ell} \bullet) \circ (\wedge_{i=1}^k \tau_i)$, where \circ denotes composition as defined in Section 2.3 and where for $\bullet \xrightarrow{W_\ell} \bullet$ the dimension of the vertices is given by $\mathfrak{d}(\bullet) = N_\ell, \mathfrak{d}(\circ) = N_{\ell+1}$. Then any tree like those in Figure 12 can be constructed from the following family of operator graphs:

$$\{[\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}]_0\}_{i \in [N_0]}, \text{ where } [\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}]_0 = \bullet \xrightarrow{W_0} \bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i} \text{ so that } \mathfrak{d}(\bullet) = N_0, \mathfrak{d}(\circ) = N_1,$$

where \mathfrak{d} is the dimension function for $[\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}]_0$. For instance, the first and second tree in said figure can be written as follows.




FIGURE 13. Constructing trees from vertices using brackets.

Using this shorthand notation, we now define the space \mathbb{T}_L .

Definition 10. Fix $L > 0$, \mathbb{T}_L is the set of operator graphs defined inductively by

$$\mathbb{T}_0 = \{[\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_1}]_0, \dots, [\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_{N_0}}]_0\}, \quad \mathbb{T}_{\ell+1} := \{[\tau_1 \cdots \tau_M]_{\ell+1} \mid M \geq 0, \forall i \in [M] \tau_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell\}.$$

Remark. Note that for any $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, there is a unique dimension function \mathfrak{d} that is compatible with its inputs: if an edge (u, v) is labeled by W_k then we must have $\mathfrak{d}(u) = N_{k+1}$ and $\mathfrak{d}(v) = N_k$. In what follows, we will implicitly assume this choice of dimension function for all of the trees being considered.

Recalling the definitions of the graph operations \wedge and \circ , we note that for $\tau = [\tau_1 \cdots \tau_M]_{\ell+1} \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell+1}$,

$$\mathbf{W}_{[\tau_1 \cdots \tau_M]_{\ell+1}} = W_{\ell+1} [\odot_{i=1}^M \mathbf{W}_{\tau_i}].$$

Note also that by construction, the trees in \mathbb{T}_L are *non-plane*, meaning that the order of the edges coming out of each vertex is ignored. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, it will thus be useful to keep track of how many ways we can rearrange its branches on the plane while not changing the resulting tree. Following Gubinelli [16], we call this quantity the *symmetry factor* $s(\tau)$ of τ , and define it recursively as

$$(14) \quad s([\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}]_0) = 1, \quad s([\tau_1]^{k_1} \cdots [\tau_m]^{k_m}]_\ell = \prod_i (k_i!) s(\tau_i)^{k_i},$$

where τ_1, \dots, τ_m are assumed to be distinct and $\tau_1^{k_1}$ denotes the repetition of τ_1 , k_1 times. Lastly, we introduce the following notation: for any vector \mathbf{x} , we let

$$(15) \quad \mathbf{x}_{[\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}]_0} = [\mathbf{x}]_i, \quad \mathbf{x}_{[\tau_1 \cdots \tau_M]_\ell} = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i},$$

and for any activation function φ ,

$$(16) \quad \varphi_{[\bullet_i]_0} = 1, \quad \varphi_{[\tau_1 \cdots \tau_M]_{\ell+1}} = \varphi_{\ell+1}^{(M)}(0) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_{\tau_i}.$$

Definition 11. Given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$ we define the sets $\mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x})$ of operator trees obtained from the trees in \mathbb{T}_ℓ by changing all the leaves' inputs from $\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}$ to \mathbf{x} . We will henceforth denote this operation by $\bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i} \mapsto \bullet_{\mathbf{x}}$.

If we extend $s(\eta)$ and φ_η to $\mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x})$ setting the base cases as $s([\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0) = \varphi_{[\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0} = 1$, then clearly $\varphi_\tau = \varphi_{\tau(\mathbf{x})}$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$ since the definition of φ only depends on the out-degree of the vertices, which is left unchanged. While it is not generally true that $s(\tau) = s(\tau(\mathbf{x}))$ one has nonetheless the useful equality

$$(17) \quad \frac{1}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_\eta = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell: \tau(\mathbf{x}) = \eta} \frac{1}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau(\mathbf{x})}.$$

which follows from the fact that $s(\tau(\mathbf{x}))/s(\tau)$ counts the number of ways in which the non-plane tree τ is obtained from $\tau(\mathbf{x})$ by applying the operation $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \bullet_{\mathbf{e}_i}$.

Example. Consider the trees $\eta := [[\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0 [\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0]_1$ and $\tau := [[\bullet_1]_0 [\bullet_2]_0]_1$. Then $\eta = \tau(\mathbf{x})$, but $s(\eta) = 2!s([\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0) = 2$ while $s(\tau) = s([\bullet_1]_0)s([\bullet_2]_0) = 1$. Notice that τ can be obtained both by $[[\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0 [\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0]_1 \mapsto [[\bullet_1]_0 [\bullet_2]_0]_1$ and $[[\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0 [\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}]_0]_1 \mapsto [[\bullet_2]_0 [\bullet_1]_0]_1$, so in $2 = s(\eta)/s(\tau)$ ways.

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 4 (Tree expansion). *Let Φ_L be as defined in (13). Then $\Phi_L(\mathbf{x})$ admits the following expansion over \mathbb{T}_ℓ :*

$$(18) \quad \Phi_\ell(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_\eta}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1}}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on depth ℓ for the first equality. If $\ell = 0$ then $\Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = W_0 \mathbf{x}$ and

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_0} \frac{\varphi_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_\tau = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \frac{1 \cdot [\mathbf{x}]_i}{1} W_0 \mathbf{e}_i = W_0 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_0} [\mathbf{x}]_i \mathbf{e}_i \right] = W_0 \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$$

as needed.

Now assume then the claim holds for ℓ . Note that for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$

$$\varphi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_{\ell+1}^{(M)}(0)}{M!} \mathbf{y}^{\odot M}$$

by Taylor expansion around the origin, where \odot denotes the Hadamard product.

If $y = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau$ then by Proposition 9 we can write

$$y^{\odot M} = \sum_{\bar{\tau} = \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_M \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}^M} \frac{M!}{\mathfrak{s}(\bar{\tau})} \odot_{i=1}^M \left(\frac{\varphi_{\tau_i}}{s(\tau_i)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i} \right).$$

In the right hand side, the summation is taken over symmetric tuples of M elements of \mathbb{T}_ℓ . These tuples, along with their associated symmetry factors \mathfrak{s} , are rigorously defined in Appendix B, and we discuss them informally here to make this proof self-contained.

For any set \mathcal{A} , a symmetric tuple $\llbracket a_1 \cdots a_M \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M$ of M elements of \mathcal{A} is obtained from the tuple (a_1, \dots, a_M) by forgetting about the order of its elements. Note that there is a natural connection between $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell} = \cup_{M \geq 0} \mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}^M$ and the trees in $\mathbb{T}_{\ell+1}$: since the latter are non-plane, they can be thought of as *nested* symmetric tuples $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}$ (meaning symmetric tuples of symmetric tuples, etc., ℓ times). To be precise, $\mathbb{T}_{\ell+1}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}^M$ are in bijection via

$$\tau := [\tau_1 \cdots \tau_m]_{\ell+1} \mapsto \bar{\tau} := \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket,$$

and under this identification we have $s(\tau) = \mathfrak{s}(\bar{\tau}) \prod_i s(\tau_i)$, where the symmetry factor of the symmetric tuple $\bar{\tau} = [(\tau_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\tau_N)^{k_N}]$ is given by $\mathfrak{s}(\bar{\tau}) := \prod_{i=1}^N (k_i)!$ when τ_1, \dots, τ_N are distinct.

We can thus leverage this connection to write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{y}) &= W_{\ell+1} \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_{\ell+1}^{(M)}(0)}{M!} \mathbf{y}^{\odot M} \\ &= \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \varphi_{\ell+1}^{(M)}(0) \sum_{\bar{\tau} = \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_M \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}^M} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}(\bar{\tau})} W_{\ell+1} \left[\odot_{i=1}^M \left(\frac{\varphi_{\tau_i}}{s(\tau_i)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{M=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\bar{\tau} = \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_M \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{T}_\ell}^M} \frac{\varphi_{\ell+1}^{(M)}(0) \prod_i \varphi_{\tau_i}}{\mathfrak{s}(\bar{\tau}) \prod_i s(\tau_i)} (W_{\ell+1} [\odot_{i=1}^M \mathbf{W}_{\tau_i}]) \left(\prod_i \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell+1}} \frac{\varphi_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality readily follows from

$$\sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_\eta}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_\eta = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell: \tau(\mathbf{x}) = \eta} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\ell} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau}.$$

□

Remark. *This result is a particular instance of a more general expansion given in Proposition 11 in the appendix.*

3.2. Expansions for related quantities. Combined with the dictionary in Section 2.3, this expansion allows us to express the coordinates of Φ_L and various related quantities as linear combinations of values of product graphs. Note that in the figures below, we label an edge with input W_ℓ by ℓ for simplicity.

3.2.1. Entry-wise expansion. We can use the expansion in Theorem 4 to derive one for the k -th entry of $\Phi_L(\mathbf{x})$. To that end, let $\mathbb{T}_{\ell,k}$ be the set of trees obtained from \mathbb{T}_ℓ by fixing the root to \mathbf{e}_k (i.e. $\circ \mapsto \bullet_{\mathbf{e}_k}$), noting that this results in a product graph. Then we can write the k -th entry of Φ_L as

$$(19) \quad [\Phi_L(\mathbf{x})]_k = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k}} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau} = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_\eta}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_\eta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

where $s(\tau)$, φ_τ and \mathbf{x}_τ are defined as in equations (14), (15) and (16) noting that these definitions only depend on τ through its set of vertices and edges.

3.2.2. Input-output Jacobian. Consider the (post-activation) Jacobian of Φ_L with respect to an input \mathbf{x} , which we define as

$$(20) \quad \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} = d(\varphi_L \circ \Phi_{L-1})_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_L \times N_0}.$$

Note that, following the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4, we can write

$$(21) \quad (\varphi_L \circ \Phi_{L-1})(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_{\eta^*}}{s(\eta^*)} \mathbf{W}_{\eta^*} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1}}$$

where η^* denotes the tree obtained from η by deleting the root and the edge which stems from it, and where φ_{η^*} and $s(\eta^*)$ are defined in the natural way, here $\varphi_{\eta^*} = \varphi_\eta$ as well as $s(\eta^*) = s(\eta)$. This operation is depicted in Figure 14, and let $(\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^* = \{\eta^* : \eta \in \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})\}$.




FIGURE 14. A tree $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_2(\mathbf{x})$ (left) and η^* (right).

Now let us take the derivative. For any tree $\eta \in (\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{x}))^*$, we want to see it as a multi-linear map in the \mathbf{x} so that we may compute its differential with respect to it. To do this, we first apply $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \circ$ to all of the vertices with input \mathbf{x} in η , then

compute the total derivative of the resulting map evaluated at $(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x})$. Concretely, let k denote the number of vertices in η with input \mathbf{x} , and η_1, \dots, η_k denote the trees obtained from η by applying $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \circ$ to each of these vertices (respectively). Then

$$d_{\mathbf{x}}\eta = \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i$$

and, arguing similarly as we did to get Equation (17) yields

$$(22) \quad \frac{1}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_{d_{\mathbf{x}}\eta} = \sum_{\eta^*: \eta^*(\mathbf{x})=\eta} \frac{1}{s(\eta^*)} \mathbf{W}_{\eta^*}.$$

In particular the equality holds since $s(\eta^*)/s(\eta)$ is equal to the number of ways in which η^* can be obtained from a tree in $(\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*$, *i.e.* to the number of times it appears in the total derivative of η .

To summarize what we have said to far, let $\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$ denote the space of trees which can be obtained from trees in $\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$ by applying $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \circ$ to exactly one of their leaves. Then we have

$$(23) \quad \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\eta \in (\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*} \frac{\varphi_{\eta}}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_{\eta}.$$

Once again, while the value of φ is invariant under $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \circ$ since it only depends on the out-degree of each vertex of the tree, the value of the symmetric factor s is not, given that \circ vertex is a new type of vertex and the equality holds thanks to Equation (22).

In Section 5, we will study the distribution of the singular values of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$ when the weight matrices of Φ_L are chosen at random. As we later explain, this amounts to estimating the elements of the sequence

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^T)^k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We note that every η in the expansion of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$ has exactly two free vertices: its root (\circ) and one of its leaves (\bullet). The transpose of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$ can thus be obtained from the same expansion by taking \mathbf{W}_{η^T} instead of \mathbf{W}_{η} (noting that φ_{η} and $s(\eta)$ are invariant under $\eta \mapsto \eta^T$). Thus we can write

$$(24) \quad \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^T = \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2 \in (\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*} \frac{\varphi_{\eta_1} \varphi_{\eta_2}}{s(\eta_1) s(\eta_2)} \mathbf{W}_{\eta_1 \circ \eta_2^T}$$


which, by linearity of the trace, gives

$$(25) \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^T) = \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2 \in (\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*} \frac{\varphi_{\eta_1} \varphi_{\eta_2}}{s(\eta_1) s(\eta_2)} \mathbf{W}_{\text{Tr}(\eta_1 \circ \eta_2^T)}.$$

Similarly, for $k = 2$ we can repeat the above procedure to obtain

$$(26) \quad \sum_{\eta_1^{(1)}, \eta_2^{(1)}, \eta_1^{(2)}, \eta_2^{(2)} \in (\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*} \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \prod_{j=1}^2 \frac{\varphi_{\eta_j^{(i)}}}{s(\eta_j^{(i)})} \right) \mathbf{W}_{\text{Tr}(\eta_1^{(1)} \circ (\eta_2^{(1)})^T \circ \eta_1^{(2)} \circ (\eta_2^{(2)})^T)},$$

and the case for general k case follows analogously, with the final expression involving product graphs of the form $\text{Tr}(\eta_1^{(1)} \circ (\eta_2^{(1)})^T \circ \dots \circ \eta_1^{(k)} \circ (\eta_2^{(k)})^T)$. This will be discussed in detail in Section 5.3.

FIGURE 15. Operator graphs arising in the expansion of $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{J}_{2,\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{J}_{2,\mathbf{x}}^T)$.

3.2.3. *Neural Tangent Kernel.* The same procedure can be used to compute the so-called Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) ([21]), which characterizes the dynamics of Φ_ℓ during gradient descent. The NTK is defined as

$$(27) \quad \Theta_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \lambda_\ell (\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x})) (\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{L+1} \times N_{L+1}},$$

where the $\lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ are known as the *layer-wise learning rates*.

To find an expansion for Θ_L , let $\partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$ denote the space of trees which can be obtained from trees in $\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$ by freeing exactly one of its height ℓ edges (i.e. one edge with input W_ℓ), making it an in-edge.

We can then write

$$(28) \quad \text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{s(\tau)} \mathbf{W}_\tau,$$

where $\mathbf{W}_\tau : \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{L+1}}$, noting that this once again follows from the fact that the symmetric factors take care of any overcounting.

Arguing as we above, we then find that

$$(29) \quad [(\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x})) (\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top]_{i,j} = \sum_{\tau \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\eta \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,j}(\mathbf{y})} \frac{\varphi_\tau \varphi_\eta}{s(\tau) s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau \circ \eta^\top}.$$

4. GENUS EXPANSION AND LIMIT THEOREMS

In this section, we develop tools to compute quantities of the form $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\}$, where G is a product graph whose edge inputs are matrices with Gaussian entries. We will extend our methods to non-Gaussian and sparse neural networks in Section 6.1. These results are all consequences of the classical Wick's Theorem, which we now recall.

For any set S of even size k , we define a *pairing* ϕ of S to be a partition of S into pairs $S_j = \{\phi_{j,1}, \phi_{j,2}\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k/2$. Then Wick's theorem reduces the task of computing expectations of a product of Gaussian random variables to that of computing pairwise covariances.

Theorem 5 (Wick's theorem). *Let $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a real centered Gaussian vector. Then for any sequence of integers i_1, \dots, i_k ,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k Z_{i_j} \right\} = \sum_{\phi} \prod_{j=1}^{k/2} \mathbb{E}\{Z_{i_{\phi_{j,1}}} Z_{i_{\phi_{j,2}}}\}.$$

where the sum is taken over all pairings of $\{1, \dots, k\}$.




FIGURE 16. Left: A pairing which is *not* admissible (in red), since a 1-edge is paired to a 0-edge and a vertex with input e_i is paired with one with input e_k . Right: An admissible pairing (in red) and the corresponding G_ϕ (note that not all edges are necessarily paired).

The arguments below are inspired by those of Dubach and Peled [11], albeit with substantial modifications to accommodate our more general setting.

4.1. Wick expansion for product graphs with random inputs. Throughout this section, we will let \mathcal{W} denote the following sequence of random matrices.

Definition 12. Let $\mathcal{W} := (W_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{r_i} \times N_{c_i}}$ are independent Gaussian random matrices with i.i.d. entries distributed as $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{R}}(0, \sigma_i^2)$.

Assumption 1. We assume that any graph G considered throughout the section is a product graph whose inputs are either deterministic or matrices in \mathcal{W} .

For any product graph G satisfying Assumption 1 and edge $e \in E$, we will say that e is an “ ℓ -edge” if its input is fixed to $W_\ell \in \mathcal{W}$. For simplicity, we label such edges by ℓ instead of W_ℓ when depicting the graph, as the latter can quickly become cumbersome.

We will consider pairings of edges of G whose inputs are matrices in \mathcal{W} , denoting the set of such edges by $E_{\mathcal{W}}$. Such a pairing is said to be *admissible* if it only pairs ℓ -edges with ℓ -edges.

Definition 13 (Admissible pairing). Let G be a product graph, and $E_{\mathcal{W}} = \{e \in E : \mathbf{X}_e = W_\ell \text{ for some } \ell(e) := \ell \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then a pairing ϕ of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ is said to be admissible if any two paired edges $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$ satisfy $\ell(e) = \ell(e')$. We denote the set of all admissible pairings of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ by $\mathcal{P}(G)$.

For any product graph G and admissible pairing $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, let G_ϕ be the product graph constructed by identifying the edges of G paired by ϕ coherently with their orientation (see, e.g., Figure 16). The inputs of the cells in G_ϕ are assigned as follows:

- When identifying two edges fixed to W_ℓ , the resulting edge will be fixed to $\mathbb{E}[W_\ell \odot W_\ell] = \sigma_\ell^2 \mathbf{I}$.
- When identifying two vertices u, v (e.g. by pairing edges which have u and v as their respective endpoints), the resulting vertex will have input $\mathbf{x}_u \odot \mathbf{x}_v$.

Examples of pairings which are and aren’t admissible are depicted in Figure 16, along with the graph G_ϕ that arises when admissibility holds.

In the event that the graph G is not connected, we write it as a disjoint union $G_\phi = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G_\phi)} (G_i)_\phi$ of its connected components $(G_i)_\phi$, where $c(G_\phi)$ denotes the number of connected components of G_ϕ .

Theorem 6 (Wick expansion). *Let G be a (possibly disconnected) product graph satisfying Assumption 1. Then*

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}.$$

where ϕ runs over all of G 's admissible pairings.

Proof. Let $G = (G, \mathfrak{d}, (\mathbf{X})_{c \in C})$ be a product graph and consider the set of indexations $\mathcal{I}^G := \prod_{v \in V(G)} \{1, \dots, N_v\}$. Recall that for each $e = (u, v) \in E$, $i_e = i_u i_v$. Then for any $\mathbf{i}_V \in \mathcal{I}^G$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ \prod_{c \in C} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right\} = \prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\}.$$

By Wick's theorem, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\} = \sum_{\phi} \prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \phi} \mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} [\mathbf{X}_{e'}]_{i_{e'}} \right\}$$

where the sum is over all pairings ϕ of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$. Note that if $\phi \notin \mathcal{P}(G)$ then

$$\prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \phi} \mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} [\mathbf{X}_{e'}]_{i_{e'}} \right\} = 0$$

and we can therefore write

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} &= \sum_{\mathbf{i}_V} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \phi} \mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} [\mathbf{X}_{e'}]_{i_{e'}} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \sum_{\mathbf{i}_V} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \phi} \sigma_{\ell(e)}^2 \delta_{i_e, i_{e'}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{i, j} := \mathbf{1}(i = j)$ is the Kronecker delta function.

For any vertices $u, v \in V$, we write $u \sim_\phi v$ if they are identified after identifying edges according to ϕ . Similarly, we write $e \sim_\phi e'$ if $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$. If we let $V_{\mathcal{W}}$ be the set of vertices adjacent to edges in $E_{\mathcal{W}}$, we then have canonical bijections

$$V(G_\phi) \simeq V_{\mathcal{W}}^c \sqcup (V_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi), \quad E(G_\phi) \simeq E_{\mathcal{W}}^c \sqcup (E_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi)$$

Note that each element in $\varepsilon \in E_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi$ corresponds to a block $\varphi(\varepsilon) \in \phi$, while each element of $\nu \in V_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi$ corresponds to a subset $\varphi(\nu) \subset V$ (these are the pre-images under the quotient maps). Then for any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ we can write the product of G_ϕ in terms of indexations of G as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{G_\phi}} \prod_{c \in E_{\mathcal{W}}^c \cup V_{\mathcal{W}}^c} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \left(\prod_{\varepsilon \in (E_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi)} \sigma_{\ell(\varepsilon)}^2 \right) \left(\prod_{\nu \in (V_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi)} \prod_{u \in \varphi(\nu)} [\mathbf{X}_u]_{i_u} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^G} \prod_{c \in E_{\mathcal{W}}^c \cup V_{\mathcal{W}}^c} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \left(\prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \phi} \sigma_{\ell(e)}^2 \delta_{i_e, i_{e'}} \right) \left(\prod_{\nu \in (V_{\mathcal{W}} / \sim_\phi)} \delta_{\mathbf{i}|_\nu} \prod_{u \in \varphi(\nu)} [\mathbf{X}_u]_{i_u} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here $\delta_{i|\nu} := \mathbf{1}(\forall u, u' \in \varphi(\nu), i_u = i_{u'})$ and $\sigma_{\ell(\varepsilon)} = \sigma_{\ell(e)}$ for any choice of $e \in \varphi(\varepsilon)$, since they all yield the same $\sigma_{\ell(e)}$. By definition, there exists a $\nu \in (V_{\mathcal{W}}/\sim_\phi)$ such that $u, u' \in \varphi(\nu)$ if and only if we have $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$ such that u, u' are either the respective heads or the respective tails of e, e' , it follows that

$$\prod_{\{e, e'\} \in \varphi(\varepsilon)} \delta_{i_e, i_{e'}} = \prod_{\nu \in (V_{\mathcal{W}}/\sim_\phi)} \delta_{i|\nu}.$$

Using this, the claim then follows from the equality

$$\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} = \left(\prod_{c \in E_{\mathcal{W}}^c \cup V_{\mathcal{W}}^c} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \left(\prod_{\nu \in (V_{\mathcal{W}}/\sim_\phi)} \prod_{u \in \varphi(\nu)} [\mathbf{X}_u]_{i_u} \right).$$

□

We now derive a centered version of Theorem 6 (Proposition 1), which we will need to derive limit theorems for \mathbf{W}_G . To that end, we need to single out the following types of admissible pairings which largely dictate its first and second-order behaviour in the limit.

Definition 14. Let $G = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} G_i$ be a product graph, given as a disjoint union of its connected components, and fix an admissible pairing $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ of its edges.

- (1) ϕ is said to be fully-atomic if and only if for every $1 \leq i \leq c(G)$, the edges in $E(G_i)$ are paired between themselves and $(G_i)_{\phi|_{G_i}}$ is a tree, where $\phi|_{G_i}$ denotes the pairing induced by ϕ on the edges of G_i .
- (2) ϕ is bi-atomic if and only if for every $1 \leq i \leq c(G)$, there exists a $j \neq i$ such that ϕ pairs edges of $E(G_i) \sqcup E(G_j)$ between themselves and $(G_i \sqcup G_j)_{\phi|_{G_i \sqcup G_j}}$ is a tree.
- (3) ϕ is atom-free if and only if there is no G_i for which ϕ pairs the edges in $E(G_i)$ between themselves and $(G_i)_\phi$ is a tree.

We denote the set of (admissible) fully-atomic, bi-atomic and atom-free pairings of G by $\mathcal{P}_A(G)$, $\mathcal{P}_B(G)$, and $\mathcal{P}_{AF}(G)$ respectively. With these definitions, we can now state and prove the following centered version of Theorem 6.

Proposition 1. Let $G = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} G_i$ be a product graph satisfying Assumption 1, with disjoint connected components G_i . Then

$$(32) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} \right) \right\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{AF}(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}$$

Proof. Let $[c(G)] := \{1, \dots, c(G)\}$, and for any $T \subseteq [c(G)]$ define $G_T := \sqcup_{i \in T} G_i$. Then by expanding the expectation in (32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_i \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} (-1)^{|T^c|} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i \in T} \mathbf{W}_{G_i} \right\} \left(\prod_{i \notin T} \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem 6, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\prod_{i \in T} \mathbf{W}_{G_i}\right\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G_T)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_T)_\phi}$$

and in turn

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G_T)} (-1)^{|T^c|} \mathbf{W}_{(G_T)_\phi} \prod_{i \notin T} \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} \\ &= \sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} (-1)^{|T^c|} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G_T) \times (\prod_{i \in T^c} \mathcal{P}_A(G_i))} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} \end{aligned}$$

and the conclusion follows from the inclusion-exclusion principle since

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(G) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{c(G)} (\mathcal{P}(G_{[c(G)] \setminus \{i\}}) \times \mathcal{P}_A(G_i))^c = \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} (\mathcal{P}(G_{[c(G)] \setminus \{i\}}) \times \mathcal{P}_A(G_i))$$

and

$$\bigcap_{i \in T^c} (\mathcal{P}(G_{[c(G)] \setminus \{i\}}) \times \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)) = \mathcal{P}(G_T) \times \prod_{i \in T^c} \mathcal{P}_A(G_i).$$

□

More generally, the same proof gives the following.

Proposition 2. *Let $G = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} G_i$ be a product graph satisfying Assumption 1, with disjoint connected components G_i . Given any sequence $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}(G_i)$ and setting $\mathcal{P}_\star := \bigcap_i [\mathcal{P}(G_{[c(G)] \setminus \{i\}}) \sqcup \mathcal{P}_i]^c$ one has*

$$(33) \quad \mathbb{E}\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_i} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi}\right)\right\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_\star} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}.$$

4.2. Genus expansion. We now study a particular setting in which it will be possible to explicitly express \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} for each ϕ . Recalling that \mathcal{W} is the sequence of random matrices serving as inputs to edges in $E_{\mathcal{W}}(G) \subset E(G)$, we assume the following.

Assumption 2. *\mathcal{W} is such that all $N_{c_i} = N_{r_i} = N$ for some integer $N > 0$, and G is such that $\mathfrak{d}(v) = N$, $\mathbf{X}_v = \mathbf{1}_N$ for all $v \in V$ and $\mathbf{X}_e = \mathbf{I}$ for all $e \in E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}(G)$.*

Under Assumption 2, the definition of \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} then directly yields

$$(34) \quad \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G N^{|V(G_\phi)|}, \quad \sigma_G = \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} \sigma_{\ell(e)},$$

given that all the edges of G_ϕ are labeled by $\mathbf{I}_{N \times N}$. The order of \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} is thus determined by the number of vertices in G_ϕ .

Instead of counting the number of vertices $|V(G_\phi)|$ directly, it is often simpler to associate a surface to G_ϕ and use its Euler characteristic to express $|V(G_\phi)|$ in terms of this surface's genus, number of edges and connected components. This forms the basis of the *genus expansion* technique, which has been used extensively to compute random matrix integrals.

To use it, we will need some basic notions from topological graph theory (see [15] for a more in-depth introduction). Any connected graph $G = (V, E)$ can be viewed as a topological space, by viewing vertices as distinct points and edges as

subspaces homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$ joining their ends, such that edges only meet at their endpoints. An *embedding* ρ of G on some orientable surface S is then defined as a homeomorphism from G (viewed as a space) to S , and is said to be *cellular* if the resulting faces are all homeomorphic to the open disk. For our purposes, all embeddings are assumed to be cellular.

The connected components of $S \setminus \rho(G)$ are referred to as the *faces* of the embedding, and we denote the total number of faces by $f(G : S)$. Lastly, we denote the genus of S is denoted by $g(S)$. For any cellular embedding, we have the following formula.

Proposition 3 (Euler Characteristic formula). *Let ρ be a (cellular) embedding of a connected $G = (V, E)$ on an orientable surface S . Then we have*

$$|V| - |E| + f(G : S) = 2 - 2g(S).$$

For instance, if G is a planar graph with F faces, then its drawing on the plane is a cellular embedding and this reduces to the famous identity $|V| - |E| + F = 2$. Further, it is well known that all orientable surfaces of genus g are equivalent up to homeomorphism (as a representative of their equivalence class, one can for instance take the surface obtained by adding g “handles” to a 2-sphere, an idea going back to [2]). For any $g \geq 0$, it thus makes sense to talk about *the* surface of genus g , which we henceforth denote by S_g .

Lastly, we can define embeddings of disconnected graphs by considering each connected component separately. Letting $c(G)$ denote the number of components and $G = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} G_i$, an embedding of G is given by embedding each G_i on an oriented surface S_i . We can also extend the definitions of f and g by writing $S = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} S_i$,

$$g(S) := \sum_{i=1}^{c(G)} g(S_i), \quad \text{and} \quad f(G : S) := \sum_{i=1}^{c(G)} f(G_i : S_i),$$

and we note that the Euler characteristic formula still holds with these definitions.

Going back the setting of Assumption 2, let G be such a product graph and $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an admissible pairing of its edges. Recalling that G_ϕ is the graph obtained from G after identifying edges paired by ϕ , we let

$$(35) \quad S_\phi := \min_{g \geq 0} \{S_g : \text{there exists an embedding } \rho : G_\phi \rightarrow S_g\}.$$

if G is connected. Otherwise, let $(S_i)_\phi$ be the surface obtained this way from each connected component G_i of G , and define $S_\phi = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} (S_i)_\phi$.

Remark. *This minimum in (35) is always attained, and the value of g for which $S_g = S_\phi$ is often referred to as the minimum orientable genus of G in the literature (see [15]).*

We do not dwell on the details of these concepts and definitions, as we essentially only care about the case when G_ϕ is a tree in our arguments. In that case, $g(S_\phi) = 0$ and we concern ourselves with $f(G_\phi : S_\phi)$ and $c(G_\phi)$ instead.

Note also that we obtained S_ϕ from G_ϕ in a different way than in [11]: in their case, G is always a cycle, which naturally gives rise to a closed surface after identifying edges. No such construction exists in our case.




FIGURE 17. A product graph whose value is the trace of a word of Ginibre random matrices.

For any G satisfying Assumption 2 and $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ we note that G_ϕ always has the same number of edges, which we denote by

$$(36) \quad \check{e}(G) := |E(G_\phi)| = |E_{\mathcal{W}}(G)|/2 + |E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}(G)|,$$

since the random edges are paired up by ϕ and the rest are left untouched. Theorem 6 then yields the following.

Corollary (Genus expansion). *Let G be a product graph satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. Then for any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$,*

$$(37) \quad \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G N^{2(c(G_\phi) - g(S_\phi)) - f(G_\phi : S_\phi) + \check{e}(G)},$$

and it follows that

$$(38) \quad \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbf{W}_G \} = \sigma_G N^{\check{e}(G)} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} N^{2(c(G_\phi) - g(S_\phi)) - f(G_\phi : S_\phi)}.$$

Proof. This follows directly from equation (34) and the Euler characteristic formula, noting that the latter yields

$$(39) \quad |V(G_\phi)| = 2(c(G_\phi) - g(S_\phi)) + |E(G_\phi)| - f(G_\phi : S_\phi).$$

□

Let us demonstrate how this result can be used to study words of random matrices, as defined in [11]. As explained in the following example, this amounts to computing the values of polygonal product graphs.

Example. *Under Assumption 2, let w be a word of matrices in \mathcal{W} , say $w = W_1 W_4^T W_2^T W_5 W_3^T$. Then taking G to be the product graph in Figure 17 below gives $\mathbf{W}_G = \text{Tr}(w)$. Products of such traces (the subject of Theorem 2.2 in [11]) can then be evaluated using Corollary 4.2 by considering disjoint unions of such graphs.*

In this specific setting, we can also refine our result on centered mixed moments.

Lemma 1. *Let G satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2. Then for every $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{AF}(G)$, we have*

$$2(c(G_\phi) - g(S_\phi)) - f(G_\phi : S_\phi) \leq \frac{c(G)}{2}.$$

Further, equality holds if and only if ϕ is bi-atomic, giving

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sigma_{G_i} N^{\check{e}(G_i)+1} |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i)| \right) \right\} = \sigma_G N^{\check{e}(G) + \frac{c(G)}{2}} \left(|\mathcal{P}_B(G)| + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right).$$

Proof. Assume that $c(G_\phi) \leq c(G)/2$. Then it suffices to prove that for each connected component G_i of G and its corresponding surface S_i ,

$$2(1 - g((S_i)_\phi)) - f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) \leq 1$$

and that the equality holds if and only if $(G_i)_\phi$ is a tree.

Since $f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) \geq 1$ and $g((S_i)_\phi) \geq 0$, we have

$$2(1 - g((S_i)_\phi)) - f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) \leq 2(1 - 0) - 1 = 1$$

with equality if and only if $f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) = 1$ and $g((S_i)_\phi) = 0$ (which is equivalent to $(G_i)_\phi$ being a tree). Now if $c(G_\phi) > c(G)/2$ instead, then there must be at least

$$2\left(c(G_\phi) - \frac{c(G)}{2}\right)$$

components of G_ϕ of the form $(G_j)_\phi$ for some $1 \leq j \leq c(G)$. Letting k be the number of components obtained this way, then we must have that $k \geq 2(c(G_\phi) - c(G)/2)$: assuming otherwise, the inequality

$$c(G) \geq k + 2(c(G_\phi) - k) = 2\left(c(G_\phi) - \frac{k}{2}\right)$$

quickly gives a contradiction. Since ϕ is atom-free,

$$f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) = 1 \implies g((S_i)_\phi) > 0$$

for these components, and it follows that

$$2(1 - g((S_i)_\phi)) - f((G_i)_\phi : (S_i)_\phi) \leq 0.$$

As for the remaining components (of which there are strictly less than $c(G)/2$) this quantity is ≤ 1 as proved above, and the lemma follows. \square

Corollary. *Let G be a product graph satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2, and $\lambda_G := (\sigma_G N^{\check{e}(G)+1})^{-1}$*

$$(40) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\lambda_G W_G - |\mathcal{P}_A(G)|)^2 \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \left(|\mathcal{P}_B(G)| + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right).$$

Lastly, we note that by combining the previous two results, we can derive the following limit theorem for the joint distribution of product graphs.

Theorem 7. *Let $(G_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of connected product graphs satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. Then for any $m \geq 1$,*

$$\left((\sigma_{G_i} N^{\check{e}(G_i)+\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{G_i} - |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i)| \sqrt{N} \right)_{i=1}^m \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_m)^\top$$

where the limit is a centered Gaussian vector with covariance function $C := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]$ having entries $[C]_{i,j} = |\mathcal{P}_B(G_i \sqcup G_j)|$.

Proof. We use the moment method. Setting

$$\tilde{Z}_i := (\sigma_{G_i} N^{\check{e}(G_i)+\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{G_i} - |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i)| \sqrt{N}$$

we want to compute the expectations

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m (\tilde{Z}_i)^{k_i} \right\}$$

for non-negative integers k_i . We are in the setting of Lemma 1 and the leading term of the expectation is the number of bi-atomic pairings of the induced graph. Given a possible pairing of its connected components, for each of its pairs (\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}') this contributes a factor $|\mathcal{P}_A(\tilde{G} \sqcup \tilde{G}')|$ to the total sum. But this is exactly the result of computing

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m (Z_i)^{k_i} \right\}$$

by applying Wick's theorem. \square

5. APPLICATIONS TO FEED-FORWARD NETWORKS

We are now fully equipped to start computing scaling limits for neural networks using the pipeline explained in the introduction. Recall that a neural network Φ_L is defined by

$$(41) \quad \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = W_0 \mathbf{x}, \quad \Phi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}) = W_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}(\Phi_\ell(\mathbf{x})),$$

for a choice of activation functions $(\varphi_\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$, layer dimensions $(N_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}$ and weight matrices $(W_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}$ (see Equation (13)). In this section, each of the results will depend on a different choice of layer dimensions $(N_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}$, and the weight matrices W_ℓ are assumed to have i.i.d. Gaussian entries with standard deviation σ_ℓ left to be specified. Extensions to non-Gaussian/sparse matrices are handled in Sections 6.2 and 6.1.

Note that the proofs of some auxiliary lemmas stated here are deferred to Section A to help with readability.

5.1. Gaussian process limit. We begin by proving a special case of the Gaussian process limit (Theorem 1), for Φ with Gaussian weights.

Assumption 3. *The input dimension N_0 of Φ_L is fixed, and $N_\ell = N$ for all other layers $\ell > 0$.*

Theorem 8. *Assume that $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_\ell = N_\ell^{-1/2}$ for $\ell \geq 1$, and Assumption 3. Then for any $M, L \geq 1$ we have*

$$(42) \quad ([\Phi_L]_1, \dots, [\Phi_L]_M) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{GP}(0, K_L \otimes \mathbf{I}_M)$$

where the right hand side is a Gaussian Process indexed on \mathbb{R}^{N_0} , with diagonal covariance function defined by

$$(43) \quad K_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}, \quad K_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E} [\varphi_{\ell+1}(X_\ell) \varphi_{\ell+1}(Y_\ell)]$$

$$(44) \quad (X_\ell, Y_\ell) \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \begin{bmatrix} K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) & K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ K_\ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) & K_\ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Following the pipeline in Section 1.2.4, begin by considering the coordinate-wise tree expansion of Φ_L given in Equation (19):

$$[\Phi_L(\mathbf{x})]_k = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\varphi_\eta}{s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_\eta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

To find the distributional limit of Φ_L using this expansion, we thus need a limit for the joint distribution of

$$(\mathbf{W}_\eta \mid \eta \in \cup_{i=1}^M \mathbb{T}_{L,k_i}(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for any fixed sequences $(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \mid i \in [M])$ and $(k_i \in [N_{L+1}] \mid i \in [M])$. Note that we have not made any assumptions on the variances σ_ℓ^2 yet: as will soon become apparent, only one such choice yields a meaningful result, and it will correspond to the so-called ‘‘GP limit’’ initialization (see [23]).

The mixed moments of the \mathbf{W}_η can be computed using Proposition 1, which yields

$$(45) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m (\mathbf{W}_{\eta_i} - \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\eta_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(\eta_i)_\phi}) \right\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{AF}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(\sqcup_i \eta_i)_\phi}.$$

To identify the leading terms on the right hand side, we must therefore identify the pairings $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{AF}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ which maximize $\mathbf{W}_{(\sqcup_i \eta_i)_\phi}$. This is done in the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *Under Assumption 3, for any $L \geq 0$ and fixed sequences $(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \mid i \in [M])$, $(k_i \in [N_{L+1}] \mid i \in [M])$ and $(\eta_i \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid i \in [M])$, we have*

$$(46) \quad \forall i \in [M], \quad \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\eta_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(\eta_i)_\psi} = 0,$$

$$(47) \quad \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{AF}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(\sqcup_i \eta_i)_\phi} = \sigma_{\sqcup_i \eta_i} N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(\sqcup_i \eta_i)| - |\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)|)} \left(\alpha(\sqcup_i \eta_i) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ denotes the set of leaves of $\sqcup_i \eta_i$ (endpoints of 0-labeled edges),

$$\alpha(\sqcup_i \eta_i) := \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sqcup_i \eta_i)} \delta_\phi \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi$$

where δ_ϕ is equal to one if roots paired by ϕ are fixed to the same \mathbf{e}_i and zero otherwise, and

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi := \prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}_j}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i) / \sim_\phi)} \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}.$$

Applying this lemma to (45) gives

$$(48) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{W}_{\eta_i} \right\} = \sigma_{\sqcup_i \eta_i} N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(\sqcup_i \eta_i)| - |\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)|)} \left(\alpha(\sqcup_i \eta_i) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right).$$

If we want to have a well-defined distributional limit for Φ_L , we must choose the standard deviations σ_ℓ so that the above quantity is $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for all choices $\eta_i \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k_i}$.

This is equivalent to requiring that $\sigma_\eta N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(\eta)| - |\mathcal{L}(\eta)|)} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ for all $L, k \geq 1$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k}$, which is in turn equivalent to

$$(49) \quad \sigma_0 = \mathcal{O}(1) \text{ and } \sigma_\ell = \mathcal{O}(N_\ell^{-1/2}) \quad \forall \ell \geq 1.$$

The canonical choice would then be the one for which $\sigma_\eta N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(\eta)| - |\mathcal{L}(\eta)|)} = 1$, and this is exactly the ‘‘GP limit’’ parametrisation of neural networks ([23]). Under said parameterisation, the method of moments then gives the following limit.

Proposition 4. *Under Assumption 3, let $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_\ell = N_\ell^{-1/2}$ for $\ell \geq 1$. Then for any $M, L \geq 1$ and fixed sequences $(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \mid i \in [M])$, $(k_i \in [N_{L+1}] \mid i \in [M])$ and $(\eta_i \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid i \in [M])$ we have*

$$(50) \quad \left(\mathbf{W}_{\eta_i} \mid i \in [M] \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{d} \left(Z_{\eta_i} \mid i \in [M] \right) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, C)$$

where the right hand side denotes a Gaussian process indexed on $(\eta_i \in \mathbb{T}_{L,k_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid i \in [M])$ with covariance $C(\eta, \nu) = \alpha(\eta \sqcup \nu)$ (with α defined as in the statement of Lemma 2).

We can make the previous result more precise using the combinatorial structure of the limiting covariances $\alpha(\eta \sqcup \nu)$.

Lemma 3. *Let α be as in 2. Given $\ell \geq 1$, $\tau = [\tau_1 \cdots \tau_n]_\ell \in \mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x}_1)$ and $\eta = [\eta_1 \cdots \eta_m]_\ell \in \mathbb{T}_\ell(\mathbf{x}_2)$ we can write*

$$\alpha([\tau]_i \sqcup [\eta]_j) = \delta_{i,j} \sum_{\pi} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \alpha(\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2)$$

where the sum is over all pairings π of the elements of $([\tau_1]_1, \dots, [\tau_n]_1, [\eta_1]_1, \dots, [\eta_m]_1)$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. It follows directly from Proposition 4 and Equation 19 that

$$([\Phi_L]_1, \dots, [\Phi_L]_M) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{GP}(0, K_L \otimes \mathbf{I}_M)$$

where for any $\ell \geq 0$, K_ℓ is defined by

$$(51) \quad K_\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\eta_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\eta_{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{y})} \frac{\varphi_{\eta_{\mathbf{x}}} \varphi_{\eta_{\mathbf{y}}}}{s(\eta_{\mathbf{x}}) s(\eta_{\mathbf{y}})} \alpha(\eta_{\mathbf{x}} \sqcup \eta_{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

What's left is to show that this definition of K_ℓ coincides with the one in the theorem statement. We proceed by induction on ℓ . The base case $\ell = 0$ follows from $\mathbb{T}_{0,i}(\mathbf{x}) = \{e_i \bullet^{W_0} \bullet \mathbf{x}\}$ and $\alpha(e_i \bullet^{W_0} \bullet \mathbf{x} \sqcup e_i \bullet^{W_0} \bullet \mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}$.

For the inductive step, we assume that the claim holds for ℓ and apply Proposition 10 with $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathbb{T}_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathbb{T}_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{y})$ and

$$\lambda(\eta, \nu) = \frac{\varphi_\eta \varphi_\nu}{s(\eta) s(\nu)} \alpha(\eta \sqcup \nu).$$

Note that $\mathbb{T}_{\ell+1,1}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ are in bijection via $\eta := [\eta_1 \cdots \eta_m]_{\ell+1} \mapsto \bar{\eta} := \llbracket \eta_1 \cdots \eta_m \rrbracket$ and under this identification we have $s(\eta) = \mathfrak{s}(\bar{\eta}) \prod_i s(\eta_i)$, $\varphi_\eta = \varphi_{\ell+1}^{(m)} \prod_i \varphi_{\eta_i}$. Lemma 3 thus gives

$$\alpha(\eta \sqcup \nu) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{\eta} \sqcup \bar{\nu})} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \alpha(\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2),$$

and this completes the proof since

$$\frac{\varphi_\eta \varphi_\nu}{s(\eta) s(\nu)} \alpha(\eta \sqcup \nu) = \frac{\varphi_{\bar{\eta}} \varphi_{\bar{\nu}}}{\mathfrak{s}(\bar{\eta}) \mathfrak{s}(\bar{\nu})} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{\eta} \sqcup \bar{\nu})} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \lambda(\pi_1, \pi_2).$$

□

5.2. Convergence of the Neural Tangent Kernel. Our next result is the convergence in L^2 of the NTK, which we recall is defined as

$$(52) \quad \Theta_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\ell=0}^L \lambda_\ell (d_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x})) (d_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{L+1} \times N_{L+1}},$$

where the λ_ℓ denote the layer-wise learning rates.

Assumption 4. *Assume that the input dimension N_0 of Φ_L is fixed, and that $N_\ell = N$ for all other layers $\ell > 0$. We also assume that $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_\ell = N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $\ell > 0$ (the GP limit initialization).*

Theorem 9. *Under Assumption 4 and $\lambda_0 = \sigma_\ell^2$, we have*

$$(53) \quad \Theta_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \xrightarrow{L^2} \Theta_L^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \otimes \text{Id}_{N_{L+1}},$$

where

$$(54) \quad \Theta_0^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}, \quad \Theta_L^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = K_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \dot{K}_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \Theta_{L-1}^\infty(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

and \dot{K}_ℓ is defined in the same way as K_ℓ but substituting φ_ℓ for φ'_ℓ in (43).

Recall that the i, j -th entry of the NTK can be expressed by the following graph expansion (see Equation (29)):

$$(55) \quad [(\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x}))(\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top]_{i,j} = \sum_{\tau \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\eta \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,j}(\mathbf{y})} \frac{\varphi_\tau \varphi_\eta}{s(\tau)s(\eta)} \mathbf{W}_{\tau \circ \eta^\top}.$$

The scaling limits of the product graphs appearing on the right hand side are as follows:

Lemma 4. *Under Assumption 4, for any $\tau \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i_1}(\mathbf{x}_1)$ and $\eta \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i_2}(\mathbf{x}_2)$, we have*

$$(56) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\sigma_\ell^2 \mathbf{W}_{\tau \circ \eta^\top} - a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) \right)^2 \right\} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right),$$

where

$$(57) \quad a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) := \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau \circ \eta^\top)} \delta_{i_1, i_2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})_\psi.$$

Remark. *The choice $\lambda_\ell := \sigma_\ell^2$ is exactly the layer-wise learning rate in the so-called “NTK parametrization” (see [21]); as with the GP limit initialization (c.f. Equation (49)), the parameter choice prevalent in the literature arises naturally.*

Our next step will be to analyze the combinatorial structure of the scaling limits that we have just computed.

Lemma 5. *For $L \geq 1$, there is a canonical bijection*

$$\partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x}) \times \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L-1,1}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \eta \mapsto (\eta^+, \eta^-)$$

under which

$$a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) = \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+) a(\tau^- \circ \eta^{-\top}), \quad s(\tau^+) s(\tau^-) = s(\tau), \quad \varphi_\tau = \dot{\varphi}_{\tau^+} \varphi_{\tau^-}$$

where $\dot{\varphi}_{[\tau_1 \dots \tau_n]_L} := \varphi_L^{(n+1)} \prod_i \varphi_{\tau_i}$ and a is defined as in the statement of Lemma 4. Further, if $\ell = L$, we have $\partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L-1,1}(\mathbf{x}) := \{\bullet\}$ so that $\partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x}) \simeq \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) = \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+)$.

Combining everything we have done so far, we prove convergence in L^2 of the NTK to its limit.

Proof of Theorem 9. For $\ell = L$ we can say

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\ell^2 [(\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{x}))(\text{d}_{W_\ell} \Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top]_{i,j} &= \sum_{\tau \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{\eta \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,j}(\mathbf{y})} \frac{\varphi_\tau \varphi_\eta}{s(\tau)s(\eta)} \sigma_\ell^2 \mathbf{W}_{\tau \circ \eta^\top} \\ &\xrightarrow{L^2} \sum_{\tau, \eta} \frac{\varphi_\tau \varphi_\eta}{s(\tau)s(\eta)} a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) \\ &= \sum_{\tau^+, \eta^+} \frac{\varphi_{\tau^+} \varphi_{\eta^+}}{s(\tau^+)s(\eta^+)} \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+) = \delta_i^j K_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

while for $\ell < L$, noting that $s(\tau) = s(\tau^+)s(\tau^-)$ and $\varphi_\tau = \dot{\varphi}_{\tau^+}\varphi_{\tau^-}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_\ell^2[(d_{W_\ell}\Phi_L(\mathbf{x}))(d_{W_\ell}\Phi_L(\mathbf{y}))^\top]_{i,j} \\ & \xrightarrow{L^2} \sum_{\tau^+,\eta^+} \sum_{\tau^-,\eta^-} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\tau^+}\dot{\varphi}_{\eta^+}}{s(\tau^+)s(\eta^+)} \frac{\varphi_{\tau^-}\varphi_{\eta^-}}{s(\tau^-)s(\eta^-)} \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+) a(\tau^- \circ \eta^{-\top}) \\ & = \delta_i^j \dot{K}_L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_\ell^2[(d_{W_\ell}\Phi_{L-1}(\mathbf{x}))(d_{W_\ell}\Phi_{L-1}(\mathbf{y}))^\top]_{1,1} \end{aligned}$$

A simple induction on L yields the sought after equalities. \square

5.3. Distribution of the squared singular values of the Jacobian. Consider the input-output Jacobian $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$, which we defined in Equation (20) as

$$\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} = d(\varphi_L \circ \Phi_{L-1})_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_L \times N_0}.$$

Letting $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N_L}\}$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top$, recall that the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of this matrix is defined as the random measure

$$(58) \quad \rho_L := \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{i=1}^{N_L} \delta_{\xi_i}$$

where δ_{ξ_i} denotes a Dirac mass at ξ_i .

Assumption 5. Assume $N_\ell = N$ for all layers $\ell \geq 0$, and that the input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies $\frac{1}{N} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rightarrow x^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

We say that ρ_L converges weakly in probability to some measure μ whenever the sequence of (real-valued) random variables $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\rho_L$ converges in probability to $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\mu$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for any choice of bounded, continuous test function f .

Theorem 10. Under Assumption 5, ρ_L converges weakly in probability to a deterministic measure $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(x, (\varphi_\ell)_\ell)$, whose moments can be evaluated explicitly by the recursion in Equation (60).

To state the recursion in question, we must first introduce non-crossing partitions and their duals.

Definition 15. A partition π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is said to be non-crossing if, whenever a, b belong to a block (disjoint subset) of π and c, d to another, we cannot have $a < c < b < d$. We denote the set of all such partitions by NC_n .

To visualize the non-crossing property, plot the sequence $(1, \dots, n)$ in clockwise order as evenly spaced points on a circle. For every block $\{a_1, \dots, a_j\}$ of $\pi \in \text{NC}_n$, connect the points corresponding to each a_i to form polygons with these points as vertices, as depicted in Figure 5.3 (if $j = 2$, simply form a line segment). If π is non-crossing, the resulting polygons and line segments will never intersect.

Further, interpreting the circle as a cycle graph whose vertices are the same points $1, \dots, n$, such a $\pi \in \text{NC}_n$ induces a partition on the edges of this cycle as follows. Label by i the edge connecting v_i and v_{i+1} and by n the edge connecting v_n and v_1 . Then two edges are put in the same block if we can draw a line inside the circle connecting them without intersecting a polygon (or line segment) corresponding to a block of π . We refer to this resulting edge partition as the *dual* of π , and denote it by π^* . Note that this is also an element of NC_n .

We can now state the defining recursion for the moments of $\gamma_L^{\text{NFC}}(x, (\varphi_\ell)_\ell)$.




FIGURE 18. A non-crossing partition π of eight elements, and its dual π^* .

Proposition 5. *Under Assumption 5, let $\sigma_\ell = \frac{1}{N}$ for all ℓ , and define*

$$(59) \quad m_{k,L}(x) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \left((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top)^k \right),$$

$$\mu_{k,\ell+1}(x) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi'_{\ell+1}(X_\ell)^{2k}] \text{ for } X_\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(0, K_\ell(x)),$$

where K_ℓ is defined recursively by

$$K_0(x) = x^2, \quad K_{\ell+1}(x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\ell+1}(X_\ell)^2].$$

Then we have $m_{k,0}(x) = 1$, $m_{1,L}(x) = \mu_{1,L}(x)m_{1,L-1}(x)$ and

$$(60) \quad m_{k,L}(x) = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \mu_{\pi,L}(x) m_{\pi^*,L-1}(x)$$

where $\mu_{\pi,L}(x) := \prod_{B \in \pi} \mu_{|B|,L}(x)$ and similarly for $m_{\pi^*,L-1}(x)$.

Remark. *The moments $m_{k,L}$ can be seen as a non-linear (activation-dependent) generalisation of the Fuss-Catalan numbers (see, e.g., [28])*

$$\text{FC}_L^{(k)} = \frac{1}{kL+1} \binom{L(k+1)}{L}, \quad \text{FC}_L^{(k)} = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \prod_{B \in \pi} \text{FC}_{L-1}^{(|B|)}.$$

Indeed, if we consider the linear case with $\varphi = \text{Id}$ in the above, then $\mu_{\pi,\ell} = 1$ for any π, ℓ and we recover $m_{k,L} = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} m_{\pi,L-1}$.

Since x is fixed a-priori in Assumption 5 we omit it from the notation in what follows. Using our pipeline, we will show how Theorem 10 follows from this proposition, and to prove the proposition itself.

Begin by noting that the k -th moment of ρ_L is equal to

$$(61) \quad \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \left((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top)^k \right),$$

for which we have derived a graph expansion in Section 3 (see Equations 25) and (26)). For general k , the latter takes the form

$$(62) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\eta_j^{(i)}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\varphi_{\eta_j^{(i)}}}{s(\eta_j^{(i)})} \right) \mathbf{W}_{\text{Tr}(\eta_1^{(1)} \circ (\eta_2^{(1)})^\top \circ \dots \circ \eta_1^{(k)} \circ (\eta_2^{(k)})^\top)},$$

where the sum is taken over all trees $\eta_j^{(i)}$ in $(\partial_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*$, for $i \in [2]$ and $j \in [k]$.




FIGURE 19. A decorated cycle (right) formed by four trees (left), with the latter's unique (undirected) cycle highlighted in red.

We call the graphs

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(\eta_1^{(1)} \circ (\eta_2^{(1)})^\top \circ \dots \circ \eta_1^{(k)} \circ (\eta_2^{(k)})^\top \right),$$

arising in this expansion *decorated cycles*, owing to their particular form: they each consist of a unique (undirected¹) cycle (in this case, of length $2kL$), and trees rooted at vertices belonging to this cycle. An example for $L = 2$ is depicted in Figure 19.

It will turn out to be convenient to work directly with the trees rooted at the cycle instead of the initial $\eta_i^{(j)}$. To that end, note that in any $\eta_i^{(j)} \in (\partial_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*$, we have a unique path of length L from the root to the (unique) free leaf, which we call the *trunk*. The tree $\eta_i^{(j)}$ then consists of this trunk, together with L subtrees $\eta_{i,1}^{(j)}, \dots, \eta_{i,L}^{(j)}$ belonging to $(\mathbb{T}_1(\mathbf{x}))^*, \dots, (\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*$, respectively which come out of the trunk. This bijection is depicted in Figure 20 below.




FIGURE 20. A tree in $(\partial_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{T}(\mathbf{x}))^*$ is in bijection with the sequence of trees rooted at its trunk (highlighted in red).

Using this bijection, any graph of the form

$$(63) \quad \mathrm{Tr} \left(\eta_1^{(1)} \circ (\eta_2^{(1)})^\top \circ \dots \circ \eta_1^{(k)} \circ (\eta_2^{(k)})^\top \right),$$

¹By that we mean that one obtains a cycle after ignoring edge directions in the graph.

thus corresponds to a unique sequence of trees

$$(64) \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_{i,l}^{(j)})_{j \in [k], i \in [2], l \in [L]} \in \prod_{i=1}^k ((\mathbb{T}_0(\mathbf{x}))^* \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*),$$

(which are product graphs) and so we adopt the notation $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ to denote the graph, as well as $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ to denote its cycle. Lastly, we use $\text{DC}(k, L)$ to denote the space of all such graphs. With this notation, we can rewrite the expansion in Equation 62) as follows.

Lemma 6. *We have the expansion*

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top)^k) = \sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \mathbf{W}_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})},$$

where the sum is taken over all $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k, L)$ (or equivalently, all $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_{i,l}^{(j)})_{i,j,l}$, c.f. Equation (64)), and

$$\frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} := \prod_{i,j,l} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\eta_{i,l}^{(j)}}}{s(\eta_{i,l}^{(j)})}.$$

Proof. This follows from the aforementioned observation, and the fact that

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\varphi_{\eta_i^{(j)}}}{s(\eta_i^{(j)})} \right) = \prod_{i,j,l} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\eta_{i,l}^{(j)}}}{s(\eta_{i,l}^{(j)})}$$

where $\dot{\varphi}$ is defined as in Lemma 5. \square

We thus need to determine the scaling limits of (values of) decorated cycles, which is achieved in the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *Let $k, L \geq 0$ and $G = G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k, L)$ be a decorated cycle. Then under Assumption 5, we have that*

$$(65) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\lambda_G \mathbf{W}_G - a(G))^2 \right\} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right),$$

where

$$(66) \quad \lambda_G = \frac{1}{\sigma_G N^{\bar{e}(G)+1}}, \text{ and } a(G) := \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(G)/\sim_\psi)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N}.$$

Remark. *Note that there is a canonical choice for the σ_ℓ which results in $\lambda_G = \frac{1}{N}$ for all decorated cycles G : this is $\sigma_\ell = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ for all $\ell \geq 0$ as chosen by [32].*

Under $\sigma_\ell = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$, the bound implies the L^2 convergence

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top)^k) = \sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k,L)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \lambda_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \mathbf{W}_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \xrightarrow{L^2} \sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k,L)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$$

with rate $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{N})$, noting that these are finite sums.

Now since $\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}((\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}^\top)^k)$ is the k -th moment of ρ_L , the method of moments gives the weak convergence in probability of ρ_L to a measure with k -th moment equalling

$$\sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k,L)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})) \quad (= m_{k,L}),$$

and what's left is to prove Proposition 5, namely that this quantity satisfies the recursion therein. This will be the most involved part of the argument.

To derive a recursive formula for the coefficients $m_{k,L}$, we analyze the structure of atomic pairings for decorated cycles, beginning with the following result.

Lemma 7. *Let $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k, L)$, $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ be this graph's cycle², and $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$. Then $\phi = \phi_C \sqcup \phi_{G \setminus C}$ for some $\phi_C \in \mathcal{P}(C(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$. In particular, all of the L -edges of $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ are paired between themselves by some pairing $\phi_L \subseteq \phi_C$.*

Proof. For ϕ to be atomic, it must pair edges in a way that collapses the undirected cycle $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ without creating any new cycles in the process. But this is only possible if edges of $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ are paired between themselves, as any edge that isn't paired this way would end up in a cycle as depicted in Figure 21 below.




FIGURE 21. A cycle formed by pairing edges that belong to $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ with edges that do not.

Further, since edges can only be paired with other edges with the same input, ϕ must contain a pairing ϕ_L of the L -edges in $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. \square

Now let $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$, and ϕ_L be as in the lemma above. Note that in $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})$, the trees $\eta_{1,L}^{(j)}, \eta_{2,L}^{(j)}$ share a root for each j , which belongs to $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. For each $j \in [k]$, we let $v_j := \text{root}(\eta_{1,L}^{(j)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j)})$ denote said roots, and note that each v_j is the head of exactly two L -edges in $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. All other vertices in the latter are heads of edges with inputs W_i with $i < L$.

Said differently, the k pairs of L -edges of $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ are in bijection with v_1, \dots, v_k , and through this bijection, $\phi_L \subseteq \phi$ induces a unique partition π of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ defined by letting a and b be in the same block of π if they label endpoints of edges which have been paired by ϕ_L . This is depicted in Figure 22, and we write $\phi_L \sim \pi$ to denote the fact that ϕ_L induces π .

For atomic ϕ 's, we notice that the only π that arise this way must be non-crossing. Indeed, if $\phi_L \sim \pi$ and π admits a crossing, then a cycle is formed as depicted in Figure 23 below.

Next, recall that by definition, v_j is the root of $\eta_{1,L}^{(j)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j)}$ for every $j \in [k]$. Upon identifying L -edges of $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ by ϕ_L , such trees get joined at their roots. More

²Meaning the subgraph which is a cycle after forgetting about edge orientations.




FIGURE 22. A pairing ϕ_L of the L -edges of a cycle $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ (left), the partition $\pi \in \text{NC}_4$ that is induced by ϕ_L (right, in red), and its dual π^* (in blue).




FIGURE 23. If $\phi_L \sim \pi$ and π has a crossing, then identifying edges according to ϕ_L creates a cycle.

precisely, if $\phi_L \sim \pi$, then for every block $B = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ of π we obtain the tree

$$(\eta_{1,L}^{(j_1)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_1)}) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_{1,L}^{(j_l)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_l)}) := \wedge_{i=1}^l (\eta_{1,L}^{(j_i)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_i)}).$$

Furthermore, for ϕ to be acyclic, it must at the very least pair edges of such trees internally within each tree (otherwise, a cycle would be formed at their roots). We therefore get, for each block $B = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ of π , a pairing $\phi_B \in \mathcal{P}_A(\wedge_{i=1}^l (\tau_L^{(j_i)} \wedge \eta_L^{j_i}))$

Having now paired L -edges belonging to $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ (using ϕ_L), and those belonging to trees of height L decorating this cycle (using the ϕ_B 's), we must describe how ϕ pairs the remaining edges. Crucially, observe that the unpaired edges have inputs W_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$ and form disjoint decorated cycles themselves. To be precise, we will need the following definition.

Definition 16. Let $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k, L)$, ϕ_L be as above and $\phi_L \sim \pi$ for some $\pi \in \text{NC}_k$. Let \tilde{B} be a block of $\pi^* \in \text{NC}_k$. Then the restriction of $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\phi_L}$ to \tilde{B} is the decorated cycle in $\text{DC}(|\tilde{B}|, L-1)$ determined by the trees

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}} = (\eta_{i,l}^{(j)})_{i,j,l}, \quad i \in [2], l \in [L-1], j \in B.$$

Returning to our previous point, the leftover edges (that were not paired by ϕ_L or ϕ_B) form one decorated cycle per block of π^* , which are given by

$$G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}}), \quad \tilde{B} \in \pi^*.$$

For ϕ to be atomic, we claim that the edges of each of these $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}})$ must once again be paired internally. This is because the $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}})$ are connected to one another in $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\phi_L \sqcup \{\phi_B\}_{B \in \pi}}$ by paths whose edges that have already been paired by ϕ_B or ϕ_L ; pairing some $e \in G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}})$ to another $e' \in G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\tilde{B}'})$ would then create a cycle which

we cannot collapse (as in Figure 23). Put differently, this implies that any pairing ϕ' of the remaining edges can be decomposed into a disjoint union as follows:

$$\phi' = \bigsqcup_{\tilde{B} \in \pi^*} \phi'_{\tilde{B}}.$$

Summarizing everything we have said so far, any pairing $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$ consists of the following:

- (1) A pairing ϕ_L of the L -edges of $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$, such that $\phi_L \sim \pi \in \text{NC}_k$.
- (2) For every block $B = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ of π , a pairing $\phi_B \in \mathcal{P}_A(\wedge_{i=1}^l (\eta_{1,L}^{(j_i)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_i)}))$.
- (3) For every block \tilde{B} of π_k^* , a pairing $\phi_{\tilde{B}} \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\tilde{B}})$.

Noting how the quantity

$$\prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})) / \sim_{\phi})} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N}$$

then factors into

$$\left(\prod_{B \in \pi} \prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})) / \sim_{\phi_B})} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N} \right) \left(\prod_{\tilde{B} \in \pi^*} \prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})) / \sim_{\phi_{\tilde{B}}})} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N} \right),$$

the decomposition of $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$ given by (1),(2),(3) yields the following result.

Lemma 8.

$$(67) \quad a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})) = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \left(\prod_{B=\{j_i\}_{i=1}^l} a(\wedge_{i=1}^l (\eta_{1,L}^{(j_i)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_i)})) \right) \left(\prod_{\tilde{B} \in \pi_k^*} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\tilde{B}}) \right).$$

Before finishing the proof of proposition 5, an example illustrating this lemma and the heavy notation that we have introduced for it is well in order. Consider the case when we're computing $m_{4,2}$, for which we end up studying decorated cycles $G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(4,2)$. Then the decomposition of $a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$ given in Lemma 8 is depicted in full detail in the figure 24 below.

We now have the tools to prove Proposition 5.

Proof of 5. Recall that

$$m_{k,L} = \sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k,L)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$$

by Proposition 6. We can then use the decomposition given in Lemma 8 for each $a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$ in this sum to get

$$\sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \text{DC}(k,L)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})} \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \left(\prod_{B=\{j_i\}_{i=1}^k} a(\wedge_{i=1}^k (\eta_{1,L}^{(j_i)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j_i)})) \right) \left(\prod_{\tilde{B} \in \pi_k^*} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\tilde{B}}) \right).$$

The next step will be to interchange the order of summation.

To that end, we must first distribute the factor $\frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta})}$. The same arguments of Proposition 10 used to prove Theorem 8 show that

$$\mu_{k,L} = \sum_{(\eta_{i,L}^{(j)})_{j \in [k], i \in [2]} \in ((\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*)^{2k}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\eta_{2,L}^{(j)}} \dot{\varphi}_{\eta_{1,L}^{(j)}}}{s(\eta_{1,L}^{(j)}) s(\eta_{2,L}^{(j)})} \right) a(\wedge_{j=1}^k (\eta_{1,L}^{(j)} \wedge \eta_{2,L}^{(j)})).$$




FIGURE 24. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$ and $\phi_2 \subset \phi$ be as in Lemma 7 (depicted in red on the left in this figure). Then ϕ_2 corresponds to a non-crossing partition π : here, π only has two blocks, which gives rise to the trees $\eta_{1,3}^{(1)} \wedge \eta_{1,3}^{(2)}$ and $\eta_{4,3}^{(1)} \wedge \eta_{4,3}^{(2)} \wedge \eta_{2,3}^{(1)} \wedge \eta_{2,3}^{(2)} \wedge \eta_{3,3}^{(1)} \wedge \eta_{3,3}^{(2)}$. Its dual has three blocks, giving rise to three decorated cycles: $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\{1,4\}} \in \text{DC}(2, 1)$, $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\{2\}} \in \text{DC}(1, 1)$ and $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\{3\}} \in \text{DC}(1, 1)$.

Notice that the sum over NC_k does not depend on a specific $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. Splitting the sum over $G(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ into two sums, the first over $(\eta_{i,L}^{(j)})_{j \in [k], i \in [2]} \in ((\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*)^{2k}$ and the second over the remaining trees in $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, interchanging the sums then gives

$$\sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \left(\prod_{B \in \pi} \mu_{|B|, L} \right) \left(\prod_{\bar{B} \in \pi^*} \sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\bar{B}}} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}})} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}})) \right).$$

Lastly, we note that

$$\sum_{G(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\bar{B}}} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}}}}{s(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}})} a(G(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\bar{B}})) = \sum_{G' \in \text{DC}(|\bar{B}|, L-1)} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_{G'}}{s(G')} a(G') = m_{|\bar{B}|, L-1},$$

and it follows that

$$m_{k, L} = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_k} \mu_{\pi, L} m_{\pi^*, L-1}.$$

□

6. EXTENSIONS TO COMPLEX, NON-GAUSSIAN AND SPARSE WEIGHTS.

6.1. Non-Gaussian weights. All of the results obtained in the previous section can be extended to neural networks Φ with non-Gaussian random weights, under moment assumptions. Consider the following more general sequence \mathcal{W} .

Definition 17. Let $N > 0$ and $\mathcal{W} := (W_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N})$, where the $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are independent matrices with entries $\sim \sigma_i Z_i$, where $\{Z_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is a family of i.i.d. random variables satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}\{Z_i^2\} = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\{Z_i^{2k+1}\} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}\{Z_i^{2k}\} < \infty \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Note that we take the matrices in this sequence to be square for simplicity only, the results in this section carrying over to rectangular matrices as in Section 4 by straightforward modifications. The graphs considered in this section are all assumed to satisfy the following condition.

Assumption 6. G is a product graph with inputs which are either elements of \mathcal{W} , or deterministic vector/matrices with entries uniformly bounded in N .

We define $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ and the set of admissible pairings of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ in exactly the same way as in the Gaussian case.

Recall also that for any G , $\check{e}(G) := |E(G_{\phi_0})|$ for any fixed admissible pairing ϕ_0 of its edges (the choice of ϕ_0 is irrelevant, as the value of $|E(G_{\phi_0})|$ is constant over pairings).

Theorem 11 (Approximate Wick expansion). *For any (possibly disconnected) product graph G*

$$(68) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1})$$

where ϕ runs over all of G 's admissible pairings.

Proof. Consider the set of indexations $\mathcal{I}^G := \prod_{v \in V(G)} \{1, \dots, N_v\}$. Recall that for each $e = (u, v) \in E$, $i_e = i_u i_v$. Then

$$\mathbf{W}_G = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^G} \prod_{c \in C} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c}, \quad \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\}$$

Following [11] we write $\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi$ whenever

$$\forall \{e, e'\} \in \phi, \quad i_e = i_{e'}$$

and say that an indexation \mathbf{i} is *balanced* whenever there exists a $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ for which $\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi$.

Note how for *unbalanced* \mathbf{i} one has $\mathbb{E}\{\prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e}\} = 0$ so that we can write the expectation as

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi} \frac{1}{|\{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G) \mid \mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi\}|} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\}$$

For simplicity write $\Gamma_\phi := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi} \frac{1}{|\{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G) \mid \mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi\}|} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\}$
so that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \Gamma_\phi.$$

Note that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ it holds, for constants depending on G but not on N , that

$$\Gamma_\phi = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi} \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(1) = \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(|\{\mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi\}|) = \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{|V(G_\phi)|})$$

Notice that the maximum value of $|V(G_\phi)|$ is reached only when ϕ is fully atomic, in which case one has

$$|V(G_\phi)| = \check{e}(G) + c(G)$$

where we recall that $\check{e} = |E(G_\phi)|$ (otherwise, this is a strict inequality).

Furthermore, for such ϕ , we have

$$(69) \quad \Gamma_\phi = \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G \ni \mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1})$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G := \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^G \mid \forall e, e' \in E_{\mathcal{W}}, i_e = i_{e'} \implies \mathbf{X}_e = \mathbf{X}_{e'} \text{ and } i_e \neq i_{e_0} \forall e_0 \in E_{\mathcal{W}} \setminus \{e, e'\}\},$$

noting that if $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G$, there exists exactly one $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ for which $\mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi$.

But in this case, we also have

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G \ni \mathbf{i} \rightsquigarrow \phi} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_e]_{i_e} \right\} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}),$$

so that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \Gamma_\phi + \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \Gamma_\phi \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \Gamma_\phi + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}) \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}) \right) + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}) \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}) \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the fact that

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus \mathcal{P}_A(G), \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}).$$

□

Proposition 7. *Let $G = \sqcup_{i=1}^{c(G)} G_i$ be a product graph with disjoint connected components G_i . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} + \sigma_{G_i} \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{\epsilon}(G_i)}) \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_B(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)/2-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)$, let $\Gamma_\phi = \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{\epsilon}(G)})$ and define Γ_{ϕ_i} similarly for each $\phi_i \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)$. Proceeding as in Proposition 1 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G_i)} \Gamma_\phi \right) \right\} = \sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} (-1)^{|T^c|} \sum_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i} \left(\Gamma_{\phi_T} \prod_{i \in T^c} \Gamma_{\phi_i} \right)$$

where the last sum is over $\mathcal{P}(G_T) \times (\prod_{i \in T^c} \mathcal{P}_A(G_i))$.

Arguing as in the proof of the previous lemma, we find that

$$(70) \quad \Gamma_{\phi_T} \prod_{i \in T^c} \Gamma_{\phi_i} = \Gamma_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i} + \mathcal{O}(N^{|V(G_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i})|-1})$$

where the implicit constants do not depend from N .

But then using inclusion exclusion, we obtain on the one hand

$$\sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} (-1)^{|T^c|} \sum_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i} \Gamma_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i} = \sum_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(G)} \Gamma_\phi$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(G)$ is the set of pairings of G such that none of its connected components are paired within themselves, and on the other hand,

$$(71) \quad \sum_{T \subseteq [c(G)]} (-1)^{|T^c|} \sum_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i} \mathcal{O}(N^{|V(G_{\phi_T \times_{i \in T^c} \phi_i})|}) = \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(G)} N^{|V(G_\phi)|-1} \right)$$

by the uniformity of the constants.

We conclude by arguing as before that the maximal order of the Γ_ϕ is reached when the partition is bi-atomic, which is the only case where $V(G_\phi) = \check{\epsilon}(G) + \frac{c(G)}{2}$ and when

$$\Gamma_\phi = \mathbf{W}_\phi + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\check{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)/2-1} \right).$$

□

Reiterating the arguments in section 5 then yields the following.

Corollary. *Let Φ be a neural network with weights W_ℓ with entries as in definition 17. Then theorems 8, 9 and 10 still hold.*

6.2. Sparse weights. Following [11], we can also go further and consider sparse matrices with i.i.d. entries satisfying the same moment assumptions as in 17.

Consider the sequence $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of matrices $\tilde{W}_i := W_i \odot B_i$, where $W_i \in \mathcal{W}$ as defined above and the B_i are independent matrices with i.i.d., Bernoulli distributed entries with parameter p_N satisfying $Np_N \rightarrow \infty$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\{[\tilde{W}_i]_{\alpha,\beta}^{2k}\} = p_N \sigma_i^{2k} \mathbb{E}\{Z_i^{2k}\}, \quad \mathbb{E}\{[\tilde{W}_i]_{\alpha,\beta}^{2k+1}\} = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

If G is a product graph whose random inputs are from $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$, we will use $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_e = \mathbf{X}_e \odot B_i$ to denote such inputs.

Assumption 7. G is a product graph with inputs which are either elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$, or deterministic vector/matrices with entries uniformly bounded in N .

Proposition 8. Let G be a product graph satisfying Assumption 7. Then

$$(72) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1})$$

Proof. Consider the set of indexations $\mathcal{I}^G := \prod_{v \in V(G)} \{1, \dots, N_v\}$, and define $\mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G$, balanced and unbalanced indexations as in the proof of theorem 11.

If $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}^G$ is unbalanced, one has $\mathbb{E}\left\{\prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_e]_{i_e}\right\} = 0$ while if $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_e]_{i_e}\right\} = \sigma_G p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2}.$$

If $\mathbf{i} \notin \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G$ is balanced, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\prod_{e \in E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_e]_{i_e}\right\} = \sigma_G p_N^l \mathcal{O}(1)$$

for some $1 \leq l < |E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2$. We can thus partition the set of balanced indexations as $\sqcup_{l=1}^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \mathcal{J}_l^G$ where \mathcal{J}_l^G is the subset of indexations which result in a factor p_N^l . Note that $\mathcal{J}_{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2}^G = \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G$. In particular we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{W}_G\} &= p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sigma_G + \sum_{l=1}^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{J}_l^G} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sigma_G p_N^l \mathcal{O}(1) \\ &= p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sigma_G + \sum_{l=1}^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \sigma_G p_N^l \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{J}_l^G|) \end{aligned}$$

Note at this point how $|\mathcal{J}_l^G| = \mathcal{O}\left(N^{|E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}|+c(G)+l}\right)$.

In fact, each \mathbf{i} is compatible to some $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ by virtue of being balanced, thus any \mathbf{i} takes at most $c(G) + |E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}| + \frac{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|}{2}$ different values, this being the maximal number of vertices in any G_ϕ . Note though that, by definition of \mathcal{J}_l^G , the indices corresponding to the $|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2$ pairs take exactly l different values. Each $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{J}_l^G$ thus takes at most $c(G) + |E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}| + l$ values, ranging from 1 to N .

Hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \sigma_G p_N^l \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{J}_l^G|) &= \sigma_G \mathcal{O}\left(N^{|E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}|+c(G)} \max\{N p_N, (N p_N)^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1}\}\right) \\ &= \sigma_G p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \mathcal{O}(N^{\check{e}(G)+c(G)-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The claim then follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} &= p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sigma_G + \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)-1}) \right) \\ &= p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_{(1)}^G} \left(\prod_{c \in C \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}} [\mathbf{X}_c]_{i_c} \right) \sigma_G + p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and that $p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2} \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)-1}) = p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}|/2-1} \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)-1})$ (since $p_N \leq 1$). \square

Similar arguments prove the centered version of this result, giving

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{c(G)} \left(\mathbf{W}_{G_i} - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G_i)} \mathbf{W}_{(G_i)_\psi} + \sigma_{G_i} p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}(G_i)|/2-1} \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G_i)}) \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_B(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} + \sigma_G p_N^{|E_{\mathcal{W}}(G)|/2-1} \mathcal{O}(N^{\tilde{\epsilon}(G)+c(G)/2-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We may then conclude the following.

Corollary. *Let Φ be a neural network with weights \tilde{W}_ℓ (as defined above) and parameters. Then theorems 8, 9 and 10 still hold with standard deviations rescaled as $\sigma_\ell \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} \sigma_\ell$.*




FIGURE 25. We consider a ReLU network Φ_2 (meaning that the activations are all $x \mapsto \max(x, 0)$), where $(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) = (2, 700, 700, 1)$. We fix two inputs $\mathbf{x} = (\pi, 1), \mathbf{y} = (e, 3) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and sample the weight matrices W_0, W_1 and W_2 700 times from 4 different ensembles and plot $(\Phi_2(\mathbf{x}), \Phi_2(\mathbf{y}))$. The contour plots in light blue in all three figures correspond to W_0, W_1, W_2 being Gaussian. On the left (dark blue) W_1 and W_2 were multiplied entry-wise by $p_N^{-1/2} \text{Ber}(p_N)$ for $p_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{300}}$ (so that roughly 96.22% of their entries are set to 0). In the middle (green), the W_i have Weibull entries multiplied by a random sign, while on the right (orange) the entries which are uniformly distributed in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$.

6.3. The complex case. We end this section by showing how all of our results (including the extensions to sparse matrices in the previous section) hold for complex-valued matrices. Noting that the definition of product graphs and the extensions in Section 3 hold *mutatis mutandis* in the complex case, we will once again only need to adapt the arguments of Section 4.

Definition 18. Let $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{C}} := (W_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})$, where for $i > 0$, the $W_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_i} \times N_{e_i}}$ are independent matrices with i.i.d. entries equal to $\sigma_i Z$ where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$. For $i < 0$, we set $W_{-i} := \bar{W}_i$.

Assumption 8. G is a product graph whose inputs are either deterministic, or matrices in $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Recall how a complex random variable $Z \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ satisfies the following moment assumptions

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z|] = 1, \quad n \neq m \implies \mathbb{E}[Z^n \bar{Z}^m] = 0$$

where \bar{Z} denotes the conjugate of Z .

This means that, in view of Wick's theorem (which takes the same form as in the real case), the correct notion of admissible pairing is given as follows.

Definition 19 (Complex admissible pairing). Let G be a product graph, and $E_{\mathcal{W}} = \{e \in E : W_e = W_\ell \text{ for some } \ell(e) := \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\}$. Then a pairing ϕ of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ is said to be admissible if any two paired edges $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$ satisfy $\ell(e) = -\ell(e')$. We denote the set of all admissible pairings of $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ by $\mathcal{P}(G)$.

At this point notice that the arguments of Sections 4 follow verbatim, with the exception of Theorem 7 which now takes the following form.

Theorem 12. Let $(G_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of connected product graphs satisfying Assumptions 8 and 2 (for $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{C}}$). Then for any $m \geq 1$,

$$((\sigma_{G_i} N^{\tilde{e}(G_i) + \frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{G_i} - |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i)| \sqrt{N})_{i=1}^m \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_m)^\top$$

where the limit is a centered complex Gaussian vector with covariance function $C := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]$ having entries $[C]_{i,j} = |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i \sqcup G_j)|$ and pseudo covariance $\Gamma := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H]$ with entries $[\Gamma]_{i,j} = |\mathcal{P}_A(G_i \sqcup \bar{G}_j)|$ where \bar{G} is obtained from G by conjugating all the random matrices..

As for non-Gaussian complex-valued matrices, we replace the entries of W_i (for $i > 0$) with $\sigma_i Z_i$, where $\{Z_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is now a family of i.i.d. random variables satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z|] = 1, \quad n \neq m \implies \mathbb{E}[Z^n \bar{Z}^m] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[|Z|^k] < \infty.$$

Complex analogues of corollaries 6.1 and 6.2 then follow straightforwardly.

7. FURTHER EXTENSIONS

In order to best illustrate our approach, we chose to restrict all of our results to the simple case of feed-forward networks with polynomial activations and no biases. This leaves room for many possible extensions, and we discuss a few of these informally below.

7.1. Random biases. The Φ_L that we have considered are compositions of linear maps W_ℓ and component-wise non-linear activations φ_ℓ . Typically one considers affine maps $W_\ell[\cdot] + b_\ell$ instead, and takes the b_ℓ to be randomly initialised Gaussians as well.

Our theory can be adapted to this by allowing vertices to be fixed to these b_ℓ , and considering pairings of the vertices as well (resulting in $\sigma_b^2 \mathbf{1}$ in \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ}), as shown in Figure 26. This allows to recover the limits in their full form.




FIGURE 26. Example of a tree arising in the expansion of a neural network with biases.

7.2. Residual networks and other neural network architectures. We briefly discuss how our theory can be extended to more complex neural network architectures, beginning with the simplest example: *residual networks*.

Recall that for the feed-forward networks considered in this paper, the network's input is represented by fixing some leaf vertices' input to \mathbf{x} . In a residual network, a new layer Z_{L+1} is obtained by adding the output Z_L of the previous layer to the output of a feed-forward network Φ taking Z_L as input. Consequently, the trees that will arise in the expansion of Z_{L+1} are formed by grafting the trees from the expansion of Z_L onto the leaves of the trees for $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$. The theory developed here thus extends to discrete residual networks with minimal modifications.

For continuous networks, the graphs arising in the expansion can be arbitrarily deep, there are infinitely many of them. Some care is therefore needed to ensure that the expansions are well-defined, namely that they converge.

More complex architectures can be studied by considering *simplicial complexes* instead of graphs. For instance, for architectures like convolutional neural networks, generic tensors must be considered in addition to matrices and vectors. Just as the former correspond to edges (1-simplices) and the latter to vertices (0-simplices), an $n + 1$ -tensor will correspond to an n -simplex. The resulting network expansion will then be over simplicial complexes, typically exhibiting a tree-like recursive structure. The theory then requires pairing n -tensors with n -tensors and counting the number of vertices in the resulting simplices.

7.3. Non-polynomial activations. A restriction we have imposed is the use of polynomial activations φ_ℓ . This choice allowed us to ignore questions of convergence (e.g. for the tree expansion in Theorem 4) given that the sums being considered are always finite. Polynomials being dense in Gaussian Sobolev spaces, we expect an extension of our results to commonly used, non-polynomial activations (e.g. Sigmoid, ReLU) to be possible through a density argument, and present some numerical evidence for this in Appendix C.

7.4. Spectrum of the Hessian matrix. A rigorous understanding of the spectrum of the Hessian matrix under training would shed light on important aspects of the training dynamics, particularly on its speed and stability as argued in [29, 31]. We expect to be able to study the empirical spectral distribution of the Hessian matrix of Φ_L using arguments similar to those in Sections 5.3 and 5.2, but anticipate the combinatorics that would ensue to be more involved.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Biamonte and V. Bergholm. Tensor networks in a nutshell, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.00006>.
- [2] H. R. Brahana. Systems of circuits on two-dimensional manifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 23:144, 1921. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16854121>.
- [3] E. Brézin, C. Itzykson, G. Parisi, and J. B. Zuber. Planar diagrams. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 59(1):35 – 51, 1978.
- [4] L. Chizat and F. Bach. On the global convergence of gradient descent for over-parameterized models using optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [5] L. Chizat, M. Colombo, X. Fernández-Real, and A. Figalli. Infinite-width limit of deep linear neural networks. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, pages 1–50, 2024. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.22200>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpa.22200>.
- [6] A. Cichocki, N. Lee, I. Oseledets, A.-H. Phan, Q. Zhao, and D. P. Mandic. Tensor networks for dimensionality reduction and large-scale optimization: Part 1 low-rank tensor decompositions. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 9(4–5):249–429, 2016. ISSN 1935-8245. doi: 10.1561/22000000059. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000059>.
- [7] B. Collins and T. Hayase. Asymptotic freeness of layerwise jacobians caused by invariance of multilayer perceptron: The Haar orthogonal case. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 397:85–109, 2021.
- [8] G. M. Constantine and T. H. Savits. A multivariate Faa di Bruno formula with applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 348:503–520, 1996. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:18986788>.
- [9] P. Diaconis and M. Shahshahani. On the eigenvalues of random matrices. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 31:49–62, 1994. ISSN 00219002. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3214948>.
- [10] S. S. Du, X. Zhai, B. Póczos, and A. Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [11] G. Dubach and Y. Peled. On words of non-Hermitian random matrices. *Annals of Probability*, 49:1886–1916, 7 2021. ISSN 2168894X. doi: 10.1214/20-AOP1496.
- [12] R. P. Feynman. Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 20:367–387, 1948. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268744472>.
- [13] A. Garriga-Alonso, C. E. Rasmussen, and L. Aitchison. Deep convolutional networks as shallow Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

- [14] X. Glorot and Y. Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.
- [15] J. L. Gross and T. W. Tucker. *Topological graph theory*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1987. ISBN 0-471-04926-3.
- [16] M. Gubinelli. Ramification of rough paths. *J. Differential Equations*, 248(4):693–721, 2010. ISSN 0022-0396,1090-2732. doi: 10.1016/j.jde.2009.11.015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2009.11.015>.
- [17] E. Hairer, S. P. Nørsett, and G. Wanner. *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I: Nonstiff problems*. Springer, Berlin, 1987.
- [18] B. Hanin. Random neural networks in the infinite width limit as Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(6A):4798 – 4819, 2023. doi: 10.1214/23-AAP1933. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP1933>.
- [19] J. Harer and D. Zagier. The Euler characteristic of the moduli space of curves. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 85:457–485, 1986.
- [20] W. Huang, W. Du, and R. Y. D. Xu. On the neural tangent kernel of deep networks with orthogonal initialization. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [21] A. Jacot, F. Gabriel, and C. Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [22] S. G. Johnston and J. Prochno. Faà di Bruno’s formula and inversion of power series. *Advances in Mathematics*, 395:108080, 2022. ISSN 0001-8708. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2021.108080>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870821005193>.
- [23] J. Lee, Y. Bahri, R. Novak, S. S. Schoenholz, J. Pennington, and J. N. Sohl-Dickstein. Deep neural networks as Gaussian processes. *ArXiv*, abs/1711.00165, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:3708505>.
- [24] A. G. d. G. Matthews, J. Hron, M. Rowland, R. E. Turner, and Z. Ghahramani. Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [25] R. I. McLachlan, K. Modin, H. Munthe-Kaas, and O. Verdier. Butcher series: A story of rooted trees and numerical methods for evolution equations, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.00906>.
- [26] S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P.-M. Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33):E7665–E7671, 2018.
- [27] R. M. Neal. *Bayesian learning for neural networks*, volume 118. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [28] A. Nica and R. Speicher. *Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [29] L. Noci, A. Meterez, T. Hofmann, and A. Orvieto. Why do learning rates transfer? reconciling optimization and scaling limits for deep learning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17457>.

- [30] R. Novak, L. Xiao, J. Lee, Y. Bahri, G. Yang, J. Hron, D. A. Abolafia, J. Pennington, and J. Sohl-Dickstein. Bayesian deep convolutional networks with many channels are Gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05148*, 2018.
- [31] A. Orvieto, J. Kohler, D. Pavlo, T. Hofmann, and A. Lucchi. Vanishing curvature and the power of adaptive methods in randomly initialized deep networks, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.03763>.
- [32] J. Pennington, S. Schoenholz, and S. Ganguli. The emergence of spectral universality in deep networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1924–1932. PMLR, 2018.
- [33] R. Penrose. Applications of negative dimensional tensors. *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications*, 1971.
- [34] T. N. Saada, A. Naderi, and J. Tanner. Beyond IID weights: sparse and low-rank deep neural networks are also Gaussian processes. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1Wi0Ys33Nm>.
- [35] A. M. Saxe, J. L. McClelland, and S. Ganguli. Exact solutions to the non-linear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6120*, 2013.
- [36] J. Sirignano and K. Spiliopoulos. Mean field analysis of neural networks: A law of large numbers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80(2):725–752, 2020.
- [37] G. 't Hooft. A planar diagram theory for strong interactions. *Nuclear Physics*, 72:461–473, 1974. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:122597626>.
- [38] G. Yang. Wide feedforward or recurrent neural networks of any architecture are Gaussian processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [39] G. Yang. Tensor programs II: Neural tangent kernel for any architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.14548*, 2020.
- [40] G. Yang and E. J. Hu. Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14522*, 2020.
- [41] G. Yang, E. J. Hu, I. Babuschkin, S. Sidor, X. Liu, D. Farhi, N. Ryder, J. Pachocki, W. Chen, and J. Gao. Tensor programs v: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03466*, 2022.
- [42] A. Zvonkin. Matrix integrals and map enumeration: An accessible introduction. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 26(8):281–304, 1997. ISSN 0895-7177. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177\(97\)00210-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(97)00210-0). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895717797002100>.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF AUXILIARY COMBINATORIAL RESULTS

A.1. Atomic pairings of trees. We begin with the following useful lemma, which highlights important features of atomic pairings of edges of trees. In what follows, recall that if τ is a tree, we refer to edges whose head is its root as root edges. Given any $e \in E(\tau)$, we also let $\tau|_e$ denote the subtree of τ rooted at e 's head, consisting of a unique root edge e along with the subtree rooted at its tail. Lastly, recall that admissible pairings only pair edges in $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ (namely edges with random matrices as inputs), and that an ℓ -edge in $E_{\mathcal{W}}$ is one that has been fixed to the random matrix $W_\ell \in \mathcal{W}$.

Lemma 9. *Let τ be a connected, directed graph with all vertices having in-degree 1, except for the root $r_\tau \in V(\tau)$ which has in-degree 0 (so that τ is a directed tree). Then for any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau)$, the following holds:*

- (1) ϕ only pairs edges which are equidistant from the root.
- (2) Let e, e' be arbitrary edges in τ . Then if $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$, ϕ is an atomic pairing of the edges in $\tau|_e \wedge \tau|_{e'}$.
- (3) For any $k \geq 0$, let e_0, \dots, e_k and e'_0, \dots, e'_k be two sequences of edges forming paths of length k which start at r_τ (so that e_i, e'_i are at distance i from the root and e_0, e'_0 are root edges). Then

$$\{e_k, e'_k\} \in \phi \implies \{e_i, e'_i\} \in \phi \text{ or } e_i = e'_i \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \leq k.$$

Proof. We begin by proving that root edges have to be paired with other root edges: consider a root edge $e = (r_\tau, v) \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau)$ and assume that it is paired to a non-root edge $e' = (u', v')$ by ϕ .

Assume first that $e' \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau|_e)$ with $u' \neq r_\tau$. Then consider the image in $(\tau)_\phi$ of the path from v to v' in τ : it starts and ends at the same vertex, while only traversing the (undirected) edge corresponding to $\{e, e'\}$ once (cf. Figure 27 left). This is a cycle, which contradicts the fact that $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau)$. Now assume that $e' \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau) \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau|_e)$ with $u' \neq r_\tau$. By what we have just shown, there must be another root edge $\tilde{e} = (r_\tau, \tilde{v})$ such that $e' \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau|_{\tilde{e}})$, and which is not paired to any edge in $E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau|_{\tilde{e}})$. Arguing as above, the image of the path from r_τ to u' is a cycle in $(\tau)_\phi$ traversing the image of \tilde{e} only once (cf. Figure 27 (middle)), giving the desired contradiction.

We now prove (2). Assume that $\{e, e'\} \in \phi$, and for contradiction that $\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\} \in \phi$ for some $\varepsilon \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau|_e)$ (which is $\neq e$) and $\varepsilon' \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau) \setminus E(\tau|_e \sqcup \tau|_{e'})$. Then consider the path which starts at the head of ε' , goes through r_τ without using edges in $\tau|_e \sqcup \tau|_{e'}$ and ends at the head of ε using the edge e (cf. Figure 27 right). This path's image in $(\tau)_\phi$ is then once again a cycle, and since it traverses $\{e, e'\}$ only once we conclude that $\phi|_{\tau|_e \sqcup \tau|_{e'}} \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau|_e \wedge \tau|_{e'})$.

To prove (3), assume that $\{e_k, e'_k\} \in \phi$. If $e_{k-1} = e'_{k-1}$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, assume that $e_{k-1} \notin E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau)$, so that it is not paired by ϕ . Then the path which starts at the head of e_k , goes to r_τ through e_{k-1} and ends at the head of e'_k via e'_{k-1} is a cycle in $(\tau)_\phi$. We must therefore have $e_{k-1}, e'_{k-1} \in E_{\mathcal{W}}(\tau)$.

Now if these edges were not paired together by ϕ , then $\{e_k, e'_k\} \notin \phi$ by (2), giving us a contradiction. This proves (3) by induction on k .

Finally (1) follows from (3) by induction on the distance from the root, using the fact that root edges have to be paired with other root edges. \square




FIGURE 27. Paths in τ which are cycles in $(\tau)_\phi$ in the proof of Proposition 9. Red dotted lines denote vertices/edges which are the same in $(\tau)_\phi$, and paths highlighted in blue are cycles in the latter.

A.2. Results in Section 5.1.

Proof of Lemma 2. For the first assertion, we just have to prove that given any $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell,k}(\mathbf{x})$ one has $\mathcal{P}_A(\eta) = \emptyset$. This is clear, since the tree η only has one ℓ -edge (namely, the one stemming from its root), which then cannot be paired with any other edge.

For the second assertion note how the leaves $\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ are the only cells appearing as tails of 0-edges. This means that any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ identifies these vertices in pairs as shown in Figure 28, in which G is the product graph obtained from $\sqcup_i \eta_i$ by deleting the vertices $\bullet_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}_j}$ and their adjacent edges.




FIGURE 28. Any admissible edge pairing induces a pairing of leaves.

In particular one obtains, with clear abuse of notation, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{(\sqcup_i \eta_i)_\phi} &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}]_\alpha [\sigma_0^2 \mathbf{I}]_{\alpha, \beta} [\mathbf{x}_i \odot \mathbf{x}_j]_\beta \\ &= \sigma_0^2 \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}]_\alpha [\mathbf{x}_i]_\beta [\mathbf{x}_j]_\beta = \sigma_0^2 \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}} \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi}. \end{aligned}$$

We can repeat this argument for all pairs of leaves, as well as an analogous one for the $c(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ roots (being the only heads of ℓ -edges). Doing so yields the following equality for any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$:

$$(74) \quad \mathbf{W}_{(\sqcup_i \eta_i)_\phi} = \sigma_0^{|\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)|} \sigma_\ell^{c(\sqcup_i \eta_i)} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi \delta_\phi \mathbf{W}_{G_\phi^1}$$

where G_ϕ^1 is obtained from $\sqcup_i \eta_i$ by removing all leaves, roots and their adjacent edges, and

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi := \prod_{\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \bullet_{\mathbf{x}_j}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i) / \sim_\phi)} \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{N_0}}.$$

Note that here, δ_ϕ arises from the roots in the same way as $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi$ did from the leaves. Since the former are fixed \mathbf{e}_i , the resulting contribution is either 0 or 1.

Further, note that under Assumption 3, G^1 is a product graph satisfying Assumption 2, in particular a product graph with all vertices having dimension $\mathfrak{d} = N$, fixed to $\mathbf{1}_N$ and with all edges fixed to random Gaussian matrices ($E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}(G^1) = \emptyset$). We can thus leverage the genus expansion results of Section 4.2 to compute the values \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} explicitly.

Note that any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)$ must induce an atom-free partition of the edges of G^1 , since each of the removed edges shares a vertex with G^1 . By Lemma 1 we know that \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} is maximized when this induced partition is bi-atomic, in which case

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G N^{(|E(G^1)| + c(G^1))/2}.$$

This yields the claim, since $\sigma_{\sqcup_i \eta_i} = \sigma_0^{|\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)|} \sigma_\ell^{c(\sqcup_i \eta_i)} \sigma_{G^1}$,

$$|E(G^1)| = |E(\sqcup_i \eta_i)| - |\mathcal{L}(\sqcup_i \eta_i)| - c(\sqcup_i \eta_i), \quad c(G^1) = c(\sqcup_i \eta_i),$$

and

$$\{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_B(G) : \psi \text{ is induced by some } \phi = \mathcal{P}_B(\sqcup_i \eta_i)\} = \mathcal{P}_B(G).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_B(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ be arbitrary. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\ell, i}(\mathbf{x})$ let $r(\tau)$ denote the unique edge whose head is the root. Then if τ, η are in the lemma's statement, $r(\tau)$ and $r(\eta)$ are the only ℓ -edges, and they must thus be paired by ϕ . Thus by Proposition 9 (1) and (2) we see that the subtrees must be bi-atomically paired in pairs. This induces a pairing π of the subtrees via the bijection $\tau \leftrightarrow r(\tau)$ and ϕ splits as

$$(75) \quad \phi = \{\{r(\tau), r(\eta)\}\} \bigsqcup_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \phi|_{\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2}.$$

The lemma then follows, since we can write

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi = \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\phi|_{\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2}}.$$

□

A.3. Results in Section 5.2.

Proof of Lemma 4. By Proposition 1 we know, setting $G := \tau \circ \eta^\top$, that

$$(76) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{W}_G - \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} \right)^2 \right\} = \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(G \sqcup G)} \mathbf{W}_{(G \sqcup G)_\phi}.$$

We prove the claim for $0 < \ell < L \neq 0$, the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = L$ cases following by a similar argument. We will be reasoning as we did to prove Lemma 2, namely by analyzing the structure of a pairing in $\mathcal{P}_A(G)$. To that end, note that the leaves of G are the only cells which are tails of the 0-labeled edges, while the two roots are the only heads of L -labeled edges.

It follows that for any $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)$, these vertices will necessarily be all paired up obtaining

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} = \sigma_0^{|\mathcal{L}(G)|} \sigma_L^2 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\psi \delta_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi}^1$$

where the product graph G^1 is obtained from G by removing all leaves, roots and their adjacent vertices. Under Assumption 4, G^1 is then a product graph satisfying Assumption 2: all of its vertices have dimension $\mathfrak{d} = N$ and fixed to $\mathbf{1}_N$, all edges except one are fixed to random Gaussian matrices, the remaining one is fixed to \mathbf{I} . We thus apply the genus expansion formula with

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{\mathcal{W}}(G^1)| &= |E(G^1)| - 1 = |E(G)| - (|\mathcal{L}(G)| + 2) - 1, \\ |E \setminus E_{\mathcal{W}}(G^1)| &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

and since any atomic partition of G induces an atomic one on G^1 , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi^1} &= \sigma_{G^1} N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)| - 3) + 2}, \\ \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} &= \sigma_G N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)| + 1)} a(G). \end{aligned}$$

The same reasoning applied to $\mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(G \sqcup G)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{(G \sqcup G)_\phi} &= \sigma_G^2 N^{|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)|} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_\phi \delta_\phi \quad (\text{for } \phi \in \mathcal{P}_B(G \sqcup G)), \\ \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(G \sqcup G)} \mathbf{W}_{(G \sqcup G)_\phi} &= \sigma_G^2 N^{|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)|} \left(\alpha(G \sqcup G) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the cases when $\ell = 0$ or $\ell = L$, noting that the pruned graphs do not contain any \mathbf{I} this time. In the $\ell = L$ case, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} &\asymp \sigma_G N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - (|\mathcal{L}(G)| + 1)) + 1} = \sigma_G N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)| + 1)}, \\ \mathbf{W}_{(G \sqcup G)_\phi} &\asymp \sigma_G^2 N^{\frac{1}{2}(2|E(G)| - 2(|\mathcal{L}(G)| + 1)) + 1} = \sigma_G^2 N^{|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)|}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, while for $\ell = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} &\asymp \sigma_G N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - (|\mathcal{L}(G)| + 2)) + 1} = \sigma_G N^{\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)|)}, \\ \mathbf{W}_{(G \sqcup G)_\phi} &\asymp \sigma_G^2 N^{\frac{1}{2}(2|E(G)| - 2(|\mathcal{L}(G)| + 2)) + 1} = \sigma_G^2 N^{|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)| - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

When $\sigma_0 = 1$, $\sigma_\ell = N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $\ell > 0$ (in which case $\sigma_G = N^{-\frac{1}{2}(|E(G)| - |\mathcal{L}(G)| - \mathbf{1}(\ell > 0))}$), we thus always obtain


$$(77) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\sigma_\ell^2 \mathbf{W}_G - a(G) \right)^2 \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \left(\alpha(G \sqcup G) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5. Each tree in $\mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})$ has exactly one L -edge which is the only edge adjacent to the root. If $\ell = L$, the canonical bijection in the lemma's statement is the map which assigns to $\eta \in \partial_L \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})$ the tree η^+ obtained by fixing η 's root edge to W_L . Since each bi-atomic pairing of $\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+$ has to necessarily pair the root edges, it follows that $\mathcal{P}_B(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+)$ and $\mathcal{P}_A(\tau \circ \eta^\top)$ are in canonical bijection, and in particular that $a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) = \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+)$.

If $\ell < L$, then any $\eta \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})$ can be viewed as a tree $\tau^- \in \partial_\ell \mathbb{T}_{L-1,1}(\mathbf{x})$, which is attached by its root to a tree $\tau^+ \in \mathbb{T}_{L,i}(\mathbf{x})$ as in the example of Figure 29. Note that this decomposition is unique.

It thus remains to show that $\mathcal{P}_A(\tau \circ \eta^\top)$ is in bijection with $\mathcal{P}_B(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+) \times \mathcal{P}_A(\tau^- \circ (\eta^-)^\top)$. This follows from Proposition 9 (3): since the root-edges of τ, η are the only L -edges we see that any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau \circ \eta^\top)$ corresponds to one $\phi' \in \mathcal{P}_A(\tau \wedge \eta)$

FIGURE 29. Decomposition of a tree in $\partial_1 \mathbb{T}_{3,i}$

which is constrained to pair the two open edges, but by (3) these are in bijection with $\mathcal{P}_B(\tau^+ \wedge \eta^+) \times \mathcal{P}_A(\tau^- \wedge \eta^-)$ which allows to conclude.

Therefore, as needed, we have

$$a(\tau \circ \eta^\top) = \alpha(\tau^+ \sqcup \eta^+)a(\tau^- \circ \eta^{-\top}).$$

□

A.4. Results in Section 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 6. Let $G = G(\eta)$ be a decorated cycle. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, we have

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G \prod_{\pi \in V(G)/\sim_\phi} \sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\odot_{\bullet, \mathbf{y}} \in \pi \mathbf{Y}]_\alpha = \sigma_G N^{V(G_\phi)} \prod_{\pi \in V(G)/\sim_\phi} \frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\odot_{\bullet, \mathbf{y}} \in \pi \mathbf{Y}]_\alpha}{N}.$$

As argued in the proof of Lemma 2 (see Figure 28), the only vertices fixed to \mathbf{x} are of degree 1 while all other vertices are fixed to $\mathbf{1}$. We therefore have

$$\odot_{\bullet, \mathbf{y}} \in \pi \mathbf{Y} \in \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \odot \mathbf{x}\},$$

so that

$$\frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\odot_{\bullet, \mathbf{y}} \in \pi \mathbf{Y}]_\alpha}{N} \in \left\{ 1, \frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\mathbf{x}]_\alpha}{N}, \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N} \right\}.$$

Since $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle / N \rightarrow x$ and

$$\frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\mathbf{x}]_\alpha}{N} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}{N} \leq \frac{\sqrt{N} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2}{N} = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\sqrt{N}} \rightarrow \sqrt{x},$$

we can conclude that

$$\mathbf{W}_{G_\phi} = \sigma_G N^{V(G_\phi)} \mathcal{O}(1)$$

so the order of \mathbf{W}_{G_ϕ} is determined by the number of vertices in G_ϕ .

Following Section 4.2, it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)} \mathbf{W}_{G_\psi} = \sigma_G N^{|E(G_\psi)|+1} a(G),$$

which is true in the event that

$$\prod_{\pi \in V(G)/\sim_\psi} \frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N [\odot_{\bullet, \mathbf{y}} \in \pi \mathbf{Y}]_\alpha}{N} = \prod_{\{\bullet, \mathbf{x}, \bullet, \mathbf{x}\} \in (\mathcal{L}(G)/\sim_\psi)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{N}$$

holds for every $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_A(G)$.

The latter is equivalent to proving that the edges whose tails are leaves of G and are fixed to \mathbf{x} are paired between themselves. In a decorated cycle, all such edges are 0-edges, and the only other 0-edges belong to $C(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. The result thus follows by Lemma 7. \square

APPENDIX B. TECHNICAL LEMMAS

In this section, we collate some technical lemmas used in Sections 3 and 5.

Lemma 10. *Consider a sequence of sets $(\mathcal{A}_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0})$ and absolutely summable sequences of vectors $(v_{a_i} \mid a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ indexed by them. Let $v_{(a_1, \dots, a_M)} := \otimes_{i=1}^M v_{a_i}$ with the convention that empty products have value 1. Then for $M \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(78) \quad (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes M} \ni \otimes_{i=1}^M \left(\sum_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} v_{a_i} \right) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}_M \in \times_{i=1}^M \mathcal{A}_i} v_{\mathbf{a}_M}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on M . If $M = 0$ then the result holds by convention. For the inductive case assume the lemma true up to M , then

$$\begin{aligned} \otimes_{i=1}^{M+1} \sum_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} v_{a_i} &= \left(\otimes_{i=1}^M \sum_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} v_{a_i} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{a_{M+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{M+1}} v_{a_{M+1}} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{\mathbf{a}_M \in \times_{i=1}^M \mathcal{A}_i} v_{\mathbf{a}_M} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{a_{M+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{M+1}} v_{a_{M+1}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{a_{M+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{M+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}_M \in \times_{i=1}^M \mathcal{A}_i} v_{\mathbf{a}_M} \otimes v_{a_{M+1}} \end{aligned}$$

Assume now $\mathbf{a}_M = (a_1, \dots, a_M)$, then $v_{\mathbf{a}_M} \otimes v_{a_{M+1}} = v_{(a_1, \dots, a_{M+1})}$ and we conclude. \square

We now turn to consider the same setting with the Hadamard product \odot instead of \otimes . Given that the Hadamard product does not care about the order of the terms, it will be convenient to write the results in terms of objects which behave like sequences invariant to permutation.

Definition 20. *Given a set \mathcal{A} we define the set of its symmetric M -tuples as the quotient \mathcal{A}^M/S_M where S_M is the symmetric group of M elements acting on \mathcal{A}^M by permuting the elements as*

$$(79) \quad \sigma \cdot (a_1, \dots, a_M) \mapsto (a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(M)}).$$

We denote this set and its elements as

$$(80) \quad \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M := \mathcal{A}^M/S_M = \{ \llbracket a_1 \cdots a_M \rrbracket : \forall i \in [M]. a_i \in \mathcal{A} \},$$

We also set $\mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}} = \bigcup_{M=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M$. For a symmetric tuple $\tau = \llbracket (a_1)^{k_1} \cdots (a_N)^{k_N} \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$, where a_1, \dots, a_N are distinct elements of \mathcal{A} , we define the symmetry factor of τ as

$$(81) \quad \mathfrak{s}(\llbracket \rrbracket) = 1, \quad \mathfrak{s}(\tau) := \prod_{i=1}^N (k_i)!$$

Informally a *symmetric* tuple $\llbracket a_1 \cdots a_M \rrbracket$ is obtained from the tuple (a_1, \dots, a_M) by forgetting about the order of its elements. Note that this is *not* the same thing as the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$, as we want to keep track of multiple appearances of element (e.g. $\llbracket a \ a \ b \rrbracket \neq \llbracket a \ b \rrbracket$, while $\{a, a, b\} = \{a, b\}$ for sets).

Proposition 9. Consider a set \mathcal{A} and a summable sequence $(v_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ indexed by \mathcal{A} . We have for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(82) \quad (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes M} \ni \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right)^{\odot M} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M} \frac{M!}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)} v_\tau$$

where for $\tau := \llbracket a_1 \cdots a_M \rrbracket$ we define $v_\tau := v_{a_1} \odot \cdots \odot v_{a_M}$.

Proof. Considering M copies of \mathcal{A} as different sets and using Lemma 10, we have on the one hand that

$$\otimes_{i=1}^M \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \times_{i=1}^M \mathcal{A}} \otimes_{i=1}^M (v_{a_i}).$$

On the other hand if we define linearly

$$\odot : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_M \mapsto v_1 \odot \cdots \odot v_M$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right)^{\odot M} &= \odot \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right)^{\otimes M} \\ &= \odot \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^M} \otimes_{i=1}^M (v_{a_i}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^M} \odot_{i=1}^M (v_{a_i}) \end{aligned}$$

by definition. Note that for any $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_M), \mathbf{a}' = (a'_1, \dots, a'_M) \in \mathcal{A}^M$,

$$\odot_{i=1}^M (v_{a_i}) = \odot_{i=1}^M (v_{a'_i})$$

whenever

$$(a_1, \dots, a_M) = (a'_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a'_{\sigma(M)}).$$

for some $\sigma \in S_M$ i.e. \odot is invariant to the action of S_M . Therefore we can write

$$\left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right)^{\odot M} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M} \frac{M!}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)} v_\tau.$$

since the cardinality of orbit τ is exactly $\frac{M!}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)}$. \square

Remark. The same argument proves an analogous tree expansion for the symmetric tensor product \square , instead of the Hadamard product \odot , defined by

$$(83) \quad v_1 \square \cdots \square v_M = \frac{1}{M!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_M} v_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\sigma(M)}.$$

Proposition 10. Let $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be polynomial functions. Fix index sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\lambda : (\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2) \times (\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a symmetric and summable function. Then if

$$(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{(a, a') \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_1} \lambda(a, a') & \sum_{(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda(a, b) \\ \sum_{(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}_2 \times \mathcal{A}_1} \lambda(b, a) & \sum_{(b, b') \in \mathcal{A}_2 \times \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda(b, b') \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

the following expansion holds

$$(84) \quad \mathbb{E}\{\varphi(X)\psi(Y)\} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}} \frac{\varphi_\tau \psi_\eta}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \lambda(\pi_1, \pi_2)$$

where $\varphi_{\llbracket \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_m \rrbracket} := \varphi^{(m)}(0)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ is the set of pairings of the entries of τ and η .

Proof. Using Wick's theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\varphi(X)\psi(Y)\} &= \sum_{M,N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi^{(M)}(0)\psi^{(N)}(0)}{M!N!} \mathbb{E}\{X^M Y^N\} \\ &= \sum_{M,N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi^{(M)}(0)\psi^{(N)}(0)}{M!N!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \mathbb{E}\{Z_{\pi_1} Z_{\pi_2}\} \\ &= \sum_{M,N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi^{(M)}(0)\psi^{(N)}(0)}{M!N!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \sum_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda_{\pi_1, \pi_2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here $[M] \sqcup [N] := ((1, 1), \dots, (1, M), (2, 1), \dots, (2, N))$ is ordered lexicographically, where with a slight abuse of notation $\mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])$ is the set of pairings of elements in $[M] \sqcup [N]$ and

$$\lambda_{(i, *), (j, *)}(c, c') = \lambda(c, c') \mathbf{1}(c \in \mathcal{A}_i) \mathbf{1}(c' \in \mathcal{A}_j).$$

The claim would thus follow from the equality

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{M!N!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \sum_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda_{\pi_1, \pi_2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \in \pi} \lambda(\gamma_1, \gamma_2), \end{aligned}$$

which we now prove. Begin by noticing that

$$(85) \quad \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \sum_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda_{\pi_1, \pi_2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$$

$$(86) \quad = \sum_{\Gamma_1: [M] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{\Gamma_2: [N] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \lambda(\Gamma(\pi_1), \Gamma(\pi_2))$$

where we write $\Gamma((i, k)) = \Gamma_i(k)$. We are simply double counting: the former is obtained by labeling the elements of $[M] \sqcup [N]$ after having paired them, and the latter by reversing the order of the operations with the functions Γ_1, Γ_2 specifying the labels.

Then for any fixed $\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N$, we have

$$(87) \quad \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \in \pi} \lambda(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \lambda(\Gamma(\pi_1), \Gamma(\pi_2))$$

whenever $\Gamma_1: [M] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$ and $\Gamma_2: [N] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ satisfy

$$\tau = \llbracket \Gamma_1(1) \cdots \Gamma_1(M) \rrbracket \text{ and } \eta = \llbracket \Gamma_2(1) \cdots \Gamma_2(N) \rrbracket.$$

Letting $\Omega_{\tau, \eta}$ denote the set of all such pairs (Γ_1, Γ_2) , we note that

$$|\Omega_{\tau, \eta}| = \frac{M! N!}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau) \mathfrak{s}(\eta)}$$

and, in turn, that

$$(88) \quad \bigsqcup_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M} \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N} \Omega_{\tau, \eta} = \{\Gamma_1 : [M] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1\} \times \{\Gamma_2 : [N] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2\}.$$

This allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \in \pi} \lambda(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \frac{1}{|\Omega_{\tau, \eta}|} \sum_{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \Omega_{\tau, \eta}} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \lambda(\Gamma(\pi_1), \Gamma(\pi_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{M!N!} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^M} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}_2}^N} \sum_{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \Omega_{\tau, \eta}} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \lambda(\Gamma(\pi_1), \Gamma(\pi_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{M!N!} \sum_{\Gamma_1 : [M] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{\Gamma_2 : [N] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \lambda(\Gamma(\pi_1), \Gamma(\pi_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{M!N!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M] \sqcup [N])} \prod_{\substack{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi \\ \pi_1 < \pi_2}} \sum_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{A}_2} \lambda_{\pi_1, \pi_2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (87), the second from $|\Omega_{\tau, \eta}| = \frac{M!}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)} \frac{N!}{\mathfrak{s}(\eta)}$, the third is (88) and the last (85). \square

Since we work with kernels which are defined as nested expectations (of the type studied in Proposition 10), it will be crucial to have a neat way of dealing with nested sequences of symmetric tuples. This structure is naturally encoded by *non-plane* rooted trees.

Definition 21. *Given a set \mathcal{A} we define the set of depth- ℓ non-plane rooted trees with depth- $\ell + 1$ \mathcal{A} -decorated leaves $\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A})$ recursively as*

$$(89) \quad \mathbf{T}_0(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}, \quad \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A})}.$$

Finally we define the set of non-plane rooted trees with \mathcal{A} -decorated terminal leaves as the union $\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A}) := \cup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A})$. For any tree $\tau = \llbracket (\tau_1)^{k_1} \dots (\tau_N)^{k_N} \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A})$, where τ_1, \dots, τ_N are distinct elements of $\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A})$, we define the symmetry factor \mathfrak{s} of τ as

$$(90) \quad \mathfrak{s}(\llbracket \] = 1, \quad \mathfrak{s}(\tau) := \mathfrak{s}(\tau) \prod_{i=1}^N \mathfrak{s}(\tau_i)^{k_i}$$

where for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we set $\mathfrak{s}(a) = 1$. We also write $\tau = \tau \llbracket a_1, \dots, a_m \rrbracket$ to show the fact that τ has exactly m leaves from \mathcal{A} and that these are a_1, \dots, a_m .

The choice of nomenclature becomes clear after noticing how nested symmetric tuples can be represented by non-plane trees in a natural way *c.f.* Figure 30.




FIGURE 30.

Definition 22. Given sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we define the nested pairings of the terminal leaves of two trees $\tau \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_1)$ and $\eta \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_2)$ as the set $\mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ recursively defined as

$$(91) \quad \forall (a, a') \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2. \mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(a \sqcup a') = \{ \{ \{ a, a' \} \} \}$$

and for $\tau = [\tau_1 \cdots \tau_n] \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ and $\eta = [\eta_1 \cdots \eta_m] \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ as

$$(92) \quad \mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\tau \sqcup \eta) = \{ \sqcup_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \phi_{\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2} \mid \pi \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{X}(\tau \sqcup \eta), \phi_{\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2) \}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\mathbb{X}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ is the set of pairings of the entries of τ and η as symmetric tuples. Note how if $\tau = \tau[a_1, \dots, a_m]$ and $\eta = \eta[a'_1, \dots, a'_n]$ then any element of $\mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ is a pairing of $(a_1, \dots, a_m, a'_1, \dots, a'_n)$.

Note how this definition is consistent in the sense that for $\tau, \eta \in \mathbf{T}_1(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{X}_\mathcal{A}$ one has $\mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\tau \sqcup \eta) = \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{X}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$.

Definition 23. Let $(\varphi_\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of polynomials and \mathcal{A} a set. We define the tree-derivatives of the φ on $\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A})$ as

$$(93) \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \varphi_a := 1, \quad \forall \tau = [\tau_1 \cdots \tau_m] \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}). \varphi_\tau := \varphi_{\ell+1}^{(m)}(0) \prod_{i=1}^m \varphi_{\tau_i}$$

Theorem 13. Let $((\varphi_\ell, \psi_\ell) \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of tuples of polynomials. Fix index sets $\mathcal{A}_x, \mathcal{A}_y$ and $\lambda : (\mathcal{A}_x \cup \mathcal{A}_y) \times (\mathcal{A}_x \cup \mathcal{A}_y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a symmetric and summable function. Then if

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_0(x, x) & K_0(x, y) \\ K_0(y, x) & K_0(y, y) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{(a, a') \in \mathcal{A}_x \times \mathcal{A}_x} \lambda(a, a') & \sum_{(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_x \times \mathcal{A}_y} \lambda(a, b) \\ \sum_{(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}_y \times \mathcal{A}_x} \lambda(b, a) & \sum_{(b, b') \in \mathcal{A}_y \times \mathcal{A}_y} \lambda(b, b') \end{bmatrix}$$

and we define recursively

$$K_{\ell+1}(x, y) := \mathbb{E}\{\varphi_{\ell+1}(X_\ell)\psi_{\ell+1}(Y_\ell)\}, \quad (X_\ell, Y_\ell) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} K_\ell(x, x) & K_\ell(x, y) \\ K_\ell(y, x) & K_\ell(y, y) \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

the following expansion holds

$$(94) \quad K_\ell(x, y) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_x)} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_y)} \frac{\varphi_\tau \psi_\eta}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbf{T}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \phi} \lambda(\alpha, \beta)$$

Proof. By induction on ℓ . If $\ell = 0$ the thesis is clear by definition of the constituent objects. Assume then expansion true for ℓ and let's show it for $\ell+1$. By Proposition 10 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\varphi_{\ell+1}(X_\ell)\psi_{\ell+1}(Y_\ell)\} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_x)}} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_y)}} \frac{(\varphi_{\ell+1})_\tau (\psi_{\ell+1})_\eta}{\mathfrak{s}(\tau)\mathfrak{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{X}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \lambda_\ell(\pi_1, \pi_2)$$

where for $\tau \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_x)$ and $\eta \in \mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A}_y)$ one defines

$$\lambda_\ell(\tau, \eta) := \frac{\varphi_\tau \psi_\eta}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)\mathbf{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{T}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \phi} \lambda(\alpha, \beta)$$

and similarly if τ, η live in the same space then in this definition either $\varphi \mapsto \psi$ or vice-versa. Putting things together, from the definitions of $\mathbf{T}_\ell(\mathcal{A})$, \mathbf{s} and φ_τ , we obtain

$$K_{\ell+1}(x, y) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}_x)} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}_y)} \frac{\varphi_\tau \psi_\eta}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)\mathbf{s}(\eta)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{T}}(\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2)} \prod_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \phi} \lambda(\alpha, \beta)$$

and the conclusion follows noticing that the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{T}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)$ implies

$$\sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{T}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \phi} \lambda(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau \sqcup \eta)} \prod_{\{\pi_1, \pi_2\} \in \pi} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{T}}(\pi_1 \sqcup \pi_2)} \prod_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \phi} \lambda(\alpha, \beta)$$

□

Remark. Given sequences $(W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ and $(\mathbf{x}_a \mid a \in \mathcal{A})$ there is a natural way to associate to each $\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A})$ an operator graph τ :

$$\forall a \in \mathcal{A}. a \mapsto \circ -_{W_0} \bullet_{\mathbf{x}_a}, \quad \forall \tau = \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{A}). \tau \mapsto (\circ -_{W_{\ell+1}} \circ) \circ (\wedge_i \tau_i)$$




FIGURE 31.

Proposition 11. Let Φ_L be as defined in (13) and $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda_a \mathbf{x}_a$ for some summable sequence $((\lambda_a, \mathbf{x}_a) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \mid a \in \mathcal{A})$ and a set \mathcal{A} , then

$$\Phi_L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \llbracket a_1, \dots, a_m \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_L(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\varphi_\tau}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} \left(\prod_i \lambda_{a_i} \right) \mathbf{W}_\tau$$

where in \mathbf{W}_τ the tree τ is viewed as a product graph (see 1).

Proof. We proceed by induction on L . For $L = 0$ by definition we have $\Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = W_0 \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{T}_L(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$ and for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ also $\varphi_a = 1$, $\mathbf{s}(a) = 1$ and $\mathbf{W}_a = W_0[\mathbf{x}_a]$. Hence

$$\sum_{a \in \mathbf{T}_0(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\varphi_a}{\mathbf{s}(a)} \lambda_a \mathbf{W}_a = \sum_{a \in \mathbf{T}_0(\mathcal{A})} W_0[\lambda_a \mathbf{x}_a] = W_0 \mathbf{x} = \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}).$$

Reasoning by induction and using the Taylor expansion in 0 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Phi_{L+1}(\mathbf{x}) &= W_{L+1}[\varphi_{L+1}(\Phi_L(\mathbf{x}))] \\
 &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_{L+1}^{(m)}(0)}{M!} W_{L+1} \left[\left(\sum_{\tau \llbracket a_1, \dots, a_m \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_L(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\varphi_{\tau}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} \left(\prod_i \lambda_{a_i} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\tau} \right)^{\odot m} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{\llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{T}_L(\mathcal{A})}} \frac{(\varphi_{L+1})_{\llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket}}{\mathbf{s}(\llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket)} W_{L+1} \left[\odot_{i=1}^m \frac{\varphi_{\tau_i}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau_i)} \left(\prod_j \lambda_{a_{i,j}} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\tau_i} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the equality

$$\left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} v_a \right)^{\odot M} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M} \frac{M!}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} v_{\tau}$$

given by Proposition 9. We can continue the equality using the definition of $\mathbf{T}_{L+1}(\mathcal{A})$ obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{\tau \simeq \llbracket \tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_{L+1}(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\varphi_{\tau}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} W_{L+1} \left[\odot_{i=1}^m \left(\prod_j \lambda_{a_{i,j}} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\tau_i} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{\tau \llbracket a_1 \cdots a_m \rrbracket \in \mathbf{T}_{L+1}(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\varphi_{\tau}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} \left(\prod_i \lambda_{a_i} \right) \mathbf{w}_{\tau}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. Using the correspondence with product graphs we obtain both the expansions

$$\Phi_L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbf{T}_L(\bullet_{\mathbf{x}})} \frac{\varphi_{\tau}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} \mathbf{w}_{\tau}, \quad \Phi_L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbf{T}_L} \frac{\varphi_{\tau}}{\mathbf{s}(\tau)} \mathbf{x}_{\tau} \mathbf{w}_{\tau},$$

by considering $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}} [\mathbf{x}]_i \mathbf{e}_i$ given that

$$(\mathbb{T}_L(\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}), s, \varphi) \simeq (\mathbf{T}_L(\{\bullet_{\mathbf{x}}\}), \mathbf{s}, \varphi), \quad (\mathbb{T}_L, s, \varphi) \simeq (\mathbf{T}_L(\{\bullet_1, \dots, \bullet_N\}), \mathbf{s}, \varphi).$$

APPENDIX C. NUMERICAL STUDY OF THE JACOBIAN SPECTRAL DISTRIBUTION

In this section we present some evidence that the results presented in this work hold for non-polynomial activation functions.

In particular we consider ReLU networks (*i.e.* with all activations equal to $\varphi(x) = x \cdot \mathbf{1}(x > 0)$). Ignoring the fact that φ is not a polynomial and applying Proposition 5 (noting that $\mu_{k,\ell}(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all k, ℓ and x in that case), we can solve the resulting recursion for $m_{k,L}$ and obtain the following closed-form formulae as a function of the network depth L :

$$m_{1,L} = \frac{1}{2^L} \quad m_{2,L} = \frac{1+2L}{4^L} \quad m_{3,L} = \frac{6L(L+1)-2L+1}{8^L}$$

$$m_{4,L} = \frac{\frac{4}{3}L(16L^2+12L+5)+1}{16^L}.$$

Quantity	L=1	L=2	L=3	Theory
$m_{1,L}$	0.501 (0.5)	0.251 (0.25)	0.126 (0.125)	$\frac{1}{2^L}$
$m_{2,L}$	0.752 (0.75)	0.316 (0.313)	0.111 (0.109)	$\frac{1+2L}{4^L}$
$m_{3,L}$	1.384 (1.375)	0.529 (0.516)	0.135 (0.131)	$\frac{6L(L+1)-2L+1}{8^L}$
$m_{4,L}$	2.840 (2.813)	1.012 (0.973)	0.191 (0.181)	$\frac{\frac{4}{3}L(16L^2+12L+5)+1}{16^L}$

TABLE 1. The first four moments of the limiting spectral distribution of the Jacobian of a depth- L ReLU network, for different values of L . In the columns, the first value is obtained numerically, by sampling L weight matrices of dimension 500×500 and averaging over 200 tries, while the value in parentheses is the theoretical prediction (we only kept the first three decimal digits for both).

Remark. *A phenomenon of vanishing gradients seems to appear here as L grows, with the theoretical prediction for $m_{k,L}$ equalling a ratio of a polynomial by a function which grows exponentially in L .*

Next, we independently initialize $M = 200$ depth-2 networks with weight matrices of dimension $N \times N$ weights, and do so for each $N \in \{50, 100, 250, 500, 700, 1000\}$. For each of these networks, we compute the first few empirical spectral moments of $\mathbf{J}_{2,\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{J}_{2,\mathbf{x}}^\top$ with respect to the input $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$. In Figure 32, we plot histograms of the resulting values for each N . The picture shows how the convergence to the limiting value is in L^2 , with the variance around the limit shrinking as the dimension increases.

In Figure 33 we plot the Mean Squared Error (MSE) (equivalently, the squared L^2 norm) between these moments and their limit found in Proposition 6. As shown in the latter, we see that the error decays like $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$.

For completeness, we repeated the same experiments with uniformly distributed weights in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and included the resulting plots below.




FIGURE 32. Distribution of empirical Jacobian moments around their limit as N increases.




FIGURE 33. Rate of convergence of empirical Jacobian moments around the limit as N increases.




FIGURE 34. Distribution of the moments of the empirical singular value distribution of the Jacobian, around their limit (vertical dotted line), as N increases. Weights uniformly distributed in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$.




FIGURE 35. Rate of convergence of empirical Jacobian moments around the limit as N increases, weights uniformly distributed in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$.

APPENDIX D. MAP OF RESULTS




FIGURE 36. Dependency graph for our results.

APPENDIX E. TABLE OF SYMBOLS

Symbol	Meaning
Φ_L	Neural network of depth L (Eqn. 13).
$\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}}$	Neural network Jacobian $\mathbf{J}_{L,\mathbf{x}} = d(\varphi_L \circ \Phi_{L-1})_{\mathbf{x}}$ (Eqn. 20).
\mathfrak{d}	Dimension function associated to cells of a graph G (Sec. 2).
$\mathbf{X}_c \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{d}(c)}$	Input of cell c in a graph G (Sec. 2).
\mathfrak{C}	Set of cell inputs of a product graph (Def. 1).
$\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{out}})$	Set of free cells (Sec. 2.2).
\mathbf{W}_G	Operator associated to a graph G (Def. 3), noting that if G is a product graph, \mathbf{W}_G is its value.
$\bullet_{\mathbf{x}_v}, \xrightarrow{\mathbf{x}_c}$	Cell fixed to \mathbf{X}_c (Sec. 2.2).
\bullet, \rightarrow	Cell fixed to $\mathbf{1}$ or \mathbf{I} (Sec. 2.2).
\circ, \dashrightarrow	In-cell (Sec. 2.2).
\circ, \dashrightarrow	Out-cell (Sec. 2.2).
$\bullet_{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto \bullet_{\mathbf{y}}$	Switching input of a cell (Def. 11).
$G_1 \wedge G_2$	Out-vertex identification (corresponds to a Hadamard product) (Def. 5).
$\mathbb{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^M$	Space of \mathcal{A} 's symmetric M -tuples (Def. 20).
$\mathfrak{s}(\cdot)$	Symmetric factor of symmetric tuples (Def. 20).
\mathbb{T}_L	Input-independent operator trees space for NN expansion (Sec. 3.1).
$\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$	Input-dependent operator trees space for NN expansion (Def. 11).
$(\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x}))^*$	Input-dependent operator trees with pruned root (Sec. 3.2).
$\partial_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$	Space of derivative operator trees with respect to input \mathbf{x} (Sec. 3.2).
$\partial_{\ell}\mathbb{T}_L(\mathbf{x})$	Space of derivative operator trees with respect to matrix W_{ℓ} (Sec. 3.2).
$\mathfrak{s}(\cdot)$	Symmetric factor of trees (Sec. 3.1).
$\mathcal{P}(G)$	Admissible pairings of edges of G with random inputs (Def. 13).
$\mathcal{P}_{\text{A}}(G), \mathcal{P}_{\text{B}}(G), \mathcal{P}_{\text{AF}}(G)$	Atomic, biatomic and atom-free pairings of G (Def. 14).
G_{ϕ}	Graph resulting from identification of G 's edges according to ϕ (Sec. 4).
$\mathbb{T}_{\ell}(\mathcal{A})$	Depth- ℓ non-plane rooted trees with \mathcal{A} -decorated leaves of depth $\ell + 1$ (Def. 21).
$\mathfrak{s}(\cdot)$	Symmetric factor of rooted trees (Def. 21).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

Email address: `n.muca-cirone22@imperial.ac.uk`

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Email address: `hamdan@maths.ox.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

Email address: `c.salvi@imperial.ac.uk`