

# Agnostic Learning of Arbitrary ReLU Activation under Gaussian Marginals

Anxin Guo<sup>\*‡</sup>Aravindan Vijayaraghavan<sup>†‡</sup>

## Abstract

We consider the problem of learning an arbitrarily-biased ReLU activation (or neuron) over Gaussian marginals with the squared loss objective. Despite the ReLU neuron being the basic building block of modern neural networks, we still do not understand the basic algorithmic question of whether one arbitrary ReLU neuron is learnable in the non-realizable setting. In particular, all existing polynomial time algorithms only provide approximation guarantees for the better-behaved unbiased setting or restricted bias setting.

Our main result is a polynomial time statistical query (SQ) algorithm that gives the first constant factor approximation for arbitrary bias. It outputs a ReLU activation that achieves a loss of  $O(\text{OPT}) + \varepsilon$  in time  $\text{poly}(d, 1/\varepsilon)$ , where  $\text{OPT}$  is the loss obtained by the optimal ReLU activation. Our algorithm presents an interesting departure from existing algorithms, which are all based on gradient descent and thus fall within the class of correlational statistical query (CSQ) algorithms. We complement our algorithmic result by showing that no polynomial time CSQ algorithm can achieve a constant factor approximation. Together, these results shed light on the intrinsic limitation of gradient descent, while identifying arguably the simplest setting (a single neuron) where there is a separation between SQ and CSQ algorithms.

---

\*Northwestern University, [anxinbguo@gmail.com](mailto:anxinbguo@gmail.com)

†Northwestern University, [aravindv@northwestern.edu](mailto:aravindv@northwestern.edu)

‡Both authors were supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. ECCS-2216970 and CCF-2154100.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Technical overview . . . . .	3
1.2	Related works . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Thresholded PCA and Initialization Guarantees</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Technical lemmas. . . . .	12
3.2	Proof of main theorem. . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Reweighted Projected Gradient Descent and Guarantees</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Re-centering the Gaussian covariates . . . . .	16
4.2	Contribution from optimal ReLU . . . . .	17
4.3	Contribution from noise . . . . .	19
4.4	Making progress on each update . . . . .	21
4.5	Putting things together . . . . .	24
<b>5</b>	<b>Lower Bounds for CSQ algorithms</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1	Preliminaries on high-dimensional geometry and CSQ . . . . .	25
5.2	Hermite expansion of negatively biased ReLU . . . . .	26
5.3	Proof of main theorem . . . . .	27
	<b>References</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Mills ratio and Gaussian integrals</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Omitted proofs from Section 2</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof for Lemma 4.2</b>	<b>38</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) is the predominant choice of activation function in machine learning. A single ReLU function or neuron has two parameters – a unit <sup>1</sup> vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a bias  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , and acts on an input  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as

$$\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b), \text{ where } \forall z \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma(z) = \max\{z, 0\}. \quad (1)$$

Given a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over samples  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , the loss incurred by a ReLU function with parameters  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d, b \in \mathbb{R}$  on distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is given by the least squares error

$$L(w, b) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ (y - \sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b))^2 \right], \text{ and } \text{OPT} = \min_{\substack{w \in \mathbb{R}^d, b \in \mathbb{R}: \\ \|w\|_2=1}} L(w, b) \quad (2)$$

is the error of the best fit ReLU function for the given data distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . The interesting setting when  $\text{OPT} > 0$  is called the agnostic [KSS94], or non-realizable setting of problem. The goal in agnostic learning is to design a polynomial time algorithm that takes in as input i.i.d. samples from the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  and outputs a ReLU neuron whose loss is competitive with best fit error  $\text{OPT}$ , e.g., with loss  $\text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  or  $O(\text{OPT}) + \varepsilon$ .

This problem of agnostic learning of a ReLU activation is also called ReLU regression, and has been studied extensively over the past decade [KKSK11, GK19, DGK<sup>+</sup>20, DKTZ22a, ATV23, WZDD23]. This problem is computationally intractable without additional assumptions on the marginal distribution of  $x$ . Most algorithmic works study the setting where the marginal distribution on  $x$  is a standard Gaussian, or make similar distributional assumptions [DGK<sup>+</sup>20, FCG20, ATV23].

Despite the ReLU neuron being the basic building block of modern neural networks, we still do not understand the basic algorithmic question of whether an arbitrary ReLU neuron is learnable in the non-realizable setting. In particular, we are not aware of any polynomial time algorithm that achieves a non-trivial multiplicative approximation for the best-fit ReLU of arbitrary bias.<sup>2</sup> The main question we address is:

*Can we design a polynomial time algorithm that learns an arbitrary ReLU activation under Gaussian marginals that achieves approximately optimal loss of  $O(\text{OPT})$ , where  $\text{OPT}$  is defined in (2)?*

Over the past decade there have been several algorithmic results in the unbiased setting i.e., the special case when the bias  $b = 0$  [GK19, FCG20, DGK<sup>+</sup>20, DKTZ22a, WZDD23]. In particular, the algorithm of [DGK<sup>+</sup>20] gives the first efficient  $O(\text{OPT})$  guarantee by minimizing a convex surrogate loss. On the other hand, there is evidence that  $\text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  may be computationally intractable [DKPZ21, DKR23]. To the best of our knowledge, the only prior algorithmic result on learning negatively-biased ReLU neuron is the recent work of [ATV23], which handles the moderate bias setting when  $|b| = O(1)$ . In fact, we are aware of few algorithmic results for agnostic learning *any linear model* in the arbitrary bias setting. (One notable exception is the line of work initiated by [DKS18] that gives an  $O(\text{OPT})$  agnostic learning guarantee for general linear halfspaces.) The

---

<sup>1</sup>In general it suffices to have polynomially bounded norm:  $\|w\| \leq W$ . But the restriction to unit vectors  $w$  is without loss of generality, since we can scale  $y$  appropriately as in Proposition 2.1.

<sup>2</sup>The existing state-of-the-art algorithms incur approximation factors that depend polynomially on  $\text{OPT}$  when bias is very negative [ATV23]. See Section 1.2 for details.

arbitrary bias setting seems to represent a common challenge across many problems in computational learning theory.

Our main result gives an affirmative answer to the above question.

**Theorem 1.1** (SQ algorithm that gets  $O(\text{OPT})$ , informal). *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an absolute constant  $\alpha \geq 1$  and an algorithm that given i.i.d. samples  $(x, y)$  from a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  with the  $x$ -marginal being Gaussian  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ , runs in polynomial time (and samples), and with high probability outputs a ReLU activation with loss at most  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ .*

See Theorem 4.10 for a more formal statement. The above theorem gives the desired agnostic learning guarantee in polynomial time for an arbitrary ReLU activation. In addition, it is a proper learner<sup>3</sup> i.e., it outputs a ReLU activation function that achieves this loss. The algorithm fits into the Statistical Query (SQ) framework [Kea93], which gives oracle access to statistics  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(x, y)]$  for some user-specified function  $f$ , up to an error tolerance of  $\tau$  (typically,  $\tau = 1/\text{poly}(d)$  for polynomial sample complexity). Our algorithm consists of two main steps – an initial phase that finds a coarse initializer  $w_0$  to the true vector  $v$ , and then an iterative procedure based on a reweighted version of projected gradient descent to get the desired error of  $O(\text{OPT})$ .

Our algorithm presents an interesting departure from existing approaches for agnostic learning with zero or restricted bias, which uses gradient descent [FCG20, ATV23, DKTZ22a] and other algorithms that fit in the framework of Correlation SQ (CSQ), where the algorithm is only allowed to query values of the form  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[yf(x)]$  or  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(x)]$ , for some function  $f$ , up to a tolerance  $\tau$ . In fact, we can prove the following strong lower bound for all CSQ algorithms.

**Theorem 1.2** (CSQ lower bound of  $\omega(\text{OPT})$ ). *There exists a function  $F(\varepsilon)$  that goes to infinity as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any constant  $\alpha \geq 1$ , there exists a family of instances with  $\text{OPT} \leq \varepsilon/\alpha$  such that any CSQ algorithm that can agnostically learn an arbitrary ReLU neuron with loss at most  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  (as defined in Eq. (2)) must use either  $2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}$  queries or queries of tolerance  $d^{-F(\varepsilon)}$ .*

The above theorem shows that no efficient CSQ algorithm can achieve error of  $O(\text{OPT})$ , since doing so requires either  $\exp(d^{\Omega(1)})$  queries (exponential time) or  $d^{-F(\varepsilon)} = d^{\omega(1)}$  tolerance (superpolynomial samples) in the CSQ framework. In particular, since many variants of gradient descent (GD) under the  $L^2$  loss are captured by the CSQ model, this points to the sub-optimality of GD for learning even a single neuron, and motivates the design of new hybrid algorithms for learning neural networks.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 together identify a new problem on which there is a separation between SQ and CSQ algorithms. The work of [CKM21] gave the first such separation by designing an SQ algorithm for PAC learning (the realizable setting) that is fixed parameter tractable<sup>4</sup> for learning a neural network with  $k$  neurons under Gaussian marginals, where superpolynomial  $d^{\Omega(k)}$  lower bounds for CSQ algorithms were known [DKKZ20]. Such a separation has also been identified for learning sparse polynomials [KLL<sup>+</sup>24, APVZ14] and planted multi or single-index models [DLS22, DPLB24], both under Gaussian marginals but only in realizable setting. Our problem of agnostic learning of a single ReLU neuron is arguably the simplest setting, and the first agnostic setting where such separation has been identified.

---

<sup>3</sup>We allow our algorithm to output  $\mathbf{0}$ , by the simple argument that  $\mathbf{0}$  is the  $L^2$ -limit of  $\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b)$ , as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ .

<sup>4</sup>i.e. in time  $f(k)\text{poly}(d)$ , where  $f(k)$  can grow very fast with  $k$ , but  $\text{poly}(d)$  is independent of  $k$ .

## 1.1 Technical overview

In this subsection we give a high-level overview of the main challenges and ideas. For exposition we often assume the optimal ReLU is  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  with  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  known, an assumption we justify in Section 2.

**When bias gets negative.** When  $b$  is bounded from below, i.e., not too negative, the optimal ReLU  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  is *linear* on a considerable portion of inputs. Intuitively, this shape should be easier to learn than the small wedge at the far end of the number line, which happens when  $b$  is very negative. This intuition matches our findings: when  $b$  is bounded from below, the problem can be solved efficiently by a combination of known algorithms [DKTZ22a, ATV23]. However, as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , a clear separation appears. Our CSQ hardness suggests that all previously effective variants of gradient descent – on  $L^2$  loss or surrogate loss, including those that involve regularization/projection – would struggle to learn the set of *all sufficiently negatively-biased ReLU neurons*.

Our goal is hence to design an algorithm that works in the  $b \rightarrow -\infty$  limit, which, combined with previous results, completely resolves the task of agnostically learning an arbitrary ReLU neuron up to constant-factor approximation.

**Structural observations.** This regime comes with one benefit: we can now apply asymptotic analysis and make claims that hold *when the optimal ReLU has sufficiently negative  $b$* . To demonstrate this flavor of argument, we present some frequently used facts that hold as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ :

1. Let  $\Phi(b)$  be the standard Gaussian cdf.  $\Phi$  decays extremely quickly as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ : its value halves once we decrease  $b$  by  $O(1/|b|)$ .
2. The optimal ReLU itself has very small  $L^2$  norm:  $\mathbb{E}[\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)^2] = \Theta(\Phi(b)/b^2)$ .
3. The optimal loss OPT is at least  $\alpha$  times even smaller,  $\text{OPT} \leq O(\Phi(b)/\alpha b^2)$ , otherwise the zero function  $\mathbf{0}$  would be an  $\alpha$ -approximation for OPT. (Lemma 2.3)
4. The additive error term  $\varepsilon$  must also satisfy  $\varepsilon \leq O(\Phi(b)/b^2)$ , otherwise  $\mathbf{0}$  suffices to achieve loss  $\varepsilon$ . (Lemma 2.4)

These facts also make use of several Gaussian integrals with well-behaved limits as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , listed in Appendix A. The relation between  $b$  and  $\varepsilon$  also justifies the assumption that we know  $b$  beforehand, since an exhaustive search over all possible  $b$ 's take no more than  $\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$  rounds.

**Algorithmic results.** We propose Algorithm 1, which assumes access to population expectations over  $\mathcal{D}$ . In our technical proofs we will account for finite-sample errors, and our formal algorithmic result is stated and proven in Theorem 4.10.

Our algorithm is a two-stage process consists of *thresholded PCA* and *reweighted “projected” gradient descent (PGD)*.<sup>5</sup> Both subroutines are motivated by the need to overcome the failure of the following gradient descent (GD) algorithm, as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ :

$$(w_{t+1}, b_{t+1}) \leftarrow (w_t, b_t) - \eta \nabla_{w,b} L(w_t, b_t), \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, T.$$

---

<sup>5</sup>We note that our “projection” is not standard: we project each iterand to the unit sphere where  $\|w\| = 1$ , which is a non-convex set. The convergence of our algorithm (Section 4.4) also does not depend on convexity. This is also known as “Riemannian GD” in literature, as the unit sphere is a Riemannian manifold.

Before introducing the two algorithms in detail, we first demonstrate an analysis of (P)GD, which motivates the two algorithms and plays an important role in analysis of reweighted PGD (Section 4).

**Algorithm 1:** Complete algorithm, assuming population access to  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Input:** Accuracy parameter  $\varepsilon$ ; access to population expectations over  $\mathcal{D}$ ; norm upper bound  $W$ .

1. Let  $h_0 = \mathbf{0}$  be the zero function, and let  $L_0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[y^2]$  be its loss.
2. Run the GD algorithm from [DKTZ22a] with accuracy  $\varepsilon$ , and obtain ReLU neuron  $h_1$  with loss  $L_1$ . This loss is competitive against the best *positively-biased* ReLU.
3. Run the GD algorithm from [ATV23] with accuracy  $\varepsilon$ , and obtain ReLU neuron  $h_2$  with loss  $L_2$ . This is competitive against the best *moderately-biased* ReLU.
4. Run a grid search over parameter space  $[0, W] \times [-O(\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}), b_0]$  with accuracy  $0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ , where each pair of parameters  $\{(\beta_i, \gamma_i) : i \in 3, \dots, N\}$  indicate our “guesses” for  $\|v\|$  and  $b$ . For each pair  $(\beta_i, \gamma_i)$ , we apply the following two subroutines on the normalized distribution  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  (Proposition 2.1), and obtain ReLU  $h_i$  with loss

$$L_i \leq 0.1\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_i + 0.1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta_i^2},$$

where  $\text{OPT}_i$  is the minimum loss among ReLUs  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  with  $\|v\| = \beta_i$  and  $b = \gamma_i$ .

- (a) *Thresholded PCA* (Section 3): output  $w_0$ , the top eigenvector of the following matrix:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \left[ xx^\top \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ |y| \geq \frac{1}{|b|} \right\} \right].$$

- (b) *Reweighted PGD* (Section 4): an iterative GD-like algorithm with initialization  $w_0$  and step size  $\eta = c'_\eta / \Phi(\Theta(b))$ , for  $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$  steps. On each iteration  $t$ , we update  $w_t$  by:

$$w_{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{w_t + \eta v_{\text{update}}}{\|w_t + \eta v_{\text{update}}\|}, \text{ where } v_{\text{update}} = (I_d - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E} \left[ f_t(x) \cdot y \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq \tilde{b} \right\} \right],$$

where  $f_t(x)$  is a weight function and  $\tilde{b}$  a threshold value, both specified during analysis.

**Output:**  $h_{\text{ind}}$ , where  $\text{ind} = \arg \min_i \{L_i : i \in [N]\}$ .

**An Analysis of (projected) gradient descent.** Consider the change in *direction* of  $w_{t+1}$ , compared to that of  $w_t$ . At iteration  $t$ ,  $w_t$  updates in the following direction:

$$-\nabla_w L(w_t, b_t) = \mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(\langle x, w_t \rangle + b)) \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq -b_t \} \cdot x],$$

where the indicator is due to the derivative of the ReLU function:  $\sigma'(z) = \mathbb{1} \{ z \geq 0 \}$ .

Let  $v^\perp$  be the component of  $v$  that is perpendicular to  $w_t$ .<sup>6</sup> Observe that, for  $w_t$ 's direction to approach that of  $v$ , the update  $-\nabla_w L(w_t, b_t)$  must have a *positive component* on  $v^\perp$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle -\nabla_w L(w_t, b_t), v^\perp \rangle &= \mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(\langle x, w_t \rangle + b_t)) \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq |b_t| \} \cdot \langle x, v^\perp \rangle] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[y \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq |b_t| \} \cdot \langle x, v^\perp \rangle] > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

<sup>6</sup>When  $w_t$  is a unit vector, we have  $v^\perp = \frac{v - \langle v, w_t \rangle w_t}{\|v - \langle v, w_t \rangle w_t\|}$ . In Section 4 we also frequently consider the 2-D plane spanned by  $w_t$  and  $v^\perp$ .

This can be viewed as a *conditioned* correlation between  $y$  and  $\langle x, v^\perp \rangle$ , where we call  $\mathbb{1}\{\langle x, w_t \rangle \geq |b_t|\}$  the *condition function*. A standard approach is to write  $y = \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) - (\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) - y)$ , where the first term comes from ReLU and the second from noise. Through these lens, GD makes progress when ReLU (conditionally) correlates with  $\langle x, v^\perp \rangle$  more than noise does.

For pictorial intuition, we also present three 3D graphs in Fig. 1, where GD is likely to be successful.




Figure 1:  $y$  value, ReLU value, and noise plotted against  $\langle x, w \rangle$  and  $\langle x, v^\perp \rangle$ , after multiplying the condition function (indicator). Here, GD can find the correct direction (to the right), in terms of the correlation calculus in Eq. (3).

**One-dimensional adversarial example.** We now give a simple one-dimensional example to show how the correlation between  $x$  and  $y$  can point to the *opposite direction*, when  $b$  is sufficiently negative. Fix an  $\alpha$ , let  $\text{OPT} = \Phi(b)/100\alpha b^2$  such that  $\mathbf{0}$  is not an  $\alpha$ -approximation. Consider the following distribution which has loss exactly  $\text{OPT}$ , illustrated in Fig. 2:

$$y = \begin{cases} \sigma(x + b) & \text{when } x \geq 0, \\ \sqrt{2\text{OPT}} & \text{when } x < 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: One-dimensional bad example, presented in Eq. (4). Note that the height of the noise (blue) decreases exponentially in  $|b|$ .

Two seemingly contradictory facts are true about this distribution:

1. The ReLU produces more *loss* than noise: the zero function incurs about  $\frac{\Phi(b)}{b^2} \approx 100\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$  loss when  $x \geq 0$ , by not fitting the ReLU.

2. The noise dominates the *correlation* with  $x$ , pulling  $\mathbb{E}[xy]$  towards the incorrect negative direction:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[\sigma(x+b) \cdot x] & = \Phi(b), \\ \mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(x+b)) \cdot x] & = -\Omega(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) = -\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{\Phi(b)}). \end{cases}$$

This phenomenon is due to the fact that the loss scales *quadratically* with  $y$ , yet the correlation  $\mathbb{E}[xy]$  scales (roughly) linearly. This issue appears when  $y$  is very close to zero, made possible only as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ . This problem is also a property of regression under  $L^2$  loss, and is one of the key differences between our problem and learning general halfspaces.

**Higher dimensions.** Returning to high-dimensional ReLU regression, we demonstrate how the aforementioned adversarial example can occur in a way that harms GD, per the analysis in Eq. (3).

Suppose we have some estimated weight  $w_t$  and bias  $b_t$ , where we assume  $\|w_t\| = 1$  for convenience. Consider the 2D plane spanned by  $w_t$  and  $v^\perp$  in Fig. 3. By removing all of the uncolored region through the condition function, the direction of correlation in Eq. (3) essentially depends on the thin green strip of width  $\frac{1}{|b_t|^{0.99}}$  above the indicator’s decision boundary, due to an estimation of Gaussian decay.




Figure 3: Plan view of the  $w_t$ - $v^\perp$  plane in high dimensional analysis of GD. The blue region only contains noise, while the red region contains both ReLU and noise. The uncolored region with  $\langle x, w_t \rangle < b_t$  does not affect the gradient.  $1 - o(1)$  portion of the probability mass is contained in the green strip.

We thus identify a key reason for the failure of GD, which gives rise to our *reweighted PGD* algorithm: the red region is too biased in the green strip, meaning that ReLU could fail to dominate the correlation Eq. (3), as in the one-dimensional adversarial example.<sup>7</sup>

**Rewighted PGD.** Since we know  $\|v\| = 1$ , it is natural to project  $w_t$  back to a unit vector after each gradient update, resulting in a variant of PGD with simpler analysis. When calculating the “gradient”, we reweight the  $x$ -marginal by some *weight function*  $f_t(x)$ , defined as the change-of-measure function between two Gaussians. Specifically, it shifts the Gaussian center to  $\rho \cdot |b| \cdot w_t$ , for some carefully chosen  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  in Section 4.3. Our algorithm performs update in the following

<sup>7</sup>Once exception is when  $b_t \leq \frac{b}{\langle w_t, v \rangle}$ . But then  $b_t$  is too negative and other problems will start to occur.



direction:

$$v_{\text{update}} = (I - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E} \left[ f_t(x) \cdot y \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq \tilde{b} \right\} \right],$$

where  $\tilde{b} \geq 0$  is tailored to the reweighted distribution, so the *condition function* (indicator) cuts out only a fraction of contribution from the ReLU, while removing as much noise as possible. Turns out, both reweighting and conditioning are necessary to guarantee that the correlation between  $y$  and  $x$  to point towards  $v^\perp$ , as in Eq. (3).

The insight behind reweighting<sup>8</sup> is the following: suppose  $w_t$  is close to  $v$  in direction, then shifting the Gaussian center along  $w_t$  would essentially *reduce the problem back to the moderate bias* case. This is clear from Fig. 3, where shifting the origin upwards in subfigure (b) would result in a similar landscape as subfigure (a). As the red zone moves closer to the origin, the noise can only cause limited harm on the gradient direction.

We note that reweighted PGD is a CSQ algorithm, which on itself cannot possibly solve our problem. One caveat is its need for a *warm start*: the method requires  $w_t$  to be close to  $v$  in the first place. In the extreme case of  $w_t \perp v$ , the red region does not become closer regardless of how we reweight along  $w_t$ . Since a randomly initialized  $w_0$  is near perpendicular to  $v$  in high dimensions, this calls for some (non-CSQ) algorithm that provides a crude estimation for direction  $v$ , before we can run reweighted PGD.

**Thresholded PCA.** The final piece of our algorithmic result is to give a warm start via *thresholding on  $y$* . Our algorithm uses threshold  $\tau = \frac{1}{|b|}$  and estimate direction  $v$  via the top eigenvector of the following matrix:

$$M = \mathbb{E}[x x^\top \mathbb{1} \{|y| \geq \tau\}].$$

This thresholding method is related to *filtered PCA* [CM20, CKM21], which uses a different matrix and exactly identifies the subspace containing the relevant directions, under the realizable setting. In the more challenging agnostic setting, it is not guaranteed that the top eigenvector would align with target direction  $v$ , hence thresholded PCA only serves as a coarse estimator for initializing reweighted PGD.

We now explain some key ingredients in the proof. Note that without noise, the ReLU would give  $M$  a magnitude of  $\Omega(b^2 \Phi(b))$  in direction  $v$ : the threshold of  $\frac{1}{|b|}$  removes exactly a constant fraction of the probability mass from the ReLU, by Gaussian tail decay; the  $b^2$  term stems from the fact that  $\langle x, v \rangle \geq |b|$  whenever the ReLU value goes above  $\tau$ .

Imagine an adversary trying to perturb the top eigenvector of  $M$ . They can only do this in two ways:

1. Generating noise in the (otherwise flat) region where  $\langle x, v \rangle + b < 0$ , increasing  $M$ 's magnitude in some direction  $u \perp v$ ;
2. Suppressing some of the  $y$ -value from the optimal ReLU to below  $\tau$ , so the magnitude along  $v$  decreases.

---

<sup>8</sup>Reweighting is conceptually similar to *rejection sampling*, a method used for learning general linear halfspaces in [DKS18, DKLZ24]. Compared to their approaches, we have to shift the Gaussian mean by a more carefully chosen amount as well as apply a conditioning indicator (see Section 4.3), due to the nature of our regression problem.

For the first task, the adversary has an OPT budget to increase  $y$  value from zero to above  $\tau$ . Since  $\text{OPT} = O(\Phi(b)/\alpha b^2)$ , it can only do so on a region with probability mass at most  $\frac{\text{OPT}}{\tau^2} = \Phi(b)/\alpha$ . This limits the magnitude along any  $u \perp v$  to be an  $O(\frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha})$  fraction of the magnitude along  $v$ .

The adversary cannot do much on the second task either. Again, since OPT has only an  $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ -fraction of the ReLU's squared  $L^2$  norm, with an OPT budget the adversary can only remove a small fraction of the ReLU's contribution from the calculation of  $M$ .

**Hardness result.** Our correlational statistical query (CSQ) hardness result follows a standard procedure, via a family  $\mathcal{G}$  of functions with small *pairwise correlation* [FGR<sup>+</sup>13]. This framework is based on the hardness of distinguishing distributions labeled by  $\mathcal{G}$ , via only noisy correlational queries.

The key to our proof is that, as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , the function  $\sigma(z + b)$  correlates less with low-degree Hermite polynomials compared to higher-order ones. To construct the family  $\mathcal{G}$ , we let  $y$  be labeled by the *truncated* ReLUs in a  $e^{\Omega(d)}$  number of near-perpendicular directions, where truncation means removing the low-order Hermite components. An  $(\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon)$ -approximator for arbitrary ReLU can fit these distributions to an error that is strictly better than error of zero function  $\mathbf{0}$ . However, outperforming  $\mathbf{0}$  is very hard under the CSQ model, as truncated ReLUs in near-perpendicular directions have very small pairwise correlation.

## 1.2 Related works

There is a rich body of work on algorithmic learning theory. Here we discuss some of the most relevant results, relating to either *arbitrary bias* or *ReLU regression*.

**Biased linear models.** Several works explicitly considered learning halfspaces with arbitrary bias, or *general halfspaces*. [DKS18] considers learning general halfspaces under the more general *nasty noise* model. They achieve an optimal  $O(\varepsilon)$  error rate, which translates into constant-factor approximation for agnostic learning. Later, [DKTZ22b] gave a faster constant-factor approximation in the agnostic setting. More recently, [DKLZ24] proposed an  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) + \varepsilon$  agnostic *tester-learner* for general halfspaces.

Going beyond the agnostic model, [DKK<sup>+</sup>22] gives algorithm and hardness results for learning general halfspace under *Massart noise* [MN06]. [DDK<sup>+</sup>23a] considers learning general halfspaces under the weaker *random classification noise (RCN)* model. Also on under RCN, [DDK<sup>+</sup>23b] makes no anti-concentration assumption on  $x$  and therefore their results carry over to the biased case.

We note that the techniques for classification do not carry over to the regression case. For instance, in the agnostic setting of classification problems, the ground truth classifier is correct  $1 - \text{OPT}$  of the time. In regression problems, however, the  $y$ -value can be perturbed on all outcomes.

**Single index models.** Learning a ReLU neuron, in the realizable setting, is a special case of the *single index models* (SIMs) [KKKS11], where the  $y$  value depends on a single, unknown direction  $v$ . One key difference of SIM is that the joint distribution of  $\langle x, v \rangle$  and  $y$  is often known, corresponding to the case where we know  $\|v\|$  and  $b$  before-hand, and the task is to statistically estimate the direction  $v$ . The CSQ and SQ hardness of this problem are completely characterized by the information exponent [DLS22] and the generative exponent [DPLB24], and a SQ-CSQ separation appears as the link function (activation function) becomes more involved.

Lately, several works [GGKS23, ZWDD24, WZDD24] sought to extend the study of SIMs to agnostic case. Particularly, the recent independent work of [WZDD24] also proposed a two-stage algorithm to give a constant approximation, for link functions that satisfy a set of assumptions. We note that the key difference between these regimes and ours is again due to our allowing for *arbitrary bias*, which breaks all usual assumptions for SIMs such as  $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)}[\sigma(z)^2] = 1$ .

The task of realizably learning a single ReLU neuron, however, is indeed solved by earlier works on SIMs and isotonic regression [KKSK11, KS09]. A number of other works [Tia17, Sol17, KSA19] also showed the effectiveness of various gradient methods in this relatively simple setting.

**Agnostic learning of a single ReLU.** While a single ReLU neuron is relatively easy to learn to error  $\text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  with the realizable assumption, one line of work [GKK19, DKZ20, GKK20, DKPZ21, DKR23] gave strong evidence that the same task takes quasi-polynomial time without this assumption. In other words, it is hard to substantially outperform polynomial regression [KKMS05] on this goal, in the agnostic setting. A qualitatively matching quasi-polynomial *proper* learning algorithm was given in [DKK<sup>+</sup>21] for unbiased ReLUs.

Nevertheless, a number of  $\text{poly}(d/\varepsilon)$ -time algorithms results are possible once we relax the objective. [GKK19] gave an  $O(\text{OPT}^{2/3}) + \varepsilon$  algorithm to unbiased ReLUs via reducing to learning *homogeneous halfspace*. Some work applied GD on the convex *matching loss* instead of the  $L^2$  objective itself, achieving better time complexity under weaker distributional assumptions, for a class of activation functions including unbiased ReLU [DGK<sup>+</sup>20, WZDD23]. Notably, we always need *some* distributional assumptions for these results, as [DKMR22] demonstrated a cryptographic hardness result for distribution-free constant-factor approximation.

Another line of work proposes to apply GD on the  $L^2$  objective itself. For unbiased ReLU, [FCG20] proved an  $O(\text{OPT}^{2/3}) + \varepsilon$  loss guarantee. Later, [DKTZ22a] showed that GD actually achieves the best-possible  $O(\text{OPT}) + \varepsilon$  error, for unbiased ReLUs. Their method also extends for ReLUs with a known *positive* bias. The most relevant work to ours is that of [ATV23], where GD is shown to produce constant approximation even under moderately negative bias. However, as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , their approximation factor depends exponentially on  $b$ , which translates to a  $(\text{OPT}^{-\text{poly}(\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation. All methods above are CSQ in nature, so they do not extend to our problem.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some notations and auxiliary results that help simplify our problem.

Let  $L(w, b) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b))^2]$  be the loss of the ReLU neuron with weight  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . In our proofs, we will often compare our loss  $L(w, b)$  to  $L(v, b)$ , where  $v$  is the unit vector that minimizes this loss for some fixed  $b$ . This is a proxy of  $\text{OPT}$  after appropriate scaling, as we explain later this section.

We will frequently use  $\varphi$  and  $\Phi$  to denote the standard Gaussian pdf and cdf respectively. We also use  $\int f(z) d\Phi(z)$  to denote the integral of  $f$  with respect to (1-dimensional) standard Gaussian measure. For any vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we use  $\|w\|$  to denote its  $L^2$  norm.

**Normalizing target vector  $v$ .** As noted before, we can assume  $\|v\| = 1$  WLOG, due to the following argument. Suppose the best-fit ReLU for  $\mathcal{D}$  is some  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  where  $v$  is not necessarily

a unit vector, then we can instead work with the normalized problem  $(x, \hat{y}) \sim \hat{\mathcal{D}}$ , where  $\hat{y} = y/\|v\|$ . Let  $\hat{L}$  be the loss function under  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ .

We prove in Appendix B the following: if we *know* the value  $\|v\|$ , then this scaling approach reduces the problem to unit vector case:

**Proposition 2.1.** *In the above setting, the optimal ReLU for  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  is  $\sigma(\langle x, \hat{v} \rangle + \hat{b})$ , where  $\|\hat{v}\| = v/\|v\|$  is a unit vector and  $\hat{b} = b/\|v\|$ , and it has loss  $\widehat{\text{OPT}} = \hat{L}(\hat{v}, \hat{b}) = \text{OPT}/\|v\|^2$ .*

*Moreover, suppose parameters  $w, b_w$  incur loss  $\hat{L}(w, b_w) \leq \alpha \cdot \widehat{\text{OPT}} + \varepsilon$  on the normalized problem  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ . Then, the pair  $(\|v\|w, \|v\|b_w)$  would incur loss  $L(\|v\|w, \|v\|b_w) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \|v\|^2\varepsilon$  on the original problem  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

**“Guessing”  $\|v\|$  and  $b$ .** To apply the appropriate scaling, we must have some knowledge about  $\|v\|$ . To this end, Algorithm 1 applies grid search over a number of guesses  $(\beta, \gamma)$  of the values  $(\|v\|, b)$ , where  $v, b$  are the parameters of the optimal ReLU over  $\mathcal{D}$ . This approach is effective as long as the approximation factor w.r.t. an “estimated optimal ReLU” is at most a constant multiple of that w.r.t. the true  $\text{OPT} = L(v, b)$ . We formalize this claim in the next proposition, also proven in Appendix B:

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\hat{v}$  be the unit vector in  $v$ ’s direction. Let  $\delta_v = \beta - \|v\|$  and  $\delta_b = \gamma - b$  denote the additive errors of our parameter estimations. Suppose function  $h$  incurs loss:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(h(x) - y)^2] \leq \alpha \cdot L(\beta\hat{v}, \gamma),$$

*then if  $|\delta_v|, |\delta_b| \leq 0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ , we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(h(x) - y)^2] \leq O(\alpha) \cdot L(v, b) + O(\varepsilon).$$

The time/sample complexity of conducting grid search will be analyzed in Theorem 4.10. Until then, we will assume the optimal ReLU is just  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$ , where  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  is a known value. This suffices for our purpose, as will only bound our approximation factor using  $L(v, b)$ , instead of using the stronger fact that  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  is the best-fit ReLU.

**Upper bounding OPT and  $\varepsilon$ .** When the optimal ReLU has very negative  $b$ , it is equal to zero on most outcomes. Intuitively, this means that the zero function should be a descent approximator. Formally, this implies the following two lemmas, also proven in Appendix B:

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose  $\alpha \geq 3$ . Let  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  be the optimal ReLU with loss OPT, where  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  sufficiently negative. If the zero function is not an  $\alpha$ -approximation to the loss of  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$ , namely,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2] > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT},$$

*then we have:*

$$\text{OPT} < \frac{3\Phi(b)}{\alpha b^2}.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Suppose  $\alpha \geq 2$ . Let  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  be the optimal ReLU with loss OPT, where  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  sufficiently negative. Then:*

$$\varepsilon < \frac{3\Phi(b)}{b^2}.$$

**SQ and CSQ.** Informally, a (C)SQ algorithm can only make queries to the (C)SQ oracle instead of accessing samples from  $\mathcal{D}$  directly. An SQ oracle answers queries in the form  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x, y)]$ , and a CSQ oracle answers the less general  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[y \cdot f(x)]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x)]$ . Both oracles will inject the answer with some noise of magnitude at most  $\tau$ . Most learning algorithms can be implemented as SQ algorithms, and some, including most gradient-based methods on  $L^2$  losses, can be implemented as CSQ algorithms. Notably, *thresholded PCA* is SQ but not CSQ, since the function  $\mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau\}$  applies directly on  $y$ .

### 3 Thresholded PCA and Initialization Guarantees

As described in Section 1.1, in order to apply reweighted PGD, it is necessary to initialize  $w_0$  in a direction that is close to the true direction  $v$ . To this end, we define *thresholded PCA* algorithm which outputs the top eigenvector of matrix

$$M = \mathbb{E}[xx^\top \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau\}],$$

where  $\tau = \frac{1}{|b|}$  is the threshold. We use  $\hat{M}$  to denote the estimation of  $M$  from  $n$  samples:

$$\hat{M} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^\top \mathbb{1}\{|y_i| \geq \tau\}.$$

During analysis we will also partition  $\mathbb{R}^d$  into two regions based on the sign of  $\langle x, v \rangle + b$ , and identify their contribution to  $M$  separately:

$$\begin{cases} M_0 = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [xx^\top \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau, \langle v, x \rangle + b < 0\}], \\ M_1 = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [xx^\top \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau, \langle v, x \rangle + b \geq 0\}]. \end{cases}$$

In this section we prove the following guarantee:

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exists constant  $\alpha_0 > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a joint distribution of  $(x, y)$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  whose  $x$ -marginal is standard Gaussian. Let  $\text{OPT}$  be the loss  $L(v, b)$  of some ReLU function  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  with  $\|v\| = 1$ . Suppose the zero function  $\mathbf{0}$  has loss at least  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ . If bias  $b$  satisfies  $b \leq -\sqrt{\alpha/\log \alpha}$ , then thresholded PCA with  $\tau = \frac{1}{|b|}$  can with high probability find a unit vector  $w$  such that:*

$$|\langle w, v \rangle| \geq 1 - O\left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha}\right),$$

using  $\text{poly}(d, 1/\varepsilon, 1/\delta)$  time and samples.

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving this theorem. In Section 3.1, we state and prove three lemmas in the following order:

1. For any unit vector  $u$ ,  $u^\top M_0 u$  is small. (Lemma 3.3)
2. For any unit vector  $u$  perpendicular to  $v$ ,  $u^\top M_1 u$  is small. (Lemma 3.4)
3.  $v^\top M_1 v$  is large, which helps us identify the true direction. (Lemma 3.5)

In Section 3.2, we give a simple proof of the main theorem using these lemmas.

### 3.1 Technical lemmas.

We will use the following bound on expectation:

**Lemma 3.2.** *For all sufficiently small  $p$  and any event  $E$  with  $\mathbb{P}[E] = p$ , we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{E\}] = O\left(p \log \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

*Proof.* Consider event  $E_u = \{|\langle x, u \rangle| \geq |\Phi^{-1}(p/2)|\}$ . Clearly we have  $\mathbb{P}[E_u] = p$ , and

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{E\}] \leq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{E_u\}].$$

It now suffices to upper bound the right hand side. Consider threshold  $t = \Phi^{-1}(p/2)$ . Then, because

$$\mathbb{P}[E_u] = 2\Phi(t) = \Theta\left(\frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{t}\right) = p,$$

we have  $t = O(\sqrt{\log(1/p)})$  for all sufficiently small  $p$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{E_u\}] &= 2 \int_t^\infty s^2 d\Phi(s) \\ &= \Theta(t^2 \Phi(t)) = O\left(p \log \frac{1}{p}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The first lemma is an application of the bound above:

**Lemma 3.3.** *For all sufficiently negative  $b$ , and for any unit vector  $u$ , we have:*

$$u^\top M_0 u = O\left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha} b^2 \Phi(b)\right).$$

*Proof.* Since the target function  $\sigma(v^\top x + b)$  is just zero on the region  $\{v^\top x + b < 0\}$ , it follows from Markov's inequality that:

$$p := \mathbb{P}[|y| \geq \tau, \langle x, v \rangle + b < 0] \leq \frac{\text{OPT}}{\tau^2}.$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have  $\text{OPT} = O\left(\frac{\Phi(b)}{\alpha b^2}\right)$ . Plugging in the value of  $\tau$  and bound for OPT, we have:

$$p = O\left(\frac{\Phi(b)}{\alpha}\right).$$

Now, for sufficiently large  $\alpha$  and sufficiently negative  $b$ , the probability  $p$  would be small enough for us to apply Lemma 3.2 and conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top M_0 u &= \mathbb{E}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau, \langle x, w \rangle + b < 0\}] \\ &= O\left(p \log \frac{1}{p}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha} b^2 \Phi(b)\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The second lemma is an immediate consequence of  $u \perp v$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *For all sufficiently negative  $b$ , and for any unit vector  $u \perp v$ , we have:*

$$u^\top M_0 u \leq \Phi(b).$$

*Proof.* Let  $x_v, x_u$  be the component of  $x$  along  $v, u$ , respectively. Because  $u \perp v$ , by the property of isotropic Gaussian, we can integrate along the  $u$ -direction for each fixed  $x_v = \langle x, v \rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top M_1 u &= \mathbb{E}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau, \langle x, v \rangle + b \geq 0\}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\langle x, u \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{\langle x, v \rangle + b \geq 0\}] \\ &= \int_{|b|}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_u^2 d\Phi(x_u) d\Phi(x_v) \\ &= \Phi(b). \end{aligned}$$

□

The proof of the third lemma follows the intuitive description in Section 1.1.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For all sufficiently negative  $b$ , we have:*

$$v^\top M_1 v = \Omega(b^2 \Phi(b)).$$

*Proof.* For convenience, we will often use random variable  $z = \langle x, v \rangle$ . Define event  $A = \{z + b \geq \tau\}$ , the outcomes on which the best-fit ReLU  $\sigma(z + b)$  takes value at least  $\tau$ . It now suffices to show the right hand side of the following expression is at least  $\Omega(b^2 \Phi(b))$ :

$$v^\top M_1 v = \mathbb{E}[\langle x, v \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau\}] \geq \mathbb{E}[z^2 \mathbb{1}\{y \geq \tau\} \mathbb{1}\{A\}].$$

Moreover, because  $t \geq |b|$  on all of  $A$ , the proof is finished once we show that  $\mathbb{P}[\{y \geq \tau\} \cap A] \geq 0.01 \Phi(b)$ .

Consider an adversary who wants to minimize the probability  $\mathbb{P}[|y| \geq \tau \mid x \in A]$ , under the constraint that  $\mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(z + b))^2 \mathbb{1}\{A\}] \leq \text{OPT}$ . Note that the adversary's action can be recorded as function  $p : [|b| + \tau, \infty) \in [0, 1]$ , where  $p(z') = \mathbb{P}[y < \tau \mid z = z']$  is the probability that they suppress the  $y$  value below threshold, when  $\langle x, v \rangle = z'$ .

We first show that the optimal strategy for the adversary is to take  $p(z) = \mathbb{1}\{z \leq t\}$ , where  $t \in [|b| + \tau, \infty)$  is the largest value for which the adversary does not exceed the budget:

$$t = \sup \left\{ t' \in [|b| + \tau, \infty) : \int_{|b| + \tau}^{|b| + \tau + t'} (z + b - \tau)^2 d\Phi(z) \leq \text{OPT} \right\},$$

which indicates the strategy to suppress exactly the *smallest ReLU values*. Consider any  $p(z)$  the adversary picks, we WLOG suppose it exhausts all the budget:

$$\int_{|b| + \tau}^{\infty} (z + b - \tau)^2 p(z) d\Phi(z) = \text{OPT} = \int_{|b| + \tau}^t (z + b - \tau)^2 d\Phi(z),$$

consequently,

$$\int_{|b|+\tau}^t (1-p(z))(z+b-\tau)^2 p(z) d\Phi(z) = \int_t^\infty p(z)(z+b-\tau)^2 d\Phi(z), \quad (5)$$

Now, to show  $\mathbb{1}\{z \leq t\}$  is optimal, it now suffices to show that it suppresses more contribution from the ReLU than this  $p(z)$ :

$$\int_{|b|+\tau}^t (1-p(z))z^2 d\Phi(z) \geq \int_t^\infty p(z)z^2 d\Phi(z). \quad (6)$$

But this is immediately true in light of Eq. (5): the value  $\frac{z^2}{(z+b-\tau)^2}$  is always larger when  $z \leq t$  than when  $z \geq t$ , hence the left hand side is indeed larger in Eq. (6). Intuitively, the adversary can gain more by paying less when the ReLU value is small.

Now, to finish the proof, we have to show that the adversary, even under this optimal strategy, cannot substantially harm the contribution from ReLU. We claim that for large  $\alpha$  and sufficiently negative  $b$  we have  $t \leq \frac{1}{|b|}$ , otherwise the adversary would exceed its budget:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|b|+\tau}^{|b|+\tau+\frac{1}{|b|}} (z+b-\tau)^2 d\Phi(z) &= \Theta \left( e^{-1} \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \right) \int_{|b|+\tau}^{\infty} (z+b-\tau)^2 d\Phi(z) \\ &= \Theta \left( e^{-1} \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \right) \frac{\Phi(b-\tau)}{(b-\tau)^2} \\ &= \Theta \left( e^{-2} \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \right) \frac{\Phi(b)}{b^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first equality is justified in Appendix A. Note that  $(e^{-2} \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!})$  is a constant independent of  $\alpha$ , hence by taking  $\alpha$  large and  $\text{OPT} = O\left(\frac{\Phi(b)}{\alpha b^2}\right)$ , we must have  $t \leq \frac{1}{|b|}$ . The proof is finished by noting that  $\Omega(1)$  fraction of the ReLU's contribution is kept when  $t \leq \frac{1}{|b|}$ :

$$\int_{|b|+\tau+t}^{\infty} z^2 d\Phi(z) \geq \int_{|b|+\frac{2}{|b|}}^{\infty} z^2 d\Phi(z) = \Omega(b^2 \Phi(b)).$$

□

### 3.2 Proof of main theorem.

The main theorem now follows from some linear algebra manipulation and concentration inequality.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* It's clear now that  $M$  has greater magnitude in  $v$  than in any perpendicular direction  $u \perp v$ , for sufficiently large  $\alpha$  and negative  $b$ . We now show that the finite-sample estimation  $\hat{M}$  using  $n = \text{poly}(d, 1/\varepsilon, 1/\delta)$  samples is a good estimator of  $M$ , in the sense that its top eigenvector still has a dominating component in  $v$ .



For each sample  $i$ , the matrix  $\mathbb{E}[x_i x_i^\top \mathbb{1}\{|y| \geq \tau\}]$  is a 1-sub-Gaussian matrix, and by an analog of Hoeffding's inequality for matrices (see [Tro12] for related results):

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\hat{M} - M\|_{op} > t] \leq 2d \exp(-\Omega(nt^2)).$$

Hence, by taking  $n = O(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{\Phi(b)^2}) = \text{poly}(\log d, \log \frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ . we have  $\|\hat{M} - M\|_{op} \leq \Phi(b)$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . Combining this with previous lemmas, it follows that with the same probability we have:

$$\|\hat{M}u\| = O\left(\frac{1}{b^2} + \frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha}\right) \|\hat{M}v\|,$$

for all unit vector  $u \perp v$ .

Let  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the output of thresholded PCA. We can decompose it into  $w = \langle w, v \rangle \cdot v + \langle w, u \rangle \cdot u$ , where  $u$  is again a unit vector perpendicular to  $v$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{M}v\| &\leq \|\hat{M}w\| \leq \langle w, v \rangle \|\hat{M}v\| + \langle w, u \rangle \|\hat{M}u\| \\ &\leq \left( \langle w, v \rangle + \langle w, u \rangle \frac{\|\hat{M}u\|}{\|\hat{M}v\|} \right) \|\hat{M}v\| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$1 \leq \langle w, v \rangle + \langle w, u \rangle \frac{\|\hat{M}u\|}{\|\hat{M}v\|} \leq \langle w, v \rangle + \frac{\|\hat{M}u\|}{\|\hat{M}v\|},$$

which means  $\langle w, v \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{\|\hat{M}u\|}{\|\hat{M}v\|}$ .

Now the proof is finished by plugging in  $b \leq -\sqrt{\alpha/\log \alpha}$ , in which case we have:

$$\langle w, v \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{\|\hat{M}u\|}{\|\hat{M}v\|} = 1 - O\left(\frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha}\right),$$

as desired.  $\square$

## 4 Reweighted Projected Gradient Descent and Guarantees

In this section, we show that given the warm start provided by thresholded PCA, our proposed *weighted PGD* algorithm can find a constant-factor approximation to the best-fit ReLU. The pseudocode of this algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2.

**Theorem 4.1.** *There exists constant  $\alpha_0 > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a joint distribution of  $(x, y)$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  such that the  $x$ -marginal is standard Gaussian. Let OPT be the loss of the best-fit ReLU  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  with  $\|v\| = 1$ . Suppose the zero function  $\mathbf{0}$  has loss at least  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ . Further suppose  $|y| \leq B$ , and that the initialization  $w_0$  has  $\langle w_0, v \rangle \geq 0.9$ .*

*If bias  $b$  satisfies  $b \leq b_0 < 0$  for some constant  $b_0$ , then reweighted PGD with  $\rho = 0.5, \lambda = 0.9$ , and  $\eta = \frac{c'_\eta}{\Phi((1-\rho)b)}$  for some constant  $c'_\eta$  can with probability  $1 - \delta$  output a unit vector  $w$  such that:*

$$\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon,$$

*using  $\text{poly}(d, 1/\varepsilon, 1/\delta, B)$  time and samples per iteration, and in  $\log(1/\varepsilon)$  iterations.*

---

**Algorithm 2:** Reweighted Projected Gradient Descent

---

**Input:**  $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, b \in \mathbb{R}^-, \eta \in (0, 1)$ ;

**for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T = O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$  **do**

    Get estimation  $\hat{v}_{\text{update}}$  of

$$(I - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \rho |b| \langle x, w_t \rangle - \frac{\rho^2 b^2}{2} \right) \cdot xy \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho) |b| \} \right]$$

    from  $n = \text{poly}(d, \frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, B)$  fresh samples;

$\tilde{w}_t \leftarrow (w_{t-1}, b_{t-1}) - \eta \cdot \hat{v}_{\text{update}}$ ;

$w_t \leftarrow \frac{\tilde{w}_t}{\|\tilde{w}_t\|}$ ;

**ind**  $\leftarrow \arg \min_{t \in [T]} \{L(w_t, b)\}$ ;

**return**  $w_{\text{ind}}$ .

---

We hereby introduce some notations used in this section. We will focus heavily on the plane spanned by vectors  $w_t$  and  $v$ . Every  $x$  on this plane can be written as  $x = x_w \cdot w_t + x_\perp \cdot v^\perp$ , where  $v^\perp \perp w_t$  is the component of  $v$  that is orthogonal to  $w_t$ :

$$v^\perp = \frac{v - \langle v, w_t \rangle w_t}{\|v - \langle v, w_t \rangle w_t\|}.$$

In Section 4.1, we explain Algorithm 2 in greater detail and introduce parameters  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$  to be determined later. Then, we break down the proof of Theorem 4.1 into three intermediate results: in Section 4.2 we lower-bound the contribution from the ReLU. In Section 4.3 we upper bound the contribution from noise and determine the choice of  $\rho, \lambda$ . Finally, in Section 4.4 we account for the sampling error, and show that  $\|w_t - v\|$  decreases exponentially on each iteration w.h.p. as long as the current loss is not yet  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$ .

#### 4.1 Re-centering the Gaussian covariates

As noted in Section 1.1, GD modifies the direction of  $w_i$  by gearing it towards the direction of the *conditioned correlation* between  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[xy \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq -b \}]$ , to learn about the direction  $v^\perp$ . One reason for its failure is that the condition function is too coarse to have the following ideal properties:

1. It should attempt to ignore the regions where  $\langle x, v \rangle \leq -b$ , since those are where the optimal ReLU neuron is zero and not informative. Conversely, it would put more weight on regions with large  $\langle x, v \rangle$ .
2. It should do so using the current estimated direction  $w_i$ , without knowing the true direction  $v$ .

In the rest of this subsection we will describe our approach, which applies both a *weight function*  $f_t(x)$  and a *condition function*  $\mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle \geq \tilde{b} \}$ , in order to achieve the objectives above. Instead of  $\mathbb{E}[xy \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ x_w \geq |b| \}]$ , on each iteration we make a “gradient” update using the vector

$$v_{\text{update}} = (I_d - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E}[f_t(x) \cdot x \cdot y \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ x_w \geq \tilde{b} \}],$$

where the two functions are defined via parameters  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$ , to be determined in Section 4.3:

$$\begin{cases} f_t(x) = \exp(\rho|b|x_w - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2b^2), \text{ and} \\ \tilde{b} = (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2\rho)|b|. \end{cases}$$

Now we explain the choice of these values. Weight function  $f_t(x)$  is the relative density that shifts the standard Gaussian  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  to  $\mathcal{N}(\rho|b|w_t, I_d)$ . Parameter  $\rho$  controls the amount of shift, relative to  $b$ .

Parameter  $\lambda$  can be understood as a lower bound for  $\langle w_t, v \rangle$ . The condition function  $\tilde{b} = (\rho + \lambda + \lambda^2\rho)|b|$  is chosen to minimize the influence of noise while maintaining most of contribution from ReLU. Specifically, if  $\langle w_t, v \rangle = \lambda$ , then the value  $\tilde{b}$  is precisely the  $x_w$ -coordinate of the point in region  $\{x : \langle x, v \rangle \geq |b|\}$  that is the *closest to the new Gaussian center*  $\rho|b|w_t$ . In other words, it cuts through the region where ReLU makes a positive contribution, in a way that at least half of the contributions are preserved.

In the rest of the section we decompose  $v_{\text{update}}$  into contributions from the optimal ReLU and from noise:  $v_{\text{update}} = v_{\text{relu}} + v_{\text{noise}}$ , where:

$$\begin{cases} v_{\text{relu}} &= (I_d - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E} \left[ f_t(x) \cdot x \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq \tilde{b}\} \right], \\ v_{\text{noise}} &= (I_d - w_t w_t^\top) \mathbb{E} \left[ f_t(x) \cdot x \cdot (y - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq \tilde{b}\} \right]. \end{cases}$$

## 4.2 Contribution from optimal ReLU

Now we prove a lower bound on  $\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle$ . First, we introduce a technical lemma which lower-bounds the contribution from ReLU on every ‘‘horizontal slice’’ (as in Fig. 3) of fixed  $x_w$ . Its proof can be found at Appendix C.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\rho\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$ . For any unit vector  $w$ , if  $\langle w, v \rangle \geq \lambda$ , then on event  $E = \{x_w \geq (\lambda - \lambda^2\rho + \rho)|b|\}$ , for all  $x_\perp \geq 0$  we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma(\langle x_w w + x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) - \sigma(\langle x_w w - x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) \\ & \geq \left( \sqrt{1 - \langle w, v \rangle^2} \right) \cdot \sigma\left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

A second observation concerns the fact that  $\|w - v\|$  must be large when  $L(w) > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$ :

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose  $\alpha$  is large and  $b$  sufficiently negative. For any unit vector  $w$ , if  $L(w, b) > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ , then:*

$$\|w - v\| \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon}{\Phi(b)}\right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $F(w, b)$  be the realizable loss  $\mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b) - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2]$ . By an elementary inequality we have  $L(w, b) \leq 2\text{OPT} + F(w, b)$ , which implies  $F(w) > 0.4\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  for large  $\alpha$ .

Meanwhile,  $F(w)$  is upper bounded by  $\|w - v\|$  by the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
F(w, b) &= \mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b) - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[(\langle x, w \rangle - \langle x, v \rangle)^2 \mathbb{1}\{\langle x, w \rangle + b \geq 0 \text{ or } \langle x, v \rangle + b \geq 0\}] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\langle x, w - v \rangle^2 \mathbb{1}\{\langle x, w \rangle \geq |b|\}] \\
&= 2 \int_{|b|}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\langle x_w w + x_{\perp} v^{\perp}, w - v \right\rangle^2 d\Phi(x_{\perp}) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= 2 \int_{|b|}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( x_w \frac{\|w - v\|^2}{2} - x_{\perp} \frac{\|w - v\| \|w + v\|}{2} \right)^2 d\Phi(x_{\perp}) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&\leq \int_{|b|}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x_w^2 \|w - v\|^4 - x_{\perp}^2 \|w - v\|^2) d\Phi(x_{\perp}) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= \int_{|b|}^{\infty} (x_w^2 \|w - v\|^4 + \|w - v\|^2) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&\leq (1.1 \|w - v\|^4 b^2 + \|w - v\|^2) \Phi(b),
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently negative  $b$ .

If  $\|w - v\| \leq \frac{1}{|b|}$ , then  $F(w, b) \leq 2.1 \|w - v\|^2 \Phi(b)$ , and we have  $\|w - v\| > \sqrt{\frac{0.4\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon}{2.1\Phi(b)}}$  as desired.

On the other hand, if  $\|w - v\| > \frac{1}{|b|}$ , then  $\|w - v\|^2 \Phi(b) \geq \frac{\Phi(b)}{b^2} \geq \frac{\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon}{6}$  by Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, and the proof is finished.  $\square$

Now we are ready to lower bound the contribution from the optimal ReLU:

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$  be constants with  $\rho\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . If on iteration  $t$  we have  $\langle w_t, v \rangle \geq \lambda$  and  $L(w_t, b) > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$ , then:*

$$\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v_{\perp} \rangle = \Omega(\sqrt{\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}((1-\lambda\rho)^2 - \frac{1}{2})}}{|b|^{3/2}}, \tag{8}$$

as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $f_t(x)$  is really a function of  $x_w$ , so we write it as  $f_t(x_w)$  in this proof. Using the

coordinate system of  $w_t$  and  $v^\perp$ , we can write the desired expression as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[f_t(x) \cdot x_\perp \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|\}] \\
&= \int_{(\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|}^{\infty} f_t(x_w) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_\perp \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) d\Phi(x_\perp) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&\geq \int_{(\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|}^{\infty} f_t(x_w) \int_0^{\infty} x_\perp \cdot \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \cdot \sigma\left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right) d\Phi(x_\perp) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \int_{(\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|}^{\infty} f_t(x_w) \int_{\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|}^{\infty} x_\perp \left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right) d\Phi(x_\perp) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \int_{(\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|}^{\infty} f_t(x_w) \cdot \Phi\left(\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)b\right) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \int_{(\lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|}^{\infty} \Phi\left(\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)b\right) d\Phi(x_w) \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \cdot \Phi\left(\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)b\right) \cdot \Phi(\lambda(1 - \lambda\rho)b) \\
&= \Omega(\|w - v\|) \cdot \frac{\varphi\left(\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)b\right) \cdot \varphi(\lambda(1 - \lambda\rho)b)}{\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}\lambda(1 - \lambda\rho)^2 b^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second inequality is due to Lemma 4.2. The third equality is by only considering the parts where  $\sigma$  is positive. The next is by a standard Gaussian integral. The fifth is a change-of-variable, due to shifting the Gaussian center to  $\rho|b|x_w$ . The second-to-last equality is elementary, and the final estimation is by Mills' ratio in Appendix A.

Using the fact that  $\varphi(a) \cdot \varphi(b) = \Theta(e^{-\frac{a^2 + b^2}{2}})$ , and plugging in Lemma 4.3, for any fixed  $\lambda, \rho$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle &= \Omega(1) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}}{\Phi(b)}} \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}(1 - \lambda\rho)^2}}{b^2} \\
&= \Omega(\sqrt{\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}\left((1 - \lambda\rho)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\right)}}{|b|^{3/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 4.3 Contribution from noise

In this section we complete the other task of bounding the contribution to  $v_{\text{update}}$  from noise. We will also compare the ReLU and noise contributions, and conclude on a choice for parameters  $\rho, \lambda$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\lambda, \rho \in (0, 1)$  be constants. For all unit vector  $u$  such that  $u \perp w$ , we have:*

$$\langle v_{\text{noise}}, u \rangle = O(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}\left(-\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \rho\lambda^2 - \rho)^2\right)}}{|b|^{1/2}}. \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* Using Cauchy-Schwarz, we can bound  $\langle v_{\text{noise}}, u \rangle$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(x) \cdot \langle x, u \rangle \cdot (y - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)) \mathbb{1}\{E\}]}{\mathcal{D}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[f(x)^2 \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|\}]} \\ & = \sqrt{2\text{OPT}} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[f(x)^2 \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|\}]} \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be explicitly written as an integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x)^2 \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b|\}] &= \int_{(\rho + \lambda + \rho \lambda^2)|b|}^{\infty} \varphi(x_w) \cdot \exp(2\rho b|x_w - \rho^2 b^2|) dx_w \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{(\rho + \lambda + \rho \lambda^2)|b|}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x_w^2 + 2\rho b|x_w - \rho^2 b^2| + \rho^2 b^2\right) dx_w \\ &= \exp(\rho^2 b^2) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{x_w \sim \mathcal{N}(2\rho b, I_d)}[x_w \geq (\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 + \rho)|b|] \\ &= \exp(\rho^2 b^2) \cdot \Phi((\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)b). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this back in, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_{\text{noise}}, u \rangle &\leq \sqrt{2\text{OPT}} \cdot \sqrt{\exp(\rho^2 b^2) \cdot \Phi((\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)b)} \\ &= O(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{1}{\varphi(\rho b)} \cdot \sqrt{\Phi((\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)b)} \\ &= O(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{1}{\varphi(\rho b)} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\varphi((\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)b)}{(\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)|b|}} \\ &= O(\sqrt{\text{OPT}}) \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}(-\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)^2)}}{|b|^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

Now we can show the realizable contribution dominates the update direction, under suitable  $\rho, \lambda$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *The following holds for all sufficiently large  $\alpha$ . Suppose  $L(w_t, b) > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$  and the zero function incurs loss at least  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ . Set  $\lambda = 0.9$  and  $\rho \in (0.3, 0.6)$ . If  $\langle w_t, v \rangle \geq \lambda$ , then for all  $u \perp w$  we have:*

$$\frac{|\langle v_{\text{noise}}, v^\perp \rangle|}{\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle} = e^{-\Omega(b^2)},$$

for all sufficiently negative  $b$ .

*Proof.*  $\square$

To compare Eq. (8) and Eq. (9), we first consider the terms involving  $e^{-\frac{1}{b^2}}$ . To ensure  $\langle v_{\text{noise}}, v^\perp \rangle$  dominates, we want it to have a *smaller* coefficient inside  $\exp\left(-\frac{b^2}{2}\right)$ , namely:

$$(1 - \rho \lambda)^2 - \frac{1}{2} - \left(-\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \rho \lambda^2 - \rho)^2\right) \leq -\Omega(1). \quad (10)$$

This is true when  $\lambda \geq 0.9$  and  $\rho \in [0.3, 0.6]$ , in which case the right hand side is less than  $-0.01$ .

Consequently, for any unit vector  $u$  such that  $u \perp w$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\langle v_{\text{noise}}, u \rangle|}{\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle} &= \frac{O(1) \cdot e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}(-\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \rho\lambda^2 - \rho)^2)}}{\Omega(\sqrt{\alpha}) \cdot e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}((1-\lambda\rho)^2 - \frac{1}{2})}} / |b|^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{O(1) \cdot e^{-\frac{0.16 \cdot b^2}{2}} \cdot |b|}{\Omega(\sqrt{\alpha})} \\ &= e^{-\Omega(b^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

A few extra comments about results in this subsection:

1. Eq. (10) does not have solution when  $\lambda < \sqrt{\frac{1}{7} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{7}} \approx 0.74$ , meaning that a warm start is necessary. This also agrees with the hardness result: reweighted PGD is a CSQ algorithm, but we need something strictly stronger, such as thresholded PCA, to build a poly-time algorithm.
2. We also need  $\rho > 0$  for it to be feasible, so reweighting is necessary.
3. It's not trivial how far we should shift the Gaussian mean along  $w$ . In particular, taking  $\rho = 1$ , then Eq. (10) is true only when  $\lambda > 1$ , an infeasible solution.

#### 4.4 Making progress on each update

Recall that our algorithm makes update by setting  $w_{t+1} := \frac{w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}}{\|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|}$ , where  $\hat{v}_{\text{update}}$  is the estimation of  $v_{\text{update}}$  from  $n$  new samples. In this subsection we will prove that, with appropriate values of  $\eta$  and  $n$ ,  $w_t$  gets provably close to  $v$  on each iteration with high probability.

First we upper bound on magnitude  $\|v_{\text{update}}\|$ :

**Lemma 4.7.** *For any  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$ , if  $\langle w_t, v \rangle \geq \lambda$ , then:*

$$\|v_{\text{update}}\| = O(\|w_t - v\|) \cdot \Phi((1 - \rho)b).$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{\text{update}}\| &= \max_{\text{unit } u: u \perp w_t} \langle v_{\text{update}}, u \rangle \\ &\leq \langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle + \max_{\text{unit } u: u \perp w} \langle v_{\text{noise}}, u \rangle \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ . It therefore suffices for us to upper bound  $\langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle$ . We will take  $f_t(x)$  into account by considering the shifted distribution: let  $\mathcal{D}'$  be the modified distribution of  $(x, y)$ , with the  $x$ -marginal being  $\mathcal{N}(\rho|b|w_t, I_d)$ . Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_{\text{relu}}, v^\perp \rangle &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \left[ f(x) \cdot x_\perp \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) \cdot (1 - \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle < (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b| \}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}'} [x_\perp \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}'} [x_\perp \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) \mathbb{1} \{ \langle x, w_t \rangle < (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2 \rho)|b| \}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second term is nonnegative: for any fixed  $x_w$ , the value of  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  always grows with  $x_\perp$ , hence they have positive correlation. It now suffices to upper bound the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\langle x, v^\perp \rangle \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\langle x - \rho|b|w_t, v^\perp \rangle \cdot \sigma(\langle x - \rho|b|w_t, v \rangle - (1 - \rho)|b|)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\langle x, v^\perp \rangle \cdot \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle - (1 - \rho)|b|)] \\ &= \langle v, v^\perp \rangle \Phi((1 - \rho)|b|). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses  $w_t \perp v^\perp$  and  $\langle w_t, v \rangle \leq 1$ . The second inequality applies change of variable, taking  $x$  to be the previous  $x - \rho|b|w_t$ , since both random variables have distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ . The proof is finished by noting  $\langle v, v^\perp \rangle = \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} = O(\sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle}) = O(\|w_t - v\|)$ .  $\square$

Now we bound the number of fresh samples we need on each iteration:

**Lemma 4.8.** *Suppose  $|y| \leq B$  for some large constant  $B$ , and let  $\lambda, \rho \in (0, 1)$  be constants. For all sufficiently negative  $b$  and  $n = \text{poly}(d, \frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, B)$  new samples, with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$  we have:*

$$\|\hat{v}_{\text{update}} - v_{\text{update}}\| \leq 0.01\|v_{\text{update}}\|,$$

on any iteration  $t$ .

*Proof.* We will apply the multivariate Chebyshev's inequality [MO60] Let  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  denote the mean and covariance matrix of the vector  $f(x) \cdot x \cdot y \cdot \mathbb{1}\{x_w \geq (\rho + \lambda - \lambda^2\rho)|b|\}$ . For any unit vector  $u$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top \Sigma u &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(x)^2 \langle x, u \rangle^2 y^2] \\ &\leq B^2 (\mathbb{E}[f(x)^4])^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}[\langle x, u \rangle^4])^{1/2} \\ &= O(B^2) \cdot \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(4\rho|b|x_w - 2\rho^2b^2) \varphi(x_w) dx \\ &= O(B^2 e^{6\rho^2b^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho \in [0.3, 0.6]$  as before. Since random variable  $\hat{v}_{\text{update}}$  has covariance  $\frac{1}{n}\Sigma$ , by Chebyshev's inequality, for all  $s > 0$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|\hat{v}_{\text{update}} - v_{\text{update}}\| \geq O(Be^{3\rho^2b^2} s/\sqrt{n})] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\sqrt{\hat{v}_{\text{update}}^\top \Omega(e^{-6\rho^2b^2}/nB^2) I_d \hat{v}_{\text{update}}} \geq s\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sqrt{\hat{v}_{\text{update}}^\top \frac{\Sigma^{-1}}{n} \hat{v}_{\text{update}}} \geq s\right] \\ &\leq \frac{d}{s^2}. \end{aligned}$$

To make this at most  $\frac{\delta}{T}$  where  $T$  is the number of iterations, we take  $s = \sqrt{\frac{d}{\delta T}}$ . In order for  $O(Be^{3\rho^2b^2} s/\sqrt{n}) \leq 0.01\|v_{\text{update}}\| = O(\Phi((1 - \rho)b))$ , it suffices to have:

$$n = O\left(\frac{sBe^{3\rho^2b^2}}{\Phi(b)}\right)^2 = \text{poly}\left(d, \frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, B, T\right).$$

$\square$



Finally, we make provable progress on each iteration when  $\eta$  is set properly:

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\rho = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $\lambda = 0.9$ . At any iteration  $t$ , if  $\eta = c_\eta \frac{\|w_t - v\|}{\|v_{\text{update}}\|}$  for some  $c_\eta \leq 0.1$ , then:*

$$\|w_{t+1} - v\|^2 \leq (1 - \Omega(c_\eta)) \|w_t - v\|^2.$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_t - v\|^2 - \|w_{t+1} - v\|^2 &= \frac{\langle w_{t+1}, v \rangle - \langle w_t, v \rangle}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left\langle \frac{w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}}{\|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|}, v \right\rangle - \langle w_t, v \rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{\eta \langle \hat{v}_{\text{update}}, v \rangle + (1 - \|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|) \langle w_t, v \rangle}{2 \|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|} \\ &\geq \frac{\eta \langle \hat{v}_{\text{update}}, v \rangle - \frac{\eta^2 \|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|^2}{2} \langle w_t, v \rangle}{2 \|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $b$  is sufficiently negative, by Lemma 4.8, with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$  we have  $\langle \hat{v}_{\text{update}}, v^\perp \rangle \geq 0.9 \|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|$ . Therefore:

$$\langle \hat{v}_{\text{update}}, v \rangle = \sqrt{1 - \langle w_t, v \rangle^2} \langle \hat{v}_{\text{update}}, v^\perp \rangle \geq \|w_t - v\| \cdot 0.9 \|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|$$

Suppose we take  $\eta = c_\eta \frac{\|w_t - v\|}{\|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|}$  for any  $c_\eta \leq 0.1$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_t - v\|^2 - \|w_{t+1} - v\|^2 &\geq \eta \|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\| \cdot \frac{0.9 \|w_t - v\| - \frac{1}{2} \eta \|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|}{2 \|w_t + \eta \hat{v}_{\text{update}}\|} \\ &= c_\eta \|w_t - v\| \cdot \frac{(0.9 - 0.5c_\eta) \|w_t - v\|}{O(1)} \\ &= \Omega(c_\eta \|w_t - v\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Since  $\|\hat{v}_{\text{update}}\| \leq 1.1 \|v_{\text{update}}\| = O(\|w_t - v\|) \Phi((1 - \rho)b)$ , it suffices to set  $\eta$  to be:

$$\eta = \frac{c'_\eta}{\Phi((1 - \rho)b)},$$

for some sufficiently small universal constant  $c'_\eta$ . Since  $\|w_t - v\|$  decreases exponentially,  $T = O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$  iterations suffice to obtain the desired  $\|w_t - v\| \leq O((\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon)/\Phi(b))$  for some  $t \in [T]$ , which produces  $L(w_t, b) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  by Lemma 4.3. Plugging this  $T$  back to the sample complexity, and our main theorem follows.

## 4.5 Putting things together

Now we can rigorously state the main algorithmic result of this paper:

**Theorem 4.10.** *There exists a constant  $\alpha$ , such that for all  $W, B > 0$  the following holds. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a the joint distribution of  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , where the  $x$ -marginal is  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $y$  satisfying  $|y| \leq B$  almost surely. With population expectations replaced by finite-sample estimates, Algorithm 1 will run in  $\text{poly}(d, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\delta}, W, B)$  time and samples, and with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , outputs parameters  $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ , such that:*

$$L(\hat{w}, \hat{b}) \leq \alpha \cdot \inf_{\substack{w \in \mathbb{R}^d, b \in \mathbb{R}: \\ \|w\|_2 \leq W}} L(w, b) + \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* The prior works that we use [ATV23, DKTZ22a] both guarantee *some* constant approximation factor. We can simply take the maximum between their factors and our algorithm’s approximation factor to be the final approximation factor.

Regarding the special case of positive bias: the algorithm in [DKTZ22a] works for a class of unbounded activations, which includes positively biased ReLUs. Specifically, for any  $b > 0$ , the new activation function  $\tilde{\sigma}(\langle x, w \rangle) = \sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b)$  is a valid activation function under their framework. We note that this requires knowledge about  $b$ , but we can again do a grid search over the “guesses” of  $b$  in polynomial time, since  $|y|$  is bounded.

Moreover, the algorithm [ATV23] for moderately-biased ReLU can solve all constant-bounded bias, for any constant of our choice. The trade-off is that the approximation factor is larger as we allow for larger constants. This guarantee is good enough for our purpose, as our algorithm has provable guarantee when  $b \leq b_\alpha < 0$ , where  $b_\alpha$  is constant.

Now we have reduced to the  $b \rightarrow -\infty$  regime. Since we also consider the zero function  $\mathbf{0}$  as a potential output, it also suffices to assume  $\mathbf{0}$  incurs loss  $> \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ . This allows us to apply our main theorems in Section 3 and Section 4, which take into account finite-sample estimations.

Finally, we bound the time complexity of our grid search approach. Suppose the optimal ReLU is some non-zero function  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$ . Then, from  $\varepsilon = O(\Phi(b)/b^2)$  we know  $b = O(\sqrt{\log 1/\varepsilon})$ , and we also have  $\|v\| \leq W$  by assumption. This means the grid search with accuracy  $0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$  terminates in  $\text{poly}(W, 1/\varepsilon)$  rounds.

During the grid search, there must be some pair  $(\beta_{\text{ind}}, \gamma_{\text{ind}})$  of parameters that correctly estimates the optimal  $\|v\|, b$  each up to error at most  $0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ . Since we apply the subroutines in a way that produces a smaller error margin than  $\alpha$  and  $\varepsilon$ :

$$L_{\text{ind}} \leq 0.1\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{ind}} + 0.1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta_{\text{ind}}^2},$$

this loss will indeed translate into  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  via Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2. □

## 5 Lower Bounds for CSQ algorithms

In this section we show the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.1** (Same as Theorem 1.2). *There exists a function  $F(\varepsilon)$  that goes to infinity as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any constant  $\alpha \geq 1$ , there exists a family of instances with  $\text{OPT} \leq \varepsilon/\alpha$  such that any CSQ algorithm that can agnostically learn an arbitrary ReLU neuron with loss at most  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$  (as defined in Eq. (2)) must use either  $2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}$  queries or queries of tolerance  $d^{-F(\varepsilon)}$ .*

In this section we will follow a standard procedure for showing CSQ hardness, which can be found in e.g. [DKPZ21]. We use many lemmas from previous works as black box.

## 5.1 Preliminaries on high-dimensional geometry and CSQ

Before proving the main theorem, we shall introduce some helpful lemmas from previous works. The first lemma quantifies the fact that, for large  $d$ , there are exponentially many near-perpendicular directions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 5.2** (Lemma 3.7 from [DKS17]). *For any constant  $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , there exists a set  $S$  of  $2^{\Omega(d^c)}$  unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , such that for each distinct  $u, v \in S$  we have:*

$$|\langle u, v \rangle| = O(d^{c-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Next, we introduce some background in CSQ hardness. Most of these definitions and lemmas can be traced back to the seminal work [FGR<sup>+</sup>13].

**Definition 5.3** (CSQ dimension). Let  $\mathcal{D}_x$  be a distribution over space  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  a set of functions from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\beta, \gamma$  two positive parameters. We define the *correlational statistical query dimension of  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{D}_x$  with pairwise correlation  $(\gamma, \beta)$* , denoted  $\text{CSD}_{\mathcal{D}_x}(\mathcal{G}, \gamma, \beta)$ , to be the largest integer  $D$  such that, there is a subset of  $D$  functions  $\{f_1, \dots, f_D\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ , such that for all  $i, j \in [D]$ :

$$|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_x}[f_i(x)f_j(x)]| \leq \begin{cases} \gamma & , \text{ if } i \neq j, \\ \beta & , \text{ if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 5.4** (average CSQ dimension). Let  $\mathcal{D}_x$  be a distribution over space  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  a finite set of functions from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\gamma$  a positive parameter. We define the *average pairwise correlation of functions in  $\mathcal{G}$*  to be:

$$\rho(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}|^2} \sum_{f, g \in \mathcal{G}} |\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_x}[f(x)g(x)]|.$$

Then, the *average correlational statistical query dimension of  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{D}_x$  with parameter  $\gamma$* , denoted  $\text{CSDA}_{\mathcal{D}_x}(\mathcal{G}, \gamma)$ , is the largest integer  $D$  such that every subset  $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  of size at least  $\frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{D}$  has average pairwise correlation  $\rho(\mathcal{G}') \geq \gamma$ .

The next lemma shows large CSQ dimension implies large average CSQ dimension:

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}_x$  be a distribution over space  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\mathcal{G}$  a finite set of functions from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\text{CSD}_{\mathcal{D}_x}(\mathcal{G}, \gamma, \beta) = D$  for some  $\gamma, \beta > 0$ . Then, for all  $\gamma' > 0$ , we have:*

$$\text{CSD}_{\mathcal{D}_x}(\mathcal{G}, \gamma + \gamma') \geq \frac{D\gamma'}{\beta - \gamma}.$$

Finally, large *Average CSQ dimension* implies the following CSQ hardness result:

**Lemma 5.6** (Theorem B.1 in [GGJ+20]). *Suppose  $x \sim \mathcal{D}_x$  and let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a real-valued function class that includes the zero-function, with  $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_x}[f(x)^2] \geq \eta$  for all non-zero  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . Let  $D = \text{CSDA}_{\mathcal{D}_x}(\mathcal{H}, \gamma)$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , then any CSQ algorithm that realizably learns  $\mathcal{H}$  up to  $L^2$  error strictly smaller than  $\eta$  needs at least  $\frac{D}{2}$  queries or queries of tolerance  $\sqrt{\gamma}$ .*

## 5.2 Hermite expansion of negatively biased ReLU

We first define some new notations. For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $H_k(x)$  be the  $k$ th Hermite polynomial (probabilist's version):

$$H_k(x) = (-1)^k \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right),$$

Note that  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k(s)^2 d\Phi(s) = k!$ , so the set

$$\left\{ \frac{H_k(x)}{\sqrt{k!}} : k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

forms an orthonormal basis for Hilbert space  $L^2_{\mathcal{N}}$ , the space of all square-integrable functions under to the standard Gaussian measure. We use  $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{N}}$  to denote the inner product and norm of this space, defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} & := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(s)g(s) d\Phi(s), \\ \|f\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2 & := \langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{N}}. \end{cases}$$

We are now equipped to analyze the Hermite expansion of negatively-biased ReLUs:

**Lemma 5.7** (Lemma 3.5 of [ATV21]). *Let  $f_b(s) = \sigma(s - b)$  for some  $b < 0$ . Then,*

$$\begin{cases} \langle f_b, H_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} & = \varphi(b) - |b|\Phi(b), \\ \langle f_b, H_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} & = \Phi(b), \end{cases}$$

and for all  $k \geq 2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_b, H_k \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} &= (-1)^k \cdot H_{k-2}(b) \cdot \varphi(b) \\ &= H_{k-2}(|b|) \cdot \varphi(b) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , the  $b$ -biased ReLU will correlate less with low-degree Hermite polynomials, in the following sense:

**Lemma 5.8.** *Fix any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $f_b(s) = \sigma(s - b)$ , then as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ , we have:*

$$\sum_{k=0}^t \left\langle f_b, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle^2 = o(1) \cdot \|f\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2.$$

*Proof.* By Parseval's identity:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\langle f_b, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle^2 = \|f_b\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2 = (2 + o(1)) \frac{\varphi(b)}{|b|^3}.$$

Applying Lemma 5.7, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^t \left\langle f_b, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle^2}{\|f_b\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2} &= \frac{o(\varphi(b)^2) + \sum_{k=2}^t H_{k-2}(|b|)^2 \cdot \varphi(b)^2/k!}{(2 + o(1))\varphi(b)/|b|^3} \\ &= O(p(|b|)) \cdot \varphi(b), \end{aligned}$$

for some polynomial  $p$  of bounded degree. Since  $\varphi(b)$  decreases exponentially with  $|b|$ , this value vanishes as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ .  $\square$

Finally, we prove the following lemma that is tailor-made for our problem.

**Lemma 5.9.** *The following holds for all sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$ . Let  $g_\varepsilon(s) = \sigma(s - b_\varepsilon)$ , where  $b_\varepsilon$  is chosen so that  $\|g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2 = 3\varepsilon$ . Let integer  $t_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  be:*

$$t_\varepsilon := \max \left\{ t \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{k=0}^t \left\langle g_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha} \right\},$$

then, we have  $t_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* By the previous lemma, for any fixed  $t$  we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^t \left\langle g_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2 = o(1) \cdot \|g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2 = o(\varepsilon).$$

Hence  $t_\varepsilon$  cannot be bounded as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Proof of main theorem

To bound the pairwise correlation of two functions defined on almost-perpendicular directions, we introduce one final lemma which we use as a black box:

**Lemma 5.10** (Lemma 2.3 from [DKPZ21]). *For function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and unit vectors  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [g(\langle x, u \rangle)g(\langle x, v \rangle)] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\langle u, v \rangle|^k \cdot \left\langle g, \frac{H_k(x)}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2.$$

We are now ready to show the main hardness result. Suppose some CSQ algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  can agnostically learn ReLUs with unbounded bias up to error  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon$ . We first fix some sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and consider the following set:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{G_{v, \varepsilon} = \tilde{g}_\varepsilon(\langle x, v \rangle) : v \in S\},$$

where  $S$  is the set of  $2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}$  almost-perpendicular unit vectors in Lemma 5.2, and  $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$  is a modification of  $g_\varepsilon$  in Lemma 5.9, by removing the *first*  $t_\varepsilon$  Hermite components from the latter:

$$\tilde{g}_\varepsilon(s) = \sum_{k=t_\varepsilon+1}^{\infty} \left\langle g_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}} \frac{H_k(s)}{\sqrt{k!}}.$$

We now show that the functions  $\{G_{v,\varepsilon} : v \in S\}$  have small pairwise correlation. For each distinct  $u, v \in S$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [G_{u,\varepsilon}(x)G_{v,\varepsilon}(x)] &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\langle u, v \rangle|^k \cdot \left\langle \tilde{g}_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k(x)}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2 \\
&= \sum_{k=t_\varepsilon+1}^{\infty} |\langle u, v \rangle|^k \cdot \left\langle \tilde{g}_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k(x)}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2 \\
&\leq |\langle u, v \rangle|^{t_\varepsilon+1} \sum_{k=t_\varepsilon+1}^{\infty} \left\langle \tilde{g}_\varepsilon, \frac{H_k(x)}{\sqrt{k!}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}^2 \\
&\leq d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)} \cdot \|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first step is by Lemma 5.10, and the last step is by property of  $S$  in Lemma 5.2. Since we also have  $\mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [G_{u,\varepsilon}(x)^2] = \|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2$  by definition, this means:

$$\text{CSD}_{\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}(\mathcal{G}, d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)}\|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2, \|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2) \geq 2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}.$$

Applying Lemma 5.5 with  $\gamma = \gamma' = d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)}\|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2$ , this translates into:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{CSDA}_{\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)}(\mathcal{G}, d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)}\|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2) &\geq \frac{2^{d^{\Omega(1)}} \cdot d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)} \cdot \|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2}{(1 - d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)})\|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2} \\
&= 2^{d^{\Omega(1)}} \text{ for all sufficiently large } d.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we show that  $\mathcal{A}$  can learn this low-correlation class  $\mathcal{G}$  up to nontrivial accuracy. Given CSQ-oracle access to  $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $y$  labeled by some  $G_{v,\varepsilon}(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs a function  $h$  with error at most:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [(h(x) - G_{v,\varepsilon}(x))^2] &\leq \alpha \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [(\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b_\varepsilon) - G_{v,\varepsilon}(x))^2] + \varepsilon \\
&= \alpha \cdot \|g_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}}^2 + \varepsilon \\
&\leq \alpha \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha} + \varepsilon \\
&< \left(3 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \varepsilon \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [G_{v,\varepsilon}(x)^2].
\end{aligned}$$

We can thus apply Lemma 5.6 with  $\eta = \|\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)} [G_{v,\varepsilon}(x)^2]$ , and conclude that  $\mathcal{A}$  must use  $2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}$  queries or queries of tolerance  $d^{-\Omega(t_\varepsilon)}$ . Now the proof is finished since  $t_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

## References

- [APVZ14] Alexandr Andoni, Rina Panigrahy, Gregory Valiant, and Li Zhang. Learning sparse polynomial functions. In Chandra Chekuri, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth An-*

*nual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 500–510. SIAM, 2014.

- [ATV21] Pranjali Awasthi, Alex Tang, and Aravindan Vijayaraghavan. Efficient algorithms for learning depth-2 neural networks with general relu activations. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 13485–13496, 2021.
- [ATV23] Pranjali Awasthi, Alex Tang, and Aravindan Vijayaraghavan. Agnostic learning of general relu activation using gradient descent. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [CKM21] Sitan Chen, Adam R. Klivans, and Raghu Meka. Learning deep relu networks is fixed-parameter tractable. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 696–707. IEEE, 2021.
- [CM20] Sitan Chen and Raghu Meka. Learning polynomials in few relevant dimensions. In Jacob D. Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2020, 9-12 July 2020, Virtual Event [Graz, Austria]*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1161–1227. PMLR, 2020.
- [DDK<sup>+</sup>23a] Ilias Diakonikolas, Jelena Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, Puqian Wang, and Nikos Zarifis. Near-optimal bounds for learning gaussian halfspaces with random classification noise. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [DDK<sup>+</sup>23b] Ilias Diakonikolas, Jelena Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Puqian Wang, and Nikos Zarifis. Information-computation tradeoffs for learning margin halfspaces with random classification noise. In Gergely Neu and Lorenzo Rosasco, editors, *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2023, 12-15 July 2023, Bangalore, India*, volume 195 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2211–2239. PMLR, 2023.
- [DGK<sup>+</sup>20] Ilias Diakonikolas, Surbhi Goel, Sushrut Karmalkar, Adam R. Klivans, and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Approximation schemes for relu regression. In Jacob D. Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2020, 9-12 July 2020, Virtual Event [Graz, Austria]*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1452–1485. PMLR, 2020.
- [DKK<sup>+</sup>21] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, and Nikos Zarifis. Agnostic proper learning of halfspaces under gaussian marginals. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2021*,

- 15-19 August 2021, Boulder, Colorado, USA, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1522–1551. PMLR, 2021.
- [DKK<sup>+</sup>22] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, and Nikos Zarifis. Learning general halfspaces with general massart noise under the gaussian distribution. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 874–885. ACM, 2022.
- [DKKZ20] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Vasilis Kontonis, and Nikos Zarifis. Algorithms and SQ lower bounds for PAC learning one-hidden-layer relu networks. In Jacob D. Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2020, 9-12 July 2020, Virtual Event [Graz, Austria]*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1514–1539. PMLR, 2020.
- [DKLZ24] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Sihan Liu, and Nikos Zarifis. Testable learning of general halfspaces with adversarial label noise. In Shipra Agrawal and Aaron Roth, editors, *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory, June 30 - July 3, 2023, Edmonton, Canada*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1308–1335. PMLR, 2024.
- [DKMR22] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, Pasin Manurangsi, and Lisheng Ren. Hardness of learning a single neuron with adversarial label noise. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2022, 28-30 March 2022, Virtual Event*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8199–8213. PMLR, 2022.
- [DKPZ21] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, Thanasis Pittas, and Nikos Zarifis. The optimality of polynomial regression for agnostic learning under gaussian marginals in the SQ model. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2021, 15-19 August 2021, Boulder, Colorado, USA*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1552–1584. PMLR, 2021.
- [DKR23] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, and Lisheng Ren. Near-optimal cryptographic hardness of agnostically learning halfspaces and relu regression under gaussian marginals. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7922–7938. PMLR, 2023.
- [DKS17] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, and Alistair Stewart. Statistical query lower bounds for robust estimation of high-dimensional gaussians and gaussian mixtures. In Chris Umans, editor, *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pages 73–84. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [DKS18] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, and Alistair Stewart. Learning geometric concepts with nasty noise. In Ilias Diakonikolas, David Kempe, and Monika Henzinger, editors,



*Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 1061–1073. ACM, 2018.

- [DKTZ22a] Ilias Diakonikolas, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, and Nikos Zarifis. Learning a single neuron with adversarial label noise via gradient descent. In Po-Ling Loh and Maxim Raginsky, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, 2-5 July 2022, London, UK*, volume 178 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4313–4361. PMLR, 2022.
- [DKTZ22b] Ilias Diakonikolas, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, and Nikos Zarifis. Learning general halfspaces with adversarial label noise via online gradient descent. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5118–5141. PMLR, 2022.
- [DKZ20] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, and Nikos Zarifis. Near-optimal SQ lower bounds for agnostically learning halfspaces and relus under gaussian marginals. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [DLS22] Alexandru Damian, Jason D. Lee, and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Neural networks can learn representations with gradient descent. In Po-Ling Loh and Maxim Raginsky, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, 2-5 July 2022, London, UK*, volume 178 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5413–5452. PMLR, 2022.
- [DPLB24] Alex Damian, Loucas Pillaud-Vivien, Jason D. Lee, and Joan Bruna. Computational-statistical gaps in gaussian single-index models (extended abstract). In Shipra Agrawal and Aaron Roth, editors, *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory, June 30 - July 3, 2023, Edmonton, Canada*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, page 1262. PMLR, 2024.
- [FCG20] Spencer Frei, Yuan Cao, and Quanquan Gu. Agnostic learning of a single neuron with gradient descent. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [FGR<sup>+</sup>13] Vitaly Feldman, Elena Grigorescu, Lev Reyzin, Santosh S. Vempala, and Ying Xiao. Statistical algorithms and a lower bound for detecting planted cliques. In Dan Boneh, Tim Roughgarden, and Joan Feigenbaum, editors, *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 655–664. ACM, 2013.
- [GGJ<sup>+</sup>20] Surbhi Goel, Aravind Gollakota, Zhihan Jin, Sushrut Karmalkar, and Adam R. Klivans. Superpolynomial lower bounds for learning one-layer neural networks using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*,

*ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3587–3596. PMLR, 2020.

- [GGK20] Surbhi Goel, Aravind Gollakota, and Adam R. Klivans. Statistical-query lower bounds via functional gradients. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [GGKS23] Aravind Gollakota, Parikshit Gopalan, Adam R. Klivans, and Konstantinos Stavropoulos. Agnostically learning single-index models using omnipredictors. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [GK19] Surbhi Goel and Adam R Klivans. Learning neural networks with two nonlinear layers in polynomial time. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1470–1499. PMLR, 2019.
- [GKK19] Surbhi Goel, Sushrut Karmalkar, and Adam R. Klivans. Time/accuracy tradeoffs for learning a relu with respect to gaussian marginals. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 8582–8591, 2019.
- [Kea93] Michael J. Kearns. Efficient noise-tolerant learning from statistical queries. In S. Rao Kosaraju, David S. Johnson, and Alok Aggarwal, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 16-18, 1993, San Diego, CA, USA*, pages 392–401. ACM, 1993.
- [KKKS11] Sham M. Kakade, Adam Kalai, Varun Kanade, and Ohad Shamir. Efficient learning of generalized linear and single index models with isotonic regression. In John Shawe-Taylor, Richard S. Zemel, Peter L. Bartlett, Fernando C. N. Pereira, and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24: 25th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2011. Proceedings of a meeting held 12-14 December 2011, Granada, Spain*, pages 927–935, 2011.
- [KKMS05] Adam Tauman Kalai, Adam R. Klivans, Yishay Mansour, and Rocco A. Servedio. Agnostically learning halfspaces. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2005), 23-25 October 2005, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Proceedings*, pages 11–20. IEEE Computer Society, 2005.
- [KKSK11] Sham M Kakade, Varun Kanade, Ohad Shamir, and Adam Kalai. Efficient learning of generalized linear and single index models with isotonic regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24, 2011.
- [KLL<sup>+</sup>24] Bobak T. Kiani, Thien Le, Hannah Lawrence, Stefanie Jegelka, and Melanie Weber. On the hardness of learning under symmetries. In *The Twelfth International Con-*

*ference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024.* OpenReview.net, 2024.

- [KS09] Adam Tauman Kalai and Ravi Sastry. The isotron algorithm: High-dimensional isotonic regression. In *COLT*. Citeseer, 2009.
- [KSA19] Seyed Mohammadreza Mousavi Kalan, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, and Amir Salman Avestimehr. Fitting relus via SGD and quantized SGD. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2019, Paris, France, July 7-12, 2019*, pages 2469–2473. IEEE, 2019.
- [KSS94] Michael J. Kearns, Robert E. Schapire, and Linda Sellie. Toward efficient agnostic learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 17(2-3):115–141, 1994.
- [MN06] Pascal MASSART and Elodie NEDELEC. Risk bounds for statistical learning. *Annals of statistics*, 34(5):2326–2366, 2006.
- [MO60] Albert W Marshall and Ingram Olkin. Multivariate chebyshev inequalities. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1001–1014, 1960.
- [Sma10] Christopher G Small. *Expansions and asymptotics for statistics*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2010.
- [Sol17] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Learning relus via gradient descent. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 2007–2017, 2017.
- [Tia17] Yuandong Tian. An analytical formula of population gradient for two-layered relu network and its applications in convergence and critical point analysis. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3404–3413. PMLR, 2017.
- [Tro12] Joel A Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12:389–434, 2012.
- [WZDD23] Puqian Wang, Nikos Zarifis, Ilias Diakonikolas, and Jelena Diakonikolas. Robustly learning a single neuron via sharpness. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 36541–36577. PMLR, 2023.
- [WZDD24] Puqian Wang, Nikos Zarifis, Ilias Diakonikolas, and Jelena Diakonikolas. Sample and computationally efficient robust learning of gaussian single-index models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.05708*, 2024.
- [ZWDD24] Nikos Zarifis, Puqian Wang, Ilias Diakonikolas, and Jelena Diakonikolas. Robustly learning single-index models via alignment sharpness. In *Forty-first International Con-*

## A Mills ratio and Gaussian integrals

Let  $\varphi, \Phi$  be the pdf and cdf of a one-dimensional Gaussian respectively. The *Mills ratio* at  $t$ , for  $t > 0$ , is defined as:

$$m(t) = \frac{1 - \Phi(t)}{\varphi(t)},$$

namely the ratio between Gaussian tail and Gaussian density. This ratio has the following asymptotic expansion “around infinity” (see e.g. [Sma10]):

$$m(t) \sim \frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t^3} + \frac{1 \cdot 3}{t^5} - \frac{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5}{t^7} + \dots,$$

where the error of every partial sum is bounded by the absolute value of the next term.

We note that this series diverges for any fixed  $t$ , since the numerator grows like a factorial. On the other hand, at the limit  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the more terms we have in a partial sum, the quicker the approximation error of this partial sum converges to zero.

Using Mills ratio, we now estimate the values of the following integrals:

- The following is often used in thresholded PCA: As  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|b|}^{\infty} t^2 d\Phi(t) &= |b|\varphi(b) + \Phi(b) \\ &= (1 + o(1))b^2\Phi(b). \end{aligned}$$

- The next one is very useful in general, as it bounds the  $L^2$  norm of a negatively biased ReLU neuron: as  $b \rightarrow -\infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|b|}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 d\Phi(t) &= (b^2 + 1)\Phi(b) - |b|\varphi(b) \\ &= \frac{2 + o(1)}{b^2}\Phi(b). \end{aligned}$$

- The following does not need  $b \rightarrow -\infty$  but is often used. For all  $b$ , we have:

$$\int_{-b}^{\infty} t(t+b) d\Phi(t) = \Phi(b).$$

We note that this is a special case of Lemma 5.7.

- This is used in proof for Lemma 3.5 with  $b - \tau$  in place of the value  $b$  below. Let  $h = \frac{c}{|b|}$  for some constant  $c$ , then:

$$\int_{|b|+h}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 \varphi(t) dt = (1 + o(1)) \cdot e^{-c} \cdot \left(1 + c + \frac{c^2}{2}\right) \cdot \int_{|b|}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 \varphi(t) dt.$$

Using the asymptotic expansion of Mills ratio:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{|b|+h}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 \varphi(t) dt = (b^2+1)\Phi(b-h) + (b+h)\varphi(b-h) \\
& = \varphi(b-h) \left[ (b^2+1) \left( \frac{1}{|b-h|} - \frac{1}{|b-h|^3} + \frac{3+o(1)}{|b-h|^5} \right) + \underbrace{(b+h)}_{\frac{b^2-h^2}{-|b-h|}} \right] \\
& = \frac{\varphi(b-h)}{|b-h|} \left[ (b^2+1) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(b-h)^2} + \frac{3+o(1)}{(b-h)^4} \right) - (b^2-h^2) \right] \\
& = \Phi(b-h) \left[ (b^2+1) \left( -\frac{1}{(b-h)^2} + \frac{3+o(1)}{(b-h)^4} \right) + 1 + h^2 \right] \\
& = \Phi(b-h) \cdot \frac{-(b^2+1) + (1+h^2)(b-h)^2 + \frac{(3+o(1))(b^2+1)}{(b-h)^2}}{(b-h)^2} \\
& = \Phi(b-h) \cdot \frac{-1 - 2bh + h^2 + b^2h^2 - 2bh^3 + h^4 + \frac{(3+o(1))(b^2+1)}{(b-h)^2}}{(b-h)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging in  $h = \frac{c}{|b|} = o(1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{|b|+h}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 \varphi(t) dt \\
& = \Phi(b-h) \cdot \frac{-1 + 2c + h^2 + c^2 + 2ch^2 + h^4 + \frac{(3+o(1))(b^2+1)}{(b-h)^2}}{(b-h)^2} \\
& = \Phi(b-h) \cdot \frac{c^2 + 2c + 2 + o(1)}{b^2} \\
& = (1+o(1)) \cdot e^{-c} \cdot \left( 1 + c + \frac{c^2}{2} \right) \cdot \int_{|b|}^{\infty} (t+b)^2 \varphi(t) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

## B Omitted proofs from Section 2

Recall that  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  is the distribution over  $(x, \hat{y})$  where  $\hat{y} = \frac{y}{\|v\|}$ . Suppose the best-fitting ReLU for  $\mathcal{D}$  is some  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  where  $v$  is not necessarily a unit vector.

**Proposition B.1** (Same as Proposition 2.1). *In the above setting, the optimal ReLU for  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  is  $\sigma(\langle x, \hat{v} \rangle + \hat{b})$  where  $\|\hat{v}\| = v/\|v\|$  is a unit vector and  $\hat{b} = b/\|v\|$ , and it has loss  $\widehat{\text{OPT}} = \hat{L}(v, b) = \text{OPT}/\|v\|^2$ .*

*Moreover, suppose parameters  $w, b_w$  incur loss  $\hat{L}(w, b_w) \leq \alpha \cdot \widehat{\text{OPT}} + \varepsilon$  on the normalized problem  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ . Then, the pair  $(\|v\|w, \|v\|b_w)$  would incur loss  $L(\|v\|w, \|v\|b_w) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \|v\|^2\varepsilon$  on the original problem  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

*Proof.* The first fact follows from the fact that the ReLU function  $\sigma$  is homogeneous:

$$\sigma(\langle x, w \rangle + b_w) - y = \|v\| \cdot \left( \sigma\left(\left\langle x, \frac{w}{\|v\|} \right\rangle + \frac{b_w}{\|v\|}\right) - \hat{y} \right), \text{ for all choices of } w \in \mathbb{R}, b_w \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The second is a result of scaling everything by  $1/\|v\|$ , except the additive  $\varepsilon$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[(\|v\|h(x) - y)^2] &= \|v\|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(h(x) - \hat{y})^2] \\ &\leq \|v\|^2 \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[(\sigma(\langle x, \hat{v} \rangle + \hat{b}) - \hat{y})^2] + \varepsilon \right) \\ &= \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b) - y)^2] + \|v\|^2 \varepsilon \\ &= \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \|v\|^2 \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition B.2** (Same as Proposition 2.2). *Let  $\hat{v}$  be the unit vector in  $v$ 's direction. Suppose we estimate  $\|v\|$  up to additive error  $\delta_v$  and  $b$  up to additive error  $\delta_b$ . Let function  $h$  be an  $(\alpha L + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the following ReLU function with loss  $L$ :*

$$\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b).$$

*Then, if  $|\delta_v|, |\delta_b| \leq 0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ , we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(h(x) - y)^2] \leq O(\alpha) \cdot \text{OPT} + O(\varepsilon).$$

*Proof.* We will repeatedly apply the elementary inequality  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ . First, we compare the loss of the estimated optimal ReLU with OPT:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b) - y)^2] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b) - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2] + 2\text{OPT} \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b) - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b + \delta_b))^2] \\ &\quad + 4\mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b + \delta_b) - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2] + 2\text{OPT}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sigma$  is 1-Lipschitz, we can remove it, cancel the terms before squaring, and get an upper bound:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b) - y)^2] \leq 4\mathbb{E}[(\langle x, \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle)^2] + 4\delta_b^2 + 2\text{OPT}.$$

Note that the first term on the right is just  $4\delta_v^2$ . Since our goal is constant approximation plus  $\varepsilon$ , it suffices to take  $|\delta_v| = |\delta_b| \leq 0.1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ , and have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(h(x) - y)^2] &\leq \alpha \cdot \mathbb{E}[(\sigma(\langle x, v + \delta_v \hat{v} \rangle + b + \delta_b) - y)^2] + \varepsilon \\ &\leq 0.08\varepsilon + 2\alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

**Lemma B.3** (Same as Lemma 2.3). Suppose  $\alpha \geq 3$ . Let  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  be the optimal ReLU with loss OPT, where  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  sufficiently negative. If the zero function is not an  $\alpha$ -approximation to the loss of  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$ , namely,

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2] > \alpha \cdot \text{OPT},$$

then we have:

$$\text{OPT} < \frac{3\Phi(b)}{\alpha b^2}.$$

*Proof.* By assumption we know that  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2] > \alpha\text{OPT}$ . By the same elementary inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} &< \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(y - \sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b))^2] + \mathbb{E}[\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)^2] \\ &= 2\text{OPT} + (2 + o(1))\frac{\Phi(b)}{b^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT} &< \frac{(2 + o(1))\Phi(b)}{(\alpha - 2)b^2} \\ &= \frac{3\Phi(b)}{\alpha b^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for all large  $\alpha$ . □

**Lemma B.4** (Same as Lemma 2.4). Suppose  $\alpha \geq 2$ . Let  $\sigma(\langle x, v \rangle + b)$  be the optimal ReLU with loss OPT, where  $\|v\| = 1$  and  $b$  sufficiently negative. Then:

$$\varepsilon < \frac{3\Phi(b)}{b^2}.$$

*Proof.* Since the loss incurred by  $\mathbf{0}$  is exactly  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2]$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon &< \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[y^2] \\ &\leq 2\text{OPT} + \mathbb{E}[\sigma(\langle v, x \rangle + b)^2] \\ &= 2\text{OPT} + \frac{(2 + o(1))\Phi(b)}{b^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\alpha \geq 2$ , for sufficiently negative  $b$  this implies:

$$\varepsilon \leq 3\Phi(b)/b^2,$$

as desired. □

## C Proof for Lemma 4.2

Let  $\Lambda = \langle w, v \rangle$ . We shall restate and prove the lemma:

**Lemma C.1** (Same as Lemma 4.2). *Consider the plane spanned by  $w$  and  $v$ , under the coordinate  $x = x_w \cdot w + x_\perp \cdot v^\perp$ . Suppose  $\rho, \lambda \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\rho\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$ . If  $\Lambda \geq \lambda$ , then on event  $E = \{x_w \geq (\lambda - \lambda^2\rho + \rho)|b|\}$ , for all  $x_\perp \geq 0$  we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma(\langle x_w w + x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) - \sigma(\langle x_w w - x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) \\ & \geq \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} \cdot \sigma\left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* Since  $v = \Lambda w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}v^\perp$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma(\langle x_w w + x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) - \sigma(\langle x_w w - x_\perp v^\perp, v \rangle + b) \\ & = \sigma\left(\Lambda x_w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b|\right) - \sigma\left(\Lambda x_w - \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b|\right) \\ & \geq \sigma\left(\Lambda x_w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b|\right) - \sigma(\Lambda x_w - |b|) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Case 1**, when  $\Lambda x_w < |b|$ . In this case the second term is zero, and the first term is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma\left(\Lambda x_w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b|\right) \geq \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp + \Lambda(\lambda - \lambda^2\rho + \rho)|b| - |b|\right) \\ & \geq \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp + \Lambda(\Lambda - \Lambda^2\rho + \rho)|b| - |b|\right), \end{aligned}$$

since  $\lambda - \lambda^2\rho + \rho$  has derivative  $1 - 2\lambda\rho < 0$ . We can thus further bound it by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp + \Lambda(\Lambda - \Lambda^2\rho + \rho)|b| - |b|\right) = \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp + (\Lambda^2 - \Lambda^3\rho + \Lambda\rho - 1)|b|\right) \\ & = \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - (1 - \Lambda^2)(1 - \Lambda\rho)|b|\right) \\ & \geq \sigma\left(\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right) \\ & = \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} \cdot \sigma\left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

**Case 2**, when  $\Lambda x_w < |b|$ . In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma\left(\Lambda x_w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b|\right) - \sigma(\Lambda x_w - |b|) = \Lambda x_w + \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp - |b| - (\Lambda x_w - |b|) \\ & = \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}x_\perp \\ & \geq \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} \cdot \sigma\left(x_\perp - \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}(1 - \lambda\rho)|b|\right). \end{aligned}$$

## Acknowledgements

We would thank Alex Tang, Pranjal Awasthi and Santosh Vempala for helpful discussions.