

# PROPORTIONAL INFINITE-WIDTH INFINITE-DEPTH LIMIT FOR DEEP LINEAR NEURAL NETWORKS

FEDERICO BASSETTI\*, LUCIA LADELLI†, PIETRO ROTONDO‡

**ABSTRACT.** We study the distributional properties of linear neural networks with random parameters in the context of large networks, where the number of layers diverges in proportion to the number of neurons per layer. Prior works have shown that in the infinite-width regime, where the number of neurons per layer grows to infinity while the depth remains fixed, neural networks converge to a Gaussian process, known as the Neural Network Gaussian Process. However, this Gaussian limit sacrifices descriptive power, as it lacks the ability to learn dependent features and produce output correlations that reflect observed labels. Motivated by these limitations, we explore the joint proportional limit in which both depth and width diverge but maintain a constant ratio, yielding a non-Gaussian distribution that retains correlations between outputs. Our contribution extends previous works by rigorously characterizing, for linear activation functions, the limiting distribution as a nontrivial mixture of Gaussians.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A neural network can be viewed as a parameterized function  $f(\cdot|\theta) : \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ , recursively defined by linear transformations composed with non-linear activation functions. When a network architecture is fixed, parameters are learned using a training dataset. In this context understanding the behaviour of neural networks with randomly initialized parameters is essential. Indeed, a randomly initialized network can be viewed as either the starting point for optimization or as the prior in a Bayesian learning framework.

In large neural networks with many neurons per layer, key insights arise through scaling limits, in particular the infinite-width limit, where the depth is fixed, and the width (number of neurons) grows to infinity. In this context, gaussian universality appears both in training under gradient flow, described by the neural tangent kernel [Jacot et al. \(2018\)](#), and in the Bayesian inference setting, where exact relations between neural networks and kernel methods have been established [Lee et al. \(2018\)](#); [de G. Matthews et al. \(2018\)](#).

Neal’s seminal work [Neal \(1996\)](#) established that Bayesian shallow networks (networks with one hidden layer and large width) converge to a Gaussian process under standard assumptions on the weight distribution. Following this result, research has been extended to multi-layer networks with nonlinear activations, demonstrating that fully connected architectures [Lee et al. \(2018\)](#); [de G. Matthews et al. \(2018\)](#); [Hanin \(2023\)](#) and even some convolutional architectures [Novak et al. \(2019\)](#); [Garriga-Alonso et al. \(2019\)](#) exhibit asymptotically Gaussian behaviour in the infinite-width limit. In this limit, Gaussian processes emerge naturally due to central limit effects on the network’s outputs, resulting in the so-called Neural Network Gaussian Process (NNGP). Convergence rates to gaussian limit for fully connected networks have also been derived [Favaro et al. \(2023a\)](#); [Trevisan, D. \(2023\)](#). The simplification of random neural networks in the NNGP regime comes at a significant cost in terms of the model’s descriptive power. Specifically, for fully connected networks in the NNGP regime, the prior distribution yields independent output components and, assuming a Gaussian likelihood, the outputs are independent also under the posterior distribution. In summary, NNGP cannot capture data dependent features. Moreover, while observed responses affect the posterior mean, they do not influence its covariance structure.

\* email: federico.bassetti@polimi.it; address: Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy.

† email: lucia.ladelli@polimi.it; address: Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy.

‡ email: pietro.rotondo@unipr.it; address: Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche, Fisiche e Informatiche Università degli Studi di Parma, Parma, Italy.

This lack of learning capability is somewhat disappointing, especially given that modern deep architectures are known to perform complex feature learning beyond what is achievable in the infinite-width limit, see [Chizat et al. \(2019\)](#); [Lewkowycz, Aitor and Bahri, Yasaman and Dye, Ethanr and Sohl-Dickstein \(2021\)](#); [Brown et al. \(2020\)](#). This limitation has oriented the research in finding alternative limit regimes that allow non-Gaussian structures, potentially improving the network’s capacity to learn data-driven features. The gaussian limit can be avoided with different approaches. For example using the mean field scaling, see e.g. [Mei et al. \(2018\)](#); [Rotskoff and Vanden-Eijnden \(2022\)](#); [Sirignano and Spiliopoulos \(2020\)](#); [Chizat and Bach \(2018\)](#), the maximal update parametrizations [Yang and Hu \(2021\)](#), heavy tailed initial weight distributions in a Bayesian setting, see e.g. [Bordino et al. \(2023\)](#); [Favaro et al. \(2023b\)](#) or the so-called proportional limit (where both the number of training patterns  $P$  and the number of neurons  $N$  diverges at the same rate) investigated in physics literature [Pacelli et al. \(2023\)](#); [Aiudi et al. \(2023\)](#); [Baglioni et al. \(2024\)](#).

A recent line of research [Hanin \(2024\)](#) proposes to examine the ratio of depth  $L$  (the number of layers) to width  $N$  (the number of neurons per layer), referred to as the ‘effective depth’, in order to understand mechanisms that may drive neural networks toward a non-Gaussian asymptotic behaviour. In the proportional limit, where both depth and width diverge but their ratio  $L/N$  converges to a positive constant  $a > 0$ , the cumulant analysis in [Hanin \(2024\)](#) shows that the limiting distribution cannot be Gaussian. In point of fact, for ReLU and linear activations, the limiting distribution has been proved to be a mixture of Gaussians when considering a single input and a single output.

Despite their simplicity, deep linear networks (i.e. networks with a linear activation) capture certain features of nonlinear deep networks and attracted the interest of many researchers, see e.g. [Saxe et al. \(2014, 2019\)](#); [Li and Sompolinsky \(2021\)](#); [Hanin and Zlokapa \(2023\)](#); [Zavatone-Veth and Pehlevan \(2021\)](#); [Chizat et al. \(2024\)](#).

Recently, [Bassetti et al. \(2024\)](#) provide an elementary representation for the prior distribution over the outputs in a deep linear network, given in terms of a mixture of Gaussians. Building on this representaion, in our paper we show that in the proportional limit  $L/N \rightarrow a$  with  $a > 0$ , linear networks with general input and output dimensions converge to a nontrivial Gaussian mixture, generalizing the above mentioned single input and single output results for this regime. We show that the mixing distribution can be explicitly defined by multiple stochastic Brownian integrals ([Proposition 3.2](#)) and that a similar representation holds also for the posterior distribution ([Propositions 3.3](#) and [3.4](#)). Interestingly, the Gaussian mixture limit allows the network to learn dependencies in the responses, a feature observed in finite networks but absent in the infinite-width limit. Moreover, unlike in the NNGP regime, in the proportional limit the output correlations depend on the observed labels. This makes the proportional limit a closer approximation to finite network behaviour than the infinite-width setting.

## 2. SETTING OF THE PROBLEM

**2.1. Bayesian fully-connected deep linear neural networks.** In a *fully-connected linear neural network with  $L$  hidden layers*, the pre-activations of each layer  $h_{i_\ell}^{(\ell)}$  ( $i_\ell = 1, \dots, N_\ell$ ;  $\ell = 1, \dots, L + 1$ ) are given recursively as a function of the pre-activations of the previous layer  $h_{i_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}$  ( $i_{\ell-1} = 1, \dots, N_{\ell-1}$ ). For  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_0})^\top$

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} h_{i_1}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_0}} \sum_{i_0=1}^{N_0} W_{i_1 i_0}^{(0)} x_{i_0} \\ h_{i_\ell}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_{\ell-1}}} \sum_{i_{\ell-1}=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} W_{i_\ell i_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)} h_{i_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L + 1 \end{aligned}$$

where  $W^{(\ell-1)}$  are the weights and we assume that the so-called biases of the  $\ell$ -th layer are zero. Assuming  $N_{L+1} = D$ , the function implemented by the neural network is the output of the last layer  $f_L(\mathbf{x}|\theta) = (h_1^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, h_D^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top$ . Here  $\theta = \{W_{i_\ell, i_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)} : \ell = 1, \dots, L + 1; i_\ell = 1, \dots, N_\ell\}$  represents the collection of all the trainable weights of the network.

Collecting  $P$  possible inputs  $\mathbf{x}_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$  ( $\mu = 1, \dots, P$ ) in a  $N_0 \times P$  matrix  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_P]$ , the function implemented by a deep linear neural network for these inputs in matrix form has the explicit expression

$$(2) \quad f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta) = [f_L(\mathbf{x}_1|\theta), \dots, f_L(\mathbf{x}_P|\theta)] = \frac{W^{(L)}}{\sqrt{N_L}} \cdots \frac{W^{(0)}}{\sqrt{N_0}} \mathbf{X}$$

where  $W^{(\ell)} = [W_{i_{\ell+1}, i_\ell}^{(\ell)}]$  are  $N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell$  matrices.

In a Bayesian neural network, a prior for the weights  $\theta$  is specified, which translates in a prior for  $f_L(\mathbf{x}_\mu|\theta)$ . It is common to assume a gaussian prior for the weights, more precisely the  $W_{ij}^{(\ell)}$  are independent and normally distributed with zero mean and layer dependent variance  $\lambda_\ell^{-1}$ , that is

$$(3) \quad W_{ij}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_\ell^{-1}).$$

Here and in the rest of the paper  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{C})$  denotes the Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mathbf{m}$  and covariance matrix (variance)  $\mathbf{C}$  (depending on the dimension  $d > 1$  or  $d = 1$ ).

The prior over the outputs is the law of the random matrix  $f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$  or, equivalently, of the collection of random vectors  $\{f_L(\mathbf{x}_\mu|\theta); \mu = 1, \dots, P\}$ .

**2.2. Explicit prior expression.** In this section, we review a result proved in [Bassetti et al. \(2024\)](#), which serves as the basis for our study. Denote by  $\mathcal{S}_D^+$  the set of  $D \times D$  symmetric strictly positive definite matrices and recall that a random matrix  $Q$  taking values in  $\mathcal{S}_D^+$  has Wishart distribution with  $N > D$  degrees of freedom and scale matrix  $C$  if  $Q = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i^\top$  where  $\mathbf{Z}_i$  are independent Gaussian vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^D$  with zero mean and covariance matrix  $C$ . Equivalently,  $Q$  has a Wishart distribution with  $N$  degrees of freedom and scale matrix  $C$  if it has the following density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the cone of symmetric positive definite matrices)

$$Q \mapsto \frac{\det(Q)^{\frac{N-D-1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(C^{-1}Q)}}{\det(C)^{N/2} 2^{DN/2} (\pi)^{D(D-1)/4} \prod_{k=1}^D \Gamma(\frac{N-D+k}{2})}.$$

See [Eaton \(2007\)](#) and the references therein. If  $D = 1$ , one has that  $\mathcal{S}_D^+ = \mathbb{R}^+$  and the Wishart distribution reduces to a Gamma distribution of parameters  $\alpha = \frac{N}{2}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{1}{2C}$ , that is

$$Q \mapsto \frac{1}{(2C)^{N/2} \Gamma(N/2)} Q^{\frac{N}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2C}Q} \quad \text{for } Q > 0.$$

It is possible to prove that in a fully-connected linear network the prior distribution over  $f(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$  is a mixture of Gaussians where the covariance matrix is an explicit function of random Wishart matrices. From now on  $Y_1 \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} Y_2$  means that the two random elements  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  have the same law, moreover  $Y_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} Y$  means that the sequence of random elements  $(Y_n)_n$  converges in law to  $Y$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ .

**Proposition 2.1** ([Bassetti et al. \(2024\)](#)). *Let  $f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$  be the outputs of a fully-connected linear network under the prior (3). If  $\min(N_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, L) > D$  and  $\lambda_L^* := \lambda_0 \dots \lambda_L$ , then*

$$(4) \quad f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} V^L \dots V^1 \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\sqrt{N_0 \lambda_L^*}} \mathbf{X}$$

where  $V^\ell$  are any  $D \times D$  independent random matrices such that  $Q^\ell = V^\ell (V^\ell)^\top$  has a Wishart distribution with  $N_\ell$  degrees of freedom and scale matrix  $\frac{1}{N_\ell} \mathbb{1}_D$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a  $D \times N_0$  matrix of independent standard normal random variables.

Above and in the rest of the paper,  $\mathbb{1}_M$  is the identity matrix of dimension  $M \times M$ .

It is worth noticing that in Proposition 2.1, for  $D \geq 2$ , one can choose any decomposition  $Q^\ell = V^\ell (V^\ell)^\top$ . For convenience in what follows we choose the Cholesky decomposition where  $V^\ell = \psi(Q^\ell)$  is a lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal entries. This  $V^\ell$  is called Cholesky factor (or Cholesky square root). The Cholesky square root  $\psi$  is one to one and continuous from  $\mathcal{S}_D^+$  to its image.

When  $Q^\ell$  has a Wishart distribution the law of its Cholesky square root  $V^\ell$  is the so-called Bartlett distribution (see [Kshirsagar \(1959\)](#)). A lower triangular random matrix  $V^\ell$  is said to have a Bartlett distribution with  $N_\ell$  degrees of freedom and scale matrix  $\frac{1}{N_\ell}\mathbb{1}_D$  if

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{ii}^\ell & \text{ is such that } (V_{ii}^\ell)^2 \sim \text{Gamma}((N_\ell - i + 1)/2, N_\ell/2) \quad i = 1, \dots, D \\ V_{ki}^\ell & \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N_\ell^{-1}) \quad \text{for } D \geq k > i \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and all the elements are independent. For the Gamma distribution we use the shape-rate parametrization.

**Notation.** *The laws of the  $V^\ell$ 's clearly depend on  $N_\ell$ , so that one should more correctly write  $V^\ell = V^{\ell, N_\ell}$ . For the sake of simplicity, we will sometimes omit this dependence. The same observation holds also for  $Q^\ell$ . When it will be useful we shall write  $Q^{\ell, N_\ell}$  in place of  $Q^\ell$ .*

**2.3. Infinite-width infinite-depth asymptotic regime.** In the rest of the paper we shall consider the proportional infinite-width infinite-depth asymptotic regime in which we fix the input and the output dimension ( $N_0$  and  $N_{L+1} = D$ ) and we assume that both the number of layers and the number of neurons diverge, more precisely:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} N_1 = N_2 = \dots = N_L = N, \quad N \rightarrow +\infty, \\ L = L(N), \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} L(N) = L_\infty \leq +\infty, \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} L(N)/N = a, \quad 0 \leq a < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, in order to stress the fact that  $f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$  depends on  $N$ , we shall use the notation  $f_{L,N}(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$ .

Before considering the general case, we briefly review what happens in the so-called lazy-training infinite-width limit, that is, when  $L(N) = L$  is a constant and  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  (a special case of the previous setting with  $a = 0$ ). Since  $Q^{\ell, N} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_{j,\ell} \mathbf{Z}_{j,\ell}^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{Z}_{j,\ell}$  are independent standard Gaussian vectors, the law of large numbers yields that  $(Q^{\ell, N}, \dots, Q^{L, N})$  converges (in law) to  $(\mathbb{1}_D, \dots, \mathbb{1}_D)$ . Using the fact that the map  $(Q^\ell, \dots, Q^L) \mapsto V^L \dots V^1$  is continuous,  $V^L \dots V^1$  also converges in probability to  $\mathbb{1}_D$ . This gives the well-known NNGP infinite-width limit:

*If  $L$  is fixed as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$f_{L,N}(\mathbf{X}|\theta) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\sqrt{N_0 \lambda_L^*}} \mathbf{X},$$

*where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a  $D \times N_0$  matrix of independent standard normal random variables.*

Our main result is that this still holds if  $a = 0$ , but as soon as  $0 < a < +\infty$ , the asymptotic normality no longer holds, and the limit distribution becomes a non-trivial mixture of Gaussians.

By representation (4) it is apparent that the crucial point is to study the asymptotic distribution of the following product of random matrices

$$\bar{V}^{L,N} := V^{L,N} \dots V^{1,N}.$$

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

To introduce the main results and ideas, we begin by considering the simple case where  $D = 1$ . As recalled above, in this case the  $V^\ell$ 's in Proposition 2.1 are independent random variables distributed as the square root of a  $\text{Gamma}(N/2, N/2)$  random variable. Hence,  $\bar{V}^{L,N}$  is a scalar random variable and the prior distribution of the output is the same of the distribution of  $\bar{V}^{L,N} \mathbf{Z}(\sqrt{N_0 \lambda_L^*})^{-1} \mathbf{X}$  where  $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbb{1}_{N_0})$ .

In this case, it is very easy to describe the limiting distribution of  $\bar{V}^{L,N}$ . First of all one has

$$\bar{V}^{L,N} = \prod_{\ell=1}^L V^{\ell, N} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(Q^{\ell, N})\right)$$

where  $(V^{\ell, N})^2 = Q^{\ell, N}$  are independent  $\text{Gamma}(N/2, N/2)$  random variables.

By direct computations, one can show that for any real number  $s$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty, L/N \rightarrow a} \mathbf{E}[e^{\frac{s}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(Q^{\ell, N})}] = e^{\frac{a}{2} \frac{s^2}{2} - s \frac{a}{2}}.$$

The right hand side is the moment generating function of a Normal distribution, which shows that  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(Q^{\ell,N})$  converges in distribution to a normal random variable  $Z_\infty$ , with  $Z_\infty \sim \mathcal{N}(-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2})$  if  $a > 0$  and  $Z_\infty = 0$  if  $a = 0$ . Details are given in next Lemma 4.1. Using the continuous mapping theorem for convergence in distribution we obtain the next statement which is the one-dimensional version of our main result.

If  $D = 1$  and (6) holds, then  $\bar{V}^{L,N}$  converges in distribution to a log-normal random variable  $\bar{V}^\infty = \exp(Z_\infty)$  where  $Z_\infty \sim \mathcal{N}(-a/2, a/2)$ , with the convention  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0) = \delta_0$ . If in addition,  $\lambda_L^* \rightarrow \lambda_\infty^*$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , then

$$f_{L,N}(\mathbf{X}|\theta) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \bar{V}^\infty \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\sqrt{N_0 \lambda_\infty^*}} \mathbf{X}$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a vector of  $N_0$  independent standard normal random variables,  $\bar{V}^\infty$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  being independent.

The previous result shows that in the proportional infinite-width infinite-depth limit (6), provided that  $a > 0$ , the asymptotic prior is a non-degenerate mixture of Gaussians. This is essentially already known, and it is contained in equation (76) of Section B.2.1 in Hanin (2024), although Hanin (2024) deals only with the case of one input, i.e.  $P = 1$  and  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}_1$ .

Our main result is that this can be extended also to the more general case  $D > 1$  as well to the posterior distribution of the outputs, as we shall see in the next subsections.

**3.1. Prior asymptotics.** If  $a = 0$  in (6), the limit prior of the network is the same as in the NNGP regime, as shown in the next proposition.

**Proposition 3.1** (the case  $a = 0$  and  $D \geq 1$ ). *If (6) holds with  $a = 0$ , that is  $L/N \rightarrow 0$ , the sequence of random matrices  $\bar{V}^{L,N}$  converges in probability to the identity matrix. If in addition  $\lambda_L^* \rightarrow \lambda_\infty^*$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , then*

$$f_{L,N}(\mathbf{X}|\theta) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\sqrt{N_0 \lambda_\infty^*}} \mathbf{X},$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a  $D \times N_0$  matrix of independent standard normal random variables.

In order to describe the limit for  $a > 0$ , we introduce some additional notation. Let  $(W_t^{(i,j)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  and  $(W_t^{(k)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  with  $1 \leq j < i \leq D$  and  $k = 1, \dots, D$  be independent standard Brownian motions and set

$$(7) \quad Z_t^{(k)} := \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(k)} - \frac{k}{2} a t \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, D.$$

For  $1 \leq i < k \leq D$  and  $h = 1, \dots, k - i$ , set  $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}^h = \{\mathbf{r} = (r_0, \dots, r_h) : r_0 := i < r_1 < \dots < r_{h-1} < r_h := k\}$  and for  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,i}^h$  define the multiple stochastic integral

$$(8) \quad H(\mathbf{r}) := e^{\frac{a}{2} \ln(a) + Z_1^{(r_h)}} \int_0^1 e^{Z_{t_1}^{(r_0)} - Z_{t_1}^{(r_1)}} \int_{t_1}^1 e^{Z_{t_2}^{(r_1)} - Z_{t_2}^{(r_2)}} \dots \int_{t_{h-1}}^1 e^{Z_{t_h}^{(r_{h-1})} - Z_{t_h}^{(r_h)}} dW_{t_h}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})} \dots dW_{t_2}^{(r_2, r_1)} dW_{t_1}^{(r_1, r_0)},$$

(with the convention that  $t_0 = 0$  if  $h = 1$  and the multiple integral reduces to a single integral). The previous stochastic integrals are well-defined, see next Section 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 for details. Finally, introduce the random lower triangular matrix  $\bar{V}^\infty$  by

$$(9) \quad \bar{V}_{k,i}^\infty := \sum_{h=1}^{k-i} \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,i}^h} H(\mathbf{r}) \quad 1 \leq i < k \leq D$$

$$\bar{V}_{k,k}^\infty := e^{Z_1^{(k)}} \quad k = 1, \dots, D.$$

**Proposition 3.2** (the case  $a > 0$  and  $D \geq 1$ ). *Let  $D \geq 1$  and assume (6) with  $a > 0$ . Then as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$*

$$\bar{V}^{L,N} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \bar{V}^\infty.$$

If in addition  $\lambda_L^* \rightarrow \lambda_\infty^*$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , then

$$f_{L,N}(\mathbf{X}|\theta) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \bar{V}^\infty \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\sqrt{N_0 \lambda^*}} \mathbf{X},$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a  $D \times N_0$  matrix of independent standard normal random variables,  $\bar{V}^\infty$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  being independent.

**3.2. Posterior asymptotics.** In a supervised learning problem one has a training set  $\{\mathbf{x}_\mu, \mathbf{y}_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^P$ , where each  $\mathbf{x}_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$  has the corresponding labels (response)  $\mathbf{y}_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^D$ . Setting  $\mathbf{S}_\mu := f_L(\mathbf{x}_\mu|\theta)$  for  $\mu = 1, \dots, P$ , the prior over the outputs is the law under (3) of  $\{\mathbf{S}_\mu; \mu = 1, \dots, P\}$ . In order to perform Bayesian learning for the network parameters, or directly for the network outputs, one requires a *likelihood for the labels given the inputs and the outputs*, which we will denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P)$ . In probabilistic terms, the function

$$(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P)$$

represents the conditional density of the response given the inputs  $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_P = \mathbf{s}_P$ . For example, in analogy to a network trained with a quadratic loss function, one can consider a Gaussian likelihood

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P) \propto e^{-\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{\mu=1}^P \|\mathbf{s}_\mu - \mathbf{y}_\mu\|^2},$$

with  $\beta > 0$ . Note that this corresponds to assume the error model:

$$\mathbf{y}_\mu = \mathbf{S}_\mu + \varepsilon_\mu = f_L(\mathbf{x}_\mu|\theta) + \varepsilon_\mu \quad \varepsilon_\mu \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \beta^{-1} \mathbf{1}_D).$$

The core of Bayesian learning is captured by the posterior distribution of  $f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$ , i.e. the conditional distribution of  $f_L(\mathbf{X}|\theta)$  given  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P]$ . To cover a slightly more general situation, it is convenient to introduce an additional input  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and the corresponding output  $f_L(\mathbf{x}_0|\theta)$ , which represents the output of the test set or the output of a new data input. Hence, while  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P]$  are available,  $\mathbf{y}_0$  is not observed. If one sets  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_P] = [\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}]$ , then the collection of all the outputs is the  $D(P+1)$  matrix  $f_{L,N}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}|\theta)$  defined in (2) with  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

In what follows, it is useful to transform the random matrix  $f_{L,N}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}|\theta)$  in a vector, defining  $\mathbf{S}_{N,0:P} = \text{vec}[f_{L,N}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}|\theta)]$ , where  $\text{vec}[A]$  is the operation of stacking the columns of matrix  $A$  into a column vector. From now on,  $P_{N,\text{prior}}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  denotes the (prior) distribution of  $\mathbf{S}_{N,0:P}$ , that is by Proposition 2.1

$$P_{N,\text{prior}}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{Law}((N_0 \lambda_L^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\bar{V}^{L,N} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]).$$

Moreover, Proposition 3.2 (applied to the input  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{X}$ ) states that, if (6) holds and  $\lambda_L^* \rightarrow \lambda_\infty^*$ , then  $P_{N,\text{prior}}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  converges weakly to

$$P_{\infty,\text{prior}}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) := \mathbf{Law}\left((N_0 \lambda_\infty^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[V^\infty \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]\right).$$

Assuming that the likelihood is bounded and continuous, this convergence easily translates from prior to posterior. This follows noticing that the joint posterior distribution of  $\mathbf{S}_{N,0:P}$  is by Bayes theorem

$$(11) \quad P_{N,\text{post}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P} | \mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \propto \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_{1:P}) P_{N,\text{prior}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P} | \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_{0:P} = \text{vec}[\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P]$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_{1:P} = \text{vec}[\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P]$  for  $\mathbf{s}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, P$ . We are assuming that, conditionally on  $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_N$ , the distribution of the labels is independent from  $\mathbf{S}_0$ .

Proposition 3.2 gives immediately the next result.

**Proposition 3.3.** *If  $\mathbf{s}_{1:P} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_{1:P})$  is a bounded and continuous function, (6) holds and  $\lambda_L^* \rightarrow \lambda_\infty^*$ , then  $P_{N,\text{post}}(\cdot | \mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  converges weakly to*

$$(12) \quad P_{\infty,\text{post}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P} | \mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}_{1:P}) P_{\infty,\text{prior}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P} | \tilde{\mathbf{X}})}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{D(P+1)}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P | \mathbf{s}) P_{\infty,\text{prior}}(d\mathbf{s} | \tilde{\mathbf{X}})}.$$

Marginalizing one obtains the posterior distribution of  $f_L(\mathbf{x}_0|\theta)$  and the corresponding asymptotic result. Indeed, the posterior predictive is the law of  $\mathbf{S}_0 = f_L(\mathbf{x}_0|\theta)$  given  $\mathbf{Y}$ , easily obtained by

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{N,\text{pred}}(d\mathbf{s}_0|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{DP}} P_{N,\text{post}}(d\mathbf{s}_0 d\mathbf{s}_1 \cdots d\mathbf{s}_P|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \\ &\propto \int_{\mathbb{R}^{DP}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_P|\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P) P_{N,\text{prior}}(d\mathbf{s}_0 d\mathbf{s}_1 \cdots d\mathbf{s}_P|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \end{aligned}$$

where the integrals are taken only with respect to the variables  $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_P$ .

**3.3. Explicit expression of the asymptotic posterior under a gaussian likelihood.** If the Gaussian likelihood (10) is assumed, both the posterior (11) and the asymptotic posterior (12) turn out to be mixtures of normal distributions.

For the sake of simplicity, in this section we assume that  $\lambda_L^* = \lambda_\infty^* = 1$ . As for the prior is concerned, standard manipulation of matrix normal random variables (see (P1) and (P2) in Appendix A), shows that the conditional distribution of  $N_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\bar{V}^{L,N} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$  given  $\bar{V}^{L,N}$  is a normal distribution with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance  $N_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \bar{Q}^{L,N}$  where

$$\bar{Q}^{L,N} := \bar{V}^{L,N} (\bar{V}^{L,N})^\top$$

and  $A \otimes B$  is the Kroneker product of matrices  $A$  and  $B$ . Since  $\mathbf{S}_{N,0:P} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} N_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\bar{V}^{L,N} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$ , one has

$$P_{N,\text{prior}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\mathbf{0}, N_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes Q) \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ)$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}_{L,N}$  is the law of  $\bar{Q}^{L,N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot|\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{C})$  denotes the distribution of a multivariate normal random vector with mean  $\mathbf{m}$  and covariance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ . The same result holds for the limit  $N_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\bar{V}^\infty \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$  with

$$\bar{Q}^\infty := \bar{V}^\infty (\bar{V}^\infty)^\top$$

in place of  $\bar{Q}^{L,N}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty(\cdot)$ , which is the law of  $\bar{Q}^\infty$ , in place of  $\mathcal{Q}_{L,N}$ .

Assuming the gaussian likelihood (10), if  $\mathbf{y}_{1:P} = \text{vec}[\mathbf{Y}]$ , the posterior distribution  $P_{N,\text{post}}$  is

$$(14) \quad P_{N,\text{post}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \propto e^{-\frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{s}_{1:P} - \mathbf{y}_{1:P}\|^2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\mathbf{0}, N_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes Q) \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ).$$

Simple (but long) computations show that also  $P_{N,\text{post}}$  is mixture of multivariate normal distributions. Exactly the same considerations hold for  $P_{\infty,\text{post}}(\cdot|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ .

In order to fully describe these mixtures, we need some additional notation. Given  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}]$ , define the functions  $\Sigma : \mathcal{S}_D^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{D(P+1)}^+$  and  $\Sigma^* : \mathcal{S}_D^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{D(P+1)}^+$  by

$$(15) \quad \Sigma(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{00}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) & \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \Sigma_{01}^\top(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) & \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{N_0} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_0^\top \mathbf{x}_0 \otimes Q & \mathbf{x}_0^\top \mathbf{X} \otimes Q \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{x}_0 \otimes Q^\top & \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \otimes Q \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) := \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{00}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) & \Sigma_{01}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \Sigma_{01}^{*\top}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) & \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &:= \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^{-1} \\ \Sigma_{00}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &:= \Sigma_{00}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) - \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^-(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \left( \mathbb{1}_{DP} - \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^-(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right) \Sigma_{01}^\top(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \Sigma_{01}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &:= \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^-(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \end{aligned}$$



and  $\Sigma_{11}^-$  is the Moore-Penrose inverse of  $\Sigma_{11}$ . Given  $\mathbf{y}_{1:P}$ , introduce also the functions  $\mathbf{m}^* : \mathcal{S}_D^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{D(P+1)}$  and  $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_D^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \beta \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^-(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{y}_{1:p} \\ \beta \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{y}_{1:p} \end{pmatrix} \\ \Psi(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) &:= \beta \mathbf{y}_{1:P}^\top (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{1:P} + \log(\det(\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, define the probability measure

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) := \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Psi(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ)}{\int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Psi(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ)}$$

and  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$  be defined as above with  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty$  in place of  $\mathcal{Q}_{L,N}$ . We are now in a position to write the explicit expression of the posterior distribution.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Assume (10),  $\lambda_L^* = 1$  and hence  $\lambda_\infty^* = 1$ , then*

$$P_{N,\text{post}}(ds_{0:P}|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} \mathcal{N}(ds_{0:P} | \mathbf{m}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}), \Sigma^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

and

$$P_{\infty,\text{post}}(ds_{0:P}|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} \mathcal{N}(ds_{0:P} | \mathbf{m}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}), \Sigma^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) \mathcal{Q}_\infty(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}).$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(\cdot|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty(\cdot|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$  are the posterior distributions of  $\bar{Q}^{L,N}$  and  $\bar{Q}^\infty$  given  $\mathbf{y}_{1:p}$ .

For a detailed derivation of the previous expression one can follow the same line of the proof of Proposition 12 in Bassetti et al. (2024). For the sake of completeness we report the full derivation in Appendix C.

From the previous proposition it follows that the weak limit of  $P_{N,\text{pred}}(ds^0|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  is

$$P_{\infty,\text{pred}}(ds_0|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} \mathcal{N}(ds_0 | \mathbf{m}_0^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}), \Sigma_{00}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) \mathcal{Q}_\infty(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

where  $\mathbf{m}_0^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) := \beta \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^-(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma_{11}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{y}_{1:p}$ .

**Remark 1.** *When  $\det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) > 0$  both  $P_{N,\text{prior}}(\cdot|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  and  $P_{\infty,\text{prior}}(\cdot|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  have a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. To see this, observe that  $\det(V^{\ell,N}) > 0$  almost surely for any  $\ell$ , which yields that  $\det(\bar{V}^{L,N}) > 0$  and hence  $\det(\bar{Q}^{L,N}) > 0$ . Similarly, by (9), one has  $\det(\bar{V}^\infty) > 0$  with probability one, and hence also  $\det(\bar{Q}^\infty) > 0$ . In summary, both  $\bar{Q}^{L,N}$  and  $\bar{Q}^\infty$  are strictly positive definite with probability one. Hence, if  $\det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) > 0$ , using  $\det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \bar{Q}^{L,N}) = \det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^D \det(\bar{Q}^{L,N})^P$ , one gets that also  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \bar{Q}^{L,N}$  is strictly positive definite with probability one. Analogously, one gets that  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \bar{Q}^\infty$  is strictly positive definite with probability one. In addition, as a consequence of what mentioned above, from (11) and (12) one immediately gets that also  $P_{N,\text{post}}(\cdot|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  and  $P_{\infty,\text{post}}(\cdot|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  are absolutely continuous. Moreover,  $\Sigma_{11}^- = \Sigma_{11}^{-1}$  and some simplifications in the expression of  $\Sigma^*$  and  $\mathbf{m}$  occur. In particular*

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{01}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &= \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^{-1}, \\ \Sigma_{00}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) &= \Sigma_{00}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) - \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^{-1} \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})^\top \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{m}_0^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \beta \Sigma_{01}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{1:p}.$$

A few comments are in order. If  $a = 0$ , for example in the NNGP regime, the limit of the prior over the outputs is

$$P_{\infty,\text{prior}}(\cdot|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{Law}\left(N_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\mathbf{Z}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}]\right),$$

which is the same of saying that  $\bar{V}^\infty = \bar{Q}^\infty = \mathbb{1}_D$  and hence  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty = \delta_{\mathbb{1}_D}$ . This yields that the posterior  $P_{\infty,\text{post}}(\cdot|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  is a multivariate normal distribution and not a mixture of normal



distributions. As a consequence, when  $a = 0$ , the covariance is given by  $\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}}{N_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_D$ , which is completely independent of the data labels  $\mathbf{y}_{1:P}$ 's. Furthermore, the output components are independent. In contrast, when  $a > 0$ , the covariance of the outputs is

$$\text{Cov} \left( N_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{vec}[\bar{V}^{L,N} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}] \middle| \mathbf{y}_{1:p} \right) = \int_{S_D^+} \left( \Sigma^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \mathbf{m}^*(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \mathbf{m}^{*\top}(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \right) \mathcal{Q}_\infty(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

where the posterior  $\mathcal{Q}_\infty(dQ|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$  explicitly depends on  $\mathbf{y}_{1:P}$  through  $\Psi(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$ , see (16). The dependence of the covariance on the labels shows a learning process which is absent in the NNGP infinite-width limit. Moreover, in the proportional limit, the output are not independent. In this sense, the proportional limit is closer to finite network behaviour than the infinite-width setting.

#### 4. PROOFS.

**4.1. Preliminary computations and proof of Proposition 3.1.** For  $k \geq i$  the  $(k, i)$ -element of the (lower triangular) product matrix  $\bar{V}^{L,N} = V^L \dots V^1$  is

$$(17) \quad \bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N} = \sum_{i \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_{L-1} \leq k} V_{j_1,i}^1 V_{j_2,j_1}^2 \dots V_{k,j_{L-1}}^L$$

and, in particular, the diagonal elements are

$$(18) \quad \bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N} = V_{r,r}^1 V_{r,r}^2 \dots V_{r,r}^L = e^{\sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(V_{r,r}^\ell)}.$$

We first consider the diagonal elements.

**Lemma 4.1.** *If (6) holds, as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$*

$$(\bar{V}_{1,1}^{L,N}, \dots, \bar{V}_{D,D}^{L,N}) \xrightarrow{\text{law}} (e^{Z_1}, \dots, e^{Z_D})$$

with  $Z_1, \dots, Z_D$  independent and  $Z_r \sim \mathcal{N}(-ar/2, a/2)$  ( $r = 1, \dots, D$ ), with the convention  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0) = \delta_0$ .

*Proof.* If  $X = \log(G)$  where  $G \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ , it is not difficult so see that

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{E}[e^{sX}] = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + s)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \beta^{-s} \quad s > -\alpha.$$

Moreover,

$$(20) \quad \Gamma(x + \alpha)/\Gamma(x) = x^\alpha (1 + \alpha(\alpha - 1)/2x + O(x^{-2})) \quad \text{for } x \rightarrow +\infty,$$

see, e.g., [Tricomi and Erdélyi \(1951\)](#). Recalling (5),  $(V_{r,r}^{\ell,N})^2 \sim \text{Gamma}((N - r + 1)/2, N/2)$ , so that by (19) and (20) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[e^{s \log(\bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N})}] &= \mathbf{E}[e^{s \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{2} \log((V_{r,r}^{\ell,N})^2)}] = \left( \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N-r+1}{2} + \frac{s}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N-r+1}{2})} \left( \frac{2}{N} \right)^{\frac{s}{2}} \right)^L \\ &= \left( 1 - \frac{r-1}{N} \right)^L \left( 1 + \frac{s(s-2)}{4(N-r+1)} + O(N^{-2}) \right)^L. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{E}[e^{s \log(\bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N})}] = \exp \left\{ \frac{a s^2}{2} - s \frac{ra}{2} \right\} = \mathbf{E}[e^{sZ_r}].$$

Since  $\bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N} = \exp(\log(\bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N}))$ , the thesis follows by the continuous mapping theorem and the independence of the  $\bar{V}_{r,r}^{L,N}$ 's.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *For  $N > D$  and for  $1 \leq i < k \leq D$  one has  $\mathbf{E}[\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N}] = 0$  and, for  $i < k \leq D$ ,*

$$\mathbf{Var}(\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N}) = \mathbf{E}[(\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N})^2] \leq \sum_{m=1}^{k-i} \frac{1}{N^m} \binom{L}{m} \binom{k-i-1}{m-1}.$$

Hence, if (6) holds, then  $\sup_{k=1,\dots,D,i<k,N>D} \mathbf{E}[(\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N})^2] < +\infty$  and, if (6) holds with  $a = 0$ , then  $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{E}[(\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N})^2] = 0$ .

*Proof.* By independence  $\mathbf{E}[\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N}] = \sum_{k \geq j_{L-1} \cdots \geq j_1 \geq i} \mathbf{E}[V_{k,j_{L-1}}^L] \cdots \mathbf{E}[V_{j_1,i}^1] = 0$  since  $\mathbf{E}[V_{j,j'}^\ell] = 0$  for  $j \neq j'$ , and in any sequence  $j_L := k \geq j_{L-1} \cdots \geq j_1 \geq i =: j_0$  there is at least one  $(j_{\ell+1}, j_\ell)$  with  $j_{\ell+1} \neq j_\ell$ , since  $k > i$ . Now write  $\mathbf{j}^{(r)} = (j_1^{(r)}, j_2^{(r)}, \dots, j_{L-1}^{(r)})$  with  $k \geq j_{L-1}^{(r)} \cdots \geq j_1^{(r)} \geq i$  for  $r = 1, 2$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[(\bar{V}_{k,i}^{L,N})^2] &= \sum_{\mathbf{j}^{(1)}, \mathbf{j}^{(2)}} \mathbf{E}[V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(1)}}^L V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(2)}}^L \cdots V_{j_1^{(1)},i}^1 V_{j_1^{(2)},i}^1] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{j}^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{j}^{(2)}} \mathbf{E}[V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(1)}}^L V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(2)}}^L] \mathbf{E}[V_{j_{L-1}^{(1)},j_{L-2}^{(1)}}^{L-1} V_{j_{L-1}^{(2)},j_{L-2}^{(2)}}^{L-1}] \cdots \mathbf{E}[V_{j_1^{(1)},i}^1 V_{j_1^{(2)},i}^1] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{j}^{(1)}} \mathbf{E}[(V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(1)}}^L)^2] \cdots \mathbf{E}[(V_{j_1^{(1)},i}^1)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that the  $V_{i_1,i_2}^\ell$ 's are independent and that  $\mathbf{E}[V_{i_1,i_2}^\ell] = 0$  if  $i_1 \neq i_2$ , one can check that if  $\mathbf{j}^{(1)} \neq \mathbf{j}^{(2)}$  then

$$\mathbf{E}[V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(1)}}^L V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(2)}}^L] \cdots \mathbf{E}[V_{j_1^{(1)},i}^1 V_{j_1^{(2)},i}^1] = 0.$$

Now,  $\mathbf{E}[(V_{r,r}^\ell)^2] = (N - r + 1)/N \leq 1$  and  $\mathbf{E}[(V_{j,j'}^\ell)^2] = 1/N$  if  $j > j'$ . Hence, given  $\mathbf{j}^{(1)}$ , if  $m$  is the number of pairs  $(j_r^{(1)}, j_{r+1}^{(1)})$  for which  $j_r^{(1)} \neq j_{r+1}^{(1)}$ , one has that

$$\mathbf{E}[(V_{k,j_{L-1}^{(1)}}^L)^2] \cdots \mathbf{E}[(V_{j_1^{(1)},i}^1)^2] \leq N^{-m}.$$

The thesis follows by simple combinatorics.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* When  $L(N)/N \rightarrow 0$ , by Lemma 4.1

$$(\bar{V}_{1,1}^{L,N}, \dots, \bar{V}_{D,D}^{L,N}) \xrightarrow{P} (1, \dots, 1).$$

From Lemma 4.2 the off-diagonal elements converge to zero in probability since  $\mathbf{Var}(\bar{V}_{k,j}^{L,N})$  converges to 0 for  $k > j$ . The second part of the proof follows combining Proposition 2.1 and the continuous mapping theorem.  $\square$

**4.2. Skorohod representation.** With reference to (5), in what follows we shall use a special representation of the random elements  $V_{i,j}^\ell = V_{i,j}^{\ell,N}$  with  $L \geq i \geq j \geq 1$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ .

Since we deal only with convergence in distribution, we can choose any representation of these random variables. For given random Bartlett matrices  $[V_{i,j}^{\ell,N}]_{i \geq j}$  with  $\ell = 1, \dots, L(N)$ , set

$$(21) \quad S_0^{(N,r)} = 0, \quad S_m^{(N,r)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \log(V_{r,r}^{\ell,N}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \log((V_{r,r}^{\ell,N})^2) \quad m = 1, \dots, L$$

$$\text{and } Z_t^{(N,r)} := S_{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)} \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Assume (6). On a suitable (complete) probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , there is an array  $[V^{\ell,N}]_{\ell=1,\dots,L=L(N), N \geq D+1}$  such that*

- (A) *for each given  $N$ ,  $V^{1,N}, \dots, V^{L,N}$  are independent lower triangular  $D \times D$  random Bartlett matrices. In particular,  $(V_{r,r}^{\ell,N})^2 \sim \text{Gamma}((N - r + 1)/2, N/2)$ , and the  $V_{r,r}^{\ell,N}$ 's are independent for  $r = 1, \dots, D$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, L(N)$  ( $N \geq D + 1$  fixed);*
- (B) *for  $1 \leq j < i \leq D$  and  $N \geq D + 1$*

$$V_{i,j}^{\ell,N} := \sqrt{\frac{L}{N}} \left( W_{\ell/L}^{(i,j)} - W_{(\ell-1)/L}^{(i,j)} \right)$$

where  $(W_t^{(i,j)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  are independent Brownian motions;

(C) if  $(Z_t^{(N,r)})_t$  are defined in (21), one has

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| Z_t^{(N,r)} - \left( \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r)} - \frac{r}{2} at \right) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

for  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ , where  $(W_t^{(r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  are independent Brownian motions;

(D) all the Brownian motions  $(W_t^{(i,j)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  and  $(W_t^{(r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  with  $D \geq i > j \geq 1$  and  $r = 1, \dots, D$  are independent.

*Proof.* The only nontrivial part of the previous proposition is point (C), which it is proved below. Let  $D[0,1]$  be the space of all functions on  $[0,1]$  that are right-continuous with left-hand limits (rcll) equipped with the sup norm  $\|X\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|X_t\|$  and the  $\sigma$ -field generated by all evaluation maps  $X \mapsto X_t$ .

For any  $r = 1, \dots, D$ , let  $[\tilde{G}_{\ell,r}^N]_{\ell,N}$  be an array of random variables such that  $\tilde{G}_{\ell,r}^N \sim \text{Gamma}((N-r+1)/2, N/2)$ , with  $[\tilde{G}_{\ell,r}^N]_{\ell,N}$  independent in  $r$  and  $\ell$  for any  $N$ . Set

$$(22) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_0^{(N,r)} &= 0, \quad \tilde{S}_m^{(N,r)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \log(\tilde{G}_{N,r}^\ell) \quad m = 1, \dots, L \\ \text{and } \tilde{Z}_t^{(N,r)} &:= \tilde{S}_{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)} \quad t \in [0,1]. \end{aligned}$$

If  $X = \log(G)$  where  $G \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ , then

$$(23) \quad \mathbf{E}[X] = \Psi(\alpha) - \log(\beta),$$

where  $\Psi(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \log(\Gamma(x))$  is the digamma function. By (23)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t^{(N,r)} &= \mathbf{E} \left[ \tilde{S}_{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[ \tilde{Z}_t^{(N,r)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}{L} \frac{L}{N} N (\Psi((N-r+1)/2) - \ln(N/2)). \end{aligned}$$

Using the asymptotic  $\Psi(x) = \ln(x) - (2x)^{-1} + O(x^{-2})$ , the fact that  $\frac{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}{L} \rightarrow t$  and  $L/N \rightarrow a$ , one gets

$$(24) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mu_t^{(N,r)} + \frac{t}{2} ar| = 0.$$

The sequence of processes  $(\tilde{S}_{0, \lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)})_{t \in [0,1]} = (\tilde{S}_{\lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)} - \mu_t^{(N,r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  is a sequence of random walk with zero means. Noticing that  $\log(\tilde{V}_{r,r}^{L,N}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \tilde{S}_L^{(N,r)} = \tilde{Z}_1^{(N,r)}$ , if (6) holds, then Lemma 4.1 yields that

$$\tilde{S}_L^{(N,r)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} Z_r,$$

where  $Z_r \sim \mathcal{N}(-ar/2, a/2)$ . Combining this fact with (24), one has that  $\tilde{S}_{0, \lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)}$  converges in law to a  $\mathcal{N}(0, a/2)$ . By a suitable version of the strong approximation of random walks (see, e.g, Thm. 12.20 in Kallenberg (1997)) one can build a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and a sequence of rcll processes  $(Z_{0,t}^{(r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with the same law of  $(\tilde{S}_{0, \lfloor Lt \rfloor}^{(N,r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  such that

$$(25) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z_{0,t}^{(r)} - \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r)}| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where  $(W_t^{(r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $[0,1]$  defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ . This construction can be done on the same  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  independently for all  $r = 1, \dots, D$ , in such a way that  $(Z_{0,t}^{(r)}, W_t^{(r)})_t$  are independent. Defining  $Z_t^{(N,r)} = Z_{0,t}^{(r)} + \mu_t^{(N,r)}$ , then  $(Z_t^{(N,r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  has the same law of the process  $(\tilde{Z}_t^{(N,r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  in  $D[0,1]$ . Combining (24) and (25) one gets also  $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z_t^{(N,r)} - (\sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r)} - \frac{r}{2} at)| \rightarrow 0$  in probability for  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ . To conclude it suffices to define

$$V_{r,r}^{N,\ell} = \exp((Z_{\ell/L}^{(N,r)} - Z_{(\ell-1)/L}^{(N,r)})) \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L.$$

Indeed, one has that, for any  $N \geq D + 1$ ,  $[V_{r,r}^{N,\ell}]_{\ell,r}$  are independent since  $(Z_t^{(N,r)})_t$  and  $(\tilde{Z}_t^{(N,r)})_t$  have the same law and  $\tilde{Z}_{\ell/L}^{(N,r)} - \tilde{Z}_{(\ell-1)/L}^{(N,r)}$  are independent for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ . Moreover,

$$(V_{r,r}^{N,\ell})^2 \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \exp(2(\tilde{Z}_{\ell/L}^{(N,r)} - \tilde{Z}_{(\ell-1)/L}^{(N,r)})) = \tilde{G}_{\ell,r}^N \sim \text{Gamma}((N-r+1)/2, N/2),$$

and this concludes the proof of (C).  $\square$

**4.3. Filtrations.** In what follows we shall need to use the processes  $(W_t^{(i,j)})_t$  appearing in (B) of Proposition 4.3 as stochastic integrator, that is we shall need to define  $\int_0^t X_s dW_s^{(i,j)}$  with  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  for suitable processes  $(X_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ . One case has already been encountered, see the definition of  $H(\mathbf{r})$  in (8). To define the stochastic integral we need to specify a filtration and check the relative measurability conditions for the process  $(X_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ . In point of fact the integrands  $(X_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  will depend on the variables  $V_{r,r}^{N,\ell}$ , the other Brownian motions  $(W_t^{(r)})_t$  and some of the  $(W_t^{(i',j')})_t$  for  $(i',j') \neq (i,j)$  in a specific way, again see (8). In order to guarantee that the processes  $(X_t)_t$  are progressively measurable all the processes we shall need to integrate will be continuous or right (left)-continuous, hence in order to check that they are progressively measurable it will be enough that they are adapted, see Lemma B.1. To this end we need to build in an appropriate way suitable right continuous and complete filtrations  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^{(i,j)}$ .

In what follows, if  $\mathcal{H}_i$  with  $i \in I$  are  $\sigma$ -fields we denote by  $\vee_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}_i$  the smallest  $\sigma$ -field which contains  $\cup_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}_i$ . For any filtration  $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{H}_\infty = \vee_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{H}_t$  the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . Moreover, if  $(W_t)_t$  is a Brownian motion we denote by  $(\mathcal{F}_t^W)_t$  its natural filtration.

Define

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \sigma(V_{r,r}^{N,\ell} : \ell = 1, \dots, L(N), r = 1, \dots, D, N > D) \bigvee \left( \bigvee_{r=1}^D \mathcal{F}_\infty^{W^{(r)}} \right).$$

For  $r = D - 1, \dots, 1$  define

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{(D,r)} = \mathcal{H}_0 \bigvee \mathcal{F}_t^{W^{(D,r)}}, \quad \mathcal{N}^{(D,r)} = \{N \subset \Omega : \exists A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty^{(D,r)} : N \subset A : P(A) = 0\}$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^{(D,r)} = \mathcal{F}_t^{(D,r)} \bigvee \mathcal{N}^{(D,r)}.$$

Iteratively, for  $r_2 = D - 1, \dots, 2$  and, given  $r_2$ , for  $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq D - 1$ , define

$$\mathcal{G}^{(r_2,r_1)} = \bigvee_{r_2 \leq q < p \leq D} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_\infty^{(p,q)} \supset \mathcal{G}_0, \quad \mathcal{F}_t^{(r_2,r_1)} = \mathcal{F}_t^{W^{(r_2,r_1)}} \bigvee \mathcal{G}^{(r_2,r_1)},$$

$$\mathcal{N}^{(r_2,r_1)} = \{N \subset \Omega : \exists A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty^{(r_2,r_1)} : N \subset A : P(A) = 0\}$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^{(r_2,r_1)} = \mathcal{F}_t^{(r_2,r_1)} \bigvee \mathcal{N}^{(r_2,r_1)}.$$

Using Lemma B.4 and Lemma B.1 one obtains the next result.

**Lemma 4.4.** *For any  $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq D$ ,  $((W_t^{(r_2,r_1)})_{t \in [0,1]}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^{(r_2,r_1)})_{t \in [0,1]})$  are standard Brownian motions. Moreover, all the integrals in (8) are well-defined.*

**4.4. Proof of Proposition 3.2.** We start from re-writing in a more convenient way (17). To this end, if  $\mathbf{j} = (j_0, j_1, \dots, j_L)$  is a vector of integers such that  $j_0 := i \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_L = k$ , define  $h = h(\mathbf{j})$  to be the number of  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  such that  $j_\ell \neq j_{\ell-1}$  and let

$$r_0 := i < r_1 < \dots < r_{h-1} < r_h := k$$

be the  $h + 1$  distinct values in  $\mathbf{j} = (j_0, \dots, j_L)$ . For  $s = 0, \dots, h$  set also

$$m_s = \#\{\ell = 1, \dots, L : (j_\ell, j_{\ell-1}) = (r_s, r_s)\}.$$

Note that  $m_0 + m_1 + \dots + m_h = L - h$ . Finally set  $n_0 = 0$  and for  $j = 1, \dots, h + 1$

$$n_j = \sum_{s=0}^{j-1} m_s + j = n_{j-1} + m_{j-1} + 1$$

in other words,  $n_0 = 0, n_1 = m_0 + 1, n_2 = m_0 + m_1 + 2, \dots$ . Note that  $n_h = L - m_h$  and  $n_{h+1} = L + 1$ . For example, let  $L = 5, i = 1, k = 4$  and  $(j_0, j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4, j_5) = (1, 1, 3, 3, 3, 4)$ . This corresponds to

$$V_{1,1}^1 V_{3,1}^2 V_{3,3}^3 V_{3,3}^4 V_{4,3}^5$$

and here  $h = 2, r_0 = 1 < r_1 = 3 < r_2 = 4, m_0 = 1, m_1 = 2, m_2 = 0$ .

With this notation one can write

$$\begin{aligned} V_{j_1, j_0}^1 \cdots V_{j_L, j_{L-1}}^L &= \left( \prod_{j=1}^h \left( \prod_{\ell=n_{j-1}+1}^{n_j-1} V_{r_{j-1}, r_{j-1}}^\ell \right) V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \right) \prod_{\ell=n_{h+1}}^L V_{r_h, r_h}^\ell \\ &= \left( \prod_{j=1}^{h+1} \prod_{\ell=n_{j-1}+1}^{n_j-1} V_{r_{j-1}, r_{j-1}}^\ell \right) \left( \prod_{j=1}^h V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (21), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} V_{j_1, j_0}^1 \cdots V_{j_L, j_{L-1}}^L &= e^{\sum_{j=1}^{h+1} \sum_{\ell=n_{j-1}+1}^{n_j-1} \frac{1}{2} \log((V_{r, r}^\ell)^2)} \prod_{j=1}^h V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \\ &= e^{\sum_{j=0}^h (S_{n_{j+1}-1}^{(N, r_j)} - S_{n_j}^{(N, r_j)})} \prod_{j=1}^h V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \\ &= e^{S_L^{(N, r_h)} + \sum_{j=1}^h (S_{n_{j-1}}^{(N, r_{j-1})} - S_{n_j}^{(N, r_j)})} \prod_{j=1}^h V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \\ &= \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)} + \sum_{j=1}^h (Z_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(N, r_{j-1})} - Z_{n_j/L}^{(N, r_j)})} \prod_{j=1}^h V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} \\ &= \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \prod_{j=1}^h e^{(Z_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(N, r_{j-1})} - Z_{n_j/L}^{(N, r_j)})} \left( W_{n_j/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} - W_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that

$$V_{r_j, r_{j-1}}^{n_j} = \sqrt{\frac{L}{N}} \left( W_{n_j/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} - W_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} \right)$$

where  $(W_t^{(r_j, r_{j-1})})_{t \in [0, 1]}$  are the independent standard Brownian motions of Proposition 4.3.

Setting  $\mathcal{R}_{k, i}^h = \{\mathbf{r} = (r_0, \dots, r_h) : r_0 := i < r_1 < \dots < r_{h-1} < r_h := k\}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{L, h} = \{\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_h) \in \mathbb{N}^h : 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_h \leq L\}$  and

$$I^L(r_j, n_j) = e^{(Z_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(N, r_{j-1})} - Z_{n_j/L}^{(N, r_j)})} \left( W_{n_j/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} - W_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} \right)$$

one can write

$$\bar{V}_{k, i}^{L, N} = \sum_{i \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_{L-1} \leq k} V_{j_1, i}^1 V_{j_2, j_1}^1 \cdots V_{k, j_{L-1}}^L = \sum_{h=1}^{k-i} \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{k, i}^h} \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{L, h}} \prod_{j=1}^h I^L(r_j, n_j).$$

We now consider the inner part of the sum:

$$\begin{aligned} H_L(\mathbf{r}) &:= \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{k, i}^h} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{L, h}} \prod_{j=1}^h I^L(r_j, n_j) \\ &= \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \sum_{n_1=1}^{L-(h-1)} I^L(r_1, n_1) \sum_{n_2=n_1+1}^{L-(h-2)} I^L(r_2, n_2) \cdots \sum_{n_h=n_{h-1}+1}^L I^L(r_h, n_h). \end{aligned}$$

It is plain to check that

$$H_L(\mathbf{r}) = \left( \frac{L}{N} \right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \Psi_1^L(0; \mathbf{r})$$

where, given  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_h)$ , the functions  $\Psi_j^L(n_{j-1}; \mathbf{r})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, h$  are defined by the backward recursion:

for  $n_{h-1} = h - 1, \dots, L - 1$

$$\Psi_h^L(n_{h-1}; \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n_h=n_{h-1}+1}^L I^L(r_h, n_h)$$

for  $j = h - 1, \dots, 2$  and  $n_{j-1} = j - 1, \dots, L - (h - j) - 1$

$$\Psi_j^L(n_{j-1}; \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n_j=n_{j-1}+1}^{L-(h-j)} I^L(r_j, n_j) \Psi_{j+1}^L(n_j; \mathbf{r})$$

and

$$\Psi_1^L(0; \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n_1=1}^{L-(h-1)} I^L(r_1, n_1) \Psi_2^L(n_1).$$

We now express  $H_L(\mathbf{r})$  as a multiple stochastic integral. To this end define

$$g_{j,\mathbf{r},N}(t) := e^{Z_t^{(N,r_{j-1})} - Z_{(t+1/L) \wedge 1}^{(N,r_j)}} \quad (j = 1, \dots, h).$$

Note that

$$I^L(r_h, n_h) = e^{(Z_{(n_h-1)/L}^{(N,r_{h-1})} - Z_{n_h/L}^{(N,r_h)})} \left( W_{n_j/L}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})} - W_{(n_j-1)/L}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})} \right) = \int_{(n_h-1)/L}^{n_h/L} g_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(t_h) dW_{t_h}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})}.$$

Hence, if

$$\mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) := \int_{\tau \wedge 1}^1 g_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(t_h) dW_{t_h}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})}$$

then

$$\Psi_h^L(n_{h-1}; \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n_h=n_{h-1}+1}^L \int_{(n_h-1)/L}^{n_h/L} g_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(t_h) dW_{t_h}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})} = \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(n_{h-1}/L).$$

Using this relation one can write

$$\begin{aligned} I^L(r_{h-1}, n_{h-1}) \Psi_h^L(n_{h-1}; \mathbf{r}) &= \int_{(n_{h-1}-1)/L}^{n_{h-1}/L} g_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(t_{h-1}) \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(n_{h-1}/L) dW_{t_{h-1}}^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})} \\ &= \int_{(n_{h-1}-1)/L}^{n_{h-1}/L} g_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(t_{h-1}) \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(\lfloor Lt_{h-1} \rfloor + 1)/L) dW_{t_{h-1}}^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking the sum as above, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{h-1}^L(n_{h-2}; \mathbf{r}) &= \int_{n_{h-2}/L}^{1-1/L} g_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(t_{h-1}) \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(\lfloor Lt_{h-1} \rfloor + 1)/L) dW_{t_{h-1}}^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})} \\ &= \int_{n_{h-2}/L}^1 \mathbb{1}\{t_{h-1} \leq 1 - 1/L\} g_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(t_{h-1}) \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(\lfloor Lt_{h-1} \rfloor + 1)/L) dW_{t_{h-1}}^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})}. \end{aligned}$$

So that, defining

$$\mathcal{G}_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) := \int_{\tau \wedge 1}^1 \mathbb{1}\{t_{h-1} \leq 1 - 1/L\} g_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(t_{h-1}) \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}\left(\frac{\lfloor Lt_{h-1} \rfloor + 1}{L}\right) dW_{t_{h-1}}^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})},$$

one obtains

$$\Psi_{h-1}^L(n_{h-2}; \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{G}_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(n_{h-2}/L).$$

Iterating this construction

$$\Psi_j^L(n_{j-1}; \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{G}_{j,\mathbf{r},N}(n_{j-1}/L)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) = \int_{\tau \wedge 1}^1 \mathbb{1}\{t_j \leq 1 - (h-j)/L\} g_{j,\mathbf{r},N}(t_j) \mathcal{G}_{j+1,\mathbf{r},N}\left(\frac{\lfloor Lt_j \rfloor +}{L}\right) dW_{t_j}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})}.$$

Note that all the stochastic integrals aboved are well-defined with respect to the right-continuous and complete filtrations  $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^{(r_j, r_{j-1})})_{t \in [0,1]}$  introduced in Subsection 4.3. Let  $(W_t^{(r)})_{t \in [0,1]}$  for  $r = 1, \dots, D$  be the Brownian motions of Proposition 4.3, recall that by (7)  $Z_t^{(r)} := \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r)} - \frac{ar}{2} t$  and set for  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$g_{j,\mathbf{r}}(t) = e^{Z_t^{(r_{j-1})} - Z_t^{(r_j)}}.$$

**Lemma 4.5.** *For every  $1 \leq i < k \leq D$ , every  $h = 1, \dots, k-i$ , every  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,i}^h$  and  $j = 1, \dots, h$*

$$(26) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |g_{j,\mathbf{r},N}(t) - g_{j,\mathbf{r}}(t)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} R_N &:= \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| Z_t^{(N, r_{j-1})} - Z_{(t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1}^{(N, r_j)} - Z_t^{(r_{j-1})} - Z_t^{(r_j)} \right| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| Z_t^{(N, r_{j-1})} - \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r_{j-1})} + \frac{ar_{j-1}t}{2} \right| \\ &+ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_{(t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1}^{(r_j)} - \frac{ar_j}{2} ((t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1) - \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_t^{(r_j)} + \frac{ar_j t}{2} \right| \\ &+ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| Z_{(t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1}^{(N, r_j)} - \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} W_{(t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1}^{(r_j)} + \frac{ar_j}{2} ((t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.3 (C) and the continuity of  $(W_t^{(r_j)})_t$  yields that

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| Z_t^{(N, r_{j-1})} - Z_{(t+\frac{1}{L}) \wedge 1}^{(N, r_j)} - Z_t^{(r_{j-1})} - Z_t^{(r_j)} \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

and hence  $R_N \rightarrow 0$  in probability. For any two bounded functions  $a_t$  and  $b_t$

$$|e^{a_t} - e^{b_t}| \leq \|a - b\|_\infty e^{\|a-b\|_\infty + \|b\|_\infty}.$$

Hence  $\|g_{j,\mathbf{r},N} - g_{j,\mathbf{r}}\| \leq R_N e^{R_N + \|g_{j,\mathbf{r}}\|}$  but  $R_N e^{R_N + \|g_{j,\mathbf{r}}\|} \rightarrow 0$  in probability.  $\square$

Since  $g_{h,\mathbf{r}}(t) = e^{Z_t^{(r_{h-1})} - Z_t^{(r_h)}}$  is continuous and  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_0^{(r_h, r_{h-1})}$  measurable, one can define

$$\mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r}}(\tau) := \int_\tau^1 g_{h,\mathbf{r}}(t) dW_{t_h}^{(r_h, r_{h-1})} \quad \tau \in [0, 1].$$

Note that  $(\mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r}}(\tau))_{\tau \in [0,1]}$  turns out to be  $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_\tau^{(r_h, r_{h-1})})_{\tau \in [0,1]}$  adapted and continuous and

$$(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_\tau^{(r_h, r_{h-1})})_{\tau \in [0,1]} \subset \bar{\mathcal{F}}_0^{(r_{h-1}, r_{h-2})}.$$

Hence, one can recursively define for  $j = h-1, \dots, 1$

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,\mathbf{r}}(\tau) = \int_\tau^1 g_{j,\mathbf{r}}(t) \mathcal{G}_{j+1,\mathbf{r}}(t_j) dW_{t_j}^{(r_j, r_{j-1})} \quad \tau \in [0, 1].$$

Note also that all these processes are continuous. Using (26) and Lemma B.3 (or directly Lemma B.2), it follows that  $\sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) - \mathcal{G}_{h,\mathbf{r}}(\tau)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Using this result and again (26) and Lemma B.3, one obtains  $\sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{G}_{h-1,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) - \mathcal{G}_{h-1,\mathbf{r}}(\tau)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Iterating,

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{G}_{1,\mathbf{r},N}(\tau) - \mathcal{G}_{1,\mathbf{r}}(\tau)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

so that  $\mathcal{G}_{1,\mathbf{r},N}(0) \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{G}_{1,\mathbf{r}}(0)$ . Which proves that

$$H_L(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{L}{N}\right)^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(N, r_h)}} \mathcal{G}_{1,\mathbf{r},N}(0) \xrightarrow{P} a^{\frac{h}{2}} e^{Z_1^{(r_h)}} G_{1,\mathbf{r}}(0) = H(\mathbf{r})$$



where  $H(\mathbf{r})$  has been defined in (8). Proposition (3.2) follows easily.

**Acknowledgements and Disclosure of Funding.** F.B. is partially supported by the MUR - PRIN project “Discrete random structures for Bayesian learning and prediction” no. 2022CLTYP4. A.P.R. is supported by #NEXTGENERATIONEU (NGEU) and funded by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR), National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), project MNESYS (PE0000006) “A Multiscale integrated approach to the study of the nervous system in health and disease” (DN. 1553 11.10.2022).

## APPENDIX

### APPENDIX A. MATRIX NORMAL DISTRIBUTION

A random matrix  $Z$  of dimension  $n_1 \times n_2$  has a centred matrix normal distribution with parameters  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  (with  $\Sigma_i$ 's positive symmetric  $n_i \times n_i$  matrices), if for any matrix  $S$  of dimension  $n_2 \times n_1$

$$(27) \quad \mathbf{E}[e^{i \operatorname{tr}(SZ)}] = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(S \Sigma_1 S^\top \Sigma_2) \right\}.$$

In symbols  $Z \sim \mathcal{MN}(0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$ .

Two useful properties are reported here, see [Gupta and Nagar \(2000\)](#) for details.

(P1) *Linear transformation of matrix normals.* Given two matrices  $H$  and  $K$  with compatible shape, if  $Z \sim \mathcal{MN}(0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  then

$$HZK \sim \mathcal{MN}(0, H \Sigma_1 H^\top, K^\top \Sigma_2 K).$$

(P2) *Equivalence with the multivariate normal.*  $Z \sim \mathcal{MN}(0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  if and only if  $\operatorname{vec}(Z) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_2 \otimes \Sigma_1)$

### APPENDIX B. FEW RESULTS ON STOCHASTIC INTEGRALS

In what follows let be  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a complete and right-continuous filtration on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and  $(W_t, \mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Brownian motion on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ .

**Lemma B.1** (Prop. 1.3 [Karatzas and Shreve \(1991\)](#)). *Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$  adapted process. If it is left continuous or right continuous, then  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -progressively measurable.*

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $(X_t^\infty)_t$  be a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$  progressively measurable process and  $(X_t^N)_t$   $N = 1, \dots, +\infty$  be a sequence of  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  progressively measurable processes such that  $P\{\int_0^T (X_t^N)^2 dt < +\infty\} = 1$  for some for  $T < +\infty$  and for every  $N \leq +\infty$ . If  $\int_0^T (X_t^N - X_t^\infty)^2 dt \xrightarrow{P} 0$  then*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t X_s^N dW_s - \int_0^t X_s^\infty dW_s \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

See Proposition 2.26 in Chp. 3 of [Karatzas and Shreve \(1991\)](#).

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $(W_t, \mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ . Let  $(X^{k, N}(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  be a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  progressively measurable process ( $k = 1, 2$ ) and  $(X^{k, \infty}(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  ( $k = 1, 2$ ) be  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  adapted and continuous processes. Let  $L_N$  and  $\epsilon_N$  such that  $L_N \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\epsilon_N \rightarrow 0$  when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Set  $A_N(t) = ((\lfloor L_N t \rfloor + 1)/L_N) \wedge 1$  and assume that also  $(X^{2, N}(A_N(t)))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  progressively measurable. For  $\tau \in [0, 1]$  let*

$$G_N(\tau) := \int_\tau^1 X^{1, N}(t) X^{2, N}(A_N(t)) \mathbb{1}\{t \leq 1 - \epsilon_N\} dW_t$$

and

$$G_\infty(\tau) := \int_\tau^1 X^{1, \infty}(t) X^{2, \infty}(t) dW_t.$$

If

$$(28) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |X^{k, N}(t) - X^{k, \infty}(t)| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad k = 1, 2,$$

then  $G_\infty(\tau)$  is continuous and

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} |G_N(\tau) - G_\infty(\tau)| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma B.2 it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 |X^{1,N}(t)X^{2,N}(A_N(t))\mathbb{1}\{t \leq 1 - \epsilon_N\} - X^{1,\infty}(t)X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 dt \\ &= \int_0^{1-\epsilon_N} |X^{1,N}(t)X^{2,N}(A_N(t)) - X^{1,\infty}(t)X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 dt + \int_{1-\epsilon_N}^1 |X^{1,\infty}(t)X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

converges to zero in probability. As  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  the last term  $\int_{1-\epsilon_N}^1 |X^{1,\infty}(t)X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 dt$  converges in probability to zero. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{1-\epsilon_N} |X^{1,N}(t)X^{2,N}(A_N(t)) - X^{1,\infty}(t)X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 dt \\ & \leq 4 \left( \int_0^{1-\epsilon_N} |X^{1,N}(t)(X^{2,N}(A_N(t)) - X^{2,\infty}(A_N(t)))|^2 dt \right. \\ & \quad + \int_0^{1-\epsilon_N} |(X^{1,N}(t) - X^{1,\infty}(t))X^{2,\infty}(A_N(t))|^2 dt \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{1-\epsilon_N} |X^{1,\infty}(t)(X^{2,\infty}(A_N(t)) - X^{2,\infty}(t))|^2 dt \right) \\ & \leq 4\|X^{1,N}\|_\infty^2 \|X^{2,N} - X^{2,\infty}\|_\infty^2 + 4\|X^{2,N}\|_\infty^2 \|X^{1,N} - X^{1,\infty}\|_\infty^2 \\ & \quad + 4\|X^{1,\infty}\|_\infty^2 \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |X^{2,\infty}(A_N(t)) - X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $\|X^{1,\infty}\|_\infty^2 \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |X^{2,\infty}(A_N(t)) - X^{2,\infty}(t)|^2 \rightarrow 0$  a.s. by continuity of  $X^{2,\infty}$ , moreover  $\|X^{k,N}\|_\infty \leq \|X^{k,N} - X^{k,\infty}\|_\infty + \|X^{k,\infty}\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} \|X^{k,\infty}\|_\infty$  by (28), so that again by (28)

$$\|X^{1,N}\|_\infty^2 \|X^{2,N} - X^{2,\infty}\|_\infty^2 + \|X^{2,N}\|_\infty^2 \|X^{1,N} - X^{1,\infty}\|_\infty^2 \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

□

If  $(W_t, \mathcal{F}_t^W)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Brownian motion on a complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , being  $(\mathcal{F}_t^W)_{t \geq 0}$  the natural filtration, one can extend  $(\mathcal{F}_t^W)_{t \geq 0}$  to a complete and right-continuous (actually continuous)  $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  filtration in such a way that  $(W_t, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_t$  is still a Brownian motion. To this end it suffices to consider

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_t^W \cup \mathcal{N})$$

where  $\mathcal{N} = \{N \subset \Omega : \exists A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty^W : N \subset A : P(A) = 0\}$  are the null set in  $\mathcal{F}_\infty^W$ . See Chapter 2 Section 7 in Karatzas and Shreve (1991).

We shall need a slightly more general construction. The proof of the next result follows with an argument analogous of the one given in Chapter 2 Section 2.A in Karatzas and Shreve (1991).

**Lemma B.4.** *Let  $(W_t, \mathcal{F}_t^W)_{t \geq 0}$  be a Brownian motion and let  $\mathcal{G}_0$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -field of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_\infty^W$  are independent. Set  $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_t^W)$ ,  $\mathcal{N}^* = \{N \subset \Omega : \exists A \in \mathcal{G}_\infty : N \subset A : P(A) = 0\}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_t \cup \mathcal{N}^*)$ . Then  $(W_t, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a standard Brownian motion, i.e. it is a Brownian motion and  $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is complete and right-continuous.*

#### APPENDIX C. POSTERIOR OF A MIXTURE OF NORMALS

Let  $\Sigma : \mathcal{S}_D^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{D(P+1)}^+$  and write

$$\Sigma(Q) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{00}(Q) & \Sigma_{01}(Q) \\ \Sigma_{01}^\top(Q) & \Sigma_{11}(Q) \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $\Sigma_{00}(Q)$ ,  $\Sigma_{01}(Q)$ ,  $\Sigma_{11}(Q)$ , are the  $D \times D$ ,  $D \times DP$  and  $DP \times DP$  submatrices of  $\Sigma(Q)$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}_D^+$ . Assume the following joint distribution in  $(\mathbf{y}_{1:P}, \mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_{1:P}, Q)$ :

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu(dQ d\mathbf{z}_{0:P} d\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) &= \mu(d\mathbf{y}_{1:p} | \mathbf{z}_{1:P}, Q) \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{0:P} | Q) \mu(dQ) \\ &:= \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{y}_{1:p} | \Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P}, \beta^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{DP}) \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P} | \mathbf{0}, \mathbb{1}_{D(P+1)}) \mathcal{Q}(dQ), \end{aligned}$$

where to simplify the notation we write  $\Sigma$  in place of  $\Sigma(Q)$ . Note that above  $\mathcal{Q}(dQ) = \mu(dQ)$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_{1:P}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{1:}$  are in  $\mathbb{R}^{DP}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^D$  and  $\mathbf{z}_{0:P}^\top = (\mathbf{z}_0^\top, \mathbf{z}_{1:p}^\top)$ . One has

$$(30) \quad \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{0:P} dQ | \mathbf{y}_{0:P}) = \mu(d\mathbf{z}_0) \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P} dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \mu(d\mathbf{z}_0) \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P} | Q, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \mu(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

and

$$\mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P} dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P} | Q, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \mu(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \propto f(\mathbf{z}_{1:P}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P} | Q) \mathcal{Q}(dQ) d\mathbf{z}_{1:P}$$

with

$$f(\mathbf{z}_{1:P}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P} | Q) := e^{-\frac{\beta}{2} (\Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{y}_{1:P})^\top (\Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P}^\top \mathbf{z}_{1:P}}.$$

Setting

$$\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}_1(Q | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \beta (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1} \Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{y}_{1:p},$$

which is well-defined since  $\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP} > 0$ , one checks that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta}{2} (\Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{y}_{1:p})^\top (\Sigma_{11}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{y}_{1:p}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}_{1:P}^\top \mathbf{z}_{1:P} \\ &= \frac{\beta}{2} \left[ \mathbf{y}_{1:p}^\top (\mathbb{1}_{DP} - \beta \Sigma_{11}^{1/2} (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1} \Sigma_{11}^{1/2}) \mathbf{y}_{1:p} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1)^\top (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP}) (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that

$$(\mathbb{1}_{DP} - \beta \Sigma_{11}^{1/2} (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1} \Sigma_{11}^{1/2}) = (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1}$$

one can write

$$f(\mathbf{z}_{1:P}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P} | Q) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Psi(Q | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1)^\top (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP}) (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1)}}{\det((\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1})^{1/2}}$$

where

$$\Psi(Q | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \beta \mathbf{y}_{1:p}^\top (\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q))^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{1:p} + \log(\det(\mathbb{1}_{DP} + \beta \Sigma_{11}(Q))).$$

Then

$$(31) \quad \mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P}, dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1)^\top (\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP}) (\mathbf{z}_{1:P} - \mathbf{m}_1)}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{DP}{2}} \det((\beta \Sigma_{11} + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1})^{1/2}} \mathcal{Q}(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

with

$$\mathcal{Q}(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Psi(Q | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} \mathcal{Q}(dQ)}{\int_{\mathcal{S}_D^+} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Psi(Q | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})} \mathcal{Q}(dQ)}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{Q}(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \mu(dQ | \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$ . Define now

$$\mathbf{s}_{0:P} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_0 \\ \mathbf{s}_{1:P} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{0|1} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} + \Sigma_{0|1}^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_0 \\ \Sigma_{11}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}_{1:P} \end{pmatrix} = A \mathbf{z}_{0:P}$$

where

$$M_{0|1} = \Sigma_{01} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{11}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{0|1}^{1/2} & M_{0|1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \Sigma_{11}^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma_{0|1} := \Sigma_{00} - \Sigma_{01} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \Sigma_{01}^\top.$$

Recall that  $\Sigma$  is a function of  $Q$  and hence  $A = A(Q)$  and  $M_{0|1} = M_{0|1}(Q)$ . From the well-known conditional distribution of a normal vector, see e.g. Proposition 3.13 in Eaton (2007), one has that (given  $Q$ )

$$\mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{s}_0 | \Sigma_{01} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{1:P}, \Sigma_{0|1}) \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{s}_{1:P} | \mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{11}) = \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P} | \mathbf{0}, \Sigma),$$

which shows that the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{s}_{0:P}$  given  $Q$  is a Gaussian with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma(Q)$ . At this stage using also (30)

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}d\mathbf{z}_{0:P}, Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) &= \mu(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|Q, \mathbf{z}_{0:P}, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})\mu(d\mathbf{z}_{0:P}dQ|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \\ &= \delta_{A(Q)\mathbf{z}_{0:P}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P})\mu(d\mathbf{z}_0)\mu(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P}|Q, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})\mu(dQ|\mathbf{y}_{1:P})\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from (31) one has

$$\mu(d\mathbf{z}_{0:P}|Q, \mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{z}_0|\mathbf{0}, \mathbb{1}_D)\mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{z}_{1:P}|\mathbf{m}_1(Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}), (\beta\Sigma_{11}(Q) + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1}).$$

Hence the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{z}_{0:P}$  given  $(Q, \mathbf{y}_{1:P})$  is a Gaussian vector with mean and covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{m}(Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \mathbf{m}_1(Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B(Q) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}_D & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\beta\Sigma_{11}(Q) + \mathbb{1}_{DP})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In conclusion, the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{s}_{0:P} = A(Q)\mathbf{z}_{0:P}$  is a Gaussian distribution with mean

$$\mathbf{m}^*(Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) = A(Q)\mathbf{m}(Q|\mathbf{y}_{1:P}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^*(Q) = A(Q)B(Q)A^\top(Q).$$

At this stage, from (14) it follows that

$$P_{N,\text{post}}(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\mathbf{Y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mu(d\mathbf{s}_{0:P}|\mathbf{y}_{1:P})$$

for the special choice  $\Sigma(Q) = \Sigma(Q|\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$  in (15) and  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{L,N}(dQ)$ . Similarly one gets  $P_{\infty,\text{post}}$  taking  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_\infty$ . At this stage, simple algebraic computations give Proposition 3.4.

## REFERENCES

- Aiudi, R., Pacelli, R., Vezzani, A., Burioni, R., and Rotondo, P. (2023). Local kernel renormalization as a mechanism for feature learning in overparametrized convolutional neural networks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11807>.
- Baglioni, P., Pacelli, R., Aiudi, R., Di Renzo, F., Vezzani, A., Burioni, R., and Rotondo, P. (2024). Predictive power of a bayesian effective action for fully connected one hidden layer neural networks in the proportional limit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 133:027301.
- Bassetti, F., Gherardi, M., Ingrosso, A., Pastore, M., and Rotondo, P. (2024). Feature learning in finite-width bayesian deep linear networks with multiple outputs and convolutional layers. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03260>.
- Bordino, A., Favaro, S., and Fortini, S. (2023). Infinitely wide limits for deep stable neural networks: sub-linear, linear and super-linear activation functions. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.04008>.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Chizat, L. and Bach, F. (2018). On the global convergence of gradient descent for overparameterized models using optimal transport. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Chizat, L., Colombo, M., Fernández-Real, X., and Figalli, A. (2024). Infinite-width limit of deep linear neural networks. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 77(10):3958–4007.
- Chizat, L., Oyallon, E., and Bach, F. (2019). On lazy training in differentiable programming. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d'Alché-Buc, F., Fox, E., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- de G. Matthews, A. G., Hron, J., Rowland, M., Turner, R. E., and Ghahramani, Z. (2018). Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Eaton, M. L. (2007). *Multivariate statistics: A vector space approach*, volume 53 of *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes - Monograph Series*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, OH.
- Favaro, S., Hanin, B., Marinucci, D., Nourdin, I., and Peccati, G. (2023a). Quantitative CLTs in deep neural networks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.06092>.
- Favaro, S., Sandra, F., and Stefano, P. (2023b). Large-width asymptotics for relu neural networks with  $\alpha$ -stable initializations. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.08065>.
- Garriga-Alonso, A., Rasmussen, C. E., and Aitchison, L. (2019). Deep convolutional networks as shallow Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gupta, A. K. and Nagar, D. K. (2000). *Matrix variate distributions*, volume 104 of *Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL. [eBook](#).
- Hanin, B. (2023). Random neural networks in the infinite width limit as Gaussian processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(6A):4798–4819.
- Hanin, B. (2024). Random fully connected neural networks as perturbatively solvable hierarchies. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(167):1–58.
- Hanin, B. and Zlokapa, A. (2023). Bayesian interpolation with deep linear networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(23):e2301345120.
- Jacot, A., Gabriel, F., and Hongler, C. (2018). Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Kallenberg, O. (1997). *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. E. (1991). *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition.
- Kshirsagar, A. M. (1959). Bartlett decomposition and Wishart distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(1):239–241.
- Lee, J., Sohl-dickstein, J., Pennington, J., Novak, R., Schoenholz, S., and Bahri, Y. (2018). Deep neural networks as Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lewkowycz, Aitor and Bahri, Yasaman and Dye, Ethanr and Sohl-Dickstein, Jascha and Gur-Ari, Guy. (2021). The large learning rate phase of deep learning. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.02218>.
- Li, Q. and Sompolinsky, H. (2021). Statistical mechanics of deep linear neural networks: The backpropagating kernel renormalization. *Phys. Rev. X*, 11:031059.
- Mei, S., Montanari, A., and Nguyen, P.-M. (2018). A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33):E7665–E7671.
- Neal, R. M. (1996). *Priors for Infinite Networks*, pages 29–53. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Novak, R., Xiao, L., Bahri, Y., Lee, J., Yang, G., Abolafia, D. A., Pennington, J., and Sohl-dickstein, J. (2019). Bayesian deep convolutional networks with many channels are Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Pacelli, R., Ariosto, S., Pastore, M., Ginelli, F., Gherardi, M., and Rotondo, P. (2023). A statistical mechanics framework for Bayesian deep neural networks beyond the infinite-width limit. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5:1497–1507.
- Rotskoff, G. and Vanden-Eijnden, E. (2022). Trainability and accuracy of artificial neural networks: An interacting particle system approach. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 75(9):1889–1935.
- Saxe, A. M., McClelland, J. L., and Ganguli, S. (2014). Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y., editors, *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*.

- Saxe, A. M., McClelland, J. L., and Ganguli, S. (2019). A mathematical theory of semantic development in deep neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(23):11537–11546.
- Sirignano, J. and Spiliopoulos, K. (2020). Mean field analysis of neural networks: A law of large numbers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80(2):725–752.
- Trevisan, D. (2023). Wide deep neural networks with Gaussian weights are very close to Gaussian processes. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11737>.
- Tricomi, F. G. and Erdélyi, A. (1951). The asymptotic expansion of a ratio of gamma functions. *Pacific J. Math.*, 1:133–142.
- Yang, G. and Hu, E. J. (2021). Tensor programs IV: Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks. In Meila, M. and Zhang, T., editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11727–11737. PMLR.
- Zavatone-Veth, J. A. and Pehlevan, C. (2021). Exact marginal prior distributions of finite Bayesian neural networks. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.