

---

# Optimal generalisation and learning transition in extensive-width shallow neural networks near interpolation

---

Jean Barbier<sup>\*1</sup> Francesco Camilli<sup>\*1</sup> Minh-Toan Nguyen<sup>\*1</sup> Mauro Pastore<sup>\*1</sup> Rudy Skerk<sup>\*2</sup>

## Abstract

We consider a teacher-student model of supervised learning with a fully-trained 2-layer neural network whose width  $k$  and input dimension  $d$  are large and proportional. We compute the Bayes-optimal generalisation error of the network for any activation function in the regime where the number of training data  $n$  scales quadratically with the input dimension, i.e., around the interpolation threshold where the number of trainable parameters  $kd+k$  and of data points  $n$  are comparable. Our analysis tackles generic weight distributions. Focusing on binary weights, we uncover a discontinuous phase transition separating a “universal” phase from a “specialisation” phase. In the first, the generalisation error is independent of the weight distribution and decays slowly with the sampling rate  $n/d^2$ , with the student learning only some non-linear combinations of the teacher weights. In the latter, the error is weight distribution-dependent and decays faster due to the alignment of the student towards the teacher network. We thus unveil the existence of a highly predictive solution near interpolation, which is however potentially hard to find.

## 1. Introduction

Understanding the expressive power and generalisation capabilities of neural networks is not only a stimulating intellectual activity, producing surprising results that seem to defy established common sense in statistics and optimisation (Bartlett et al., 2021), but has important practical implications in cost-benefit planning whenever a model is deployed. E.g., from a fruitful research line that spanned three decades, we now know that deep fully-connected Bayesian neural networks with  $O(1)$  read-out weights and  $L_2$  regularisation behave as kernel machines (the so-called Neural

Network Gaussian processes, NNGPs) in the heavily over-parametrised, infinite-width regime (Neal, 1996; Williams, 1996; Lee et al., 2018; Matthews et al., 2018; Hanin, 2023), and so suffer from these models’ limitations. Indeed, kernel machines infer the decision rule by first embedding the data in a fixed a priori feature space, the renowned *kernel trick*, then operating linear regression/classification over the features. In this respect, they do not learn features (in the sense of statistics relevant for the decision rule) from the data, so they need larger and larger feature spaces and training sets to fit their higher order statistics (Yoon & Oh, 1998; Dietrich et al., 1999; Gerace et al., 2021; Bordelon et al., 2020; Canatar et al., 2021; Xiao et al., 2023).

Many efforts have been devoted to studying Bayesian neural networks in a regime where they could learn a better feature map from the data. In the so-called proportional regime, when the width of the network is large and proportional to the size of the training set, recent studies showed how a limited amount of feature learning makes the network equivalent to optimally regularised kernels (Li & Sompolinsky, 2021; Pacelli et al., 2023; Camilli et al., 2023; Cui et al., 2023; Baglioni et al., 2024). This effect could be a consequence of the fully-connected architecture, as, e.g., convolutional neural networks learn more informative features in this regime (Naveh & Ringel, 2021; Seroussi et al., 2023; Aiudi et al., 2023; Bassetti et al., 2024). Another scenario recently proposed is the mean-field scaling, i.e., when the read-out weights are small: in this case too a Bayesian network can learn features in the proportional regime (Rubin et al., 2024a; van Meegen & Sompolinsky, 2024).

In this paper, we consider instead the generalisation performance of a fully-connected 2-layer Bayesian network of extensive width trained end-to-end near the interpolation threshold, when the sample size  $n$  is scaling like the number of trainable parameters: for input dimension  $d$  and width  $k$ , both large and proportional,  $n = \Theta(d^2) = \Theta(kd)$ . We consider i.i.d. standard Gaussian input vectors with labels generated by a teacher network with matching architecture, in order to study the Bayes-optimal performance of the model. The activation of the hidden layer is only required to admit a decomposition in the basis of Hermite polynomials.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Strada Costiera 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy <sup>2</sup>International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), Via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy.

**Our contributions and related works** The aforementioned setting is related to the recent paper Maillard et al. (2024b), with however two major differences: said work considers only Gaussian distributed weights and quadratic activation. These hypotheses allow numerous simplifications for the analysis, exploited in a series of works (Du & Lee, 2018; Soltanolkotabi et al., 2019; Venturi et al., 2019; Sarao Mannelli et al., 2020; Gamarnik et al., 0; Martin et al., 2024; Arjevani et al., 2025). Thanks to this, Maillard et al. (2024b) map the learning model onto a generalised *linear* model (GLM) where the goal is to infer a Wishart matrix from linear observations, which is analysable using known results on the GLM (Barbier et al., 2019) and matrix denoising (Barbier & Macris, 2022; Maillard et al., 2022; Pourkamali et al., 2024; Semerjian, 2024).

Our main contribution is a general statistical mechanics framework for characterising the prediction performance of shallow Bayesian neural networks, able to handle arbitrary activation functions and different distributions of i.i.d. weights. In particular, we show that there is not always universality in the teacher weights, and that their discrete rather than Gaussian nature plays an important role in learning. Focusing on binary  $\pm 1$  weights as example of non-Gaussian weights, our theory draws a rich picture with two phases separated by a learning phase transition when tuning the sample rate  $\alpha = n/d^2$ :

- (i) For low  $\alpha$ , feature learning occurs only because the student tunes its weights to match non-linear combinations of the teacher’s ones, rather than aligning to those weights themselves. This phase is *universal* in the law of the i.i.d. teacher inner weights: our numerics obtained with binary inner weights match the theory valid for Gaussian ones.
- (ii) For high enough  $\alpha$  and binary weights, a *specialisation transition* occurs, where the student can align its weights to the actual teacher ones. We give a unified description of the two phases and identify the relevant order parameters (sufficient statistics) needed to deduce the generalisation error through scalar systems of equations.

The picture that emerges is closely connected to recent findings in the context of extensive-rank matrix denoising (Barbier et al., 2024). In this model similar phases were identified, with one being universal in the signal prior law and the other not, with the estimator “synchronising” with the hidden signal beyond the transition. We believe that this picture and the one found in the present paper are not just similar, but are actually both a manifestation of the same fundamental mechanism in matrix inference/learning.

From a technical point of view, our derivation is based on a Gaussian ansatz on the replicated post-activations of the hidden layer, which generalises Conjecture 3.1 of Cui et al. (2023), where it is specialised to the case of linearly many data ( $n = \Theta(d)$ ). To obtain this generalisation, we write the

kernel arising from the covariance of the aforementioned post-activations as an infinite series of scalar order parameters derived from the expansion of the activation function in the Hermite basis, following an approach recently devised in Aguirre-López et al. (2024) in the context of the random features model (see also Hu et al. (2024) and Ghorbani et al. (2021)). Another key ingredient of our analysis is a generalisation of an ansatz used in the replica method by Sakata & Kabashima (2013) for dictionary learning.

On the algorithmic side, we show empirically that reaching the specialisation solution is hard, even for a student exploiting the discrete nature of the teacher weights: Monte Carlo sampling fails to find it and instead gets stuck in a sub-optimal glassy phase. It is only when sampling the weights by Monte Carlo initialised on the teacher that the specialisation solution can be found. As secondary algorithmic approach, we adapt the GAMP-RIE (generalised approximate message-passing with rotational invariant estimator), introduced in Maillard et al. (2024b) for the special case of quadratic activation, to generic activation. The resulting algorithm described in Appendix G, which *cannot* exploit the discreteness of the weights, nevertheless matches the prediction performance associated with the universal (Gaussian) branch of our theory for all  $\alpha$ . We conjecture it to be the best prediction performance achievable by a polynomial-time learner when  $n = \Theta(d^2)$ .

## 2. Teacher-student setting

We consider supervised learning with a shallow neural network in the classical teacher-student setup. The data-generating model, i.e., the teacher, is thus a 2-layer neural network itself, with readout weights  $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and internal weights  $\mathbf{W}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ , drawn entrywise i.i.d. from  $P_v^*$  and  $P_W^*$ , respectively; we assume  $P_W^*$  to be centred and with unit variance. The whole set of parameters of the teacher is denoted  $\theta^* = (\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{W}^*)$ . The inputs are i.i.d. standard Gaussian vectors  $\mathbf{x}_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for  $\mu = 1, \dots, n$ . The responses  $y_\mu$  are possibly random outputs of a kernel  $P_{\text{out}}^*$ :

$$y_\mu \sim P_{\text{out}}^*(\cdot | \lambda_\mu^*), \quad \lambda_\mu^* := \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right). \quad (1)$$

The kernel can be stochastic or model a deterministic rule if taking  $P_{\text{out}}^*(y|\lambda) = \delta(y - \tau^*(\lambda))$  for some outer non-linearity  $\tau^*$ . The activation function  $\sigma$  is applied entrywise to vectors and admits an expansion in Hermite polynomials with Hermite coefficients  $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}$  (see App. A):  $\sigma(x) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{\mu_\ell}{\ell!} \text{He}_\ell(x)$ . In the main we assume it has vanishing 0th Hermite coefficient in order to simplify the presentation, i.e., that it is centred  $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \sigma(z) = 0$ ; in App. F we relax this assumption. The set of input/output pairs  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_\mu, y_\mu)\}_{\mu \leq n}$  forms the training set for a student network with matching architecture.

The Bayesian student learns via the posterior distribution of the weights  $\theta = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{W})$  given the training data, defined by

$$dP(\theta | \mathcal{D}) := \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} dP_v(\mathbf{v}) dP_W(\mathbf{W}) \prod_{\mu=1}^n P_{\text{out}}(y_\mu | \lambda_\mu(\theta))$$

with post-activation  $\lambda_\mu(\theta) := k^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \sigma(d^{-1/2} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_\mu)$  and  $P_v, P_W$  are the priors assumed by the student, which are also fully factorised. From now on, we focus on the Bayes-optimal case  $P_W = P_W^*, P_v = P_v^*, P_{\text{out}} = P_{\text{out}}^*$ , but most of our calculations remain valid with a mismatch.

We aim at evaluating the average generalisation error of the student. Let  $(\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}} \sim P_{\text{out}}(\cdot | \lambda_{\text{test}}^*))$  be a fresh sample drawn using the teacher independently from  $\mathcal{D}$ . Given any prediction function  $\tau$ , the Bayes estimator for the test response reads  $\hat{y}^\tau(\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}, \mathcal{D}) := \langle \tau(\lambda_{\text{test}}(\theta)) \rangle$ , where the expectation  $\langle \cdot \rangle := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{D}]$  is w.r.t. the posterior  $P(\theta | \mathcal{D})$ . Then, for a performance measure  $\mathcal{C} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the associated Bayes generalisation error is

$$\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}, \tau} := \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}}} \mathcal{C}(y_{\text{test}}, \langle \tau(\lambda_{\text{test}}(\theta)) \rangle). \quad (2)$$

An important case is the square loss  $\mathcal{C}(y, \hat{y}) = (y - \hat{y})^2$  with the choice  $\tau(\lambda) = \int dy y P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) =: \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda]$ . The Bayes-optimal mean-square generalisation error follows:

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} := \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}}} (y_{\text{test}} - \langle \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda_{\text{test}}] \rangle)^2. \quad (3)$$

In the text we consider linear readout with Gaussian label noise,  $P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\Delta}(y - \lambda)^2) / \sqrt{2\pi\Delta}$ , as main example. In this case, the generalisation error  $\varepsilon^{\text{opt}}$  takes a simpler form for numerical evaluation than (3), thanks to the concentration of ‘‘overlaps’’ entering it, see App. C.

In order to theoretically compute  $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}, \tau}, \varepsilon^{\text{opt}}$  and other relevant quantities, one can tackle the computation of the average log-partition function, or free entropy in statistical mechanics vocabulary:  $f_n := \mathbb{E} \ln \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{D}) / n$ , where  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{D})$  is the normalisation of the posterior, and the expectation is w.r.t. the training data  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\theta^*$ . The mutual information between teacher weights and the data is related to the free entropy  $f_n$ , see App. D. E.g., in the case of linear readout with Gaussian label noise we have  $I(\theta^*; \mathcal{D}) / (kd) = -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_n - \frac{\alpha}{2\gamma} \ln(2\pi e \Delta)$ . Considering the mutual information per parameter allows us to interpret  $\alpha$  as a sort of signal-to-noise ratio, s.t. the mutual information defined in this way increases with it.

We consider the challenging extensive-width regime with quadratically many samples, i.e., a large size limit

$$d, k, n \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{k}{d} \rightarrow \gamma, \quad \frac{n}{d^2} \rightarrow \alpha. \quad (4)$$

We denote this joint  $d, n, k$  limit with these rates by  $\widetilde{\lim}$ .

*Notations:* Bold is for vectors and matrices,  $d$  is the input dimension,  $k$  the width of the hidden layer,  $n$  the size of the training set  $\mathcal{D}$ , with asymptotic ratios  $k/d \rightarrow \gamma$  and  $n/d^2 \rightarrow \alpha$ ,  $s$  will be the number of replicas in the replica method,  $\mathbf{A}^{\circ\ell}$  is the Hadamard power, i.e.,  $(\mathbf{A}^{\circ\ell})_{ij} = A_{ij}^\ell$ ,  $(\mathbf{v})$  is the diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $(\mu_\ell)$  are the Hermite coefficients of activation  $\sigma(x) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{\mu_\ell}{\ell!} \text{He}_\ell(x)$ .

### 3. Results: mutual information, learning transition and Bayes generalisation error

**Mutual information and learning transition** Our first result is a tractable formula for the mutual information.

**Result 3.1 (Mutual information).** *For any  $\alpha, \gamma$ , under the scaling limit (4) the mutual information verifies*

$$\widetilde{\lim} \frac{I(\theta^*; \mathcal{D})}{kd} = \min \{I_{\text{uni}}(\alpha, \gamma), I_{\text{sp}}(\alpha, \gamma)\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $I_{\text{uni}}$ , corresponding to the universal (Gaussian weights) mutual information, is given by (86) in App. D, and the mutual information  $I_{\text{sp}}$  associated with the specialisation solution is (100).

We locate the specialisation phase transition  $\alpha_{\text{sp}} = \alpha_{\text{sp}}(\gamma)$  as the non-analytic point of the mutual information where the formula ‘‘changes branch’’, namely:

$$\alpha_{\text{sp}}(\gamma) := \min \{ \alpha : I_{\text{sp}}(\alpha, \gamma) \leq I_{\text{uni}}(\alpha, \gamma) \}. \quad (6)$$

The transition may occur only if the distribution of the teacher and student’s weights is non-Gaussian. In this article, we focus on the case where the weights are binary  $\pm 1$  for which the transition is sharp. Then,  $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{sp}}$  corresponds to the *universal phase*, where  $I_{\text{uni}}$  obtained from the Gaussian weights theory is the correct mutual information. Instead,  $\alpha > \alpha_{\text{sp}}$  is the *specialisation phase* where  $I_{\text{sp}}$  is the correct one. We will discuss below their differences.

**Bayes generalisation error** Another main result is a formula for the generalisation error. Let us introduce

$$\begin{cases} q_K(q_2, q_W) := \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} q_2 + g(q_W) \\ r_2 := 1 + \gamma (\mathbb{E} v_1^*)^2 \\ r_K := \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} r_2 + g(1) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with  $g(x) := \sum_{\ell=3}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_\ell^2}{\ell!} x^\ell$  (see also (57) for a more explicit expression of it), as well as the definitions of  $\psi_{P_{\text{out}}}$  and  $\psi_{P_W}$  deferred to App. E, specifically (73), (99). Consider then the two following systems of equations. The first one should be considered for the universal phase  $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{sp}}$ :

$$(S_{\text{uni}}) \begin{cases} q_2 = r_2 - \frac{1}{q_2} (1 - \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \int \mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}^3(y) dy) \\ \hat{q}_2 = 4\alpha \partial_{q_2} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, 0); r_K), \end{cases}$$

where  $\mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}$  is the asymptotic spectral distribution of the observation matrix in the denoising problem of  $\mathbf{S}^* := \mathbf{W}^{*\top}(\mathbf{v}^*)\mathbf{W}^*$  given  $\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2) = \sqrt{\hat{q}_2/kd}\mathbf{S}^* + \mathbf{Z}$ , with  $\mathbf{Z}$  a standard GOE matrix (a symmetric matrix whose upper triangular part has i.i.d. entries from  $\mathcal{N}(0, (1 + \delta_{ij})/d)$ ). The second system of equations holds instead in the specialisation phase  $\alpha > \alpha_{\text{sp}}$ :

$$(S_{\text{sp}}) \begin{cases} q_W = 2\partial_{\hat{q}_W} \psi_{P_W}(\hat{q}_W) \\ \hat{q}_W = \frac{\hat{q}_2 q_W}{\gamma + \gamma \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)} + \frac{4\alpha}{\gamma} \partial_{q_W} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W); r_K) \\ q_2 = r_2 - \frac{1 - q_W^2}{1 + \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)} \\ \hat{q}_2 = 4\alpha \partial_{q_2} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W); r_K). \end{cases}$$

From these equations, we can write the joint law of  $(\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}^a, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}))_{a \geq 0} = (\lambda^a)_{a \geq 0}$  for a common test input  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}$  independent of  $\mathcal{D}$ , where  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^a)_{a \geq 1}$  are conditionally i.i.d. samples from the posterior  $dP(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ . The Bayes error in the limit  $\widetilde{\text{lim}}$  follows.

**Result 3.2** (Law of the post-activations and Bayes generalisation error). *For  $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{sp}}(\gamma)$  let  $q_K^* = q_K(q_2^*, 0)$  where  $(q_2^*, \hat{q}_2^*)$  is the solution of the system  $(S_{\text{uni}})$  yielding the maximum value of the replica symmetric free entropy potential (85). For  $\alpha > \alpha_{\text{sp}}(\gamma)$  let  $q_K^* = q_K(q_2^*, q_W^*)$  where  $(q_W^*, \hat{q}_W^*, q_2^*, \hat{q}_2^*)$  is the solution of the system  $(S_{\text{sp}})$  yielding the maximum value of the potential (98). In the limit  $\widetilde{\text{lim}}$  the post-activations  $(\lambda^a)_{a \geq 0}$  for a test input are centred Gaussians with  $\mathbb{E}\lambda^a \lambda^b = q_K^* + (r_K - q_K^*)\delta_{ab}$ , see App. C.*

Assume  $\mathcal{C}$  has series expansion  $\mathcal{C}(y, \tau) = \sum_{i \geq 0} c_i(y) \tau^i$ . The limiting Bayes generalisation error is

$$\widetilde{\text{lim}} \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}, \tau} = \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda^a), y_{\text{test}} | \lambda^0} \sum_{i \geq 0} c_i(y_{\text{test}}(\lambda^0)) \prod_{a=1}^i \tau(\lambda^a). \quad (8)$$

In particular, letting  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \lambda] = \int dy (\cdot) P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda)$ , the limiting Bayes-optimal mean-square generalisation error is


$$\widetilde{\text{lim}} \varepsilon^{\text{opt}} = \mathbb{E}_{\lambda^0, \lambda} (\mathbb{E}[y^2 | \lambda^0] - \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^0] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda]). \quad (9)$$

We will interpret the variables in the previous systems of equations in Sec. 5 as ‘‘overlaps’’ between combinations of teacher and student’s weights.

## 4. Numerical experiments

Results 3.1 and 3.2 together provide a unified theory describing the generalisation capabilities of a Bayesian shallow network with generic activation. Our analysis pinpoints the presence of two distinct phases: a universal one, where the prior on the inner weights is irrelevant (only its first two moments matter), and a specialisation one, where exploiting the prior is instead essential to achieve better generalisation.

Before explaining our theory, let us compare its predictions with simulations. In Fig. 1, we report the theoretical curves



**Figure 1. Top:** Theoretical prediction (solid curves) of the Bayes-optimal mean-square generalisation error for polynomial activations:  $\sigma_1(x) = \text{He}_2(x)/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\sigma_2(x) = \text{He}_3(x)/\sqrt{6}$ ,  $\sigma_3(x) = \text{He}_2(x)/\sqrt{2} + \text{He}_3(x)/6$ , with  $\gamma = 0.5$ ,  $d = 150$ , Gaussian label noise with  $\Delta = 1.25$ , and fixed read-outs  $\mathbf{v} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$ . Dots are obtained by plugging the overlaps obtained from MCMC into Eq. (49) in App. C, which neglects some finite size effects by assuming Eq. (18) (which is validated numerically, see Fig. 2). Circles are the error of GAMP-RIE (Maillard et al., 2024b) extended to generic activation. They are obtained by plugging estimator (120) in (3). Points are averaged over 16 instances of the data. Error bars for MCMC are the standard deviation over instances (omitted for GAMP-RIE, but of the same order). The information-theoretic transitions (vertical lines) are identified comparing the mutual information of the 2 phases, see Eq. (6) and App. D. Dashed and dotted lines denote, respectively, universal and specialisation branches where they are metastable. The MCMC points follow the specialisation curve before the transition as they are obtained with informative initialisation, converging to the specialisation solution once it becomes metastable. The inset zooms on the specialisation phase. **Bottom:** All parameters as above, except  $\Delta = 0.1$ . Generalisation error for popular activations in the universal phase, which has the algorithmically tractable performance. The MCMC points (inset) are obtained using (46), to account for lack of equilibration due to glassiness, which prevents using (49). Even in the possibly glassy region, the GAMP-RIE attains the universal performance.

from Result 3.2, focusing on the optimal mean-square generalisation error, for networks with  $\pm 1$  inner weights and

Gaussian output channel, for different activation functions in the hidden layer. The numerical points are of two kinds: the dots, obtained from Monte Carlo sampling of the posterior distribution of the model’s weights, and the circles, obtained from an extension of the GAMP-RIE of Maillard et al. (2024b) to account for generic activation (see App. G). The universal phase, where the error of the student with binary inner weights matches the one of a student with  $P_W = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , is superseded at  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  by a specialisation phase where the student’s inner weights start aligning with the teacher’s ones. This transition is different in nature w.r.t. the perfect recovery threshold  $\alpha_{\text{PR}}$  identified in Maillard et al. (2024b), which is the point where the student with Gaussian weights attains perfect generalisation. Indeed, when the inner weights are Gaussian, perfect generalisation is *not* due to the alignment of the student towards the teacher, see Barbier et al. (2024) for a related discussion.

Even when dominating the posterior measure, the specialisation solution is *algorithmically hard to reach*: simulations exhibit it only when sampling with informative initialisation (i.e., the MCMC runs to sample  $\theta$  are initialised in the vicinity of the teacher’s  $\theta^*$ ). The critical value  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  is obtained from Result 3.1, Eq. (6) (see App. D, Fig. 3). In Fig. 1, we split the case of polynomial activations (top panel) and the one of ReLU, ELU (defined in Table 1) for illustration purposes: in the latter case,  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  shifts to larger values for the choice of the other hyperparameters we could explore, and it is thus more challenging to sample. The remarkable agreement between theoretical curves and experimental points in both phases validates the assumptions used in Sec. 5.

The two identified phases are akin to those recently described in Barbier et al. (2024) for matrix denoising. The model we consider is indeed a matrix model in  $\mathbf{W}$ , with the amount of observations scaling as the number of matrix elements. When data are scarce, the student’s discrete prior on  $\mathbf{W}^*$  is not enough to break the numerous symmetries of the problem, resulting in an “effective rotational invariance” at the source of the prior universality. Hence, posterior samples have a vanishing overlap with  $\theta^*$ . On the other hand, when data are sufficiently abundant,  $\alpha > \alpha_{\text{sp}}$ , there is a “synchronisation” of the student’s samples with the teacher. From an algorithmic point of view, however, the student is able to find these highly performing weight configurations only when it is strongly informed about the ground-truth weights, which signals a statistical-computational gap.

The phenomenology observed depends on the activation function selected. In particular, by expanding  $\sigma$  in Hermite basis we realise that the way the first three terms enter information theoretical quantities is completely described by order 0, 1 and 2 tensors later defined in (19), that are combinations of the inner and readout weights. In our scaling regime, order 0 and 1 tensors are recovered exactly by the

student because of the overwhelming abundance of data compared to their dimension. The challenging part is thus to learn the second order tensor. On the contrary, learning any higher order tensors is doomed, and they are seen as noise by the student, unless they are given some information about  $\mathbf{W}^*$ . In that case, they have a chance of finding  $\mathbf{W}^*$ , thus potentially yielding a non-trivial recovery of all higher-order tensors in a single shot. This is the mechanism behind the specialisation solution. For odd activation  $\sigma$ , where  $\mu_2 = 0$ , the aforementioned order-2 tensor does not contribute any more to learning. Indeed, we observe numerically that the generalisation error sticks to a constant value for  $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{sp}}$ , whereas at the phase transition it suddenly drops. This is because the learning of the order-2 tensor is skipped entirely, and the only chance to perform better is to learn all the other higher-order tensors through specialisation.

By extending universality results to generic activations, we are able to use the GAMP-RIE of Maillard et al. (2024b), publicly available at Maillard et al. (2024a), to obtain a conjecturally optimal polynomial-time predictor for test data. Its generalisation error follows our universal theoretical curve even in the  $\alpha$  regime where MCMC sampling experiences a glassy phase, and in particular after  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  (see Fig. 1, circles). Extending this algorithm, initially proposed for quadratic activation only, to generic activation is possible thanks to the identification of an *effective* GLM on which the learning problem can be mapped (while the mapping is exact when  $\sigma(x) = x^2$  as exploited by Maillard et al. (2024b)), see App. G. The key observation is that our effective GLM representation holds not only from a theoretical perspective to describe the universal phase, but also algorithmically.

Finally, we emphasize that our theory is consistent with Cui et al. (2023), as our generalisation curves at  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  match theirs at  $\alpha_1 := n/d \rightarrow \infty$ , which is when the student learns perfectly the combinations  $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{W} / \sqrt{k}$  (but nothing more).

## 5. Evaluation of the free entropy and generalisation error by the replica method

The goal is to compute the asymptotic free entropy using the replica method (Mezard et al., 1986), a powerful approach from spin glasses that can be used to study learning problems (Engel & Van den Broeck, 2001). Define the “replicated free entropy”  $f_{n,s} := \ln \mathbb{E} Z^s(\mathcal{D}) / (ns)$ . The starting point to tackle the data average in the free entropy is  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \ln Z / n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} f_{n,s} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n,s}$ , assuming that the limits commute. Considering first  $s \in \mathbb{N}^+$  an integer,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} Z^s(\mathcal{D}) &= \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_v(\mathbf{v}^a) dP_W(\mathbf{W}^a) \\ &\times \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \int dy \prod_{a=0}^s P_{\text{out}} \left( y \mid \frac{\mathbf{v}^{a\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \right) \right]^n, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\theta^0 = \theta^*$  denotes the teacher. We have to identify the law of the family

$$\{\lambda^a\}_{a=0,\dots,s} := \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{v}^{a\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \right\}_{a=0,\dots,s}, \quad (11)$$

which are dependent random variables due to the common random Gaussian input  $\mathbf{x}$ , conditionally on  $\{\theta^a := (\mathbf{v}^a, \mathbf{W}^a)\}_a$ . Our key hypothesis is that *we assume*  $\{\lambda^a\}$  to be jointly Gaussian, an ansatz we cannot prove due to the presence of the non-linearity but that we validate a posteriori thanks to the excellent match between our theory and the empirical generalisation curves, see Sec. 3. Similar Gaussian assumptions have been the crux of a whole line of recent works on the analysis of neural networks, and are now known under the name of ‘‘Gaussian equivalence’’ (Goldt et al., 2020; Hastie et al., 2022; Mei & Montanari, 2022; Goldt et al., 2022; Hu & Lu, 2023). This can also sometimes be heuristically justified based on Breuer–Major Theorems (Nourdin et al., 2011; Pacelli et al., 2023).

Recalling the Hermite expansion of  $\sigma$ , by using Mehler’s formula, see App. A, the covariance  $K^{ab} := \mathbb{E} \lambda^a \lambda^b$  reads

$$K^{ab} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!} \sum_{i,j=1}^k \frac{v_i^a (\Omega_{ij}^{ab})^{\ell} v_j^b}{k} =: \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!} Q_{\ell}^{ab} \quad (12)$$

where, given two replica indices  $a, b$ , we introduced the matrix overlap with indices  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$  defined as

$$\Omega_{ij}^{ab} := \sum_{\alpha=1}^d \frac{W_{i\alpha}^a W_{j\alpha}^b}{d}. \quad (13)$$

The covariance matrix  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $\{\lambda^a\}$  is a complicated object but, as we argue hereby, simplifications occur in the large dimension limit. In particular, the first two ‘‘overlaps’’ below will play a special role:

$$Q_1^{ab} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^d \sum_{i,j=1}^k \frac{v_i^a W_{i\alpha}^a W_{j\alpha}^b v_j^b}{kd}, \quad (14)$$

$$Q_2^{ab} = \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2=1}^d \sum_{i,j=1}^k \frac{v_i^a W_{i\alpha_1}^a W_{i\alpha_2}^a W_{j\alpha_1}^b W_{j\alpha_2}^b v_j^b}{kd^2}. \quad (15)$$

We claim that the higher-order overlaps  $(Q_{\ell}^{ab})_{\ell \geq 3}$ , a priori needed for the covariance  $K^{ab}$ , can be simplified drastically in terms of simpler order parameters:

$$Q_W^{ab} := \frac{1}{kd} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{b\top}], \quad Q_v^{ab} := \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{v}^{a\top} \mathbf{v}^b. \quad (16)$$

The reason is the following. In the covariance  $K^{ab}$ , Eq. (12), the Hadamard powers of the overlap  $\Omega$  appear inside quadratic forms with read-out vectors a priori correlated with it. For Hadamard powers  $\ell \geq 3$ , the off-diagonal




Figure 2. Monte Carlo dynamics of the overlaps  $q_W = Q_W^{01}$  and  $q_\ell = Q_\ell^{01}$  ( $\ell = 1, \dots, 5$ ) between student and teacher weights, with activation function  $\sigma(x) = \text{He}_1(x) + \text{He}_2(x)/\sqrt{2} + \text{He}_3(x)/6$ ,  $d = 150$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ ,  $\Delta = 1.25$  and two different choices of sample rate:  $\alpha = 0.5$  (Top),  $\alpha = 1.3$  (Bottom). Both the read-out  $\mathbf{v}^*$  and inner weights  $\mathbf{W}^*$  of the teacher are drawn from the Rademacher distribution. The dynamics is initialised informatively, i.e. on the teacher weights. During the dynamics the read-outs are kept fixed, while at each time step we attempt to change the sign of one element of the inner weights. The overlap  $q_1$  is fluctuating close to 1 in both figures (with fluctuations of  $O(1/\sqrt{d})$ ). **Top:** the overlaps  $q_W$  and  $q_\ell$  for  $\ell > 2$  at equilibrium converge to 0, while  $q_2$  can be estimated by the universal theory. **Bottom:** the overlaps  $q_\ell$  for  $\ell > 2$  are trivially equal to  $q_W^\ell$ , also during the dynamics, in agreement with (18). Overlaps  $q_W$  and  $q_2$  can be determined through the theory for the specialisation phase.

part of the matrix  $(\Omega^{ab})^{\circ \ell}$  is of sufficiently small order to consider it diagonal when evaluating any quadratic form, including with vectors strongly aligned with its eigenvectors; in other words, the eigenvectors of  $\Omega^{\circ \ell}$  are sufficiently close to the standard basis for any quadratic form to be dominated by the diagonal contribution in the large system limit. The same happens, e.g., for a standard Wishart matrix: its eigenvectors and the ones of its square Hadamard power are delocalised, while for higher powers, the eigenvectors are strongly localised. Moreover, by permutation invariance, the diagonal of  $\Omega^{ab}$  is expected to concentrate onto a constant, thus equal to  $Q_W^{ab}$ . With these observations in mind, we can assume the following simplification at leading order:

$$(\Omega_{ij}^{ab})^\ell \approx \delta_{ij} (Q_W^{ab})^\ell \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 3. \quad (17)$$

This implies in particular that

$$Q_\ell^{ab} \approx (Q_W^{ab})^\ell Q_v^{ab} \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 3. \quad (18)$$

This assumption is verified numerically, see Fig. 2. For what

follows, it is convenient to define the tensors  $\mathbf{S}_\ell^a$  with entries

$$S_{\ell;\alpha_1\dots\alpha_\ell}^a := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^a W_{i\alpha_1}^a \cdots W_{i\alpha_\ell}^a. \quad (19)$$

Indeed, the generic  $\ell$ -th term of the series (12) can be written as the overlap  $\mathbf{Q}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{s+1 \times s+1}$  of these tensors, for example

$$Q_1^{ab} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d S_{1;\alpha}^a S_{1;\alpha}^b, \quad (20)$$

$$Q_2^{ab} = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2=1}^d S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^a S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^b. \quad (21)$$

Then, the average replicated partition function reads  $\mathbb{E}Z^s = \int d\mathbf{Q}_1 d\mathbf{Q}_2 d\mathbf{Q}_W d\mathbf{Q}_v \exp(F_S + nF_E)$  where the ‘‘potentials’’  $F_E, F_S$  are functions of the symmetric matrices  $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{s+1 \times s+1}$ . The so-called energetic potential is defined as

$$e^{F_E} := \int dy d\lambda \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} \lambda}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{a=0}^s P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda^a), \quad (22)$$

and the entropic potential taking into account the degeneracy of the order parameters is instead given by

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F_S} &:= \int \prod_{a=0}^s d\mathbf{S}_1^a d\mathbf{S}_2^a \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_v(\mathbf{v}^a) dP_W(\mathbf{W}^a) \\ &\times \prod_{a=0}^s \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_2^a - \frac{\mathbf{W}^{aT}(\mathbf{v}^a)\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_1^a - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{aT}\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \\ &\times \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta\left(Q_W^{ab} - \frac{1}{kd} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{bT}]\right) \delta\left(Q_v^{ab} - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{aT} \mathbf{v}^b}{k}\right) \\ &\times \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \left[ \delta\left(Q_1^{ab} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d S_{1;\alpha}^a S_{1;\alpha}^b\right) \right. \\ &\left. \times \delta\left(Q_2^{ab} - \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2=1}^d S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^a S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^b\right) \right]. \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

The energetic term is easily computed, see App. E.1. For the entropic term, we interpret (23) as the (unnormalised) average of the last factor  $\prod_{a \leq b} [\delta(Q_1^{ab} - \dots) \delta(Q_2^{ab} - \dots)]$  under the law of the tensors  $(\mathbf{S}_1^a, \mathbf{S}_2^a)$  induced by the replicated weights conditionally on  $\mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{s+1 \times s+1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} P((\mathbf{S}_1^a, \mathbf{S}_2^a)_{a=0}^s | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v) &:= V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W)^{-kd} V_v(\mathbf{Q}_v)^{-k} \\ &\times \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_v(\mathbf{v}^a) dP_W(\mathbf{W}^a) \\ &\times \prod_{a=0}^s \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_2^a - \frac{\mathbf{W}^{aT}(\mathbf{v}^a)\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_1^a - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{aT}\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \\ &\times \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta(kdQ_W^{ab} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{bT}]) \delta(kQ_v^{ab} - \mathbf{v}^{aT} \mathbf{v}^b) \end{aligned}$$

with the normalisations

$$\begin{aligned} V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W)^{kd} &:= \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_W(\mathbf{W}^a) \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta(kdQ_W^{ab} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{bT}]), \\ V_v(\mathbf{Q}_v)^k &:= \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_v(\mathbf{v}^a) \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta(kQ_v^{ab} - \mathbf{v}^{aT} \mathbf{v}^b). \end{aligned}$$

Given that the number  $n$  of data scales as  $d^2$ , and that  $\mathbf{S}_1^a$  are only  $d$ -dimensional, they can be reconstructed perfectly: we assume that at equilibrium the related overlaps  $Q_1^{ab}$  are identically 1, or saturate to their maximum value. In other words, in the quadratic regime, the  $\mu_1$  contribution in  $\sigma(x) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{\mu_\ell}{\ell!} \text{He}_\ell(x)$  is perfectly learnable, while the higher order coefficients play a non-trivial role. In fact, once the deltas fixing  $Q_1^{ab}$  are written in Fourier representation, this appears clear, since their exponents are of  $O(k)$ , whereas the leading terms are of  $O(k^2)$ , ultimately implying trivial saddle point equations for  $Q_1^{ab}$ , if tracked down. We thus neglect said delta functions over  $Q_1^{ab}$  and set directly  $\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$ , the all-ones matrix. In contrast, Cui et al. (2023) study the linear data regime  $n \sim k$ , where the  $\mu_1$  term is the only potentially learnable one.

After these operations we get at leading exponential order

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}Z^n(\mathcal{D}) &= \int \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s dQ_2^{ab} dQ_W^{ab} dQ_v^{ab} \quad (24) \\ &\times e^{nF_E(\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v) + kd \ln V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W)} \\ &\times \int dP((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v) \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta(d^2 Q_2^{ab} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{S}_2^a \mathbf{S}_2^{bT}]), \end{aligned}$$

where  $P((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v)$  is the conditional marginal law. We have neglected the sub-leading term  $\exp(k \ln V_v(\mathbf{Q}_v))$ . From here on, our ansatz of  $P((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v)$  determines which of the two phases is described.

In the *universal* phase, which occurs for low  $\alpha$ , scarcity of data prevents the student from learning separately the teacher’s weights  $(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{W}^*)$ , that are instead recovered only via the combinations  $(\mathbf{S}_1^* = k^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^{*T} \mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{S}_2^* = k^{-1/2} \mathbf{W}^{*T}(\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^*)$ . Here, the generalisation error is independent of the choice of the prior  $P_W$ .

A second approach, inspired by Sakata & Kabashima (2013) (see also Kabashima et al. (2016)), correctly predicts the Bayes-optimal performance of the model for high  $\alpha$  and non-Gaussian priors over  $\mathbf{W}$  (such as Rademacher): here the student is able to overlap non-trivially with the actual teacher’s  $(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{W}^*)$ . We call this the *specialisation* phase.

**Universal phase** For low  $\alpha$ , the student is sensitive only to the combinations  $\mathbf{S}_\ell$ , defined in (19). In the large  $d$  limit

an effective rotational invariance of the matrix  $\mathbf{S}_2$  holds. As argued also in Barbier et al. (2024) this makes it impossible to have  $O(1)$  overlaps of the columns of the student’s  $\mathbf{W}$  with those of the teacher, resulting in a trivial overlap  $\mathbf{Q}_W$ . Instead, each column of  $\mathbf{W}$  has a non-trivial overlap profile of  $O(1/\sqrt{k})$  with all columns of  $\mathbf{W}^*$ , which is correctly captured by spherical integrals (Itzykson & Zuber, 1980; Matytsin, 1994; Guionnet & Zeitouni, 2002). Therefore, the correct ansatz for  $dP((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v)$  to plug in (24) is

$$dP((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v) = \prod_{a=0}^n dP(\mathbf{S}_2^a), \quad Q_W^{ab} = \delta_{ab}, \quad (25)$$

where  $dP(\mathbf{S}_2^a)$  is the probability distribution of the random matrix  $k^{-1/2} \mathbf{W}^a \tau(\mathbf{v}^a) \mathbf{W}^a$ , with each  $\mathbf{W}^a$  being made of i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries due to universality, and i.i.d.  $v_i^a \sim P_v$ . We stress that Gaussian universality is only on the choice of the prior over the inner weights  $\mathbf{W}$ , as the distribution of  $\mathbf{v}$  enters explicitly the law of  $\mathbf{S}_2$  (Maillard et al., 2024b). From (18) one can see that ansatz (25) removes the dependence on  $\mathbf{Q}_v$  from the partition function (we are assuming  $Q_v^{aa} = 1$ ).

**Specialisation phase** For high enough  $\alpha$ , a Bayes-optimal student with Rademacher prior over  $\mathbf{W}$  can learn something about the teacher’s weights. In this regime, for the same reason we took  $\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$  to write (24) ( $\mathbf{Q}_1$  is a statistics trivially learnable in the quadratic data regime  $\alpha > 0$ ), we can assume that  $\mathbf{Q}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$  as well: if the student is able to learn non-trivially the  $dk = \Theta(d^2)$  inner weights  $\mathbf{W}^*$ , then it must be that the data contains enough information to reconstruct perfectly the few  $k = \Theta(d)$  parameters of the read-out layer  $\mathbf{v}^*$ . In this phase, the correct ansatz for  $dP((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v)$  to plug in (24) is

$$dP((\mathbf{S}_2^a) | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v) = \left( \prod_{a=0}^s d\mathbf{S}_2^a \prod_{\alpha=1}^d \delta(S_{2;\alpha\alpha}^a - \sqrt{k}\mathbb{E}v) \right) \times \prod_{\alpha_1 < \alpha_2}^d \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^a (Q_W^{ab})^{-1} S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^b}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det(Q_W^{ab})}}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}v$  is the mean of the read-out prior  $P_v$ . In words, first, the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{S}_2^a$  are  $d$  random variables whose  $O(1)$  fluctuations cannot affect the free entropy in the asymptotic regime we are considering, being too few compared to  $n = \Theta(d^2)$ . Hence, we assume they concentrate to their mean. Concerning the  $d(d-1)/2$  off-diagonal elements of the matrices  $(\mathbf{S}_2^a)_{\alpha}$ , they are zero-mean variables whose distribution at given  $\mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v$  is assumed to be factorised over the input indices; their covariance is then defined as  $\mathbb{E}[S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^a S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^b | \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v] = (Q_W^{ab})^2 Q_v^{ab} = (Q_W^{ab})^2$ , which is non-trivial when the student aligns its hidden layer with the teacher, resulting in a non-trivial  $\mathbf{Q}_W$ .

The full derivation of our results under the ansätze (25), (26) combined with a replica symmetric assumption (i.e., a

form  $Q^{ab} = r\delta_{ab} + q(1 - \delta_{ab})$  for all overlaps and for  $K^{ab}$ , which is rigorously known to yield exact results in Bayes-optimal learning as we consider (see Barbier & Panchenko (2022) and Barbier & Macris (2019)), is found in App. E. Result 3.2 follows by evaluating the mutual information from Result 3.1 at the saddle point for the  $q$  and  $r$  parameters, obtained from the systems of equations in Sec. 3.

## 6. Conclusion and perspectives

In this work we provided a unified description of the optimal generalisation capability of a fully-trained 2-layer neural network of extensive width with generic activation when the sample size scales with the number of trainable parameters, a setting whose analysis has resisted for a long time to attempts based on mean-field approaches used, e.g., to study committee machines (Barkai et al., 1992; Engel et al., 1992; Schwarze & Hertz, 1992; 1993; Mato & Parga, 1992; Monasson & Zecchina, 1995; Aubin et al., 2018). We unveil two phases requiring different methods: a universal phase where the model behaves as if it had inner Gaussian weights, and a specialisation phase where the student’s discrete inner weights can align with the teacher’s, even though a statistical-computational gap prevents the tested algorithms to do so without side information. This work opens a number of research directions.

A natural extension is to consider models which are not Bayes-optimal, e.g., trained through empirical risk minimisation to learn a teacher with mismatched architecture. The formalism we provide here can be extended to these cases, by keeping track of additional order parameters. The extension to deeper architectures is also possible, in the vein of Cui et al. (2023) and Pacelli et al. (2023) who analysed the overparametrised proportional regime.

Moreover, the precise way the computationally-hard specialisation phase arises through ergodicity breaking in the loss landscape is left for future studies. Phase transitions of this kind are known in the statistical mechanics of learning literature at least since Györgyi (1990), when theoretical understanding was limited to linear models. An interesting research direction is the possible connection with Grokking, a sudden drop in generalisation error occurring during the training of neural nets close to interpolation (see Rubin et al. (2024b) for an interpretation in terms of thermodynamic first-order phase transitions).

Finally, we considered the idealised scenario of Gaussian inputs. Extensions of the theory are possible to get closer to realistic cases of structured inputs: data with a covariance (Monasson, 1992; Loureiro et al., 2021a), mixture models (Del Giudice, P. et al., 1989; Loureiro et al., 2021b), hidden manifolds (Goldt et al., 2020), object manifolds and simplexes (Chung et al., 2018; Rotondo et al., 2020), etc.

## Software and data

A GitHub repository to reproduce the results of this paper can be found at <https://github.com/Minh-Toan/extensive-width-NN>

## References

- Aguirre-López, F., Franz, S., and Pastore, M. Random features and polynomial rules, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10164>.
- Aiudi, R., Pacelli, R., Vezzani, A., Burioni, R., and Rotondo, P. Local kernel renormalization as a mechanism for feature learning in overparametrized convolutional neural networks, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11807>.
- Arjevani, Y., Bruna, J., Kileel, J., Polak, E., and Trager, M. Geometry and optimization of shallow polynomial networks, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.06074>.
- Aubin, B., Maillard, A., Barbier, J., Krzakala, F., Macris, N., and Zdeborová, L. The committee machine: Computational to statistical gaps in learning a two-layers neural network. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2018/file/84f0f20482cde7e5eacaf7364a643d33-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/84f0f20482cde7e5eacaf7364a643d33-Paper.pdf).
- Baglioni, P., Pacelli, R., Aiudi, R., Di Renzo, F., Vezzani, A., Burioni, R., and Rotondo, P. Predictive power of a Bayesian effective action for fully connected one hidden layer neural networks in the proportional limit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 133:027301, Jul 2024. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.027301. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.027301>.
- Barbier, J. Overlap matrix concentration in optimal Bayesian inference. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 10(2):597–623, 05 2020. ISSN 2049-8772. doi: 10.1093/imaiai/iaaa008. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaaa008>.
- Barbier, J. and Macris, N. The adaptive interpolation method: a simple scheme to prove replica formulas in bayesian inference. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 174(3):1133–1185, Aug 2019. ISSN 1432-2064. doi: 10.1007/s00440-018-0879-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-018-0879-0>.
- Barbier, J. and Macris, N. Statistical limits of dictionary learning: Random matrix theory and the spectral replica method. *Phys. Rev. E*, 106:024136, Aug 2022. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.106.024136. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.024136>.
- Barbier, J. and Panchenko, D. Strong replica symmetry in high-dimensional optimal Bayesian inference. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 393(3):1199–1239, Aug 2022. ISSN 1432-0916. doi: 10.1007/s00220-022-04387-w. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-022-04387-w>.
- Barbier, J., Krzakala, F., Macris, N., Miolane, L., and Zdeborová, L. Optimal errors and phase transitions in high-dimensional generalized linear models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(12):5451–5460, 2019. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1802705116. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1802705116>.
- Barbier, J., Camilli, F., Ko, J., and Okajima, K. On the phase diagram of extensive-rank symmetric matrix denoising beyond rotational invariance, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.01974>.
- Barkai, E., Hansel, D., and Sompolinsky, H. Broken symmetries in multilayered perceptrons. *Phys. Rev. A*, 45:4146–4161, Mar 1992. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.45.4146. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.45.4146>.
- Bartlett, P. L., Montanari, A., and Rakhlin, A. Deep learning: a statistical viewpoint. *Acta Numerica*, 30:87–201, 2021. doi: 10.1017/S0962492921000027. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492921000027>.
- Bassetti, F., Gherardi, M., Ingrosso, A., Pastore, M., and Rotondo, P. Feature learning in finite-width bayesian deep linear networks with multiple outputs and convolutional layers, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03260>.
- Bordelon, B., Canatar, A., and Pehlevan, C. Spectrum dependent learning curves in kernel regression and wide neural networks. In III, H. D. and Singh, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1024–1034. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/bordelon20a.html>.
- Camilli, F., Tieplova, D., and Barbier, J. Fundamental limits of overparametrized shallow neural networks for supervised learning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.05635>.

- Canatar, A., Bordelon, B., and Pehlevan, C. Spectral bias and task-model alignment explain generalization in kernel regression and infinitely wide neural networks. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):2914, 05 2021. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-23103-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23103-1>.
- Chung, S., Lee, D. D., and Sompolinsky, H. Classification and geometry of general perceptual manifolds. *Phys. Rev. X*, 8:031003, Jul 2018. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.8.031003. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.8.031003>.
- Cui, H., Krzakala, F., and Zdeborova, L. Bayes-optimal learning of deep random networks of extensive-width. In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 6468–6521. PMLR, 07 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/cui23b.html>.
- Del Giudice, P., Franz, S., and Virasoro, M. A. Perceptron beyond the limit of capacity. *J. Phys. France*, 50(2):121–134, 1989. doi: 10.1051/jphys:01989005002012100. URL <https://doi.org/10.1051/jphys:01989005002012100>.
- Dietrich, R., Opper, M., and Sompolinsky, H. Statistical mechanics of support vector networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82:2975–2978, 04 1999. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.2975. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.2975>.
- Du, S. and Lee, J. On the power of over-parametrization in neural networks with quadratic activation. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1329–1338. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/du18a.html>.
- Engel, A. and Van den Broeck, C. *Statistical mechanics of learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2001. ISBN 9780521773072.
- Engel, A., Köhler, H. M., Tschepke, F., Vollmayr, H., and Zippelius, A. Storage capacity and learning algorithms for two-layer neural networks. *Phys. Rev. A*, 45:7590–7609, May 1992. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.45.7590. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.45.7590>.
- Gamarnik, D., Kızıldağ, E. C., and Zadik, I. Stationary points of a shallow neural network with quadratic activations and the global optimality of the gradient descent algorithm. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 0(0): null, 0. doi: 10.1287/moor.2021.0082. URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2021.0082>.
- Gardner, E. The space of interactions in neural network models. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 21(1):257, Jan 1988. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/21/1/030. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/21/1/030>.
- Gerace, F., Loureiro, B., Krzakala, F., Mézard, M., and Zdeborová, L. Generalisation error in learning with random features and the hidden manifold model. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2021(12):124013, Dec 2021. ISSN 1742-5468. doi: 10.1088/1742-5468/ac3ae6. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/ac3ae6>.
- Ghorbani, B., Mei, S., Misiakiewicz, T., and Montanari, A. Linearized two-layers neural networks in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):1029 – 1054, 2021. doi: 10.1214/20-AOS1990. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AOS1990>.
- Goldt, S., Mézard, M., Krzakala, F., and Zdeborová, L. Modeling the influence of data structure on learning in neural networks: The hidden manifold model. *Phys. Rev. X*, 10:041044, Dec 2020. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.10.041044. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.10.041044>.
- Goldt, S., Loureiro, B., Reeves, G., Krzakala, F., Mezard, M., and Zdeborová, L. The Gaussian equivalence of generative models for learning with shallow neural networks. In Bruna, J., Hesthaven, J., and Zdeborová, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning Conference*, volume 145 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 426–471. PMLR, 08 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v145/goldt22a.html>.
- Guionnet, A. and Zeitouni, O. Large deviations asymptotics for spherical integrals. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 188(2):461–515, 2002. ISSN 0022-1236. doi: 10.1006/jfan.2001.3833. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022123601938339>.
- Györgyi, G. First-order transition to perfect generalization in a neural network with binary synapses. *Phys. Rev. A*, 41:7097–7100, Jun 1990. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.41.7097. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.41.7097>.
- Hanin, B. Random neural networks in the infinite width limit as Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(6A):4798 – 4819, 2023. doi: 10.1214/

- 23-AAP1933. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP1933>.
- Hastie, T., Montanari, A., Rosset, S., and Tibshirani, R. J. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(2):949 – 986, 2022. doi: 10.1214/21-AOS2133. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AOS2133>.
- Hu, H. and Lu, Y. M. Universality laws for high-dimensional learning with random features. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(3):1932–1964, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2022.3217698. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2022.3217698>.
- Hu, H., Lu, Y. M., and Misiakiewicz, T. Asymptotics of random feature regression beyond the linear scaling regime, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08160>.
- Itzykson, C. and Zuber, J. The planar approximation. II. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 21(3):411–421, 03 1980. ISSN 0022-2488. doi: 10.1063/1.524438. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.524438>.
- Kabashima, Y., Krzakala, F., Mézard, M., Sakata, A., and Zdeborová, L. Phase transitions and sample complexity in Bayes-optimal matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(7):4228–4265, 2016. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2016.2556702. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2016.2556702>.
- Lee, J., Sohl-dickstein, J., Pennington, J., Novak, R., Schoenholz, S., and Bahri, Y. Deep neural networks as Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B1EA-M-0Z>.
- Li, Q. and Sompolinsky, H. Statistical mechanics of deep linear neural networks: The backpropagating kernel renormalization. *Phys. Rev. X*, 11: 031059, Sep 2021. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.11.031059. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.11.031059>.
- Loureiro, B., Gerbelot, C., Cui, H., Goldt, S., Krzakala, F., Mezard, M., and Zdeborová, L. Learning curves of generic features maps for realistic datasets with a teacher-student model. In Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 18137–18151. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021a. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/9704a4fc48ae88598dcbdcdf57f3fdef-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/9704a4fc48ae88598dcbdcdf57f3fdef-Paper.pdf).
- Loureiro, B., Sicuro, G., Gerbelot, C., Pacco, A., Krzakala, F., and Zdeborová, L. Learning Gaussian mixtures with generalized linear models: Precise asymptotics in high-dimensions. In Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 10144–10157. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021b. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/543e83748234f7cbab21aa0ade66565f-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/543e83748234f7cbab21aa0ade66565f-Paper.pdf).
- Maillard, A., Krzakala, F., Mézard, M., and Zdeborová, L. Perturbative construction of mean-field equations in extensive-rank matrix factorization and denoising. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2022(8):083301, Aug 2022. doi: 10.1088/1742-5468/ac7e4c. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/ac7e4c>.
- Maillard, A., Troiani, E., Martin, S., Krzakala, F., and Zdeborová, L. Github repository ExtensiveWidthQuadraticSamples. <https://github.com/SPOC-group/ExtensiveWidthQuadraticSamples>, 2024a.
- Maillard, A., Troiani, E., Martin, S., Krzakala, F., and Zdeborová, L. Bayes-optimal learning of an extensive-width neural network from quadratically many samples, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03733>.
- Martin, S., Bach, F., and Biroli, G. On the impact of overparameterization on the training of a shallow neural network in high dimensions. In Dasgupta, S., Mandt, S., and Li, Y. (eds.), *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 238 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3655–3663. PMLR, 02–04 May 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v238/martin24a.html>.
- Mato, G. and Parga, N. Generalization properties of multi-layered neural networks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 25(19):5047, Oct 1992. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/25/19/017. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/19/017>.
- Matthews, A. G. D. G., Hron, J., Rowland, M., Turner, R. E., and Ghahramani, Z. Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=H1-nGgWC->.
- Matytsin, A. On the large- $N$  limit of the Itzykson-Zuber integral. *Nuclear Physics B*, 411(2):805–820, 1994. ISSN 0550-3213. doi: 10.1016/0550-3213(94)90471-5. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0550321394904715>.

- Mei, S. and Montanari, A. The generalization error of random features regression: Precise asymptotics and the double descent curve. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 75(4):667–766, 2022. doi: 10.1002/cpa.22008. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpa.22008>.
- Mezard, M., Parisi, G., and Virasoro, M. *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond*. World Scientific, 1986. doi: 10.1142/0271. URL <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/0271>.
- Monasson, R. Properties of neural networks storing spatially correlated patterns. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 25(13):3701, Jul 1992. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/25/13/019. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/13/019>.
- Monasson, R. and Zecchina, R. Weight space structure and internal representations: A direct approach to learning and generalization in multilayer neural networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75:2432–2435, Sep 1995. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.2432. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.2432>.
- Naveh, G. and Ringel, Z. A self consistent theory of Gaussian processes captures feature learning effects in finite CNNs. In Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 21352–21364. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/b24d21019de5e59da180f1661904f49a-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/b24d21019de5e59da180f1661904f49a-Paper.pdf).
- Neal, R. M. *Priors for Infinite Networks*, pp. 29–53. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1996. ISBN 978-1-4612-0745-0. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-0745-0\_2. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0745-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0745-0_2).
- Nishimori, H. *Statistical Physics of Spin Glasses and Information Processing: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 07 2001. ISBN 9780198509417. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198509417.001.0001.
- Nourdin, I., Peccati, G., and Podolskij, M. Quantitative Breuer–Major theorems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 121(4):793–812, 2011. ISSN 0304-4149. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2010.12.006>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304414910002917>.
- Pacelli, R., Ariosto, S., Pastore, M., Ginelli, F., Gherardi, M., and Rotondo, P. A statistical mechanics framework for Bayesian deep neural networks beyond the infinite-width limit. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(12):1497–1507, 12 2023. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-023-00767-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-023-00767-6>.
- Pourkamali, F., Barbier, J., and Macris, N. Matrix inference in growing rank regimes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(11):8133–8163, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2024.3422263. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2024.3422263>.
- Rotondo, P., Pastore, M., and Gherardi, M. Beyond the storage capacity: Data-driven satisfiability transition. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 125:120601, Sep 2020. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.120601. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.120601>.
- Rubin, N., Ringel, Z., Seroussi, I., and Helias, M. A unified approach to feature learning in bayesian neural networks. In *High-dimensional Learning Dynamics 2024: The Emergence of Structure and Reasoning*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZmOSJ2MV2R>.
- Rubin, N., Seroussi, I., and Ringel, Z. Grokking as a first order phase transition in two layer networks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3ROGsTX3IR>.
- Sakata, A. and Kabashima, Y. Statistical mechanics of dictionary learning. *Europhysics Letters*, 103(2):28008, Aug 2013. doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/103/28008. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/103/28008>.
- Sarao Mannelli, S., Vanden-Eijnden, E., and Zdeborová, L. Optimization and generalization of shallow neural networks with quadratic activation functions. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 13445–13455. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/9b8b50fb590c590ffbf1295ce92258dc-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/9b8b50fb590c590ffbf1295ce92258dc-Paper.pdf).
- Schwarze, H. and Hertz, J. Generalization in a large committee machine. *Europhysics Letters*, 20(4):375, Oct 1992. doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/20/4/015. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/20/4/015>.
- Schwarze, H. and Hertz, J. Generalization in fully connected committee machines. *Europhysics Letters*, 21(7):785, Mar 1993. doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/21/

7/012. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/21/7/012>.

Semerjian, G. Matrix denoising: Bayes-optimal estimators via low-degree polynomials. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 191(10):139, Oct 2024. ISSN 1572-9613. doi: 10.1007/s10955-024-03359-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-024-03359-9>.

Seroussi, I., Naveh, G., and Ringel, Z. Separation of scales and a thermodynamic description of feature learning in some CNNs. *Nature Communications*, 14(1): 908, Feb 2023. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-36361-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36361-y>.

Soltanolkotabi, M., Javanmard, A., and Lee, J. D. Theoretical insights into the optimization landscape of overparameterized shallow neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(2):742–769, 2019. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2018.2854560. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2018.2854560>.

van Meegen, A. and Sompolinsky, H. Coding schemes in neural networks learning classification tasks, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16689>.

Venturi, L., Bandeira, A. S., and Bruna, J. Spurious valleys in one-hidden-layer neural network optimization landscapes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(133): 1–34, 2019. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/18-674.html>.

Williams, C. Computing with infinite networks. In Mozer, M., Jordan, M., and Petsche, T. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 9. MIT Press, 1996. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/1996/file/ae5e3ce40e0404a45ecacaaf05e5f735-Paper.pdf>.

Xiao, L., Hu, H., Misiakiewicz, T., Lu, Y. M., and Pennington, J. Precise learning curves and higher-order scaling limits for dot-product kernel regression. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2023(11):114005, Nov 2023. doi: 10.1088/1742-5468/ad01b7. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/ad01b7>.

Yoon, H. and Oh, J.-H. Learning of higher-order perceptrons with tunable complexities. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 31(38):7771–7784, 09 1998. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/31/38/012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/31/38/012>.

## A. Hermite basis and Mehler's formula

Recall the Hermite expansion of the activation:

$$\sigma(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}}{\ell!} \text{He}_{\ell}(x). \quad (27)$$

We are expressing it on the basis of the probabilist's Hermite polynomials, generated through

$$\text{He}_{\ell}(z) = \frac{d^{\ell}}{dt^{\ell}} \exp(tz - t^2/2) \Big|_{t=0}. \quad (28)$$

The Hermite basis has the property of being orthogonal with respect to the standard Gaussian measure, which is the distribution of the input data:

$$\int Dz \text{He}_k(z) \text{He}_{\ell}(z) = \ell! \delta_{k\ell}, \quad (29)$$

where  $Dz := dz \exp(-z^2/2)/\sqrt{2\pi}$ . By orthogonality, the coefficients of the expansions can be obtained as

$$\mu_{\ell} = \int Dz \text{He}_{\ell}(z) \sigma(z). \quad (30)$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma(z)^2] = \int Dz \sigma(z)^2 = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!}. \quad (31)$$

These coefficients for some popular choices of  $\sigma$  are reported in Table 1 for reference. The Hermite basis can be generalised to an orthogonal basis with respect to the Gaussian measure with generic variance:

$$\text{He}_{\ell}^{[r]}(z) = \frac{d^{\ell}}{dt^{\ell}} \exp(tz - t^2 r/2) \Big|_{t=0}, \quad (32)$$

so that, with  $D_r z := dz \exp(-z^2/2r)/\sqrt{2\pi r}$ , we have

$$\int D_r z \text{He}_k^{[r]}(z) \text{He}_{\ell}^{[r]}(z) = \ell! r^{\ell} \delta_{k\ell}. \quad (33)$$

From Mehler's formula

$$\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{r^2 - q^2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(u, v) \begin{pmatrix} r & q \\ q & r \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}\right] = \frac{e^{-\frac{u^2}{2r}} e^{-\frac{v^2}{2r}}}{\sqrt{2\pi r} \sqrt{2\pi r}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} \frac{q^{\ell}}{\ell! r^{2\ell}} \text{He}_{\ell}^{[r]}(u) \text{He}_{\ell}^{[r]}(v), \quad (34)$$

and by orthogonality of the Hermite basis, (12) readily follows by noticing that the variables  $(h_i^a = (\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{x})_i / \sqrt{d})_{i,a}$  at given  $(\mathbf{W}^a)$  are Gaussian with covariances  $\Omega_{ij}^{ab}$ , Eq. (13), so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\sigma(h_i^a) \sigma(h_j^b)] = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\mu_{\ell}^{[r]})^2}{\ell! r^{2\ell}} (\Omega_{ij}^{ab})^{\ell}, \quad \mu_{\ell}^{[r]} = \int D_r z \text{He}_{\ell}^{[r]}(z) \sigma(z). \quad (35)$$

Moreover, as  $r = \Omega_{ii}^{aa}$  converges for  $d$  large to the variance of the prior of  $\mathbf{W}^*$  by Bayes-optimality, whenever  $\Omega_{ii}^{aa} \rightarrow 1$  we can specialise this formula to the simpler case  $r = 1$  we reported in the main text.

Table 1. First Hermite coefficients of the activation functions reported in Fig. 1.  $\theta$  is the Heaviside step function.

$\sigma(z)$	$\mu_0$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\dots$	$\mathbb{E}_z[\sigma(z)^2]$
$\text{ReLU}(z) = z\theta(z)$	$1/\sqrt{2\pi}$	1/2	$1/\sqrt{2\pi}$	0	$-1/\sqrt{2\pi}$	$\dots$	1/2
$\text{ELU}(z) = z\theta(z) + (e^z - 1)\theta(-z)$	0.16052	0.76158	0.26158	-0.13736	-0.13736	$\dots$	0.64494

## B. Nishimori identities

The Nishimori identities are a very general set of symmetries arising in inference in the Bayes-optimal setting as a consequence of Bayes' rule. To introduce them, consider a test function  $f$  of the teacher weights, collectively denoted by  $\theta^*$ , of  $s - 1$  replicas of the student's weights  $(\theta^a)_{2 \leq a \leq s}$  drawn conditionally i.i.d. from the posterior, and possibly also of the training set  $\mathcal{D}$ :  $f(\theta^*, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^s; \mathcal{D})$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle f(\theta^*, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^s; \mathcal{D}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \langle f(\theta^1, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^s; \mathcal{D}) \rangle, \quad (36)$$

where we have replaced the teacher's weights with another replica from the student. The proof is elementary, see e.g. (Barbier et al., 2019).

The Nishimori identities have some consequences also on our replica symmetric ansatz for the free entropy. In particular, they constrain the values of some order parameters. For instance

$$m_2 = \widetilde{\lim} \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}, \theta^*} \langle \text{Tr}[\mathbf{S}_2^a \mathbf{S}_2^*] \rangle = \widetilde{\lim} \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \langle \text{Tr}[\mathbf{S}_2^a \mathbf{S}_2^b] \rangle = q_2, \quad \text{for } a \neq b \quad (37)$$

assuming concentration of such order parameters takes place, which can be proven in great generality in Bayes-optimal learning (Barbier, 2020; Barbier & Panchenko, 2022). Another example is

$$r_2 = \widetilde{\lim} \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \langle \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{S}_2^a)^2] \rangle = \widetilde{\lim} \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*} \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{S}_2^*)^2] = \rho_2 = 1 + \gamma(\mathbb{E}v^*)^2. \quad (38)$$

When the value of some order parameters is determined by the Nishimori identities, as for  $r_2, \rho_2$ , then the respective Fourier conjugates  $\hat{r}_2, \hat{\rho}_2$  vanish (meaning that the desired constraints were already enforced without the need of additional delta functions). This is because in the entropic count of how many configurations make  $r_2, \rho_2$  take those values in the posterior measure, these constraints are automatically imposed by the measure.

## C. Alternative representation for the mean-square generalisation error

In this section we report the details on how to obtain Result 3.2 and how to write the generalisation error defined in (3) in a form more convenient for numerical sampling. From its definition, the Bayes-optimal generalisation error can be recast as

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \mathbb{E}[y_{\text{test}}^2 | \lambda^*] - 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \mathbb{E}[y_{\text{test}} | \lambda^*] \langle \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda] \rangle + \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \langle \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda] \rangle^2, \quad (39)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[y | \lambda] = \int dy y P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda)$ , and  $\lambda^* = \lambda^0$  and  $\lambda$  are the random variables (random due to the test input  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}$ , drawn independently of the training data  $\mathcal{D}$ , and their respective weights  $\theta^*, \theta$ )

$$\lambda^* = \lambda^0 = \lambda(\theta^*, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}) = \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}}{\sqrt{d}}\right), \quad \lambda = \lambda^1 = \lambda(\theta, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}) = \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma\left(\frac{\mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}}{\sqrt{d}}\right). \quad (40)$$

Recall that the bracket  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is the average w.r.t. to the posterior and acts on  $\theta = \theta^1, \theta^2, \dots$  which are replicas, i.e., conditionally i.i.d. samples from  $dP(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ . Notice that the last term on the r.h.s. of (39), that can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \langle \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda] \rangle^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \langle \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^1] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^2] \rangle,$$

with superscripts being replica indices, i.e.,  $\lambda^a := \lambda(\theta^a, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}})$ .

In order to show Result 3.2 for a generic  $P_{\text{out}}$  we assume the joint Gaussianity of the variables  $(\lambda^0, \lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots)$ , with covariance given by  $K^{ab}$  with  $a, b = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Indeed, in the limit  $\widetilde{\lim}$ , our theory considers  $(\lambda^a)_{a \geq 0}$  as jointly Gaussian under the randomness of a common input, here  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}$ , conditionally on the weights  $(\theta^a)$ . Their covariance depends on the weights  $(\theta^a)$  through various overlap order parameters introduced in the main. But in the large limit  $\widetilde{\lim}$  these overlaps are assumed to concentrate under the quenched posterior average  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle \cdot \rangle$  towards non-random asymptotic values predicted to be (56), with the overlaps entering  $K^{ab}$  given by the solution of  $(S_{\text{uni}})$  or  $(S_{\text{sp}})$  (depending on the phase) with maximum free entropy. This hypothesis is then confirmed by the excellent agreement between our theoretical predictions based on this assumption and the experimental results. This implies directly the result (8) from definition (2). For the special case of optimal mean-square generalisation error it yields

$$\widetilde{\lim} \varepsilon^{\text{opt}} = \mathbb{E}_{\lambda^0} \mathbb{E}[y_{\text{test}}^2 | \lambda^0] - 2\mathbb{E}_{\lambda^0, \lambda^1} \mathbb{E}[y_{\text{test}} | \lambda^0] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^1] + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda^1, \lambda^2} \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^1] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^2] \quad (41)$$

where, in the replica symmetric ansatz,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\lambda^0)^2] = K^{00}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\lambda^0 \lambda^1] = \mathbb{E}[\lambda^0 \lambda^2] = K^{01}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\lambda^1 \lambda^2] = K^{12}, \quad \mathbb{E}[(\lambda^1)^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\lambda^2)^2] = K^{11}. \quad (42)$$

For the dependence of the elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  on the overlaps under this ansatz we defer the reader to (62), (63). In the Bayes-optimal setting, using the Nishimori identities (see App. B), one can show that  $K^{01} = K^{12}$  and  $K^{00} = K^{11}$ . Because of these identifications, we would additionally have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\lambda^0, \lambda^1} \mathbb{E}[y_{\text{test}} | \lambda^0] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^1] = \mathbb{E}_{\lambda^1, \lambda^2} \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^1] \mathbb{E}[y | \lambda^2]. \quad (43)$$

Plugging the above in (41) yields (9).

Let us now prove a formula for the optimal mean-square generalisation error written in terms of the overlaps that will be simpler to evaluate numerically, which holds for the special case of linear readout with Gaussian label noise  $P_{\text{out}}^*(y | \lambda) = P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\Delta}(y - \lambda)^2) / \sqrt{2\pi\Delta}$ . The following derivation is exact and does not require any Gaussianity assumption on the random variables ( $\lambda^a$ ). For the linear Gaussian channel the means verify  $\mathbb{E}[y | \lambda] = \lambda$  and  $\mathbb{E}[y^2 | \lambda] = \lambda^2 + \Delta$ . Plugged in (39) this yields

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} - \Delta = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \lambda_{\text{test}}^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \lambda^* \langle \lambda \rangle + \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}} \langle \lambda^1 \lambda^2 \rangle, \quad (44)$$

whence we clearly see that the generalisation error depends only on the covariance of  $\lambda_{\text{test}}(\theta^*) = \lambda^0(\theta^0), \lambda^1(\theta^1), \lambda^2(\theta^2)$  under the randomness of the shared input  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}$  at fixed weights, regardless of the validity of the Gaussian equivalence principle we assume in the replica computation. This covariance was already computed in (12); we recall it here for the reader's convenience

$$K(\theta^a, \theta^b) := \mathbb{E} \lambda^a \lambda^b = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i,j=1}^k v_i^a (\Omega_{ij}^{ab})^{\ell} v_j^b = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!} Q_{\ell}^{ab}, \quad (45)$$

where  $\Omega_{ij}^{ab} := d^{-1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d W_{i\alpha}^a W_{j\alpha}^b$ , and  $Q_{\ell}^{ab}$  as introduced in (12) for  $a, b = 0, 1, 2$ . We stress that  $K(\theta^a, \theta^b)$  is not the limiting covariance  $K^{ab}$  whose elements are in (62), (63), but rather the finite size one.  $K(\theta^a, \theta^b)$  provides us with an efficient way to compute the generalisation error numerically, that is through the formula

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} - \Delta = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} K(\theta^*, \theta^*) - 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle K(\theta^*, \theta^1) \rangle + \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle K(\theta^1, \theta^2) \rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\ell}^2}{\ell!} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle Q_{\ell}^{00} - 2Q_{\ell}^{01} + Q_{\ell}^{12} \rangle. \quad (46)$$

In the above, the posterior measure  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is taken care of by Monte Carlo sampling (when it equilibrates). In addition, one can verify numerically that inside an arbitrary quadratic form one can replace in the large system limit the matrix

$$(\Omega_{ij}^{ab})^{\ell} \approx (Q_W^{ab})^{\ell} \delta_{ij} = \left( \frac{1}{kd} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{b\top}] \right)^{\ell} \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 3, \quad (47)$$

and this for any two conditionally i.i.d. posterior samples  $\mathbf{W}^a, \mathbf{W}^b$ , both in the universal phase (where  $Q_W^{ab} = \delta_{ab}$ ) and in the specialisation phase (where  $Q_W^{ab}$  is non-trivial). Putting all these ingredients together we get

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} - \Delta = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \left\langle \mu_1^2 (Q_1^{00} - 2Q_1^{01} + Q_1^{12}) + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (Q_2^{00} - 2Q_2^{01} + Q_2^{12}) + g(Q_W^{00}) - 2g(Q_W^{01}) + g(Q_W^{12}) \right\rangle. \quad (48)$$

In the Bayes-optimal setting one can use again the Nishimori identities that imply  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle Q_1^{12} \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle Q_1^{01} \rangle$ , and analogously  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle Q_2^{12} \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle Q_2^{01} \rangle$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle g(Q_W^{12}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \langle g(Q_W^{01}) \rangle$ . Inserting these identities in (48) one gets

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} - \Delta = \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*, \mathcal{D}} \left\langle \mu_1^2 (Q_1^{00} - Q_1^{01}) + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (Q_2^{00} - Q_2^{01}) + g(Q_W^{00}) - g(Q_W^{01}) \right\rangle. \quad (49)$$

This formula makes no assumption (other than (47)), which we checked numerically for the first higher-order overlaps, see Fig. 2) on the distribution of the  $\lambda$ 's. That it depends only on the covariance is simply a consequence of the quadratic nature of the generalisation error we consider.

*Remark C.1.* Note that the derivation up to (46) did not assume Bayes-optimality (while (49) does). Therefore, one can consider it in cases where the true posterior average  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  is replaced by one not verifying the Nishimori identities. This is the formula we use to compute the generalisation error of Monte Carlo-based estimators in Fig. 1, bottom. This is indeed needed to compute the generalisation in the glassy regime, where MCMC cannot equilibrate.




Figure 3. Mutual information in the universal (dashed) and specialisation (dotted) phase, for the activation functions in Fig. 1 (top panel),  $\gamma = 0.5$  and Gaussian label noise with variance  $\Delta = 1.25$ .  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  is the point where they cross (dash-dot line). The continuous line represents the stable (equilibrium) branch. The horizontal black dash-dot line at  $\ln 2$  corresponds to the upper bound on the mutual information per parameter for Rademacher inner weights, as proven in Barbier et al. (2024), towards which the mutual information converges when  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ .

## D. Linking free entropy and mutual information

It is possible to relate the mutual information (MI) of the inference task to the free entropy  $f_n = \mathbb{E} \ln \mathcal{Z}$  introduced in the main. Indeed, recalling that the teacher parameters are denoted  $\theta^* = (\mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$ , we can write the MI as

$$\frac{I(\theta^*; \mathcal{D})}{kd} = \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{D})}{kd} - \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{D} | \theta^*)}{kd}, \quad (50)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(Y | X)$  is the conditional Shannon entropy of  $Y$  given  $X$ . It is straightforward to show that the free entropy is

$$-\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_n = \frac{\mathcal{H}(\{y_\mu\}_{\mu \leq n} | \{\mathbf{x}_\mu\}_{\mu \leq n})}{kd} = \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{D})}{kd} - \frac{\mathcal{H}(\{\mathbf{x}_\mu\}_{\mu \leq n})}{kd}, \quad (51)$$

by the chain rule for the entropy. On the other hand  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{D} | \theta^*) = \mathcal{H}(\{y_\mu\} | \theta^*, \{\mathbf{x}_\mu\}) + \mathcal{H}(\{\mathbf{x}_\mu\})$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{D} | \theta^*)}{kd} \approx -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \int dy P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) \ln P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) + \frac{\mathcal{H}(\{\mathbf{x}_\mu\}_{\mu \leq n})}{kd}, \quad (52)$$

where  $\lambda \sim \mathcal{N}(0, r_K)$ , with  $r_K$  given by (7) (assuming here that  $\mu_0 = 0$ , see App. F if the activation  $\sigma$  is non-centred), and the equality holds asymptotically in lim. This allows us to express the MI as

$$\frac{I(\theta^*; \mathcal{D})}{kd} = -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_n + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \int dy P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) \ln P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda). \quad (53)$$

Specialising the equation to the Gaussian channel, one obtains

$$\frac{I(\theta^*; \mathcal{D})}{kd} = -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_n - \frac{\alpha}{2\gamma} \ln(2\pi e \Delta). \quad (54)$$

Note that the choice of normalising by  $kd$  is not accidental. Indeed, the number of parameters is  $kd + k \approx kd$ . Hence with this choice one can interpret the parameter  $\alpha$  as an effective signal-to-noise ratio.

Thanks to the relation between free entropy and mutual information, and using the theory devised in the main, we are able to evaluate the mutual information in the universal and specialisation phases, identifying the critical value of  $\alpha$  where the transition between the two occurs (see Eq. (6)). In Fig. 3 we report the curves we used to obtain  $\alpha_{\text{sp}}$  in Fig. 1, top panel.

*Remark D.1.* The arguments of Barbier et al. (2024) to show the existence of an upper bound on the mutual information per variable in the case of discrete variables and the associated inevitable breaking of universality beyond a certain threshold in matrix denoising apply to the present model too. It implies, as in the aforementioned paper, that the mutual information per variable cannot go beyond  $\ln 2$  for Rademacher inner weights. Our theory is consistent with this fact as emphasised by the vertical line in Figure 3.

## E. Details of the replica calculation

We report here the details of the replica calculation we sketched in the main text, both for the universal and the specialisation phases. The common starting point is (24). The energetic potential  $F_E$  in (22) has always the same form in the two approaches, while the entropic terms will depend on the phase. We shall thus treat them separately.

### E.1. Energetic potential

The replicated energetic potential is reported here for the reader's convenience:

$$F_E = \ln \int dy \int \frac{d\lambda e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} \lambda}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{a=0}^s P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda^a). \quad (55)$$

After applying our ansatz (17) and using that  $Q_1^{ab} = 1$  in the quadratic-data regime, the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{K}$  in replica space defined in (12) reads

$$\mathbf{K} = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathbf{Q}_v \circ g(\mathbf{Q}_W), \quad (56)$$

where the function

$$g(x) = \sum_{\ell=3}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_\ell^2}{\ell!} x^\ell = \mathbb{E}_{(y,z)|x}[\sigma(y)\sigma(z)] - \mu_0^2 - \mu_1^2 x - \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} x^2, \quad (y, z) \sim \mathcal{N}\left((0, 0), \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ x & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \quad (57)$$

is applied component-wise to the matrix elements of  $\mathbf{Q}_W$ , and  $\circ$  is the Hadamard product.  $F_E$  is already expressed as a low-dimensional integral, but within the replica symmetric (RS) ansatz it simplifies considerably. The RS ansatz amounts to assume that the saddle point solutions are dominated by order parameters of the form (below  $\mathbf{1}_s$  and  $\mathbb{I}_s$  are the all-ones vector and identity matrix of size  $s$ )

$$\mathbf{Q}_W = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_W & m_W \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ m_W \mathbf{1}_s & (r_W - q_W) \mathbb{I}_s + q_W \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \iff \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho}_W & -\hat{m}_W \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ -\hat{m}_W \mathbf{1}_s & (\hat{r}_W + \hat{q}_W) \mathbb{I}_s - \hat{q}_W \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_2 & m_2 \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ m_2 \mathbf{1}_s & (r_2 - q_2) \mathbb{I}_s + q_2 \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \iff \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho}_2 & -\hat{m}_2 \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ -\hat{m}_2 \mathbf{1}_s & (\hat{r}_2 + \hat{q}_2) \mathbb{I}_s - \hat{q}_2 \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_v = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_v & m_v \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ m_v \mathbf{1}_s & (r_v - q_v) \mathbb{I}_s + q_v \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \iff \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_v = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho}_v & -\hat{m}_v \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ -\hat{m}_v \mathbf{1}_s & (\hat{r}_v + \hat{q}_v) \mathbb{I}_s - \hat{q}_v \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (60)$$

where we reported the ansatz also for the Fourier conjugates for future convenience, though not needed for the energetic potential. The RS ansatz, which is equivalent to an assumption of concentration of the order parameters, is known to be asymptotically exact in the large system limit when analysing Bayes-optimal inference and learning, as in the present paper, see (Nishimori, 2001; Barbier, 2020; Barbier & Panchenko, 2022). Under the RS ansatz  $\mathbf{K}$  acquires a similar form:

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_K & m_K \mathbf{1}_s^\top \\ m_K \mathbf{1}_s & (r_K - q_K) \mathbb{I}_s + q_K \mathbf{1}_s \mathbf{1}_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \quad (61)$$

with

$$m_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} m_2 + m_v g(m_W), \quad q_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} q_2 + q_v g(q_W), \quad (62)$$

$$\rho_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} \rho_2 + \rho_v g(\rho_W), \quad r_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} r_2 + r_v g(r_W). \quad (63)$$

In the RS ansatz it is thus possible to give a convenient low-dimensional representation of the multivariate Gaussian integral of  $F_E$  in terms of white Gaussians:

$$\lambda^a = \xi\sqrt{q_K} + u^a\sqrt{r_K - q_K}, \quad \text{for } a = 1, \dots, s \quad (64)$$

$$\lambda^0 = \xi\sqrt{\frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} + u^0\sqrt{\rho_K - \frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} \quad (65)$$

where  $\xi, (u^a)_{a=0}^s$  are all i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables. Then

$$F_E = \ln \int dy \mathbb{E}_{\xi, u^0} P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{\frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} + u^0\sqrt{\rho_K - \frac{m_K^2}{q_K}}) \prod_{a=1}^s \mathbb{E}_{u^a} P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{q_K} + u^a\sqrt{r_K - q_K}). \quad (66)$$

The last product over the replica index  $a$  contains all identical factors thanks to the RS ansatz, therefore, by expanding for  $s \rightarrow 0$  we get

$$F_E = s \int dy \mathbb{E}_{\xi, u^0} P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{\frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} + u^0\sqrt{\rho_K - \frac{m_K^2}{q_K}}) \ln \mathbb{E}_u P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{q_K} + u\sqrt{r_K - q_K}) + O(s^2). \quad (67)$$

For the Gaussian channel  $P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\Delta}(y - \lambda))/\sqrt{2\pi\Delta}$  the above gives

$$F_E = -\frac{s}{2} \ln [2\pi(\Delta + r_K - q_K)] - \frac{s}{2} \frac{\Delta + \rho_K - 2m_K + q_K}{\Delta + r_K - q_K} + O(s^2). \quad (68)$$

In the Bayes-optimal setting the Nishimori identities enforce

$$r_2 = \rho_2 = \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{S}_2^*)^2] = 1 + \gamma(\mathbb{E}v^*)^2, \quad r_v = \rho_v = r_W = \rho_W = 1, \quad (69)$$

$$m_2 = q_2, \quad m_v = q_v, \quad m_W = q_W, \quad (70)$$

which implies also that

$$r_K = \rho_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}r_2\mu_2^2 + g(1), \quad m_K = q_K. \quad (71)$$

Therefore the above simplifies to

$$F_E = s \int dy \mathbb{E}_{\xi, u^0} P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{q_K} + u^0\sqrt{r_K - q_K}) \ln \mathbb{E}_u P_{\text{out}}(y | \xi\sqrt{q_K} + u\sqrt{r_K - q_K}) + O(s^2) \quad (72)$$

$$=: s \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W, q_v); r_K) + O(s^2). \quad (73)$$

Notice that the energetic contribution to the free entropy has the same form as in the generalised linear model (Barbier et al., 2019). For our running example of Gaussian output channel the function  $\psi_{P_{\text{out}}}$  reduces to

$$\psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W, q_v); r_K) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln [2\pi(\Delta + r_K - q_K)] - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (74)$$

In what follows we shall restrict ourselves only to the replica symmetric ansatz, in the Bayes-optimal setting. Therefore, identifications as the ones in (69)-(70) are assumed.

## E.2. Free entropy and mutual information for the universal phase

Let us take the computation from (25). When the number of data  $n$  is sent to  $+\infty$ , the integral over the order parameters in (24) is dominated by the saddle points w.r.t.  $\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v$ . As anticipated  $Q_W^{ab} = \delta_{ab}$ , i.e.,  $m_W = q_W = 0$ , and consequently only  $Q_v^{aa} = 1$  appears in the expression due to (62) and  $g(0) = 0$ . The only nontrivial saddle point is thus performed over the order parameter  $\mathbf{Q}_2 = (Q_2^{ab})_{0 \leq a \leq b \leq s}$ . Therefore, in the thermodynamic limit the leading order contribution to the replicated free entropy reads

$$f_{n,s} = \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{1}{s} F_E(\mathbf{Q}_2) + \frac{kd}{ns} \ln V_W(\mathbb{I}_{s+1}) + \frac{1}{ns} \ln \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP(\mathbf{S}_2^a) \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta(d^2 Q_2^{ab} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{S}_2^a \mathbf{S}_2^{b\text{T}}]) \right\} + o(1), \quad (75)$$

where we have abused the notation  $F_E(\mathbf{Q}_2) := F_E(\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbb{I}_{s+1}, \mathbb{I}_{s+1})$ . Extremisation is over  $\mathbf{Q}_2$  only.

The only high-dimensional part remaining is that of the variables  $(\mathbf{S}_2^a)_{0 \leq a \leq s}$ . Using the Fourier representation of the delta function<sup>1</sup>, the last term in (75) rewrites as

$$J_{n,s}(\mathbf{Q}_2) := \frac{1}{ns} \ln \int \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s d\hat{Q}_2^{ab} \exp \left[ -\frac{d^2}{4} \sum_{a,b=0}^s Q_2^{ab} \hat{Q}_2^{ab} \right] \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP(\mathbf{S}_2^a) \exp \left[ \frac{d}{4} \sum_{a,b=0}^s \hat{Q}_2^{ab} \text{Tr} \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_2^a \mathbf{S}_2^{b\top}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \right] \quad (76)$$

up to vanishing corrections. Notice that we have re-normalised  $\mathbf{S}_2^a$  by  $\sqrt{d}$  in order to work with matrices with  $O(1)$  eigenvalues. Using the Bayes-optimality of the setting, we can perform an additional simplifying RS ansatz on the saddle point optimisation:

$$Q_2^{aa} = r_2, \quad 0 \leq a \leq s, \quad \text{and} \quad Q_2^{ab} = q_2, \quad a \neq b, \quad (77)$$

$$\hat{Q}_2^{aa} = -\hat{r}_2, \quad 0 \leq a \leq s, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{Q}_2^{ab} = \hat{q}_2, \quad a \neq b. \quad (78)$$

Therefore,  $J_{n,s}$  at leading order in  $n$  appears as

$$J_{n,s}(q_2, r_2) = \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{1}{ns} \ln \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP(\mathbf{S}_2^a) \exp \left( -\frac{d(\hat{r}_2 + \hat{q}_2)}{4} \sum_{a=0}^s \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_2^a}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{d\hat{q}_2}{4} \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sum_{a=0}^s \frac{\mathbf{S}_2^a}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^2 \right] \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{d^2}{4ns} ((s+1)\hat{r}_2 r_2 - s(s+1)\hat{q}_2 q_2) \right\}, \quad (79)$$

where extremisation is w.r.t.  $\hat{r}_2$  and  $\hat{q}_2$ . From the above it is clear that when  $s \rightarrow 0$ , it must be the case that  $\hat{r}_2$  vanish (otherwise a divergence appears). This happens because the Nishimori identities in the Bayes-optimal setting are indeed sufficient to fix the values of  $Q_2^{aa} = r_2$  without the need of Fourier conjugates. In order to take the 0 replica limit, one then decouples replicas with a Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation which introduces an expectation over a standard GOE matrix  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $O(1)$  eigenvalues (i.e., a symmetric matrix whose upper triangular part has i.i.d. entries from  $\mathcal{N}(0, (1 + \delta_{ij})/d)$ ) through the identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}} e^{\frac{d}{2} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}\mathbf{Z}]} = e^{\frac{d}{4} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}^2]}$$

for any symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . After these standard steps the replica limit of  $J_{n,s}$  reads

$$J_{n,0}(q_2) = \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*, \mathbf{Z}} \ln \int dP(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2) \exp \left( -\frac{d\hat{q}_2}{4} \text{Tr} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^2 + \frac{d\sqrt{\hat{q}_2}}{2} \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2 (\sqrt{\hat{q}_2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^* + \mathbf{Z})] \right) - \frac{1}{4\alpha} \hat{q}_2 q_2 \right\} \quad (80)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{kd}} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{W}_i^\top = \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{W}_i^\top$  and similarly for  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*$ . The high-dimensional integral that remains is the free entropy per datum of a Bayes-optimal matrix denoising problem:

$$\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2) = \sqrt{\hat{q}_2} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^* + \mathbf{Z}, \quad (81)$$

with a rotationally invariant prior on  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*$ . Therefore, we can directly import the results from (Pourkamali et al., 2024; Maillard et al., 2024b):

$$J_{n,0}(q_2) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{\hat{q}_2(r_2 - q_2)}{4} - \iota(\hat{q}_2) \right\} \quad (82)$$

where we remind the reader that  $r_2 = 1 + \gamma(\mathbb{E}v^*)^2$ , and

$$\iota(\hat{q}_2) := \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d^2} I(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*; \mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)) = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}). \quad (83)$$

<sup>1</sup>In this manuscript, we often represent the delta function using its Fourier representation  $\delta(x - c) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{i\mathbb{R}} d\hat{x} \exp(\hat{x}(x - c))$ . Formally the integration is over the imaginary axis  $i\mathbb{R}$ . The complex-valued Fourier conjugates  $\hat{x}$  associated with order parameters will enter effective actions and the final integrals will be performed by saddle-point through contour deformation in  $\mathbb{C}$ . In inference problems, saddle-point integration will always pick real-valued parameters for all the integrated quantities, including Fourier conjugates. Therefore, we will never specify that integrals over Fourier parameters are over  $i\mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, trivial multiplicative constants such as the  $1/2\pi$  appearing here play no role in the final equations, and will therefore be dropped without notice.

Here  $I(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*; \mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2))$  is the MI related to the channel (81),  $\mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}$  is the asymptotic spectral law of the observation matrix  $\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)$  and  $\Sigma(\mu) := \int \ln|x-y|d\mu(x)d\mu(y)$ . Extremisation is w.r.t.  $\hat{q}_2$  only.

The other quantity to simplify is the entropic contribution  $\ln V_W(\mathbb{I}_{s+1})$ . It is not difficult to verify that when the matrix overlap in the argument is the identity this contribution is vanishing. The intuitive reason is that in that case the  $\delta$ 's in the integral defining  $V_W$  are imposing constraints that are already approximately verified by samples from the prior  $P_W$  with high probability. Therefore, integration w.r.t. the prior of these constraints is virtually still measuring the whole probability space, yielding  $V_W(\mathbb{I}_{s+1}) = 1$  at leading exponential order.

Furthermore, by (56), in this phase we have

$$q_K = q_K(q_2, 0, 0) = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2}q_2, \quad r_K = \mu_1^2 + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2}(1 + \gamma(\mathbb{E}v^*)) + g(1). \quad (84)$$

Hence, the final replica symmetric potential in the universal phase reads

$$f_{\text{uni}} = \text{extr} \left\{ \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, 0, 0); r_K) + \frac{\hat{q}_2(r_2 - q_2)}{4\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \iota(\hat{q}_2) \right\}, \quad (85)$$

while the mutual information (see App. D) is

$$I_{\text{uni}} = -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_{\text{uni}} + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \int dy P_{\text{out}}(y|\lambda) \ln P_{\text{out}}(y|\lambda). \quad (86)$$

In our running example of Gaussian channel  $P_{\text{out}}$  with noise intensity  $\Delta$ , the above reads

$$f_{\text{uni}} = \text{extr} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(\Delta + r_K - \mu_1^2 - \frac{\mu_2^2}{2}q_2) - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\hat{q}_2(\rho_2 - q_2)}{4\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \iota(\hat{q}_2) \right\} \quad (87)$$

and the mutual information is

$$I_{\text{uni}} = \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{2\gamma} \ln(\Delta + r_K - \mu_1^2 - \frac{\mu_2^2}{2}q_2) - \frac{\hat{q}_2(\rho_2 - q_2)}{4\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \iota(\hat{q}_2) \right\} - \frac{\alpha}{2\gamma} \ln \Delta. \quad (88)$$

For a generic output channel the system of saddle point equations read

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\text{uni}}) \begin{cases} q_2 = r_2 - \frac{1}{\hat{q}_2} (1 - \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \int \mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}^3(y) dy), \\ \hat{q}_2 = 4\alpha \partial_{q_2} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, 0, 0); r_K). \end{cases} \quad (89)$$

Only the second equation is channel-dependent. For a Gaussian output channel  $P_{\text{out}}(y|\lambda) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\Delta}(y-\lambda)^2)/\sqrt{2\pi\Delta}$  we have

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\text{uni}}) \begin{cases} q_2 = r_2 - \frac{1}{\hat{q}_2} (1 - \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \int \mu_{\mathbf{Y}(\hat{q}_2)}^3(y) dy), \\ \hat{q}_2 = \alpha \mu_2^2 / [\Delta + r_K - \mu_1^2 - q_2 \mu_2^2 / 2]. \end{cases} \quad (90)$$

### E.3. Free entropy and mutual information for the specialisation phase

Following from the ansatz (26), the replicated partition function for the specialisation phase reads (again, equality here is at leading exponential order and we already took  $\mathbf{Q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_v$  as all-ones matrices, and used a Fourier representation for the delta function fixing  $\mathbf{Q}_2$  in (24))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{Z}^s(\mathcal{D}) &= \int \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s dQ_2^{ab} d\hat{Q}_2^{ab} dQ_W^{ab} e^{n F_E(\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top) + kd \ln V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W) + \frac{d^2}{4} \text{Tr} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2^\top} \\ &\times \left[ \int \prod_{a=0}^s dS_2^a \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det(\mathbf{Q}_W^{o2})}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s S_2^a (\mathbf{Q}_W^{o2})_{ab}^{-1} S_2^b - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s \hat{Q}_2^{ab} S_2^a S_2^b} \right]^{d(d-1)/2} \\ &\times \int \left( \prod_{a=0}^s \prod_{\alpha=1}^d dS_{2;\alpha\alpha}^a \delta(S_{2;\alpha\alpha}^a - \sqrt{k}(\mathbb{E}v)) \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4} \sum_{a,b=0}^s \hat{Q}_2^{ab} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d S_{2;\alpha\alpha}^a S_{2;\alpha\alpha}^b}. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Integration over the diagonal elements  $(S_{2;\alpha\alpha}^a)_\alpha$  can be done straightforwardly, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}Z^s(\mathcal{D}) &= \int \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s dQ_2^{ab} d\hat{Q}_2^{ab} dQ_W^{ab} e^{nF_E(\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top) + kd \ln V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W) + \frac{d^2}{4} \text{Tr} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2^\top (\mathbf{Q}_2 - \gamma \mathbf{11}^\top (\mathbb{E}v)^2)} \\ &\quad \times \left[ \int \prod_{a=0}^s dS_2^a \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det(\mathbf{Q}_W^{\circ 2})}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s S_2^a (\mathbf{Q}_W^{\circ 2})_{ab}^{-1} S_2^b - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s S_2^a \hat{Q}_2^{ab} S_2^b} \right]^{d(d-1)/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Using the change of variable  $\mathbf{S}_2 \rightarrow (\mathbf{Q}_W^{\circ 2})^{1/2} \mathbf{S}_2$  (where  $^{1/2}$  is a matrix square root), the remaining Gaussian integral over the off-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{S}_2$  can be performed exactly, leading to

$$\mathbb{E}Z^s(\mathcal{D}) = \int \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s dQ_2^{ab} d\hat{Q}_2^{ab} dQ_W^{ab} e^{nF_E(\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W) + kd \ln V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W) + \frac{d^2}{4} \text{Tr} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2^\top (\mathbf{Q}_2 - \gamma \mathbf{11}^\top (\mathbb{E}v)^2) - \frac{d(d-1)}{4} \ln \det[\mathbb{I}_{s+1} + \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \mathbf{Q}_W^{\circ 2}]} \quad (93)$$

where, being in the Bayes-optimal setting we can assume  $\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top$ , and therefore  $F_E(\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W) := F_E(\mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{11}^\top)$ . In order to proceed and perform the  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  limit, we use the RS ansatz for  $\mathbf{Q}_2$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_W$  introduced in (58) and (59), combined with the Nishimori identities, combined with the Nishimori identities

$$\begin{aligned} m_W &= q_W, \quad r_W = \rho_W = 1, \quad r_2 = \rho_2 = 1 + \gamma(\mathbb{E}v)^2, \\ \hat{m}_W &= \hat{q}_W, \quad \hat{r}_W = \hat{\rho}_W = 0, \quad \hat{r}_2 = \hat{\rho}_2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

We can start by evaluating the normalisation factor  $V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W)$  by representing the delta function fixing  $\mathbf{Q}_W$  in Fourier space and introducing its conjugate variable  $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W$  (both are symmetric matrices), so that

$$\begin{aligned} V_W(\mathbf{Q}_W)^{kd} &= \int d\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W e^{\frac{kd}{2} \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}_W \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W} \left[ \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_W(w^a) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b=0}^s w^a w^b \hat{Q}_W^{ab}\right) \right]^{kd} \\ &= \int d\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W e^{\frac{kd}{2} \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}_W \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W} \left( \mathbb{E}_{w^0, \xi_w} \left( \mathbb{E}_w \left[ e^{-\frac{\hat{q}_W}{2} w^2 + \hat{q}_W w^0 w + \sqrt{\hat{q}_W} \xi_w w} \right] \right)^s \right)^{kd}, \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where in the second line we used the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation, introduced  $\xi_w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $w, w^0 \sim P_W$ . Note that we reduced the matrix integral into a one-dimensional integral over a single element of the weight matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  using the factorisation of its prior law.

With the RS ansatz (58), (59) and the Nishimori identities computing traces is straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}_W \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_W &= -s(s+1) \hat{q}_W \hat{q}_W, \\ \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}_2 \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 &= -s(s+1) \hat{q}_2 \hat{q}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Finally, the determinant term in the exponent of the integrand of (93) reads

$$\ln \det[\mathbb{I}_{s+1} + \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \mathbf{Q}_W^{\circ 2}] = s \ln[1 + \hat{q}_2(1 - q_W^2)] - s \hat{q}_2 + O(s^2). \quad (97)$$

All the terms that appear in the exponent of (93) are now explicit. In order to proceed with the calculations one should switch the limit in  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $n, k, d \rightarrow \infty$  and compute the integrals with the saddle point approximation. These are standard procedures in a replica calculation, we thus report the result (which, as we recall, holds in the Bayes-optimal setting):

$$f_{\text{sp}} = \text{extr} \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} \psi_{P_W}(\hat{q}_W) + \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W, 1); r_K) - \frac{\gamma}{2\alpha} q_W \hat{q}_W + \frac{(r_2 - q_2) \hat{q}_2}{4\alpha} - \frac{1}{4\alpha} \ln(1 + \hat{q}_2(1 - q_W^2)) \right\}, \quad (98)$$

where  $\psi_{P_{\text{out}}}$  is given by (73), extremisation is w.r.t.  $\hat{q}_W, \hat{q}_2, q_W, q_2$ , and

$$\psi_{P_W}(\hat{q}_W) := \mathbb{E}_{w^0, \xi_w} \ln \mathbb{E}_w \left[ e^{-\frac{\hat{q}_W}{2} w^2 + \hat{q}_W w^0 w + \sqrt{\hat{q}_W} \xi_w w} \right]. \quad (99)$$

The mutual information follows from (53):

$$I_{\text{sp}} = -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} f_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \int dy P_{\text{out}}(y|\lambda) \ln P_{\text{out}}(y|\lambda). \quad (100)$$

With the shortcut notation

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_{\hat{q}_W, \xi_w} := \frac{\int dP_W(x) (\cdot) e^{-\frac{\hat{q}_W}{2} x^2 + (\hat{q}_W w^0 + \sqrt{\hat{q}_W} \xi_w) x}}{\int dP_W(y) e^{-\frac{\hat{q}_W}{2} y^2 + (\hat{q}_W w^0 + \sqrt{\hat{q}_W} \xi_w) y}}, \quad (101)$$

the resulting saddle point equations therefore read

$$(\text{S}_{\text{sp}}) \begin{cases} q_W = \mathbb{E}_{w^0, \xi_w} [w^0 \langle x \rangle_{\hat{q}_W, \xi_w}], \\ \hat{q}_W = \hat{q}_2 q_W / [\gamma + \gamma \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)] + 2 \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \partial_{q_W} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W, 1); r_K), \\ q_2 = r_2 - (1 - q_W^2) / [1 + \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)], \\ \hat{q}_2 = 4\alpha \partial_{q_2} \psi_{P_{\text{out}}}(q_K(q_2, q_W, 1); r_K). \end{cases} \quad (102)$$

All the above formulae are easily specialised for the Gaussian output channel case using (74). We report here, for the reader's convenience, the saddle point equations in such setting (recalling that  $g$  is defined in (57)):

$$(\text{S}_{\text{sp}}) \begin{cases} q_W = \mathbb{E}_{w^0} [w^0 \langle w \rangle_{\hat{q}_W}], \\ \hat{q}_W = \hat{q}_2 q_W / [\gamma + \gamma \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)] + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} g'(q_W) / [\Delta + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (r_2 - q_2) + (g(1) - g(q_W))], \\ q_2 = r_2 - (1 - q_W^2) / [1 + \hat{q}_2 (1 - q_W^2)], \\ \hat{q}_2 = \alpha \mu_2^2 / [\Delta + \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (r_2 - q_2) + (g(1) - g(q_W))]. \end{cases} \quad (103)$$

If one assumes that the overlaps appearing in (49) are self-averaging around the values that solve the saddle point equations, that is  $Q_1^{00}, Q_1^{01} \rightarrow 1$  (as assumed in this scaling),  $Q_2^{00} \rightarrow r_2, Q_2^{01} \rightarrow q_2$ , and  $Q_W^{00} \rightarrow 1, Q_W^{01} \rightarrow q_W$ , then the limiting Bayes-optimal generalisation error for the Gaussian channel case appears as

$$\varepsilon^{\text{opt}} - \Delta = \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (r_2 - q_2) + (g(1) - g(q_W)). \quad (104)$$

## F. Non-centred activations

In this section we consider the generic case in which the activation function in (27) is non-centred, i.e.,  $\mu_0 \neq 0$ . This reflects on the law of the post-activations, which will still be Gaussian, centred at

$$\mathbb{E} \lambda^a = \frac{\mu_0}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^a =: \mu_0 \Lambda^a, \quad (105)$$

and with the covariance given by (12) (we are assuming  $Q_W^{aa} = 1$ ; if not,  $Q_W^{aa} = r$ , the formula can be generalised as explained in App. A). In the above, we have introduced the new mean parameter  $\Lambda^a$ . Notice that, if the  $\mathbf{v}^*$ 's have a  $\bar{v} = O(1)$  mean, then  $\Lambda^a$  scales as  $\sqrt{k}$  due to our choice of normalisation.

Concerning the energetic potential, it will now appear as

$$F_E = F_E(\mathbf{K}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \ln \int dy \int \frac{d\boldsymbol{\lambda} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{K}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{s+1} \det \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{a=0}^s P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda^a + \mu_0 \Lambda^a), \quad (106)$$

while in the entropic part we have the additional constraint  $\Lambda^a = \sum_i v_i^a / \sqrt{k}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} F_S(\mathbf{Q}_v, \mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) &:= \ln \int \prod_{a=0}^s d\mathbf{S}_1^a d\mathbf{S}_2^a \int \prod_{a=0}^s dP_v(\mathbf{v}^a) dP_W(\mathbf{W}^a) \\ &\times \prod_{a=0}^s \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_2^a - \frac{\mathbf{W}^{a\top}(\mathbf{v}^a)\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \delta\left(\mathbf{S}_1^a - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{a\top}\mathbf{W}^a}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \delta\left(Q_W^{ab} - \frac{1}{kd} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{W}^a \mathbf{W}^{b\top}]\right) \delta\left(Q_v^{ab} - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{a\top} \mathbf{v}^b}{k}\right) \\ &\times \prod_{a \leq b, 0}^s \left[ \delta\left(Q_1^{ab} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d S_{1;\alpha}^a S_{1;\alpha}^b\right) \delta\left(Q_2^{ab} - \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2=1}^d S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^a S_{2;\alpha_1\alpha_2}^b\right) \right] \prod_{a=1}^s \delta\left(\Lambda^a - \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^a\right). \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

As already mentioned for centred activations, the Dirac  $\delta$ 's on  $\mathbf{Q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_v$  never really contribute to the thermodynamics, as they involve a number of variables of  $\Theta(d) = \Theta(k)$ , whereas the free energy scales at  $\Theta(n) = \Theta(d^2) = \Theta(k^2)$ . This is even more so for the few variables  $\Lambda^{a \geq 1}$ , which are only  $\Theta(s)$  in number. Hence,  $F_S$  defined in (107) collapses on (23) at leading order. A similar fact was already pointed out in Gardner (1988). Since  $\Lambda$  only appear in the energetic potential  $F_E$ , their value can be determined by saddle point for  $n$  large, as for the other order parameters. In other words, the student can always determine  $\Lambda^{a \geq 1}$  from a maximum likelihood estimation at given teacher. Therefore, in what follows we can carry out the computation (and the replica trick) for a fixed realisation of  $\Lambda^0$ . After saddle point integration, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^s(\mathcal{D}, \Lambda^0) | \Lambda^0] = \exp \underset{\substack{\Lambda^{a \geq 1}, \mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \\ \mathbf{Q}_W, \mathbf{Q}_v}}{\text{extr}} \left( F_S(\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_W) + nF_E(\mathbf{K}, \Lambda) \right). \quad (108)$$

The treatment for  $F_S$  is the same as the one discussed above, while  $F_E$  becomes

$$e^{F_E} = \int dy \mathbb{E}_{\xi, u^0} P_{\text{out}} \left( y | \mu_0 \Lambda^0 + \xi \sqrt{\frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} + u^0 \sqrt{\rho_K - \frac{m_K^2}{q_K}} \right) \prod_{a=1}^s \mathbb{E}_{u^a} P_{\text{out}} \left( y | \mu_0 \Lambda + \xi \sqrt{q_K} + u^a \sqrt{r_K - q_K} \right),$$

where we have assumed replica symmetry also in the  $\Lambda^{a \geq 1} =: \Lambda$ . Therefore, the simplification of the potential  $F_E$  proceeds as in the centred activation case, yielding at leading order in the replicas

$$\frac{F_E(r_K, q_K, \Lambda, \Lambda^0)}{s} = \int dy \mathbb{E}_{\xi, u^0} P_{\text{out}} \left( y | \mu_0 \Lambda^0 + \xi \sqrt{q_K} + u^0 \sqrt{r_K - q_K} \right) \ln \mathbb{E}_u P_{\text{out}} \left( y | \mu_0 \Lambda + \xi \sqrt{q_K} + u \sqrt{r_K - q_K} \right)$$

in the Bayes-optimal setting. From this equation it is clear that the optimal student's estimate for  $\Lambda$  is precisely  $\Lambda = \Lambda^0$ : indeed,  $F_E$  is written in the form of a cross-entropy parametrised by  $\Lambda$ , and it attains its maximum at this value.

In the case when  $P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) = f(y - \lambda)$  then one can verify that the contributions due to the means, containing  $\mu_0$ , cancel each other. This is verified in our running example where  $P_{\text{out}}$  is the Gaussian channel:

$$\frac{F_E(r_K, q_K, \Lambda, \Lambda^0)}{s} = -\frac{1}{2} \ln [2\pi(\Delta + r_K - q_K)] - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\mu_0^2}{2} \frac{(\Lambda - \Lambda^0)^2}{\Delta + r_K - q_K}, \quad (109)$$

which is identical to (74) when  $\Lambda = \Lambda^0$ . We notice that the above arguments hold both with quenched and learnable readout weights  $\mathbf{v}$ .

## G. Equivalence to generalised linear models in the universal phase, and extension of GAMP-RIE to arbitrary activation

The saddle point equations for the overlaps in the universal phase can also be derived from the effective equivalence of our model to a generalised linear model (GLM). For simplicity, let us consider  $P_{\text{out}}(y | \lambda) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\Delta}(y - \lambda)^2)/\sqrt{2\pi\Delta}$  (these assumptions can be relaxed):

$$y_\mu | (\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{x}_\mu) \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right) + \sqrt{\Delta} z_\mu, \quad \mu = 1 \dots, n, \quad (110)$$

where  $z_\mu$  are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Expanding  $\sigma$  in the Hermite polynomial basis we have

$$y_\mu | (\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{x}_\mu) \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} \mu_0 \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{1}_k}{\sqrt{k}} + \mu_1 \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{kd}} + \frac{\mu_2}{2} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \text{He}_2 \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right) + \dots + \sqrt{\Delta} z_\mu \quad (111)$$

where  $\dots$  represents the terms beyond second order. Without loss of generality, for this choice of output channel we can set  $\mu_0 = 0$  as discussed in App. F. In the universal phase, the higher order terms in  $\dots$  cannot be learned given quadratically many samples and, as a result, play the role of effective noise, which we assume independent of the first three terms. Given that, this noise is asymptotically Gaussian thanks to the central limit theorem (it is a projection of a centred function applied entry-wise to a vector with i.i.d. entries), its variance is  $g(1)$  (see Eq. (57)). We thus obtain the effective equivalent model

$$y_\mu | (\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{x}_\mu) \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} \mu_1 \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{kd}} + \frac{\mu_2}{2} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \text{He}_2 \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right) + \sqrt{\Delta + g(1)} z_\mu, \quad (112)$$

where  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  mean equality in law. The first term in this expression can be learned with vanishing error given quadratically many samples (Remark G.1), thus can be ignored. This further simplifies the model to

$$\bar{y}_\mu := y_\mu - \mu_1 \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{kd}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\mu_2}{2} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \text{He}_2 \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right) + \sqrt{\Delta + g(1)} z_\mu, \quad (113)$$

where  $\bar{y}_\mu$  is  $y_\mu$  with the (asymptotically) perfectly learned linear term removed, and the last equality in distribution is again conditional on  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{x}_\mu)$ . From the formula

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top}}{\sqrt{k}} \text{He}_2 \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{d}} \right) = \text{Tr} \frac{\mathbf{W}^{*\top} (\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^*}{d\sqrt{k}} \mathbf{x}_\mu \mathbf{x}_\mu^\top - \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{1}_k}{\sqrt{k}} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{kd}} \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{x}_\mu \mathbf{x}_\mu^\top - \mathbb{I}_d) \mathbf{W}^{*\top} (\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^*], \quad (114)$$

where  $\approx$  is exploiting the concentration  $\text{Tr} \mathbf{W}^{*\top} (\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^* / (d\sqrt{k}) \rightarrow \mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{1}_k / \sqrt{k}$ , and the Gaussian equivalence property that  $\mathbf{M}_\mu := (\mathbf{x}_\mu \mathbf{x}_\mu^\top - \mathbb{I}_d) / \sqrt{d}$  behaves like a GOE sensing matrix, i.e., a symmetric matrix whose upper triangular part has i.i.d. entries from  $\mathcal{N}(0, (1 + \delta_{ij})/d)$  (Maillard et al., 2024b), the model can be seen as a GLM with signal  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^* := \mathbf{W}^{*\top} (\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^* / \sqrt{kd}$ :

$$y_\mu^{\text{GLM}} = \frac{\mu_2}{2} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}_\mu \bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*] + \sqrt{\Delta + g(1)} z_\mu. \quad (115)$$

Starting from this equation, the arguments of App. E and Maillard et al. (2024b), based on known results on the GLM (Barbier et al., 2019) and matrix denoising (Barbier & Macris, 2022; Maillard et al., 2022; Pourkamali et al., 2024), allow us to obtain the free entropy of the GLM. The result is consistent with the one obtained in App. E with the replica method.

We have thus identified an effective GLM representation of the learning model, which is valid in the universal phase. On the contrary, in the specialisation phase we cannot consider the . . . terms in Eq. (111) as noise uncorrelated with the first ones, as the model is aligning with the actual teacher’s weights, such that it learns all the successive terms at once.

We now assume that this mapping holds at the algorithmic level, namely, that we can process the data algorithmically as if they were coming from the identified GLM, and thus try to infer the signal  $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^* = \mathbf{W}^{*\top} (\mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{W}^* / \sqrt{kd}$  and construct a predictor from it. Based on this idea, we propose the Algorithm 1 below that can indeed reach the performance predicted by the universal branch of our theory.

*Remark G.1.* In the linear data regime, where  $n/d$  converges to a fixed constant  $\alpha_1$ , only the first term in (111) can be learned while the rest behaves like noise. By the same argument as above, the model is equivalent to

$$y_\mu = \mu_1 \frac{\mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{W}^* \mathbf{x}_\mu}{\sqrt{kd}} + \sqrt{\Delta + \nu - \mu_0^2 - \mu_1^2} z_\mu, \quad (116)$$

where  $\nu = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)}[\sigma^2(z)]$ . This is again a GLM with signal  $\mathbf{S}_1^* = \mathbf{W}^{*\top} \mathbf{v}^* / \sqrt{k}$  and Gaussian sensing vectors  $\mathbf{x}_\mu$ . Define  $q_1$  as the limit of  $\mathbf{S}_1^{a\top} \mathbf{S}_1^b / d$  where  $\mathbf{S}_1^a, \mathbf{S}_1^b$  are drawn independently from the posterior. With  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the signal converges in law to a standard Gaussian vector. Using known results on GLMs with Gaussian signal, we obtain the following saddle point equations for  $q_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= \frac{\hat{q}_1}{\hat{q}_1 + 1} \\ \hat{q}_1 &= \frac{\alpha_1}{1 + \Delta_1 - q_1} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{\Delta + \nu - \mu_0^2 - \mu_1^2}{\mu_1^2}. \quad (117)$$

In the quadratic data regime, as  $\alpha_1 = n/d$  goes to infinity, the overlap  $q_1$  converges to 1 and the first term in (111) is learned with vanishing error.

*Remark G.2.* The same argument can be easily generalised for general  $P_{\text{out}}$ , leading to the following equivalent GLM in the universal phase of quadratic data regime:

$$y_\mu^{\text{GLM}} \sim \tilde{P}_{\text{out}}(\cdot \mid \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}_\mu \bar{\mathbf{S}}_2^*]) \quad (118)$$

**Algorithm 1** GAMP-RIE for training shallow neural networks with arbitrary activation

---

**Input:** Fresh data point  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}$  with unknown associated response  $y_{\text{test}}$ , dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_\mu, y_\mu)\}_{\mu=1}^n$ .

**Output:** Estimator  $\hat{y}_{\text{test}}$  of  $y_{\text{test}}$ .

Estimate  $y^{(0)} := \mu_0 \mathbf{v}^{*\top} \mathbf{1} / \sqrt{k}$  as

$$\hat{y}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu};$$

Estimate  $\langle \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{W} \rangle$  using Monte Carlo sampling;

Estimate the  $\mu_1$  term in the Hermite expansion (111) as

$$\hat{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} = \mu_1 \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{W} \rangle \mathbf{x}_{\mu}}{\sqrt{kd}};$$

Compute

$$\tilde{y}_{\mu} = \frac{y_{\mu} - \hat{y}_{\mu}^{(0)} - \hat{y}_{\mu}^{(1)}}{\mu_2/2};$$

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{\Delta + g(1)}{\mu_2^2/4};$$

Input  $\{(\mathbf{x}_{\mu}, \tilde{y}_{\mu})\}_{\mu=1}^n$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}$  into Algorithm 1 in [Maillard et al. \(2024b\)](#) to estimate  $\langle \mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{W} \rangle$ ;

Output

$$\hat{y}_{\text{test}} = \hat{y}^{(0)} + \mu_1 \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{W} \rangle \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}}{\sqrt{kd}} + \frac{\mu_2}{2} \frac{1}{d\sqrt{k}} \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{x}_{\text{test}} \mathbf{x}_{\text{test}}^\top - \mathbb{I}) \langle \mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{W} \rangle]. \quad (120)$$


---

where

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{out}}(y|x) := \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} P_{\text{out}}\left(y \mid \frac{\mu_2}{2} x + z \sqrt{g(1)}\right) \quad (119)$$

and  $\mathbf{M}_{\mu}$  are independent GOE sensing matrices.

*Remark G.3.* One can show that the system of equations ( $S_{\text{uni}}$ ) in the main or in (89) can be mapped onto the fixed point of the state evolution equations (92), (94) of the GAMP-RIE in [Maillard et al. \(2024b\)](#) up to changes of variables. This confirms that when (89) has a unique solution, which is the case in all our tests, the GAMP-RIE asymptotically matches our universal solution. The deviations of the GAMP-RIE points at small  $\alpha$  in Fig. 1, bottom part, are thus due to finite size effects. This match also suggests the optimality of GAMP-RIE among polynomial-time algorithms, given the presence of the universal branch for all  $\alpha$ . Assuming the validity of the aforementioned effective GLM, a potential improvement could come from a generalisation of GAMP which, in the denoising step, would correctly exploit the discrete prior over inner weights rather than using the RIE (which is prior independent). However, the results of [Barbier et al. \(2024\)](#) suggest that optimally denoising matrices with discrete entries is hard, and the RIE is the best efficient procedure to do so. Consequently, we tend to believe that improving GAMP-RIE is out of reach without strong side information about the teacher.