
How degenerate is the parametrization of neural networks with the ReLU activation function?

Julius Berner

Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria
julius.berner@univie.ac.at

Dennis Elbrächter

Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria
dennis.elbraechter@univie.ac.at

Philipp Grohs

Faculty of Mathematics and Research Platform DataScience@UniVienna, University of Vienna
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria
philipp.grohs@univie.ac.at

Abstract

Neural network training is usually accomplished by solving a non-convex optimization problem using stochastic gradient descent. Although one optimizes over the networks parameters, the loss function generally only depends on the realization of a neural network, i.e. the function it computes. Studying the functional optimization problem over the space of realizations can open up completely new ways to understand neural network training. In particular, usual loss functions like the mean squared error are convex on sets of neural network realizations, which themselves are non-convex. Note, however, that each realization has many different, possibly degenerate, parametrizations. In particular, a local minimum in the parametrization space needs not correspond to a local minimum in the realization space. To establish such a connection, inverse stability of the realization map is required, meaning that proximity of realizations must imply proximity of corresponding parametrizations. In this paper we present pathologies which prevent inverse stability in general, and proceed to establish a restricted set of parametrizations on which we have inverse stability w.r.t. to a Sobolev norm. Furthermore, we show that by optimizing over such restricted sets, it is still possible to learn any function, which can be learned by optimization over unrestricted sets. While most of this paper focuses on shallow networks, none of methods used are, in principle, limited to shallow networks, and it should be possible to extend them to deep neural networks.

1 Introduction and Motivation

In recent year much effort has been invested into explaining and understanding the overwhelming success of deep learning based methods. On the theoretical side, impressive approximation capabilities of neural networks have been established [8, 9, 15, 19, 31, 32, 35, 37]. No less important are recent results on the generalization of neural networks, which deal with the question of how well networks, trained on limited samples, perform on unseen data [2–6, 16, 28]. Last but not

least, the optimization error which quantifies how well a neural network can be trained by solving the optimization problem with stochastic gradient descent, has been analyzed in different scenarios [1, 10, 12, 21, 23, 24, 26, 36]. While there are many interesting approaches to the latter question, they tend to require very strong assumptions (e.g. (almost) linearity, convexity, or extreme over-parametrization). Thus a satisfying explanation for the success of stochastic gradient descent for a non-smooth, non-convex problem remains elusive.

In the present paper we intend to pave the way for a functional perspective on the optimization problem, which will allow for new mathematical approaches towards understanding the training of neural networks, see Section 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. To this end we examine degenerate parametrizations with undesirable properties in Section 2. These can be roughly classified as

- C.1 unbalanced magnitudes of the parameters
- C.2 weight vectors with the same direction
- C.3 weight vectors with directly opposite directions.

Subject to these, Theorem 3.1 establishes inverse stability for shallow ReLU networks. This is accomplished by a refined analysis of the behavior of neural networks with ReLU activation function near a discontinuity of their derivative and requires to endow the function space with a Sobolev norm. Inverse stability connects the loss surface of the parametrized minimization problem to the loss surface of the functional problem, see Proposition 1.2. Note that this functional approach of analyzing the loss surface is conceptually different from previous approaches as in [10, 17, 22, 29, 30, 34].

1.1 Inverse Stability of Neural Networks

We will focus on neural networks with the ReLU activation function, and adapt the mathematically convenient notation from [32], which distinguishes between the *parametrization* of a neural network and its *realization* function. Let $N = (N_0, \dots, N_L) \in \mathbb{N}^{L+1}$ be a network architecture specifying the number of neurons N_i in each of the L layers. We then define the set \mathcal{P}_N of *parametrizations* with architecture N as

$$\mathcal{P}_N := \prod_{\ell=1}^L (\mathbb{R}^{N_\ell \times N_{\ell-1}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}) \quad (1)$$

and the *realization* map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}: \mathcal{P}_N &\rightarrow C(\mathbb{R}^{N_0}, \mathbb{R}^{N_L}) \\ \Theta &= ((A_\ell, b_\ell))_{\ell=1}^L \mapsto \mathcal{R}(\Theta) := W_L \circ \rho \circ W_{L-1} \dots \rho \circ W_1, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $W_\ell(x) := A_\ell x + b_\ell$ and $\rho(x) := x_+$ is applied component-wise.

We refer to A_ℓ and b_ℓ as the weights and biases in the ℓ -th layer. Note that a parametrization Θ uniquely induces a realization function $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)$, while in general there can be multiple non-trivially different parametrizations with the same realization. To put it in mathematical terms, the realization map is not injective. Consider the basic counterexample

$$\Theta = ((A_1, b_1), \dots, (A_{L-1}, b_{L-1}), (0, 0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = ((B_1, c_1), \dots, (B_{L-1}, c_{L-1}), (0, 0)) \quad (3)$$

from [33] where regardless of A_ℓ, B_ℓ, b_ℓ and c_ℓ both realization functions coincide with $\mathcal{R}(\Theta) = \mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = 0$. However, it is well-known that the realization map is Lipschitz continuous, meaning that close¹ parametrizations induce realization functions which are close in the uniform norm on compact sets, see e.g. [2, Lemma 14.6], [6, Theorem 4.2] and [33, Proposition 5.1].

We will shed light upon the inverse question. Given realizations $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ that are close (in some norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_N)$, which we will specify later), do the parametrizations Γ and Θ have to be close? In view of the above counterexample this cannot be true in general and, at least, we need to allow for a re-parametrization of one of the networks, i.e. we get the following question.

Given $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ that are close, does there exist a re-parametrization Φ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = \mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ such that Γ and Φ are close?

¹On the finite dimensional vector space \mathcal{P}_N all norms are equivalent and we take w.l.o.g. the maximum norm $\|\Phi\|_\infty$, i.e. the maximum of the absolute values of the entries of the A_ℓ and b_ℓ .

As we will see in Section 2, this question is fundamentally connected to understanding the redundancies and degeneracies of ReLU network parametrization. By suitable regularization, i.e. considering a subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}_N$ of parametrizations, we can avoid these pathologies and establish a positive answer to the question above. The, to the best of our knowledge, only other research conducted in this direction coined the term *inverse stability* of neural networks for this property [33].

Definition 1.1 (Inverse stability). *Let $s, \alpha > 0$, $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}_N$, and let $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_N)$. We say that the realization map is (s, α) inverse stable on Ω w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|$, if for every $\Gamma \in \Omega$ and $g \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ there exists $\Phi \in \Omega$ with*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = g \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi - \Gamma\|_\infty \leq s \|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)\|^\alpha. \quad (4)$$

In Section 2 we will see why inverse stability w.r.t. the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(U)}$ (on some open domain $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$) fails. Therefore, we consider a norm which takes into account not only the maximum error of the function values but also of the gradients (component-wise). In mathematical terms, we make use of the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)}$ defined for every Lipschitz continuous function $g: \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_L}$ by $\|g\|_{W^{1,\infty}} := \max\{\|g\|_{L^\infty(U)}, |g|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)}\}$ with the Sobolev semi-norm $|g|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)}$ given by

$$|g|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)} := \|Dg\|_{L^\infty(U)} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in U} \|Dg(x)\|_\infty. \quad (5)$$

See [14] for further information on Sobolev norms, and [7] for further information on the derivate of ReLU networks.

1.2 Implications of inverse stability for neural network optimization

We continue by showing how inverse stability opens up new perspectives on the optimization problem for neural networks. Specifically, consider a loss function $\mathcal{L}: C(\mathbb{R}^{N_0}, \mathbb{R}^{N_L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ on the space of continuous functions. For illustration, we take the commonly used mean squared error (MSE) which, for training data $((x^i, y^i))_{i=1}^n \in (\mathbb{R}^{N_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_L})^n$, is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(g) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g(x^i) - y^i\|_2^2, \quad \text{for } g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{N_0}, \mathbb{R}^{N_L}). \quad (6)$$

Typically, the optimization problem is over some subset of parametrizations $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}_N$, i.e.

$$\min_{\Gamma \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)) = \min_{\Gamma \in \Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x^i) - y^i\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

From an abstract point of view, by writing $g = \mathcal{R}(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ this is equivalent to the corresponding optimization problem over the space of realizations $\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$, i.e.

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)} \mathcal{L}(g) = \min_{g \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g(x^i) - y^i\|_2^2. \quad (8)$$

However, the loss landscape of the former problem is only properly connected to the landscape of the latter if the realization map is inverse stable on Ω . Otherwise a realization $g \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_N)$ can be arbitrarily close to a global or local minimum in the realization space but every parametrization Φ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = g$ is far away from the corresponding minimum in the parameter space (see Example A.1). The next proposition shows that, if we have inverse stability, local minima of (7) in the parameter space are local minima of (8) in the realization space.

Proposition 1.2 (Parameter minimum \Rightarrow realization minimum). *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}_N$ and $\|\cdot\|$ a norm on $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_N)$ such that the realization map is (s, α) inverse stable on Ω w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|$. Let $\Gamma_* \in \Omega$ be a local minimum of $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{R}$ on Ω with radius $r > 0$, i.e. for all $\Theta \in \Omega$ with $\|\Gamma_* - \Theta\|_\infty \leq r$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Theta)). \quad (9)$$

Then $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_)$ is a local minimum of \mathcal{L} on $\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ with radius $(\frac{r}{s})^{1/\alpha}$, i.e. for all $g \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ with $\|\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*) - g\| \leq (\frac{r}{s})^{1/\alpha}$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)) \leq \mathcal{L}(g). \quad (10)$$

See Appendix A.2 for a proof. Using Proposition 1.2, it is now possible to transfer results, which are gained by analyzing the optimization problem over the realization space, to the parametrized setting. Note that on the functional side we consider a problem with convex loss function but non-convex feasible set, see [33, Section 3.2]. This opens up completely new avenues of investigation using tools from functional analysis and, e.g., utilizing recent results [18, 33] exploring the topological properties of neural network realization spaces.

For ease of presentation, we restrict ourselves to two-layer networks, where we present a proof for $(4, 1/2)$ inverse stability w.r.t. the Sobolev semi-norm on a suitably regularized set of parametrizations. Both the regularizations as well as the stronger norm (compared to the uniform norm) will be shown to be necessary in Section 2. We now present, in an informal way, a collection of our main results. A short proof making the connection to the formal results can be found in Appendix A.2.

Corollary 1.3 (Inverse stability and implications - colloquial). *Suppose we are given data $((x^i, y^i))_{i=1}^n$ and want to solve a typical minimization problem for ReLU networks with shallow architecture $N = (N_0, N_1, 1)$, i.e.*

$$\min_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_N} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x^i) - y^i|^2. \quad (11)$$

First we augment the architecture to $\tilde{N} = (N_0+2, N_1+1, 1)$, while omitting the biases, and augment the samples to $\tilde{x}^i = (x_1^i, \dots, x_{N_0}^i, 1, -1)$. Furthermore, we assume that the parametrizations

$$((|a_1| \dots |a_{N_1+1}|^T, 0), (c, 0)) \in \Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}} \quad (12)$$

are regularized such that

- C.1 the network is balanced, i.e. $\|a_i\|_\infty = |c_i|$*
- C.2 no non-zero weights in the first layer are redundant, i.e. $a_i \not\parallel a_j$*
- C.3 the last two coordinates of each weight vector a_i are strictly positive.*

Then for the new minimization problem

$$\min_{\Gamma \in \Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(\tilde{x}^i) - y^i|^2 \quad (13)$$

it holds that

- 1. every local minimum in the parametrization space Ω with radius $r > 0$ is a local minimum in the realization space $\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ with radius $\frac{r^2}{16}$ w.r.t. $|\cdot|_{W^{1,\infty}}$.*
- 2. the global minimum is at least as good as the global minimum of (11), i.e.*

$$\min_{\Gamma \in \Omega} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(\tilde{x}^i) - y^i|^2 \leq \min_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_N} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x^i) - y^i|^2. \quad (14)$$

The omission of bias weights is standard in neural network optimization literature [10, 12, 21, 23]. While this severely limits the functions that can be realized with a given architecture, it is sufficient to augment the problem by one dimension in order to recover the full range of functions that can be learned [1]. Here we augment by two dimensions, so that the third regularization condition can be fulfilled without losing range. This argument is not limited to the MSE loss function but works for any loss function based on evaluating the realization. Moreover, note that, for simplicity, the regularization assumptions stated above are stricter than necessary and possible relaxations are discussed in Section 3.

2 Obstacles to inverse stability - degeneracies of ReLU parametrizations

In the remainder of this paper we will focus on shallow networks without biases and with output dimension one. We define the set of parametrizations of two-layer networks without biases and




Figure 1: The figure shows g_k for $k = 1, 2$.

with architecture $N = (d, m, 1)$ by $\mathcal{N}_N := \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}$. The realization map² \mathcal{R} is, for every $\Theta = (A, c) = ([a_1 | \dots | a_m]^T, (c_1, \dots, c_m)) \in \mathcal{N}_N$, given by

$$\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \mapsto \mathcal{R}(\Theta)(x) = c\varrho(Ax) = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \varrho(\langle a_i, x \rangle). \quad (15)$$

Note that each function $x \mapsto c_i \varrho(\langle a_i, x \rangle)$ represents a so-called ridge function which is zero on the halfspace $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i, x \rangle \leq 0\}$ and linear with gradient $c_i a_i$ on the other halfspace. Thus, we refer to the weight vectors a_i also as the directions of Θ . Moreover, for $\Theta \in \mathcal{N}_N$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)(0) = 0$ and, as long as the domain of interest $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ contains the origin, the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)}$ is equivalent to its semi-norm, since

$$\|\mathcal{R}(\Theta)\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \text{diam}(U) \text{ess sup}_{x \in U} \|D\mathcal{R}(\Theta)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} \text{diam}(U) |\mathcal{R}(\Theta)|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \quad (16)$$

see also inequalities of Poincaré-Friedrichs type [13, Subsection 5.8.1]. Therefore, in the rest of the paper we will only consider the Sobolev semi-norm³

$$|\mathcal{R}(\Theta)|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)} = \text{ess sup}_{x \in U} \sum_{i \in [m] : \langle a_i, x \rangle > 0} c_i a_i. \quad (17)$$

In (17) one can see that in our setting $|\cdot|_{W^{1,\infty}(U)}$ is independent of U (as long as U is open and contains the origin) and will thus be abbreviated by $|\cdot|_{W^{1,\infty}}$.

2.1 Failure of inverse stability w.r.t uniform norm

All proofs for this section can be found in Appendix A.3. We start by showing that inverse stability fails w.r.t. the uniform norm. This example is adapted from [33, Theorem 5.2] and represents, to the best of our knowledge, the only degeneracy which has already been observed before.

Example 2.1 (Failure due to exploding gradient). *Let $\Gamma = (0, 0) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)}$ and $g_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)})$ be given by (see Figure 1)*

$$g_k(x) := k\rho(\langle (k, 0), x \rangle) - k\rho(\langle (k, -\frac{1}{k^2}), x \rangle), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (18)$$

Then for every sequence $(\Phi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)}$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = g_k$ it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)\|_{L^\infty((-1,1)^2)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_k - \Gamma\|_\infty = \infty. \quad (19)$$

In particular, note that inverse stability fails here even for a non-degenerate parametrization of the zero function, and this counterexample could be lifted to any larger network which has a single $(0, 0)$ weight pair. However, for this type of counterexample the magnitude of the gradient of $\mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)$ needs to go to infinity, which is our motivation for looking at inverse stability w.r.t. $|\cdot|_{W^{1,\infty}}$.

²This is a slight abuse of notation, justified by the fact that \mathcal{R} acts the same on \mathcal{P}_N with zero biases b_1, b_2 and weights $A_1 = A$ and $A_2 = c$.

³For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we abbreviate $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$.




Figure 2: Shows $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ ($r = 0.5$) and g_3 .






Figure 3: Shows $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and g_2 .

2.2 Failure of inverse stability w.r.t. Sobolev norm

In this section we present four degenerate cases where inverse stability fails w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$. This collection of counterexamples is complete in the sense that we can establish inverse stability under assumptions which are designed to exclude these four pathologies.

Example 2.2 (Failure due to complete unbalancedness). Let $r > 0$, $\Gamma := ((r, 0), 0) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)}$ and $g_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)})$ be given by (see Figure 2)

$$g_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} \rho(\langle (0, 1), x \rangle), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (20)$$

The only way to parametrize g_k is $g_k(x) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)(x) = c\rho(\langle (0, a), x \rangle)$ with $a, c > 0$, and we have

$$\|\Phi_k - \Gamma\|_\infty \geq r \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (21)$$

This is a very simple example of a degenerate parametrization of the zero function, since $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = 0$ regardless of choice of r . The issue here is that we can have a weight pair, i.e. $((r, 0), 0)$, where the product is independent of the value of one of the parameters. Note that one gets a slightly more subtle version of this pathology by considering $\Gamma_k := ((k, 0), \frac{1}{k^2}) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)}$ instead (see Example A.2). In this case one could still get an inverse stability estimate for each fixed k ; the rate of inverse stability (s, α) would however get worse with increasing k .

Example 2.3 (Failure due to redundant directions). Let

$$\Gamma := \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (1, 1) \right) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)} \quad (22)$$

and $g_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)})$ be given by (see Figure 3)

$$g_k(x) := 2\rho(\langle (1, 0), x \rangle) + \frac{1}{k} \rho(\langle (0, 1), x \rangle), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (23)$$

We have for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Phi_k \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)}$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = g_k$ that

$$\|\Phi_k - \Gamma\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{2} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (24)$$

This example illustrates that redundant directions prevent inverse stability.

The next example shows that not only redundant weight vectors can cause issues, but also weight vectors of opposite direction, as they would allow for a (balanced) degenerate parametrization of the zero function.

Example 2.4 (Failure due to opposite weight vectors 1). Let $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in [m]$, be pairwise linearly independent with $\|a_i\|_\infty = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 0$. We define

$$\Gamma := ([a_1 | \dots | a_m | -a_1 | \dots | -a_m]^T, (1, \dots, 1, -1, \dots, -1)) \in \mathcal{N}_{(d,2m,1)} \quad (25)$$

and note that $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = 0$. Now let $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_\infty = 1$ be linearly independent to each a_i , $i \in [m]$, and let $g_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_{(d,2m,1)})$ be given by (see Figure 4)

$$g_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} \rho(\langle v, x \rangle), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (26)$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\Phi_k \in \mathcal{N}_{(d,2m,1)}$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = g_k$ it holds that

$$\|\Phi_k - \Gamma\|_\infty \geq C \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (27)$$




Figure 4: Shows $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and g_3 ($a_1 = (1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $a_2 = (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $a_3 = (0, 1)$, $v = (1, 0)$).




Figure 5: Shows the weight vectors of Θ_2 (grey) and Γ_2 (black).

Thus we will need an assumption which prevents each individual Γ from having weight vectors with opposite directions. This will, however, not be enough as is demonstrated by the next example, which is similar but more subtle.

Example 2.5 (Failure due to opposite weight vectors 2). *We define the weight vectors*

$$a_1^k = (k, k, \frac{1}{k}), \quad a_2^k = (-k, k, \frac{1}{k}), \quad a_3^k = (0, -\sqrt{2}k, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}k}), \quad c^k = (k, k, \sqrt{2}k) \quad (28)$$

and consider the parametrizations (see Figure 5)

$$\Gamma_k := \left([-a_1^k | -a_2^k | -a_3^k]^T, c^k \right) \in \mathcal{N}_{(3,3,1)}, \quad \Theta_k := \left([a_1^k | a_2^k | a_3^k]^T, c^k \right) \in \mathcal{N}_{(3,3,1)}. \quad (29)$$

Then it holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\Phi_k \in \mathcal{N}_{(3,3,1)}$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)$ that

$$\|\Phi_k - \Gamma_k\|_\infty \geq \frac{k}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma_k)|_{W^{1,\infty}} = 3. \quad (30)$$

Note that Γ and Θ need to have multiple exactly opposite weight vectors which add to something small (compared to the size of the individual vectors), but not zero, since otherwise reparametrization would be possible (see Lemma A.3).

3 Inverse stability for two-layer Neural Networks

We now establish an inverse stability result using assumptions which are designed to exclude the pathologies from the previous section. First we present a rather technical theorem which considers a parametrization Γ in the unrestricted parametrization space \mathcal{N}_N and a function g in the corresponding function space $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N)$. The aim is to use assumptions which are as weak as possible, while allowing us to find a parametrization Φ of g , whose distance to Γ can be bounded relative to $|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}}$. We then continue by defining a restricted parameter space \mathcal{N}_N^* , for which we get uniform inverse stability (meaning that we get the same estimate for every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_N^*$).

Theorem 3.1 (Inverse stability at $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_N$). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $N := (d, m, 1)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $\Gamma = ([a_1^\Gamma | \dots | a_m^\Gamma]^T, c^\Gamma) \in \mathcal{N}_N$, $g \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N)$, and let $I^\Gamma = \{i \in [m] : a_i^\Gamma \neq 0\}$.*

Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:

C.1 It holds for all $i \in [m]$ with $\|c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq 2|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ that $|c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta$.

C.2 It holds for all $i, j \in I^\Gamma$ with $i \neq j$ that $\frac{a_i^\Gamma}{\|a_j^\Gamma\|_\infty} \neq \frac{a_j^\Gamma}{\|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty}$.

C.3 There exists a parametrization $\Theta = ([a_1^\Theta | \dots | a_m^\Theta]^T, c^\Theta) \in \mathcal{N}_N$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Theta) = g$ and

(a) it holds for all $i, j \in I^\Gamma$ with $i \neq j$ that $\frac{a_i^\Gamma}{\|a_j^\Gamma\|_\infty} \neq -\frac{a_j^\Gamma}{\|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty}$ and for all $i, j \in I^\Theta$ with

$$i \neq j \text{ that } \frac{a_i^\Theta}{\|a_j^\Theta\|_\infty} \neq -\frac{a_j^\Theta}{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty},$$

(b) it holds for all $i \in I^\Gamma, j \in I^\Theta$ that $\frac{a_i^\Gamma}{\|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty} \neq -\frac{a_j^\Theta}{\|a_j^\Theta\|_\infty}$

where $I^\Theta := \{i \in [m] : a_i^\Theta \neq 0\}$.

Then there exists a parametrization $\Phi \in \mathcal{N}_N$ with

$$\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = g \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi - \Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta + 2|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (31)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A.1. Note that each of the conditions in the theorem above corresponds directly to one of the pathologies in Section 2.2. Somewhat curiously, Condition C.1, which deals with unbalancedness, only imposes an restriction on the weight pairs whose product is small compared to the distance of $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and g . As can be glanced from Example 2.2 and seen in the proof of Theorem 3.1, such a balancedness assumption is in fact only needed to deal with degenerate cases, where $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and g have parts with mismatching directions of negligible magnitude. Otherwise a matching reparametrization is always possible.

Condition C.2 requires Γ to not have any redundant directions, the necessity of which is demonstrated by Example 2.3. Note that the first two conditions are mild from a theoretical perspective, in the sense that they only restrict the parameter space and not the corresponding space of realizations. Specifically we can define the restricted parameter space

$$\mathcal{N}'_{(d,m,1)} := \{\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_{(d,m,1)} : |c_i^\Gamma| = \|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \text{ for all } i \in [m] \text{ and } \Gamma \text{ satisfies Condition C.2}\} \quad (32)$$

for which we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}'_N) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N). \quad (33)$$

To see that perfect balancedness (i.e. $|c_i^\Gamma| = \|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty$) does not restrict the set of realization, observe that the ReLU is positively homogeneous (i.e. $\rho(\lambda x) = \lambda \rho(x)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}$). Further note that for a perfectly balanced Γ , Condition C.1 is satisfied with

$$\beta = (2|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (34)$$

in (31). It is also possible to relax the balancedness assumption by only requiring $|c_i^\Gamma|$ and $\|\Gamma_i\|_\infty$ to be close to $\|c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty^{1/2}$, which would still give a similar estimate but with a worse exponent. In particular this suggests that, in practice, it should be reasonable to enforce balancedness by a regularizer on the weights.

To see that for any $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_N$ there is a $\Gamma' \in \mathcal{N}'_N$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{R}(\Gamma')$, further note that

$$c_1 \rho(\langle a_1, x \rangle) + c_2 \rho(\langle a_2, x \rangle) = (c_1 + \frac{c_2 \|a_2\|_\infty}{\|a_1\|_\infty}) \rho(\langle a_1, x \rangle), \quad (35)$$

if a_2 is a positive multiple of a_1 (i.e. $\frac{a_2}{\|a_2\|_\infty} = \frac{a_1}{\|a_1\|_\infty}$). This makes Condition C.2 unproblematic from a theoretical perspective. From a practical point of view, enforcing this condition could be achieved by a regularization term using a barrier function. Alternatively one could employ a non-standard approach of combining such redundant neurons by changing one of them according to (35) and either setting the other one to zero or removing it entirely⁴. In order to satisfy Conditions C.3a and C.3b we need to restrict the parameter space in a way which also restricts the corresponding space of realizations. One possibility to do so is the following approach, which also incorporates the previous restrictions as well as the transition to networks without biases.

Definition 3.2 (Restricted parameter space). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$. We define*

$$\mathcal{N}^*_{(d,m,1)} := \left\{ \Gamma \in \mathcal{N}'_{(d,m,1)} : (a_i^\Gamma)_{d-1}, (a_i^\Gamma)_d > 0 \text{ for all } i \in [m] \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Here we no longer have $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N^*) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N)$. Note, however, that for every $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_{(d,m,1)}$ there exists $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}^*_{(d+2,m+1,1)}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds (see Lemma A.4) that

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x_1, \dots, x_d, 1, -1) = \mathcal{R}(\Theta)(x). \quad (37)$$

In particular, this means that for any optimization problem over an unrestricted parameter space $\mathcal{P}_{(d,m,1)}$, there is a corresponding optimization problem over the parameter space $\mathcal{N}^*_{(d+2,m+1,1)}$ whose solution is at least as good (see also Corollary 1.3). Our main result now states that for such a restricted parameter space we have uniform $(4, 1/2)$ inverse stability (see Appendix A.4 for a proof).

Corollary 3.3 (Inverse stability on \mathcal{N}_N^*). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N := (d, m, 1)$. For every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_N^*$ and $g \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N^*)$ there exists a parametrization $\Phi \in \mathcal{N}_N^*$ with*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = g \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi - \Gamma\|_\infty \leq 4|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (38)$$

⁴This could be of interest in the design of dynamic network architectures [25, 27, 38] and is also closely related to the co-adaption of neurons, to counteract which, dropout was invented [20].

4 Outlook

Understanding the pathologies which prevent inverse stability is an important first step towards understanding the connection of the parametrized and the functional optimization problem for training deep neural networks. Although our positive inverse stability result, so far, only covers shallow networks, it is based on conditions which, in principle, are not limited to shallow networks. While technically challenging it should be very much possible to employ the methods used here in order to produce inverse stability results for deep neural networks.

Another interesting direction would be to use this $W^{1,\infty}$ inverse stability result in order to obtain an L^∞ inverse stability under a bounded angle condition (see Appendix A.5).

Motivated by the necessity of Conditions C.1-C.3, we are highly encouraged to implement corresponding regularizers (penalizing unbalancedness and redundancy in terms of parallel vectors) in state-of-the-art networks and hope to observe positive impacts on the optimization behavior. Furthermore we want to point out, that there are already approaches, called *Sobolev Training*, reporting better generalization and data-efficiency by employing the Sobolev norm as loss [11]. In general, our results enable the transfer of novel insights from the study of realization spaces of neural networks to the study of neural network training.

Acknowledgment

The research of JB and DE was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grants I3403-N32 and P 30148. The authors would like to thank Pavol Harár for helpful comments.

References

- [1] Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, and Z. Song. A Convergence Theory for Deep Learning via Over-Parameterization. *arXiv:1811.03962*, 2018.
- [2] M. Anthony and P. Bartlett. *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [3] S. Arora, R. Ge, B. Neyshabur, and Y. Zhang. Stronger generalization bounds for deep nets via a compression approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 254–263, 2018.
- [4] P. L. Bartlett, D. J. Foster, and M. Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *arXiv:1706.08498*, 2017.
- [5] P. L. Bartlett, N. Harvey, C. Liaw, and A. Mehrabian. Nearly-tight VC-dimension and pseudodimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. *arXiv:1703.02930*, 2017.
- [6] J. Berner, P. Grohs, and A. Jentzen. Analysis of the generalization error: Empirical risk minimization over deep artificial neural networks overcomes the curse of dimensionality in the numerical approximation of Black-Scholes partial differential equations. *arXiv:1809.03062*, 2018.
- [7] J. Berner, D. Elbrächter, P. Grohs, and A. Jentzen. Towards a regularity theory for relu networks—chain rule and global error estimates. *arXiv:1905.04992*, 2019.
- [8] H. Bölcskei, P. Grohs, G. Kutyniok, and P. Petersen. Optimal approximation with sparsely connected deep neural networks. *arXiv:1705.01714*, 2017.
- [9] M. Burger and A. Neubauer. Error Bounds for Approximation with Neural Networks. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 112(2):235–250, 2001.
- [10] A. Choromanska, M. Henaff, M. Mathieu, G. B. Arous, and Y. LeCun. The loss surfaces of multilayer networks. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 192–204, 2015.
- [11] W. M. Czarnecki, S. Osindero, M. Jaderberg, G. Swirszcz, and R. Pascanu. Sobolev training for neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4278–4287, 2017.

- [12] S. S. Du, J. D. Lee, H. Li, L. Wang, and X. Zhai. Gradient Descent Finds Global Minima of Deep Neural Networks. *arXiv:1811.03804*, 2018.
- [13] L. C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations (second edition)*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [14] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy. *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions, Revised Edition*. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, 2015.
- [15] K.-I. Funahashi. On the approximate realization of continuous mappings by neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 2(3):183–192, 1989.
- [16] N. Golowich, A. Rakhlin, and O. Shamir. Size-independent sample complexity of neural networks. *arXiv:1712.06541*, 2017.
- [17] I. J. Goodfellow, O. Vinyals, and A. M. Saxe. Qualitatively characterizing neural network optimization problems. *arXiv:1412.6544*, 2014.
- [18] R. Gribonval, G. Kutyniok, M. Nielsen, and F. Voigtlaender. Approximation spaces of deep neural networks. *arXiv: 1905.01208*, 2019.
- [19] I. Gühring, G. Kutyniok, and P. Petersen. Error bounds for approximations with deep ReLU neural networks in $W^{s,p}$ norms. *arXiv:1902.07896*, 2019.
- [20] G. E. Hinton, N. Srivastava, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. R. Salakhutdinov. Improving neural networks by preventing co-adaptation of feature detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.0580*, 2012.
- [21] K. Kawaguchi. Deep learning without poor local minima. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 586–594, 2016.
- [22] H. Li, Z. Xu, G. Taylor, C. Studer, and T. Goldstein. Visualizing the loss landscape of neural nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6389–6399, 2018.
- [23] Y. Li and Y. Liang. Learning overparameterized neural networks via stochastic gradient descent on structured data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8157–8166, 2018.
- [24] Y. Li and Y. Yuan. Convergence analysis of two-layer neural networks with relu activation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 597–607, 2017.
- [25] H. Liu, K. Simonyan, and Y. Yang. Darts: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv:1806.09055*, 2018.
- [26] S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P.-M. Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33):E7665–E7671, 2018.
- [27] R. Miiikkulainen, J. Liang, E. Meyerson, A. Rawal, D. Fink, O. Francon, B. Raju, H. Shahrzad, A. Navruzyan, N. Duffy, and B. Hodjat. Chapter 15 - evolving deep neural networks. In R. Kozma, C. Alippi, Y. Choe, and F. C. Morabito, editors, *Artificial Intelligence in the Age of Neural Networks and Brain Computing*, pages 293 – 312. Academic Press, 2019.
- [28] B. Neyshabur, S. Bhojanapalli, D. McAllester, and N. Srebro. Exploring generalization in deep learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5947–5956, 2017.
- [29] Q. Nguyen and M. Hein. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ICML’17, pages 2603–2612. JMLR.org, 2017.
- [30] J. Pennington and Y. Bahri. Geometry of neural network loss surfaces via random matrix theory. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ICML’17, pages 2798–2806. JMLR.org, 2017.

- [31] D. Perekrestenko, P. Grohs, D. Elbrächter, and H. Bölcskei. The universal approximation power of finite-width deep relu networks. *arXiv:1806.01528*, 2018.
- [32] P. Petersen and F. Voigtlaender. Optimal approximation of piecewise smooth functions using deep ReLU neural networks. *arXiv:1709.05289*, 2017.
- [33] P. Petersen, M. Raslan, and F. Voigtlaender. Topological properties of the set of functions generated by neural networks of fixed size. *arXiv:1806.08459*, 2018.
- [34] I. Safran and O. Shamir. On the quality of the initial basin in overspecified neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 774–782, 2016.
- [35] U. Shaham, A. Cloninger, and R. R. Coifman. Provable approximation properties for deep neural networks. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 44(3):537 – 557, 2018.
- [36] O. Shamir and T. Zhang. Stochastic gradient descent for non-smooth optimization: Convergence results and optimal averaging schemes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 71–79, 2013.
- [37] D. Yarotsky. Error bounds for approximations with deep relu networks. *Neural Networks*, 94: 103–114, 2017.
- [38] B. Zoph, V. Vasudevan, J. Shlens, and Q. V. Le. Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8697–8710, 2018.

A Appendix - Proofs and Additional Material

A.1 Proof of the Main Theorem

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $a_i^\Theta = 0$ implies $c_i^\Theta = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$. We now need to show that there always exists a way to reparametrize Θ such that architecture and realization remain the same and it also fulfills (31). For simplicity of notation we will write $r := |g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ throughout the proof. Let $f_i^\Gamma: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ resp. $f_i^\Theta: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the part that is contributed by the i -th neuron, i.e.

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i^\Gamma \quad \text{with} \quad f_i^\Gamma(x) := c_i^\Gamma \rho(\langle a_i^\Gamma, x \rangle), \quad (39)$$

$$g = \mathcal{R}(\Theta) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i^\Theta \quad \text{with} \quad f_i^\Theta(x) := c_i^\Theta \rho(\langle a_i^\Theta, x \rangle). \quad (40)$$

Further let

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\Gamma,i}^+ &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Gamma, x \rangle > 0\}, \\ H_{\Gamma,i}^0 &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Gamma, x \rangle = 0\}, \\ H_{\Gamma,i}^- &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Gamma, x \rangle < 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

By conditions C.2 and C.3a we have for all $i \in I^\Gamma$ that

$$H_{\Gamma,i}^0 \neq H_{\Gamma,j}^0 \quad \text{for all } j \in I^\Gamma \setminus \{i\}. \quad (42)$$

Further note that we can reparametrize Θ such that the same holds there. To this end observe that

$$c\rho(\langle a, x \rangle) + c'\rho(\langle a', x \rangle) = (c + c' \frac{\|a'\|_\infty}{\|a\|_\infty})\rho(\langle a, x \rangle), \quad (43)$$

given that a' is a positive multiple of a . Specifically, let $(J_k)_{k=1}^K \subseteq I^\Theta$ be a partition of I^Θ (i.e. $J_k \neq \emptyset$, $\cup_{k=1}^K J_k = I^\Theta$ and $J_k \cap J_{k'} = \emptyset$ if $k \neq k'$), such that for all $k \in [K]$ it holds that

$$i, j \in J_k \implies \frac{a_j^\Theta}{\|a_j^\Theta\|_\infty} = \frac{a_i^\Theta}{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty}. \quad (44)$$

We denote by j_k the smallest element in J_k and make the following replacements, for all $i \in I^\Theta$, without changing the realization of Θ :

$$a_i^\Theta \mapsto a_i^\Theta, c_i^\Theta \mapsto \sum_{j \in J_k} c_j^\Theta \frac{\|c_j^\Theta\|_\infty}{\|c_{j_k}^\Theta\|_\infty}, \quad \text{if } i \in J_k \text{ and } i = j_k, \quad (45)$$

$$a_i^\Theta \mapsto 0, c_i^\Theta \mapsto 0, \quad \text{if } i \in J_k \text{ and } i \neq j_k. \quad (46)$$

Note that we also update the set $I^\Theta := \{i \in [m] : a_i^\Theta \neq 0\}$ accordingly. Let now

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\Theta,i}^+ &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Theta, x \rangle > 0\}, \\ H_{\Theta,i}^0 &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Theta, x \rangle = 0\}, \\ H_{\Theta,i}^- &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle a_i^\Theta, x \rangle < 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

By construction, we have for all $i \in I^\Theta$ that

$$H_{\Theta,i}^0 \neq H_{\Theta,j}^0 \quad \text{for all } j \in I^\Theta \setminus \{i\}. \quad (48)$$

Next, for $s \in \{-1, 1\}^{[m]}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} H_\Gamma^s &:= \bigcap_{i \in [m] : s_i = 1} H_{\Gamma,i}^+ \cap \bigcap_{i \in [m] : s_i = -1} H_{\Gamma,i}^-, \\ H_\Theta^s &:= \bigcap_{i \in [m] : s_i = 1} H_{\Theta,i}^+ \cap \bigcap_{i \in [m] : s_i = -1} H_{\Theta,i}^-, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and

$$S^\Gamma := \{s \in \{0, 1\}^{[m]} : H_\Gamma^s \neq \emptyset\}, \quad S^\Theta := \{s \in \{0, 1\}^{[m]} : H_\Theta^s \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (50)$$

The H_Γ^s , $s \in S^\Gamma$, and H_Θ^s , $s \in S^\Theta$, are the different linear regions of $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ respectively. Note, that they have non-empty interior, since they are non-empty intersections of open sets. Next observe that the derivatives of f_i^Γ, f_i^Θ are (a.e.) given by

$$Df_i^\Gamma(x) := c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma \mathbf{1}_{H_{\Gamma,i}^+}(x), \quad Df_i^\Theta(x) := c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta \mathbf{1}_{H_{\Theta,i}^+}(x). \quad (51)$$

Note that for every $x \in H_\Gamma^s, y \in H_\Theta^s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x) &= \sum_{i \in [m], s_i=1} c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma =: \Sigma_s^\Gamma, \\ D\mathcal{R}(\Theta)(y) &= \sum_{i \in [m], s_i=1} c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta =: \Sigma_s^\Theta. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Next we use that for $s \in S^\Gamma, t \in S^\Theta$ we have $|\Sigma_s^\Gamma - \Sigma_t^\Theta| \leq r$ if $H_s^\Gamma \cap H_t^\Theta \neq \emptyset$, and compare adjacent linear regions of $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) - \mathcal{R}(\Theta)$. Let now $i \in I^\Gamma$ and consider the following cases:

Case 1: We have $H_{\Gamma,i}^0 \neq H_{\Theta,j}^0$ for all $j \in I^\Theta$. This means that the $Df_k^\Theta, k \in [m]$, and the $Df_k^\Gamma, k \in [m] \setminus \{i\}$, are the same on both sides near the hyperplane $H_{\Gamma,i}^0$, while the value of Df_i^Γ is 0 on one side and $c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma$ on the other. Specifically, there exist $s^+, s^- \in S^\Gamma$ and $s^* \in S^\Theta$ such that $s_i^+ = 1, s_i^- = -1, s_j^+ = s_j^- = s_j^*$ for all $j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}$, and $H_\Gamma^{s^+} \cap H_\Theta^{s^*} \neq \emptyset, H_\Gamma^{s^-} \cap H_\Theta^{s^*} \neq \emptyset$, which implies

$$\|c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty = \|(\Sigma_{s^+}^\Gamma - \Sigma_{s^*}^\Theta) - (\Sigma_{s^-}^\Gamma - \Sigma_{s^*}^\Theta)\|_\infty \leq 2r. \quad (53)$$

Case 2: There exists $j \in I^\Theta$ such that $H_{\Gamma,i}^0 = H_{\Theta,j}^0$. Note that this implies $H_{\Gamma,i}^+ = H_{\Theta,j}^+$ due to Condition C.3b. This means that the $Df_k^\Theta, k \in [m] \setminus \{j\}$, and the $Df_k^\Gamma, k \in [m] \setminus \{i\}$, are the same on both sides near the hyperplane $H_{\Gamma,i}^0 = H_{\Theta,j}^0$, while the values of Df_i^Γ and Df_j^Θ change. Specifically there exist $s^+, s^- \in S^\Gamma$ and $t^+, t^- \in S^\Theta$ such that $s_i^+ = 1, s_i^- = -1, s_k^+ = s_k^-$ for all $k \in [m] \setminus \{i\}, t_j^+ = 1, t_j^- = -1, t_k^+ = t_k^-$ for all $k \in [m] \setminus \{j\}$ and $H_\Gamma^{s^+} \cap H_\Theta^{t^+} \neq \emptyset, H_\Gamma^{s^-} \cap H_\Theta^{t^-} \neq \emptyset$, which implies

$$\|c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma - c_j^\Theta a_j^\Theta\|_\infty = \|(\Sigma_{s^+}^\Gamma - \Sigma_{t^+}^\Theta) - (\Sigma_{s^-}^\Gamma - \Sigma_{t^-}^\Theta)\|_\infty \leq 2r. \quad (54)$$

Analogously we get for $i \in I^\Theta$ that $H_{\Theta,i}^0 \neq H_{\Gamma,j}^0$ for all $j \in I^\Gamma$ implies $\|c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta\|_\infty \leq 2r$, and that the existence of a $j \in I^\Gamma$ such that $H_{\Theta,i}^0 = H_{\Gamma,j}^0$ implies that $\|c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta - c_j^\Gamma a_j^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq 2r$.

Intuitively that means that each f_i^Γ resp. f_i^Θ either has some matching f_j^Θ resp. f_j^Γ (i.e. case 1), or the product of its coefficients must be small (i.e. case 2). In particular we can reparametrize Θ such that matching indices either correspond to matching functions in the sense above, or both functions with this index are sufficiently small.

Specifically, let

$$I_1 := \{i \in [m] : H_{\Gamma,i}^0 \neq H_{\Theta,j}^0 \text{ for all } j \in I^\Theta\} \cup \{i \in [m] : a_i^\Gamma = 0\} \quad (55)$$

and

$$I_2 := \{i \in [m] : \exists j \in I^\Theta \text{ such that } H_{\Gamma,i}^0 = H_{\Theta,j}^0\}. \quad (56)$$

Then the above establishes that there exists a permutation $\pi : [m] \rightarrow [m]$ such that for every $i \in I_1$ it holds that

$$\|c_{\pi(i)}^\Theta a_{\pi(i)}^\Theta\|_\infty, \|c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq 2r, \quad (57)$$

and for every $i \in I_2$ that

$$\|c_{\pi(i)}^\Gamma a_{\pi(i)}^\Gamma - c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta\|_\infty \leq 2r. \quad (58)$$

We make the following replacements, for all $i \in [m]$, without changing the realization of Θ :

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow a_{\pi(i)}^\Theta, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow c_{\pi(i)}^\Theta. \quad (59)$$

In order to balance the weights of Θ for I_1 , we further make the following replacements, for all $i \in I_1$ with $a_i^\Theta \neq 0$, without changing the realization of Θ :

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow a_i^\Theta \left(\frac{|c_i^\Theta|}{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty} \right)^{1/2}, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow c_i^\Theta \left(\frac{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty}{|c_i^\Theta|} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (60)$$

This implies for every $i \in I_1$ that

$$|c_i^\Theta|, \|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty \leq (2r)^{1/2}. \quad (61)$$

Moreover, due to Condition C.1, we get for every $i \in I_1$ that

$$|c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta. \quad (62)$$

Thus we get for every $i \in I_1$ that

$$|c_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Theta - a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta + (2r)^{1/2}. \quad (63)$$

Let now $i \in I_2$. By definition of I_2 and Condition C.3b, there exist $\lambda_i^\Gamma, \lambda_i^\Theta > 0$ and $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|e_i\|_\infty = 1$ such that $a_i^\Gamma = \lambda_i^\Gamma e_i$ and $a_i^\Theta = \lambda_i^\Theta e_i$. In particular we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta|_\infty &= |c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta|, \\ |c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma|_\infty &= |c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma|, \text{ and} \\ |c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma a_i^\Gamma|_\infty &= |c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq 2r. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Consider the following cases:

Case A: We have $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq 2r$ which means $|c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta| \leq 4r$.

Case B.1: We have $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r$ and $|c_i^\Gamma| > \lambda_i^\Gamma$. Then it holds that

$$\left| \frac{c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta}{c_i^\Gamma} - \lambda_i^\Gamma \right| = \frac{1}{|c_i^\Gamma|} |c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq \frac{2r}{|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma|^{1/2}} \leq (2r)^{1/2}. \quad (65)$$

Case B.2: We have $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r$ and $|c_i^\Gamma| < \lambda_i^\Gamma$. Then it holds that

$$\left| \frac{c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta}{\lambda_i^\Gamma} - c_i^\Gamma \right| = \frac{1}{|\lambda_i^\Gamma|} |c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq \frac{2r}{|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma|^{1/2}} \leq (2r)^{1/2}. \quad (66)$$

Case B.3: We have $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r$ and $|c_i^\Gamma| = \lambda_i^\Gamma$. Then it holds that

$$\left| \left(\frac{\lambda_i^\Theta}{|c_i^\Theta|} \right)^{1/2} c_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma \right| \leq (2r)^{1/2} \text{ and } \left| \left(\frac{|c_i^\Theta|}{\lambda_i^\Theta} \right)^{1/2} \lambda_i^\Theta - \lambda_i^\Gamma \right| \leq (2r)^{1/2}, \quad (67)$$

since for $x, y > 0$ it holds that $|x - y| \leq |x^2 - y^2|^{1/2}$, and $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r$ implies $\text{sgn}(c_i^\Gamma) = \text{sgn}(c_i^\Theta)$. This means we can (approximately) match the balancing of (c_i^Θ, a_i^Θ) to the balancing of (c_i^Γ, a_i^Γ) . Specifically, we make the following replacements, for all $i \in I_2$, without changing the realization of Θ :

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow a_i^\Theta \left(\frac{|c_i^\Theta|}{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty} \right)^{1/2}, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow c_i^\Theta \left(\frac{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty}{|c_i^\Theta|} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \text{if } |c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq 2r, \quad (68)$$

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow \frac{c_i^\Theta a_i^\Theta}{c_i^\Gamma}, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow c_i^\Gamma, \quad \text{if } |c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r, |c_i^\Gamma| > \lambda_i^\Gamma, \quad (69)$$

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow a_i^\Gamma, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow \frac{c_i^\Theta \lambda_i^\Theta}{\lambda_i^\Gamma}, \quad \text{if } |c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r, |c_i^\Gamma| < \lambda_i^\Gamma, \quad (70)$$

$$a_i^\Theta \rightarrow a_i^\Theta \left(\frac{|c_i^\Theta|}{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty} \right)^{1/2}, \quad c_i^\Theta \rightarrow c_i^\Theta \left(\frac{\|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty}{|c_i^\Theta|} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \text{if } |c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r, |c_i^\Gamma| = \lambda_i^\Gamma. \quad (71)$$

Now for every $i \in I_2$ with $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| > 2r$, (65), (66), and (67) directly imply that

$$|c_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Theta - a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq (2r)^{1/2}. \quad (72)$$

For every $i \in I_2$ with $|c_i^\Gamma \lambda_i^\Gamma| \leq 2r$ we get, due to Condition C.1, that

$$\begin{aligned} |c_i^\Theta|, \|a_i^\Theta\|_\infty &\leq 2r^{1/2}, \\ |c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty &\leq \beta \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

and consequently

$$|c_i^\Theta - c_i^\Gamma|, \|a_i^\Theta - a_i^\Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta + 2r^{1/2}. \quad (74)$$

Combining (63), (72), and (74) we get that

$$\|\Theta - \Gamma\|_\infty \leq \beta + 2r^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (75)$$

which completes the proof. \square

A.2 Proofs for Section 1

Proof of Proposition 1.2. By Definition 1.1 for every $g \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ with $\|\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*) - g\| \leq (\frac{r}{s})^{1/\alpha}$ there is $\Phi \in \Omega$ with

$$\mathcal{R}\Phi = g \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Gamma_* - \Phi\|_\infty \leq s\|\mathcal{R}\Gamma_* - g\|^\alpha \leq r. \quad (76)$$

Therefore by assumption it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Phi)) = \mathcal{L}(g). \quad (77)$$

which proves the claim. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3. We just need combine the main observations from our paper. First, note that the assumptions imply that the restricted parametrization space Ω we are optimizing over precisely equals the space $\mathcal{N}_{(N_0+2, N_1+1, 1)}^*$ from Definition 3.2. Secondly, Corollary 3.3 implies that the realization map is $(4, 1/2)$ inverse stable on Ω . Thus, Proposition 1.2 directly proves Item 1. For the proof of Item 2 we make use of Lemma A.4. It implies that for every $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_{(N_0, N_1, 1)}$ there exists a $\Gamma \in \Omega$ such that it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(\tilde{x}^i) - y^i|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{R}(\Theta)(x^i) - y^i|^2, \quad (78)$$

which proves the claim. \square

A.3 Proofs for Section 2

Proof of Example 2.1. We have for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\|g_k\|_{L^\infty((-1,1)^2)} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad |g_k|_{W^{1,\infty}} = k^2. \quad (79)$$

Assume that there exists sequence of networks $(\Phi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)}$ with $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = g_k$ and with bounded parameters, i.e. $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\Phi_k\| \leq C$. By the Lipschitz continuity of the realization map (see also [33, Prop. 5.1]) it follows that also $|\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ is bounded which contradicts (79). \square

Proof of Example 2.3. Any parametrization of g_k must be of the form

$$\Phi_k := \left(\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{bmatrix}, (c_1, c_2) \right) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,2,1)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (80)$$

with $c_1 a_1 = 2$ and $c_2 a_2 = \frac{1}{k}$. The proof is completed by direct calculation. \square

Proof of Example 2.4. Let Φ_k be an arbitrary parametrization of g_k given by

$$\Phi_k = ([\tilde{a}_1 | \tilde{a}_2 | \dots | \tilde{a}_{2m}]^T, \tilde{c}) \in \mathcal{N}_{(d,2m,1)} \quad (81)$$

As g_k has two linear regions separated by the hyperplane with normal vector v , there exists $i \in [2m]$ and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\tilde{a}_i = \lambda_i v. \quad (82)$$

The distance of any weight vector $\pm a_i$ of Γ to the line $\{\lambda v : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ can be lower bounded by

$$\|\pm a_i - \lambda v\|_\infty^2 \geq \frac{1}{d} \|\pm a_i - \lambda v\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{d} [\|a_i\|_2^2 - \langle a_i, v \rangle^2], \quad i \in [m], \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (83)$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the linear independence of v to each a_i , $i \in [m]$, establishes that $\min_{i \in [m]} [\|a_i\|_2^2 - \langle a_i, v \rangle^2] > 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Example 2.5. Since $x = \rho(x) - \rho(-x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the difference of the realizations is linear, i.e.

$$\mathcal{R}(\Theta_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma_k) = \langle c_1^k a_1^k + c_2^k a_2^k + c_3^k a_3^k, x \rangle = \langle (0, 0, 3), x \rangle \quad (84)$$

and thus the difference of the gradients is constant, i.e.

$$|\mathcal{R}(\Theta_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma_k)|_{W^{1,\infty}} = 3, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (85)$$

However, regardless of the balancing and reordering of the weight vectors a_i^k , $i \in [3]$, we have that

$$\|\Theta_k - \Gamma_k\|_\infty \geq \frac{k}{2}. \quad (86)$$

Now we show that, up to balancing and reordering, there does not exist any other parametrization of Θ_k with the same realization – in other words inverse stability fails for this example. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume there exists a network

$$\Phi_k = ([\tilde{a}_1|\tilde{a}_2|\tilde{a}_3]^T, \tilde{c}) \in \mathcal{N}_{(3,3,1)} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k). \quad (87)$$

Note that $\mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)$ has eight distinct gradients on the different linear regions. As the linear regions of $\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)$ need to match exactly, for every $i \in [3]$ it holds that

$$\tilde{c}_i \neq 0 \quad (88)$$

and there exists, up to reordering of the indices, $\lambda_i \neq 0$ with

$$\tilde{a}_i = \lambda_i a_i^k. \quad (89)$$

We now distinguish three cases.

Case 1 (exactly one flip): Assume that exactly one λ_i has a negative sign. Then it holds that

$$0 = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)((0, 0, -1)) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)((0, 0, -1)) = \lambda_i \tilde{c}_i \neq 0. \quad (90)$$

Case 2 (exactly two flips): Assume that exactly one λ_i has a positive sign. If $i = 1$, then

$$k^2 = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)((-1, 0, 0)) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)((-1, 0, 0)) = 0 \quad (91)$$

and similar for the case $i = 2$ by considering $x = (1, 0, 0)$. We conclude that $i = 3$, but then

$$2k^2 = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)((0, 1, 0)) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)((0, 1, 0)) = 0. \quad (92)$$

Case 3 (exactly three flips): Assume that all λ_i , $i \in [3]$, have a negative sign. Then it holds that

$$3 = \mathcal{R}(\Theta_k)((0, 0, 1)) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)((0, 0, 1)) = 0. \quad (93)$$

As all cases lead to a contradiction, this proves the claim. \square

A.4 Additional proofs for Section 3

Proof of Corollary 3.3. Since $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_N^*$ and $g \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_N^*)$, Conditions C.1-C.3 are fulfilled with

$$\beta = (2|g - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma)|_{W^{1,\infty}})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (94)$$

by definition of \mathcal{N}_N^* . We can choose $\Theta \in \mathcal{N}_N^*$ with $g = \mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ and none of the reparametrizations in the proof of Theorem 3.1 take Θ out of \mathcal{N}_N^* . In particular the reparametrization in (45) does not happen, since Θ cannot have redundant directions. This proves the claim. \square

A.5 Additional material

Example A.1 (Without inverse stability: parameter minimum $\not\Rightarrow$ realization minimum). *Consider the two domains*

$$D_1 := \{(x_1, x_2) \in (-1, 1)^2 : x_2 \geq |x_1|\}, \quad D_2 := \{(x_1, x_2) \in (-1, 1)^2 : x_1 > |x_2|\}. \quad (95)$$

For simplicity of presentation, assume we are given two samples $x^1 \in D_1$, $x^2 \in D_2$ with labels $y^1 = 0$, $y^2 = 1$. The corresponding MSE is

$$\mathcal{L}(g) = \frac{1}{2}(g(x^1))^2 + (g(x^2) - 1)^2. \quad (96)$$

for every $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$. Let the zero realization function be parametrized by

$$\Gamma_* = (0, (-1, 0)) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)} \quad (97)$$

with loss $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_)) = \frac{1}{2}$. Note that changing each parameter by less than $\frac{1}{2}$ does not decrease the loss, as this rotates the vector $(-1, 0)$ by at most 45° . Thus Γ_* is a local minimum in the parameter space. However, the sequence of realizations given by*

$$g_k(x) = \frac{1}{k}\rho(x_1 - x_2) = \mathcal{R}((1, -1), \frac{1}{k}) \quad (98)$$

satisfies that

$$\|g_k - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)\|_{W^{1,\infty}((-1,1)^2)} = \|g_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}((-1,1)^2)} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad (99)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}(g_k) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{k})^2 \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)), \quad (100)$$

see Figure 6. Accordingly, $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_)$ is not a local minimum in the realization space even w.r.t. the Sobolev norm. The problem occurs, since inverse stability fails due to unbalancedness of Γ_* .*




Figure 6: The figure shows two samples $((x^i, y^i))_{i=1,2}$, the realization $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_*)$ of the local parameter minimum (left) and g_3 (right).

Example A.2 (Failure due to unbalancedness). *Let*

$$\Gamma_k := ((k, 0), \frac{1}{k^2}) \in \mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (101)$$

and $g_k \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{N}_{(2,1,1)})$ be given by

$$g_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} \rho(\langle (0, 1), x \rangle), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (102)$$

The only way to parametrize g_k is $g_k(x) = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_k)(x) = c\rho(\langle (0, a), x \rangle)$ with $a, c > 0$, and we have

$$\|\Phi_k - \Gamma_k\|_\infty \geq k \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{R}(\Phi_k) - \mathcal{R}(\Gamma_k)|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (103)$$

Lemma A.3. *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in [m]$, such that $\sum_{i \in [m]} a_i = 0$. Then it holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that*

$$\sum_{i \in [m]} \rho(\langle a_i, x \rangle) = \sum_{i \in [m]} \rho(\langle -a_i, x \rangle). \quad (104)$$

Proof. By assumption we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that $\sum_{i \in [m]} \langle a_i, x \rangle = 0$. This implies for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\sum_{i \in [m]: \langle a_i, x \rangle \geq 0} \langle a_i, x \rangle - \sum_{i \in [m]} \langle a_i, x \rangle = \sum_{i \in [m]: \langle a_i, x \rangle \leq 0} -\langle a_i, x \rangle, \quad (105)$$

which proves the claim. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_{(d,m,1)}$. Then there exists $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}_{(d+2,m+1,1)}^*$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)(x_1, \dots, x_d, 1, -1) = \mathcal{R}(\Theta)(x). \quad (106)$$

Proof. Since $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_{(d,m,1)}$ it can be written as

$$\Theta = ((A, b), (c, e)) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{R}(\Theta)(x) = c\rho(Ax + b) + e, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (107)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}$, and $e \in \mathbb{R}$. We define for $i \in [m]$

$$b_i^+ := \begin{cases} b_i + 1 & : b_i \geq 0 \\ 1 & : b_i < 0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad b_i^- := \begin{cases} 1 & : b_i \geq 0 \\ -b_i + 1 & : b_i < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (108)$$

for $i \in [m]$ let

$$c_i^* := \begin{cases} c_i & : c_i \neq 0 \\ 1 & : c_i = 0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_i^* := \begin{cases} (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,d}, b_i^+, b_i^-) & : c_i \neq 0 \\ (0, \dots, 0, 1, 1) & : c_i = 0 \end{cases}, \quad (109)$$

and for $i = m + 1$ let

$$c_i^* := \begin{cases} e & : e \neq 0 \\ 1 & : e = 0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_i^* := \begin{cases} (0, \dots, 0, 2, 1) & : e \neq 0 \\ (0, \dots, 0, 1, 1) & : e = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (110)$$

In order to balance the network, for every $i \in [m + 1]$ let $a_i^\Gamma = a_i^* (\frac{|c_i^*|}{\|a_i^*\|_\infty})^{1/2}$ and $c_i^\Gamma = c_i^* (\frac{\|a_i^*\|_\infty}{|c_i^*|})^{1/2}$, then the claim follows by direct computation. \square

Lemma A.5. Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\Theta = ([a_1 | \dots | a_m]^T, c) \in \mathcal{N}_{(d, m, 1)}$, and

$$\lambda := \max_{i, j \in [m], \frac{a_i}{\|a_i\|_\infty} \neq \frac{a_j}{\|a_j\|_\infty}} \frac{\langle a_i, a_j \rangle}{\|a_i\| \|a_j\|}. \quad (111)$$

Then it holds that

$$|\mathcal{R}(\Theta)|_{W^{1, \infty}} \leq \frac{2}{B\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}} \|\mathcal{R}(\Theta)\|_{L^\infty([-B, B]^d)}. \quad (112)$$

Proof. Note that, by the condition on the minimum angle between the hyperplanes, elementary calculus establishes that the minimal perimeter inside each linear region is lower bounded by $B\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}$. As $\mathcal{R}(\Theta)$ is linear on each region, the claim follows. \square