

Backward Oversmoothing: why is it hard to train deep Graph Neural Networks?

Nicolas Keriven

CNRS, IRISA, Rennes, France
nicolas.keriven@cnrs.fr

Abstract

Oversmoothing has long been identified as a major limitation of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs): input node features are smoothed at each layer and converge to a non-informative representation, *if the weights of the GNN are sufficiently bounded*. This assumption is crucial: if, on the contrary, the weights are sufficiently large, then oversmoothing may not happen. Theoretically, GNN could thus learn to not oversmooth. However it does not really happen in practice, which prompts us to examine oversmoothing from an *optimization* point of view.

In this paper, we analyze *backward oversmoothing*, that is, the notion that backpropagated errors used to compute gradients are also subject to oversmoothing from output to input. With non-linear activation functions, we outline the key role of the *interaction* between forward and backward smoothing. Moreover, we show that, due to backward oversmoothing, GNNs provably exhibit many *spurious stationary points*: as soon as the *last* layer is trained, the *whole* GNN is at a stationary point. As a result, we can exhibit regions where gradients are near-zero while the loss stays high. The proof relies on the fact that, unlike forward oversmoothing, backward errors are subjected to a *linear* oversmoothing even in the presence of non-linear activation function, such that the *average* of the output error plays a key role. Additionally, we show that this phenomenon is *specific* to deep GNNs, and exhibit counter-example Multi-Layer Perceptron. This paper is a step toward a more complete comprehension of the optimization landscape specific to GNNs.

1 Introduction

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [28, 4] are deep architectures that have *de facto* become the state-of-the-art for machine learning problems on graphs [3, 13, 34], with numerous applications ranging from chemistry [30] to physics [20], social networks analysis and epidemiology [21], combinatorial optimization [5], and many others. Given a graph of size n represented by a graph-matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (that can be various flavors of normalized adjacency, Laplacian...) and input node features as rows of $X^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_0}$, a vanilla GNN follows the propagation equation:

$$X^{(k+1)} = \rho(PX^{(k)}W^{(k)}) \quad (1)$$

where $W^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times d_{k+1}}$ are learnable weights and ρ is a non-linear activation function applied element-wise. A common interpretation is that GNNs realize “message-passing” through the matrix P . Many variants of message-passing exist (including some that cannot be written as fixed matrix multiplication [32]), but most GNNs follow some flavors of this simple architecture.

While theoretical and empirical studies of GNNs form an extremely large literature, with e.g. significant progress in the understanding of GNN expressivity or generalization [31], some early topics and fundamental issues remain, to this day, active research questions [22, 23]. Among them, **oversmoothing** [17, 24, 27] is a long-standing problematic phenomenon. It is rather unique to GNNs, and easy to formulate: since node representations are mixed by the matrix P (“smoothed”) at each layer, when the GNN becomes very deep they converge to a constant, uninformative limit. This prevents regular GNNs from being too deep, which is an issue: it has been theoretically shown that GNN need depth for optimal performance [15, 18], and shallow GNNs are subject to *under-reaching*, where distant nodes do not communicate at all [19]. Oversmoothing has been the topic of a very large literature [27], with many strategies to mitigate it, such as different flavors of skip connections [16] or normalization [41]. Nevertheless, to some extent, there are still some fundamental open questions about this phenomenon – and about GNNs depth in general.




Figure 1: **Left, center:** norm of gradients with respect to epochs, for each layer, for deep GNN (left) or MLP (center) with $k = 40$. The output layer is outlined. **Right:** loss with respect to epochs, for shallow ($k = 5$) and deep ($k = 40$) GNN or MLP. Node classification task on Contextual Stochastic Block Model (CSBM) data [6].

Oversmoothing is rather easy to theoretically prove [24, 27]. For instance, when P is a stochastic matrix, assuming that the weights $W^{(k)}$ do not expand too much the node representations’ norm, the matrix P shrinks all directions but the constant one by at least its second-largest eigenvalue $\lambda < 1$, and typical measures of oversmoothing [27] converge exponentially fast to 0 as k increases (see Thm. 1). The hypothesis on the weights is crucial: when they are large¹, oversmoothing may not happen. As such, the GNN *could learn* to not oversmooth, as suggested by [36, 9]. However: a) it is not common to directly *initialize* weights with high spectral norm, as this can lead to explosion of the features or the gradients, and b) when using regular initialization and gradient descent, vanilla deep GNNs generally do *not* learn to counteract oversmoothing (Fig. 1), even though this would clearly lead to better minimizers of the loss. There is therefore a problem *with the optimization process itself*.

Contribution. In this paper, we thus look at oversmoothing from the **optimization** point of view. For this we put forth the notion of **backward oversmoothing**: just as the node representations are oversmoothed as k increases (in the “forward”), then so are the backpropagated errors, when k decreases from output to input. We show that it is the **interaction** between forward smoothing and backward smoothing that eventually produces backward oversmoothing *at the middle layers* (Thm. 2), especially in the presence of a non-linear ρ . Then, our main result is that backward oversmoothing produces many **spurious stationary points**: we prove that, as soon as *the output layer* is trained, then *the whole GNN* is in a near stationary-point. We argue that this is the main reason why deep GNNs are “hard” to train: the last layer quickly reaches a stationary point, and the GNN gets stuck with near-zero gradients (Fig. 1, left) in easy-to-reach local minima with provably high loss (Thm. 3 and Cor. 2). Moreover, we also show that regular Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) are *not* subjected to the same phenomenon (Prop. 2 and Fig. 1, center), making our result *specific* to deep GNN optimization.

Our results rely on a precise characterization of the smoothed limit of the backward signal – which is generally unfeasible in forward oversmoothing due to the non-linearity ρ , hence the plethora of studies that study oversmoothing only for linear GNNs [15, 25]. This constant limit is related to the *average* of the output error across nodes. The proofs contains several key observations that we believe may be useful in designing methods to counteract oversmoothing from an optimization point of view in the future. Note that this paper does *not* propose new methods to “solve” oversmoothing: there are a great number of them already [27] and it is slightly out of scope here. Besides, our results only apply to vanilla GNNs without the strategies that are typically used to address oversmoothing, which are left for future work. Instead, we explore important aspects of oversmoothing that were relatively ignored, and hope that it may give inspirations for further developments in the future.

Related work. Theoretical optimization for deep learning is a vast field that is still riddled with open questions. Many existing results characterize the existence or absence of “bad” critical points that are local minima or saddle points [38, 39, 42, 33, 7]. Other works study the convergence to these stationary points [1, 14, 40]. For both line of results, the situation can be reasonably well-characterized with linear activations, which is therefore the focus of many existing works [38, 1]. In the non-linear case, the existence of local minima is almost always guaranteed [39, 7]. In the specific case of GNNs, the authors in [35] proves global convergence of *linear* GNNs and study the effect of skip connections on convergence rates, while [8] study the convergence of Graph Neural Tangent Kernels, which corresponds to infinitely-wide GNNs. Note that in general, these works *adapt* existing results from MLPs to GNNs, while in contrast, the results and intuitions presented in this paper *are specific to GNNs*, and do *not* apply to MLPs (see

¹A weight matrix whose spectral norm is larger than 1 will be said to be *expanding*.

Thm. 3 and Prop. 2). Overall, optimization for GNNs remains a relatively under-explored topic from a theoretical point of view [22].

As mentioned above, oversmoothing is a long-standing problem in GNNs [17, 24], see [27] for a survey. Typical strategies to mitigate it include variants of skip connections [16, 26] or normalization [41]. On the theoretical side, various measures of diversity of node representations have been proven to converge exponentially fast to zero [24, 27], see Thm. 1. On the other hand, depth is also provably useful for GNNs [15, 18]. Modern approaches to oversmoothing also relate it to *over-squashing* [10, 43], where deep GNNs may lose information about distant neighborhoods if they are not wide enough. However we keep our focus on depth and oversmoothing here.

To our knowledge, there are not many works at the intersection of optimization and oversmoothing. Recently, in [43], the authors relate oversmoothing to vanishing gradients, however: a) they assume Gaussian weights, and b) to our understanding, by assuming contracting Jacobians they place themselves in a case where *the forward signal itself converges to zero* with increasing layer index. This of course results in oversmoothing (a zero signal has zero Dirichlet energy), but is a somewhat strong hypothesis. We will rather look at a more general framework where the forward signal can oversmooth without necessarily converging to 0 itself. Closer to us, in [25] the authors introduce the idea of backward oversmoothing (calling it *gradient oversmoothing*) and show that the backpropagated error is oversmoothed from output to input. However, their work has two main limitations: a) it is only valid in the linear case ($\rho = Id$), and b) they do not explain why precisely having a smoothed backpropagated error is detrimental for optimization. We consider a general ρ instead, which allows us to uncover non-trivial *interactions* between forward and backward oversmoothing (Thm. 2). We then use these results to formally prove the existence of spurious stationary points caused by oversmoothing, which we argue is the main reason why deep GNNs are hard to train.

Outline. We start with preliminaries in Sec. 2. In Sec. 3 we recall the classical forward oversmoothing, then show backward oversmoothing (Thm. 2). In Sec. 4, we then prove our main result, which is the existence of many easily describable near-stationary points for GNNs. We also discuss the difference between GNNs and MLPs. We conclude in Sec. 5. Proofs are provided in the appendix, and the code is available at <https://gitlab.inria.fr/nkeriven1/backward-oversmoothing>

2 Preliminaries

Notations. The norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the euclidean norm for vectors and spectral norm (max singular value) for matrices. The norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. The sign \lesssim is an upper bound up to a multiplicative constant that does not involve the graph size n or the number of layers L . For A and B of the same size, $A \odot B$ is the Hadamard (element-wise) product.

Graphs. In this paper, graphs of size n are represented by propagation matrices $P \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ with non-negative coefficients. Of particular interest to us will be **symmetric bi-stochastic** matrices, that is, $P1 = 1$ and P is symmetric. It is not so usual (e.g. the random walk matrix $D^{-1}A$ is a typical stochastic propagation matrix, but it is not symmetric), but will be convenient. In decentralized optimization, such matrices are called *gossip* matrices [2]. A possible choice is $P = Id - (D - A)/d_{\max}$, where A is the adjacency matrix of the graph, D its diagonal matrix of degrees, and d_{\max} any constant larger than its maximum degree. Our main assumption on P will be the following.

Assumption 1 (Propagation matrix). *Assume that $P \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ is symmetric and (bi-)stochastic: $P1_n = 1_n$. Moreover, assume that 1 is a simple eigenvalue, and that all other eigenvalues λ_i are such that $|\lambda_i| \leq \lambda < 1$.*

In other words, the eigenvector $u_1 = \frac{1_n}{\sqrt{n}}$ associated to the eigenvalue 1 is simple, and all other directions are shrunk by at least $\lambda < 1$, which will naturally results in oversmoothing toward the constant vector u_1 . For connected graph, this is generally satisfied: for instance, for the matrix P outlined above, the largest connected component of Cora [37] has $1 - \lambda \approx 8.81 \cdot 10^{-5}$, for that of Citeseer [37] $1 - \lambda \approx 6.58 \cdot 10^{-5}$, and so on. For the Contextual Stochastic Block Model (CSBM) [6] synthetic data that we use in Fig. 1 and 2, we have the more reasonable $1 - \lambda \approx 0.16$.

GNN: forward. Recall that the input node features are $X^{(0)} = X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_0}$. We decompose the GNN (1) into the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(k)} &= PX^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_k}, & (\text{message-passing}) \\ H^{(k)} &= F^{(k)}W^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{k+1}} & (\text{weights multiplication}) \\ X^{(k+1)} &= \rho(H^{(k)}), & (\text{activation function}) \\ \text{out} &= H^{(L)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\text{out}}}, & (\text{output after } L \text{ layers}) \end{aligned}$$

where ρ is a non-linear activation function applied element-wise. We call $F^{(k)}$ the **forward signal**, going “from” input ($k = 0$) to output ($k = L$). We assume that the input node features are bounded $\|X_{i,:}^{(0)}\|_2 \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$. The following classical assumption encompasses most activation functions.

Assumption 2. *The function ρ is 1-Lipschitz, and $|\rho(x)| \leq |x|$.*

Spectral norm of the weights. A crucial ingredients in oversmoothing is the “contracting” vs. “expanding” nature of the weights $W^{(k)}$. This is generally quantified by $s_k = \|W^{(k)}\|_2$ the leading singular value of $W^{(k)}$, or more simply the maximal $s = \max_k s_k$. Note that the s_k evolve over the optimization process, however here most of our results are expressed at a particular point in time and involve the “current” s_k without ambiguity.

Loss function. We consider a loss function $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that we aim to minimize. We classically assume that it can be decomposed into a sum over the graph nodes:

$$\mathcal{L}(H) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(h_i) \quad (2)$$

for some functions $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where the h_i are the rows of H . Note that transductive semi-supervised learning can be emulated by having some² $\ell_i = 0$, but we will generally assume that every node has a training label for simplification. We also assume the following bound.

Assumption 3. *There are constants $D_{\mathcal{L}}, D'_{\mathcal{L}} \geq 0$ such that $\left\| \frac{\partial \ell_i(h)}{\partial h} \right\|_2 \leq D_{\mathcal{L}} \|h\|_2 + D'_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

Our two main running examples will be regression with the Mean Square Error (MSE) loss, or classification with the Cross-Entropy loss. We show that they verify Assumption 3 in App. A.2.

Example 1 (Regression). *In the regression case, every node i has a label $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\text{out}}}$ in a bounded domain $\|y_i\| \leq 1$ (w.l.o.g.), and*

$$\ell_i(h) = \frac{1}{2} \|h - y_i\|^2 \quad (3)$$

Assumption 3 is satisfied with $D_{\mathcal{L}} = D'_{\mathcal{L}} = 1$.

Example 2 (Classification). *In the classification case, every node i has a discrete label $y_i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, the output dimension is $d_{\text{out}} = C$, and*

$$\ell_i(h) = -\log \left(e^{h_{y_i}} / \sum_c e^{h_c} \right) \quad (4)$$

Assumption 3 is satisfied with $D_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $D'_{\mathcal{L}} = C + 1$.

GNN: backpropagation. First-order optimization methods rely on gradients $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(k)}}$, which in deep learning are computed by backpropagation. For GNNs, the backpropagation equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(k)}} &= F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)}, \\ \text{where } B^{(k)} &:= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(k)}} = \rho'(H^{(k)}) \odot \left(P^\top B^{(k+1)} (W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \text{ and } B^{(L)} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(L)}} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note that $P^\top = P$ in our case. We have written these equations here to emphasize the object $B^{(k)} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(k)}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{k+1}}$ that we call the **backward signal**³. It satisfies a recursion equation, going “from”

²Generally this may also involve replacing the normalization $1/n$ by $1/n_{\text{train}}$ the number of labelled samples.

³It has several names in the literature, but here we emphasize its similarity to the forward signal.

output ($k = L$) to input ($k = 0$). Often, the initialization $B^{(L)} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(L)}}$ at the last layer represents the predictive “error” of the GNN: for instance, for the MSE loss, it is directly $B^{(L)} = \frac{1}{n}(H^{(L)} - Y)$ where Y contains the labels y_i as its rows. The full gradient $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(k)}} = F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)}$ is a product between the forward and the backward signal in the node dimension. Note that we do not perform mini-batching of nodes here⁴ and only consider full gradients.

3 Oversmoothing: forward and backward

As is usual in the literature [27], we measure oversmoothing by the sum of the pairwise differences between nodes. For $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(X) := \left(\frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|X_{i,:} - X_{j,:}\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (6)$$

Note that oversmoothing is sometimes measured by the *Dirichlet energy*, where pairwise distances are considered only along the edges of the graph. However for connected graphs the two definitions are within a (graph-dependent) multiplicative constant of each other, and we find this choice more convenient to work with in our framework.

3.1 Forward oversmoothing

We recall the classical “forward” oversmoothing result [24] with our notations here.

Theorem 1 (Forward oversmoothing [24]). *Under Assumptions 1 and 2 we have*

$$\mathcal{E}(X^{(k)}) \leq (\lambda s)^k \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \quad (7)$$

In particular, if $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ for $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, then $\mathcal{E}(X^{(k)}) \leq \lambda^{(1-\alpha)k} \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)})$.

The proof of this theorem is quite straightforward and is included in App. A.1 for completeness. It states that $\mathcal{E}(X^{(k)})$ decreases exponentially fast with k , which is the classical rate of oversmoothing [27] (Fig. 2, left). Note that with our hypotheses its initial value is bounded $\mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Expansion. We see that the main condition for oversmoothing is $s\lambda < 1$. This authorizes *some* expansion $s > 1$, but s is still bounded. In the rest of the paper, we will put an emphasis on “how much” expansion is authorized, as we believe that this quantifies how much the weights should deviate from their initial value to escape the oversmoothing regime. More in details, we will consider rates of the form $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ for some *expansion rate* $\alpha \leq 1$. As α decreases, this decreases the range of authorized s above 1, up until $\alpha = 0$ and $s \leq 1$. As remarked in the introduction, if at some point during training $s > 1/\lambda$, then the GNN does not necessarily oversmooth [9]. Hence the GNN could learn to *not* oversmooth [36], but this does not really happen in practice (Fig. 1) hence the need to examine the optimization process in more details.

Linear vs. non-linear oversmoothing. Remark that while $X^{(k)}$ converges to a constant vector across nodes, due to the presence of the non-linear activation function ρ it is generally difficult to explicitly characterize *what* this limit constant vector is (although some fixed point theorems may apply in certain circumstances [43]). This is one of the reasons why many theoretical analyses of oversmoothing focus on linear GNNs $\rho = Id$, which greatly simplifies the scenario [15, 25]. In this case, the forward signal become closer and closer to $X^{(k)} \approx \frac{1_{n \times n}}{n} X^{(0)} W_1 \dots W_k$, which involves the *average of the input features* across nodes $\frac{1_n^\top X^{(0)}}{n}$. As we will see later, this intuition plays a crucial role in backward oversmoothing.

3.2 Backward oversmoothing

Due to the multiplication by $P^\top = P$ from the output layer $k = L$ to the input $k = 1$, the backward signal will naturally also be oversmoothed. This has been showed in the linear case [36]. In the general case, we need the following.

⁴Indeed, batching is notoriously hard to define for node-tasks, as nodes are not independent. A GNN would typically require the L -hop subgraph around every batched node to be applied, which, for even moderate L , is generally the whole graph.

Assumption 4. Assume that ρ' is D_ρ -Lipschitz.

Note that this excludes vanilla ReLU (which is not fully differentiable anyway) but includes any smoothed variants like softplus [11]. The following result is proved in App. A.3.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1 to 4,

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \leq \frac{D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} s^{L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}}}{n} \left(\frac{D_\rho s^{L+1}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} \lambda^{k+1} + (\lambda s)^{L-k} \right)$$

The bound on $\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)})$ involves two terms: one that decreases exponentially in k , the other one in $L - k$. Hence backward oversmoothing happens *at the middle layers* (Fig. 2, right), when *both* k and $L - k$ are high. This is due to the term $\rho'(H^{(k)})$ in the backpropagation equations (5) which modulates the rows of $B^{(k)}$. When the forward signal is oversmoothed (high k), this modulation is almost constant, and backward smoothing is exceedingly simple: $B^{(k)} \propto P B^{(k+1)} W^{(k+1)\top}$. It leads to backward oversmoothing after sufficiently many iterations (high $L - k$). On the contrary, at low k , the modulation $\rho'(H^{(k)})$ can be high. Hence, compared to the linear case [25], it is the *interaction* between forward and backward smoothing that leads to backward oversmoothing, at the middle layers.




Figure 2: Pairwise differences (6) for the forward signal (left) and backward signal (right) with respect to the layer index k , at initialization, on a node classification task on CSBM synthetic data [6].

The previous theorem describe a quite non-trivial relationship between λ and s , making it difficult to assess the effects of the expansion rate α . We can simplify it by instantiating the loss.

Corollary 1. Take $q = 2$ for a regression problem with the MSE loss, or $q = 1$ for a classification problem with the cross-entropy loss. Under Assumptions 1 to 4, if $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ where $0 \leq \alpha < 1 - \sqrt{1 - 1/q}$, then for all $q\alpha < \beta < \frac{1-q\alpha}{1-\alpha}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(\beta L)}) \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\lambda^{(\beta-q\alpha)L} + \lambda^{(1-q\alpha-(1-\alpha)\beta)L} \right) \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (8)$$

In other words, taking the layer index $k = \beta L$ proportional to the depth L , with sufficiently low α we obtain an explicit exponential rate. The level α is more permissive in the classification case, since $D_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. Note that, if $s \leq 1$, we obtain that for all $0 < \beta < 1$, $\mathcal{E}(B^{(\beta L)}) \lesssim \frac{1}{n} (\lambda^{\beta L} + \lambda^{(1-\beta)L})$.

Backward oversmoothing is not (necessarily) vanishing gradients. While one might feel that backward oversmoothing is detrimental for GNN training, it is not clear exactly why this is true. A first idea would be to relate backward oversmoothing to *vanishing gradients*: if the pairwise differences $\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)})$ vanish, then maybe the *norm* $\|B^{(k)}\|$ vanish altogether, as was shown in [43] in very specific cases. However, this is not true in general, and we prove the following in App. A.5.

Proposition 1. For all L and n , there is a GNN that satisfy assumptions 1 to 4 with $s \leq 1$ such that for all k :

$$\left\| \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial W^{(k)} \right\|_F = 1 \quad (9)$$

That is, we can have both backward oversmoothing but with arbitrarily high gradients (the constant 1 is arbitrary here). Hence the answer is not vanishing gradients, at least not automatically. In the next section, we relate backward oversmoothing with stationary points.

4 Backward oversmoothing and spurious stationary points

While backward oversmoothing is not directly responsible for vanishing gradients, in practice we observe the following when training deep GNNs (Fig. 1, left): the norms of the gradients will quickly decrease to a very small value in the few first iterations, then get stuck and remain constant. This points us to the following hypothesis, which we analyze in this section: after a few iterations, deep GNNs reach a

stationary point. Note that this does not seem to necessarily happen for MLPs (Fig. 1, center). We first introduce the following definition for near-stationary points [29, 12].

Definition 1 (δ -stationary point). *The weight $W^{(k)}$ is said to be at a δ -stationary point if*

$$\left\| \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial W^{(k)} \right\|_F \leq \delta \quad (10)$$

*If this is true for all $1 \leq k \leq L$, then the GNN is said to be at a **global δ -stationary point**.*

Note that, in terms of vocabulary, we somewhat distinguish the notion of stationary points with that of *vanishing gradient*, even for small δ . Indeed, “vanishing gradients” often refers to the fact that gradient amplitudes may have vastly *different* orders of magnitude across layers, and is generally understood to be a strictly detrimental phenomenon. On the contrary, stationary points can be detrimental – e.g., spurious local minima⁵, saddle points – or simply the sign of successful training: after all, characterizing the rates of convergence to near-stationary points is the main goal of theoretical non-convex optimization [29, 12].

We now turn to the main result of this paper, which will exist in two main flavors, depending on our assumptions. For convenience we define the function

$$\xi_q(\alpha) = \frac{1 - (2q+1)\alpha + q\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)} \quad (11)$$

and note that $\xi_q(\alpha) > 0$ for $\alpha \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2q} - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4q^2}}$, which is roughly equal to 0.38 for $q = 1$ and 0.21 for $q = 2$. The following theorem is proved in App. A.7.

Theorem 3 (A stationary output layer is a global stationary point). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 to 4 hold. Assume that the parameter $W^{(L)}$ is at a $\bar{\delta}$ -stationary point.*

1. *Taking $q = 2$ for regression or $q = 1$ for classification, suppose that $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$, with $\xi_q(\alpha) > 0$. Assume that the output forward signal is lower-bounded: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|F^{(L)}\|_F \geq D_F$. For $\delta > 0$, if*

$$L \gtrsim \frac{\log(1/(D_F\delta))}{\xi_q(\alpha) \log(1/\lambda)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\delta} \lesssim \lambda^{\alpha L} D_F \delta \quad (12)$$

then the GNN is at a global δ -stationary point.

2. *Alternatively, for $\delta > 0$:*

- (a) *in the regression case, assume that the node values y_i are drawn i.i.d. from a **centered bounded** distribution on \mathbb{R}^p , i.e. such that $\mathbb{E}y = 0$ and $\|y\| \leq 1$ almost surely. Suppose that $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ such that $\xi_2(\alpha) > 0$, and $L \gtrsim \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\xi_2(\alpha) \log(1/\lambda)}$*
- (b) *in the classification case, assume that the node labels y_i are drawn iid **uniformly** from $\{1, \dots, C\}$. Suppose that $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$, with $\alpha < \frac{1}{3}$, and $L \gtrsim \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{(1-3\alpha) \log(1/\lambda)}$*

for $\nu > 0$, if

$$n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \lambda^{-2\alpha L} \log(1/\nu) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\delta} \lesssim \lambda^{2\alpha L} \delta^2 \quad (13)$$

then, with probability at least $1 - \nu$, the GNN is at a global δ -stationary point.

This theorem shows that, for sufficiently deep GNNs, under some mild assumptions, **every $\bar{\delta}$ -stationary point for the output layer L is also a global δ -stationary point**, for some small δ related to $\bar{\delta}$ and L . In other words, as soon as the last layer of the GNN is “trained”, then gradients vanish *at every layers* and the GNN cannot train anymore. As one might guess, the last (linear) layer is exceedingly easy to train, this generally happens in the first few iterations (Fig. 1). Note that, while backward oversmoothing is the underlying mechanism for this result as we will explain next, δ -stationarity happens **at every layers**, not just the middle or last ones.

Theorem 3 exists in two main flavors. Either we assume that the output layer $F^{(L)}$ is bounded away from zero – otherwise the output $H^{(L)} = F^{(L)}W^{(L)}$ is always zero and $W^{(L)}$ does not play any role. Or, without this assumption, we might suppose instead that the problem is “balanced”, that is, centered distribution for regression or balanced classes for classification, and obtain the result in a probabilistic version. This gives rise to different rates, as well as different conditions on $\bar{\delta}$.

⁵Note here that the term “spurious” is used loosely, as it is generally admitted that in deep learning local minima may generalize better than an elusive global minimum.

Spurious stationary point. To complete the previous result, we might now ask: is it possible to have a global δ -stationary point, for an arbitrary high loss? As one might expect, the answer is yes. We give an example below, proved in App. A.7.

Corollary 2 (Spurious stationary points). *There is an activation function ρ that satisfy Assumptions 2 and 4, and a joint distribution \mathcal{P} on (x, y) where the marginal distribution on y is centered bounded with a variance σ_y^2 , such that the following holds. Considering the regression case, assuming that the $(X_{i,:}^{(0)}, y_i)$ are drawn iid from \mathcal{P} , and that $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ with $\xi_2(\alpha) > 0$ then for all $\delta > 0$, if $L \gtrsim \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\xi_2(\alpha) \log(1/\lambda)}$, $n \gtrsim \delta^{-2} \lambda^{-2\alpha L} \log(1/\nu)$, then with probability at least $1 - \nu$, there exists a **global δ -stationary point** such that*

$$\mathcal{L}(H^{(L)}) \geq \sigma_y^2 - \delta \quad (14)$$

In other words, there is a family of GNNs and a regression problem that satisfy all the Assumptions of the paper, such that any sufficiently deep GNN can have δ -stationary points *with a loss close to the variance of the labels*. Moreover, remark that, since the conditions $s < \lambda^{-\alpha}$ and $\xi_2(\alpha) > 0$ define open sets, there is in fact a *non-empty open set* of parameters $\{W^{(1)}, \dots, W^{(L)}\}$ that have near-zero gradients and high loss. Informally, it will then be difficult for a first-order optimization to escape from such a bad critical region. Note however that we do not show that such an open set contains exact local minima or saddle points, just that it is a bad *flat* region.

GNNs are not MLPs. It is known, both in theory and in practice, that the landscape of classical MultiLayer Perceptrons is riddled with local minima and saddle points [33, 42, 7, 39]. As a final remark on our results, we show that the near-stationary points that we characterize in this paper are indeed specific to GNNs.

Proposition 2 (MLPs are not GNNs). *Consider a regression problem, in the MLP case $P = Id$. There is a centered bounded distribution of labels y_i , such that the following holds. For all depth $L > 0$, there is an MLP that satisfy Assumptions 2 to 4, such that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(L)}} = 0$, $s \leq 1$, but there exists k such that*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(k)}} \right\| = 1 \quad (15)$$

with probability 1.

This proposition contradicts Thm. 3 for MLPs. Hence, our results are indeed not another characterization of existing bad critical points in deep learning, but are instead specific to deep GNNs.

Sketch of proof. We finish this paper by a sketch of proof of Theorem 3, as we consider that it provides interesting intuitions. The full proof can be found in App. A.6.

In forward oversmoothing, the signal $X^{(k)}$ converges to a constant node representation when k increases. As mentioned in the previous section, in the linear case $\rho = Id$ it is easy to show [15] that it converges to the *average* of the input signal $X^{(k)} \approx \mathbf{1}_n \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_n^\top X^{(0)}}{n} \right) W^{(0)} \dots W^{(k-1)}$. On the contrary, in the non-linear case, the limit does not have a simple characterization in general. The situation is different for *backward* oversmoothing $B^{(k)} = \rho'(H^{(k)}) \odot (P^\top B^{(k+1)} (W^{(k+1)})^\top)$. When the forward signal is oversmoothed (near the output layer), the term $\rho'(H^{(k)})$ is approximately constant, and **the smoothing equation is approximately linear** $B^{(k)} \approx c P^\top B^{(k+1)} (W^{(k+1)})^\top$ for some scalar c , even with general ρ . This major difference between forward and backward oversmoothing is a key point of our analysis: to some extent, we *can* compute the limit representation of the backward oversmoothed signal, and it relates to the *average* of the output error: at the middle layers, $B^{(k)} \approx c \mathbf{1}_n \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_n^\top B^{(L)}}{n} \right) (W_L \dots W_{k+1})^\top$. We thus obtain the following theorem, which is the core of the proof of Thm 3.

Theorem 4. *Take $q = 2$ for a regression problem, or $q = 1$ for a classification problem. Under Assumptions 1 to 4, if $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ with $\xi_q(\alpha) > 0$, the GNN is at a global δ -stationary point, with*

$$\delta \lesssim \lambda^{\xi_q(\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \left\| \mathbf{1}_n^\top B^{(L)} \right\|_2 \quad (16)$$

The key component here is the norm of $\mathbf{1}_n^\top B^{(L)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{\partial \ell_i(h_i)}{\partial h_i}$, which is indeed the *average* of the output error of the GNN. One notable aspect of this result is that it applies to *every layer* k , even though

oversmoothing is the underlying phenomenon. This is due to several mechanisms acting on the gradients $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial W^{(k)} = F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)}$:

1. **In the last layers:** the forward signal is oversmoothed and approximately constant $F^{(k)} \approx 1_n v^\top$ for some v , and thus the dot product $F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)} \approx v 1_n^\top B^{(k)}$ directly relates to the average of $B^{(k)}$. Since $\rho'(H^{(k)})$ is also approximately constant, the recursive equation (5) to compute $B^{(k)}$ is simplified, and the average of $B^{(k)}$ relates to that of $B^{(L)}$
2. **In the middle layers:** backward oversmoothing kicks in, and as described above it is *similar to the linear regime*: $B^{(k)} \approx c 1_n \left(\frac{1_n^\top B^{(L)}}{n} \right) (W_L \dots W_{k+1})^\top$ accumulates around the average of $B^{(L)}$
3. **In the first layers:** the norm of the backward signal does not grow much from that of the middle layers, so we can conclude.

To conclude with the proof of Theorem 3, we then bound the average output error $\|(B^{(L)})^\top 1_n\|_2$ when the last layer is at a stationary point: since the output of the GNN is almost constant due to forward oversmoothing, when the last layer is trained the average error automatically vanish.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we explored the links between oversmoothing and optimization. Our major finding is that deep GNNs possesses many *spurious near-stationary points*, that are a) easy-to-reach: as soon as the last layer is trained; and b) fully specific to GNNs: we exhibit a counter-example MLP. The underlying mechanism is *backward oversmoothing*, that is, the backward errors are also prone to oversmoothing. Two key observations on backward oversmoothing are that: a) for non-linear GNNs, it *interacts* in non-trivial ways with forward oversmoothing, and b) when the forward signal is also oversmoothed, the recursive iterations on the backward signal are almost linear, meaning that we can fully *characterize the constant oversmoothed limit*, despite the non-linearity ρ .

Outlooks. An important limitation of our results is that they only apply to vanilla GNNs, without the common fixes to oversmoothing: skip connections, normalization, and so on. A direct extension would be to examine to which extent these fixes also act on the optimization side, and what are the remaining limitations. Nevertheless, our results may help design better optimization algorithms for GNNs, that *directly* compensate for spurious flat regions without necessarily changing the underlying architecture by adding skip connections, normalization, and so on.

More generally, given the relative scarcity of theoretical works on optimization for GNNs [23], these results are only a first step towards a better comprehension of this fundamental field. As mentioned above, a major characteristic of our results and intuitions is that *they are specific to GNNs* and do not apply *at all* to regular MLPs, which is not so common. An important path for future work would be to identify more fundamental differences between existing results for MLPs [38, 39, 42, 33, 7] and their GNN counterpart, beyond simple adaptations.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the European Union ERC-2024-STG-101163069 MALAGA.

References

- [1] S. Arora, N. Golowich, N. Cohen, and W. Hu. A convergence analysis of gradient descent for deep linear neural networks. *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, 2019.
- [2] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah. Randomized gossip algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52:2508–2530, 6 2006. ISSN 00189448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2006.874516.
- [3] M. M. Bronstein, J. Bruna, T. Cohen, and P. Veličković. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges. *arXiv:2104.13478*, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13478>.
- [4] J. Bruna, W. Zaremba, A. Szlam, and Y. LeCun. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. In *International Conference on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6203>.

- [5] Q. Cappart, D. Chételat, E. B. Khalil, A. Lodi, C. Morris, and P. Velickovic. Combinatorial optimization and reasoning with graph neural networks. *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4348–4355, 2021. ISSN 10450823. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2021/595. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2102.09544>.
- [6] Y. Deshpande, A. Montanari, E. Mossel, and S. Sen. Contextual stochastic block models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018-Decem:8581–8593, 2018. ISSN 10495258.
- [7] T. Ding, D. Li, and R. Sun. Sub-optimal local minima exist for neural networks with almost all non-linear activations. pages 1–58, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.01413>.
- [8] S. S. Du, K. Hou, B. Póczos, R. Salakhutdinov, R. Wang, and K. Xu. Graph neural tangent kernel: Fusing graph neural networks with graph kernels. pages 1–17, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.13192>.
- [9] B. Epping, A. René, M. Helias, and M. T. Schaub. Graph neural networks do not always oversmooth. pages 1–19, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.02269>.
- [10] L. Fesser and M. Weber. Mitigating over-smoothing and over-squashing using augmentations of forman-ricci curvature. 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.09384>.
- [11] X. Glorot, A. Bordes, and Y. Bengio. Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2011. ISSN 15208532. doi: 10.1002/ecs2.1832.
- [12] A. Hollender and M. Zampetakis. The computational complexity of finding stationary points in non-convex optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–55, 2024. ISSN 14364646. doi: 10.1007/s10107-024-02139-3.
- [13] W. Hu, M. Fey, M. Zitnik, Y. Dong, H. Ren, B. Liu, M. Catasta, and J. Leskovec. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 1–34, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00687>.
- [14] C. Jin, P. Netrapalli, R. Ge, S. M. Kakade, and M. I. Jordan. On nonconvex optimization for machine learning: Gradients, stochasticity, and saddle points. pages 1–31, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.04811>.
- [15] N. Keriven. Not too little, not too much: a theoretical analysis of graph (over)smoothing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12156>.
- [16] G. Li, M. Müller, B. Ghanem, and V. Koltun. Training graph neural networks with 1000 layers. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 139:6437–6449, 2021. ISSN 26403498.
- [17] Q. Li, Z. Han, and X. M. Wu. Deeper insights into graph convolutional networks for semi-supervised learning. *32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2018*, pages 3538–3545, 2018.
- [18] A. Loukas. What graph neural networks cannot learn: depth vs width. In *International Conference on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.03199>.
- [19] W. Lu, Z. Guan, W. Zhao, Y. Yang, and L. Jin. Nodemixup: Tackling under-reaching for graph neural networks. 12 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.13032>.
- [20] J. A. Martínez, O. Cerri, M. Spiropulu, J. R. Vlimant, and M. Pierini. Pileup mitigation at the large hadron collider with graph neural networks. *European Physical Journal Plus*, 134:1–12, 2019. ISSN 21905444. doi: 10.1140/epjp/i2019-12710-3.
- [21] E. A. Meirom, H. Maron, S. Mannor, and G. Chechik. How to stop epidemics: Controlling graph dynamics with reinforcement learning and graph neural networks. *arXiv:2010.05313*, pages 1–23, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.05313>.
- [22] C. Morris, N. Dym, H. Maron, İsmail İlkan Ceylan, F. Frasca, R. Levie, D. Lim, M. Bronstein, M. Grohe, and S. Jegelka. Future directions in foundations of graph machine learning. pages 1–20, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02287>.
- [23] C. Morris, F. Frasca, N. Dym, H. Maron, İsmail İlkan Ceylan, R. Levie, D. Lim, M. Bronstein, M. Grohe, and S. Jegelka. Future directions in the theory of graph machine learning. 2024. URL <http://tinyurl.com/mpn89vju><http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02287>.
- [24] K. Oono and T. Suzuki. Graph neural networks exponentially lose expressive power for node classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.10947>.
- [25] M. Park and D. Kim. Taming gradient oversmoothing and expansion in graph neural networks. pages 1–19, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.04824>.

- [26] H. Pei, Y. Li, H. Deng, J. Hai, P. Wang, J. Ma, J. Tao, Y. Xiong, and X. Guan. Multi-track message passing: Tackling oversmoothing and oversquashing in graph learning via preventing heterophily mixing. Technical report, 2024. URL <https://github.com>.
- [27] T. K. Rusch, M. M. Bronstein, and S. Mishra. A survey on oversmoothing in graph neural networks. 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10993>.
- [28] F. Scarselli, M. Gori, A. C. Tsoi, G. Monfardini, M. Hagenbuchner, and G. Monfardini. The graph neural network model. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20:61–80, 2009.
- [29] O. Shamir. Can we find near-approximately-stationary points of nonsmooth nonconvex functions? 2 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.11962>.
- [30] M. Sypetkowski, F. Wenkel, F. Poursafaei, N. Dickson, K. Suri, P. Fradkin, and D. Beaini. On the scalability of gnns for molecular graphs. 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11568>.
- [31] A. Vasileiou, S. Jegelka, R. Levie, and C. Morris. Survey on generalization theory for graph neural networks. pages 1–51, 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.15650>.
- [32] P. Veličković, A. Casanova, P. Liò, G. Cucurull, A. Romero, and Y. Bengio. Graph attention networks. *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018 - Conference Track Proceedings*, pages 1–12, 2018.
- [33] L. Venturi, A. S. Bandeira, and J. Bruna. Spurious valleys in one-hidden-layer neural network optimization landscapes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20:1–33, 2019. ISSN 15337928.
- [34] L. Wu, P. Cui, J. Pei, and L. Zhao. *Graph Neural Networks: Foundations, Frontiers, and Applications*. 2022. ISBN 9789811660542. doi: 10.1007/978-981-16-6054-2.
- [35] K. Xu, M. Zhang, S. Jegelka, and K. Kawaguchi. Optimization of graph neural networks: Implicit acceleration by skip connections and more depth. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 139:11592–11602, 2021. ISSN 26403498.
- [36] C. Yang, R. Wang, S. Yao, S. Liu, and T. Abdelzaher. Revisiting over-smoothing in deep gcns. 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.13663>.
- [37] Z. Yang, W. W. Cohen, and R. Salakhutdinov. Revisiting semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings. *33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2016*, 1:86–94, 2016.
- [38] C. Yun, S. Sra, and A. Jadbabaie. Global optimality conditions for deep neural networks. *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018 - Conference Track Proceedings*, pages 1–14, 2018.
- [39] C. Yun, S. Sra, and A. Jadbabaie. Small nonlinearities in activation functions create bad local minima in neural networks. *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, pages 1–33, 2019.
- [40] J. Zhang, H. Li, S. Sra, and A. Jadbabaie. Neural network weights do not converge to stationary points: An invariant measure perspective. Technical report, 2022.
- [41] L. Zhao and L. Akoglu. Pairnorm: Tackling oversmoothing in gnns. *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020*, pages 1–17, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.12223>.
- [42] Y. Zhou and Y. Liang. Critical points of linear neural networks: Analytical forms and landscape properties. *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018 - Conference Track Proceedings*, pages 1–18, 2018.
- [43] Álvaro Arroyo, A. Gravina, B. Gutteridge, F. Barbero, C. Gallicchio, X. Dong, M. Bronstein, and P. Vandenberghenst. On vanishing gradients, over-smoothing, and over-squashing in gnns: Bridging recurrent and graph learning. 2 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10818>.

A Proofs

Before we start, remark that

$$\mathcal{E}(X) = n^{-1/2} \|J^\perp X\|_F \quad (17)$$

Where $J = 1_n 1_n^\top / n$ is the orthogonal projector onto the subspace spanned by 1_n , and $J^\perp = Id - J$ is the projector on its orthogonal. Remark $\mathcal{E}(X) \leq \|X\|_{2,\infty}$ where $\|X\|_{2,\infty} := \max_i \|X_{i,:}\|$.

We denote by $s^{(j:k)} = \prod_{\ell=j}^{k-1} s_\ell$, or simply $s^{(k)} = s^{(0:k)}$. We also denote $S_L = s^{(L+1)}$ and $A_L = S_L^2 D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} + S_L D'_{\mathcal{L}}$.

A.1 Proof of Thm. 1

Proof of Thm 1. Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can decompose it as $Px = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle x, v_i \rangle v_i$ where the v_i are the eigenvectors of P , $v_1 = 1_n / \sqrt{n}$, $\lambda_1 = 1$, and $|\lambda_i| \leq \lambda$ for $i \geq 2$ by Assumption 1. Since J^\perp is the projector on $\text{Span}(v_1)^\perp$ we have $\|J^\perp x\|^2 = \sum_{i \geq 2} \langle x, v_i \rangle^2$, and

$$\|J^\perp Px\|^2 = \left\| J^\perp \sum_i \lambda_i \langle x, v_i \rangle v_i \right\|^2 = \sum_{i \geq 2} \lambda_i^2 \langle x, v_i \rangle^2 \leq \lambda^2 \|J^\perp x\|^2$$

Combining these equations, we get

$$\mathcal{E}(PX) \leq \lambda \mathcal{E}(X) \quad (18)$$

Since ρ is 1-Lipschitz, we get immediately $\mathcal{E}(\rho(X)) \leq \mathcal{E}(X)$, and using $\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_2$ we have $\mathcal{E}(XW) \leq \mathcal{E}(X) \|W\|_2^2$. Combining these equations allows us to conclude. \square

A.2 Assumption 3 for MSE and cross-entropy

For the MSE, we have

$$\frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial h} = h - y_i \quad (19)$$

hence $D_{\mathcal{L}} = D'_{\mathcal{L}} = 1$ (since $y_i \leq 1$).

For the cross entropy loss with C classes, we have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial h} \right\| \leq \left| \frac{\exp(h_{y_i})}{\sum_c \exp(h_c)} - 1 \right| + \sum_{c \neq y_i} \left| \frac{\exp(h_c)}{\sum_c \exp(h_c)} \right| \leq C + 1 \quad (20)$$

hence $D_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $D'_{\mathcal{L}} = C + 1$.

A.3 Proof of Thm 2

Proof of Thm 2. We first use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(X \odot Z) &= \left(\frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j,k} |X_{ik} Z_{ik} - X_{jk} Z_{jk}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j,k} X_{ik}^2 |Z_{ik} - Z_{jk}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j,k} Z_{jk}^2 |X_{ik} - X_{jk}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|X\|_\infty \mathcal{E}(Z) + \|Z\|_\infty \mathcal{E}(X) \end{aligned}$$

We thus get

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \leq \left\| P^\top B^{(k+1)} (W^{(k+1)})^\top \right\|_\infty \mathcal{E}(\rho'(H^{(k)})) + \mathcal{E} \left(P^\top B^{(k+1)} (W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \left\| \rho'(H^{(k)}) \right\|_\infty$$

We bound each of these term. By Lemma 2 and 3 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|P^\top B^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top\right\|_\infty &\leq \left\|P^\top B^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top\right\|_{2,\infty} \\ &\leq s_{k+1} \left\|B^{(k+1)}\right\|_{2,\infty} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} s^{(k+1:L+1)} (S_L D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} + D'_{\mathcal{L}})\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 4 we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho'(H^{(k)})) \leq D_\rho \mathcal{E}(P X^{(k)} W^{(k)}) \leq D_\rho \lambda^{k+1} s^{(k+1)} \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)})$$

And finally by (18) we have $\mathcal{E}(P^\top B^{(k+1)}) \leq \lambda \mathcal{E}(B^{(k+1)})$ and $|\rho'(\cdot)| \leq 1$ by Assumption 2. At the end of the day we get

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \leq \frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)})}{n} \underbrace{(S_L^2 D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} + S_L D'_{\mathcal{L}})}_{A_L} \lambda^{k+1} + s_{k+1} \lambda \mathcal{E}(B^{(k+1)})$$

which leads us to

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \leq \frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L}{n} \sum_{\ell=k}^{L-1} \lambda^{2\ell+1-k} s^{(k+1:\ell+1)} + \lambda^{L-k} s^{(k+1:L+1)} \mathcal{E}(B^{(L)})$$

To simplify the bound, taking $s = \max s_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) &\leq \frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L}{n} \lambda^{k+1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1-k} (\lambda^2 s)^\ell + (\lambda s)^{L-k} \mathcal{E}(B^{(L)}) \\ &\leq \frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L}{n} \frac{\lambda^{k+1}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} + (\lambda s)^{L-k} \mathcal{E}(B^{(L)})\end{aligned}$$

and we use $\mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \leq \|X^{(0)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq D_{\mathcal{X}}$ and by Lemma 3 we have $\mathcal{E}(B^{(L)}) \leq \|B^{(L)}\|_{\infty,2} \leq (D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} S_L + D'_{\mathcal{L}})/n$, and $S_L \leq s^{L+1}$. We obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \leq \frac{D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} s^{L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}}}{n} \left(\frac{D_\rho s^{L+1}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} \lambda^{k+1} + (\lambda s)^{L-k} \right)$$

□

A.4 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof of Corollary 1. In the regression case, we have $D_{\mathcal{L}} = 1$, while in the classification case, $D_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. Hence, taking $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ with $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, the result of Thm 2 reads

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\lambda^{k-q\alpha L} + \lambda^{L-k-\alpha(L-k)-(q-1)\alpha L} \right)$$

where $q = 2$ in the regression case and $q = 1$ in the classification case, and the multiplicative constant does not depend on L or n . Choosing $k = \beta L$, we get

$$\mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\lambda^{(\beta-q\alpha)L} + \lambda^{(1-q\alpha-(1-\alpha)\beta)L} \right)$$

This goes to 0 as L increases when $\beta > q\alpha$ and $\beta < \frac{1-q\alpha}{1-\alpha}$. This is possible when $q\alpha < \frac{1-q\alpha}{1-\alpha}$, which after a few computations leads to the condition $\alpha < 1 - \sqrt{1 - 1/q}$.

□

A.5 Proof of Prop 1

Proof of Prop 1. Consider a trivial GNN with $\rho = Id$ and $W^{(k)} = 1$, with $d_k = 1$ for all layer k , a constant input signal $X^{(0)} = 1_n$, constant zero labels $Y = 0_n$, and the MSE loss $\mathcal{L}(H) = \frac{1}{2n} \|H - Y\|_2^2$. Then, since $P1 = 1$, $F^{(k)} = 1_n$ and $B^{(k)} = \frac{2}{n} 1_n$ for all k . The gradient is therefore constant, equal to

$$\left| F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)} \right| = 1$$

□

A.6 Proof of Thm 3

Proof of Thm 3. Our strategy is to bound $\varepsilon_n := \|1_n^\top B^{(L)}\|_2$ and use Thm 4. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta} &\geq \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(L)}} \right\|_F = \left\| F^{(L)\top} B^{(L)} \right\|_F \\ &\geq \left\| J F^{(L)\top} B^{(L)} \right\|_F - \left\| J^\perp F^{(L)\top} B^{(L)} \right\|_F \\ &\geq \left\| v 1_n^\top B^{(L)} \right\|_F - n \left\| B^{(L)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \mathcal{E}(F^{(L)}) \\ &\geq \|v\|_2 \varepsilon_n - (D_{\mathcal{L}} D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \lambda^{L+1} D_{\mathcal{X}} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $v = \frac{1}{n} 1_n^\top F^{(L)}$

First case In the first case, we assume that the output of the GNN before the last linear layer is not close to 0:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| F^{(L)} \right\|_F \geq D_F \quad (22)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|v 1_n\|_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| J F^{(L)} \right\|_F \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| F^{(L)} \right\|_F - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| J^\perp F^{(L)} \right\|_F \geq D_F - \mathcal{E}(F^{(L)}) \geq D_F - D_{\mathcal{X}} s^L \lambda^L \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by combining the two, for L large enough:

$$\varepsilon_n \leq \frac{\bar{\delta} + (D_{\mathcal{L}} D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \lambda^{L+1} D_{\mathcal{X}}}{D_F - D_{\mathcal{X}} s^L \lambda^L} \quad (23)$$

Combined with Thm 4, the GNN is at a global δ -stationary point, with

$$\delta \lesssim \frac{1}{D_F} \left(\lambda^{\xi_q(\alpha)L} + \lambda^{(1-(q+1)\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \bar{\delta} \right) \quad (24)$$

Equating the two terms and inverting we get conditions on L and $\bar{\delta}$ to bound the r.h.s.

A few computations show that $\frac{1-(2q+1)\alpha+q\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)} \leq 1 - (q+1)\alpha$. We thus get

$$\delta_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{D_F} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1-(2q+1)\alpha+q\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)} L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \delta \right) \quad (25)$$

Second case: regression Alternatively, for the regression case we have $\mathcal{L}(H) = \frac{1}{n} \|H - Y\|^2$, and therefore

$$\varepsilon_n = \left\| 1_n^\top B^{(L)} \right\|_2 = \frac{2}{n} \left\| 1_n^\top (H^{(L)} - Y) \right\| \quad (26)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left\| 1_n^\top H^{(L)} \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_i y_i \right\| \quad (27)$$

Since the distribution of the y_i is centered, by an application of Hoeffding's inequality we have that, with probability $1 - \nu$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_i y_i \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}}$$

Additionally

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\| 1_n^\top H^{(L)} \right\| = \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} F^{(L)} \right) W^{(L)} \right\| \leq s \|v\|$$

Thus, with probability $1 - \nu$, combining with (21),

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_n &\lesssim s \|v\| + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\ \varepsilon_n^2 &\lesssim s \|v\| \varepsilon_n + \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\ \varepsilon_n^2 &\lesssim s \left(\delta + (D_{\mathcal{L}} D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \lambda^{L+1} D_{\mathcal{X}} \right) + \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

By solving the order-2 inequality, this leads to

$$\varepsilon_n \lesssim \sqrt{\delta + (D_{\mathcal{L}} D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \lambda^{L+1} D_{\mathcal{X}}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}}$$

Combined with Thm 4, the GNN is at a global δ -stationary point, with

$$\delta \lesssim \lambda^{\frac{1-5\alpha+2\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)}L} + \lambda^{(1/2-2\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \left(\sqrt{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \right)$$

where the multiplicative constant does not depend on L or n . A few computations show that $\xi_2(\alpha) = \frac{1-5\alpha+2\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)} \leq 1/2 - 2\alpha$, We thus get

$$\delta \lesssim \lambda^{\xi_2(\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \sqrt{\delta} \quad (28)$$

Second case: classification Let $SM(h) = \left[\frac{e^{h_j}}{\sum_c e^{h_c}} \right]_j$ be the softmax function. In the classification case, we have

$$\varepsilon_n = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_i SM(H_{i,:}^{(L)}) - e_{y_i} \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_i SM(H_{i,:}^{(L)}) - \frac{1_C}{C} \right\| + \left\| \frac{1_C}{C} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i e_{y_i} \right\| \quad (29)$$

Since the y_i are uniformly distributed among all the classes, $\mathbb{E} e_y = 1_C/C$ and by Hoeffdings inequality

$$\left\| \frac{1_C}{C} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i e_{y_i} \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}}$$

Since the softmax function is 1-Lipschitz and $1_C/C = SM(0_C)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_n &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_i SM(H_{i,:}^{(L)}) - \frac{1_C}{C} \right\| + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \|H_{i,:}^{(L)}\| + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|H^{(L)}\|_F + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\|JH^{(L)}\|_F + \|J^\perp H^{(L)}\|_F \right) + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{n} 1_n^\top H^{(L)} \right\|_2 + \mathcal{E}(H^{(L)}) + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&\leq s \|v\|_2 + \mathcal{E}(H^{(L)}) + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
&\leq s \|v\|_2 + s^{L+1} \lambda^L + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \\
\varepsilon_n^2 &\lesssim s \left(\delta + (D_{\mathcal{L}} D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \lambda^{L+1} D_{\mathcal{X}} \right) + \varepsilon_n \left(s^{L+1} \lambda^L + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{n}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

The additional term $s^L \lambda^L$ is negligible. We thus obtain the same result as in the regression case when combined with Thm 4:

$$\delta \leq \lambda^{\frac{1-3\alpha+\alpha^2}{2(1-\alpha)}L} + \lambda^{(1-3\alpha)L/2} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \sqrt{\delta} \quad (30)$$

Here for $q = 1$ however, the condition $\alpha \leq 1/3$ is stronger, and $\lambda^{(1-3\alpha)L/2}$ becomes the dominant term. \square

A.7 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof of corollary 2. We place ourselves in the regression case, and consider that the last weight is zero: $W^{(L)}$. Then, by the same computations as in the proof of Thm 3 (that is, Hoeffding's inequality to bound ε_n and an application of Thm 4), we are indeed at a global δ -stationary point. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{L}(H^{(L)}) = \mathcal{L}(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i y_i^2 \geq \sigma_y^2 - \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\nu)}{2n}} \quad (31)$$

with probability at least $1 - \nu$, again by Hoeffding's inequality. With our assumptions on n this last term is less than δ . \square

A.8 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof of Prop 2. Consider a joint distribution $(x, y) \sim \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{1,1} + \delta_{-1,-1})$, which indeed results in a marginal distribution of the y 's that is centered and bounded. Draw the node features and labels (X_i, y_i) iid from this distribution.

Consider an MLP with $\rho = Id$, $d_k = 1$, and $W^{(\ell)} = 1$ except for one $W^{(k)} = 0$. Since the global output is 0, we have

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(L)}} = 0_n^\top B^{(L)} = 0 \quad (32)$$

However, for the layer k ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W^{(k)}} &= F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)} = (XW^{(0)} \dots W^{(k-1)})^\top B^{(L)} (W^{(k+1)} \dots W^{(L)})^\top \\
&= X^\top \frac{1}{2n} (0 - Y) = -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_i x_i y_i = -1
\end{aligned}$$

since $(x, y) \sim \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{1,1} + \delta_{-1,-1})$. \square

A.9 Proof of Thm 4

Proof of Thm 4. Define

$$\varepsilon_n^{(k)} = \left\| 1_n^\top B^{(k)} \right\|_2 \quad (33)$$

and $\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon_n^{(L)}$. We divide the proof in several steps.

Last layers. In the last layers, the bound is due to the forward oversmoothing: since the forward signal is almost constant, the gradient $F^\top B$ is almost the average of the backward signal, which is directly related to ε_n . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_n^{(k)} &= \left\| 1_n^\top B^{(k)} \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| 1_n^\top \left(\rho'(H^{(k)}) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| 1_n^\top \left((J\rho'(H^{(k)})) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \left\| 1_n^\top \left((J^\perp \rho'(H^{(k)})) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1, we have

$$\left\| 1_n^\top \left((J\rho'(H^{(k)})) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \rho'(H^{(k)}) \right\|_\infty \left\| W^{(k+1)}(B^{(k+1)})^\top P 1_n \right\|_2$$

and since $P1 = 1$ and $\rho'(\cdot) \leq 1$,

$$\left\| 1_n^\top \left((J\rho'(H^{(k)})) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 \leq s_{k+1} \varepsilon_n^{(k+1)}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 1 and by the same computations as in the proof of Thm 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| 1_n^\top \left((J^\perp \rho'(H^{(k)})) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right) \right\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{n} \left\| PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right\|_\infty \left\| J^\perp \rho'(H^{(k)}) \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right\|_\infty n \mathcal{E}(\rho'(H^{(k)})) \\ &\leq D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L \lambda^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the same computation as in the proof of Cor 1

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_n^{(k)} &\leq D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L \sum_{\ell=k}^{L-1} \lambda^{2\ell+1-k} s^{(k+1:\ell+1)} + s^{(k+1:L+1)} \varepsilon_n \\ &\leq \frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L \lambda^{k+1}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} + s^{L-k} \varepsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

From this we get, using $\|F^\top 1_n/n\|_F \leq \|F\|_{2,\infty}$ and $\|B\|_F/\sqrt{n} \leq \|B\|_{2,\infty}$, Lemma 3 and 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| F^{(k)\top} B^{(k)} \right\|_F &\leq \left\| (JF^{(k)})^\top B^{(k)} \right\|_F + \left\| (J^\perp F^{(k)})^\top B^{(k)} \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| \frac{F^{(k)\top} 1_n}{n} \cdot 1_n^\top B^{(k)} \right\|_F + \left\| B^{(k)} \right\|_F \sqrt{n} \mathcal{E}(F^{(k)}) \\ &\leq \left\| F^{(k)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \varepsilon_n^{(k)} + n \left\| B^{(k)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \lambda^{k+1} s^{(k)} \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \\ &\leq s^{(k)} D_{\mathcal{X}} \varepsilon_n^{(k)} + \frac{A_L}{s_k} \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \lambda^{k+1} \\ &\leq D_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L \lambda^{k+1} s^k}{1 - \lambda^2 s} + s^L \varepsilon_n \right) + \frac{A_L}{s_k} \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) \lambda^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda s < 1$, we obtain that: for all $\ell \geq k$,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(\ell)}} \right\|_F \leq D_{\mathcal{X}} (D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \left(\frac{D_\rho D_{\mathcal{X}}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} (\lambda s)^{k+1} + \lambda^{k+1} \right) + D_{\mathcal{X}} s^L \varepsilon_n \quad (34)$$

First layers. In the middle layers, due to forward but also backward oversmoothing, the norm of B itself is small. In the first layers, we simply relate the norm of the backward signal to that of the middle layers.

Considering $\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\|_2 \|B\|_F$, and $\|\rho'(A) \odot B\|_F \leq \|B\|_F$, and $\|P\|_2$, for $\ell < k$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|B^{(\ell)}\|_F &= \|\rho'(H^{(\ell)}) \odot (P^\top B^{(\ell+1)} (W^{(\ell+1)})^\top)\|_F \leq \|P\|_2 \|B^{(\ell+1)}\|_F \|W^{(\ell+1)}\|_2 \\ &\leq s_{\ell+1} \|B^{(\ell+1)}\|_F \leq s^{k-\ell} \|B^{(k)}\|_F \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \|B^{(k)}\|_F &\leq \|JB^{(k)}\|_F + \|J^\perp B^{(k)}\|_F \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon_n^{(k)} + \sqrt{n} \mathcal{E}(B^{(k)}) \end{aligned}$$

and from this,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F^{(\ell)\top} B^{(\ell)}\|_F &\leq \|F^{(\ell)}\|_F \|B^{(\ell)}\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} s^\ell D_{\mathcal{X}} s^{k-\ell} \|B^{(k)}\|_F \leq D_{\mathcal{X}} s^k (\varepsilon_n^{(k)} + n \mathcal{E}(B^{(k)})) \\ &\lesssim D_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{D_\rho \mathcal{E}(X^{(0)}) A_L \lambda^{k+1} s^k}{1 - \lambda^2 s} + s^L \varepsilon_n + \lambda^{L-k} A_L \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that for all $\ell < k$,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(\ell)}} \right\|_F \leq D_{\mathcal{X}} A_L \left(\frac{D_\rho D_{\mathcal{X}}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} \lambda^{k+1} s^k + \lambda^{L-k} \right) + D_{\mathcal{X}} s^L \varepsilon_n \quad (35)$$

Combining (34) and (35), we obtain that for all ℓ :

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(\ell)}} \right\|_F \lesssim D_{\mathcal{X}} (D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} s^{2L+1} + D'_{\mathcal{L}} s^L) \left(\frac{D_\rho D_{\mathcal{X}}}{1 - \lambda^2 s} (\lambda s)^{k+1} + \lambda^{k+1} + s \lambda^{L-k} \right) + D_{\mathcal{X}} s^L \varepsilon_n \quad (36)$$

Now, taking $s \leq \lambda^{-\alpha}$ and $k = \beta L$,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(\ell)}} \right\|_F \lesssim \lambda^{((1-\alpha)\beta - q\alpha)L} + \lambda^{(1-\beta - q\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \varepsilon_n$$

The terms that do not depend on ε_n decrease with L when $\frac{q\alpha}{1-\alpha} < \beta < 1 - q\alpha$. This is possible when $0 < 1 - (2q+1)\alpha + q\alpha^2$, which translates to having

$$\alpha < 1 + \frac{1}{2q} - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4q^2}} \quad (37)$$

which is equal to ≈ 0.38 for $q = 1$ and ≈ 0.21 for $q = 2$. Choosing then $\beta = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q\alpha}{1-\alpha} + 1 - q\alpha \right)$, we get the final rate

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial H^{(\ell)}} \right\|_F \lesssim \lambda^{\xi_q(\alpha)L} + \lambda^{-\alpha L} \varepsilon_n$$

□

B Technical Lemma

Lemma 1. For two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ we have

$$\|(A \odot B)^\top 1_n\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|B\|_\infty \|A\|_F \quad (38)$$

Moreover, denoting $J = 1_n 1_n^\top / n$,

$$\|((JA) \odot B)^\top 1_n\|_2 \leq \|A\|_\infty \|B^\top 1_n\|_2 \quad (39)$$

Proof. Simply

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A \odot B)^\top 1_n\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij} b_{ij} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_{ij}^2 \right) \leq n \|B\|_\infty^2 \|A\|_F^2\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|((JA) \odot B)^\top 1_n\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_k a_{kj} \right) b_{ij} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_k a_{kj} \right)^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_{ij} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \|A\|_\infty^2 \|B^\top 1_n\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2. *We have*

$$\|PX\|_{2,\infty} \leq \|X\|_{2,\infty} \quad (40)$$

and

$$\|XW\|_{2,\infty} \leq \|W\|_2 \|X\|_{2,\infty} \quad (41)$$

Proof. It is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}\|PX\|_{2,\infty} &= \max_i \left\| \sum_j P_{ij} X_{j,:} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \|X\|_{2,\infty} \max_i \sum_j P_{ij} = \|X\|_{2,\infty}\end{aligned}$$

Since the P_{ij} are non-negative and sum to 1.

The second equation is immediate by

$$\|XW\|_{2,\infty} = \max_i \|WX_{i,:}^\top\|_2 \leq \|W\|_2 \|X\|_{2,\infty}$$

□

Lemma 3. *For all k we have:*

$$\|X^{(k+1)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq s^{(k)} D_{\mathcal{X}} \quad (42)$$

and

$$\|B^{(k)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq \frac{1}{n} (S_L D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} + D'_{\mathcal{L}}) s^{(k+1:L+1)} \quad (43)$$

Proof. By recursion, since $|\rho(x)| \leq |x|$ and by Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned}\|X^{(k+1)}\|_{2,\infty} &= \|\rho(PX^{(k)}W^{(k)})\|_{2,\infty} \\ &\leq \|PX^{(k)}W^{(k)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq s_k \|X^{(k)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq s^{(k)} D_{\mathcal{X}}\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\|H^{(k)}\|_{2,\infty} \leq s^{(k+1)} D_{\mathcal{X}}$.

In the same fashion, since $\rho' \leq 1$ and using Lemma 2,

$$\left\| B^{(k)} \right\|_{2,\infty} = \left\| \rho'(H^{(k)}) \odot \left(PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right) \right\|_{2,\infty} \quad (44)$$

$$\leq \left\| PB^{(k+1)}(W^{(k+1)})^\top \right\|_{2,\infty} \quad (45)$$

$$\leq s_{k+1} \left\| B^{(k+1)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \leq s^{(k+1:L+1)} \left\| B^{(L)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \quad (46)$$

$$\text{and } \left\| B^{(L)} \right\|_{2,\infty} \leq \frac{1}{n}(D_{\mathcal{L}} \left\| H^{(L)} \right\|_{2,\infty} + D'_{\mathcal{L}}) \leq \frac{1}{n}(s^{(L+1)} D_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\mathcal{L}} + D'_{\mathcal{L}}). \quad \square$$