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Abstract

We analyze deep ReLU neural networks trained with mini-batch Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) and weight decay. We study the source of SGD noise and prove that when training with weight decay, the only solutions of SGD at convergence are zero functions. Furthermore, we show, both theoretically and empirically, that when training a neural network using SGD with weight decay and small batch size, the resulting weight matrices are expected to be of small rank. Our analysis relies on a minimal set of assumptions and the neural networks may be arbitrarily wide or deep, and may include residual connections, as well as batch normalization layers.

1 Introduction

Over the past few years, neural networks have challenged machine learning theory with several mysteries. We consider two of them here that are, to our knowledge, so far unsolved. The first is about the mathematical reasons for a bias in Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) towards neural networks with low-rank weight matrices, a fact which has been empirically observed (e.g., Timor et al. [2022], Huh et al. [2021]). The second is regarding the role and origin of SGD noise (e.g., Li et al. [2021]). The origin of the SGD noise represents a puzzling and rather neglected question: why does SGD, under certain conditions, never stop making updates? In this paper, we report a simple observation that solves both mysteries and, somewhat surprisingly, shows that they have the same mathematical root. The observation is that $\frac{\partial f_W}{\partial W}$ is a matrix of rank $\leq 1$, where $f_W$ is a deep ReLU network with a scalar output and weight matrices $\{W_i\}_{i \in I}$ ($I$ is some finite set of indices).

1.1 Related Work

Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is one of the standard workhorses for optimizing deep models [Bottou, 1991]. Though initially proposed to remedy the computational bottleneck of gradient descent (GD), recent studies suggest SGD also induces a crucial implicit regularization, which prevents the overparameterized models from converging to the minima that cannot generalize well [Zhang et al., 2016; Jastrzębski et al., 2017; Keskar et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2019]. Empirical studies suggest that (i) SGD outperforms GD [Zhu et al., 2019], (ii) small batch SGD generalizes better than large batch SGD [Hoffer et al., 2017; Keskar et al., 2017], and (iii) gradient descent with additional noise cannot compete with SGD [Zhu et al., 2019]. However, despite many efforts, the potentially important, yet implicit, regularization induced by SGD noise has never been fully understood. Furthermore, we are unaware of any study of the noise in the output of the network during SGD training, a noise which seems to be present even at very long training times, suggesting that true convergence to a single set of weight matrices matrices for all data points is never reached.

$\frac{\partial f_W}{\partial W}$ is a matrix of rank at most 1.

1When $f_W$ outputs a $k$-dimensional vector, each output component of the tensor corresponding to $\frac{\partial f_W}{\partial W}$ is a matrix of rank at most 1.
A separate focus of considerable research in recent years has been the implicit bias in linear neural networks towards rank minimization. Most of the interest was on the matrix factorization problem, which corresponds to training a depth-2 linear neural network with multiple outputs w.r.t. the square loss. As described by Timor et al. [2022], Gunasekar et al. [2017] initially conjectured that the implicit regularization in matrix factorization can be characterized by the nuclear norm of the corresponding linear predictor. This conjecture was formally refuted by Li et al. [2020]. Razin and Cohen [2020] conjectured that the implicit regularization in matrix factorization can be explained by rank minimization, and also hypothesized that some notion of rank minimization may be key to explaining generalization in deep learning. Li et al. [2020] established evidence that the implicit regularization in matrix factorization is a heuristic for rank minimization. Beyond factorization problems, Ji and Telgarsky [2020] showed that in linear networks of output dimension 1, gradient flow (GF) w.r.t. exponentially-tailed classification losses converges to networks where the weight matrix of every layer is of rank 1.

However, with nonlinear neural networks, things are less clear. Empirically, a series of papers [Denton et al., 2014, Alvarez and Salzmann, 2017, Tukan et al., 2021, Yu et al., 2017, Arora et al., 2018] showed that replacing the weight matrices by low-rank approximations results in only a small drop in accuracy. This suggests that the weight matrices in practice may be close to low-rank matrices. However, whether they provably behave this way remains unclear. Timor et al. [2022] show that for nonlinear ReLU networks, GF does not minimize rank. They also argue that ReLU networks of sufficient depth can have low-rank solutions under $\ell_2$ norm minimization. This interesting result, however, applies to layers added to a network that already solves the problem and may not have any low-rank bias. It is not directly related to the mechanism described in this paper, which applies to all layers in the network but only in the presence of regularization and SGD, unlike the phenomenon described in Timor et al. [2022].

1.2 Contributions

We provide a mathematical analysis of the origin of SGD noise and of the implicit rank-minimization of SGD. We analyze deep ReLU networks trained with mini-batch stochastic gradient descent and regularization (i.e., weight decay). Our analysis is fairly generic: the neural networks may include linear layers, residual connections, and batch normalization layers. In addition, the loss function is only assumed to be differentiable. The central contributions are:

- In Props. 1-2 we study the source of SGD noise. The result shows that SGD noise must be always present, even asymptotically, regardless of the batch size, as long as we incorporate weight decay. Thus, SGD noise is a generic property; this also means that, generically, there is never convergence of SGD. These predictions are later validated empirically in Sec. 4.2.
- In Thm. 1 we prove that mini-batch SGD has an implicit bias towards networks with low-rank matrices. This theorem connects batch size, weight decay, optimization and rank.
- In particular, in Sec. 3.2 we theoretically predict that the batch size, weight decay and learning rate act as low-rank regularizers. For instance, we predict that the presence of weight decay is crucial to obtain low-rank solutions. These predictions are later validated empirically in Sec. 4.3.

2 Problem Setup

We consider the problem of training a model for a standard classification or regression problem. Formally, the target task is defined by a distribution $P$ over samples $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the instance space, and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a label space.

A function $f_W \in \mathcal{F} \subset \{f' : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k\}$ assigns a prediction to an input point $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and its performance on the distribution $P$ is measured by the expected risk

$$L_P(f_W) := \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P}[\ell(f_W(x), y)],$$

where $\ell : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a non-negative, differentiable, loss function (e.g., MSE or cross-entropy losses). For simplicity, throughout the paper, we focus on the case where $k = 1$.

Since we do not have direct access to the full population distribution $P$, the goal is to learn a predictor, $f_W$, from some balanced training data $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ of independent and identically distributed
(i.i.d.) samples drawn from $P$ along with regularization that controls the complexity of the learned model and typically helps reducing overfitting. Namely, we intend to minimize the regularized empirical risk

$$L^\lambda_S(f_W) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i) + \lambda \|W\|^2_2,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is predefined hyperparameter, controlling the amount of regularization. In order to minimize this objective, we typically use mini-batch SGD, which is described below in more details.

### 2.1 Architectures and Training

In this work, the function $f_W$ represents a neural network, consisting of a set of layers of weights interlaced with activation units. We employ a fairly generic definition of a neural network, that includes linear layers, residual connections and batch normalization layers. To include normalization layers, we extend $f_W$‘s input to be $(x; \tilde{X})$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{X} = {x_{ij}}_{j=1}^B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a batch of samples (see details below). For simplicity, we denote by $f_W(x)$ a network without normalization layers. When $\tilde{X}$ is clear from context, we simply write $\tilde{f}_W(x) := f_W(x; \tilde{X})$.

**Optimization.** In this work, we consider optimizing $f_W$ using mini-batch stochastic gradient descent (SGD), possibly with detaching certain layers. Namely, we aim at minimizing the regularized empirical risk $L^\lambda_S(f_W)$ by applying SGD for a certain number of iterations. We initialize $W_0$ using a standard initialization procedure and iteratively update $W_t$. At each iteration, we sample a subset $S = \{(x_{ij}, y_{ij})\}_{j=1}^B \subset S$ uniformly at random and update $W_{t+1} \leftarrow W_t - \eta_t \cdot \nablaWL_S(f_W(\cdot ; \tilde{X})),

$$
\tilde{X} = \{x_{ij}\}_{j=1}^B \text{ and } \eta_t > 0 \text{ is our learning rate at iteration } t. \text{ Here, } f_W(\cdot ; \tilde{X}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

is the function given by $f_W(x; \tilde{X})$ for a fixed value of $\tilde{X}$. Furthermore, for a given function $g_\theta = g_\theta^L \circ \ldots \circ g_\theta^1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ where $\{g_\theta^i\}_{j=1}^B$ are detached, $\frac{\partial \text{arg}L}{\partial \theta^i} = \nabla \theta^i g_\theta(z)$ denotes the pseudo gradient of $g_\theta$, which is computed using the chain rule, while treating $\{g_\theta^i\}_{j=1}^B$ as independent of $\theta$.

**Network architecture.** Formally, $f_W$ is as a directed acyclic graph (DAG) $G = (V, E)$, where $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_L\}$ consists of the various layers of the network and each edge $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j) \in E$ specifies a connection between two layers. Each layer is a function $v_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ and each connection holds a weight matrix $W^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_j}$. The layers are divided into three categories: the input layer $v_1$, the output layer $v_L$ and intermediate layers. In this setting, we do not have connections directed towards the input layer nor connections coming out of the output layer (i.e., $\forall i \in [L] : \{v_i, v_L\}, (v_0, v_i) \notin E$). Given an input $x$ and batch $\tilde{X}$, the output of a given layer $v_i$ is evaluated as follows

$$v_i(x; \tilde{X}) := \sigma(n_i(\sum_{j \in \text{pred}(i)} W^{ij} \cdot v_j(x; \tilde{X}))),$$

except for the output layer $v_L$ that computes

$$f_W(x; \tilde{X}) := v_L(x; \tilde{X}) = \sum_{j \in \text{pred}(L)} W^{Lj} \cdot v_j(x; \tilde{X}),$$

where $\text{pred}(i)$ is the set of indices $j$, such that $(v_i, v_j) \in E$. Here, $\sigma$ is an element-wise activation function (e.g., ReLU, Leaky ReLU, sigmoid) and $n_i$ is either the identity function $n_i(z; \tilde{X}) = z$ or batch normalization (see below).

In this setting, the weight matrices $W^{pi}$ could be trainable, $(v_p, v_q) \in E_T$ (e.g., fully-connected layers), or constant, $(v_p, v_q) \notin E_T$ (e.g., residual connections). Throughout the analysis, we consider paths within the graph $G$, denoted by $\pi = (\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_T)$, where $\pi_0 = 1$, $\pi_T = L$ and for all $i = 0, \ldots, T-1 : (v_{\pi_i}, v_{\pi_{i+1}}) \in E$.

**Batch normalization layers.** As mentioned above, the neural networks may or may not include batch normalization layers [Ioffe and Szegedy 2015]. A batch normalization layer is defined in the
We start by spelling out the conditions for what we call in this paper convergence of SGD. We note that SGD noise is generically unavoidable (when training is successful). For simplicity, we focus on training a network with normalization layers \[ W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \] that differ by only one sample. We denote the following manner,

\[
n_\ell(v_l(x; \tilde{X}); \tilde{X}) = \gamma_l \cdot A_l(\tilde{X}) \cdot (v_l(x; \tilde{X}) - b_l(\tilde{X})) + \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_l
\]

\[
A_l(\tilde{X}) = \text{diag} \left( \left( \frac{\text{Var}_{\tilde{X} \sim U[\tilde{X}]}(v_l(\tilde{x}; \tilde{X}))}{\text{Var}_{\tilde{X} \sim U[\tilde{X}]}(v_l(\tilde{x}; \tilde{X}))} \right)_{j=1}^{d_l} \right)
\]

\[
b_l(\tilde{X}) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X} \sim U[\tilde{X}]}[v_l(\tilde{x}; \tilde{X})],
\]

where \( \gamma_l, \beta_l \in \mathbb{R} \) are trainable scale and shift parameters and \( \mathbb{1} := (1, \ldots, 1) \). To simplify the analysis, we detach (also known as stop-gra(Grill et al., 2020)) the matrices \( A_l(\tilde{X}) \) during backpropagation at any step during training. Namely, we treat \( \frac{\partial A_l(\tilde{X})}{\partial W} = 0 \) in order to compute the training updates (without changing the forward passes). We note that detaching is a commonly used approach for training a network with normalization layers [Wiesler et al., 2014; Ioffe, 2017; Raiko et al., 2012; Povey et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2019; Gouk et al., 2021; Ali et al., 2022]. In fact, Xu et al. [2019] showed that detaching the variance term of layer normalization is competitive and even improves the performance on various tasks.

### 3 Theoretical Results

In this section, we describe our main theoretical results. In Sec. 3.1, we prove that SGD noise is inevitable when applying weight decay. In Sec. 3.2 we provide a brief analysis showing that mini-batch SGD implicitly learns neural networks with low-rank matrices. Proofs are provided in the supplementary material.

#### 3.1 Degeneracy and the Origin of SGD Noise

We use the term ‘SGD noise’ to refer to the inherent inability of SGD to converge to a stationary solution for the weight matrices that is the same across different mini-batches. In this section, we characterize the convergence of mini-batch SGD. Our results are essentially impossibility results that show that convergence of SGD takes place only when the network is the zero function. This implies that asymptotic noise is generically unavoidable (when training is successful). For simplicity, we focus on normalization-free univariate neural networks \( f_W: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) and assume that \( \forall i \in [m]: x_i \neq 0 \).

We start by spelling out the conditions for what we call in this paper convergence of SGD. We note that at convergence, we have \( \nabla_{W^{m}} L_\beta(f_W) = 0 \) across all pairs \( (v_p, v_q) \in E_T \) and mini-batches \( \tilde{S} \subset S \) of size \( B < m \). Specifically, we can write,

\[
0 = \nabla_{W^{m}} L_\beta(f_W) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{(x,y) \in \tilde{S}} \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x), y)}{\partial f_W(x)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x)}{\partial W^{pq}} + 2\lambda W^{pq}.
\]

Suppose we have two batches \( \tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2 \subset S \) of size \( B \) that differ by only one sample. We denote the unique sample of each batch by \( (x_i, y_i) \) and \( (x_j, y_j) \) respectively. We notice that

\[
0 = \nabla_{W^{m}} L_\beta(f_W) - \nabla_{W^{m}} L_\beta(f_W) = \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{pq}} - \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_j), y_j)}{\partial f_W(x_j)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_j)}{\partial W^{pq}}.
\]

Therefore, we conclude that for all \( i, j \in [m] \),

\[
M^{pq} = \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{pq}} = \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_j), y_j)}{\partial f_W(x_j)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_j)}{\partial W^{pq}}.
\]

Hence, for all \( (v_p, v_q) \in E_T \) and \( i \in [m] \),

\[
\frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{pq}} + 2\lambda W^{pq} = M^{pq} + 2\lambda W^{pq} = 0.
\]

Therefore, unless \( \lambda = 0 \) or \( (v_p, v_q) \in E_T : W^{pq} = 0 \), we conclude that \( \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0 \) for all \( i \in [m] \). In this case, we also obtain that \( \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{pq}} m_{i=1} = \text{collinear vectors by Eq. 8} \).
Therefore, any convergence point of training a neural network using mini-batch SGD along with weight decay is highly degenerate and does not perfectly fit any one of the training labels. To better understand the essence of this degeneracy, we provide the following proposition, which is specialized for ReLU networks.

**Proposition 1** \((\lambda > 0)\). Let \(\ell(a, b)\) be a differentiable loss function, \(\lambda > 0\), and let \(f_W(x)\) be a ReLU neural network, where \(\{(v_p, v_1) \in E \mid v_p \in V\} \subset E_T\). Let \(W\) be a convergence point of mini-batch SGD for minimizing \(L^S(f_W)\) (see Eq. 6). Then, either \(f_W \equiv 0\) or \(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m\) are collinear vectors.

The above proposition shows that unless the training samples lie on a one-dimensional linear space, any convergence point of SGD corresponds to the zero function. Since both conditions are unrealistic, we conclude that convergence is impossible in any practical scenario.

In the following proposition, we look at the convergence of SGD when training without weight decay.

**Proposition 2** \((\lambda = 0)\). Let \(\ell(a, b)\) be a differentiable loss function, \(\lambda = 0\), and let \(f_W(x)\) be a ReLU neural network, where \(\{(v_p, v_1) \in E \mid v_p \in V\} \subset E_T\). Let \(W\) be a convergence point of mini-batch SGD for minimizing \(L^S(f_W)\). Assume that \(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m\) are not collinear vectors. Then, for any \(i \in [m]\), for which \(\frac{\partial\ell(x_i, y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0\), we have, \(f_W(x_i) = 0\). In particular, if \(\ell\) is convex and \(\forall b \in \mathbb{R}, \exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \ell(a, b) = \inf_a \ell(a, b)\), then, \(\forall i \in [m] : f_W(x_i) = 0\).

The above proposition shows that at convergence, the neural network outputs zero for any training sample that it does not perfectly fit (i.e., \(\frac{\partial\ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0\)). In particular, if \(\ell\) is an exponential-type loss function (e.g., binary cross-entropy, logistic loss and exponential loss), \(\ell(a, b)\) has no minima \(a\) for any \(b \in \mathbb{R}\), and therefore, the only possible convergence points are ones for which \(f_W(x_i) = 0\) across all \(i \in [m]\). While theoretically convergence to a non-zero function is not guaranteed, in practice training without weight decay can still fall into the regime of ‘almost convergence’, in which it is impossible to derive Eq. 8 without relying on optimization with SGD, and without weight decay, we could not argue that \(W^{pq}\) is proportional to the low-rank matrix \(M^{pq}\). Finally, the analysis above is independent of the batch size as long as it is strictly smaller than the full dataset’s size.

### 3.2 Implicit Rank Minimization

In the previous section we showed that if convergence were to take place, then the neural network would be highly degenerate with zero weight matrices. As a next step, we study rank minimization in the absence of convergence. Specifically, we demonstrate an implicit bias of mini-batch SGD to learn weight matrices of small rank, depending on the batch size, the weight decay and its ability to successfully minimize the objective function. In the following theorem, we introduce an upper bound on the distance of the various weight matrices within the network from matrices of rank \(\leq B^*\) as a function of the progress of the optimization. The theorem holds for neural network with or without batch normalization.

**Theorem 1.** Let \(\| \cdot \|\) be any matrix norm and \(\ell\) any differentiable loss function. Let \(f_W(x, \hat{x})\) be a ReLU neural network and \(W^{pq}\) be a given matrix within \(f_W\) and let \(B^* \in [m]\). Then,

\[
\min_{\substack{V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x} : \\
\text{rank}(V) \leq B^*}} \| W^{pq} - V \| \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \min_{\substack{S \subset \hat{S} : |S| = B^*}} \| \nabla_{W^{pq}} L^S(f_W) \|
\]

The theorem above provides an upper bound on the minimal distance between the various weight matrices in the network and matrices of rank \(\leq B^*\). The upper bound is proportional to the minimal norm (w.r.t. the selection of the batch) of the gradient of a regularized risk evaluated on a batch.
of size $B^*$ and essentially depends on the training hyperparameters (e.g., batch size, learning rate, weight decay, etc’). Therefore, it can be used to draw predictions about the relationships between certain hyperparameters, the rank and the performance. Several interesting predictions follow the theorem above.

**Rank and batch size.** We note that SGD training with batches of size $B$ directly minimizes the following objective $\text{Avg}_{S \subset S}: |S| = B \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$ (for all $(p,q) \in E$). This quantity upper bounds the term $\min_{S \subset S}: |S| = B \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$ from Eq. 10. Therefore, if training successfully minimizes $\text{Avg}_{S \subset S}: |S| = B \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$, then, we expect $W^p$ to be close to a matrix of rank $\leq B$. Hence, we predict that the batch size regularizes the rank of the various matrices in the network (when fixing the other hyperparameters). Namely, we expect training with smaller batch sizes to produce matrices of smaller ranks. Specifically, in contrast to SGD with small batch sizes, we expect that GD would not regularize the rank of the network’s matrices.

**Rank and weight decay.** The dependence of the bound on $\lambda$ is twofold: through the multiplicative term $\lambda^{-1}$ and through the term $\min_{S \subset S}: |S| = B^* \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$ that indirectly depends on $\lambda$. For two degrees of weight decay $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$, as long as SGD minimizes $\min_{S \subset S}: |S| = B^* \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$ to a small value (for both $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$), then we expect the matrices $W^p$ to be of smaller ranks when utilizing $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$. Therefore, we predict that the ranks of the weight matrices should decrease as we increase $\lambda$. Furthermore, if $\lambda = 0$, then the bound is infinite and we lose the low-rank constraint. Therefore, we predict that without weight decay we should not observe an implicit regularization towards rank minimization.

**Rank and learning rate.** Typically, unless the learning rate is not too large, when training a model with larger learning rates we expect the objective’s gradient to be of a smaller norm. Thus, for larger values of $\eta$, we expect $\min_{S \subset S}: |S| = B^* \| \nabla_{W^p} L^2_{\tilde{S}}(f_W) \|$ to be smaller. Therefore, similar to the batch size, we predict that the learning rate also induces a regularization effect, that is, with larger learning rates we learn matrices of smaller rank. Furthermore, as we discussed and observe empirically, when training with small batch sizes we expect to learn matrices of very small ranks. We note that neural networks with matrices of very low ranks typically underperform on the training set, due to their limited expressivity. Therefore, we predict that to effectively train a model with smaller batch sizes it is necessary to decrease the learning rate accordingly, which is consistent with previous empirical observations [Krizhevsky] 2014 [Goyal et al.] 2018.

### 4 Experiments

In this section we experimentally analyze the convergence (and non-convergence) of training neural networks with SGD. In addition, we empirically study the implicit bias towards rank minimization in deep ReLU networks. Throughout the experiments we extensively vary different hyperparameters (e.g., the learning rate, weight decay, and the batch size) and study their effect on the rank of the various matrices in the network\(^2\).

For each run we used one Tesla-k80 GPU for 5-20 hours.

#### 4.1 Setup

**Evaluation process.** Following the problem setup, we consider $k$-class classification problems and train a multilayered neural network $f_W = e \circ h = e \circ g^t \circ \cdots \circ g^1: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ on some balanced training dataset $S$. The model is trained using CE/ MSE loss minimization between its logits and the one-hot encodings of the labels. Here, $g^1, \ldots, g^t$ are the various hidden layers of the network (e.g., fully-connected layers or residual blocks), where $e$ is its top linear layer. After each epoch, we compute the averaged rank across the network’s weight matrices and its train and test accuracy rates. To estimate the rank of a given matrix, we normalize it and count how many of its singular values are \( \notin [-1e-4, 1e-4] \).

**Architectures.** We consider two types of architectures. The first architecture is an MLP. Our MLPs, denoted by MLP-BN-L-H consist of $L$ hidden layers, where each layer contains a linear layer of width $H$, followed by batch normalization and ReLU activations. On top of that, we compose a linear output layer. The second architecture, denoted by RES-BN-L-H, consist of a linear layer of width $H$.

\(^2\)The plots are best viewed when zooming into the pictures.
Figure 1: **Convergence of MLP-5-2000 trained on MNIST and CIFAR10 with CE/MSE loss.** In (a) we plot the averaged distance between the weight matrices at epoch $t$ and epoch $t+1$, captured by $\frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{(p,q) \in E} \| W_{pq}^{t+1} - W_{pq}^t \|$. In (b) we plot the train accuracy rates, in (c) we plot the averaged train loss and in (d) we plot the average rank across the trainable matrices.

Figure 2: **Average rank of MLP-BN-10-100 trained on CIFAR10 with varying batch sizes.** Each line stands for the results of a different value of $\lambda$. In the (top) row we plot the average rank across layers and in the (bottom) row we plot the train and test accuracy rates for each setting.

followed by $L$ residual blocks, each computing a function of the form $z + \sigma(n_2(W_2\sigma(n_1(W_1z))))$, where $W_1, W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times H}$, $n_1, n_2$ are batch normalization layers and $\sigma$ is the element-wise ReLU function. Again, the network is ended with a linear output layer. We denote by MLP-$L$-$H$ and RES-$L$-$H$ the same architectures without applying batch normalization.

### 4.2 Experiments on SGD Noise

In Sec. 3.1 we showed that training a neural network with SGD along with weight decay, cannot converge to a non-zero function. To verify this prediction, we trained MLP-5-2000 networks
with varying degrees of weight decay $\lambda \in \{0, 1e-6, 1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3\}$ and investigated their convergence. Each model was trained using SGD with batch size 128 and learning rate 0.1 for 2000 epochs (without learning rate scheduling or momentum). We trained the models once with the cross-entropy loss and once with the squared loss.

To evaluate the convergence of the networks, we use the following quantity: $d(W_{t+1}, W_t) := \frac{1}{|E^p|} \sum_{(p,q) \in E^p} \| W^p_{t+1} - W^p_t \|$, where $\{W^p_t\}_{(p,q) \in E^p}$ are the various trainable matrices in the network at epoch $t$. This quantity measures the averaged distance between the network’s matrices at epochs $t$ and $t+1$. Convergence is possible only if $\lim_{t \to \infty} d(W_{t+1}, W_t) = 0$.

In Fig.3, we monitor (a) $d(W_{t+1}, W_t)$, (b) the train accuracy rates, (c) the train losses and (d) the averaged rank of the trainable matrices. As predicted in Prop.1, when training with $\lambda > 0$, $W_t$ either converges to zero and $f_{W_t}$ to the zero function (e.g., see the results of training on CIFAR10 with the cross-entropy loss and $\lambda = 1e-4, 1e-3$) or $W_t$ does not converge (i.e., $d(W_{t+1}, W_t)$ does not tend to zero). On the other hand, the term $d(W_{t+1}, W_t)$ is smaller by orders of magnitude when using $\lambda = 0$ in comparison to using $\lambda > 0$ (except for cases when the selection of $\lambda > 0$ leads to $W^p_{t+1} \to 0$). Interestingly, even though for certain values of $\lambda > 0$, the training loss and accuracy converged, the network’s parameters do not converge.

Finally, when training for cross-entropy loss minimization without weight decay we encounter the ‘almost convergence’ regime discussed in Sec.3.1. Namely, even though perfect convergence is impossible (see Prop.2) for a fixed sized neural network, the term $d(W_{t+1}, W_t)$ may become as small as we wish by increasing the size of the neural network. Therefore, since the MLP-5-2000 is relatively large (compared to the dataset’s size), we may inaccurately get the impression that $d(W_{t+1}, W_t)$ tends to zero.
4.3 Experiments on Rank Minimization

Rank, batch size and the learning rate. We train instances of MLP-BN-10-100, RES-BN-5-500 and MLP-L-5-500 using SGD with different batch sizes $B$ and initial learning rates $\eta$. The learning rate is decayed by a factor of 0.1 three times at epochs 60, 100, and 200 and training is stopped after 500 epoch. We trained the models with weight decay $\lambda = 5e^{-4}$ and momentum 0.9.

As can be seen in Figs. 2, 4 and 5 by decreasing the batch size, we essentially strengthen the low-rank constraint over the network’s matrices, which eventually leads to matrices of lower ranks. This is consistent with the prediction made in Sec. 3.2 that we expect to learn matrices of smaller ranks when training the network with smaller batch sizes. In addition, we also notice that when increasing the learning rate, the rank minimization constraint strengthens as well, which leads to lower ranks and generally worse training performances. Therefore, to properly train a neural network with smaller batch sizes, it is necessary to decrease the learning rate accordingly.

Rank minimization and weight decay. To study the effect of the weight decay on rank minimization, we trained instances of MLP-BN-10-100 using SGD with different batch sizes $B \in \{16, 32, 64, 128\}$ and values of $\lambda \in \{0, 1e^{-4}, 2e^{-4}, 4e^{-4}, 8e^{-4}, 6e^{-3}\}$. The learning rate is initially $\eta = 0.1$ and is decayed by a factor of 0.1 three times at epochs 60, 100, and 200 and training is stopped after 500 epoch. We trained the models with weight decay $\lambda = 5e^{-4}$ and momentum 0.9.

The results are reported in Fig. 3. As can be seen, by increasing $\lambda$ we typically impose stronger rank minimization constraints, as predicted in Sec. 3.2. In addition, regardless of the batch size, we lose the rank minimization constraint when training with $\lambda = 0$ as predicted in Sec. 3.2.

5 Conclusions

In this work we theoretically studied the source of SGD noise and the implicit bias towards low-rank weight matrices in deep neural networks. We make several theoretical and empirical observations:

- SGD noise is inevitable when applying weight decay, regardless of the batch size;
- We show that the batch size, weight decay and learning rate contribute to a regularizing effect on the rank of the trainable matrices of neural networks;
- Weight decay and training with mini-batches are necessary to obtain rank minimization.

It has not escaped our attention that these results have a rich set of implications with respect to other mysteries of deep learning that are yet to be solved. They include questions such as why SGD training of networks generalizes well, the relationship between rank minimization and architectural choices (residual networks [He et al., 2017], transformers [Vaswani et al., 2017] and convolutional networks [LeCun et al., 1999]) and whether rank minimization extends beyond the standard settings of supervised learning.
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6 Additional Experiments

Auxiliary experiments on SGD noise. We study the existence of SGD noise when training neural networks with batch normalization and weight decay. For this purpose, we repeated the experiment in Sec. 4.2 with MLP-BN-5-2000 networks. The results are summarized in Fig. 6. Interestingly, even though in this case we incorporated batch normalization layers, the results are very similar to those presented in Fig. 1 in the main text.

Figure 6: Convergence of MLP-BN-5-2000 trained on CIFAR10 with cross-entropy loss. In (a) we plot the averaged distance between the weight matrices at epoch $t$ and epoch $t + 1$, captured by

$$\frac{1}{|E_T|} \sum_{(p,q) \in E_T} \| W_{pq}^{t+1} - W_{pq}^t \|. $$

In (b) we plot the train accuracy rates, in (c) we plot the averaged train loss and in (d) we plot the average rank across the trainable matrices.

7 Analyzing Standard Neural Networks

Lemma 1. Let $f_W$ be a neural network and $W^{pq}$ be a given matrix within $f_W$. Then, for any input $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\text{rank} \left( \frac{\partial f_W(x)}{\partial W^{pq}} \right) \leq 1$.

Proof. We would like to show that the matrix $\frac{\partial f_W(x)}{\partial W^{pq}}$ is of rank $\leq 1$. We note that for any input $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the output can be written as follows,

$$f_W(x) = \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0l_1} \cdot v_1(x),$$

where $l_0 = L$. In addition, each layer $v_l$ can also be written as

$$v_l(x) = D_l(x) \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_1)} W^{l_1l_2} \cdot v_l(x),$$

where $D_l(x) := \text{diag}[\sigma'(u_l(x))]$, such that, $u_l(x) := \sum_{l' \in \text{pred}(l)} W^{l'l'} \cdot v_{l'}(x)$. Therefore, for any input $x$, we can write $f_W(x)$ as the sum of matrix multiplications along paths $\pi$ from $v_1$ to $v_{l_0}$. Specifically, we can write $f_W(x)$ as a follows

$$f_W(x) = \sum_{\pi \text{ from } p \text{ to } l_0} W^{\pi_{F-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{F-1}}(x) \cdot \ldots \cdot D_{\pi_1}(x) \cdot W^{pq} \cdot v_q(x)$$

$$+ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } 1 \text{ to } l_0} W^{\pi_{F-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{F-1}}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_{F-2}} \ldots \cdot D_{\pi_2}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_1} x$$

$$= \left[ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } p \text{ to } l_0} W^{\pi_{F-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{F-1}}(x) \cdot \ldots \cdot D_{\pi_1}(x) \right] \cdot W^{pq} \cdot v_q(x)$$

$$+ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } 1 \text{ to } l_0} W^{\pi_{F-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{F-1}}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_{F-2}} \ldots \cdot D_{\pi_2}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_1} x$$

$$=: u_q(x)^T \cdot W^{pq} \cdot v_q(x)$$

$$+ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } 1 \text{ to } l_0} W^{\pi_{F-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{F-1}}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_{F-2}} \ldots \cdot D_{\pi_2}(x) \cdot W^{\pi_1} x,$$
where $T := T(\pi)$ denotes the length of the path $\pi$. We note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with measure 1 over $W$, the matrices $\{D_l(x)\}_{l=1}^{\pi_i}$ are constant in the neighborhood of $W$. In addition, $v_q(x)$ is independent of $W^{pq}$. Therefore, we conclude that $\frac{\partial f_W(x)}{\partial W^{pq}} = u_q(x) \cdot v_q(x)^T$. Finally, since $v_q(x)$ and $u_q(x)$ are vectors, we obtain that \( \text{rank} \left( \frac{\partial f_W(x)}{\partial W^{pq}} \right) \leq 1. \)

**Proposition 1** ($\lambda > 0$). Let $\ell(a, b)$ be a differentiable loss function, $\lambda > 0$, and let $f_W(x)$ be a ReLU neural network, where $\{(v_p, v_1) \in E \mid v_p \in V \} \subset E_T$. Let $W$ be a convergence point of mini-batch SGD for minimizing $L_S(f_W)$ (see Eq. 6). Then, either $f_W \equiv 0$ or $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are collinear vectors.

**Proof.** Let $(p, 1) \in E_T$ be a given trainable connection and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By Eq. 11, we can write

$$f_W(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\pi} W^{\pi_i \pi_{i-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{i-1}}(x_i) \cdot W^{\pi_{i-1} \pi_{i-2}} \cdots D_{\pi_1}(x_1) \cdot W^{\pi_1} \cdot x$$

$$= \sum_{(v_p, v_1) \in E_T} E_p(x) \cdot W^{p1} \cdot x$$

$$= \sum_{(v_p, v_1) \in E_T} E_p(x) \cdot W^{p1} \cdot x,$$

where $E_p(x) := \sum_{i=p}^{\pi} W^{\pi_i \pi_{i-1}} \cdot D_{\pi_{i-1}}(x_i) \cdots W^{\pi_2 \pi_1} \cdot D_{\pi_1}(x_1)$. We denote $E_{p,i} := E_p(x_i)$ and we can write \( \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{pq}} = E_{p,i} \cdot x_i^T. \)

We would like to show that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are collinear vectors for $f_W \equiv 0$. Assume the opposite by contradiction, i.e., that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is not a set of collinear vectors and that $f_W \neq 0$. In particular, by Eq. 12 we have, $W^{p1} \neq 0$ for some $p$.

According to the analysis in Sec. 3.1 of the main text, \( \{ \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial \text{vec}(W^{\pi_i})} \}_{i=1}^m \) are collinear vectors. Therefore, for any pair $i, j \in [m]$, there is a scalar $\alpha_{ij}^p \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $E_{p,i} \cdot x_i^T = \alpha_{ij}^p E_{p,j} \cdot x_j^T$.

Consider a given index $i \in [m]$. We would like to show that either $E_{p,i} = 0$ or $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a set of collinear vectors. Assume that there exists $j \in [m]$, for which $\alpha_{ij}^p = 0$. Then, $E_{p,i} \cdot x_i^T = 0$, which implies that either $E_{p,i} = 0$ or $x_i = 0$ (which is false by assumption). Otherwise ($\forall j \in [m] : \alpha_{ij}^p \neq 0$), either $E_{p,i} = 0$ or $x_i$ and $x_j$ are collinear. Since this argument holds for all $j \in [m]$, unless $E_{p,i} = 0$, we obtain that $x_i$ and $x_j$ are collinear for all $j \in [m]$. Note that if $\{x_i, x_j\}$ are collinear for all $j \in [m]$, then, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a set of collinear vectors. Therefore, we conclude that either $E_{p,i} = 0$ or $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a set of collinear vectors (which we assumed to be false). We note that if $E_{p,i} = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$, then, $M^{p1} = 0$ (see Eq. 8 in the main text), and by Eq. 9 in the main text, we have, $W^{p1} = 0$ in contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that $f_W \equiv 0$ or $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are collinear vectors.

**Proposition 2** ($\lambda = 0$). Let $\ell(a, b)$ be a differentiable loss function, $\lambda = 0$, and let $f_W(x)$ be a ReLU neural network, where $\{(v_p, v_1) \in E \mid v_p \in V \} \subset E_T$. Let $W$ be a convergence point of mini-batch SGD for minimizing $L_S(f_W)$. Assume that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are not collinear vectors. Then, for any $i \in [m]$, for which $\frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0$, we have, $f_W(x_i) = 0$. In particular, if $\ell$ is convex and $\forall b \in \mathbb{R}^n : a^* \in \mathbb{R} : \ell(a^*, b) = \inf_a \ell(a, b)$, then, $\forall i \in [m] : f_W(x_i) = 0$.

**Proof.** Let $i \in [m]$ be an index for which $\frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0$. We consider two possibilities: (i) there exist an index $j \in [m]$ for which $\frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_j), y_j)}{\partial f_W(x_j)} = 0$ or (ii) for all indices $j \in [m]$, we have $\frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_j), y_j)}{\partial f_W(x_j)} \neq 0$. Assume the former holds. Then, by Eq. 8 (in the main text), we have,

$$\forall (v_p, v_1) \in E : \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{p1}} = 0.$$ (13)

This implies that $E_{p,i} \cdot x_i^T = \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W^{p1}} = 0$ for all $(v_p, v_1) \in E$ (see the proof of Prop. 1). Since $x_i \neq 0$, we conclude that $E_{p,i} = 0$ for all $(v_p, v_1) \in E$, which implies that $f_W(x_i) = 0$ by Eq. 12.
If the latter holds, then, for all $i, j \in [m]$ and $(p, q) \in E_T$, we have
\[
\frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W_{pq}} = \left[ \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_j), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_j)} \right] \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \right]^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_j)}{\partial W_{pq}}.
\] (14)

In particular, $\left\{ \frac{\partial f_W(x_i)}{\partial W_{pq}} \right\}_{i=1}^m$ are collinear for all $(v_p, v_q) \in E$. Hence, by the proof of Prop. 1, either $\forall i \in [m] \forall (v_p, v_q) \in E : E_{p,i} = 0$ or $\left\{ x_{ij} \right\}_{i=1}^m$ is a set of collinear vectors. Therefore, since $\left\{ x_{ij} \right\}_{i=1}^m$ is not a set of collinear vectors, by Eq. 12 we obtain that $\forall i \in [m] : f_W(x_i) = 0$.

Finally, if $\ell$ is convex and $\forall b \in \mathbb{R} : a^* \in \mathbb{R} : \ell(a^*, b) = \inf_a \ell(a, b)$, we obtain that $\forall i \in [m] : \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_i), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_i)} \neq 0$. Hence, by the above, we conclude that, $\forall i \in [m] : f_W(x_i) = 0$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\| \cdot \|$ be any matrix norm and $\ell$ any differentiable loss function. Let $f_W(x, \tilde{X})$ be a ReLU neural network and $W_{pq}$ be a given matrix within $\tilde{f}_W$ and let $B^* \in [m]$. Then,
\[
\min_{V \in \mathbb{R}^{B^* \times d_q}} \| W_{pq} - V \| \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+} \| \nabla_{W_{pq}} L_S^\lambda(\tilde{f}_W) \|.
\] (10)

**Proof.** Let $\tilde{S} = \left\{ (x_{ij}, y_i)_{j=1}^{B^*} \right\}$ be a batch of $B^*$ samples and $\tilde{X} = \left\{ x_{ij} \right\}_{i=1}^{B^*}$ be the corresponding unlabeled batch. By the chain rule, we can write the gradient of the loss function as follows
\[
\frac{\partial L_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{f}_W)}{\partial W_{pq}} = \frac{1}{B^*} \sum_{j=1}^{B^*} \frac{\partial \ell(f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X}), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X})} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}} + 2\lambda W_{pq}.
\] (15)

According to Lems. 1 and 2, the matrix $U_{\tilde{S}} := -\frac{1}{\lambda B^*} \sum_{j=1}^{B^*} \frac{\ell(f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X}), y_i)}{\partial f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X})} : \frac{\partial f_W(x_{ij}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}}$ is of rank $\leq B^*$. Therefore, we obtain the following
\[
\min_{V} \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+} \| W_{pq} - V \| \leq \min_{\tilde{S} \in S : |\tilde{S}| = B^*} \{ \frac{\partial L_{\tilde{S}}^\lambda(\tilde{f}_W)}{\partial W_{pq}} \},
\] (16)

which completes the proof of this theorem.

**8 Analyzing Neural Networks with Batch Normalization**

**Lemma 2.** Let $\tilde{f}_W$ be a neural network and $W_{pq}$ be a given matrix within $f_W$. Then, for any batch $\tilde{X} = \left\{ x_{ij} \right\}_{j=1}^{B^*}$ and real values $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_B \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\text{rank} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{B} \beta_i \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_{i}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}} \right) \leq B$.

**Proof.** We would like to show that $\frac{\partial f_W(x_{i}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{B} \beta_i \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_{i}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}}$ are matrices of rank $\leq B$. We note that for any fixed vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the network can be written as follows
\[
f(x; \tilde{X}) = \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(L)} W^{l_1} \cdot v_{l_1}(x; \tilde{X}).
\]

In addition, each layer $v_{l_1}$ can also be written as
\[
v_{l_1}(x) = D_{l_1}(x; \tilde{X}) \cdot \left[ \gamma_{l_1} \cdot A_{l_1}(\tilde{X}) \cdot \left( \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_1)} W^{l_1l_2} \cdot v_{l_2}(x; \tilde{X}) - b_{l_2}(\tilde{X}) \right) + \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_1} \right] = D_{l_1}(x; \tilde{X}) \cdot \left[ \gamma_{l_1} \cdot A_{l_1}(\tilde{X}) \cdot \left( \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_1)} W^{l_1l_2} \cdot \left( v_{l_2}(x; \tilde{X}) - \mu_{l_2}(\tilde{X}) \right) \right) + \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_1} \right] = \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_1)} Q_{l_1}(x; \tilde{X}) \cdot W^{l_1l_2} \cdot \left( v_{l_2}(x; \tilde{X}) - \mu_{l_2}(\tilde{X}) \right) + D_{l_1}(x; \tilde{X}) \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_1}.
\]
where \( D_l(x; \tilde{X}) := \text{diag}[\sigma'(n_l(u_l(x; \tilde{X})), \tilde{X})], \) such that, \( u_l(x; \mathcal{X}) :=\)
\[
\left[ \gamma_l A_l(\tilde{X}) \left( \sum_{i' \in \text{pred}(l)} W^{l_{i'}} \cdot v_{i'}(x; \tilde{X}) - b_{i'}(\tilde{X}) \right) + \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_l \right].
\]
Here, \( b_l(\tilde{X}) := \sum_{i \in \text{pred}(l)} W^{l_i} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim U[\mathcal{X}]} \left[ v_i(x; \tilde{X}) \right] \) and \( Q_l(x; \tilde{X}) := \gamma_l D_l(x; \tilde{X}) \cdot A_l(x; \tilde{X}). \) For simplicity, we write \( t_0 := L, \mu_l := \mu_l(x; \tilde{X}), v^j_l := v_l(x_j; \tilde{X}) \) and \( Q^j_l := Q_l(x_j; \tilde{X}) \). We define
\[
\Delta^j_l := \begin{cases} 
  x^j_l & \text{if } l = 1 \\
  v^j_l - \mu_l & \text{if } l \neq 1
\end{cases}
\]
Hence, we can write \( f(x_{j_0}; \tilde{X}) \) as a follows
\[
f(x_{j_0}; \tilde{X}) = \sum_{t \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0}v^j_{l_1} = \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0}v^j_{l_1} = \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0} \cdot \left[ Q^j_{l_0} \left( \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_1)} W^{l_1}l_{l_2} \cdot (v^j_l - \mu_l) \right) + D^j_{l_1} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_l \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0} \cdot D^j_{l_1} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_l + \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_0)} W^{l_0} \cdot Q^j_{l_1} \cdot W^{l_1}l_{l_2} \cdot (v^j_l - \mu_l)
\]
For any \( l_{t+2} \neq 1 \), we can write
\[
\Delta^j_{l_{t+2}} = v^j_{l_{t+2}} - \mu_{l_{t+2}}
\]
\[
= D^j_{l_{t+2}} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_{t+2}} + Q^j_{l_{t+2}} \cdot \left( \sum_{l_{t+3} \in \text{pred}(l_{t+2})} W^{l_{t+2}l_{t+3}} \cdot (v^j_{l_{t+3}} - \mu_{l_{t+3}}) \right) - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j_{t+1} = 1}^{B} Q^j_{l_{t+2}} \cdot \left( \sum_{l_{t+3} \in \text{pred}(l_{t+1})} W^{l_{t+1}l_{t+3}} \cdot (v^j_{l_{t+3}} - \mu_{l_{t+3}}) \right)
\]
\[
= D^j_{l_{t+2}} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_{t+2}} + \sum_{l_{t+3} \in \text{pred}(l_{t+2})} \sum_{j_{t+1} = 1}^{B} \alpha_{j_{t+1}, j_{t+2}} Q^j_{l_{t+2}} \cdot W^{l_{t+2}l_{t+3}} \cdot \Delta^j_{l_{t+3}},
\]
where \( \alpha_{i,j} = -1/B \) for all pairs \( i \neq j \) and \( \alpha_{ii} = \frac{B-1}{B} \) otherwise.
Hence, by recursion we can write the $T$’th expansion of $f_W$,

$$f_W(x_{j_0}; \hat{x}) = \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_{0})} W^{l_{0}l_1} \cdot D^{j_0}_{l_1} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_1}$$

$$+ \sum_{l_1 \in \text{pred}(l_{0})} \sum_{l_2 \in \text{pred}(l_{1})} W^{l_{0}l_1} \cdot Q^{j_0}_{l_1} \cdot W^{l_1l_2} \cdot D^{j_0}_{l_2} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_2}$$

$$+ \sum_{l_{2} \in \text{pred}(l_{0})} \sum_{l_3 \in \text{pred}(l_{2})} \sum_{l_{3} \in \text{pred}(l_{3})} \cdots \sum_{l_{t+1} \in \text{pred}(l_{t})} W^{l_{0}l_1} \cdot Q^{j_0}_{l_1} \cdot W^{l_1l_2} \cdot D^{j_0}_{l_2} \cdot \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta_{l_2} \cdot W^{l_2l_3} \cdot \alpha_{j_0,j_1} Q^{j_1}_{l_2} \cdot \cdots \cdot W^{l_{t-1}l_{t}} \cdot B^{j_{t-1}} \cdot W^{l_{t}l_{t+1}} \cdot B^{j_{t}} \cdot W^{l_{t+1}l_{t+2}} \cdot B^{j_{t+1}}.$$
With this terminology we can write

\[ f_W(x_{j_0}, \tilde{X}) = \sum_{\pi \text{ from some node to } L} E^{j_0}_{1, \pi} + \sum_{\pi \text{ from some node to } L} E^{j_0}_{2, \pi} + \sum_{\pi \text{ from } 1 \to L} E^{j_0}_{1, \pi} + \sum_{\pi \text{ from } q \to L} E^{j_0}_{2, \pi} =: Z^{j_0}_1 + Z^{j_0}_2 + Z^{j_0}_3 + Z^{j_0}_4. \]

We note that for any \( x \) and \( \tilde{X} \), with measure 1 over \( W \), the matrices \( D_l(x; \tilde{X}) \) are constant in the neighborhood of \( W \). Together with the assumption that \( A_l(x; \tilde{X}) \) are detached, the pseudo-gradients of the matrices \( Q^l_\pi \) with respect to \( W^{pq} \) are zero. Therefore, since the terms \( Z^{j_0}_1 \) and \( Z^{j_0}_3 \) do not involve \( W^{pq} \), we have \( \frac{\partial f_W(x_{j_0}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W^{pq}} = \frac{\partial (Z^{j_0}_1 + Z^{j_0}_3)}{\partial W^{pq}} \).

As a next step, we would like to represent the pseudo-gradients \( \frac{\partial Z^{j_0}}{\partial W^{pq}} \) and \( \frac{\partial Z^{j_0}}{\partial W^{pq}} \) individually. We start with \( \frac{\partial Z^{j_0}}{\partial W^{pq}} \). For simplicity, we assume that that each \( \pi \) from \( q \) to \( L \) that crosses through \((p, q)\) is of length \( T(\pi) \geq 3 \). With slight abuse of notation, we denote \( T := T(\pi) \). We can write

\[ Z^{j_0}_2 = \sum_{\pi \text{ from some node to } L} W^{\pi T \pi T - 1} \cdot Q^{j_0}_{\pi T - 1} \cdot W^{\pi T - 1 \pi T - 2} \cdot \sum_{j_1=1}^B \alpha_{j_0,j_1} Q^{j_1}_{\pi T - 2} \cdot W^{\pi T - 2 \pi T - 3} \]

\[ \cdot \sum_{j_{T-4}=1}^{B} \alpha_{j_{T-5},j_{T-4}} Q^{j_{T-4}}_{\pi T - 4} \cdot W^{\pi 3 \pi 2} \]

\[ \cdot \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \alpha_{j_{T-4},j_{T-3}} Q^{j_{T-3}}_{\pi 2} \cdot W^{\pi 2 \pi 1} \cdot D^{j_{T-2}}_{\pi 1} \cdot 1 \cdot \beta_{j_{T-2}} \]

\[ = \sum_{\pi \text{ from } q \to L} W^{\pi T \pi T - 1} \cdot Q^{j_0}_{\pi T - 1} \cdot W^{\pi T - 1 \pi T - 2} \cdot \sum_{j_1=1}^B \alpha_{j_0,j_1} Q^{j_1}_{\pi T - 2} \cdot W^{\pi T - 2 \pi T - 3} \]

\[ \cdot \sum_{j_{T-4}=1}^{B} \alpha_{j_{T-5},j_{T-4}} Q^{j_{T-4}}_{\pi T - 4} \cdot W^{\pi 3 \pi 2} \]

\[ \cdot \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \alpha_{j_{T-4},j_{T-3}} Q^{j_{T-3}}_{\pi 2} \cdot W^{\pi 2 \pi 1} \cdot D^{j_{T-2}}_{\pi 1} \cdot 1 \cdot \beta_{j_{T-2}} \]

\[ = \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \left[ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } q \to L} \left( u^{\pi,1}_{j_{0},j_{T-3}} \right)^\top \cdot W^{pq} \right] \cdot W^{pq} \cdot 1 \cdot \beta_{j_{T-2}} \]

\[ + \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \left[ \sum_{\pi \text{ from } q \to L} \left( u^{\pi,2}_{j_{0},j_{T-3}} \right)^\top \cdot W^{pq} \right] \cdot W^{pq} \cdot 1 \cdot \beta_{j_{T-2}} \]

\[ = \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \left( u^{\pi,1}_{j_{0},j_{T-3}} \right)^\top \cdot W^{pq} \cdot u^{\pi,2}_{j_{0},j_{T-3}} \cdot W^{pq}. \]
where

\[
(u_{j_0,j_{T-3}}^{\rho_1})^\top := W^{\pi T-1} \cdot Q_{\tau_{T-1}}^{j_0} \cdot W^{\pi T-1} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_0,j_1} Q_{\tau_{T-2}}^{j_1} \\
\vdots W^{\pi T-3} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_T-5,j_T-4} Q_{\tau_{T-4}}^{j_T-4} \cdot W^{\pi T-2} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_T-4,j_T-3} Q_{\tau_{T-3}}^{j_T-3} \\
(u_{j_0,j_{T-3}}^{1})^\top := \sum_{\pi \text{ from } q \text{ to } L} \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} u_{j_{T-3}}^{\pi_1} \\
(u_{j_0,j_{T-3}}^{2})^\top := \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} B \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_T-3,j_T-2} Q_{\tau_2}^{j_T-2} \cdot W_{\rho q} \cdot D_{q_{T-2}} \cdot I \cdot \beta_\rho.
\]

Therefore, we can write

\[
Z_{4}^{j_0} = \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} B \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_T-3,j_T-2} Q_{\tau_2}^{j_T-2} \cdot W_{\rho q} \cdot D_{q_{T-2}} \cdot I \cdot \beta_\rho.
\]

Next, we would like to analyze the pseudo gradient \( \frac{\partial Z_{4}^{j_0}}{\partial W_{\rho q}} \). We can write

\[
Z_{4}^{j_0} = \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} B \sum_{\sum_{j_1=1}^B} \alpha_{j_T-3,j_T-2} Q_{\tau_2}^{j_T-2} \cdot W_{\rho q} \cdot D_{q_{T-2}} \cdot I \cdot \beta_\rho.
\]
which is a matrix of rank $\leq B$. Finally, we notice that

$$
\sum_{j_0=1}^{B} \beta_{j_0} \cdot \frac{\partial f_W(x_{j_0}; \tilde{X})}{\partial W_{pq}} = \sum_{j_0=1}^{B} \beta_{j_0} \left( \frac{\partial Z_{j_0}^2}{\partial W_{pq}} + \frac{\partial Z_{j_0}^4}{\partial W_{pq}} \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j_0=1}^{B} \beta_{j_0} \cdot \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \left( u_{1,j_{j_0,j_{T-3}}} \cdot (u_{2,j_{T-3}}^{2} + u_{3,j_{T-3}}^{3})^T \right) \quad (19)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j_{T-3}=1}^{B} \left( \sum_{j_0=1}^{B} \beta_{j_0} u_{1,j_{j_0,j_{T-3}}} \right) \cdot (u_{2,j_{T-3}}^{2} + u_{3,j_{T-3}}^{3})^T,
$$

which is also a matrix of rank $\leq B$. \qed