

Geometry of Critical Sets and Existence of Saddle Branches for Two-layer Neural Networks

Leyang Zhang^{*}, Yaoyu Zhang^{1†}, Tao Luo^{1,2‡}

¹ School of Mathematical Sciences, Institute of Natural Sciences, MOE-LSC
Shanghai Jiao Tong University

² CMA-Shanghai, Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

Abstract

This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of critical point sets in two-layer neural networks. To study such complex entities, we introduce the critical embedding operator and critical reduction operator as our tools. Given a critical point, we use these operators to uncover the whole underlying critical set representing the same output function, which exhibits a hierarchical structure. Furthermore, we prove existence of saddle branches for any critical set whose output function can be represented by a narrower network. Our results provide a solid foundation to the further study of optimization and training behavior of neural networks.

1 Introduction

Neural networks have achieved success in a wide range of applications, but their high performance is less understood. Theoretical studies are thus made to uncover such mysteries. One major area in theoretical study is the analysis of loss landscape. The study is challenging because of loss landscapes' various possible shapes Hong et al. [2020], Skorokhodov and Burtsev [2019], the high dimensionality problem, and its complicated dependence on data, model structure, and loss function Calin [2020], Sun et al. [2020].

In recent years numerous works have been trying to understand the loss landscape of neural networks in various ways by focusing on its simple structures behind these complicated phenomenon. One direction is discovering the general structures and properties of overparameterized models that are possessed by neural networks. Examples include the analysis of global minimum dimension Cooper [2021], which only requires smoothness and overparameterized setting, and the optimistic sample estimate, which works for almost any models analytic in parameters and inputs Zhang et al. [2023b]. Another direction focuses on the special properties of neural networks, such as the study of critical points. For example, criticality is preserved when increasing model width Zhang et al. [2022, 2021], saddles instead of local minima are what mainly affects training dynamics Dauphin et al. [2014], non-existence of spurious valleys for wide neural networks Venturi et al. [2019], etc. However, we still do not have a clear picture about the geometry and functional properties of the set of critical points.

^{*}leyangz_hawk@outlook.com

[†]zhyy.sjtu@sjtu.edu.cn

[‡]luotao41@sjtu.edu.cn, corresponding author

In this paper, we make a step further by studying the critical sets, i.e., sets of critical points, of a neural network. Focusing on two-layer neural networks and utilizing the special properties of it, we characterize the geometry of the critical sets representing a given critical function, and we discuss the existence of saddles in these sets. Surprisingly, we show that these sets have a hierarchical but simple structure, and we identify lots of saddles in these sets. More precisely, our contribution in this work can be summarized as follows.

- (a) Given a critical point of a neural network, the critical set representing the same output function is a finite union of its subsets. Each subset is a Cartesian product of an Euclidean space and several identical submanifolds.
- (b) Moreover, if the output function can be represented by a narrower (fewer neurons) network than the model, there exist many saddles (saddle branches) in the critical set representing it.
- (c) We present two maps, the critical embedding and critical reduction operators to help us study the geometry and functional properties of critical sets.

2 Related Works

Geometry of critical sets. There have been many works studying the geometry of critical sets. For example, the Embedding Principle shows that the loss landscape of a neural network contains those of narrower ones [Fukumizu and ichi Amari, 2000, Fukumizu et al., 2019, Simsek et al., 2021, Zhang et al., 2021, 2022]. Using a critical embedding operator which preserves output function and criticality of loss, these works characterize a subset of the critical points representing a given output function. In this paper we follow this idea, but also introduce another criticality-preserving operator, i.e., critical reduction operator. We use both operators to give a complete characterization of these sets. Other works focus on global minima. Cooper [2021] shows how sample size determines the dimension of global minima for generic samples in overparameterized regime. Under teacher-student setting, ref. Zhang et al. [2023a] gives a complete characterization of the structure and gradient dynamics near global minima. In contrast, our paper mainly focus on non-global critical points/sets.

Analysis of Saddles. Under the belief that saddles rarely trap gradient methods [Skorokhodov and Burtsev, 2019], some works try to show the prevalence of saddles in loss landscape of a neural network. Refs. Fukumizu and ichi Amari [2000], Fukumizu et al. [2019], Simsek et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2021, 2022] showed that in general embedding a local minimum of a narrower network to a wider one tends to produce strict saddles. Additionally, research by Venturi et al. [2019] and Li et al. [2022] revealed that when the width of a neural network exceeds the sample size, saddles not only exist but in fact there are no spurious valleys. Similar works have been made for deep linear network [Nguyen and Hein, 2017, Nguyen, 2019], and furthermore classifies its strict and non-strict saddles [Achour et al., 2022]. Our work describes two types of saddles, one called the “embedding saddles”, while the other produces “saddle branches” which cannot be described by Embedding Principle.

3 Main Results

3.1 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we will work with two-layer (fully-connected) neural networks. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a two-layer neural network of width m is denoted by g_m , or just g when the width is clear from

context:

$$g(\theta, x) = g_m(\theta, x) = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma(w_k^\top x) \quad (1)$$

where $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m = (a_1, w_1, \dots, a_m, w_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ is parameter and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is input. We call each $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ an input weight and each $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ an output weight. Given samples $\{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, let $e_i(\theta) = e_i(g, \theta) = g(\theta, x_i) - y_i$ for each i and define the L^2 loss function

$$R(\theta) = R(g, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n (g(\theta, x_i) - y_i)^2.$$

In this paper, we will always assume that our activation $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an analytic non-polynomial function. One important result for such activation is about the linear independence of neurons which we show below. This result helps us characterize the critical sets by determining the minimal width of output functions they represent.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an analytic non-polynomial. Then for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$ and any $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the neurons $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if every two of them are linearly independent.*

Proof. See the proof of A.1 in Appendix. □

In particular,

- (a) If σ does not have parity and $\sigma(0) \neq 0$, then $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if $w_{k_1} \neq w_{k_2}$ for all distinct $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, m'\}$.
- (b) If σ does not have parity and $\sigma(0) = 0$, then $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if $w_{k_1} \neq w_{k_2}$ for all distinct $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, m'\}$, or $w_k = 0$ for some k .
- (c) If σ is an odd or even function, then $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if $w_{k_1} \neq w_{k_2}$ for all distinct $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, m'\}$, or when $\sigma(0) = 0$ we have an extra case $w_k = 0$ for some k .

3.2 Illustration of Main Results

In this section we first introduce the main results in Section 4 and Section 5 by analyzing a concrete example. Then we present the main results in an informal way. Consider a single neuron network $g_1((a', w'), x) = a' e^{w'^\top x}$ with $a' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w', x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Consider four samples

$$(x_1, y_1) = ((1, 0), 1), (x_2, y_2) = ((0, 1), 1), (x_3, y_3) = ((1, 1), 0), (x_4, y_4) = ((1, -1), 0).$$

and define the loss $R(g_1, \cdot)$ with respect to these samples. It is not difficult to see that $\theta' = (a', w') = (1, (\log \frac{1}{3}, 0))$ is the critical point of R with non-zero output weight. Moreover, $R(g_1, \theta') > 0$.

Let $g_m(\theta, x) = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k e^{w_k^\top x}$ for any $m \geq 3$. Up to permutations of the components of a point, the set of critical points θ for $R(g_m, \cdot)$ with $g_m(\theta, \cdot) = g_r(\theta', \cdot)$ is the union of the following sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{1,m-1} &:= \{(1, w', 0, w_2, \dots, 0, w_m) : w_k \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}, \forall 2 \leq k \leq m\} \\ \mathcal{C}^{1,m-2} &:= \{(\delta, w', 1 - \delta, w', 0, w_3, \dots, 0, w_m) : w_k \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}, \forall 3 \leq k \leq m, \delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}\} \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{C}^{1,0} &:= \left\{ (\delta_1, w', \delta_2, w', \dots, \delta_m, w') : \delta_1, \dots, \delta_m \neq 0, \sum_{k=1}^m \delta_k = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ is the zero set of $w \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(g_r, \theta') \sigma(w^\top x_i)$; in particular, $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'} = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$. On the other hand, using the splitting embedding operator, we only get proper subsets of them. Moreover, we notice that i) $\mathcal{C}^{1,l_1}, \mathcal{C}^{1,l_2}$ are connected for all $l_1, l_2 \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ and ii) any point in $\mathcal{C}^{1,l}$ with $l > 0$ is a saddle, while part of $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ are strict saddles. See also Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: Illustration of $\mathcal{C}^{1,l}$ for $0 \leq l \leq m-1$ defined above. For each $0 \leq l \leq m-1$, $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ is an affine subspace of dimension $(m-l-1)+l = m-1$. The set $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ has strict saddles, and points in all the other $\mathcal{C}^{1,l}$ with $1 \leq l \leq m-1$ are saddles. Moreover, these critical sets are connected to one another, as shown in this figure. See Lemma A.3 and its remark for a proof.

In general, we have the following results for the observations above. First, we completely characterize the geometry of critical sets representing a given critical function.

Theorem 3.1 (branch geometry – informal). *The critical points of a width- m neural network representing a critical network of minimal width $r \leq m$, say $g_r(\theta', \cdot)$ for some $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$, forms a finite union of sets which we call branches. Each branch is isometric to $\mathbb{R}^N \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$, where $N, l \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent of θ' and samples, while the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ depends on θ' and samples, with its dimension $\dim \mathcal{M}_{\theta'} \leq d-1$. Moreover, these branches are connected to each other.*

For illustration, consider the example above discussing the set of critical points of a four-neuron network representing a single-neuron network. The branches are precisely $\mathcal{C}^{1,m-1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ as well as those obtained by permuting the indices of the points in these critical sets. Moreover, in Theorem 3.1 the \mathbb{R}^N is \mathbb{R}^0 , and $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ is just $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$, i.e., the zero set of

$$\mathbb{R}^2 \ni w \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^4 (a' e^{w^\top x_i} - y_i) e^{w^\top x_i}.$$

To systematically study these critical sets we present critical embedding and critical reduction operators in Section 4. These maps are output- and criticality-preserving. Intuitively, given a critical point $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ with representing a network of width r , we can map it by critical reduction

operator to a $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$ which represent the same network. Then, using embedding operator and solving the equation (in w)

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e_i(g_r, \theta') \sigma(w^\top x_i) = 0,$$

we are able to determine the critical points in $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ representing the same network as θ does. A detailed treatment can be found in Theorem 5.1. Then we show the branch connectivity in Theorem 5.2.

Second, we demonstrate a simple relationship between critical network and saddle existence.

Theorem 3.2 (existence of saddles – informal). *Following the notations in Theorem 3.1, the set of critical points of $R(g_m, \cdot)$ representing $g_r(\theta', \cdot)$ contains saddles¹ whenever $r < m$.*

This theorem is summary of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2. In the latter proposition we show that any critical point $\theta^* = (a_k^*, w_k^*)_{k=1}^m$ with $a_k^* = 0$ for some k must be a saddle. Intuitively, this can be shown in the following way: given any such critical point θ^* and some $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $a_k = 0$, we perturb w_k arbitrarily small to obtain some non-critical point $\tilde{\theta}$ with $R(g_m, \theta^*) = R(g_m, \tilde{\theta})$. Since $\nabla R(g_m, \tilde{\theta}) \neq 0$, we can find some θ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{\theta}$ with $R(g_m, \theta) < R(g_m, \tilde{\theta}) = R(g_m, \theta^*)$. See also Figure 2 for illustration. Similarly, there is a θ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{\theta}$ with $R(g_m, \theta) > R(g_m, \tilde{\theta}) = R(g_m, \theta^*)$. This shows θ^* is a saddle.




Figure 2: Illustration of our method above to show every point in $\mathcal{C}^{1,l}$ with $l > 1$ is a saddle. Starting from $\theta^* \in \mathcal{C}^{1,l}$, we first perturb it to $\tilde{\theta}$ with the same loss value as that of θ^* , then, using the fact that $\nabla R(g_m, \theta^*) \neq 0$, we perturb it to a θ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{\theta}$ with $R(g_m, \theta) < R(g_m, \tilde{\theta}) = R(g_m, \theta^*)$.

4 Criticality Preserving Operators

We introduce two criticality preserving operators to help us study the critical sets of loss function. The first one is the *critical embedding operator*, which is introduced in Zhang et al. [2021,

¹a saddle θ for a differentiable function f is a point with $\nabla f(\theta) = 0$, and θ is neither a local minimum nor local maximum of it.

2022]. For completeness and our specific consideration of two-layer neural networks, we rewrite it in Definition 4.3. The second one, which can be viewed as a “converse” of critical embedding, is *critical reduction operator* introduced in Definition 4.4. Then we show in Proposition 4.1 that these operators preserve output function, error terms of loss, and most importantly criticality of loss.

First, let’s introduce an action on $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ which is induced by the symmetry properties of a neural network model. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, recall that S_m is the set of permutations on $\{1, \dots, m\}$.

Definition 4.1 (permutation action). *For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ define an action $S_m \times \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ by*

$$\pi \cdot \theta = (a_{\pi(k)}, w_{\pi(k)})_{k=1}^m, \quad \forall \theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, each π acts on $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ by permuting the indices of a_k and w_k ’s, so it can be viewed as an orthogonal transformation on $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$. Thus, for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, $\pi \cdot E = \{\pi \cdot \theta : \theta \in E\}$ is isometric to E .

We then define a stratification of parameter space by the number of features. Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a partition of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ is a sequence of numbers $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$ such that $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_r = N$.

Definition 4.2 (stratification of parameter space). *Given $m, r, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$ such that $t_r + l = m$. Define $Q_P^{r,l}$ as the set of points $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ such that*

- (a) $a_1, \dots, a_{t_r} \neq 0$ and $a_{t_r+1} = \dots = a_m = 0$.
- (b) $\sigma(w_{t_{j-1}+1}^T(\cdot)), \dots, \sigma(w_{t_j}^T(\cdot))$ are linearly dependent for all $1 \leq j \leq r$.
- (c) $\sigma(w_{t_j}^T(\cdot))$ and $\sigma(w_{t_{j'}}^T(\cdot))$ are linearly independent for all distinct $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

Furthermore, define $Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l} := \pi \cdot Q_P^{r,l} = \{\pi \cdot \theta : \theta \in Q_P^{r,l}\}$. Then define $Q^{r,l} = \cup_{P,\pi} Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$.

Given r, l, P, π as above, we call r the effective feature number, l the ineffective feature number, and $Q_P^{r,l}$, $Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ and $Q^{r,l}$ as branches of $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$. When we emphasize the underlying neural network width m , we write $Q_P^{r,l}(m)$, $Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l}(m)$ and $Q^{r,l}(m)$, respectively.

The requirement (b) and (c) can be made explicitly for input weights. If σ has no parity (b) says $w_k = w_{t_j}$ for all $t_{j-1} < k \leq t_j$ and all $1 \leq j \leq r$ and (c) says $w_{t_j} \neq w_{t_{j'}}$ for all distinct $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. The case for an odd/even σ is more complicated: one case for (b) writes $w_k = \pm w_{t_j}$ and for (c) $w_{t_j} \pm w_{t_{j'}} \neq 0$ for distinct j, j' ; moreover, if $\sigma(0) = 0$ then $w_1, \dots, w_{t_r} \neq 0$ when $r > 1$ (because $\sigma(0) = 0$ is linearly dependent with all the neurons $\sigma(w_1^T(\cdot)), \dots, \sigma(w_{t_r}^T(\cdot))$), but when $r = 1$ we may have $w_k = 0$ for some $1 \leq k \leq t_r$.

Then we note that given $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a unique branch $Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ containing θ in the following way: first count the number of a_k ’s which are zero; this determines l . Second, for each k with $a_k \neq 0$, find all w_k ’s such that $\sigma(w_k^T(\cdot))$ and $\sigma(w_{k'}^T(\cdot))$ are linearly dependent. This uniquely divides the set $\{k \in \{1, \dots, m\} : a_k \neq 0\}$ into several groups, thus determining r which is just the number of groups. Then find a permutation $\pi \in S_m$ and a partition P such that $\pi^{-1} \cdot \theta \in Q_P^{r,l}$. It follows that $\theta \in Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$.

Definition 4.3 (critical embedding operator, summary from Zhang et al. [2021]). *Given partition $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$ as above and an index mapping $\mathcal{I} : \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $\Delta(P) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{t_r})$ be any vector such that $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \delta_k = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r$. Then define $\iota_{P,\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ by*

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta) = & (\delta_1 a'_1, w'_1, \dots, \delta_{t_1} a'_1, w'_1, \dots, \\ & \delta_{t_{r-1}+1} a'_r, w'_r, \dots, \delta_{t_r} a'_r, w'_r \\ & 0, w'_{\mathcal{I}(1)}, \dots, 0, w'_{\mathcal{I}(l)}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\theta = (a'_k, w'_k)_{k=1}^r$. Furthermore, define $\iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I},\pi}(\theta) = \pi \cdot \iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta)$ for any given permutation $\pi \in S_m$. We call both $\iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}$ and $\iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I},\pi}$ (two-layer) critical embedding operators.

Definition 4.4 (critical reduction operator). *Given any branch $Q_P^{r,l}$ with $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$, define $\varphi_P : Q_P^{r,l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$ by*

$$\varphi_P(\theta) = \left(\sum_{k=t_0+1}^{t_1} a_k, w_{t_1}, \dots, \sum_{k=t_{r-1}+1}^{t_r} a_k, w_{t_r} \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$. Similarly, define $\varphi_{P,\pi} : Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$ by $\varphi_{P,\pi}(\theta) = \varphi_P(\pi^{-1} \cdot \theta)$, where the permutation π^{-1} is just the inverse of permutation π .

Since $\cup_{P,\pi} \cup_{r,l} Q_{P,\pi}^{r,l} = \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ is in the domain in one of such mappings. Moreover, the composition of two critical reduction operators finds the minimal network representing points in $Q_P^{r,l}$, as long as the composition is well-defined.

We then present the properties of the two operators.

Proposition 4.1 (properties of critical embedding and critical reduction operators). *Given $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \leq m$, denote g_m and g_r as the neural networks of width m and r , respectively (see Definition of g in Section 3.1). Let $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$. For any $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, The following results hold for $\iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta')$ and φ_P :*

- (a) (output function is preserved) $g_r(\theta', x) = g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x)$ and $g_m(\theta, x) = g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x)$.
- (b) (error-term is preserved) $e_i(g_r, \theta') = e_i(g_m, \iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta'))$ and $e_i(g_m, \theta) = e_i(g_r, \varphi_P(\theta))$.
- (c) (criticality is preserved) $\nabla R(g_r, \theta') = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_m, \iota_{\Delta(P),\mathcal{I}}(\theta')) = 0$ and $\nabla R(g_m, \theta) = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_r, \varphi_P(\theta)) = 0$.

Proof. The proof of results for critical embedding operator can be found in e.g. Zhang et al. [2021, 2022]. For completeness we prove the results for both operators in Proposition A.1. \square

5 Geometry and Functional Properties of Critical Sets

We are now ready to study the structures of critical sets. In Section 5.1, we use critical embedding and critical reduction operators to characterize the branches $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ of $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ (see Definition 5.1 below for $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$), including the covering property, structure of the critical set representing a given output function, the connectivity of these branches, as well as their dimensions. These geometrical properties have a hierarchical dependence on the effective feature number r and ineffective feature

number l . Based on the characterization of branches, in Section 5.2 we investigate the relationship between saddle existence and minimal width of output function. We introduce two types of saddle. One is called “embedding saddles” obtained directly from applying the critical embedding operator (Proposition 5.1). The other one occupies every branch $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ with $l > 0$, categorizing it as a “saddle branch” (Proposition 5.2).

First, let’s group critical points with non-zero loss value into different “branches” according to the stratification of parameter space (Definition 4.2).

Definition 5.1 (branches of critical set). *Given $l \leq m$, $r \leq m - l$ and a partition $P = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r)$ with $t_0 = 0, t_r = m - l$, we denote $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ (“ \mathcal{C} ” stands for “critical”) as the subset consisting of critical points $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$ in $Q_P^{r,l}$. Furthermore, define $\mathcal{C}_{P,\pi}^{r,l} := \pi \cdot \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ for any given permutation $\pi \in S_m$. We call $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$, $\mathcal{C}_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ (critical) branches of $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$. When we emphasize the underlying neural network width m , we write $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m)$, $\mathcal{C}_{P,\pi}^{r,l}(m)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$, respectively.*

Remark 5.1. By definition, for each permutation $\pi \in S_m$, $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ are isometric, indicating that $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ is a finite union of isometric subsets for any given r and l . Furthermore, this means to study the $\mathcal{C}_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ ’s we only need to study the $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ ’s.

5.1 Geometry of Critical Sets

Theorem 5.1 (embedding geometry). *Given effective feature numbers r and ineffective feature numbers l as in Definition 5.1, we have the following results.*

- (a) (covering) *The set of non-global critical points of R , $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0) \setminus R^{-1}(0)$, is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ ’s, i.e., $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0) \setminus R^{-1}(0) = \cup_{r,l} \mathcal{C}^{r,l}$.*
- (b) (embedding structure) *For any partition $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$ such that $t_r + l = m$ and any index mapping $\mathcal{I} : \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}^{r,0}(r)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m).$$

Conversely, φ_P induces a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m) \rightarrow \prod_{r'=0}^r \mathcal{C}^{r',r-r'}(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$$

such that the inverse image of every θ' , $\overline{\varphi^{-1}(\theta')}$ is a finite union of sets, each one isometric to $\mathbb{R}^{l_r-r} \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$. Here $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is an analytic set determined by θ' of dimension at most $d - 1$.

Proof. See the proof of A.1 in Appendix. □

Remark 5.2. When σ is also an odd function, $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ is always an analytic set of dimension $d - 1$. See Lemma A.2.

By Theorem 5.1 (a), we can see that to study the critical points of R (with non-zero loss), it suffices to study all the branches $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ ’s. Then (b) tells us each such branch has a simple, hierarchical structure depending on the effective feature number r and ineffective feature number l . In fact, more can be deduced from (b). First, for every critical point θ , the set \mathcal{C}_θ of critical points representing

the same output function as θ is a finite union of sets taking the form $\overline{\varphi_{P',\pi'}^{-1}(\varphi_{P,\pi}(\theta))}$'s. More precisely, if $\theta \in C_{P,\pi}^{r,l}$ and $\theta' := \varphi_{P,\pi}(\theta)$,

$$\bigcup_{l=0}^{m-r} \bigcup_{P',\pi'} \overline{\varphi_{P',\pi'}^{-1}(\theta')} = \mathcal{C}_\theta = \{\tilde{\theta} \in (\nabla R)^{-1}(0) : g(\tilde{\theta}, \cdot) = g(\theta, \cdot)\}, \quad (5)$$

so $\mathcal{C}_{\theta'}$ is a finite union of sets, each one isometric to a Euclidean space product several identical analytic set² of dimension at most $d - 1$.

Second, (b) helps us analyze the dimension of each branch $C^{r,l}$. Given effective feature number $r \leq m$, let $N := \dim(\nabla R(g_r, \cdot))^{-1}(0)$ be the dimension of the critical points for width- r network g_r . From Theorem 5.1 (b), we can see that for each ineffective feature number l , $\dim C^{r,l} \leq (m - l - r) + N + l(d - 1)$ and in particular when σ is an odd activation satisfying assumption 3.1, $\dim C^{r,l} = (m - l - r) + N + l(d - 1)$. Thus, when $d = 1$, $\dim C^{r,l}$ decreases as l increases; when $d = 2$ and σ is odd, $\dim C^{r,l_1} = \dim C^{r,l_2}$ as long as both sets are non-empty; when $d > 2$ and σ is odd, $\dim C^{r,l}$ increases as l increases. See also figure 3

Theorem 5.2 (connectivity of branches). *The following results hold for branches of $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ defined as in Definition 5.1.*

- (a) *Given effective feature number r_1 and a partition $P_1 = (t_0, \dots, t_{r_1})$ with $t_{r_1} + l_1 = m$. Let s_1 count the number of elements in the set $\{j : t_j - t_{j-1} > 0\}$. If the ineffective feature numbers l_1, l_2 satisfy $l_1 < l_2$, $r_1 + l_1 < m$ and $r_2 + l_2 \leq m$, then there are partitions $P_{2,1}, \dots, P_{2,s_1}$ and permutations $\pi_{2,1}, \dots, \pi_{2,s_1}$ such that $\overline{C_{P_1}^{r_1,l_1}} \cap C_{P_{2,j},\pi_{2,j}}^{r_1,l_2} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s_1$.*
- (b) *Suppose the effective feature numbers r_1, r_2 with $r_1 < r_2$. Given a partition P_1 as in (a), then there are ineffective feature numbers l_1, l_2 , a partition P_2 and a permutation π_2 giving $\overline{C_{P_1}^{r_1,l_1}} \cap \overline{C_{P_2,\pi_2}^{r_2,l_2}} \neq \emptyset$, if the following requirements are satisfied.*
- i) $l_1 > 0$.
 - ii) $2r_2 - r_1 + l \leq m$.
 - iii) *For some $\theta \in C_{P_1}^{r_1,l_1}$ the common zero set of the $(d + 1)$ -many maps*

$$\begin{aligned} w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma(w^T x_i) \\ w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma'(w^T x_i) (x_i)_1 \\ &\vdots \\ w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma'(w^T x_i) (x_i)_d \end{aligned}$$

has at least r_2 -many elements.

Proof. See the proof of Theorem A.2 in Appendix. □

²An analytic set is the common zero set of a finite collection of (real) analytic functions.




Figure 3: As illustrated by the figure, $\mathcal{C}^{r,0}, \mathcal{C}^{r,1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}^{r,m-r}$ are connected to one another, and when σ for each $1 \leq l \leq m$ the branch $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ is an analytic set of dimension $(m-l-r) + N + (d-1)$ with $N = \dim(\nabla R(g_r, \cdot))^{-1}(0)$. Furthermore, each $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ with $1 \leq l \leq m-r$ consist only of saddles, while the branch $\mathcal{C}^{r,0}$ has strict saddles provided that the hypothesis in 5.1 is satisfied.

5.2 Saddle and Saddle Connectivity

Proposition 5.1 (Embedding saddles). *Let $r < m$. Suppose that $\theta' = (a'_k, w'_k)_{k=1}^r \in \mathcal{C}_{P^*}^{r,0}(r)$ is a critical point of R and the matrices*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta') \sigma''(w_j'^T x_i) \begin{pmatrix} (x_i)_1(x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_1(x_i)_d \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_i)_d(x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_d(x_i)_d \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(w_l'^T x_i)^2$ are non-zero for some j and l . Then there is a partition $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r = m)$ such that $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,0}(m)$ contains strict saddle points $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying $g(\theta, \cdot) = g(\theta', \cdot)$.

Proof. See the proof of Proposition A.2 □

Proposition 5.2 (Saddle branches). *Let $r < m$. Any branch $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ with $l > 0$ consists only of saddle points. Moreover, for any $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}^{r,0}$, θ_0 is connected to a saddle θ_1 via a line segment $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, such that $\gamma(t) \in (\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ and $g(\gamma(t), \cdot) = g(\theta_0, \cdot)$ for all t .*

Proof. See the proof of Proposition A.3. See also Figure 3 for illustration. □

6 Conclusion

In this paper we characterize the geometry of critical sets and the existence of saddle branches of a neural network. The analysis is based on a stratification of parameter space according to the

width of output functions they represent. First we present two criticality preserving maps, namely the critical embedding operator and critical reduction operator. Then we categorize the critical points with non-zero loss value into branches according the stratification of parameter space, and characterize the geometry of these branches with the two operators. We uncover some of their simple geometry, meanwhile showing the covering property, connectivity and dimensions of them. Finally we prove that whenever the minimal width of such output function is smaller than that of our model, the critical set representing it always has saddle branches, and often strict saddles as well. In general, the paper provides a foundation for more detailed investigation of neural network optimization and training behaviors. Future works may explore which branches are generically non-empty/empty as well as how the structures of these branches impact gradient dynamics.

7 Acknowledgement

This work is sponsored by the National Key R&D Program of China Grant No. 2022YFA1008200 (T. L., Y. Z.), the National Natural Science Foundation of China Grant No. 12101401 (T. L.), No. 12101402 (Y. Z.), Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Key Project No. 22JC1401500 (T. L.), the Lingang Laboratory Grant No. LG-QS-202202-08 (Y. Z.), Shanghai Municipal of Science and Technology Major Project No. 2021SHZDZX0102.

References

- E. M. Achour, F. Malgouyres, and S. Gerchinovitz. The loss landscape of deep linear neural networks: a second-order analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13289v2*, 2022.
- O. Calin. *Deep Learning Architecture: A Mathematical Approach*. Springer Series in the Data Sciences. Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 2020.
- Y. Cooper. Global minima of overparameterized neural networks. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(2):679–691, 2021.
- Y. Dauphin, R. Pascanu, C. Gulcehre, K. Cho, S. Ganguli, and Y. Bengio. Identifying and attacking the saddle point problem in high-dimensional non-convex optimization. *NeurIPS*, 27:2933–2941, 2014.
- K. Fukumizu and S. ichi Amari. Local minima and plateaus in hierarchical structures of multilayer perceptrons. *Neural Networks*, 13:317–327, 2000.
- K. Fukumizu, S. Yamaguchi, Y. ichi Mototake, and M. Tanaka. Semi-flat minima and saddle points by embedding neural networks to overparameterization. *NeurIPS*, 32, 2019.
- A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- W. R. Hong, Z. Emam, M. Goldblum, L. Fowl, J. K. Terry, F. Huang, and T. Goldstein. Understanding generalization through visualizations. *NeurIPS, Workshop publishing*, pages 87–97, 2020.
- D. Li, T. Ding, and R. Sun. On the benefit of width for neural networks: Disappearance of basins. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(3):1728–1758, 2022.
- Q. Nguyen. On connected sublevel sets in deep learning. *ICML*, page 4790–4799, 2019.

- Q. Nguyen and M. Hein. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. *ICML*, 70:2603–2612, 2017.
- B. Simsek, F. Ged, A. Jacot, F. Spadaro, C. Hongler, W. Gerstner, and J. Brea. Geometry of the loss landscape in overparametrized neural networks: Symmetry and invariances. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 139, 2021.
- I. Skorokhodov and M. Burtsev. Loss landscape sightseeing with multi-point optimization. *NeurIPS, Workshop publishing*, 2019.
- R. Sun, D. Li, S. Liang, and T. Ding. The global landscape of neural networks. *Nonconvex Optimization for Signal Processing and Machine Learning*, 37(5):95–108, 2020.
- L. Venturi, A. S. Bandeira, and J. Bruna. Spurious valleys in one-hidden-layer neural network optimization landscapes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(133):1–34, 2019.
- L. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and T. Luo. Structure and gradient dynamics near global minima of two-layer neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00508*, 2023a.
- Y. Zhang, Z. Zhang, T. Luo, and Z.-Q. J. Xu. Embedding principle of loss landscape of deep neural networks. *NeurIPS*, 34:14848–14859, 2021.
- Y. Zhang, Y. Li, Z. Zhang, T. Luo, and Z.-Q. J. Xu. Embedding principle: a hierarchical structure of loss landscape of deep neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning*, 1(1):60–113, 2022.
- Y. Zhang, Z. Zhang, L. Zhang, Z. Bai, T. Luo, and Z.-Q. J. Xu. Optimistic estimate uncovers the potential of nonlinear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08921*, 2023b.

A Appendix

Lemma A.1 (Lemma 3.1). *Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an analytic non-polynomial. Then for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$ and any $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the neurons $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if every two of them are linearly independent.*

Proof. First assume that $\sigma^{(s)}(0) \neq 0$ for infinitely many even and odd integer s 's, and $\sigma(0) \neq 0$, then by Simsek et al. [2021], we know that for any $m, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent if and only if w_1, \dots, w_m are distinct; in particular, if and only if every two of them are linearly independent. A similar argument holds when $\sigma(0) = 0$, except that now $\sigma(0x) = 0$ and thus we need to take $w_k = 0$ into consideration as well.

Second, assume that σ is an even or odd function, then there are even numbers $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^{(s_j)}(0) \neq 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, suppose that $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly dependent, we must claim that either $w_k \pm w_j = 0$ for some distinct $k, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ or when $\sigma(0) = 0$, $w_k = 0$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Indeed, if this is not true, there is a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $w_k^\top v \pm w_j^\top v \neq 0$ for all distinct $k, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and when $\sigma(0) = 0$, $w_k^\top v \neq 0$ for all k . Since $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent, there are constants $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}$ not all zero, such that $\sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma(w_k^\top x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma((w_k^\top v)z) = 0, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}$$

Rewriting this in power series expansion near the origin, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma((w_k^\top v)z) = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \alpha_s \left(\sum_{k=1}^m a_k (w_k^\top v)^s \right) z^s = 0 \quad (6)$$

for all z sufficiently close to 0, where $\alpha_s = \sigma^{(s)}(0)$ for each $s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $k_1 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be such that $|w_{k_1}^\top v| > |w_k^\top v|$ for all k . If $a_{k_1} \neq 0$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^m a_k (w_k^\top v)^s = \Theta(w_{k_1}^\top v)^s \rightarrow \infty$$

as $s \rightarrow \infty$; in particular, $\alpha_{s_j} \sum_{k=1}^m a_k (w_k^\top v)^{s_j} \neq 0$ for sufficiently large j , which contradicts equation (6). Thus, $a_{k_1} = 0$. By repeating this procedure we can see that $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 0$, contradicting our assumption on the linear dependence of these neurons. Therefore, we conclude that if $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly dependent, either

- (a) $w_k \pm w_j = 0$ for some distinct $k, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, which means the neurons $\sigma(w_k^\top x)$ and $\sigma(w_j^\top x)$ are linearly dependent; or
- (b) $w_k = 0$ for some k provided that $\sigma(0) = 0$, which means the constant-zero neuron $\sigma(w_k^\top x)$ is linearly independent with any other neurons.

Conversely, if $\sigma(w_1^\top x), \dots, \sigma(w_m^\top x)$ are linearly independent, then trivially every two of them are linearly independent. This completes the proof. \square

Proposition A.1 (Proposition 4.1). *Given $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \leq m$, denote g_m and g_r as the neural networks of width m and r , respectively, i.e.,*

$$g_m(\theta, x) = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma(w_k^T x), \quad \forall \theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$g_r(\theta', x) = \sum_{k=1}^r a'_k \sigma(w'_k{}^T x), \quad \forall \theta' = (a'_k, w'_k)_{k=1}^r \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Let $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$. For any $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, The following results hold for $\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')$ and φ_P :

- (a) (output function is preserved) $g_r(\theta', x) = g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x)$ and $g_m(\theta, x) = g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x)$.
- (b) (error-term is preserved) $e_i(g_r, \theta') = e_i(g_m, \iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'))$ and $e_i(g_m, \theta) = e_i(g_r, \varphi_P(\theta))$.
- (c) (criticality is preserved) $\nabla R(g_r, \theta') = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_m, \iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')) = 0$ and $\nabla R(g_m, \theta) = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_r, \varphi_P(\theta)) = 0$.

Proof. The key to proving the results for both operators is that they do not “introduce new input weights”. The three parts (a), (b), (c) then follows from straightforward computation. Let $\theta' =: (a'_j, w'_j)_{j=1}^r$ and $\theta =: (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$.

- (a) For $\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}$ we use the fact that $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \delta_k = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r$ to deduce that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_r(\theta', x) &= \sum_{j=1}^r a'_j \sigma(w'_j{}^T x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \delta_k \right) a'_j \sigma(w'_j{}^T x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^r [\delta_{t_{j-1}+1} a'_j \sigma(w'_j{}^T x) + \dots + \delta_{t_j} a'_j \sigma(w'_j{}^T x)] \\ &= g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for φ_P we use the fact that any neuron with zero output weight does not affect the output of the neural network to deduce that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_m(\theta, x) &= \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \sigma(w_k^T x) = \sum_{k=1}^{t_r} a_k \sigma(w_k^T x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k \right) \sigma(w_{t_j}^T x) \\ &= g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x). \end{aligned}$$

- (b) By (a), $g_r(\theta', x_i) - y_i = g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x_i) - y_i$ and $g_m(\theta, x_i) - y_i = g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x_i) - y_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, so the desired result follows.

- (c) For $\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')$: denote $(a''_k, w''_k)_{k=1}^m = \iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')$, given $1 \leq k \leq m$, $w''_k = w'_k$ and $a''_j = \delta a_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq r$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, whence by (b),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(g_m, \cdot)}{\partial a_k}(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x_i) - y_i) \sigma(w''_k{}^T x_i) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (g_r(\theta', x_i) - y_i) \sigma(w_j{}^T x_i) = \frac{\partial R(g_r, \cdot)}{\partial a_j} \end{aligned}$$

and for each $1 \leq t \leq d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(g_m, \cdot)}{\partial (w_k)_t}(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')) &= 2a''_k \sum_{i=1}^n (g_m(\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta'), x_i) - y_i) \sigma'(w''_k{}^T x_i)(x_i)_t \\ &= 2\delta a_j \sum_{i=1}^n (g_r(\theta', x_i) - y_i) \sigma'(w_j{}^T x_i)(x_i)_t \\ &= \frac{\partial R(g_r, \cdot)}{\partial a_j}. \end{aligned}$$

From these equations we can see that $\nabla R(g_r, \theta') = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_m, \iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\theta')) = 0$.

Similarly, for $\varphi_P(\theta)$: denote $(a''_j, w''_j)_{j=1}^r = \varphi_P(\theta)$, given $1 \leq j \leq r$, $w''_j = w_{t_j}$, whence by (b),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(g_r, \cdot)}{\partial a_j}(\varphi_P(\theta)) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x_i) - y_i) \sigma(w''_j{}^T x_i) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (g_m(\theta, x_i) - y_i) \sigma(w_{t_j}{}^T x_i) \\ &= \frac{\partial R(g_m, \cdot)}{\partial a_{t_j}} \end{aligned}$$

and for each $1 \leq t \leq d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(g_r, \cdot)}{\partial (w_j)_t}(\varphi_P(\theta)) &= 2a''_j \sum_{i=1}^n (g_r(\varphi_P(\theta), x_i) - y_i) \sigma'(w''_j{}^T x_i) \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=t_{j-1}}^{t_j} a_k \sum_{i=1}^n (g_m(\theta, x_i) - y_i) \sigma'(w_{t_j}{}^T x_i) \\ &= \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \frac{\partial R(g_m, \cdot)}{\partial (w_k)_t}. \end{aligned}$$

From these equations we can see that $\nabla R(g_m, \theta) = 0$ implies $\nabla R(g_r, \varphi_P(\theta)) = 0$. □

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 5.1). *Given effective feature numbers r, r_1, r_2 and ineffective feature numbers l, l_1, l_2 as in Definition 5.1, we have the following results.*

- (a) (covering) *The set of non-global critical points of R , $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0) \setminus R^{-1}(0)$, is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$'s, i.e., $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0) \setminus R^{-1}(0) = \cup_{r,l} \mathcal{C}^{r,l}$.*

(b) (embedding structure) For any partition $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r)$ such that $t_r + l = m$ and any index mapping $\mathcal{I} : \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have

$$\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}^{r,0}(r)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m).$$

Conversely, φ_P induces a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m) \rightarrow \prod_{r'=0}^r \mathcal{C}^{r',r-r'}(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)r}$$

such that the inverse image of every θ' , $\overline{\varphi^{-1}(\theta')}$ is a finite union of sets, each one isometric to $\mathbb{R}^{t_r-r} \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$. Here $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is an analytic set determined by θ' of dimension at most $d-1$.

Proof. (a) According to the remark after the definition of stratification of $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ (Definition 4.2), for any critical point $\theta \in (\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$, there is an effective feature number r and ineffective feature number l with $\theta \in Q^{r,l}$. Thus, if we also have $R(\theta) \neq 0$ then $\theta \in \mathcal{C}^{r,l}$. This shows the covering property of these branches.

(b) The fact that $\iota_{\Delta(P), \mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}^{r,0}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ follows from Proposition 4.1.

For the converse, fix any $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ and denote

$$\theta' = (a'_j, w'_j)_{j=1}^r = \varphi(\theta).$$

By Proposition 4.1, θ' is also a critical point of $R(g', \cdot)$. Moreover, since the input weights of θ' are distinct, $\theta' \in Q^{r',r-r'}(r)$ for some $0 \leq r' \leq r$ (in fact, if $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$, r' is the number of j 's such that $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k \neq 0$). This proves the first part of the result.

We then show that there is an (affine) isometry $\mathcal{T} : \overline{\varphi^{-1}(\theta')} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{t_r-r} \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$. First, let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a subspace consisting of vectors $v = (\delta_k)_{k=1}^m$ such that $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \delta_j = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r$ and $\delta_k = 0$ for all $k > t_r$. Second, let $\mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$ be the zero set of the analytic function

$$w \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta') \sigma(w^T x_i), \quad (7)$$

where each $e_i(\theta') = \sum_{j=1}^r a'_j \sigma(w_j^T x_i) - y_i$. Clearly, for any other $\tilde{\theta} = (\tilde{a}_k, \tilde{w}_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}(m)$, $\varphi(\tilde{\theta}) = \theta'$ if and only if

- i) $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} \tilde{a}_k = a_j = \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k$, if and only if $\sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} (\tilde{a}_k - a_k) = 0$.
- ii) $w_k = w'_j$ for all $t_{j-1} < k \leq t_j$ and all $1 \leq j \leq r$.
- iii) For each $k \in \{t_r+1, \dots, m\}$, $\frac{\partial R}{\partial a_k}(\tilde{\theta}) = 0$, because $a_k = 0$ automatically yields $\frac{\partial R}{\partial w_k}(\tilde{\theta}) = 0$. But we have

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial a_k}(\tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta') \sigma(w_k^T x_i),$$

whence $w_k \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$.

Therefore, up to a rearrangement \mathcal{T}_1 of the components of points in $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ we have $\overline{\varphi^{-1}(\theta')} = (E + A_{\theta'}) \times \prod_{k=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$, where

$$A_{\theta'} = \begin{pmatrix} a'_1, & \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(t_1 - 1)\text{-many 0's}}, & \dots, & a'_r, & \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(t_r - 1)\text{-many 0's}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\dim E = t_r - r$, so there is an linear isometry $\mathcal{T}_2 : E + A_{\theta'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{t_r - r}$. Finally, let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_2, id) \circ \mathcal{T}_1$ (id is the identity map on $\prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$). Then clearly \mathcal{T} is an isometry between $\overline{\varphi^{-1}(\theta')}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{t_r - r} \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathcal{M}_{\theta'}$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let σ be an odd, analytic, non-polynomial activation. Given n inputs x_1, \dots, x_n such that $x_{i_1} \pm x_{i_2} \neq 0$ for all distinct $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $x_i \neq 0$ for all i . For any e_1, \dots, e_n not all zero, the zero set of the function*

$$\tau : \mathbb{R}^d \ni w \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(w^T x_i)$$

is an analytic set of dimension $d - 1$.

Proof. It is clear that $\sigma(w^T x_{i_1})$ and $\sigma(w^T x_{i_2})$ are linearly independent if and only if $i_1 = i_2$. By Lemma 3.1, this means the neurons (in $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$) $\sigma(w^T x_1), \dots, \sigma(w^T x_n)$ are linearly independent. Thus, there is some $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(w^T x_i) \neq 0$, say it is greater than zero. Because σ is odd, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(-w^T x_i) = - \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(w^T x_i) < 0.$$

Since $\sigma(0) = 0$, it is clear that $\tau^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $\tau^{-1}(0)$ is an analytic set of dimension no greater than $d - 2$. Then in particular it is a countable union of analytic submanifolds in \mathbb{R}^d of dimension $\leq d - 2$. By Hatcher [2002], the space $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau^{-1}(0)$ is path connected and clearly contains w and $-w$. Thus, there is some continuous $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tau^{-1}(0)$ with $\gamma(0) = w$ and $\gamma(1) = -w$. Now the function

$$[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(\gamma(t)^T x_i)$$

is also continuous, positive at 0 and negative at 1, whence by the Mean Value theorem for continuous functions, there is some $t \in [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \sigma(\gamma(t)^T x_i) = 0$, contradicting $\gamma(t) \notin \tau^{-1}(0)$. Therefore, we conclude that $\tau^{-1}(0)$ is an analytic set of dimension at least $d - 1$. Since τ is not constant-zero, it must be of dimension $d - 1$, completing the proof. \square

Theorem A.2 (Theorem 5.2). *The following results hold for branches of $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ defined as in Definition 5.1.*

- (a) *Given effective feature number r_1 and a partition $P_1 = (t_0, \dots, t_{r_1})$ with $t_{r_1} + l_1 = m$. Let s_1 count the number of elements in the set $\{j : t_j - t_{j-1} > 0\}$. If the ineffective feature numbers l_1, l_2 satisfy $l_1 < l_2$, $r_1 + l_1 < m$ and $r_2 + l_2 \leq m$, then there are partitions $P_{2,1}, \dots, P_{2,s_1}$ and permutations $\pi_{2,1}, \dots, \pi_{2,s_1}$ such that $\overline{C_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}} \cap C_{P_{2,j}, \pi_{2,j}}^{r_1, l_2} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s_1$.*

(b) Suppose the effective feature numbers r_1, r_2 with $r_1 < r_2$. Given a partition P_1 as in (a), then there are ineffective feature numbers l_1, l_2 , a partition P_2 and a permutation π_2 giving $\mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}} \neq \emptyset$, if the following requirements are satisfied.

i) $l_1 > 0$.

ii) $2r_2 - r_1 + l \leq m$.

iii) For some $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}$ the common zero set of the $(d+1)$ -many maps

$$\begin{aligned} w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma(w^T x_i) \\ w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma'(w^T x_i)(x_i)_1 \\ &\vdots \\ w &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta) \sigma'(w^T x_i)(x_i)_d \end{aligned}$$

has at least r_2 -many elements.

Proof. (a) Since $r_1 + l_1 < m$, there must be some $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $t_j - t_{j-1} > 0$. If $j \neq r$, we simply find a permutation $\pi_1 \in S_m$ that “switches” the entries $a_{t_{j-1}+1}, w_{t_{j-1}+1}, \dots, a_{t_j}, w_{t_j}$ and $a_{t_{r-1}+1}, w_{a_{r-1}+1}, \dots, a_{t_r}, w_{t_r}$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{P, \pi_1}^{r_1, l_1}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_1^{-1} \circ \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}}$ have the same geometry for any effective feature number r_2 , any ineffective feature number l_2 , and any partition P_2 and permutation π_2 , we work instead with $\mathcal{C}_{P_1, \pi_1}^{r_1, l_1}$. Thus, without loss of generality we may assume that $j = r$ in the beginning.

Fix any $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathcal{C}_P^{r_1, l_1}$. Denote $a' := \sum_{k=t_{r-1}+1}^{t_r} a_k$, which is non-zero by requirement (b) in Definition 5.1. Let $\theta' = (a'_k, w'_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ be such that

- $a'_k = a_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq t_{r-1}$ and all $k > t_r$.
- $a'_k = 0$ for all $t_{r-1} + 1 < k \leq t_r$ and $a'_{t_{r-1}+1} = a'$.
- $w'_k = w_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$.

Similarly, define for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ a point $\theta_N = (a_{k,N}, w_{k,N})_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ be such that

- $a_{k,N} = a_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq t_{r-1}$ and all $k > t_r$.
- $a_{k,N} = \frac{1}{2(t_r - t_{r-1} + 1)N}$ for all $t_{r-1} + 1 < k \leq t_r$ and $a_{t_{r-1}+1, N} = (1 - \frac{1}{2n})a'$.
- $w_{k,N} = w_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$.

Then clearly $\theta' \in \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_2}^{r_1, l_2}}$ where $P_2 = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{r-1}, t_{r-1} + 1)$ and $l_2 = l_1 + (t_r - t_{r-1} - 1)$. Similarly, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we clearly have $\theta_N \in \mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}$. Meanwhile, we have $\theta' \in \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}}$ because

$$\theta' = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \theta_N.$$

Therefore, $\theta' \in \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}}$, completing the proof.

(b) We will construct the branch $\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}$ explicitly. For simplicity, denote $P_1 = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{r_1})$. Since $\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2} \neq \emptyset$, $r_2 \leq m - l_2$ must hold, so we may let $t_{r_2} := m - l_2$. Since $r_1 + 2(r_2 - r_1) + l \leq m$, we can define a partition

$$P_2 = (t_0, \dots, t_{r_1}, t_{r_1} + 2, \dots, t_{r_1} + 2(r_2 - r_1 - 1), t_{r_2}).$$

For permutation π_2 , simply define π_2 as the identity map on $\{1, \dots, m\}$ (in general there are more than one ways to define π_2). Because the given function have at least r_2 -many common zeros, we can find some $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1}$ such that $w_{t_{r_1}+2}, \dots, w_{t_{r_1}+2(r_2-r_1-1)}, w_{t_{r_2}}$ are distinct, and moreover are also distinct from $w_1, \dots, w_{t_{r_1}}$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the $\theta_N = (a_{k,N}, w_{k,N})_{k=1}^m$ is a point in $\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}$, where

- $a_{k,N} = a_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq t_{r_1}$.
- $a_{k,N} = \frac{1}{N}$ for all $k = t_{r_1} + 1, t_{r_1} + 3, \dots, t_{r_1} + 2(r_2 - r_1 - 1) - 1$, and $a_{k,N} = -\frac{1}{N}$ for all $k = t_{r_1} + 2, t_{r_1} + 4, \dots, t_{r_1} + 2(r_2 - r_1 - 1)$.
- $a_{k,N} \neq 0$ for all $t_{r_1} + 2(r_2 - r_1 - 1) < t_{r_2}$, and they sum to zero.
- $w_{k,N} = w_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$.

Notice that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \theta_N = \theta$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}_{P_1}^{r_1, l_1} = \overline{\mathcal{C}_{P_2, \pi_2}^{r_2, l_2}} \neq \emptyset$. □

Proposition A.2 (Proposition 5.1). *Let $r < m$. Suppose that $\theta' = (a'_k, w'_k)_{k=1}^r \in \mathcal{C}_{P^*}^{r, 0}(r)$ is a critical point of R and the matrices*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e_i(\theta') \sigma''(w_j^{i,T} x_i) \begin{pmatrix} (x_i)_1 (x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_1 (x_i)_d \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_i)_d (x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_d (x_i)_d \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(w_l^{i,T} x_i)^2$ are non-zero for some j and l . Then there is a partition $P = (t_0, \dots, t_r = m)$ such that $\mathcal{C}_P^{r, 0}(m)$ contains strict saddle points $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m$ satisfying $g(\theta, \cdot) = g(\theta', \cdot)$.

Proof. Our proof is based on the idea of K. Fukumizu [Fukumizu and ichi Amari, 2000]. Note that $\nabla_w^2 R(\theta)$ is the sum of the following matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_1^2 A_1 & \dots & a_1 a_{t_1} A_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{t_1} a_1 A_1 & \dots & a_{t_1}^2 A_1 \end{pmatrix} & \dots & * \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ * & \dots & \begin{pmatrix} a_{t_{r-1}+1}^2 A_r & \dots & a_{t_{r-1}+1} a_{t_r} A_r \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{t_r} a_{t_{r-1}+1} A_r & \dots & a_{t_r}^2 A_r \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 B_1 & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \dots & a_{t_1} B_1 \end{pmatrix} & \dots & O \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \dots & \begin{pmatrix} a_{t_{r-1}+1} B_r & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \dots & a_{t_r} B_r \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the two matrices above, A_1, \dots, A_r are $d \times d$ matrices determined by w'_1, \dots, w'_r , O are zero matrices (possibly with different sizes), and for each $1 \leq j \leq r$,

$$B_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^r a'_k \sigma(w_k^{\text{T}} x_i) - y_i \right) \sigma''(w_j^{\text{T}} x_i) \begin{pmatrix} (x_i)_1(x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_1(x_i)_d \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_i)_d(x_i)_1 & \dots & (x_i)_d(x_i)_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the vector $v = (va_k, vw_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ with $va_k = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $vw_k = 0$ whenever $k \notin \{t_{j-1} + 1, \dots, t_j\}$ (the $va_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $vw_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are entries of v). Then $\text{Hess}R(\theta)v$ equals

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} a_{t_{j-1}+1}^2 A_j & \dots & a_{t_{j-1}+1} a_{t_j} A_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{t_j} a_{t_{j-1}+1} A_j & \dots & a_{t_j}^2 A_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ * & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a_{t_{j-1}+1} B_j & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & \dots & a_{t_j} B_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ O & & \vdots \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} vw_{t_{j-1}+1} \\ \vdots \\ vw_{t_j} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $v^{\text{T}} (\text{Hess}R(\theta)v)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k,k'=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k a_{k'} ((vw_k)^{\text{T}} A_j (vw_{k'})) + \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k ((vw_k)^{\text{T}} B_j (vw_k)) \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k \sqrt{A_j} vw_k \right|^2 + \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_k ((vw_k)^{\text{T}} B_j (vw_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sqrt{A_j}$ is the square root matrix of A_j , i.e., $\sqrt{A_j} \sqrt{A_j} = A_j$. By hypothesis, we may further assume that B_j is not a zero matrix. Since B_j is symmetric, there is some $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u^{\text{T}} B_j u \neq 0$. Further consider any vector v defined as above which also satisfies

$$v_{t_{j-1}+1} = \dots = v_{t_j-1} = 0, v_{t_j} = u.$$

Then

$$v^{\text{T}} (\text{Hess}R(\theta)v) = |\sqrt{A_j} u|^2 a_{t_j}^2 + (u^{\text{T}} B_j u) a_{t_j}.$$

Notice that we can view the right side of this equation as a polynomial in a_{t_j} of degree at most 2. If $\sqrt{A_j} u = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then for any $a_{t_j} < 0$ we have $v^{\text{T}} (\text{Hess}R(\theta)v) < 0$. If $\sqrt{A_j} u \neq 0$, then for any a_{t_j} between 0 and $-\frac{u^{\text{T}} B_j u}{|\sqrt{A_j} u|^2}$ we have $v^{\text{T}} (\text{Hess}R(\theta)v) < 0$. In either case, we can see that $\text{Hess}R(\theta)$ has a negative eigenvalue.

Then we find a positive eigenvalue of $\text{Hess}R(\theta)$. Indeed, our hypothesis implies that

$$\frac{\partial^2 R}{\partial a_l \partial a_l}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(w_l^{\text{T}} x_i)^2 > 0.$$

Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$ be the vector which has 1 in the a_{t_l} -th entry and zero in all other entries. Then it is clear that

$$v^{\text{T}} \text{Hess}R(\theta)v = |v|^2 \frac{\partial^2 R}{\partial a_l \partial a_l} > 0.$$

Thus, there must be a positive eigenvalue for $\text{Hess}R(\theta)$. Since $\text{Hess}R(\theta)$ has both negative and positive eigenvalues, θ is a strict saddle. □

We then show use Proposition 5.1 to show that there exist strict saddles in $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ in the example (see also Section 3.2).

Lemma A.3. *For the example in Section 3.2, $\theta' = (1, (\log \frac{1}{3}, 0))$ is a critical point of $R(g_1, \cdot)$ such that the matrices*

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 e_i(\theta') \sigma''(w'^T x_i) \begin{pmatrix} (x_i)_1(x_i)_1 & (x_i)_1(x_i)_2 \\ (x_i)_2(x_i)_1 & (x_i)_2(x_i)_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \sigma(w'^T x_i)^2$ are non-zero. Here $\sigma = \exp(\cdot)$.

Proof. We start by showing that θ' is a critical point of $R(g_1, \cdot)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} e_1(\theta') &= 1 \cdot e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} - 1 = -\frac{2}{3} \\ e_2(\theta') &= 1 \cdot e^{0 \cdot \log 1/3} - 1 = 0 \\ e_3(\theta') &= 1 \cdot e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} - 0 = \frac{1}{3} \\ e_4(\theta') &= 1 \cdot e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} - 0 = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the partial derivatives of $R(g_1, \cdot)$ at θ' are all zero, because

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial R}{\partial a}(\theta') &= -\frac{2}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} + 0 + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial R}{\partial (w)_1}(\theta') &= -\frac{2}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} + 0 + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial R}{\partial (w)_2}(\theta') &= 0 + 0 + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} \cdot 1 + e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} \cdot (-1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the first matrix, it suffices to show that one of the entries of this 2×2 matrix is non-zero. But this follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^4 e_i(\theta') \sigma''(w'^T x_i) (x_i)_2^2 &= 0 + 0 + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} \cdot 1^2 + \frac{1}{3} e^{1 \cdot \log 1/3} \cdot (-1)^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{9} \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the entry at the second row and second column is non-zero. For the second matrix, note that when $\sigma = \exp(\cdot)$, $\sigma(w'^T x_i) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 4$, whence $\sum_{i=1}^4 \sigma(w'^T x_i) > 0$ as well. \square

Thus, the requirements in Proposition 5.1 are satisfied and we conclude that $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$ contains strict saddles.

Proposition A.3 (Proposition 5.2). *Let $r < m$. Any branch $\mathcal{C}^{r,l}$ with $l > 0$ consists only of saddle points. Moreover, for any $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}^{r,0}$, θ_0 is connected to a saddle θ_1 via a line segment $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)m}$, such that $\gamma(t) \in (\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ and $g(\gamma(t), \cdot) = g(\theta_0, \cdot)$ for all t .*

Proof. First we show that any branch $\mathcal{C}_P^{r,l}$ with $l > 0$ consists only of saddle points. So fix an arbitrary point $\theta = (a_k, w_k)_{k=1}^m \in \mathcal{C}^{r,l}$. Since $l > 0$, there is some $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $a_j = 0$. By the proof of Theorem A.1, w_j must lie in an analytic set of dimension $\leq d - 1$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is some $\tilde{w}_j \in B(w_j, \varepsilon) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ not in this set, and thus the point $\tilde{\theta} = (\tilde{a}_k, \tilde{w}_k)_{k=1}^m$ with

$\tilde{a}_k = a_k$ for all k and $\tilde{w}_k = w_k$ for all $k \neq j$ satisfies $R(\tilde{\theta}) = R(\theta)$ but is not a critical point, i.e., $\nabla R(\tilde{\theta}) \neq 0$. It follows that we can find $\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2 \in B(\tilde{\theta}, \varepsilon)$ with

$$R(\tilde{\theta}_1) > R(\tilde{\theta}), \quad R(\tilde{\theta}_2) < R(\tilde{\theta}).$$

Notice that $\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2$ are both points in the open ball $B(\theta, 2\varepsilon)$ because

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\theta}_i - \theta| &\leq |\tilde{\theta}_i - \tilde{\theta}| + |\tilde{\theta} - \theta| \\ &= |\tilde{\theta}_i - \theta| + |\tilde{w}_j - w_j| < \varepsilon + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using $R(\tilde{\theta}) = R(\theta)$ we have $R(\tilde{\theta}_1) > R(\theta)$ and $R(\tilde{\theta}_2) < R(\theta)$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we can see that θ is neither a local minimum nor local maximum, whence a saddle.

Now we show that any point θ_0 in $\mathcal{C}^{r,0}$ is connected to some $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{r,1}$ via a line segment. Given $\theta_0 = (a_{k0}, w_{k0})_{k=1}^m \in \mathcal{C}^{r,0}$, by rearranging the indices of it we may assume that $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{C}_P^{r,0}$ for some partition $P = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r)$ of $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Since $r < m$, there is some $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $t_j - t_{j-1} > 0$. Define $\theta_1 = (a_{k1}, w_{k1})_{k=1}^m$ as follows

- (a) $a_{k1} = a_{k0}$ for all $k \notin \{t_{j-1} + 1, \dots, t_j\}$.
- (b) $a_{k1} = 0$ for all $t_{j-1} < k < t_j$ and $a_{t_j 1} = \sum_{k=t_{j-1}+1}^{t_j} a_{k0}$.
- (c) $w_{k1} = w_{k0}$ for all k .

Then define $\gamma(t) = (1-t)\theta_0 + t\theta_1$ for $t \in [0, 1]$, i.e., γ is the line segment connecting θ_0 and θ_1 . Then it is easy to check that for each $t \in [0, 1]$, $\gamma(t) \in (\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$ and $g(\gamma(t), \cdot) = g(\theta_0, \cdot)$. □

Remark A.1. In general such line segment γ is not unique, so in general θ_0 is connected to more than one saddle via line segments in $(\nabla R)^{-1}(0)$.