

A Proof of Theorem 5

Let us first verify that M_d is a submartingale for the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_d\}_{d \geq 1}$ with \mathcal{F}_d being the sigma algebra generated by all weights and biases up to and including layer d (for background on sigma algebras and martingales we refer the reader to Chapters 2 and 37 in [3]). Since $\text{act}^{(0)}$ is a fixed non-random vector, it is clear that M_d is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_d . We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[M_d \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] &= \frac{1}{n_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \text{act}^{(d)} \right\|^2 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_d} \sum_{\beta=1}^{n_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} > 0\}} \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right],\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

where we can replace the sigma algebra \mathcal{F}_{d-1} by the sigma algebra generated by $\text{act}^{(d-1)}$ since the computation done by a feed-forward neural net is a Markov chain with respect to activations at consecutive layers (for background see Chapter 8 in [3]). Next, recall that by assumption the weights and biases are symmetric in law around 0. Note that for each β , changing the signs of all the weights $w_{\alpha,\beta}^{(d)}$ and biases $b_{\beta}^{(d)}$ causes $\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)}$ to change sign. Hence, we find

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} > 0\}} \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} < 0\}} \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right].$$

Note that

$$\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} > 0\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} < 0\}} \right) = \text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)}.$$

Symmetrizing the expression in (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[M_d \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] &= \frac{1}{2n_d} \sum_{\beta=1}^{n_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{preact}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2n_d} \sum_{\beta=1}^{n_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(b_{\beta}^{(d)} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_{d-1}} \text{act}_{\alpha}^{(d-1)} w_{\alpha,\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \nu_2^{(d)} + \frac{1}{n_{d-1}} \left\| \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right\|^2 \geq M_{d-1},\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where in the second equality we used that the weights $w_{\alpha,\beta}^{(d)}$ and biases $b_{\beta}^{(d)}$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_{d-1} with mean 0 and in the last equality that $\text{Var}[w_{\alpha,\beta}^{(d)}] = 2/n_{j-1}$. The above computation also yields that for each $d \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_d] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_d} \left\| \text{act}^{(d)} \right\|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n_0} \left\| \text{act}^{(0)} \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d \nu_2^{(j)}.\quad (11)$$

It also shows that $\widehat{M}_d = M_d - \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \nu_2^{(j)}$ is a martingale. Taking the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ in (11) proves (4). Next, assuming condition (4), we find that

$$\sup_{d \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[\max\{M_d, 0\}] \leq \frac{1}{n_0} \left\| \text{act}^{(0)} \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)},$$

which is finite. Hence, we may apply Doob's pointwise martingale convergence theorem (see Chapter 35 in [3]) to conclude that the limit

$$M_{\infty} = \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} M_d$$

exists and is finite almost surely. Indeed, Doob's result states that if our martingale \widehat{M}_d is bounded in L^1 uniformly in d , then, almost surely, \widehat{M}_d has a finite pointwise limit as $d \rightarrow \infty$. To show (5) we will need the following result.

Lemma 1. Fix $d \geq 1$. Then

$$\frac{M_{d-1}^2 + (6 - \nu_2^{(d)})M_{d-1}}{n_d} \leq \text{Var}[M_d \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] \leq \frac{C(1 + M_{d-1}^2 + M_{d-1})}{n_d},$$

where

$$C = \max\{1, \frac{1}{2}\mu_4^{(d)} - \frac{1}{4}(\mu_2^{(d)})^2, 2|\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} - 3|\}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$M_d = \frac{1}{n_d} \sum_{\beta} \left(\text{act}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2,$$

and, conditioned on $\text{act}^{(d-1)}$, the random variables $\{\text{act}_{\beta}^{(d)}\}_{\beta}$ are i.i.d. Hence,

$$\text{Var}[M_d \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] = \frac{1}{n_d} \text{Var} \left[\left(\text{act}_1^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1} \right]. \quad (12)$$

We apply the same symmetrization trick as in the derivation of (10) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{act}_1^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1} \right] &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{preact}_1^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_{d-1}} \text{act}_{\alpha}^{(d-1)} w_{\alpha,1}^{(d)} + b_1^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which after using that the odd moments of $w_{\alpha,1}^{(d)}$ and $b_1^{(d)}$ vanish becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_{d-1}} \text{act}_{\alpha}^{(d-1)} w_{\alpha,1}^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] + \frac{6\nu_2^{(d)}}{n_{d-1}} \left\| \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nu_4^{(d)}.$$

To evaluate the first term, note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_{d-1}} \text{act}_{\alpha}^{(d-1)} w_{\alpha,1}^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] = \sum_{\substack{\alpha_i=1 \\ 1 \leq i \leq 4}}^{n_{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^4 \text{act}_{\alpha_i}^{(d-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^4 w_{\alpha_i,1}^{(d)} \right].$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^4 w_{\alpha_i,1}^{(d)} \right] = \frac{4}{n_{d-1}^2} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_1=\alpha_2\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_1=\alpha_3\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_1=\alpha_4\}} + (\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} - 3) \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_1=\alpha_2=\alpha_3=\alpha_4\}} \right],$$

we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_{d-1}} \text{act}_{\alpha}^{(d-1)} w_{\alpha,1}^{(d)} \right)^4 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] = \frac{4}{n_{d-1}^2} \left(3 \left\| \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right\|^4 + (\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} - 3) \left\| \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right\|_4^4 \right),$$

where we recall that $\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} = \mu_4^{(d)} / (\mu_2^{(d)})^2$. Putting together the preceding computations and using that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\text{act}_{\beta}^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right] = M_{d-1} + \frac{1}{2} \nu_2^{(d)},$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\left(\text{act}_1^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1} \right] &= 5M_{d-1}^2 + \frac{2(\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} - 3)}{n_{d-1}^2} \left\| \text{act}^{(d-1)} \right\|_4^4 \\ &\quad + \left(6 - \nu_2^{(d)} \right) M_{d-1} + \frac{1}{2} \nu_4^{(d)} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\nu_2^{(d)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the excess kurtosis $\tilde{\mu}_4^{(d)} - 3$ of $\mu^{(d)}$ is bounded below by -2 for any probability measure (see Chapter 4 in [28]) and observe that $\|\text{act}^{(d-1)}\|_4^4 \leq \|\text{act}^{(d-1)}\|^4$. Therefore, using that $\frac{1}{2}\nu_4^{(d)} - \frac{1}{4}(\nu_2^{(d)})^2 \geq 0$, we obtain

$$M_{d-1}^2 + (6 - \nu_2^{(d)})M_{d-1} \leq \text{Var} \left[\left(\text{act}_1^{(d)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1} \right] \leq C(1 + M_{d-1}^2 + M_{d-1})$$

with

$$C = \max\{1, \frac{1}{2}\nu_4^{(d)} - \frac{1}{2}(\nu_2^{(d)})^2, 2|\tilde{\mu}_4| - 3\}.$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. \square

To conclude the proof of Theorem 5 we write

$$\mathbb{E} [M_d^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] = \text{Var}[M_d \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] + \left(M_{d-1} + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2^{(d)} \right)^2$$

and combine Lemma 1 with the expression (11) to obtain with C as in Lemma 1

$$\mathbb{E} [M_d^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] \leq \frac{C}{n_d} (1 + M_{d-1}^2 + M_d) + M_{d-1}^2 + M_{d-1}\nu_2^{(d)} + \frac{1}{4}\nu_4^{(d)}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [M_d^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{d-1}] \geq M_{d-1}^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_d} \right) + M_d \left(\nu_2^{(d)} + \frac{6 - \nu_2^{(d)}}{n_d} \right) \geq M_{d-1}^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_d} \right).$$

Taking expectations of both sides in the inequalities above yields with C as in Lemma 1

$$\mathbb{E} [M_{d-1}^2] \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_d} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} [M_d^2] \leq (a_d + \mathbb{E} [M_{d-1}^2]) \left(1 + \frac{C}{n_d} \right),$$

where

$$a_d \leq \frac{C}{n_d} \left(1 + M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) + \nu_2^{(d)} \left(M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) + (\nu_2^{(d)})^2$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d a_d &\leq C \left(1 + M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{n_j} + \left(M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^d \nu_2^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^d (\nu_2^{(j)})^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 + M_0^2 + \left(M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^d \nu_2^{(d)} + \sum_{j=1}^d (\nu_2^{(j)})^2 \right) \left(1 + C \left(1 + M_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_2^{(j)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{n_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating the lower bound in this inequality yields the lower bound in (5). Similarly, using that $1 + C/n_d > 1$, we iterate the upper bound to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [M_d^2] &\leq (a_d + \mathbb{E} [M_{d-1}^2]) \left(1 + \frac{C}{n_d} \right) \\ &\leq (a_d + a_{d-1} + \mathbb{E} [M_{d-2}^2]) \left(1 + \frac{C}{n_d} \right) \left(1 + \frac{C}{n_{d-1}} \right) \\ &\cdots \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^d a_j + M_0^2 \right) \exp \left(C \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{n_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the above estimate for $\sum_j a_j$, gives the upper bound in (5) and completes the proof of Theorem 5.

B Proof of Corollary 2

Fix a fully connected ReLU net \mathcal{N} with depth d and hidden layer widths n_0, \dots, n_d . We fix an input $\text{act}^{(0)}$ to \mathcal{N} and study the empirical variance $\widehat{\text{Var}}[M]$ of the squared sizes of activations M_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$. Since the biases in \mathcal{N} are 0, the squared activations M_j are a martingale (see (10)) and we find

$$\mathbb{E}[M_j M_{j'}] = \mathbb{E}[M_{\min\{j, j'\}}^2].$$

Thus, using that by (5) for some $c > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}[M_j^2] \geq c \exp\left(c \sum_{k=j}^{d-1} \frac{1}{n_k}\right),$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{Var}}_d] &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[M_j^2] - \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j, j'=1}^d \mathbb{E}[M_j M_{j'}] \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[M_j^2] - \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j=1}^d (d-j+1) \mathbb{E}[M_j^2] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{j-1}{d} c \exp\left(c \sum_{k=j}^{d-1} \frac{1}{n_k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

To see that this sum is exponential in $\sum 1/n_j$ as in (7), let us consider the special case of equal widths $n_j = n$. Then, writing

$$\beta = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{n_j},$$

we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{j-1}{d} c \exp\left(c \sum_{k=j}^{d-1} \frac{1}{n_k}\right) \approx c \int_0^1 x e^{\beta c(1-x)} dx = \frac{e^{\beta c}}{\beta^2 c} + \frac{1}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta c}\right).$$

This proves the lower bounds in (6) and (7). The upper bounds are similar.

C Proof of Theorem 6

To understand the sizes of activations produced by $\mathcal{N}_L^{\text{res}}$, we need the following Lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let \mathcal{N} be a feed-forward, fully connected ReLU net with depth d and hidden layer widths n_0, \dots, n_d having random weights as in Definition 1 and biases set to 0. Then for each $\eta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\|x + \eta \mathcal{N}(x)\|^2 = \|x\|^2 (1 + O(\eta)).$$

Proof of Lemma. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x + \eta \mathcal{N}(x)\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\|x\|^2 + 2\eta \langle x, \mathcal{N}(x) \rangle + \eta^2 \|\mathcal{N}(x)\|^2] \\ &= \|x\|^2 (1 + \eta^2 + 2\eta \mathbb{E}[\langle \hat{x}, \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}) \rangle]), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\hat{x} = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$, and we have used the fact that $\|\mathcal{N}(x)\|^2 = \|x\|^2$ (see (10)) as well as the positive homogeneity of ReLU nets with zero biases:

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda x) = \lambda \mathcal{N}(x), \quad \lambda > 0.$$

Write

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle x, \mathcal{N}(x) \rangle] = \sum_{\beta=1}^n x_\beta \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_\beta(x)].$$

Let us also write $x = x^{(0)}$ for the input to \mathcal{N} , similarly set $x^{(j)}$ for the activations at layer j . We denote by $W_\beta^{(j)}$ the β^{th} row of the weights $W^{(j)}$ at layer j in \mathcal{N} . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{N}_\beta(x) \mid x^{(d-1)}] &= \mathbb{E} [x_\beta^{(d)}] = \mathbb{E} [W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} > 0\}} \mid x^{(d-1)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mid W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} \mid \mathbf{1}_{\{W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} > 0\}} \mid x^{(d-1)}] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\mid W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} \mid \mid x^{(d-1)}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E} [\mid W_\beta^{(d)} x^{(d-1)} \mid^2 \mid x^{(d-1)}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \|x^{(d-1)}\|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using that $\|x^{(j)}\|$ is a supermartingale (since its square is a martingale by (10)):

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{N}_\beta(x)] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \mathbb{E} [\|x^{(d-1)}\|] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \|x^{(0)}\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \|x\|.$$

Hence, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle \hat{x}, \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}) \rangle] = O\left(\frac{\|\hat{x}\|_1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = O(1)$$

since by Jensen's inequality,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n |x_j| \leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2, \quad x_j \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Combining this with (13) completes the proof. \square

The Lemma implies part (i) of the Theorem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [M_L^{res}] &= \mathbb{E} [\|\mathcal{N}_{L-1}^{res}(x) + \eta_L \mathcal{N}_L(\mathcal{N}_{L-1}^{res}(x))\|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\|\mathcal{N}_{L-1}^{res}(x) + \eta_L \mathcal{N}_L(\mathcal{N}_{L-1}^{res}(x))\|^2 \mid \mathcal{N}_{L-1}^{res}(x)] \right] \\ &= (1 + O(\eta_L)) \mathbb{E} [M_{L-1}^{res}],\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\eta_\ell^2 = O(\eta_\ell)$ since $\eta_\ell \in (0, 1)$. Iterating this inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E} [M_L^{res}] = \prod_{\ell=1}^L (1 + O(\eta_\ell)) = \exp \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(1 + O(\eta_\ell)) \right) = \exp \left(O \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \eta_\ell \right) \right),$$

Derivation of the estimates (ii) follows exactly the same procedure and hence is omitted. Finally, using these estimates, we find that the mean empirical variance of $\{M_\ell^{res}\}$ is exponential in $\sum_\ell \eta_\ell$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L (M_\ell^{res})^2 - \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L M_\ell^{res} \right)^2 \right] &\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} [(M_\ell^{res})^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp \left(O \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \eta_j \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(O \left(\sum_{j=1}^L \eta_j \right) \right).\end{aligned}$$