

# Lecture 3: Approximation Theory

(or: what functions can we approximate with a neural network?)

Speaker: Phillip Isola

# Announcements

# Announcements

- Pset 1 is out (on Canvas) — due 9/26

# Announcements

- Pset 1 is out (on Canvas) — due 9/26
- OH started this week: see course webpage for hours+locations



### 3. What functions can neural networks express?

# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)

# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)
- Constructive proof with 3-layer ReLU networks

# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)
- Constructive proof with 3-layer ReLU networks
- Improvements (Stone-Weierstrass, Barron's theorem)


# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)
- Constructive proof with 3-layer ReLU networks
- Improvements (Stone-Weierstrass, Barron's theorem)
- Width and depth

# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)
- Constructive proof with 3-layer ReLU networks
- Improvements (Stone-Weierstrass, Barron's theorem)
- Width and depth
- Limitations of approximation theory

# Deep learning



What kinds of functions  
*can* we learn?  
Can the NN approximate the  
function we want to learn?

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \mathbf{y}^{(i)})$$



# Learning and Approximation

- How well will our trained neural network do on new data?

- We minimize the *empirical risk*:  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \mathbf{y}^{(i)})$

- We actually want the *population risk (test error)* to be small:

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$$

# Learning and Approximation

- How well will our trained neural network do on new data?

- We minimize the *empirical risk*:  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \mathbf{y}^{(i)})$

- We actually want the *population risk (test error)* to be small:

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$$

## Important questions:


**Approximation:** what is the best  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta^*)$  we can achieve with our model?

**Optimization:** how well are we minimizing  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)$ ?

**Generalization:** how different is  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)$  from  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ ?

# Recall: Classification

- one unit:  $\sigma(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} + b)$




can one unit/neuron  
do it? how many?

# Recall: Classification

- one unit:  $\sigma(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} + b)$

- 2 layers:

$$\sigma \left( \sum_j w_{2j} \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x} + b_{1j}) + b_2 \right)$$




can one unit/neuron  
do it? how many?

# Recall: Classification

- one unit:  $\sigma(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x} + b)$

- 2 layers:

$$\sigma \left( \sum_j w_{2j} \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{w}_j^\top \mathbf{x} + b_{1j}) + b_2 \right)$$



can one unit/neuron  
do it? how many?

- Today, we will mostly look at this in a regression framework

Main question: **what class of functions can we express with deep networks?**

Main question: **what class of functions can we express with deep networks?**

Answer: **Everything (that is continuous)**



# Making things formal

- **“Universal Approximation”**: for any continuous function  $g(\mathbf{x})$  and any error  $\epsilon$  there exists a neural network  $f(\mathbf{x})$  such that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^d$ :

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon$$

# Making things formal

- **“Universal Approximation”**: for any continuous function  $g(\mathbf{x})$  and any error  $\epsilon$  there exists a neural network  $f(\mathbf{x})$  such that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^d$ :

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon$$

- Weaker: average error  $\|f - g\|_1 = \int_0^1 |f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon$

# Making things formal

- **“Universal Approximation”**: for any continuous function  $g(\mathbf{x})$  and any error  $\epsilon$  there exists a neural network  $f(\mathbf{x})$  such that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^d$ :

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon$$

- Weaker: average error  $\|f - g\|_1 = \int_0^1 |f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon$

- We often approximate functions via linear combinations of “basis” functions...

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \phi_j(\mathbf{x})$$

# Formal result

- What functions can a neural network approximate (by setting its parameters to arbitrary values)?

*we will prove this:*


**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that

$$\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon.$$

# Approximating a univariate function with an MLP

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

"3-Layer" ReLU network




Main idea: approximate a function as a weighted sum of “basis” functions

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \phi_j(\mathbf{x})$$

- What could these be?

Main idea: approximate a function as a weighted sum of “basis” functions




$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \phi_j(\mathbf{x})$$

- What could these be?




Main idea: approximate a function as a weighted sum of “basis” functions



$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \phi_j(\mathbf{x})$$



- What could these be?



**indicators / bumps!**

$$f_{\text{step}}(x) = \sum_j \alpha_j \mathbf{1}[x \in R_j]$$

# Step 1: approximate $g(x)$ with indicator functions




$$f_{\text{step}}(x) = \sum_j \alpha_j \mathbf{1}[x \in R_j]$$

- How could we set  $\alpha_j$ ?
- What does the approximation error depend on?
- (Could we do better?)

# Side remark: Lipschitz functions

- Function  $g(x)$  is L-Lipschitz if

$$|g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x}')| \leq L \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|$$




[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lipschitz\\_continuity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lipschitz_continuity)

# Side remark: Lipschitz functions

- Function  $g(x)$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz if

$$|g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x}')| \leq L \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|$$



[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lipschitz\\_continuity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lipschitz_continuity)

# Proof idea

1. Approximate univariate continuous functions by indicator functions

# Proof idea

1. Approximate univariate continuous functions by indicator functions
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions  
(takes two layers)

# Proof idea


1. Approximate univariate continuous functions by indicator functions
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions (takes two layers)
3. Combine linearly such approx indicator functions using layer 3



# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs

```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x], {x, -2, 2}]  
Plot[-relu[x - 1], {x, -2, 2}, PlotRange → {{-2, 2}, {0, -1.5}}]
```


Out[•]=



# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs


```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x], {x, -2, 2}]  
Plot[-relu[x - 1], {x, -2, 2}, PlotRange → {{-2, 2}, {0, -1.5}}]
```

Out[•]=



```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x] - relu[x - 1], {x, -3, 3}]
```


Out[•]=






# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs

```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x] - relu[x - 1] - relu[x - 3], {x, -2, 5}]
```




# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs

```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x] - relu[x - 1] - relu[x - 3], {x, -2, 5}]
```




```
In[•]:= Plot[relu[x] - relu[x - 1] - relu[x - 3] + relu[x - 4], {x, -2, 6}]
```



# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs

- Adjusting slope


$$f_{\gamma}(x) = \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - (u - \gamma)}{\gamma}\right) - \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - u}{\gamma}\right) - \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - v}{\gamma}\right) + \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - (v - \gamma)}{\gamma}\right)$$



# Step 2: approximate indicator functions with ReLUs

- Adjusting slope


$$f_{\gamma}(x) = \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - (u - \gamma)}{\gamma}\right) - \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - u}{\gamma}\right) - \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - v}{\gamma}\right) + \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{x - (v - \gamma)}{\gamma}\right)$$



# Approximating a univariate function with an MLP

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$


3-Layer ReLU network



# Approximating a univariate function with an MLP

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

3-Layer ReLU network




Layer 2 and 3 are both strictly linear, hence can collapse into a single linear layer, hence: a 2-layer ReLU net can approx any continuous univariate function arbitrarily well.



# Approximating a multivariate function with an MLP

$$f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$



# Proof idea

1. Same as univariate case, but make cube-shaped bumps

# Proof idea

1. Same as univariate case, but make cube-shaped bumps
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions

# Proof idea

1. Same as univariate case, but make cube-shaped bumps
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions
3. Repeat construction for each input dimension (layers 1 and 2, in parallel)

# Proof idea



1. Same as univariate case, but make cube-shaped bumps
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions
3. Repeat construction for each input dimension (layers 1 and 2, in parallel)
4. Combine linearly, and threshold using another ReLU (also on layer 2, now layer 2 has a ReLU activation, unlike in univariate case)

# Proof idea

1. Same as univariate case, but make cube-shaped bumps
2. Use ReLUs to build continuous approximation to indicator functions
3. Repeat construction for each input dimension (layers 1 and 2, in parallel)
4. Combine linearly, and threshold using another ReLU (also on layer 2, now layer 2 has a ReLU activation, unlike in univariate case)
5. Combine linearly such approx indicator functions using layer 3





# Multiple dimensions





# Multiple dimensions





# Approximating one bump

- dimension-wise: same as before
- cube:  $R = \times_{i=1}^d [u_i, v_i]$


$$f_{\gamma,i}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{x_i - (u_i - \gamma)}{\gamma} \right) - \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{x_i - u_i}{\gamma} \right) - \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{x_i - v_i}{\gamma} \right) + \text{ReLU} \left( \frac{x_i - (v_i - \gamma)}{\gamma} \right)$$

# Putting dimensions together (Layer 2)

- $R = \times_{i=1}^d [u_i, v_i]$
- We have one indicator for each coordinate. How to combine?


# Putting dimensions together (Layer 2)

- $R = \times_{i=1}^d [u_i, v_i]$
- We have one indicator for each coordinate. How to combine?



# Putting dimensions together (Layer 2)

- $R = \times_{i=1}^d [u_i, v_i]$
- We have one indicator for each coordinate. How to combine?



- sum and threshold at  $d-1$ !

# Comments

**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon$ .

- Width of the network is **exponential in dimension** (curse of dimension)

# Comments

**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon$ .

- Width of the network is **exponential in dimension** (curse of dimension)
- Needs large weights of  $1/\gamma$

# Comments

**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon$ .

- Width of the network is **exponential in dimension** (curse of dimension)
- Needs large weights of  $1/\gamma$
- Approximation only on average, not point-wise

# Comments

**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon$ .

- Width of the network is **exponential in dimension** (curse of dimension)
- Needs large weights of  $1/\gamma$
- Approximation only on average, not point-wise
- Does not adapt to flat regions



# Comments

**Theorem:** Let  $g$  be an arbitrary  $L$ -Lipschitz function and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists a 3-layer ReLU network  $f$  with  $\Omega([L/\epsilon]^d)$  units such that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} |f(x) - g(x)| dx \leq 2\epsilon$ .

- Width of the network is **exponential in dimension** (curse of dimension)
- Needs large weights of  $1/\gamma$
- Approximation only on average, not point-wise
- Does not adapt to flat regions
- **If you can approximate bumps, you can approximate continuous functions**

# Improvements: 2 layers, point-wise

**Theorem:** Universal approximation with 2 layers (*Hornik, Stinchcombe, White 1989, Leshno et al 1993*)

Suppose we use a continuous activation function that is not a polynomial.

Then for any continuous function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $\epsilon$ , there exists a 2-layer network  $f$  with bias terms such that  $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0,1]^d$

# Improvements: 2 layers, point-wise

**Theorem:** Universal approximation with 2 layers (*Hornik, Stinchcombe, White 1989, Leshno et al 1993*)

Suppose we use a continuous activation function that is not a polynomial.

Then for any continuous function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $\epsilon$ , there exists a 2-layer network  $f$  with bias terms such that  $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0,1]^d$

- uses a “heavy” tool (Stone-Weierstrass theorem), bumps as products

# Improvements: 2 layers, point-wise

**Theorem:** Universal approximation with 2 layers (*Hornik, Stinchcombe, White 1989, Leshno et al 1993*)

Suppose we use a continuous activation function that is not a polynomial. Then for any continuous function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $\epsilon$ , there exists a 2-layer network  $f$  with bias terms such that  $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0,1]^d$

- uses a “heavy” tool (Stone-Weierstrass theorem), bumps as products
- still exponential in dimension

# Improvements: 2 layers, point-wise

**Theorem:** Universal approximation with 2 layers (*Hornik, Stinchcombe, White 1989, Leshno et al 1993*)

Suppose we use a continuous activation function that is not a polynomial.

Then for any continuous function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $\epsilon$ , there exists a 2-layer network  $f$  with bias terms such that  $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0,1]^d$

- uses a “heavy” tool (Stone-Weierstrass theorem), bumps as products
- still exponential in dimension
- other proofs: *Cybenko 1989, Funahashi 1989, Barron 1993*

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons
- Construction: use Fourier representation as approximation



# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons
- Construction: use Fourier representation as approximation
  - "Basis functions" are cos functions

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons
- Construction: use Fourier representation as approximation
  - "Basis functions" are cos functions
  - Approximate with finitely many

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons
- Construction: use Fourier representation as approximation
  - "Basis functions" are cos functions
  - Approximate with finitely many
  - Approximate cos with other activation functions

# Improvements: Barron's theorem

- Statement: smooth functions can be approximated with fewer neurons
- Construction: use Fourier representation as approximation
  - "Basis functions" are cos functions
  - Approximate with finitely many
  - Approximate cos with other activation functions

**Theorem (Barron):** For  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a 2-layer neural network with

$k$  hidden units such that  $\int_0^1 |f(x) - g(x)|^2 dx \leq 4C_f/k$  where

$$C_f = \|\widehat{\nabla f}\|_1^2 = \left( \int \|w\| |\hat{f}(w)| dw \right)^2$$

*square integral of the  
Fourier transform of the  
gradient of  $f$*

# 3. What functions can neural networks express?

- Approximation theory (and why we care)
- Constructive proof with 3-layer ReLU networks
- Improvements (Stone-Weierstrass, Barron's theorem)
- Width and depth

# Deeper networks?

- 2-layer networks can approximate “all” functions. Why make it deeper?

# Deeper networks?

- 2-layer networks can approximate “all” functions. Why make it deeper?
- Works better in practice


# Deeper networks?

- 2-layer networks can approximate “all” functions. Why make it deeper?
- Works better in practice
- In theory, some functions can be approximated much more efficiently with deeper networks



# Depth vs width


$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$




# Depth vs width

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$


**Main question:** Is it better to add width or to add depth?



# Depth vs width




# Depth vs width




ReLU-nets are piecewise linear. The more neurons they have, the more separate pieces they can have, and the more “wiggly” functions they can fit.

# Depth vs width



ReLU-nets are piecewise linear. The more neurons they have, the more separate pieces they can have, and the more “wiggly” functions they can fit.


# Depth vs width



ReLU-nets are piecewise linear. The more neurons they have, the more separate pieces they can have, and the more “wiggly” functions they can fit.

The number of linear pieces increases:

# Depth vs width




ReLU-nets are piecewise linear. The more neurons they have, the more separate pieces they can have, and the more “wiggly” functions they can fit.

The number of linear pieces increases:

- linearly with width

# Depth vs width




ReLU-nets are piecewise linear. The more neurons they have, the more separate pieces they can have, and the more “wiggly” functions they can fit.

The number of linear pieces increases:

- linearly with width
- exponentially with depth






# Effect of a ReLU



ReLU can potentially split each linear piece.

If the input has  $N$  such pieces, the output can have up to  $2N$ .


*Each additional layer in depth can double the number of linear pieces.*




$x$  ———  
 $\text{ReLU}(x)$  ———

# Depth vs width


Let's compare adding **one neuron** in depth, or **one neuron** in width.





VS





# Adding one neuron in depth (one more layer)



# Adding one neuron in depth (one more layer)





# Adding one neuron in depth (one more layer)



Let  $\kappa(x)$  be the number of linear pieces in  $x$ .



# Adding one neuron in depth (one more layer)



Let  $\kappa(x)$  be the number of linear pieces in  $x$ .

$$\kappa(\text{relu}(f(x))) \leq 2\kappa(f(x))$$

# Adding one neuron in depth (one more layer)





Let  $\kappa(x)$  be the number of linear pieces in  $x$ .

$$\kappa(\text{relu}(f(x))) \leq 2\kappa(f(x))$$



Max number of linear pieces is  
exponential in depth

# Adding one neuron in width







# Adding one neuron in width



$$\kappa(\tilde{f}(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \kappa(z_i)$$


# Adding one neuron in width




$$\kappa(\tilde{f}(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \kappa(z_i)$$

$$\kappa(\tilde{f}(x)) \leq \underbrace{(n+1)}_{\text{width}} K \quad K = \max_i \kappa(z_i)$$

# Adding one neuron in width



Max number of linear pieces is  
linear in width




$$\kappa(\tilde{f}(x)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \kappa(z_i)$$

$$\kappa(\tilde{f}(x)) \leq \underbrace{(n+1)}_{\text{width}} K \quad K = \max_i \kappa(z_i)$$

# Depth vs width: summary


Number of linear pieces increases up to exponentially in depth, but only up to linearly in width:

$$\kappa(f(x)) \leq (2n)^L$$


For full derivation, see: <https://fleuret.org/dlc/materials/dlc-handout-6-1-benefits-of-depth.pdf>

# Depth vs width: summary

Number of linear pieces increases up to exponentially in depth, but only up to linearly in width:

$$\kappa(f(x)) \leq (2n)^L$$


For full derivation, see: <https://fleuret.org/dlc/materials/dlc-handout-6-1-benefits-of-depth.pdf>

What are the implications for approximating wiggly functions?


# Depth separation: sawtooth function

**Theorem** (*Telgarsky 2015,2016*): For any  $L > 1$  there exists a function  $g(x)$  such that  $g(x)$  can be expressed by a (deep) ReLU network with  $3L^2 + 6$  units and  $2L^2 + 4$  layers, but any (shallow) ReLU network with  $L$  layers and  $\leq 2^L$  nodes cannot approximate it to error  $\|f - g\|_1 < 1/32$ .

*Note: You can approximate it with a 2-layer network, but need exponentially more units*


# Depth separation: sawtooth function

$$g(x) = \text{relu}(2\text{relu}(x) - 4\text{relu}(x - \frac{1}{2}))$$



# Depth separation: sawtooth function


$$g(g(x))$$






# Depth separation: sawtooth function

$$g(g(g(x)))$$



# Depth separation: sawtooth function

Proof of Theorem 5.1 ((Telgarsky 2015, 2016)).




# Depth separation: more examples

- Indicator of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  can be approximated to accuracy  $\epsilon$  using a 3-layer ReLU net with  $O(d/\epsilon)$  neurons. But it cannot be approximated to an accuracy higher than  $O(1/d^4)$  using a 2-layer network, unless its width is exponential in  $d$ .

$$g(x) = \mathbf{1}[\|x\| \leq 1]$$

# Unit ball experiment



# Depth separation: more examples

- Indicator of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  can be approximated to accuracy  $\epsilon$  using a 3-layer ReLU net with  $O(d^2/\epsilon)$  neurons. But it cannot be approximated to an accuracy higher than  $O(1/d^4)$  using a 2-layer network, unless its width is exponential in  $d$ .
- Several nonlinear and twice-differentiable functions (including  $x \mapsto x^2$ ) can be approximated to accuracy  $\epsilon$  using ReLU networks of depth and width  $O(\text{poly}(\log(1/\epsilon)))$ , but cannot be approximated to similar accuracy by constant-depth ReLU networks, unless their width is at least  $\Omega(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ .

# Can more depth solve everything?

B. Hanin and M. Sellke. *Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width*. 2017

Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. *The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width*. 2017

# Can more depth solve everything?

- What if we have an infinitely deep net. What's the smallest width we need?

B. Hanin and M. Sellke. *Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width*. 2017

Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. *The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width*. 2017

# Can more depth solve everything?

- What if we have an infinitely deep net. What's the smallest width we need?
- for input dimension  $d$ , width  $d$  is not enough (*Lu et al 2017*)


B. Hanin and M. Sellke. *Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width*. 2017

Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. *The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width*. 2017



# Can more depth solve everything?

- What if we have an infinitely deep net. What's the smallest width we need?
- for input dimension  $d$ , width  $d$  is not enough (*Lu et al 2017*)




*Illustration: H. Lin & S. Jegelka, 2018*

B. Hanin and M. Sellke. *Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width*. 2017

Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. *The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width*. 2017

# Can more depth solve everything?

- What if we have an infinitely deep net. What's the smallest width we need?
- for input dimension  $d$ , width  $d$  is not enough (*Lu et al 2017*)



*Illustration: H. Lin & S. Jegelka, 2018*

- $d+1$  units in a layer is enough (*Hanin & Sellke 2017*).

B. Hanin and M. Sellke. *Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width*. 2017


Z. Lu, H. Pu, F. Wang, Z. Hu, and L. Wang. *The expressive power of neural networks: A view from the width*. 2017

# Depth vs width in practice

*Ongoing science!*

# Depth vs width in practice

*Ongoing science!*




[Kaplan\*, McCandlish\*, et al. 2020]



# Depth vs width in practice

**Main question:** Is it better to add width or to add depth?

*Ongoing science!*




[Kaplan\*, McCandlish\*, et al. 2020]


# Depth vs width in practice

**Main question:** Is it better to add width or to add depth?

*Ongoing science!*



[Kaplan\*, McCandlish\*, et al. 2020]




[Henighhan\*, Kaplan\*, Katz\*, et al., 2020]


# Depth vs width in practice

**Main question:** Is it better to add width or to add depth?

Ongoing science!



[Kaplan\*, McCandlish\*, et al. 2020]





[Henighan\*, Kaplan\*, Katz\*, et al., 2020]

**Answer:** there is an optimal "aspect ratio" (width/depth), which varies for different problems. But large range of aspect ratios are acceptable. Depth and width should be roughly similar: if you scale one, scale the other too.



Preview: better architectures can approximate important function classes more efficiently.

- **ResNet: 1-unit** width is enough (*Lin & Jegelka 2018*)





# Preview: better architectures can approximate important function classes more efficiently.

Goal: Fit this image  
(a function  $x,y \rightarrow I$ )


ReLU-net

TanH-net

ReLU P.E.

RBF ReLU

SIREN



(Note: this result may be due to improved approximation ability but it might also be due to improved optimization ability; these two effects are typically coupled in experiments)

[Sitzmann\*, Martel\*, Bergman, Lindell, Wetzstein, NeurIPS 2020]

# Preview: better architectures can approximate important function classes more efficiently.

Goal: Fit this image  
(a function  $x, y \rightarrow I$ )


ReLU-net

TanH-net

ReLU P.E.

RBF ReLU

SIREN



(Note: this result may be due to improved approximation ability but it might also be due to improved optimization ability; these two effects are typically coupled in experiments)

[Sitzmann\*, Martel\*, Bergman, Lindell, Wetzstein, NeurIPS 2020]

Preview: better architectures *are not necessarily universal*

- Being universal has a cost: we can fit any kind of data, including noise

# Preview: better architectures *are not necessarily universal*

- Being universal has a cost: we can fit any kind of data, including noise
- Sometimes it is better to impose architectural constraints to prevent overfitting to noise, or to bake in structural knowledge we know a priori is true

# Preview: better architectures *are not necessarily universal*

- Being universal has a cost: we can fit any kind of data, including noise
- Sometimes it is better to impose architectural constraints to prevent overfitting to noise, or to bake in structural knowledge we know a priori is true
- This is what next week's lectures will be about

# Summary and comments

- Main idea: approximate a function by a sum of “basis” functions
- Tells us fundamental limitations, with practical implications
- In practice, can seemingly do with much smaller networks...
- Shallow networks cannot easily approximate deep networks (efficiency)
- Building blocks for understanding approximation with other architectures