
TOWARDS STRONG PRUNING FOR LOTTERY TICKETS WITH NON-ZERO BIASES

Jonas Fischer

Max Planck Institute for Informatics
Saarbrücken, Germany
fischer@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Rebekka Burkholz

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
Saarbrücken, Germany
burkholz@cispa.de

ABSTRACT

The strong lottery ticket hypothesis holds the promise that pruning randomly initialized deep neural networks could offer a computationally efficient alternative to deep learning with stochastic gradient descent. Common parameter initialization schemes and existence proofs, however, are focused on networks with zero biases, thus foregoing the potential universal approximation property of pruning. To fill this gap, we extend multiple initialization schemes and existence proofs to non-zero biases, including explicit 'looks-linear' approaches for ReLU activation functions. These do not only enable truly orthogonal parameter initialization but also reduce potential pruning errors. In experiments on standard benchmark data sets, we further highlight the practical benefits of non-zero bias initialization schemes, and present theoretically inspired extensions for state-of-the-art strong lottery ticket pruning.

1 INTRODUCTION

Challenging tasks across different domains, from protein structure prediction for drug development to detection in complex scenes for self driving cars, have recently been solved through deep neural networks (NNs). This success, however, is due to heavy overparameterization and comes at the expense of large amounts of computational resources that these models require to be trained and to be deployed. While training small NNs from scratch commonly fails, the lottery ticket hypothesis (LTH) conjectured by Frankle & Carbin (2019) bears a potential solution. The LTH states that within a large, randomly initialized NN there exist a well trainable, much smaller subnetwork, or 'ticket', which can be identified by pruning the large NN. Thus, both training and deployment becomes computationally much cheaper at the expense of the pruning algorithm. Even more promising is the conjecture of existence of 'strong tickets' by Ramanujan et al. (2020), which are subnetworks of randomly initialized NNs that do *not* require any further training. As such, expensive training is obsolete, and the existence of these tickets was later proven for networks without biases (Malach et al., 2020; Pensia et al., 2020; Orseau et al., 2020).

However, most successfully trained NN architectures have non-zero biases. Such bias terms are important to equip NNs with the universal approximation property (in the standard way).

To enable training by pruning, we therefore generalize common initialization schemes to non-zero biases and prove the strong lottery ticket hypothesis in this setting.

For the discovery of strong lottery tickets, Ramanujan et al. (2020) proposed `edge-popup`, the so far only algorithm capable of retrieving strong lottery tickets. Their proposal is not suited to recover bias parameters and finds only relatively dense tickets. We here extend their approach in multiple ways to recover strong tickets that include bias parameters and are much sparser than the ones obtained by vanilla `edge-popup`. In particular, we extend the popup scores to bias terms, and slowly anneal the sparsity of the network to the desired target sparsity. Moreover, from the LTH proof we conclude that it is necessary to (re)scale the initial parameters of a strong lottery ticket, for which we propose an efficient optimization to find such a good rescaling factor in each epoch.

In a synthetic data study, we show that strong lottery tickets found on NNs with non-zero bias initialization outperform tickets found in zero-initialized bias networks. Furthermore, we show that on this data, `edge-popup` with rescaling finds much sparser tickets of higher quality.

Contributions

- We generalize the strong lottery ticket hypothesis to networks with potentially non-zero initial biases, which enables pruning alone to achieve the universal approximation property.
- We extend standard initialization schemes to non-zero biases and prove the existence of strong lottery tickets in this setting.
- We enable pruning algorithms for strong lottery tickets, in particular `edge-popup`, to find tickets with biases, which are hence capable of universal approximation.
- We extend `edge-popup` further by an annealing schedule for the target sparsity and an appropriate parameter rescaling inspired by our theoretical results, which allow to recover much sparser tickets.

1.1 RELATED WORK

The lottery ticket hypothesis (Frankle & Carbin, 2019) has spurred the development of neural network pruning algorithms that either prune before (Wang et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2019; Tanaka et al., 2020; Verdenius et al., 2020), during (Frankle & Carbin, 2019; Srinivas & Babu, 2016; You et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020), or after training (Savarese et al., 2020; LeCun et al., 1990; Hassibi & Stork, 1992; Dong et al., 2017; Li et al., 2017; Molchanov et al., 2017). Their main objective is to identify a subnetwork of a randomly initialized neural network that can be trained to achieve a similar performance as the trained full network. Zhou et al. (2019) and Ramanujan et al. (2020) postulated an even stronger hypothesis, as they realized that the randomly initialized neural network contains so called ‘strong’ lottery tickets that do not require further training after pruning. Malach et al. (2020); Pensia et al. (2020); Orseau et al. (2020) proved their existence by deriving realistic lower bounds on the width of the original randomly initialized neural network that contains a lottery ticket with a given probability.

However, the proposed pruning algorithm for strong lottery tickets, i.e. `edge-popup` (Ramanujan et al., 2020), as well as the existence proofs only handle neural network architectures with zero biases. A reason might be that very large neural networks can compensate for missing biases in the studied application, i.e. image classification, and state-of-the-art algorithms and proofs for strong lottery tickets do not cover highly sparse tickets. Another reason might be that most neural network initialization schemes propose zero biases. Exceptions include a data dependent choice of biases (Yang et al., 2019) and a random scheme that does not try to prevent exploding or vanishing gradients in deep neural networks (Hanin & Rolnick, 2019). The recent trend in the search for weak lottery tickets towards rewinding parameters to values obtained early during training (Frankle et al., 2020) also results in lottery ticket initialization with non-zero biases.

None of these non-zero bias initialization schemes are designed in support of the existence of strong lottery tickets. We fill this gap with this work.

1.2 NOTATION

Let $f(x)$ denote a bounded function, without loss of generality $f : [-1, 1]^{n_0} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{n_L}$, that is parameterized as a deep neural network with architecture $\bar{n} = [n_0, n_1, \dots, n_L]$, i.e., depth L and widths n_l for layers $l = 0, \dots, L$ with ReLU activation function $\phi(x) := \max(x, 0)$. It maps an input vector $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ to neurons $x_i^{(l)}$ as:

$$\mathbf{x}^{(l)} = \phi(\mathbf{h}^{(l)}), \quad \mathbf{h}^{(l)} = \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)} + \mathbf{b}^{(l)}, \quad \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1} \times n_l}, \quad \mathbf{b}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l},$$

where $\mathbf{h}^{(l)}$ is the pre-activation, $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ is the weight matrix, and $\mathbf{b}^{(l)}$ is the bias vector of layer l . For convenience, the parameters of the network are subsumed in a vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} := ((\mathbf{W}^{(l)}, \mathbf{b}^{(l)}))_{l=1}^L$. We also write $f(x | \boldsymbol{\theta})$ to emphasize the dependence of f on its parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

The supremum norm of any function g is defined with respect to the same domain $\|g\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in [-1, 1]^{n_0}} \|g\|_2$.

Assume furthermore that a ticket f_ϵ can be obtained by pruning a large mother network f , which we indicate by writing $f_\epsilon \subset f_0$. The sparsity level ρ of f_ϵ is then defined as the fraction of non-zero weights that remain after pruning, i.e., $\rho = \left(\sum_l \|\mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)}\|_0 \right) / \left(\sum_l \|\mathbf{W}_0^{(l)}\|_0 \right)$, where $\|\cdot\|_0$ denotes the l_0 -norm, which counts the number of non-zero elements in a vector or matrix. Another important quantity that influences the existence probability of lottery tickets is the in-degree of a node i in layer l of the target f , which we define as the number of non-zero connections of a neuron to the previous layer plus 1 if the bias is non-zero, i.e., $k_i^{(l)} := \|\mathbf{W}_{i,:}^{(l)}\|_0 + \|b_i^{(l)}\|_0$, where $\mathbf{W}_{i,:}^{(l)}$ is the i -th row of $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$. The maximum degree of all neurons in layer l is denoted as $k_{l,\max}$. In the formulation of theorems, we make use of the universal constant C that can attain different values.

2 MOTIVATION: NEURAL NETWORKS WITH ZERO BIASES ARE NOT UNIVERSAL FUNCTION APPROXIMATORS

Why do we need to initialize non-zero biases? With potentially non-zero biases, neural networks have the universal approximation property (Scarselli & Tsoi, 1998). Thus, for a given $\epsilon > 0$ and arbitrary continuous function g , if it is large enough, a neural network can approximate g up to error ϵ . Standard neural networks and also weak lottery tickets are able to learn non-zero biases even from zero initialization. If we rely on pruning alone to learn a model with high performance, however, non-zero biases need to be available from the start, as the following Lemma clarifies.

Lemma 1. *Neural networks with ReLU activation function without biases are not universal function approximators.*

Proof. We can prove this statement easily with a counterexample. Let us try to approximate the constant function $g(x) = 0.5$ on the domain $[-1, 1]$ with a neural network without biases. Note that an univariate ReLU network without biases represents a function $f(x) = w_+ \phi(x) + w_- \phi(-x)$ with two parameters $w_+, w_- \in \mathbb{R}$. The minimum mean squared error with respect to $g(x)$ that f can achieve is $\int_{-1}^1 (g(x) - f(x))^2 dx = 1/16$ for $w_+ = 3/4$ and $w_- = 3/4$. Thus for any $\epsilon < 1/16$, $f(x)$ fails to approximate $g(x)$ up to error ϵ . \square

Note that a neural ReLU network with non-zero biases can represent the function $g(x) = 0.5$ perfectly. For instance, a network of depth $L = 1$ with one neuron in the intermediary layer is sufficient, as $0.5 = \phi(0.5)$.

3 INITIALIZATION OF NON-ZERO BIASES

Common initialization schemes (e.g. He et al. (2015); Glorot & Bengio (2010); Burkholz & Dubatovka (2019)) set all biases to zero, while network weights are drawn randomly to obtain parameter diversity. Proofs of the strong lottery ticket hypothesis have focused on this setting, thereby foregoing the universal approximation property of deep neural networks (Scarselli & Tsoi, 1998), since pruning alone can only recover the zero-initialized biases.

The only option to circumvent this issue would be to concatenate the input with a constant and create an extra neuron in each layer that can equip the neurons in the next layer with a non-zero bias. This construction, however, is not well trainable with SGD and would create neurons with high degrees that are more difficult to find in randomly initialized neural networks. Instead, we propose a more natural approach that is amenable to training with SGD, that is, the initialization of non-zero biases, which become subject to pruning in addition to the network weights.

How should these biases be initialized? A good approach has to fulfill two essential criteria. a) The randomly initialized neural network needs to be trainable by SGD. This property is also critical for most pruning algorithms, as they are inspired by SGD and define pruning scores based on gradients. b) The randomly initialized neural network should contain lottery tickets with high probability.

Before we can answer how to initialize biases, we first have to face a different issue pertaining strong lottery tickets. Standard initialization approaches, like He (He et al., 2015) or Glorot (Glorot & Bengio, 2010) initialization, achieve trainability by ensuring that the output of a deep

neural network is contained within a reasonable range, thus rendering the computations of gradients numerically feasible. Network weights are commonly initialized according to a distribution with variance σ^2 that is inverse proportional to the number of neurons n in a layer, $\sigma^2 \propto 1/n$. In consequence, after pruning a high percentage of these weights, the network output is heavily down-scaled, which needs to be compensated by up-scaling the output, as also discovered experimentally by Ramanujan et al. (2020) and mentioned by Malach et al. (2020).

3.1 OUTPUT SCALING

For ReLU networks with zero biases, the appropriate output scaling after or during pruning is straight forward to compute, as networks of depth L are L -homogeneous in the network parameters. Multiplying each parameter with the same scalar σ leads to a scaling factor of σ^L : $f(x | \sigma\theta) = \sigma^L f(x | \theta)$. This holds no longer true for non-zero biases.

The following observation helps us to develop a notion that is similar to homogeneity for networks with non-zero biases.

Lemma 2. *Let $h(\theta_0, \sigma)$ denote a transformation of the parameters θ_0 of the deep neural network f_0 , where each weight is multiplied by a scalar σ_l , i.e., $h_{ij}^{(l)}(w_{0,ij}^{(l)}) = \sigma_l w_{0,ij}^{(l)}$, and each bias is transformed to $h_i^{(l)}(b_{0,i}^{(l)}) = \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_m b_{0,i}^{(l)}$. Then, we have $f(x | h(\theta_0, \sigma)) = \prod_{l=1}^L \sigma_l f(x | \theta_0)$.*

Lemma 2 suggests that if we scale each weight by a factor $\sigma_{w,l}$, scaling the corresponding biases by a factor $\sigma_{b,l} = \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_{w,m}$ would result in the same network f without scaling of parameters. We only have to correct the output by dividing it with a factor $\prod_{l=1}^L \sigma_{w,l}$. From this observation, we directly derive our initialization proposal, as it suggests an equivalence (irrespective of scaling) between initialising parameters in $\theta_i \in U[0, 1]$ and our more realistic setting. Concretely, we propose to replace $b_i^{(l)} = 0$ by $b_i^{(l)} \sim U([- \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}, \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}])$ or $b_i^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_{w,m})$, respectively, when the weights are $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim U([- \sigma_{w,l}, \sigma_{w,l}])$ or $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w,l})$.

As a general remark, note that the scaling factor of the output $\prod_{m=1}^L \sigma_{w,m}$ quickly approaches zero for increasing depth, which could render one-shot pruning numerically infeasible. For that reason, we propose a computationally cheap rescaling procedure that allows us to find significantly sparser strong lottery tickets. This is also helpful for maintaining the trainability of the pruned network (Hayou et al., 2021), which we discuss next in the context of initializations with non-zero biases.

3.2 TRAINABILITY

The question remains whether the large original network is still trainable with such an initialization. A common criterion to prevent initial vanishing or exploding gradients, in particular in mean field analyses Schoenholz et al. (2017), is to ensure that the squared signal norm of the input can propagate through the initial network. To bound the second moment of the squared output, we generalize Cor. 3 for normal distributions in Burkholz & Dubatovka (2019) to symmetric weight and bias distributions.

Lemma 3. *Assume that the weights and biases of a fully-connected deep neural network f are drawn independently from distributions that are symmetric around the origin 0 with variances $\sigma_{w,l}^2$ or $\sigma_{b,l}^2$, respectively. Then, for every input \mathbf{x}_0 , the second moment of the output is*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2 \right) = \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)}\|_2^2 \prod_{l=1}^L \frac{n_l \sigma_{w,l}^2}{2} + \sigma_{b,L}^2 \frac{n_L}{2} + \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \sigma_{b,l}^2 \frac{n_l}{2} \prod_{k=l+1}^L \frac{n_k \sigma_{w,k}^2}{2}.$$

For $\sigma_{w,l}^2 \approx 2/n_l$ (as usually realized by He initialization He et al. (2015)) and our choice $\sigma_{b,l} = \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_{w,m}$, this implies that $\mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2 \right) \approx \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)}\|_2^2 + 1$, which prevents initial signal and gradient explosions even for high depth L .

‘Looks linear’ and orthogonal initialization The above lemma assumes that the weights and biases are drawn independently at random. This does not hold for orthogonal weight initialization, whose benefits have been highlighted in numerous works in general (Pennington et al., 2017;

2018; Saxe et al., 2014) and in particular for lottery ticket pruning (Lee et al., 2020). The marginal distribution of each weight entry is still normally distributed as $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/n_l)$ so that our lottery ticket existence proof still applies approximately to this setting. However, the main advantage of orthogonal weight initialization for trainability is usually induced by (approximate) dynamical isometry. For ReLU activation functions, this is not achievable simply by initializing the whole matrix $W^{(l)}$ as orthogonal Pennington et al. (2017; 2018); Burkholz & Dubatovka (2019). The solution is in fact based on the same insight that enables all current lottery ticket existence proofs for ReLUs, i.e., that the identity can be represented by $x = \phi(x) - \phi(-x)$.

As dynamical isometry can be achieved by a Jacobian that is similar to the identity, Burkholz & Dubatovka (2019); Balduzzi et al. (2017) could ensure perfect dynamical isometry for ReLUs by a ‘looks linear’ initialization of the weight matrix and zero biases so that the full signal is always preserved at initialization. Effectively, each neural network layer computes $\tilde{x}^{(l)} = \phi\left(W_0^{(l)}\tilde{x}^{(l-1)}\right) - \phi\left(-W_0^{(l)}\tilde{x}^{(l-1)}\right)$, where the matrix $W_0^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l/2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1}/2}$ is orthogonal. Extending this idea by non-zero biases corresponds, effectively, to $\tilde{x}^{(l)} = \phi\left(W_0^{(l)}\tilde{x}^{(l-1)} + b_l\right) - \phi\left(-W_0^{(l)}\tilde{x}^{(l-1)} - b_l\right)$, where the matrix $W_0^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l/2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1}/2}$. Concretely, we define

$$W^{(l)} = \begin{bmatrix} W_0^{(l)} & -W_0^{(l)} \\ -W_0^{(l)} & W_0^{(l)} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$b^{(l)} = \begin{bmatrix} b_0^{(l)} & -b_0^{(l)} \end{bmatrix}$$

for orthogonal, non-zero bias initialization with $b_0^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_{b,l}^2 I\right)$ independently from the weights. Note that each entry of the weight matrix is again distributed as $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2/n_l)$ as in case of He initialization.

How should we choose the variance $\sigma_{b,l}^2$ of the biases? Similarly to Lemma 3, we can derive the variance of the output signal as

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) = \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)}\|_2^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \sigma_{b,l}^2 \frac{n_l}{2}.$$

Initially, the additional $\sum_{l=1}^L \sigma_{b,l}^2 \frac{n_l}{2}$ is easier to control than in Lemma 3, exactly because the weights do not scale the biases randomly. Note that we could improve this further and initialize the bias also dependent on the weights and make them cancel out to achieve again perfect dynamical isometry at initialization and $\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) = \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)}\|_2^2$. However, this would depend on a carefully chosen dependence between weights and biases that gets destroyed during training and/or pruning. For that reason, we still assume a situation similar to Lemma 3 and initialize $\sigma_{b,l} = \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_{w,m}$. This case is also supported (at least approximately) by our lottery ticket existence proof and respects the scaling of parameters as outlined in Lemma 2.

With the trainability of randomly initialized networks, we have fulfilled the first criterion of a good initialization proposal for non-zero biases. The second criterion, the existence of lottery tickets, is discussed in the next section.

4 EXISTENCE OF LOTTERY TICKETS WITH NON-ZERO BIASES

Proofs of the existence of lottery tickets have derived sufficient conditions under which pruning algorithms should have a good chance to find a winning ticket. This approach can therefore also inform the design of promising planting experiments.

The first proof of the strong lottery ticket hypothesis (Malach et al., 2020) has shown that a weight-bounded deep neural target network of depth L and width n with ReLU activation functions is contained up to error ϵ with high probability in a larger deep neural network of double the depth of the target network, i.e., $2L$. Their strong requirement on the width of the large network to be

of polynomial order $O(n^5 L^2/\epsilon^2)$ or, under additional sparsity assumptions, $O(n^2 L^2/\epsilon^2)$, was subsequently improved to a logarithmic dependency of the form $O(n^2 \log(nL)/\epsilon)$ for weights that follow an unusual hyperbolic distribution (Pensia et al., 2020) and $O(n \log(nL/\epsilon))$ for uniformly distributed weights (Orseau et al., 2020). The resulting winning tickets, however, have a less sparse representation than the target network, which allows them to gain flexibility in their representation. In fact, the improvement is achieved by the insight that many different parametrizations exist that can compute almost the same function as the target network. They all have in common that two neural network layers are needed to approximate a neuron $\phi(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x})$, which explains the $2L$ depth requirement.

So far, all of these works assume that the target network has zero biases. This limits significantly the class of functions that we can hope to learn by pruning alone and does therefore not apply to the general setting, in which we want to plant lottery tickets.

To extend the existence proofs, the first question that we have to answer is: How does the error propagate through a network with non-zero biases? Similarly to Lemma 1 in (Pensia et al., 2020), we can deduce from the answer how close each parameter θ_ϵ needs to be to the target one in order to guarantee an ϵ approximation of the entire network.

Lemma 4 (Approximation propagation). *Assume $\epsilon > 0$ and let the target network f and its approximation f_ϵ have the same architecture. If every parameter θ of f and corresponding θ_ϵ of f_ϵ in layer l fulfils $|\theta_\epsilon - \theta| \leq \epsilon_l$ for*

$$\epsilon_l := \epsilon \left(L \sqrt{n_l k_{l,\max}} \left(1 + \sup_{x \in [-1,1]^{n_0}} \|\mathbf{x}^{(l)}\|_1 \right) \prod_{k=l+1}^L \left(\|\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\|_\infty + \epsilon/L \right) \right)^{-1},$$

then it follows that $\|f - f_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$.

The proof is provided in the supplement. Note that large weights in every layer could imply that ϵ_l is exponential in L . However, if we assume bounded weights so that $\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|_\infty \leq 1$, we receive a moderate scaling of $\epsilon_l = C\epsilon/L$, where C depends on the maximum degree of the neurons $k_{l,\max} \leq n_{l-1} + 1$ and the size of the biases via $\sup_{x \in [-1,1]^{n_0}} \|\mathbf{x}^{(l)}\|_1$. As we expect each output component of the target network f to be in $[0, 1]$, reasonable choices of biases lead usually to $\sup_{x \in [-1,1]^{n_0}} \|\mathbf{x}^{(l)}\|_1 \leq n_{l-1}$ and thus $\epsilon_l = \epsilon/(L(n_l + 1)(n_{l-1} + 1)e)$. Otherwise, we could rescale all parameters and thus the output to ensure desirable scaling. However, this would come at the expense that we would also have to adapt the allowed error ϵ accordingly.

Next, we extend the proof of the existence of lottery tickets in (Orseau et al., 2020) to non-zero biases. In addition, we generalize it to domains $[-1, 1]^{n_0}$ (instead of balls with radius 1) and present sharper width estimates based on the in-degrees of neurons instead of the full target network width n_l . The big advantage of our initialization scheme is that we can directly transfer an approach that would assume uniformly distributed parameters in $\theta_i \sim U([-1, 1])$.

Theorem 5 (Existence of lottery ticket). *Assume that $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and a target network f with depth L and architecture \bar{n} are given. Each weight and bias of a larger deep neural network f_0 with depth $2L$ and architecture \bar{n}_0 is initialized independently, uniformly at random according to $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim U([- \sigma_{w,l}, \sigma_{w,l}])$ and $b_i^{(l)} \sim U([- \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}, \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}])$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, f_0 contains an approximation $f_\epsilon \subset f_0$ so that $\|f - \lambda f_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ if for $l = 1, \dots, L$*

$$n_{2l-1,0} = C n_{l-1} \log \left(\frac{k_{l-1,\max} n_l}{\min \{ \epsilon_l, \delta/L \}} \right) \text{ and } n_{2l,0} = n_l,$$

where ϵ_l is defined in Eq. (B.3) and the output is scaled by $\lambda = \prod_{l=1}^{2L} \sigma_{w,l}^{-1}$.

A similar statement holds also for normal distributions, i.e., $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w,l}^2)$ and $b_i^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}^2)$. Note that, essentially, we receive the same scaling as in case of zero biases. Only the maximum degree $k_{l-1,\max}$ is modified by $+1$. The reason is that we can treat each bias as an additional weight in the construction of a ticket. We provide the full proof in the appendix and restrict ourselves in the following to the description of the main idea.

Proof Idea. Layer $2l - 1$ and $2l$ of the large network serve the representation of the neurons in Layer l of the target network, e.g. neuron $\phi\left(\sum_j w_j x_j^{(l-1)} + b\right)$. By using the identity $x = \phi(x) - \phi(-x)$ for ReLUs, we can express the preactivation also as $\sum_j \phi\left(w_j x_j^{(l-1)}\right) - \phi\left(-w_j x_j^{(l-1)}\right) + \text{sign}(b)\phi(|b|)$. Note that the neurons $\phi\left(w_j x_j^{(l-1)}\right)$, $\phi\left(-w_j x_j^{(l-1)}\right)$, and $\phi(|b|)$ all have degree 1 so that they exist with high probability in the wide Layer $2l - 1$. The width needs to be only of order $\log(1/\epsilon)$ according to results by Luecker (Luecker, 1998) on the subset sum problem, which can be applied to finding lottery tickets (Orseau et al., 2020). Accordingly, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for each parameter θ (i.e., w_j , $-w_j$, or $|b|$) exists a subset S of n uniformly distributed parameters $X_i \sim U([-1, 1])$ so that $|\theta - \sum_{i \in S} X_i| < \epsilon_l$ for $n \geq C \log 1/\min\{\epsilon_l, \delta\}$. Repeating this argument in combination with union bounds over k_i parameters per neuron, all neurons in a layer, and all layers, leads to the desired results.

5 PARAMETER RESCALING DURING PRUNING

According to Sec. 3.1 and our existence proof, we expect that the output of a pruned network usually does not match the right target range. The lottery ticket f_ϵ needs to be rescaled by a scaling factor $\lambda > 0$ (and usually $\lambda > 1$). In the existence proof, $\lambda = \prod_{m=1}^L \sigma_{w,m}$ but this factor can be vanishing small for very deep networks. Furthermore, in many applications we do not know the exact size of the network parameters and the output might also not be restricted to $[-1, 1]$. For these reasons, we propose to learn an appropriate output scaling factor $\lambda > 0$ that successively adapts the lottery ticket f_ϵ after each pruning epoch. For regression minimizing the mean squared error with respect to N data samples with targets $y_{i,s}$, this scalar can be easily computed as

$$\lambda_{\text{mse}} = \left(\sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} y_{i,s} x_{i,s}^{(L)} \right) / \left(\sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} x_{i,s}^{(L)} x_{i,s}^{(L)} \right).$$

In case of a different loss \mathcal{L} , we only have to solve a one-dimensional optimization problem of the form

$$\min_{\lambda > 0} \mathcal{L}(y, \lambda x^{(L)})$$

which can, for instance, be achieved with stochastic gradient descent. To distribute the scaling factor on the different layers, we use again the parameter transformation in Lemma 2

$$w_{ij}^{(l)} = w_{ij}^{(l)} \lambda^{1/L}, \quad b_i^{(l)} = b_i^{(l)} \lambda^{l/L},$$

which ensures that the overall output of the neural network is scaled by λ . As we show next, this parameter rescaling allows us to obtain much sparser lottery tickets than pure pruning.

6 EXPERIMENTS

We compare `edge-popup` with annealing of target sparsities against `edge-popup-scaled` for networks initialized with and without biases. On two synthetic benchmarks, which represent simple yet challenging tasks which are common in machine learning, we evaluate these methods for both He as well as ‘looks-linear’ orthogonal initialization with and without non-zero bias extensions. All experiments are carried out on commodity hardware. `Edge-popup` training was conducted in the default way suggested by the original authors by SGD with momentum of 0.9 and weight decay 0.0005, combined with cosine annealing of the learning rate starting from 0.1. We train for $e = 10$ epochs and $e_a = 5$ annealing epochs in case of the shifted ReLU example and $e_a = 20$ annealing epochs in case of the ellipse and sparsity levels 0.01, 0.05. In case of higher sparsity levels, $e_a = 10$ annealing epochs are sufficient. During annealing, we slowly reduce the sparsity over time by ρ^{i/e_a} , where ρ is the desired network sparsity, and i is the current epoch. We used a batch size of 32 in all experiments and report mean based on 5 repetitions.

6.1 A SHIFTED RELU

First, we consider data of a regression problem that follows a shifted ReLU function $\phi_b(x) = \max(0, x + b)$ with $b = 0.5$. We thus draw $N = 10^4$ iid samples $x_i \sim U[-1, 1]$ with targets




Figure 1: *Strong lottery ticket pruning with edge-popup*. Shown are the results for discovered tickets of different target sparsities, methods, and initialization schemes. Top: Shifted ReLU data, lower is better. Bottom: Ellipse data, higher is better.

$y_i = \phi(x_i + 0.5) + n_i$ with independent Gaussian noise $n_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.01^2)$. For a network of depth 5, where each layer is of width 100, we retrieve strong lottery tickets at target sparsities $\{0.002, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2\}$. We report the mean squared error (MSE) of the strong tickets on the test set as mean across 5 repetitions in Fig. 1 (top).

We observe that consistently, the non-zero bias initialized networks enable the recovery of strong tickets with orders of magnitude smaller errors than in networks with zero-initialized bias. Furthermore, `edge-popup-scaled` with proper rescaling of parameters consistently outperforms the vanilla (unscaled) algorithm for extreme sparsities. At lower sparsity levels, rescaled `edge-popup` allows to retrieve well performing tickets that match the low error of their denser counterparts, whereas vanilla `edge-popup` fails to find good tickets.

6.2 THE ONION SLICE

Next, we consider a classification problem, where points are arranged in elliptic rings, and each point is labeled by the ring it appears in. $N = 10^4$ inputs are again sampled iid from uniform distributions $x_1, x_2 \sim U[-1, 1]$ and one of four labels is assigned as target based on the value $y = 0.5(x_1 - 0.3)^2 + 1.2(x_2 + 0.5)^2$. Class boundaries are defined as $(0.2, 0.5, 0.7)$, while noise is introduced by flipping a label to a neighboring class with probability 0.01.

For networks of depth 5 and width 100, we retrieve strong lottery tickets at target sparsities $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5\}$. We report the accuracy of tickets on the test set as mean across 5 repetitions in Fig. 1 (bottom). Tickets pruned from networks initialized with non-zero biases outperform their zero-bias counterparts. An exception to this rule is given by the unscaled `edge-popup` for sparsity 0.01, where both initialization approaches (with non-zero and zero biases) show unsatisfactory performance. In contrast, the rescaled `edge-popup` with non-zero bias He initialization is still able to retrieve extremely sparse tickets with more than 10 accuracy points margin to all other approaches.

7 DISCUSSION

We have transferred the strong lottery ticket hypothesis to neural networks with potentially non-zero initial biases and proven the existence of strong lottery tickets under realistic conditions with respect to the network width and initialization scheme. This generalization equips training by pruning for strong lottery tickets with the universal approximation property.

Along with the proof, we have extended standard initialization schemes to non-zero biases and formally shown that our proposal defines well trainable neural networks, while they support the existence of strong lottery tickets. These initialization schemes include the 'looks-linear' approach (Burkholz & Dubatovka, 2019; Balduzzi et al., 2017) that ensures initial dynamical isometry of ReLU networks, which often leads to favorable training properties.

Based on our theoretical insights, we have derived a parameter rescaling strategy that enables pruning algorithms to find sparser strong lottery tickets. We have extended the `edge-popup` algorithm (Ramanujan et al., 2020) for strong lottery ticket pruning accordingly and demonstrated the utility of our innovations in experiments. With the development of pruning algorithms that can find highly sparse strong lottery tickets, we anticipate that the importance of non-zero bias initializations for lottery ticket pruning will become more apparent.

REFERENCES

- David Balduzzi, Marcus Frean, Lennox Leary, J. P. Lewis, Kurt Wan-Duo Ma, and Brian McWilliams. The shattered gradients problem: If resnets are the answer, then what is the question? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- Rebekka Burkholz and Alina Dubatovka. Initialization of ReLUs for dynamical isometry. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- Xin Dong, Shangyu Chen, and Sinno Jialin Pan. Learning to prune deep neural networks via layer-wise optimal brain surgeon. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.

-
- Jonathan Frankle and Michael Carbin. The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Jonathan Frankle, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Daniel Roy, and Michael Carbin. Linear mode connectivity and the lottery ticket hypothesis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 9, pp. 249–256, May 2010.
- Boris Hanin and David Rolnick. Deep relu networks have surprisingly few activation patterns. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Babak Hassibi and David G. Stork. Second order derivatives for network pruning: Optimal brain surgeon. In *International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1992.
- Soufiane Hayou, Jean-Francois Ton, Arnaud Doucet, and Yee Whye Teh. Robust pruning at initialization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 1026–1034, 2015.
- Yann LeCun, John S Denker, and Sara A Solla. Optimal brain damage. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 598–605, 1990.
- Namhoon Lee, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip H. S. Torr. Snip: single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Namhoon Lee, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, Stephen Gould, and Philip H. S. Torr. A signal propagation perspective for pruning neural networks at initialization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Hao Li, Asim Kadav, Igor Durdanovic, Hanan Samet, and Hans Peter Graf. Pruning filters for efficient convnets. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- George S. Lueker. Exponentially small bounds on the expected optimum of the partition and subset sum problems. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 12(1):51–62, 1998.
- Eran Malach, Gilad Yehudai, Shai Shalev-Schwartz, and Ohad Shamir. Proving the lottery ticket hypothesis: Pruning is all you need. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Pavlo Molchanov, Stephen Tyree, Tero Karras, Timo Aila, and Jan Kautz. Pruning convolutional neural networks for resource efficient inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Laurent Orseau, Marcus Hutter, and Omar Rivasplata. Logarithmic pruning is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Samuel S. Schoenholz, and Surya Ganguli. Resurrecting the sigmoid in deep learning through dynamical isometry: theory and practice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Samuel S. Schoenholz, and Surya Ganguli. The emergence of spectral universality in deep networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2018.
- Ankit Pensia, Shashank Rajput, Alliot Nagle, Harit Vishwakarma, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Optimal lottery tickets via subset sum: Logarithmic over-parameterization is sufficient. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 2599–2610, 2020.
- Vivek Ramanujan, Mitchell Wortsman, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Ali Farhadi, and Mohammad Rastegari. What’s hidden in a randomly weighted neural network? In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 11893–11902, 2020.

-
- Pedro Savarese, Hugo Silva, and Michael Maire. Winning the lottery with continuous sparsification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 11380–11390, 2020.
- Andrew M. Saxe, James L. McClelland, and Surya Ganguli. Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- Franco Scarselli and Ah Chung Tsoi. Universal approximation using feedforward neural networks: A survey of some existing methods, and some new results. *Neural Netw.*, 11(1):15–37, January 1998.
- Samuel S. Schoenholz, Justin Gilmer, Surya Ganguli, and Jascha Sohl-Dickstein. Deep information propagation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Suraj Srinivas and R. Venkatesh Babu. Generalized dropout. *CoRR*, abs/1611.06791, 2016.
- Hidenori Tanaka, Daniel Kunin, Daniel L. Yamins, and Surya Ganguli. Pruning neural networks without any data by iteratively conserving synaptic flow. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Stijn Verdenius, Maarten Stol, and Patrick Forré. Pruning via iterative ranking of sensitivity statistics, 2020.
- Chaoqi Wang, Guodong Zhang, and Roger B. Grosse. Picking winning tickets before training by preserving gradient flow. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Greg Yang, Jeffrey Pennington, Vinay Rao, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Samuel S. Schoenholz. A mean field theory of batch normalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Haoran You, Chaojian Li, Pengfei Xu, Yonggan Fu, Yue Wang, Xiaohan Chen, Richard G. Baraniuk, Zhangyang Wang, and Yingyan Lin. Drawing early-bird tickets: Toward more efficient training of deep networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Hattie Zhou, Janice Lan, Rosanne Liu, and Jason Yosinski. Deconstructing lottery tickets: Zeros, signs, and the supermask. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.

A APPENDIX

B THEORY

In the following section, we present the proofs of the theorems and lemmas of the main manuscript.

B.1 SCALING RELATIONSHIP: PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Statement. Let $h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ denote a transformation of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ of the deep neural network f_0 , where each weight is multiplied by a scalar σ_l , i.e., $h_{ij}^{(l)}(w_{0,ij}^{(l)}) = \sigma_l w_{0,ij}^{(l)}$, and each bias is transformed to $h_i^{(l)}(b_{0,i}^{(l)}) = \prod_{m=1}^l \sigma_m b_{0,i}^{(l)}$. Then, we have $f(x | h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma})) = \prod_{l=1}^L \sigma_l f(x | \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$.

Proof. Let the activation function ϕ of a neuron either be a ReLU $\phi(x) = \max(x, 0)$ or the identity $\phi(x) = x$. A neuron $x_i^{(l)}$ in the original network becomes $g(x_i^{(l)})$ after parameter transformation. We prove the statement by induction over the depth L of a deep neural network.

First, assume that $L = 1$ so that we have $x_i^{(1)} = \phi\left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(1)} x_j + b_i^{(1)}\right)$. After transformation by $w_{ij}^{(1)} \mapsto \sigma_1 w_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $b_i^{(1)} \mapsto \sigma_1 b_i^{(1)}$, we receive $g(x_i^{(1)}) = \phi\left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(1)} \sigma_1 x_j + \sigma_1 b_i^{(1)}\right) = \sigma_1 x_i^{(1)}$ because of the homogeneity of $\phi(\cdot)$. This proves our claim for $L = 1$.

Next, our induction hypothesis is that $g\left(x_i^{(L-1)}\right) = \prod_{m=1}^{L-1} \sigma_m x_i^{(L-1)}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g\left(x_i^{(L)}\right) &= \phi\left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(L)} \sigma_L g\left(x_j^{(L-1)}\right) + b_i^{(L)} \prod_{m=1}^L \sigma_m\right) \quad (\text{def. of transformation}) \\ &= \phi\left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(L)} \sigma_L \prod_{m=1}^{L-1} \sigma_m x_j^{(L-1)} + b_i^{(L)} \prod_{m=1}^L \sigma_m\right) \quad (\text{induction hypothesis}) \\ &= \prod_{m=1}^L \sigma_m x_i^{(L)} \quad (\text{homogeneity of } \phi), \end{aligned}$$

which was to be shown. \square

B.2 TRAINING OF f_0 IS FEASIBLE: PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Statement. Assume that the weights and biases of a fully-connected deep neural network f are drawn independently from distributions that are symmetric around the origin 0 with variances $\sigma_{w,l}^2$ or $\sigma_{b,l}^2$, respectively. Then, for every input \mathbf{x}_0 , the second moment of the output is

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) = \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)}\|_2^2 \prod_{l=1}^L \frac{n_l \sigma_{w,l}^2}{2} + \sigma_{b,L}^2 \frac{n_L}{2} + \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \sigma_{b,l}^2 \frac{n_l}{2} \prod_{k=l+1}^L \frac{n_k \sigma_{w,k}^2}{2}.$$

Proof. First, let us focus on the distribution of a neuron $x_i^{(l)}$ given all neurons of the previous layer with $x_i^{(l)} = \phi\left(h_i^{(l)}\right)$. Since we assume that the weights and biases are distributed independently with zero mean, it follows that also the preactivation $h_i^{(l)} = \sum_j w_{ij}^{(l)} x_j^{(l-1)} + b_i^{(l)}$ has zero mean and variance $\mathbb{V}\left(h_i^{(l)} \mid \mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\right) = \sum_j \left(x_j^{(l-1)}\right)^2 \mathbb{V}\left(w_{ij}^{(l)}\right) + \mathbb{V}\left(b_i^{(l)}\right) = \sigma_{w,l}^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_2^2 + \sigma_{b,l}^2$, where \mathbb{V} is the variance operator. It is furthermore symmetric around zero so that a neuron $x_i^{(l)} = \phi\left(h_i^{(l)}\right) \sim 0.5\delta_0 + 0.5p_{h_{i,+}}$ is projected to zero with probability 0.5 and otherwise follows the distribution of the positive preactivation $p_{h_{i,+}}$, where δ_0 denotes the delta distribution at 0 and $h_{i,+}$ the random variable h_i conditional on $h_i > 0$. In consequence, the squared neuron value $\left(x_i^{(l)}\right)^2 \sim 0.5\delta_0 + 0.5p_{h_i^2}$ has expectation $\mathbb{E}\left(\left(x_i^{(l)}\right)^2\right) = 0.5 \mathbb{E}\left(\left(h_i^{(l)}\right)^2\right) = 0.5 \sigma_{w,l}^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_2^2 + 0.5 \sigma_{b,l}^2$.

Since all the neurons are independent and identically distributed given the neurons of the previous layer, we can easily deduce the expected signal norm

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(l)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_2^2\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \mathbb{E}\left(\left(x_i^{(l)}\right)^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_2^2\right) = \frac{n_l}{2} \left(\sigma_{w,l}^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_2^2 + \sigma_{b,l}^2\right).$$

This gives us the expected signal norm of an arbitrary layer conditioned on the previous layer. We can use this relationship to also compute the average squared signal norm of the output layer, which is

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right),$$

where the first equality is by definition of the network, and the second equality holds by law of total expectation. By recursively repeating this argument on the inner expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(2)}\|_2^2\right) \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\dots \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-1)}\|_2^2\right) \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-2)}\|_2^2\right) \dots \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Using the derivation further above, which provides a solution to the expected signal norm for a layer conditioned on the previous layer, we can iteratively resolve the innermost expectation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_2^2\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\dots \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-1)}\|_2^2\right) \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-2)}\|_2^2\right) \dots \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\dots \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{n_L}{2}\left(\sigma_{w,L}^2\|\mathbf{x}^{(L-1)}\|_2^2 + \sigma_{b,L}^2\right) \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-2)}\|_2^2\right) \dots \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\dots \frac{n_L\sigma_{w,L}^2}{2}\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{x}^{(L-1)}\|_2^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(L-2)}\|_2^2\right) + \frac{n_L\sigma_{b,L}^2}{2} \dots \mid \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)}\|_2^2\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Repeating this last argument provides the statement that was to be shown. \square

B.3 ERROR PROPAGATION: PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Statement. Assume $\epsilon > 0$ and let the target network f and its approximation f_ϵ have the same architecture. If every parameter θ of f and corresponding θ_ϵ of f_ϵ in layer l fulfils $|\theta_\epsilon - \theta| \leq \epsilon_l$ for

$$\epsilon_l := \epsilon \left(L\sqrt{m_l} \left(1 + \sup_{x \in [-1,1]^{n_0}} \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_1 \right) \prod_{k=l+1}^L \left(\|\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\|_\infty + \epsilon/L \right) \right)^{-1},$$

then it follows that $\|f - f_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. Our objective is to bound $\|f - f_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. We frequently use the triangle inequality and that $|\phi(x) - \phi(y)| \leq |x - y|$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1 to derive

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{x}^{(l)} - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon^{(l)}\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{h}^{(l)} - \mathbf{h}_\epsilon^{(l)}\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)} \right) \mathbf{x}^{(l-1)} \right\|_2 + \|\mathbf{b}^{(l)} - \mathbf{b}_\epsilon^{(l)}\|_2 + \left\| \mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)} - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon^{(l-1)} \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \epsilon_l \sqrt{m_l} \sup_{x \in [-1,1]^{n_0}} \|\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)}\|_1 + \epsilon_l \sqrt{m_l} + \left(\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|_\infty + \epsilon_l \right) \left\| \left(\mathbf{x}^{(l-1)} - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon^{(l-1)} \right) \right\|_2\end{aligned}$$

with $\epsilon_l \leq \epsilon/L$. m_l denotes the number of parameters in layer l that are smaller than ϵ_l and $\|\mathbf{W}\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |w_{i,j}|$. Note that $m_l \leq n_l k_{l,\max}$. The last inequality follows from the fact that all entries of the matrix $\left(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)} \right)$ and of the vector $\left(\mathbf{b}^{(l)} - \mathbf{b}_\epsilon^{(l)} \right)$ are bounded by ϵ_l and maximally m_l of these entries are non-zero. Furthermore, $\left\| \mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)} \right\|_\infty \leq \left(\|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\|_\infty + \epsilon_l \right)$ follows again from the fact that each entry of $\left(\mathbf{W}^{(l)} - \mathbf{W}_\epsilon^{(l)} \right)$ is bounded by ϵ_l .

Thus, at the last layer it holds for all $\mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^{n_0}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x) - f_\epsilon(x)\|_2 &= \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(L)} - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon^{(L)} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^L \epsilon_l \sqrt{m_l} \left(1 + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^{n_0}} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(l-1)} \right\|_1 \right) \prod_{k=l+1}^L \left(\left\| \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \right\|_\infty + \epsilon/L \right) \leq L \frac{\epsilon}{L} = \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

using the definition of ϵ_l in the last step. \square

B.4 EXISTENCE OF LOTTERY TICKET: PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Statement. Assume that $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and a target network f with depth L and architecture \bar{n} are given. Each weight and bias of a larger deep neural network f_0 with depth $2L$ and architecture \bar{n}_0 is initialized independently, uniformly at random according to $w_{ij}^{(l)} \sim U([- \sigma_{w,l}, \sigma_{w,l}])$ and $b_i^{(l)} \sim U([- \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}, \prod_{k=1}^l \sigma_{w,k}])$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, f_0 contains an approximation $f_\epsilon \subset f_0$ so that $\|f - \lambda f_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ if for $l = 1, \dots, L$

$$n_{2l-1,0} = C n_{l-1} \log \left(\frac{1}{\min \{\epsilon_l, \delta_l\}} \right) \text{ and } n_{2l,0} = n_l,$$

where ϵ_l is defined in Eq. (B.3), $\delta_l = \delta / (L k_{l-1, \max} n_l)$, and the output is scaled by $\lambda = \prod_{l=1}^{2L} \sigma_{w,l}^{-1}$.

Proof. Lemma 2 simplifies the above parameter initialization to an equivalent setting, in which each parameter is distributed as $w_{ij}, b_i \sim U[-1, 1]$, while the overall output is scaled by the stated scaling factor λ . We assume that all parameters are bounded by 1 so that we can find them within the range $[-1, 1]$. Otherwise, we would need to increase n_{2l-1} by a factor that is proportional to the maximum parameter value θ_{\max} , which is integrated into our constant C .

Every layer l of f corresponds in our construction to two layers of f_0 , i.e., layers $2l - 1$ and $2l$. The neurons in layer $2l$ correspond directly to the output neurons in layer l of f . Thus, we only need width $n_{2l,0} = n_l$ in f_0 . Layer $2l - 1$ serves the construction of intermediary neurons of in-degree 1. Using the identity $\phi(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(-x)$, we see that all neurons in layer l of f can indeed be represented by a two-layer neural network consisting of $3n_{l-1}$ intermediary neurons of degree 1, as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{(l)} &= \phi \left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(l)} x_j^{(l-1)} + b_i^{(l)} \right) \\ &= \phi \left(\sum_j w_{ij}^{(l)} \phi \left(x_j^{(l-1)} \right) - \sum_j w_{ij}^{(l)} \phi \left(-x_j^{(l-1)} \right) + b_i^{(l)} \phi(1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 4, we need to approximate each $w_{ij}^{(l)}$ and $-w_{ij}^{(l)}$ up to error $\epsilon_l/2$ and $b_i^{(l)}$ up to error ϵ_l to guarantee our overall approximation objective. Since we have to do this for every parameter, our overall approximation can only be successful with probability $1 - \delta$ if we increase our success probability for each parameter, $1 - \delta_l$, accordingly. In total, we have $m_{l, \max}$ of such non-zero parameters in layer l with $m_{l, \max} \leq 2n_l k_{l, \max}$. (To be precise, $m_{l, \max}$ denotes the number of parameters that are bigger than ϵ_l). The successes of finding different parameters are not necessarily independent but we can identify a sufficient δ_l with the help of a union bound. Accordingly, $1 - \delta \geq 1 - \sum_{l=1}^L \delta_l m_{l, \max}$ is fulfilled for $\delta_l \leq \delta / (2L n_l k_{l, \max})$. Note that we later integrate the factor 2 in the constant related to the layer width.

With probability at least $1 - \delta_l$, we can approximate each single parameter by solving the subset sum problem for the corresponding neuron. As outlined in Cor. 2 by Pensia et al. (2020), which is based on Cor. 3.3 by Lueker (1998), we need $C \log \left(\frac{1}{\min(\delta_l, \epsilon_l)} \right)$ neurons in layer $2l - 1$ per neuron of the form $\phi \left(\pm x_j^{(l-1)} \right)$ or $\phi(1)$. Since we have to represent $3n_{l-1}$ of these neurons, in total we require layer $2l - 1$ of f_0 to have width

$$n_{2l-1,0} \geq C n_{l-1} \log \left(\frac{1}{\min(\delta_l, \epsilon_l)} \right).$$

Next, we briefly explain the main ideas that lead to this result. The main difference of our situations in comparison with Pensia et al. (2020) is that we additionally create neurons of the form $\phi(1)$ to represent non-zero biases. Let $\phi(y)$ be our target neuron, where y is either $y = x_j^{(l-1)}$ or $y = 1$ depending on which neuron we want to represent. Note that we can construct multiple candidates for a neuron $\phi(y)$ by pruning neurons in layer $2l - 1$. We achieve that by setting all weights that do not lead to y in the previous layer and the bias term of a neuron to zero or, if $y = 1$, we set all weights to zero and keep the non-zero bias term if the bias is positive. Let the index set of the such pruned neurons corresponding to y be I . This leaves us with neurons of the form $w_{2,i}\phi(w_{1,i}y)$ with $\text{sign}(y)w_{1,i} \sim U[0, 1]$ and $w_{2,i} \sim U[-1, 1]$ for $i \in I$. For the probability distribution of $w_{1,i}w_{2,i}$, Cor. 2 of Pensia et al. (2020) states that it contains a uniform distribution. It follows that the subset sum problem has a solution. Thus, for any parameter $\theta \in [-1, 1]$ there exists a subset $S \subset I$ so that with probability at least $1 - \delta_l$

$$|\theta - \sum_{i \in S} w_{1,i}w_{2,i}| \leq \epsilon_l.$$

if $|I| \geq C \log\left(\frac{1}{\min(\delta_l, \epsilon_l)}\right)$, which was to be shown.

Note that the same result also holds for normally distributed $w_{1,i}, w_{2,i}$, as their product contains a uniform distribution. This follows from the fact that the normal distribution contains a uniform distribution Pensia et al. (2020). Thus, the product of two normal distributions contains a product of two uniform distributions and this product of uniform distributions contains a uniform distribution as stated by Cor. 2 of Pensia et al. (2020). \square

‘Looks-linear’ initializations are also covered by this proof. When we can construct a parameter $w_{ij}^{(l)}$ by solving a subset sum problem, we can construct $-w_{ij}^{(l)}$ in the same way just with the negative correspondents of the parameters that construct $w_{ij}^{(l)}$.

This figure "nonzero_bias_res.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2110.11150v1>