Simulating Posterior Bayesian Neural Networks with Dependent Weights

Nicola Apollonio* Giovanni Franzina† Giovanni Luca Torrisi‡

Abstract

In this paper we consider posterior Bayesian fully connected and feedforward deep neural networks with dependent weights. Particularly, if the likelihood is Gaussian, we identify the distribution of the wide width limit and provide an algorithm to sample from the network. In the shallow case we explicitly compute the distribution of the output, proving that it is a Gaussian mixture. All the theoretical results are numerically validated.

MSC 2010 Subject Classification: 68T07; 68W20; 60B10.
Keywords: Deep Neural Networks, Shallow Neural Networks, Wide Width Limit, Gaussian Mixture, Rejection Sampling.

1 Introduction

The theoretical study of Bayesian neural networks was initiated by Neal [29] who proved that if a shallow Bayesian neural network is initialized with independent Gaussian parameters (i.e., biases and weights), then the output of the network converges in distribution to a Gaussian process, as the number of neurons grows large (*i.e.*, in the wide width limit). This result was extended to Bayesian deep neural networks two decades later (see [16, 22, 26]) and only recently it has been made quantitative by the use of the optimal transport theory (see [6] and [33]), by the Stein method for Gaussian approximation (see [3, 4, 8, 13]), and by alternative techniques ([7, 11]). Another promising approach to analyze Bayesian neural networks is through the lens of large deviations. First results in this direction are given in [23]. These findings have been successively generalized in [2, 34]. A different perspective is provided by the so-called mean field analysis of networks (see [27, 15]).

The advantage of the Bayesian framework is that it allows to include in the model both prior knowledge and observed data through a prior distribution on network's parameters and a likelihood function, respectively. The emergence of Gaussian processes helped to understand how large neural networks work, how to make them more efficient, and motivated the use of Bayesian regression inference methods, see [22]. However, as noticed by [28] and [21], the connection with Gaussian processes also highlighted the limitations of wide width neural networks with independent and Gaussian distributed weights. Indeed, there are at least three drawbacks with the choice of an uncorrelated Gaussian prior on the weights: (*i*) Hidden layers do not represent hidden features that capture important aspects of the data; (*ii*) In the infinite width limit the coordinates of the output become independent and identically distributed Gaussian processes, which is usually

*Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy. e-mail: nicola.apollonio@cnr.it
†Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy. e-mail: giovanni.franzina@cnr.it
‡Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy. e-mail: giovanniluca.torrisi@cnr.it

unsuitable; (*iii*) The assumption of independent Gaussian weights is often unrealistic, as estimated weights of deep neural networks show dependencies and heavy tails (see [25, 35]).

To circumvent these problems, some authors ([5, 12, 19]) proposed to initialize the neural network with independent and identically distributed non-Gaussian weights. However, due to the independence assumption, in the wide width limit, the output of the neural network still converges to a stochastic process with independent coordinates. A more structured statistical assumption on the weights have been proposed by [1, 21]. Letting $W_{hj}^{(\ell+1)}$ denote the random weight between the node h at the hidden layer $\ell+1$ and the node j at the hidden layer ℓ, in [21] it is assumed that $W_{hj}^{(\ell+1)} := \sqrt{V_{n_\ell,j}^{(\ell)}} N_{hj}^{(\ell)}$, where $V_{n_\ell,j}^{(\ell)}$ are i.i.d. random variances and $N_{hj}^{(\ell)}$ are independent and Gaussian distributed centered random variables with variance $C_W > 0$. Note that, for fixed ℓ and j, the weights $\{W_{hj}^{(\ell+1)}\}_h$ are stochastically dependent (we refer the reader to Section 2.2 for a rigorous description of the model). It is proved in [21] that a fully connected and feedforward deep neural network, with dependent weights (as previously described) and suitable chosen random variances, in the (sequential) wide width limit behaves as a mixture of Gaussian processes (see Theorem 4.1 for the precise statement). The reference [1] provides an algorithmic framework to approximate a neural network of finite width and depth, and with not necessarily independent and identically distributed parameters, with a mixture of Gaussian processes with error bounds on the approximation error.

To the best of our knowledge, progresses in the study of posterior Bayesian neural networks refer to models with a fixed variance for the Gaussian prior, see [10, 17, 18, 30, 33]. An exception is the recent work by [9] where it is proved that, if the parameters of the Bayesian neural network follow a Gaussian prior and the variance of both the last hidden layer and the Gaussian likelihood function is distributed according to an Inverse-Gamma prior law, then the posterior Bayesian neural network converges to a Student-t process in the wide width limit. In this paper we are concerned with posterior Bayesian neural networks with dependent weights $\{W_{hj}^{(\ell+1)}\}_h$ as described above. Under mild assumptions on the likelihood we prove the existence of the wide width limit (extending Proposition 1 in [17]). Also, more significantly, for a Gaussian likelihood we identify the limiting distribution showing that it is a mixture of Gaussian (see Theorem 5.2). This result holds assuming that the covariance random matrix of the last layer is almost surely invertible under the prior distribution. Remarkably, we provide quite general sufficient conditions which guarantee a such invertibility assumption (see Theorem 6.1).

For a fixed number of neurons at each layer, we propose the use of rejection sampling to sample from the posterior Bayesian deep neural network with a Gaussian likelihood. The rejection sampling algorithm is constructed through a number of intermediate steps, in which we compute the conditional distribution of the output at each layer under the posterior (see Section 7.2 and Theorems 7.2 and 7.3). Since the acceptance probability involved in the proposed rejection sampling algorithm is not known in closed form, we prove the consistency of the simulation when the acceptance probability is approximated by a Monte Carlo estimator (see Theorem 7.4). To sample from the distribution of the posterior Bayesian shallow neural network, again in the case of a Gaussian likelihood, we can avoid the use of rejection sampling. Indeed, in such a case we can prove that the conditional law of the output is a mixture of Gaussian (see Theorem 8.1).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the model of fully connected and feedforward neural networks with dependent weights which is investigated in the article. Section 3 is devoted to preliminaries on matrices, infinitely divisible distributions and mixture of Gaussian distributions. In Section 4 we describe the (sequential) wide width limit of the prior Bayesian neural network, as proved in [21]. In Section 5 we study the wide width limit of the posterior Bayesian neural network, identifying the limit in the case of a Gaussian likelihood. In Section 6 we address

the problem of the invertibility of the random covariance matrix mentioned before. Sections 7 and 8 concern the simulation of the posterior Bayesian network with dependent weights both in the deep and shallow cases. Examples and numerical illustrations are provided in Sections 9 and 10, respectively.

2 Artificial neural networks

In this paper, the points of $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^* := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$, are view as column vectors, and so we write, *e.g.*, $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ in place of $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where $*^\top$ denotes the transpose of $*$. Throughout this article, we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ the Euclidean inner product and the corresponding norm on $\mathbb{R}^m$, respectively. Hereafter, we also use the notation $X \overset{d}{=} Y$ to denote that two random elements X and Y have the same law. Usually in the sequel $\mathfrak{c}$ denotes a positive normalizing constant, which may vary from line to line.

2.1 Fully connected and feedforward neural networks

Fully connected and feedforward neural networks are defined in this paper as follows. Let L, $n_0, \ldots$, $n_{L+1} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be integers. For $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, we set

$$Z_h^{(\ell+1)}(x) := B_h^{(\ell+1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} W_{hj}^{(\ell+1)} \sigma(Z_j^{(\ell)}(x)), \quad h = 1, \ldots, n_{\ell+1}$$

$$Z_h^{(1)}(x) := B_h^{(1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} W_{hj}^{(1)} x_j, \quad h = 1, \ldots, n_1$$

where $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n_0})^\top$ is the input, $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ (a measurable function) is the activation function, $\{B_h^{(\ell)}\}$ and $\{W_{hj}^{(\ell)}\}$ are real parameters called biases and weights, respectively. The network consists of $L + 1$ layers and, on each layer $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, L + 1\}$, there are n_ℓ artificial neurons. The network is called *deep* if $L \geq 2$ and *shallow* if $L = 1$.

By definition, the network is therefore a parametrized family of functions. In statistical learning, fully connected neural networks are tipically used to estimate an unknown target function $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}}$. More precisely, for a fixed network architecture $(L, n_0, \ldots, n_{L+1}, \sigma)$ and for a given training dataset $\mathcal{D} := \{(x(i), y(i))\}_{i=1,\ldots,d} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the objective is to produce an estimate of the parameter $\Theta = (\{B_h^{(\ell)}\}, \{W_{hj}^{(\ell)}\})$, say Θ^*, in such a way that the output of the corresponding neural network is a good estimate of f, i.e.,

$$(Z_1^{(L+1)}(x'(i')), \ldots, Z_{n_{L+1}}^{(L+1)}(x'(i')))^\top \Big|_{\Theta=\Theta^*} \approx f(x'(i')), \quad i' = 1, \ldots, t$$

for a test set $\mathcal{T} := \{x'(i')\}_{i'=1,\ldots,t}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Here, for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ we have $y(i) := f(x(i))$,

$$x(i) := (x_1(i), \ldots, x_{n_0}(i))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}, \text{ and } y(i) := (y_1(i), \ldots, y_{n_{L+1}}(i))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}}.$$

Throughout the paper we consider the $n_0 \times d$ matrix $\mathbf{x} := (x(1) \ldots x(d))$ and the $n_{L+1} \times d$ matrix $\mathbf{y} := (y(1) \ldots y(d))$.

2.2 Fully connected and feedforward neural networks with dependent weights

From now on, all the random quantities are defined on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, on which different probability laws will be defined. Hereon $\mathcal{N}_1(\mu, v)$ denotes the one-dimensional Gaussian law with mean μ and variance v.

The prior knowledge on the parameter Θ is modeled via a *prior* probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. In particular, throughout the paper we assume that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$,

- For $h = 1, \dots, n_\ell$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, L+1$, $B_h^{(\ell)}$ are random variables with
$$B_h^{(\ell)} \sim \mathcal{N}_1(0, C_B)$$
for a constant $C_B \geq 0$;
- For $h = 1, \dots, n_\ell$, $j = 1, \dots, n_{\ell-1}$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, L+1$, $W_{hj}^{(\ell)}$ are random variables defined by
$$W_{hj}^{(\ell)} := \sqrt{V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)}} N_{hj}^{(\ell)},$$
where, for $j = 1, \dots, n_0$, $V_{n_0,j}^{(0)} := n_0^{-1}$ and, for $j = 1, \dots, n_{\ell-1}$ and $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, $V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)}$, are random variables with
$$V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)} \sim \mathcal{M}_{n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)},$$
being $\mathcal{M}_{n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}$ probability laws on $[0, \infty)$, and, for $h = 1, \dots, n_\ell$, $j = 1, \dots, n_{\ell-1}$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, L+1$, $N_{hj}^{(\ell)}$ are random variables with
$$N_{hj}^{(\ell)} \sim \mathcal{N}_1(0, C_W),$$
for a constant $C_W > 0$;
- All the random variables $\{B_h^{(\ell)}, V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)}, N_{hj}^{(\ell)}\}$ are independent among themselves.

Under these distributional assumptions, one speaks of fully connected and feedforward neural network *with dependent weights*, see the seminal paper by [21], where the model has been introduced. Indeed, note that for a fixed ℓ and j, the random weights $W_{1j}^{(\ell)}, \dots, W_{n_\ell j}^{(\ell)}$ are dependent. Note also that if $V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)} := \frac{1}{n_{\ell-1}}$, then we recover the well-known fully connected and feedforward Gaussian neural network.

The Bayesian appraoch allows to incorporate in the model the observed data through a likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \Theta)$. Then the posterior knowledge on the parameter is summarized by the *posterior* probability measure
$$\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}} := \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \Theta)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \Theta)},$$
where $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}$ denotes the expectation under the prior probability measure and it is assumed
$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \Theta) > 0.$$
If the law of Θ under the prior has density $\mathrm{p}_{prior}(\cdot)$, then the law of Θ under the posterior has density
$$\mathrm{p}_{\text{posterior}}(\theta) \propto \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \theta)\mathrm{p}_{\text{prior}}(\theta),$$
and one estimates the parameter Θ by maximizing $\mathrm{p}_{\text{posterior}}(\cdot)$ (maximum a posteriori estimate).

3 Preliminaries

In this section we provide some preliminaries on real matrices and infinitely divisible distributions, and we give the formal definition of a mixture Gaussian distribution. As general references for the first two topics, we cite the monographs by [20] and [24], and [32], respectively.

3.1 Matrices

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, be a $p \times q$ real matrix. We denote by $\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A})$ the column vector in $\mathbb{R}^{pq}$ obtained by stacking the columns of $\mathbf{A}$ on top of one another (starting from the leftmost column). For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times v}$, we denote by $(\mathbf{A} \,|\, \mathbf{V})$ the $p\times(q+v)$ real matrix obtained by attaching $\mathbf{V}$ to the right-hand side of $\mathbf{A}$. Similarly, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ and $\mathbf{V}' \in \mathbb{R}^{v'\times q}$, we denote by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ - \\ \mathbf{V}' \end{pmatrix}$$

the $(p + v') \times q$ real matrix obtained by attaching $\mathbf{V}'$ to the bottom of $\mathbf{A}$.

Let $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times s}$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{p'\times q'}$ and $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathbb{R}^{r'\times s'}$. We define the tensor product $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}'$ as the $pr \times qs$ real matrix $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}' = (a_{ij}\mathbf{A}')_{1\le i\le p,\, 1\le j\le q}$. Two elementary properties of the tensor product of matrices that will be used throughout the paper are the following:

$$(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}')^\top = \mathbf{A}^\top \otimes (\mathbf{A}')^\top \quad \text{and, for } q = p' \text{ and } s = r', \quad (\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}')(\mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{C}') = \mathbf{AC} \otimes \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}' \tag{1}$$

We recall a couple of properties of the operator $\mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$ which will be extensively used later on. For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ and $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times p}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{AA}') = \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A}^\top)^\top \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A}'), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace operator. For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times r}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times s}$, we have

$$\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{AA}'\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}) = ((\widetilde{\mathbf{A}})^\top \otimes \mathbf{A})\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A}'). \tag{3}$$

Let $\mathbf{Id}_p$ denote the $p\times p$, $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, identity matrix. By (3) we have that the i-th column of $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times r}$ can be written as

$$(\mathbf{Id}_q \otimes e_i^\top)\mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{A}')^\top), \qquad i = 1, \ldots, r, \tag{4}$$

where $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ are the (column) vectors of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^r$.

For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, we denote by $rk(\mathbf{A})$ the rank of $\mathbf{A}$, i.e., the number of linearly independent columns or rows within $\mathbf{A}$. We set $\mathbf{0}_p := (0, \ldots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{1}_p := (1, \ldots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and denote by $\mathrm{diag}_r(a_1, \ldots, a_r)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}^*$, a diagonal $r \times r$ matrix with diagonal elements $a_1, \ldots, a_r$.

The following elementary lemma holds. We include a proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$, with $n \ge p$, be p-dimensional (column) vectors and let $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ be positive numbers. Then the $p \times p$ matrix $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i a_i a_i^\top$ is positive definite if and only if the $p \times n$ matrix $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ has rank equal to p.*

Proof. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i a_i a_i^\top = (\sqrt{c_1}a_1, \ldots, \sqrt{c_n}a_n)(\sqrt{c_1}a_1, \ldots, \sqrt{c_n}a_n)^\top,$$

for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$u^\top \sum_{i=1}^n c_i a_i a_i^\top u = \|(\sqrt{c_1}a_1, \ldots, \sqrt{c_n}a_n)^\top u\|^2$$

and this quantity is strictly positive if and only if $(\sqrt{c_1}a_1, \ldots, \sqrt{c_n}a_n)^\top u \neq \mathbf{0}_n$, *i.e.*, the rows of the matrix $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ are linearly independent, *i.e.*, $rk((a_1, \ldots, a_n)) = p$. □

3.2 Infinitely divisible random variables and Gaussian mixtures

3.2.1 Infinitely divisible random variables

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$. An $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random vector Y (seen as usual as a column vector) is said to have an infinitely divisible law if, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, there exist independent and identically distributed $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random vectors $Y_{n1}, \ldots, Y_{nn}$ such that $Y \stackrel{d}{=} Y_{n1} + \ldots + Y_{nn}$. It turns out that Y has an infinitely divisible distribution if and only if there exists a triple (a, A, ρ), where $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (column vector), A is a $d \times d$ positive semi-definite real matrix and ρ is a Borel measure concentrated on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_d\}$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min\{1, x^2\}\rho(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty,$$

such that

$$\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\mathbf{i}u^\top Y} = \mathrm{e}^{\Psi(u)}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{i} := \sqrt{-1}$$

where

$$\Psi(u) := \mathbf{i}u^\top a - \frac{1}{2}u^\top A u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathrm{e}^{\mathbf{i}u^\top x} - 1 - \mathbf{i}u^\top x \mathbf{1}\{\|x\| < 1\})\rho(\mathrm{d}x).$$

The measure ρ is unique and it is called the Lévy measure. The law of Y is uniquely determined by the triple (a, A, ρ).

If Y is a non-negative random variable it turns out that

$$\Psi(u) = \mathbf{i}ua + \int_{(0,\infty)} (\mathrm{e}^{\mathbf{i}ux} - 1)\rho(\mathrm{d}x),$$

where $a \geq 0$ is a non-negative constant and ρ is a Borel measure on $(0, \infty)$ such that

$$\int_{(0,\infty)} \min\{1, x\}\rho(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty\,;$$

in such a case the law of Y is uniquely determined by (a, ρ) and we write $Y \sim \mathrm{ID}(a, \rho)$.

3.2.2 Gaussian mixtures

Let $\mathcal{N}_m(c, \mathbf{C})$ denote the m-dimensional Gaussian distribution with mean $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (a column vector) and covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}$. For later purposes, we recall that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}_m(c, \mathbf{C})$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times m}$, and $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$, then

$$\mathbf{A}X + a \sim \mathcal{N}_k(a + \mathbf{A}c, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A}^\top). \tag{5}$$

Let κ be a random vector with values on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and let $\mathbf{K}$ be a positive semi-definite and symmetric random matrix with values on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. We say that a random vector X with values on $\mathbb{R}^m$ has the Gaussian mixture distribution with parameters $(\kappa, \mathbf{K})$, denoted by $X \sim \mathcal{MG}(\kappa, \mathbf{K})$, if $X \,|\, (\kappa, \mathbf{K}) \sim \mathcal{N}_m(\kappa, \mathbf{K})$.

4 The wide width limit under the prior

We start introducing some notation. For $\ell = 1, \ldots, L+1$ and $i = 1, \ldots, d$, we set

$$Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(i)) := (Z_1^{(\ell)}(x(i)), \ldots, Z_{n_\ell}^{(\ell)}(x(i)))^\top,$$

and we consider the $n_\ell \times d$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) := (Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(1)) \ldots Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(d))).$$

Here we explicited the dependence on B since throughout the paper, for the sake of clarity, we distinguish the cases $C_B > 0$ and $C_B = 0$. For later purposes, we vectorialize the $n_\ell \times d$ random matrix $\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ defining the $n_\ell d$-dimensional random vector

$$Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L+1.$$

The following Theorem 4.1 is one of the main results in [21] (see Theorem 16). It extends to the case of dependent weights the Gaussian behavior of fully connected and feedforward neural networks with independent Gaussian weights, in the infinite width limit (see the seminal paper by [29] and the more recent contributions by [16, 22, 26]).

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that:*
(i) The activation function σ is continuous and such that

$$\forall\ z \in \mathbb{R},\ |\sigma(z)| \le a_1 + a_2|z|^{a_3} \text{ for some positive constants } a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0.$$

(ii) $\forall\ \ell = 1, \dots, L$, $\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} V_{n_\ell,j}^{(\ell)} \to \mathrm{ID}(a^{(\ell)}, \rho^{(\ell)})$ in distribution as $n_\ell \to \infty$, for some non-negative infinitely divisible random variable $\mathrm{ID}(a^{(\ell)}, \rho^{(\ell)})$.

Then, under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$, we have

$$\lim_{n_L \to \infty} \dots \lim_{n_1 \to \infty} Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) = G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ in distribution.}$$

Here $G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is the $n_{L+1}d$-dimensional random vector $G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{G}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top)$, where $\mathbf{G}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is the $n_{L+1} \times d$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{G}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (G^{(L+1)}(x(1)) \dots G^{(L+1)}(x(d))),$$

$$G^{(L+1)}(x(i)) := (G_1^{(L+1)}(x(i)), \dots, G_{n_{L+1}}^{(L+1)}(x(i)))^\top, \quad i = 1, \dots, d$$

are n_{L+1}-dimensional (column) random vectors, and

$$G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{MG}(\mathbf{0}_{n_{L+1}d}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Here $\{\mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{\ell=1,\dots,L+1}$ is a Markov chain, with state space the space of $d \times d$ positive semi-definite and symmetric matrices, defined recursively by the following stochastic recurrence:

$$\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')))_{1 \le i,i' \le d}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')) := C_B + C_W \frac{x(i)^\top x(i')}{n_0},$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) := C_B \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top + C_W \Bigg(a^{(\ell-1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}[\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})] + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty))} T_j^{(\ell-1)} \sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \Bigg), \tag{7}$$

for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$.

Here, σ acts componentwise on vectors, $\{\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, for $\ell = 3, \ldots, L+1$, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, and, for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L+1$, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{T_j^{(\ell-1)}\}_{j=1,\ldots,N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty))}$ are the points of a Poisson process on $(0,\infty)$ with mean measure $\rho^{(\ell-1)}$, independent of the sequence $\{\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$.

5 The wide width limit under the posterior, and identification of the limiting distribution

Theorem 4.1 provides the wide width limit of the fully connected and feedforward neural network with dependent weights at the start of the training, i.e., under the prior probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$. We aim at studying the asymptotic behavior of the network in the wide width limit, under the posterior distribution specialized by the likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \Theta) := g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)$, where $g(\cdot, y) : \mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d} \to [0,\infty)$ is a measurable function such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)] > 0 \tag{8}$$

and $y := \text{vec}(\mathbf{y}^\top)$. In other words, we will analyze the network under the posterior distribution

$$\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}} = \mathfrak{c} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}} \tag{9}$$

where, as usual in this paper, $\mathfrak{c}$ denotes the normalizing (positive) constant.

We will also study the wide width limit $G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ under the posterior distribution

$$\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior}} = \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}} g(G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}, \tag{10}$$

and so we assume that g satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)] > 0. \tag{11}$$

5.1 The wide width limit under the posterior

Hereafter, for a p-dimensional random vector Y defined on a probability space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A})$ we denote by $\mathbb{A}_Y$ the probability law induced by Y on $\mathbb{R}^p$.

The following theorem holds.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1 and suppose that the likelihood $g(\cdot, y)$ is bounded and continuous and satisfies (8) and (11). Then*

$$\lim_{n_L\to\infty} \cdots \lim_{n_1\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})} = \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior}, G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})} \qquad \textit{weakly.}$$

Proof. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and continuous function. To avoid confusion, we remind that

$$\mathfrak{c} = (\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)])^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}} = (\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)])^{-1}$$

are the normalizing constants appearing in (9) and (10), respectively. By the definitions of the posterior laws we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi)\\
&= \mathfrak{c}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)g(\xi,y)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) - \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)g(\xi,y)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi)\\
&= \mathfrak{c}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)g(\xi,y)(\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) - \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi))\\
&\qquad + (\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}})\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)g(\xi,y)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) =: \mathfrak{c}\, I_1 + (\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}})\, I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (using a standard notation)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d}} f(\xi)\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi)\Big| &\le \mathfrak{c}\,|I_1| + |\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}|\,|I_2|\\
&\le \mathfrak{c}\,|I_1| + \|f\|_\infty \|g(\cdot,y)\|_\infty\,|\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the quantity $\|f\|_\infty\|g(\cdot,y)\|_\infty$ is finite and does not depend on $n_1,\dots,n_L$. Since $g(\cdot,y)$ and $f(\cdot)g(\cdot,y)$ are bounded and continuous functions (not depending on $n_1,\dots,n_L$), by Theorem 4.1 it follows

$$\lim_{n_L\to\infty}\dots\lim_{n_1\to\infty}\mathfrak{c} = \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}} \quad\text{and}\quad \lim_{n_L\to\infty}\dots\lim_{n_1\to\infty} I_1 = 0,$$

and the proof is completed. □

5.2 Identification of the limiting distribution

In this section we compute the distribution of $G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ under the posterior law $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior}}$, when the likelihood function takes the form

$$g(\xi,y) := \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d}\|\xi(i)-y(i)\|^2\right), \tag{12}$$

with $\xi := \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)$, where $\boldsymbol{\xi} := (\xi(1)\dots\xi(d))$ and the $\xi(i)$'s are column vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}}$.

Suppose that the symmetric random matrix $\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$, defined in the statement of Theorem 4.1, is positive definite with probability 1 under the prior. Hereafter, we consider: the $n_{L+1}d\times n_{L+1}d$ positive definite and symmetric random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}}\otimes\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1},$$

where $\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is the $d\times d$ positive definite and symmetric random matrix

$$\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) := 2\mathbf{Id}_d + \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1},$$

and the $n_{L+1}d$-dimensional random vector

$$\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})^\top),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is the $n_{L+1}\times d$ random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y}\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}.$$

The following theorem holds.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1. If $g(\cdot, y)$ is of the form (12) and*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\det(\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})) > 0) = 1, \tag{13}$$

then, under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior}}$, we have

$$G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{MG}(\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Proof. Since

$$\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) = \mathfrak{c} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\xi(i) - y(i)\|^2\right) \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi),$$

by Theorem 4.1 and the assumption (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{posterior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi) &= \mathfrak{c} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\xi(i) - y(i)\|^2\right) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\left[(\det(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})))^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi\right)\right] \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&= \mathfrak{c}\, \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\Bigg[(\det \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-n_{L+1}/2} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\xi(i) - y(i)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi\right)\Bigg] \mathrm{d}\xi.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\xi(i) - y(i)\|^2 = \mathrm{Tr}[(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{y})^\top], \tag{15}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\xi(i) - y(i)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi \\
&\qquad = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[2(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{y})^\top\right] + \xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

By (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top) &= (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2})\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top) \\
&= \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(\mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top))^\top = \xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2} = ((\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\xi)^\top.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes \mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi &= (\mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top))^\top \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top],
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the latter equality follows by (2). Combining this relation with (16) we have

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{d}\|\xi(i)-y(i)\|^2-\frac{1}{2}\xi^\top(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}}\otimes\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\xi$$
$$=-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[2(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})^\top+\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top\right]. \tag{18}$$

Hereafter, we often use the shorthand notation $\lambda=\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, $\boldsymbol{\Delta}=\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{D}=\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{K}=\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\xi-\lambda)^\top\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-1}(\xi-\lambda)\\
&=(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top))^\top\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-1}(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top))\\
&=(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top))^\top(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}}\otimes\mathbf{D})(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top))\\
&=(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top))^\top\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})^\top) &(19)\\
&=\mathrm{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})^\top), &(20)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (19) we applied (3) with $\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{A}'=(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})^\top$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}=\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}}$ and in (20) we applied (2) with $\mathbf{A}=\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\mathbf{A}'=\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})^\top$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\lambda})^\top)&=\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top)-\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)+\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top)\\
&=\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)-2\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top)+\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top) &(21)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top=2\mathbf{y}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top.$$

By these relations and (20) we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top-4\mathbf{y}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top]=(\xi-\lambda)^\top\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-1}(\xi-\lambda)-\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top). \tag{22}$$

A straightforward computation shows

$$\mathrm{Tr}[2(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})^\top+\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top]=\mathrm{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top-4\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{y}^\top]+2\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^\top).$$

On combining this latter relation with (22) we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}[2(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\mathbf{y})^\top+\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top]=(\xi-\lambda)^\top\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-1}(\xi-\lambda)-\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top)+2\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^\top). \tag{23}$$

By this equality, (14) and (18) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathrm{posterior},G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\xi)\\
&=\mathfrak{c}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[(\det\mathbf{K}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-n_{L+1}/2}\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\mathbf{D}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))^\top)\right)\\
&\qquad\times\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\xi-\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))^\top(\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}(\xi-\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))\right)\Bigg]\mathrm{d}\xi\\
&=\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[(2\pi)^{-(n_{L+1}d)/2}\det(\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1/2}\\
&\qquad\times\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\xi-\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))^\top(\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}))^{-1}(\xi-\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))\right)\Bigg]\mathrm{d}\xi, &(24)
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed. □

6 Sufficient conditions for (13)

Clearly, condition (13) is crucial to identify the distribution of the wide width limit of the posterior Bayesian neural network (see Theorem 5.2).

The following theorem provides mild sufficient conditions on the activation function σ which guarantee (13). Hereafter, for a Borel set $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we set

$$\sigma(A) := \{\sigma(x) : \ x \in A\},$$

where, as usual, σ acts componentwise.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1 and that*

$$\exists\ A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ such that } A \text{ and } \sigma(A) \text{ have positive Lebesgue measure.} \tag{25}$$

If moreover

$$\text{The data } x(1), \dots, x(d) \text{ are linearly independent vectors of } \mathbb{R}^{n_0}, \text{ with } n_0 \geq d, \tag{26}$$

and, for each $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$,

$$a^{(\ell-1)} = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty)) = \infty) = 1, \tag{27}$$

then (13) holds.

Note that condition (i) of Theorem 4.1 and the assumption (25) are satisfied by all the activation functions usually used in the applications (ReLU, Sigmoid, etc.).

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is based on the following proposition which is proved later on in this section.

Proposition 6.2. *Assume conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1, (25) and let* $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$ *be fixed. If*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\det(\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) > 0) = 1 \tag{28}$$

and (27) holds, then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\det(\mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})) > 0) = 1. \tag{29}$$

Proof of Theorem 6.1. The statement immediately follows by Proposition 6.2 noticing that the assumption (26) guarantees that $\det(\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})) > 0$ by Lemma 3.1. □

The proof of Proposition 6.2 exploits the following lemmas, which are proved at the end of this section.

Lemma 6.3. *Let X be a real-valued m-dimensional (column) random vector and suppose that its law and the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$ are not singular and that $\mathbb{E}[XX^\top] < \infty$ (i.e., all the entries of the matrix $\mathbb{E}[XX^\top]$ are finite). Then the matrix $\mathbb{E}[XX^\top]$ is positive definite.*

Lemma 6.4. *Let $X_1, \dots, X_r$ be r (column) random vectors with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $1 \leq r \leq d$. If the law of $\text{vec}((X_1, \dots, X_r))$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$, then the random vectors $\{X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ are linearly independent almost surely.*

Proof of Proposition 6.2. We assume $C_B > 0$. The proof in the case when $C_B = 0$ is similar. We divide the proof in two steps: in the first step we prove that, under the foregoing assumptions, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{The law of } \sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))|\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}), \text{ under } \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}, \\ &\text{and the Lebesgue measure on } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ are not singular;} \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

in the second step we conclude the proof.

Step 1: Proof of (30). Recall that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$. Let $\varphi_{\ell-1}$ denote the (Gaussian) density of $\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, under the prior (which exists since by assumption $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is invertible). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \in \sigma(A) \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) &= \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \sigma^{-1}(\sigma(A)) \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \qquad (31) \\ &= \int_A \varphi_{\ell-1}(x)\mathrm{d}x > 0 \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.} \qquad (32) \end{aligned}$$

where in (31) we used that $\sigma^{-1}(\sigma(A)) \supseteq A$ and in (32) we used that A has positive Lebesgue measure. The claim follows noticing that by assumption $\sigma(A)$ has positive Lebesgue measure.

Step 2: Conclusion of the proof. Recall that, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) = C_B \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top + C_W \Bigg(& a^{(\ell-1)} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})] \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty))} T_j^{(\ell-1)} \sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Here, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$: if $\ell = 2$, then $\{\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, if $\ell \in \{3, \dots, L+1\}$, then, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, and, if $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$, then, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{T_j^{(\ell-1)}\}_{j=1,\dots,N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty))}$ are the points of a Poisson process on $(0,\infty)$ with mean measure $\rho^{(\ell-1)}$, independent of the sequence $\{\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$.

Observe that the matrix $C_B \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top$ is positive semi-definite. Since by assumption (27) we have that $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(N_{\ell-1}((0,\infty)) = \infty) = 1$ when $a^{(\ell-1)} = 0$, the claim follows if we prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})] \text{ is positive definite, } \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.} \tag{34}$$

and that

$$\det\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} T_j^{(\ell-1)} \sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \right) > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a. s.} \tag{35}$$

Proof of (34). By (30) we have that the law of $\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\,|\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$ and the Lebesgue measure are not singular. By condition (i) of Theorem 4.1 and the Gaussianity of $\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$ all the entries of $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})]$ are finite $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$-a.s. . The claim then follows by Lemma 6.3.

Proof of (35). Note that, for $n \geq d$ arbitrarily fixed, by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) = d\right\} \\
&\quad\equiv \left\{rk\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} T_j^{(\ell-1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top\right) = d\right\} \\
&\quad\equiv \left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n} T_j^{(\ell-1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \quad \text{is positive definite}\right\} \\
&\quad\subset \left\{\sum_{j\geq 1} T_j^{(\ell-1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \quad \text{is positive definite}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\left(\det\left(\sum_{j\geq 1} T_j^{(\ell-1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top\right) > 0\right) \\
&\qquad \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\left(rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) = d\right), \quad \text{for each } n \geq d. \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

By (30) there exists a Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with strictly positive Lebesgue measure such that

$$p := \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \in A \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) > 0 \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.} \qquad (37)$$

Let $1 \leq r \leq \min\{n, d\}$ and define the event

$$D_{n,r} := \{\text{the matrix } (\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))) \text{ has at least } r \text{ columns in } A\}.$$

We will prove later on that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \leq r-1\}) = 0. \qquad (38)$$

Thus, by assuming (38),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r}) &= \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \geq r\}) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \leq r-1\}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \geq r\}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \geq r).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $r = d$ in this latter relation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,d}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))))) \geq d) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))))) = d).
\end{aligned}$$

So (35) follows by (36) and this latter relation if we prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,d}) = 1.$$

Due to the dominated convergence theorem, in turn, this latter limits holds if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,d} \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.}$$

In order to prove this latter relation holds, we note that since, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, the random vectors $\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$ are independent and identically distributed given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, recalling the definition of p in (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,d} \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) &= \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\Big(\big(\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))\big) \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{has at least } d \text{ columns in } A \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})\Big) \\ &= \sum_{k=d}^{n} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{d} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=d}^{n} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,d} \,|\, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed.

It remains to prove (38). We start noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}&D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \le r-1\} \\ &\equiv \Big\{ \exists\, j \in \{r, \dots, n\} \text{ and } i_1, \dots, i_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \sigma(\zeta_{i_h}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \in A \;\forall\; h = 1, \dots, j \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{and } rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))))) \le r-1 \Big\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{j=r}^{n} \bigcup_{\{i_1,\dots,i_j\} \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}} \Big\{ \sigma(\zeta_{i_h}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \in A \;\forall\; h = 1, \dots, j \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{and } \sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \text{ are linearly dependent} \Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$L_j := \{(x_1, \dots, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times j} : \; x_1, \dots, x_j \quad \text{are linearly dependent}\}.$$

Using the union bound, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \le r-1\}) \\ &\le \sum_{j=r}^{n} \sum_{\{i_1,\dots,i_j\} \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\Big(\sigma(\zeta_{i_h}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \in A \;\forall\; h = 1, \dots, j \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{and } \sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \text{ lin. dep.} \Big) \\ &= \sum_{j=r}^{n} \sum_{\{i_1,\dots,i_j\} \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}((\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))) \in A^j \cap L_j),\end{aligned}$$

where A^j is the j-th Cartesian power of A. Let

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))} = \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\ll} + \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\perp}$$

be the Lebesgue decomposition of $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))}$, being

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\ll} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\perp}$$

the part absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and the singular part, respectively. Since the Lebesgue measure of A^j is strictly positive (by the choice of A) we necessarily have $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\perp}(A^j) = 0$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(D_{n,r} \cap \{rk((\sigma(\zeta_1^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_n^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))) \le r-1\}) \\ \le \sum_{j=r}^{n} \sum_{\{i_1,\dots,i_j\}\subseteq\{1,\dots,n\}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\ll}(L_j). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{F}' := \{(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))^{-1}(E) : \ E \text{ Borel set of } \mathbb{R}^{d\times j}\},$$

i.e., the σ-field generated by $(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))$. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the probability measure on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}')$ defined by

$$\mathbb{Q}(F) := \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\ll}(E),$$

for

$$F := (\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))^{-1}(E).$$

Obviously

$$\mathbb{Q}_{(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))} \equiv \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))),\ll}.$$

Therefore the law of $(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and so by Lemma 6.4 the random vectors $\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$ are linearly independent $\mathbb{Q}$-a.s. Thus

$$\mathbb{Q}_{(\sigma(\zeta_{i_1}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})),\dots,\sigma(\zeta_{i_j}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})))}(L_j) = 0.$$

Combining this with (39) we finally have (38). □

Proof of Lemma 6.3. We start noticing that the matrix $\mathbb{E}[XX^\top]$ is positive semi-definite. Indeed, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have

$$u^\top \mathbb{E}[XX^\top]u = \mathbb{E}|u^\top X|^2 \ge 0.$$

Reasoning by contradiction, suppose that there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_m\}$ such that $\mathbb{E}|v^\top X|^2 = 0$. Hence, $v^\top X = 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., i.e. $\mathbb{P}_X(H_v) = 1$, where by H_v we are denoting the hyperplane $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \ v^\top y = 0\}$. Let A^c denote the complement of a set A. Since $\mathbb{P}_X$ and the Lebesgue measure are not singular, letting $\mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}$ denote the continuous part in the Lebesgue decomposition of $\mathbb{P}_X$ with respect to

the Lebesgue measure, we have that there exists a Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(B) > 0$. Therefore, since $\mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(H_v) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = 1 - \mathbb{P}_X(H_v) = \mathbb{P}_X(H_v^c) \geq \mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(H_v^c) \geq \mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(B \cap H_v^c) \\ = \mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(B \cap H_v^c) + \mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(B \cap H_v) = \mathbb{P}_{X,\ll}(B) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, and the proof is completed. □

Proof of Lemma 6.4. Recall that, for $1 \leq r \leq d$, the vectors $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ are linearly dependent if and only if every $r \times r$ submatrix of $A := (a_1, \ldots, a_r)$ has determinant equal to zero. Let $\mathcal{J}_r$ be the collection of subsets of $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ with cardinality equal to r. For $J \in \mathcal{J}_r$, $J = \{j_1, \ldots j_r\}$, let $p_J : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^r$ be the projection $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)^\top \mapsto (x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_r})^\top$. Clearly, for every $J \in \mathcal{J}_r$, $\widetilde{p}_J(A) := (p_J(a_1), \ldots, p_J(a_r))$ is an $r \times r$ submatrix of A, and every $r \times r$ submatrix of A arises in this way for some $J \in \mathcal{J}_r$. Note that $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ are linearly dependent if and only if $f(A) = 0$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times r} \to [0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$f(A) := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r} |\det(\widetilde{p}_J(A))|.$$

It is easily realized that f is a continuous function (as composition of continuous functions), and so f is measurable. Set $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_r)$ and

$$E := \{\text{the random vectors } X_1, \ldots, X_r \text{ are linearly independent}\}.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{P}(E) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(f(\mathbf{X}) = 0) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\det(\widetilde{p}_{\{1,\ldots,r\}}(\mathbf{X})) = 0).$$

Since $\det(\widetilde{p}_{\{1,\ldots,r\}}(\cdot))$ is a polynomial function, by the absolute continuity of the law of $\mathrm{vec}((X_1, \ldots, X_r))$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure and by the classical fact (see [14]) that every non-identically zero polynomial function $p : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ is non-zero almost everywhere, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\det(\widetilde{p}_{\{1,\ldots,r\}}(\mathbf{X})) = 0) = 0.$$

Therefore $\mathbb{P}(E) = 1$, and the proof is completed. □

7 Simulating the neural network under the posterior distribution

7.1 Some more notation and useful relations

Hereon, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L+1$, we consider: the $n_\ell \times d$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} := (B^{(\ell)} \ldots B^{(\ell)}),$$

where

$$B^{(\ell)} := (B_1^{(\ell)}, \ldots, B_{n_\ell}^{(\ell)})^\top,$$

and the $n_\ell \times n_{\ell-1}$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} := (W_{hj}^{(\ell)})_{1 \leq h \leq n_\ell, 1 \leq j \leq n_{\ell-1}}, \quad W_{hj}^{(\ell)} := \sqrt{V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)}} N_{hj}^{(\ell)};$$

for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L$, we consider: the $n_\ell \times d$ random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})) := (\sigma(Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(1))) \ldots \sigma(Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(d)))),$$

where

$$\sigma(Z_B^{(\ell)}(x(i))) := (\sigma(Z_1^{(\ell)}(x(i))), \dots, \sigma(Z_{n_\ell}^{(\ell)}(x(i))))^\top, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

We note that, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, it holds

$$\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} + \mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Setting

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)} := (B^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{W}^{(\ell)}), \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L+1$$

and defining

$$\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) := \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} + \mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L+1 \tag{40}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{B}^{(L+1)} + \mathbf{W}^{(L+1)} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L+1. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Since $Z_B^{(L+1)}(x(i))$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, is the i-th column of the $n_{L+1} \times d$ random matrix $\mathbf{Z}_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$, by (4), for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, we have

$$Z_B^{(L+1)}(x(i)) = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top) \mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})) \right)^\top \right), \tag{42}$$

where $e_1^{(d)}, \dots, e_d^{(d)}$ are the column vectors of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

For $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\} &= \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} + \mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\} \\ &= (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)}) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{Id}_d \end{pmatrix} \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\} \\ &= (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, B^{(\ell)}) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix} \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $\mathbf{z}^{(\ell)}$ denotes a realization of $\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ and the relation (43) follows noticing that $\mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} = B^{(\ell)} \mathbf{1}_d^\top$. Similarly,

$$\mathbf{Z}_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}^{(1)} + \mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \,|\, \mathbf{B}^{(1)}) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ - \\ \mathbf{Id}_d \end{pmatrix} = (\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \,|\, B^{(1)}) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hereafter, we make the convention that if $C_B = 0$ then

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)} = (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, B^{(\ell)}) := \mathbf{W}^{(\ell)}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L+1,$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix} := \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}), \quad \ell = 2, \dots, L+1,$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix} := \mathbf{x}.$$

For $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, we clearly have

$$\begin{aligned} \left((\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, B^{(\ell)}) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix} \right)^\top &= \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, B^{(\ell)})^\top \\ &= (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d) \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)})^\top \\ - \\ (B^{(\ell)})^\top \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where if $C_B = 0$ we set

$$(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d) := \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)})^\top \\ - \\ (B^{(\ell)})^\top \end{pmatrix} := (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)})^\top.$$

For $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, by (43), (44), the definition of $Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ and (3) with

$$\mathbf{A} = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d), \quad \mathbf{A}' = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)})^\top \\ - \\ (B^{(\ell)})^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell},$$

we have

$$Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\} = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)) W_B^{(\ell)} \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\}, \tag{45}$$

where $W_B^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)$-dimensional column vector

$$W_B^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)} \,|\, B^{(\ell)})^\top).$$

If $C_B = 0$, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, we clearly have

$$Z_0^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_0^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\} = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top) W_0^{(\ell)} \,|\, \{\mathbf{Z}_0^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}\}, \tag{46}$$

where $W_0^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell n_{\ell-1}$-dimensional column vector

$$W_0^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)})^\top).$$

Similarly,

$$Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)) W_B^{(1)}, \tag{47}$$

where $W_B^{(1)}$ is the $n_1(n_0+1)$-dimensional column vector

$$W_B^{(1)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \,|\, B^{(1)})^\top).$$

If $C_B = 0$, we clearly have

$$Z_0^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes \mathbf{x}^\top) W_0^{(1)}, \tag{48}$$

where $W_0^{(1)}$ is the $n_1 n_0$-dimensional column vector

$$W_0^{(1)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{W}^{(1)})^\top).$$

By the statistical assumptions on the model, we have that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$,

$$W_0^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_1 n_0}\left(\mathbf{0}_{n_1 n_0}, \frac{C_W}{n_0}\mathbf{Id}_{n_1 n_0}\right),$$

$$B^{(\ell)} \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_\ell}\left(\mathbf{0}_{n_\ell}, C_B \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\right), \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, n_\ell$$

and, for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L+1$,

$$W_0^{(\ell)} \sim \mathcal{MG}\left(\mathbf{0}_{n_\ell n_{\ell-1}}, C_W \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \ldots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)})\right).$$

Hereon, we assume that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)} > 0) = 1, \qquad \text{for all } \ell = 2, \ldots, L+1. \tag{49}$$

Note that, since the random variables $V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \ldots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}$ are independent and identically distributed, this condition is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n_{\ell-1}} V_{n_{\ell-1},j}^{(\ell-1)} > 0\right) = 1,$$

which, in turn, is equivalent to

$$\det\left(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_\ell - 1}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \ldots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)})\right) > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}\text{-almost surely.}$$

Since, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L+1$, $W_0^{(\ell)}$ and $B^{(\ell)}$ are independent, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, W_B^{(\ell)}}(\mathrm{d}w_b^{(\ell)}) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, W_0^{(\ell)}}(\mathrm{d}w_0^{(\ell)}) \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, B^{(\ell)}}(\mathrm{d}b^{(\ell)}), \tag{50}$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, W_0^{(1)}}(\mathrm{d}w_0^{(1)}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi C_W n_0^{-1})^{(n_1 n_0)/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{n_0}{2C_W}\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)})^\top)\right) \mathrm{d}w_0^{(1)}, \tag{51}$$

for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, B^{(\ell)}}(\mathrm{d}b^{(\ell)}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{C_B \neq 0\}} \frac{1}{(2\pi C_B)^{n_\ell/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2C_B}\mathrm{Tr}[b^{(\ell)}(b^{(\ell)})^\top]\right) \mathrm{d}b^{(\ell)} \\ + \mathbf{1}_{\{C_B = 0\}} \delta_{\mathbf{0}_{n_\ell}}(\mathrm{d}b^{(\ell)}).\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

and, for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}, W_0^{(\ell)}}(\mathrm{d}w_0^{(\ell)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[(2\pi)^{-(n_\ell n_{\ell-1})/2}(\det(C_W \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \ldots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(w_0^{(\ell)})^\top (C_W \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \ldots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}))^{-1} w_0^{(\ell)}\right)\Bigg] \mathrm{d}w_0^{(\ell)}.\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Here, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L+1$, $w_b^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)$-dimensional column vector $w_b^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)} \mid b^{(\ell)})^\top)$, $w_0^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell n_{\ell-1}$-dimensional column vector $w_0^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)})^\top)$, $\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell \times n_{\ell-1}$ matrix $\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)} = (w_{hj}^{(\ell)})$, $w^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell n_{\ell-1}$-dimensional column vector $w^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)})^\top)$, $b^{(\ell)}$ is the n_ℓ-dimensional column vector $b^{(\ell)} := (b_1^{(\ell)}, \ldots, b_{n_\ell}^{(\ell)})^\top$, and $\delta_x(\cdot)$ denotes the Dirac measure at x.

7.2 On the neural network under the posterior distribution

For $\ell = 1, \dots, L+1$, set

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell := \sigma\{B^{(r)}, \mathbf{W}^{(r)} : 1 \le r \le \ell\} \subset \mathcal{F}$$

i.e., the σ-algebra generated by the random weights and biases up to the ℓ-th layer, and consider the measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{L+1})$. Letting g denote the likelihood function defined in (12), by e.g. Corollary 10.2.1 p. 422 in [31], there exists a unique probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{L+1})$ such that

$$\forall\ \ell = 1, \dots, L+1,\ \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}\Big|_{\mathcal{H}_\ell} := \mathfrak{c}\, \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, \mathcal{H}_\ell] \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}},$$

where, as usual, $\mathfrak{c}$ denotes the normalizing constant (which clearly varies from ℓ to ℓ). Note that, by measurability,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}} \equiv \mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{H}_{L+1},$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}}$ is defined by (9).

7.2.1 Markovianity of $\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{\ell=1,\dots,L+1}$ under the posterior

The following proposition holds.

Proposition 7.1. *Under* $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, $\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{\ell=1,\dots,L+1}$ *is a Markov chain.*

Proof. We give the proof only in the case $C_B > 0$. The proof when $C_B = 0$ is similar. Let $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$ be arbitrarily fixed. By the definition of the posterior, for $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)})$ and $A^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_j d})$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell-1$, we have (recall that in general $\mathfrak{c}$ denotes a constant which may be different from line to line)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}(Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A \,|\, Z_B^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(j)},\ j = 1, \dots, \ell-1) \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\mathbf{E}_{\text{posterior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\}\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(j)},\ j = 1, \dots, \ell-1\}] \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c} \int_\Omega \mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\}\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(j)},\ j = 1, \dots, \ell-1\}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, \mathcal{H}_\ell] \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}} \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\, \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\}\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(j)},\ j = 1, \dots, \ell-1\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(1)}] \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(\ell-1)}],
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where the latter equality follows noticing that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{\ell=1,\dots,L+1}$ is a Markov chain. Similarly, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}(Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(\ell-1)}) \\
&\qquad = \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A^{(\ell-1)}].
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $A = \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}$ it follows $\mathfrak{c} = \widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}$, and the proof is completed. □

By this proposition we clearly have that, for each $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}d})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A) \\
&= \int_A \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_L d}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_1 d}} \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) | Z_B^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(L+1)} | z^{(L)}) \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) | Z_B^{(L-1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(L)} | z^{(L-1)}) \\
&\qquad \dots \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) | Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(2)} | z^{(1)}) \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(1)}),
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

and therefore, to sample from the distribution of $Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})$ under the posterior, one has to sample in sequential order from the laws:

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})|Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}, \quad \ell = 2,\dots,L+1.$$

7.2.2 The law of $Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ under the posterior

The next theorem shows that $Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ (resp., $Z_0^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$) has the same Gaussian law both under the prior and under the posterior.

Theorem 7.2. *The following claims hold:*
(i) If $C_B > 0$, then, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$ and under $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, we have

$$Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_1 d}(\mathbf{0}_{n_1 d}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)\text{diag}_{n_0+1}(n_0^{-1}C_W,\dots,n_0^{-1}C_W,C_B)(\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top),$$

(ii) If $C_B = 0$, then, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$ and under $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, we have

$$Z_0^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_1 d}(\mathbf{0}_{n_1 d}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes \mathbf{x}^\top \text{diag}_{n_0}(n_0^{-1}C_W,\dots,n_0^{-1}C_W)\mathbf{x}).$$

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case $C_B > 0$. The proof when $C_B = 0$ follows similar lines. By the definition of the posterior, (42) with $\ell = 2$, the independence, under the prior, of $Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_B^{(1)}$ (see (47)) from $\{\mathbf{\Theta}^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell=2,\dots,L+1}$, for $z^{(1)} = \text{vec}((\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})}(z^{(1)}) \\
&= \mathfrak{c}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\left[\exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|Z_B^{(L+1)}(x(i)) - y(i)\|^2\right) \,\middle|\, Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(1)}\right] \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})}(z^{(1)}) \\
&= \mathfrak{c}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\text{vec}((\Phi_{\mathbf{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}))^\top) - y(i)\|^2\right)\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_1}\otimes(\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_B^{(1)}}(z^{(1)}) \\
&= \mathfrak{c}\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_1}\otimes(\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_B^{(1)}}(z^{(1)}) = \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},Z_B^{(1)}}(z^{(1)})\,. \qquad (56)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the normalizing constant must be equal to 1. On the other hand, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$,

$$W_B^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_1(n_0+1)}(\mathbf{0}_{n_1(n_0+1)}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes \text{diag}_{n_0+1}(n_0^{-1}C_W,\dots,n_0^{-1}C_W,C_B)).$$

By this relation and (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_B^{(1)} \\
&\sim \mathcal{N}_{n_1 d}(\mathbf{0}_{n_1 d}, (\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))(\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes \text{diag}_{n_0+1}(n_0^{-1}C_W,\dots,n_0^{-1}C_W,C_B))(\mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))^\top) \\
&= \mathcal{N}_{n_1 d}(\mathbf{0}_{n_1 d}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)\text{diag}_{n_0+1}(n_0^{-1}C_W,\dots,n_0^{-1}C_W,C_B)(\mathbf{x}^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top),
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter equality follows by the second relation in (1). The claim follows combining this relation with (56). □

7.2.3 Sampling from the transition distributions under the posterior

In the following theorem we (basically) compute the transition probabilities of the Markov chain $\{Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{\ell=1,\dots,L+1}$, under the posterior distribution.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$ be fixed, let $z^{(\ell-1)} = \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top)$ and assume (49). The following claims hold:*
(i) If $C_B > 0$, then, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$, we have that $W_B^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(\ell-1)}$ has probability density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}$ equal to

$$\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(w_b^{(\ell)} \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathfrak{c}\, \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(w_b^{(\ell)}) I_B(w_b^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(\cdot)$ is the probability density of the Gaussian mixture distribution

$$\mathcal{MG}(\mathbf{0}_{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}+1}(C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}, \dots, C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}, C_B)), \tag{57}$$

i.e., the density of $W_B^{(\ell)}$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$, and, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L$,

$$I_B(w_b^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top) \\ \mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \dots \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2 \Bigg)\Bigg],$$

where, using an obvious notation, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)} = (b^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{w}^{(\ell)})$, $w_b^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)} \,|\, b^{(\ell)})^\top)$ and

$$I_B(w_b^{(L+1)}, \mathbf{z}^{(L)}, \mathbf{y}) \\ := \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(L)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2 \right). \tag{58}$$

(ii) If $C_B = 0$, then, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$, we have that $W_0^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_0^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(\ell-1)}$ has probability density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell n_{\ell-1}}$ equal to

$$\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_0^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_0^{(\ell-1)}}(w_0^{(\ell)} \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathfrak{c}\, \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_0^{(\ell)}}(w_0^{(\ell)}) I_0(w_0^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_0^{(\ell)}}(\cdot)$ is the probability density of the Gaussian mixture distribution

$$\mathcal{MG}(\mathbf{0}_{n_\ell n_{\ell-1}}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}, \dots, C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}})),$$

i.e., the density of $W_0^{(\ell)}$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$, and, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L$,

$$I_0(w_0^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top) \\ \mathrm{vec}\left(\Phi_{\mathbf{W}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \dots \Phi_{\mathbf{W}^{(\ell+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2 \Bigg)\Bigg],$$

and

$$I_0(w_0^{(L+1)}, \mathbf{z}^{(L)}, \mathbf{y}) := \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\mathrm{vec}\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{w}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(L)})^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2 \right).$$

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case $C_B > 0$. The proof when $C_B = 0$ follows similar lines. For $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, by the definition of the posterior, for $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)})$ and $A' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell-1}d})$, we have (along a similar computation as for (54))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}(W_B^{(\ell)} \in A \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A') = \mathfrak{c}\mathbf{E}_{\text{posterior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\}\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A'\}] \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\,\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\}\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A'\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\
&\quad = \mathfrak{c}\,\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \in A'\}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})]].
\end{aligned}$$

By (42) and the independence, under the prior, between $Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\{W_B^{(r)}\}_{r=\ell,\dots,L+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(\ell-1)}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\Bigg[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\} \\
&\times \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\text{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \ldots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2\right)\Bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Using (50), (52) and (53), by independence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(\ell)} \in A\} g(Z_B^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(\ell-1)}] \\
&= \mathfrak{c} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}(n_L+1)}} \mathbf{1}\{w_b^{(\ell)} \in A\} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\text{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \ldots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2\right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{r=\ell}^{L+1} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},W_0^{(r)}}(\mathrm{d}w_0^{(r)})\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},B^{(r)}}(\mathrm{d}b^{(r)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Therefore $W_B^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(\ell-1)}$ has a probability density $\mathrm{p}_{\text{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)} \,|\, Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)})$, with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}$, which is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\Bigg[(\det(C_W\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \text{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}))^{-1/2} \\
&\times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left((w_0^{(\ell)})^\top(C_W\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes \text{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}(V_{n_{\ell-1},1}^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, V_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}}^{(\ell-1)}))^{-1}w_0^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{C_B}\text{Tr}(b^{(\ell)}(b^{(\ell)})^\top)\right)\right)\Bigg] \\
&\times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell+1}(n_\ell+1)}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{L+1}(n_L+1)}} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{d} \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\text{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \ldots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. - y(i)\|^2\right) \prod_{r=\ell+1}^{L+1} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},W_0^{(r)}}(\mathrm{d}w_0^{(r)})\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},B^{(r)}}(\mathrm{d}b^{(r)}).
\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows noticing that an elementary computation yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(w_0^{(\ell)})^\top(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}((C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}})^{-1},\dots,(C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}})^{-1})w_0^{(\ell)}+\frac{1}{C_B}\mathrm{Tr}(b^{(\ell)}(b^{(\ell)})^\top)\\
&=(w_0^{(\ell)})^\top(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}}((C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}})^{-1},\dots,(C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}})^{-1}))w_0^{(\ell)}+\frac{1}{C_B}(b^{(\ell)})^\top b^{(\ell)}\\
&=(w_b^{(\ell)})^\top(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_{\ell-1}+1}(C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}},\dots,C_W V^{(\ell-1)}_{n_{\ell-1},n_{\ell-1}},C_B))^{-1}w_b^{(\ell)}. \qquad (60)
\end{aligned}
$$

□

In view of this theorem, to sample from the distribution of $Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, $\ell=2,\dots,L+1$, under the posterior, one may proceed as follows (mutatis mutandis one samples from the distribution of $Z_0^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_0^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, $\ell=2,\dots,L+1$, under the posterior). In practice, one first samples from the law of $W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, under the posterior, using rejection sampling, and then uses the relation (45) to sample from the law of $Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, under the posterior.

To be more specific, this is the algorithm:

- *Step 1*: Sample from the Gaussian mixture law (57) and let $\star_{\mathcal{M}G}$ denote the realization; sample from the uniform law on $[0,1]$ and let $\star_{\mathcal{U}}$ denote the realization; accept $\star_{\mathcal{M}\mathcal{G}}$ as a realization of $W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, under the posterior, if condition $\star_{\mathcal{U}}\le I_B(\star_{\mathcal{M}G},\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})$ holds. Else, $\star_{\mathcal{M}G}$ is not accepted as a realization of $W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, under the posterior, and one repeats the whole Step 1.

- *Step 2*: Due to relation (45), a realization of the random variable $Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$, under the posterior, is obtained multiplying by $(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))$ the realization of the random variable $W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}$ obtained in the previous Step 1.

By (58), we know the analytic expression of $I_B(w_b^{(L+1)},\mathbf{z}^{(L)},\mathbf{y})$. However, for $\ell=2,\dots,L+1$, we are not able to compute exactly the quantity $I_B(w_b^{(\ell)},\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})$. Therefore, the rejection sampling algorithm described above has to be applied replacing I_B by a suitable estimate, say $\widehat{I}_B$, and we will speak about *approximate simulation* of the posterior neural network. In Section 7.3 we will show that the approximate simulation is *consistent*. More precisely, we will prove that, for each $\ell=2,\dots,L$, the total variation distance between the posterior law of $Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ and the law of the random variable sampled by the approximate simulation converges to zero, as suitable parameters grow large. As we will see in Section 8, in the case of a shallow neural network, *i.e.*, $L=1$, the computations in the proof of Theorem 7.3 can be put forward, and one can prove that, under the posterior, $Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}$ has an explicit Gaussian mixture distribution. So, in the case of a shallow neural network, we are able to produce a *perfect simulation* of the posterior neural network *without exploiting rejection sampling.*

7.3 Consistency of the approximate simulation of the posterior neural network

Hereafter, for ease of notation we set $a\wedge b:=\min\{a,b\}$ and $a\vee b:=\max\{a,b\}$, $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$.

In this section we assume $C_B>0$, but clearly, mutatis mutandis, all continue to hold if $C_B=0$. Let $\ell\in\{2,\dots,L\}$ ($\ell\neq L+1$) and consider the Monte Carlo estimator of $I_B(*,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})$ defined by

$$
\widehat{I}_B(*,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y}):=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{r=1}^{N}\{[(1-\delta)\vee\Psi(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_r^{(L+1)},\dots,\boldsymbol{\Theta}_r^{(\ell+1)},*,\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}),\mathbf{y})]\wedge\delta\},
$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}), \mathbf{y})\\ &:= \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{i=1}^{d} \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_{L+1}} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)\\ &\qquad\qquad \mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \ldots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

and, for $s = \ell+1, \dots, L+1$, $\{\Theta_r^{(s)}\}_{1 \le r \le N}$ are N independent replicas of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(s)} = (B^{(s)}, \mathbf{W}^{(s)})$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$. Note that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, the quantity $\widehat{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})$ is a consistent estimator of $I_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})$, indeed setting, for ease of notation,

$$\Psi(y) := \Psi(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_1^{(L+1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_1^{(\ell+1)}, y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}), \mathbf{y}), \ \widetilde{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\{(1-\delta) \vee \Psi(*)\} \wedge \delta],$$

we have

$$\lim_{\delta \to 1} \lim_{N \to \infty} \widehat{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) = \lim_{\delta \to 1} \widetilde{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\Psi(*)] = I_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where the first equality follows by the law of large numbers and the second one by the dominated convergence theorem. Note also that

$$1 - \delta \le \widehat{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}), \widetilde{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \le \delta \quad \text{uniformly in all the variables} \tag{61}$$

For $\ell = 2, \dots, L$, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, let $\{(W_B^{(\ell)})_n\}_{n \ge 1}$ be independent replicas of $W_B^{(\ell)}$, *i.e.*, independent $n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)$-dimensional random vectors distributed according to the Gaussian mixture law (57); let $\{U_n\}_{n \ge 1}$ be a sequence of independent random variables with the uniform law on $[0,1]$, and suppose that the families of random elements $\{(W_B^{(\ell)})_n\}_{n \ge 1}$, $\{U_n\}_{n \ge 1}$ and $\mathcal{T} := \{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_r^{(s)}\}_{1 \le r \le N, \ell+1 \le s \le L+1}$ are independent. For $\ell = 2, \dots, L$, define the random variable

$$\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)}) := \inf\{n \ge 1 : \ U_n \le \widehat{I}_B((W_B^{(\ell)})_n, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})\}.$$

In the next theorem d_{TV} denotes the total variation distance between probability laws.

Theorem 7.4. *For any $\ell \in \{2, \dots, L+1\}$, it holds*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 1} \limsup_{N \to \infty} d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot), \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot)\right) = 0,$$

where $R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ is a random vector which, under $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, has law

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(C)\\ &\quad := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell-1} d}} \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}, (\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \mid \mathbf{1}_d))(W_B^{(\ell)})_{\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})}}(C) \mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}, \mathrm{Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(\ell-1)}),\end{aligned}$$

$C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)})$, i.e., $R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ is the random vector simulated by the rejection sampling algorithm when I_B is replaced by $\widehat{I}_B$.

The proof uses the following lemma, which is proved at the end of this section.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $(A,\mathcal{A})$ be a measurable space and let $\mathbb{A}$ be a probability measure on it. Let X and Y be two random vectors with values on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and S a random vector with values on $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$. We assume that X,Y and S are defined on $(A,\mathcal{A})$. Then*

$$d_{TV}(\mathbb{A}_X(\cdot),\mathbb{A}_Y(\cdot))\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} d_{TV}(\mathbb{A}_{X\,|\,S=s}(\cdot),\mathbb{A}_{Y\,|\,S=s}(\cdot))\mathbb{A}_S(\mathrm{d}s).$$

Proof of Theorem 7.4. Let $\ell\in\{2,\dots,L\}$ be arbitrarily fixed. Hereon, for ease of notation, we simply write $\widehat{\tau}$ in place of $\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})$ and, for $v=(v_1,\dots,v_m),v'=(v'_1,\dots,v'_m)\in\mathbb{R}^m$, we write $v\le v'$ in place of $v_i\le v'_i$ for each $i=1,\dots,m$; moreover, we write W_n in place of $(W_B^{(\ell)})_n$. For $w=\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{w}^\top)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_{\widehat{\tau}}\le w\,|\,\mathcal{T})=\sum_{n\ge1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_n\le w,\widehat{\tau}=n\,|\,\mathcal{T})\\
&=\sum_{n\ge1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_n\le w,U_k>\widehat{I}_B(W_k,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})),\,k=1,\dots,n-1,\,U_n\le\widehat{I}_B(W_n,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T})\\
&=\sum_{n\ge1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_n\le w,\,U_n\le\widehat{I}_B(W_n,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T})\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(U_k>\widehat{I}_B(W_k,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})),\,k=1,\dots,n-1\,|\,\mathcal{T})\\
&=\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_1\le w,\,U_1\le\widehat{I}_B(W_1,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T})\sum_{n\ge1}(\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T}))^{n-1}\\
&\quad=\frac{1}{1-\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})}\,\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_1\le w,\,U_1\le\widehat{I}_B(W_1,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T}):=\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(U_1>\widehat{I}_B(W_1,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T}).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}(W_1\le w,\,U_1\le\widehat{I}_B(W_1,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,|\,\mathcal{T})\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathbf{1}\{y\le w\}\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\int_0^1\mathbf{1}\{u\le\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\}\mathrm{d}u\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathbf{1}\{y\le w\}\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}y
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$1-\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}y$$

we have that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$, $W_{\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})}$ has probability density

$$\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_{\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})}}(y):=\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}[\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T})\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})]\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y),$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T}):=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}y\right)^{-1}.$$

Setting

$$\tau(z^{(\ell-1)}):=\inf\{n\ge1:\ U_n\le I_B(W_n,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\},$$

similar arguments show that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}$, the probability density of $W_{\tau(z^{(\ell-1)})}$ is given by $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot\,|\,z^{(\ell-}$
So, defining

$$\mathfrak{c}(z^{(\ell-1)}):=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)I_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})\,\mathrm{d}y\right)^{-1},$$

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)}) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \widetilde{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \, \mathrm{d}y \right)^{-1}$$

and, suppressing, for ease of notation, the dependence on $z^{(\ell-1)}$ of τ, $\widehat{\tau}$, $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{c}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})|Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_{\widehat{\tau}}}(\cdot)) \\
&= d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_{\tau}}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_{\widehat{\tau}}}(\cdot)) \\
&:= \sup_{C\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)})} |\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}((\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_\tau \in C) \\
&\qquad\qquad - \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{prior}}((\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_{\widehat{\tau}} \in C)| \\
&= \sup_{C\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)})} \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathbf{1}\{(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))y \in C\} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times (\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(y \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)}) - \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_{\widehat{\tau}}}(y)) \, \mathrm{d}y \Big| \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} |\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(y \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)}) - \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_{\widehat{\tau}}}(y)| \, \mathrm{d}y. \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}$$

We continue this chain of relations noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} |\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{posterior},W_B^{(\ell)}\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}}(y \,|\, z^{(\ell-1)}) - \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_{\widehat{\tau}}}(y)| \, \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} |\mathfrak{c} I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}[\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T}) \widehat{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})]| \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \Big| \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \Big[(\mathfrak{c} - \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})) I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})(I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) - \widehat{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})) \Big] \Big| \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y.
\end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$1 - p := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \, \mathrm{d}y,$$

it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \Big| \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \Big[(\mathfrak{c} - \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})) I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})(I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) - \widehat{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})) \Big] \Big| \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\leq (1-p)\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} |\mathfrak{c} - \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})| \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \left[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} |I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) - \widehat{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y})| \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \mathrm{d}y \right] \\
&\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \left[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})| \left| I_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) - \widehat{I}_B(y, \mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{y}) \right| \right] \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y) \mathrm{d}y,
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter inequality follows noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-p)\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} |\mathfrak{c} - \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})| &= (1-p)\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \Big| \frac{1}{1-p} - \frac{1}{1-\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})} \Big| \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \Big| \frac{p - \widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})}{1-\widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})} \Big| = \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}} \Big| \widehat{c}(\mathcal{T})(p - \widehat{p}(\mathcal{T})) \Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz and the Minkowski inequalities we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\left[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})||I_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})-\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})|\right] \mathrm{p}_{\text{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\mathrm{d}y\\
&\le 2\left(\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\left[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})|^2\right]\right)^{1/2}\\
&\qquad\times\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}\left[|I_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})-\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})|^2\right]^{1/2} \mathrm{p}_{\text{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\\
&\le 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})|^2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} |I_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})-\widetilde{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})|\mathrm{p}_{\text{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\widetilde{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})-\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})|^2]^{1/2}\mathrm{p}_{\text{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right). \qquad (63)
\end{aligned}
$$

Noticing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})-\widetilde{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y})| &\le \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\{(1-\delta)\vee\Psi(y)\}\wedge\delta-\Psi(y)|]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\{(1-\delta)\vee\Psi(y)\}\wedge\delta-\Psi(y)|\mathbf{1}\{\Psi(y)\le 1-\delta\}]\\
&\quad+\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\{(1-\delta)\vee\Psi(y)\}\wedge\delta-\Psi(y)|\mathbf{1}\{\delta\ge\Psi(y)>1-\delta\}]\\
&\quad+\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\{(1-\delta)\vee\Psi(y)\}\wedge\delta-\Psi(y)|\mathbf{1}\{\Psi(y)>\delta\}]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[(1-\delta-\Psi(y))\mathbf{1}\{\Psi(y)\le 1-\delta\}]+\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[(\Psi(y)-\delta)\mathbf{1}\{\Psi(y)>\delta\}]\le 1-\delta
\end{aligned}
$$

and that

$$
\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}_{\text{prior}}(\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y}))\le\delta^2/N,
$$

we have that the rightmost expression in (63) is less than or equal to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})|^2]}\left(1-\delta+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_\ell(n_{\ell-1}+1)}}\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}_{\text{prior}}(\widehat{I}_B(y,\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)},\mathbf{y}))^{1/2}\mathrm{p}_{\text{prior},W_B^{(\ell)}}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right)\\
&\le 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathcal{T})|^2]}\left(1-\delta+\delta/\sqrt{N}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

By the definition of the law of $R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ under $\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$ we have

$$
\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}\equiv\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))W_{\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})}}(\cdot).
$$

Therefore, combining all the previous relations with (62), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d_{TV}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})|Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})|Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot))\\
&=d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))(W_B^{(\ell)})_{\tau(z^{(\ell-1)})}}(\cdot),\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior},(\mathbf{Id}_{n_\ell}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))(W_B^{(\ell)})_{\widehat{\tau}(z^{(\ell-1)})}}(\cdot))\\
&\qquad\le 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T})|^2]}\left(1-\delta+\delta/\sqrt{N}\right). \qquad (64)
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Lemma 7.5 with $A=\Omega$, $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{H}_{L+1}$, $\mathbb{A}=\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, $X=Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$, $Y=R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $S=Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot)\right)\\
&\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell-1}d}} d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(\ell-1)}}\right)\\
&\qquad\qquad\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(\ell-1)}) \qquad (65)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (65) and (64) we deduce

$$d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot)\right)$$
$$\leq 2\left(1-\delta+\delta/\sqrt{N}\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell-1}d}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[|\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T})|^2]}\,\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(\ell-1)}).$$

By (61) and the definition of $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T})$ we have

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}(z^{(\ell-1)},\mathcal{T})\leq(1-\delta)^{-1},\quad \text{uniformly in all the variables}$$

and so, applying three times the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot)\right)$$
$$\leq 2(1-\delta)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell-1}d}}\widetilde{c}(z^{(\ell-1)})\,\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathrm{d}z^{(\ell-1)}).$$

Note that

$$(1-\delta)\widetilde{c}(z^{(\ell-1)})\leq 1\quad \text{uniformly in } z^{(\ell-1)}$$

and that by the dominated convergence theorem

$$(1-\delta)\widetilde{c}(z^{(\ell-1)})\to 0\times\mathfrak{c}(z^{(\ell-1)})=0,\quad \text{as } \delta\to 1.$$

Therefore, applying again the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 1}\limsup_{N\to\infty} d_{TV}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot),\mathbf{P}_{\text{posterior},R_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x})}(\cdot)\right)=0,$$

which gives the claim. □

Proof. Lemma 7.5 Let $C\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be arbitrarily fixed. We have

$$\mathbb{A}_X(C)-\mathbb{A}_Y(C)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}(\mathbb{A}_{X\,|\,S=s}(C)-\mathbb{A}_{Y\,|\,S=s}(C))\mathbb{A}_S(\mathrm{d}s).$$

Therefore, taking the modulus and then the supremum over all the Borel sets C, we have

$$d_{TV}(\mathbb{A}_X(\cdot),\mathbb{A}_Y(\cdot))\leq\sup_{C\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\mathbb{A}_{X\,|\,S=s}(C)-\mathbb{A}_{Y\,|\,S=s}(C)|\mathbb{A}_S(\mathrm{d}s)$$
$$\leq\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} d_{TV}(\mathbb{A}_{X\,|\,S=s}(\cdot),\mathbb{A}_{Y\,|\,S=s}(\cdot))\mathbb{A}_S(\mathrm{d}s).$$

□

8 The distribution of the posterior shallow neural network

In this section we consider the neural network in the shallow case, i.e., for $L=1$, and compute the laws of $Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}$ and $Z_0^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_0^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}$ under the posterior.

We start introducing some further notation. Hereon we assume that condition (49), with $\ell=2$, is in force.

• If $C_B>0$ we consider: the $n_2(n_1+1)\times n_2(n_1+1)$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}):=\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1},$$

where $\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}$ is the inverse of the $(n_1+1)\times(n_1+1)$ matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) := 2\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\\ -\\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\\ -\\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top\end{pmatrix}^\top + \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(C_W V^{(1)}_{n_1,1},\dots,C_W V^{(1)}_{n_1,n_1},C_B)^{-1}$$

and the $n_2(n_1+1)$-dimensional random vector

$$\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top$ is the transpose of the $n_2\times(n_1+1)$ random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y}\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\\ -\\ \mathbf{1}_d^\top\end{pmatrix}^\top \mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}.$$

• If $C_B=0$ we consider: the $n_2n_1\times n_2n_1$ random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) := \mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes\mathbf{S}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1},$$

where $\mathbf{S}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}$ is the inverse of the $n_1\times n_1$ random matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) := 2\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top + \mathrm{diag}_{n_1}(C_W V^{(1)}_{n_1,1},\dots,C_W V^{(1)}_{n_1,n_1})^{-1},$$

the n_2n_1-dimensional random vector

$$\mu_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top$ is the transpose of the $n_2\times n_1$ random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\mathbf{S}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}.$$

The following theorem holds.

Theorem 8.1. *Assume (49) with $\ell=2$ and let $z^{(1)}=\mathrm{vec}((\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top)$. The following claims hold:*
(i) If $C_B>0$, then, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$, we have

$$Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{MG}(\nu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}),\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)^\top),$$

where

$$\nu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)^\top)^\top).$$

(ii) If $C_B=0$, then, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$, we have

$$Z_0^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_0^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{MG}(\nu_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}),\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\mathbf{S}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})),$$

where

$$\nu_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_0(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}))^\top).$$

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case $C_B > 0$. The proof when $C_B = 0$ follows similar lines. We start noticing that for $L = 1$ (and so $\ell = 2$), given $\mathbf{Z}_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{z}^{(1)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(L+1)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \ldots \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(\ell)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(\ell-1)})\right)^\top\right) &= \mathrm{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{(B^{(2)},\mathbf{W}^{(2)})} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\right)^\top\right) \\ &= \mathrm{vec}\left(\mathbf{Z}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})^\top\right) = (\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))W_B^{(2)},\end{aligned}$$

where the latter equality follows by (45). On combining this with (59) and (60), for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{n_2(n_1+1)})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(2)} \in A\} g(Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}), y) \,|\, Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(1)}] \\ &= \mathfrak{c} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2(n_1+1)}} \mathbf{1}\{w_b^{(2)} \in A\} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[(\det(C_W \mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_1}(V_{n_1,1}^{(1)}, \ldots, V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}))^{-1/2} \\ &\times \exp\Bigg(-\frac{1}{2}\Bigg(2\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbb{I}_d))w_b^{(2)} - y(i)\|^2 \\ &\quad + (w_b^{(2)})^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(C_W V_{n_1,1}^{(1)}, \ldots, C_W V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}, C_B))^{-1} w_b^{(2)}\Bigg)\Bigg] \mathrm{d}w_0^{(2)} \mathrm{d}b^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Along a similar computation as for (17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(w_b^{(2)})^\top (\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(C_W V_{n_1,1}^{(1)}, \ldots, C_W V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}, C_B)^{-1} w_b^{(2)} \\ &\quad = \mathrm{Tr}[(\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)}) \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(C_W V_{n_1,1}^{(1)}, \ldots, C_W V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}, C_B)^{-1} (\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})^\top].\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))w_b^{(2)}$$

is the i-th column of $(\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top$, as in (15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^d \|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (e_i^{(d)})^\top)(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2} \otimes (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d))w_b^{(2)} - y(i)\|^2 \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}(((\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top - \mathbf{y})((\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top - \mathbf{y})^\top).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the term inside the exponential in (66) equals

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\Bigg((\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})\Bigg[2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d) \\ &+ \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(C_W V_{n_1,1}^{(1)}, \ldots, C_W V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}, C_B)^{-1}\Bigg](\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})^\top - 4(\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top \mathbf{y}^\top\Bigg) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^\top) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\Bigg(\mathrm{Tr}\Bigg((\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})(\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})^\top - 4(\mathbf{w}^{(2)} \,|\, b^{(2)})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_d)^\top \mathbf{y}^\top\Bigg)\Bigg) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}^\top).\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

From now on, we often use the shorthand notation μ in place of $\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in place of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ in place of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})$ and $\mathbf{S}$ in place of $\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})$. Along similar computations as for (20) we have

$$(w_b^{(2)}-\mu)^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(w_b^{(2)}-\mu)=\mathrm{Tr}(((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})-\boldsymbol{\mu})\mathbf{S}((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|b^{(2)})-\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top).$$

Elementary computations yield (see the analogous calculation in (21))

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}(((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})-\boldsymbol{\mu})\mathbf{S}((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})-\boldsymbol{\mu})^\top)\\&\quad=\mathrm{Tr}((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})^\top)-2\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})^\top)+\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{S}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})^\top=2\mathbf{y}\left((\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\\-\\\mathbf{1}_d^\top\end{pmatrix}\right)^\top.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\begin{pmatrix}(\mathbf{w}^{(2)})^\top\\-\\(b^{(2)})^\top\end{pmatrix}-4(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}\,|\,b^{(2)})\begin{pmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\\-\\\mathbf{1}_d^\top\end{pmatrix}\mathbf{y}^\top\right]\\&\qquad=(w_b^{(2)}-\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}))^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}(w_b^{(2)}-\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}))\\&\qquad\quad-\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top).\end{aligned}$$

By this relation, (67) and (66) we then have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}[\mathbf{1}\{W_B^{(2)}\in A\}g(Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}),y)\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}]\\&=\mathfrak{c}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2(n_1+1)}}\mathbf{1}\{w_b^{(2)}\in A\}\\&\quad\times\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{prior}}\Bigg[(\det(C_W\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes\mathrm{diag}_{n_1}(V_{n_1,1}^{(1)},\dots,V_{n_1,n_1}^{(1)}))^{-1/2}\\&\quad\times\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})^\top)\right)\\&\quad\times\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(w_b^{(2)}-\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}))^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}(w_b^{(2)}-\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}))\right)\Bigg]\mathrm{d}w_b^{(2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$,

$$W_B^{(2)}\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}\sim\mathcal{MG}(\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}),\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}))$$

(see the first lines of the proof of Theorem 7.3). By this relation, (45) and (5) we have that, under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{posterior}}$, $Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\,|\,Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})=z^{(1)}$ follows the distribution

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{MG}\Big((&\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y}),\\&(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))^\top\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows noticing that by (3) we have

$$(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))\mu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})=\mathrm{vec}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)^\top)^\top)=\nu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{y})$$

and by (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})(\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d))^\top\\&\qquad=\mathbf{Id}_{n_2}\otimes(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top\,|\,\mathbf{1}_d)^\top.\end{aligned}$$

□

9 Examples

In this section we analyze two specific models of fully connected and feedforward neural networks with dependent weights, for which the existence of the wide width limit under the posterior is guaranteed (see Section 9.3). Although in the following models one can consider any classical activation function, for simplicity we focus on the ReLU function $\sigma(x) := \max\{0, x\}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

9.1 Model 1

The first model that we analyze is a fully connected and feedforward neural network with dependent weights, as defined in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, with $C_B > 0$ and $V^{(\ell)}_{n_\ell,j} := Y^{(\ell)}_j/n_\ell$, $j = 1, \dots, n_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, where, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\{Y^{(\ell)}_j\}_{j\geq 1,\ell=1,\dots,L}$ are independent random variables and $\{Y^{(\ell)}_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ are identically distributed with $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(Y^{(\ell)}_1 > 0) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}} Y^{(\ell)}_1 \in (0, \infty)$. By the law of the large numbers, for each $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} V^{(\ell)}_{n_\ell,j} \to \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}} Y^{(\ell)}_1, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}\text{-a.s., as } n_\ell \to \infty.$$

Therefore, the assumption (ii) of Theorem 4.1 holds with $a^{(\ell)} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}} Y^{(\ell)}_1 > 0$ and $\rho^{(\ell)} \equiv 0$. If the data are such that (26) is satisfied and the activation function σ is e.g. the ReLU function, then condition (i) of Theorem 4.1 holds and assumption (25) is satisfied. So all the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1 are fullfilled and (13) holds with

$$\mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) = C_B \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top + C_W a^{(\ell-1)} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\sigma(\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_1(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_1(\mathbf{x}))^\top]$$

for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, and $\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ given by (6). Here, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\zeta^{(1)}_1(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, and, for $\ell = 3, \dots, L+1$, $\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_1(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$.

To make the model more realistic, under the prior, the weights should be heavy-tailed (see the introduction and the references [25, 35]). For instance, this happens if, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\{Y^{(\ell)}_j\}_{j\geq 1,\ell=1,\dots,L}$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with $Y^{(1)}_1 \stackrel{d}{=} (WE)^2$, where WE has the Weibull distribution with parameters $(1, 1/2)$, i.e., it has density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure)

$$f_{WE}(x) := \frac{1}{2} x^{-1/2} \mathrm{e}^{-\sqrt{x}}, \quad x > 0\,.$$

(Obviously, we could work with a general Weibull density, however, since we are interested in simulating the model, we prefer to make a specific choice of the parameters soon at this stage.) Indeed, in such a case, the Laplace transform of $W^{(2)}_{11}$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is equal to infinity, as the following simple computation shows. For each $\theta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\theta W^{(2)}_{11}}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta}{n_1}(WE)N^{(2)}_{11}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta}{n_1}(WE)N^{(2)}_{11}} \mathbf{1}\{N^{(2)}_{11} \leq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta}{n_1}(WE)N^{(2)}_{11}} \mathbf{1}\{N^{(2)}_{11} > 0\}] = \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

The latter relation follows noticing that: (i) the first addend in (68) is finite, (ii) letting $f_{N^{(2)}_{11}}$ denote the Gaussian density of $N^{(2)}_{11}$, by independence and the fact that the Weibull law with parameters $(1, 1/2)$ is heavy-tailed, for the second addend it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta}{n_1}(WE)N^{(2)}_{11}} \mathbf{1}\{N^{(2)}_{11} > 0\}] = \int_0^\infty f_{N^{(2)}_{11}}(y)\mathrm{d}y \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta y}{n_1}x} f_{WE}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty.$$

If $\theta < 0$ one can reason in a similar manner. Note also that a standard computation shows $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}(WE)^2 = 24$, and so in this specific case $a^{(\ell)} = 24$, $\ell = 1, \dots, L$.

9.2 Model 2

The second model that we analyze is a fully connected and feedforward neural network with dependent weights, as defined in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, with $C_B > 0$ and $V^{(\ell)}_{n_\ell, j} := \frac{\pi^2}{n_\ell^2} Y^{(\ell)}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, where, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\{Y^{(\ell)}_j\}_{j \geq 1, \ell = 1, \dots, L}$ is a family of independent and identically distributed random variables with $Y^{(1)}_1 \overset{d}{=} (HC)^2$, where HC denotes a random variable distributed according to the half-Cauchy law, i.e., with probability density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure)

$$f_{HC}(x) := \frac{2}{\pi(1+x^2)} \mathbf{1}\{x > 0\}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}(Y^{(1)}_1 > 0) = 1$, $\ell = 1, \dots, L$. Under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, it turns out (see Appendix E in [21]) that, for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} V^{(\ell)}_{n_\ell, j} \to \text{ID}(0, \rho^{(1)}), \quad \text{in distribution, as } n_\ell \to \infty,$$

where

$$\rho^{(1)}(\mathrm{d}x) := x^{-3/2} \mathbf{1}\{x > 0\} \mathrm{d}x. \tag{69}$$

Therefore, the assumption (ii) of Theorem 4.1 holds with $a^{(\ell)} := 0$ and $\rho^{(\ell)} = \rho^{(1)}$ for each ℓ. Note that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\rho^{(1)}((\varepsilon, \infty)) = 2\varepsilon^{-1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^{(1)}((0, \varepsilon]) = +\infty,$$

and therefore a Poisson process with mean measure $\rho^{(1)}$ have infinitely many points on $(0, \infty)$. Consequently, the assumption (27) is satisfied. If the data are such that (26) is satisfied and the activation function σ is e.g. the ReLU function, then condition (i) of Theorem 4.1 holds and assumption (25) is satisfied. So all the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1 are fullfilled and (13) holds with

$$\mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) = C_B \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top + C_W \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} T^{(\ell-1)}_j \sigma(\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_j(\mathbf{x})) \sigma(\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_j(\mathbf{x}))^\top,$$

for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, and $\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ given by (6). Here, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{prior}}$, $\{\zeta^{(1)}_j(\mathbf{x})\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta^{(1)}_1(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, for $\ell = 3, \dots, L+1$, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_j(\mathbf{x})\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_1(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, and, for $\ell = 2, \dots, L+1$, given $\mathbf{K}^{(\ell-1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\{T^{(\ell-1)}_j\}_{j \geq}$ are the points of a Poisson process on $(0, \infty)$ with mean measure $\rho^{(\ell-1)}$, independent of the sequence $\{\zeta^{(\ell-1)}_j(\mathbf{x})\}_{j \geq 1}$.

Here again, to make the model more realistic, under the prior, the weights should be heavy-tailed (see the introduction and the references [25, 35]). This is the case for the Model 2. Indeed, the Laplace transform of $W^{(2)}_{11}$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is equal to infinity, as the following simple computation shows. For each $\theta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\theta W^{(2)}_{11}}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta\pi}{n_1}(HC) N^{(2)}_{11}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta\pi}{n_1}(HC) N^{(2)}_{11}} \mathbf{1}\{N^{(2)}_{11} \leq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta\pi}{n_1}(HC) N^{(2)}_{11}} \mathbf{1}\{N^{(2)}_{11} > 0\}] = \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

The latter relation follows noticing that (i) the first addend in (70) is finite, (ii) letting $f_{N_{11}^{(2)}}$ denote the Gaussian density of $N_{11}^{(2)}$, for the second addend we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta\pi}{n_1}(HC)N_{11}^{(2)}}\mathbf{1}\{N_{11}^{(2)}>0\}] = \int_0^\infty f_{N_{11}^{(2)}}(y)\mathrm{d}y \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\theta\pi y}{n_1}x} f_{HC}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty.$$

If $\theta < 0$ one can reason in a similar manner.

9.3 Model 1 and 2: wide width limit and simulation, under the posterior

By Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, we have that, under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}}$ with $g(\cdot, y)$ given by (12), the output of the fully connected and feedforward neural network with dependent weights corresponding to both Models 1 and 2 converges in law to

$$G^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{MG}(\lambda^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{\Delta}^{(L+1)}(\mathbf{x})),$$

in the sequential limit as $n_1 \to \infty, \ldots, n_L \to \infty$; since, for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L+1$, condition (49) holds for both models, we have that:

(a) Under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, the corresponding fully connected and feedforward *deep* neural network with dependent weights can be simulated exploiting Theorem 7.2(i) to sample from the "initial" distribution and exploiting the rejection sampling algorithm described at the end of Section 7.2.3 to sample from the laws of the "intermediate outputs".

(b) Under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}}$, the corresponding fully connected and feedforward *shallow* neural network with dependent weights can be simulated exploiting Theorem 7.2(i) to sample from the "initial" distribution and exploiting Theorem 8.1(i) to sample from the law of the output.

The details on the numerical simulation of Models 1 and 2 are given in the forthcoming Section 10.

10 Numerical illustrations

In this section we provide some numerical simulations of the Models 1 and 2.

10.1 Simulation of Model 1

We consider Model 1 specified by setting $C_B := 1$, $C_W := 1$, $L := 2$, $n_0 := 4$, $n_3 := 1$, $n_1 = n_2 = n \in \{4, 8, 16, 32\}$, $x(1) := (1, 0, 0, 0)^\top$, $x(2) := (0, 1, 0, 0)^\top$, $x(3) := (0, 0, 1, 0)^\top$, $d := 3$, $y(1) := f(x(1))$, $y(2) := f(x(2))$, $y(3) := f(x(3))$ where $f(v) = 10^{-1}\|v\|^2 + 5$, activation function $\sigma(x) := \max\{0, x\}$, $\{Y_j^{(\ell)}\}_{j\geq 1, \ell=1,2}$ random variables which, under $\mathbb{P}_{prior}$, are independent and identically distributed with $Y_1^{(1)} \stackrel{d}{=} (WE)^2$, where WE has the Weibull distribution with parameters $(1, 1/2)$. As noticed in Section 9.1, we have $a^{(\ell)} = 24$ and $\rho^{(\ell)} \equiv 0$, $\ell = 1, 2$. So

$$\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')))_{1\leq i,i'\leq d},$$

where

$$K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')) := 1 + \frac{1}{4}x(i)^\top x(i'),$$

$$\mathbf{K}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_3^\top + 24\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\max\{\zeta_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}), 0\}\max\{(\zeta_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}), 0\}^\top],$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_3^\top + 24\mathbb{E}_{\text{prior}}[\max\{\zeta_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}), 0\}\max\{\zeta_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\}^\top],$$

with $\zeta_1^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_3(\mathbf{0}_3, \mathbf{K}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}))$, $\ell = 1, 2$. If the likelihood function is of the form (12) and the number of neurons at hidden layers grow large (sequentially), then the posterior Bayesian deep neural network converges in law to

$$G^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_3(\lambda^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{\Delta}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x})),$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Delta}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{D}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}, \qquad \mathbf{D}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) := 2\mathbf{Id}_3 + \mathbf{K}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1},$$

and

$$\lambda^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^\top),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the 1×3 matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y}\mathbf{D}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}.$$

Under $\mathbb{P}_{\text{posterior}}$ with $g(\cdot, y)$ given by (12), the corresponding fully connected and feedforward neural network is simulated according to Section 9.3(a). So we sample

$$Z_B^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_{3n_1}(\mathbf{0}_{3n_1}, \mathbf{Id}_{n_1} \otimes (\mathbf{x}^\top \mid \mathbf{1}_3)\text{diag}_5(4^{-1}, \ldots, 4^{-1}, 1)(\mathbf{x}^\top \mid \mathbf{1}_3)^\top), \quad n_1 \in \{\} \tag{71}$$

and then we simulate the random variables

$$Z_B^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \ell = 2, 3$$

according to the rejection sampling algorithm described in the Steps 1 and 2 at the end of Section 7.2.3. We implemented this algorithm estimating $I_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y})$ (which comes into play to simulate $Z_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$), with the Monte Carlo estimator

$$\widehat{I}_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}) \quad := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{r=1}^{N}\{[(1-\delta) \vee \Psi(\mathbf{\Theta}_r^{(3)}, *, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}), \mathbf{y})] \wedge \delta\},$$

where $N = 100$, $\delta = 0.99$,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{\Theta}^{(3)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}), \mathbf{y})$$
$$:= \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{3}\|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_3} \otimes (e_i^{(3)})^\top)\text{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_{\mathbf{\Theta}^{(3)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \circ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2\right)$$

(recall the definition of the operator Φ in (40)) and $\{\mathbf{\Theta}_r^{(3)}\}_{1 \le r \le N}$ are independent replicas of $(B^{(3)}, \mathbf{W}^{(3)})$ where $\{B_h^{(3)}\}_{h=1,\ldots,n_2}$ are independent standard Gaussian random variables, $\{W_{1j}^{(3)}\}_{1 \le j \le n_2}$ are independent for different j's with $W_{1j}^{(3)} := \sqrt{Y_j^{(2)}/n_2}N_{1j}^{(3)}$ and $\{N_{1j}^{(3)}\}$ are independent standard Gaussian random variables, independent of the $\{Y_j^{(2)}\}$. Note that the acceptance probability which comes into play to sample from the law of $Z_B^{(3)}(\mathbf{x})$ is known in closed form and given by

$$I_B(*, \mathbf{z}^{(2)}, \mathbf{y}) := \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{3}\|(\mathbf{Id}_{n_3} \otimes (e_i^{(3)})^\top)\text{vec}\left(\left(\Phi_* \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(2)})\right)^\top\right) - y(i)\|^2\right).$$

See Figure 1 for a numerical illustration.



Figure 1: **Model 1**. Distribution function of the marginals of the 3-variate posterior Bayesian neural network for different widths ($n = 4, 8, 16, 32$) compared to the corresponding marginal distribution functions for the wide width limit. All the parameters are specified in Section 10.1.

10.2 Simulation of the Model 2

We consider the Model 2 specified by: $C_B := 1$, $C_W := 1$, $L = 1$, $n_0 := 4$, $n_1 \in \{2, 4, 8, 16\}$, $n_2 := 1$, $d := 3$, $x(1) := (1, 0, 0, 0)^\top$, $x(2) := (0, 1, 0, 0)^\top$, $x(3) := (0, 0, 1, 0)^\top$, $y(1) := f(x(1))$, $y(2) := f(x(2))$, $y(3) := f(x(3))$ where $f(v) = 10^{-1}\|v\|^2 + 5$, activation function $\sigma(x) := \max\{0, x\}$, $\{Y_j^{(1)}\}_{j\geq 1}$ random variables which, under $\mathbb{P}_{prior}$, are independent and identically distributed with $Y_1^{(1)} \stackrel{d}{=} (HC)^2$.

We have

$$\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) := (K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')))_{1\leq i,i'\leq d},$$

where

$$K^{(1)}(x(i), x(i')) := 1 + \frac{1}{4}x(i)^\top x(i'),$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_3^\top + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} T_j^{(1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top,$$

Here, $\{\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with $\zeta_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{N}_3(\mathbf{0}_3, \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))$, independent of $\{T_j^{(1)}\}_{j\geq 1}$, which are the points of a Poisson process on $(0, \infty)$ with mean measure $\rho^{(1)}$ defined by (69). If the likelihood function is of the form (12) and the number of hidden neurons grows large, then the posterior Bayesian shallow neural network converges in law to

$$G^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{MG}(\lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})),$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{D}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}, \qquad \mathbf{D}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) := 2\mathbf{Id}_3 + \mathbf{K}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1},$$

and

$$\lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^\top),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the 1×3 matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y}\mathbf{D}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}.$$

To sample the random matrix $\mathbf{K}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$, we note that letting $\{T_{(j)}^{(1)}\}_{j\geq 1}$, $T_{(1)} > T_{(2)} > \ldots$, denote the sequence of points $\{T_j^{(1)}\}_{j\geq 1}$ ordered in decreasing way, one has

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} T_j^{(1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j\geq 1} T_{(j)}^{(1)}\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma(\zeta_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))^\top,$$



Figure 2: **Model 2**. Distribution function of the marginals of the 3-variate posterior Bayesian neural network for different widths ($n = 2, 4, 8, 16$) compared to the corresponding marginal distribution functions for the wide width limit. All the parameters are specified in Section 10.2.

and, as noticed in Appendix E.3.2 of [21],

$$T^{(1)}_{(j)} = \frac{4}{(\sum_{k=1}^{j} E_k)^2},$$

where $\{E_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with the exponential law with mean 1.

To sample the shallow neural network specified by the Model 2, we simulate $Z^{(1)}_B(\mathbf{x})$ according to the Gaussian law (71) and then, using Theorem 8.1, we sample from the law of $Z^{(2)}_B(\mathbf{x}) \,|\, Z^{(1)}_B(\mathbf{x}) = z^{(1)}$ according to the Gaussian mixture

$$\mathcal{MG}(\nu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}), (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_3)\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_3)^\top),$$

where

$$\nu_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathrm{vec}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y})(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^\top \,|\, \mathbf{1}_3)^\top)^\top),$$

$$\mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) := 2 \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_3^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_3^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top + \mathrm{diag}_{n_1+1}(\pi^2(HC)_1^2/n_1^2, \ldots, \pi^2(HC)_{n_1}^2/n_1^2, 1)^{-1}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}) := 2\mathbf{y} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}) \\ - \\ \mathbf{1}_3^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \mathbf{S}_B(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})^{-1}.$$

Here $\{(HC)_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,n_1}$ are independent random variables distributed according to the half-Cauchy law. We lastly observe that $HC \overset{d}{=} \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{2}U\right)$, where U follows the uniform law on $(0, 1)$. For a numerical illustration, we refer to Figure 2.

Acknowledgments. The research of the second author was supported by the Italian Ministry of University and Research with the PRIN 2022 grant no. 2022HKBF5C "Variational Analysis of complex systems in Materials Science, Physics and Biology" (B53D23009290006). All the authors acknowledge the support of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica - GNAMPA group.

References

[1] S. Adams, S. Patanè, M. Lahijanian, and L. Laurenti. Finite neural networks as mixtures of gaussian processes: From provable error bounds to prior selection. *arXiv:2407.18707*, 2024.

[2] L. Andreis, F. Bassetti, and C. Hirsch. LDP for the covariance process in fully connected neural networks. *arXiv:6431605*, 2025.

[3] N. Apollonio, D. De Canditiis, G. Franzina, P. Stolfi, and G. L. Torrisi. Normal approximation of random gaussian neural networks. *Stochastic Systems*, 2025. to appear.

[4] K. Balasubramanian, L. Goldstein, and A. Salim. Gaussian random field approximation via stein's method with applications to wide random neural networks. *Appl. Comput. Harm. Anal.*, 72, 2024.

[5] K. Balasubramanian and N. Ross. Finite-dimensional Gaussian approximation for deep neural networks: Universality in random weights. *arXiv:2507.12686*, 2025.

[6] A. Basteri and D. Trevisan. Quantitative Gaussian approximation of randomly initialized deep neural networks. *Machine Learning*, 113:6373–6393, 2024.

[7] A. Bordino, S. Favaro, and S. Fortini. Non-asymptotic approximations of Gaussian neural networks via second-order Poincaré inequalities. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (AABI24)*, 2024.

[8] V. Cammarota, D. Marinucci, M. Salvi, and S. Vigogna. A quantitative functional central limit theorem for shallow neural networks. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications*, 11:85–108, 2024.

[9] F. Caporali, S. Favaro, and D. Trevisan. Student-t processes as infinite-width limits of posterior Bayesian neural networks. *arXiv:2502.0427*, 2025.

[10] L. Celli and G. Peccati. Entropic bounds for conditionally Gaussian vectors and application to neural networks. *arXiv:2504.08335*, 2025.

[11] R. Eldan, D. Mikulincer, and T. Schramm. Non-asymptotic approximations of neural networks by Gaussian processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1754–1775, 2021.

[12] S. Favaro, S. Fortini, and S. Peluchetti. Deep stable neural networks: Large-width asymptotics and convergence rates. *Bernoulli*, 29:2574–2597, 2023.

[13] S. Favaro, B. Hanin, D. Marinucci, I. Nourdin, and G. Peccati. Quantitative CLTs in deep neural networks. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 2025. to appear.

[14] H. Federer. *Geometric Measure Theory*. Springer, New York, 1969.

[15] K. Hajjar, L. Chizat, and C. Giraud. Training integrable parameterizations of deep neural networks in the infinite-width limit. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25, 2024.

[16] B. Hanin. Random neural networks in the infinite width limit as Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33:4798–4819, 2023.

[17] J. Hron, Y. Bahri, R. Novak, J. Pennington, and J. Sohl-Dickstein. Exact posterior distributions of wide Bayesian neural networks. In *Workshop on Uncertainty and Robustness in Deep Learning*, 2020.

[18] P. Izmailov, S. Vikram, M. D. Hoffman, and A. G. Wilson. What are Bayesian neural network posteriors really like? In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.

[19] P. Jung, H. Lee, J. Lee, and H. Yang. α-stable convergence of heavy-tailed infinitely wide neural networks. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 55:1415–1441, 2023.

[20] P. Lancaster and M. Tismenetsky. *Theory of Matrices: With Applications*. San Diego University Press, San Diego, 1985.

[21] H. Lee, F. Ayed, P. Jung, J. Lee, H. Yang, and F. Caron. Deep neural networks with dependent weights: Gaussian process mixture limit, heavy tails, sparsity and compressibility. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24:78 pp., 2023.

[22] J. Lee, Y. Bahri, R. Novak, S. Schoenholz, J. Pennington, and J. Sohl-Dickstein. Deep neural networks as Gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

[23] C. Macci, B. Pacchiarotti, and G. L. Torrisi. Large and moderate deviations for Gaussian neural networks. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 2025. to appear.

[24] K. V. Mardia, J. T. Kent, and J. M. Bibby. *Multivariate Analysis Probability and Mathematical Statistics*. Academic Press, Waltham, 1995.

[25] C. H. Martin and M. W. Mahoney. Traditional and heavy-tailed self regularization in neural network models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.

[26] A. G. D. G. Matthews, J. Hron, M. Rowland, R. E. Turner, and Z. Ghahramani. Gaussian process behaviour in wide deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

[27] S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P.M. Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layers neural network. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)*, 2018.

[28] R. M. Neal. *Bayesian Learning for Neural Networks*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, 1995.

[29] R. M. Neal. Priors for infinite networks. In *Bayesian Learning for Neural Networks. Lecture Notes in Statistics*, volume 118, pages 29–53. Springer, New York, 1996.

[30] L. Pezzetti, S. Favaro, and S. Peluchetti. Function-space MCMC for Bayesian wide neural networks. *arXiv:2408.14325*, 2024.

[31] T. Rolski, H. Schmidli, V. Schmidt, and J. Teugels. *Stochastic Processes for Insurance and Finance*. Wiley, Chichester, 1999.

[32] K. Sato. *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[33] D. Trevisan. Wide deep neural networks with Gaussian weights are very close to Gaussian processes. *arXiv:2312.11737*, 2025.

[34] Q. Vogel. Large deviations of Gaussian neural networks with ReLU activation. *arXiv:2405.16958*, 2024.

[35] F. Wentzel, K. Roth, B. S. Veeling, J. Swiatkowski, L. Tran, S. Mandt, J. Snoek, T. Salimans, R. Jenatton, and S. Nowozin. How good is the Bayes posterior in deep neural networks really? In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10248–10259, 2020.