

On the optimal approximation of Sobolev and Besov functions using deep ReLU neural networks

Yunfei Yang *

Abstract

This paper studies the problem of how efficiently functions in the Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)$ and Besov spaces $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0,1]^d)$ can be approximated by deep ReLU neural networks with width W and depth L , when the error is measured in the $L^p([0,1]^d)$ norm. This problem has been studied by several recent works, which obtained the approximation rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d})$ up to logarithmic factors when $p = q = \infty$, and the rate $\mathcal{O}(L^{-2s/d})$ for networks with fixed width when the Sobolev embedding condition $1/q - 1/p < s/d$ holds. We generalize these results by showing that the rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d})$ indeed holds under the Sobolev embedding condition. It is known that this rate is optimal up to logarithmic factors. The key tool in our proof is a novel encoding of sparse vectors by using deep ReLU neural networks with varied width and depth, which may be of independent interest.

Keywords: Deep Neural Network, Nonlinear Approximation, Sobolev Space, Besov Space
MSC: 41A25, 41A46, 68T07

1 Introduction

Deep learning methods have made remarkable achievements in many fields such as computer vision, natural language processing and scientific computing [LeCun et al., 2015; Raissi et al., 2019]. The breakthrough of deep learning has motivated a lot of research on the theoretical understanding of why deep neural networks are so powerful in applications. One of the key reasons for the great success of neural networks is their ability to effectively approximate many complex nonlinear functions. The well-known universal approximation theorem [Cybenko, 1989; Hornik, 1991] shows that a neural network with one hidden layer can approximate any continuous functions on compact sets up to any prescribed accuracy. In recent studies, approximation rates of deep neural networks have been derived for many function spaces, such as continuous functions [Shen et al., 2019, 2020, 2022; Yarotsky, 2018], piecewise smooth functions [Petersen and Voigtlaender, 2018], Sobolev functions [Lu et al., 2021; Yarotsky, 2017; Yarotsky and Zhevnerchuk, 2020] and Besov functions [Siegel, 2023; Suzuki, 2019].

In this paper, we are interested in the problem of how efficiently functions in Sobolev or Besov spaces can be approximated by deep neural networks with the ReLU activation function [Nair and Hinton, 2010]. To be concrete, our goal is to estimate the L^p -approximation rate

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{NN}(W,L)} \|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)}$$

*School of Mathematics (Zhuhai), Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, P.R. China. E-mail address: yangyunfei@mail.sysu.edu.cn.

for the function class $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ of deep neural networks with width W and depth L , when the target function class \mathcal{F} is the unit ball of the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)$ or the Besov space $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0, 1]^d)$ (see Section 2 below for precise definitions of these spaces and the neural network class). This problem has been studied by several recent works. For the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{s,\infty}([0, 1]^d)$, Yarotsky and Zhevnerchuk [2020] proved the rate $\mathcal{O}((L/\log L)^{-2s/d})$ when the network width W is finite. This result was improved to $\mathcal{O}((W^2L^2 \log W)^{-s/d})$ for $0 < s \leq 1$ in Shen et al. [2022] and $\mathcal{O}((WL/(\log W \log L))^{-2s/d})$ for all $s > 0$ in Lu et al. [2021]. For general Sobolev and Besov spaces, Siegel [2023] obtained the rate $\mathcal{O}(L^{-2s/d})$ for networks with finite width under the strict Sobolev embedding condition $1/q - 1/p < s/d$, which guarantees that $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0, 1]^d)$ are compactly embedded in $L^p([0, 1]^d)$. We generalize these results by proving that, under the condition $1/q - 1/p < s/d$,

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)} \leq 1} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{NN}(W,L)} \|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} \leq C(WL)^{-2s/d}, \quad (1.1)$$

for sufficiently large width W and depth L . Similar result also holds when the Sobolev space is replaced by the Besov space. It is known that the rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d})$ is optimal up to logarithmic factors [Lu et al., 2021; Siegel, 2023].

As pointed out by Siegel [2023], the main technical difficulty in proving (1.1) is to deal with the case when $p > q$. Because, when $p \leq q$, the approximation rate (1.1) can be achieved by classical linear approximation methods using piecewise polynomials, while for $p > q$, nonlinear adaptive methods are required [DeVore, 1998]. Thus, in the nonlinear regime $p > q$, one needs to use piecewise polynomials on an adaptive non-uniform grid, which cannot be handled by the methods in Lu et al. [2021]; Shen et al. [2022]. To overcome this difficulty, Siegel [2023] used a novel bit-extraction technique to optimally encodes sparse vectors using deep ReLU networks with fixed width. One of our main technical contributions is a generalization of this result, presented in Theorem 4.6, to the case when both the width and depth vary.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our main results on the approximation of Sobolev and Besov functions. The proof is given in Section 4. We illustrate how to apply the approximation results to derive convergence rates for learning algorithms in Section 3. Finally, we remark that, unless otherwise specified, we will use C to denote constants which may change from line to line. This convention is standard and convenient in analysis. The constants C may depend on some other parameters and this dependence will be made clear from the context.

2 Main approximation results

Let us begin with a formal definition of the neural network classes used in this paper. Given $L, N_1, \dots, N_L \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the mapping $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ that can be parameterized by a fully connected ReLU neural network of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(x) &= x, \\ g_{\ell+1}(x) &= \sigma(A_\ell g_\ell(x) + b_\ell), \quad \ell = 0, 1, \dots, L-1, \\ g(x) &= A_L g_L(x) + b_L, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1} \times N_\ell}$, $b_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1}}$ with $N_0 = d$ and $N_{L+1} = k$. The activation function $\sigma(t) := \max\{t, 0\}$ is the Rectified Linear Unit function (ReLU) and it is applied component-wisely. We remark that there is no activation function in the output layer, which is the usual

convention in applications. The numbers $W := \max\{N_1, \dots, N_L\}$ and L are called the width and depth (the number of hidden layers) of the neural network, respectively. We denote by $\mathcal{NN}_{d,k}(W, L)$ the set of mappings that can be parameterized by ReLU neural networks with width W and depth L . When the input dimension d and the output dimension k are clear from contexts, we simplify the notation to $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ for convenience. We will give some basic properties of the neural network classes in Proposition 4.1 below.

The purpose of this paper is to study the approximation of Sobolev and Besov functions by using neural networks. Let us recall the definitions of Sobolev and Besov spaces for the reader's convenience [Adams and Fournier, 2003; Di Nezza et al., 2012; Triebel, 1992]. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain, which we take to be the unit cube $\Omega = [0, 1]^d$ in the following. For $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, we denote by $L^q(\Omega)$ the set of functions f whose L^q norm on Ω is finite. In other words, when $q < \infty$,

$$\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q = \int_{\Omega} |f(x)|^q dx < \infty.$$

When $q = \infty$, we have the standard modification $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} |f(x)| < \infty$. For a positive integer $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we say $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ is in the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ if it has weak derivatives of order s and

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}^q := \|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + |f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}^q < \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

where the Sobolev semi-norm $|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}$ is defined by

$$|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}^q := \sum_{|\gamma|=s} \|\partial^\gamma f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q.$$

Here $\gamma = (\gamma_i)_{i=1}^d$ with $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ is a multi-index with total degree $|\gamma| = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i$ and we make the usual modification when $q = \infty$. When s is not an integer, we modify the Sobolev semi-norm by generalizing the Hölder condition

$$|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}^q := \sum_{|\gamma|=\lfloor s \rfloor} \left(\|\partial^\gamma f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\partial^\gamma f(x) - \partial^\gamma f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{d+(s-\lfloor s \rfloor)q}} dx dy \right),$$

when $q < \infty$ and

$$|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,\infty}(\Omega)} := \sum_{|\gamma|=\lfloor s \rfloor} \left(\|\partial^\gamma f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \text{ess sup}_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{|\partial^\gamma f(x) - \partial^\gamma f(y)|}{|x - y|^{s-\lfloor s \rfloor}} \right).$$

Then, we can define the space $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ via the norm (2.1) for non-integer s . These spaces are also called Sobolev-Slobodeckij spaces in the literature.

Next, we define the Besov spaces through the moduli of smoothness. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -th order modulus of smoothness of a function $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$\omega_k(f, t)_q = \sup_{|h| < t} \|\Delta_h^k f\|_{L^q(\Omega_{kh})},$$

where $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Omega_{kh} = \{x \in \Omega : x + kh \in \Omega\}$ and the k -th order difference Δ_h^k is given by

$$\Delta_h^k f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} f(x + jh).$$

Let $s > 0$, $1 \leq q, r \leq \infty$ and fix an integer $k > s$. The Besov space $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)$ is defined through the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)} := \|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + |f|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)},$$

where the Besov semi-norm is given by

$$|f|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)} := \begin{cases} \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{-s}\omega_k(f,t)_q)^r t^{-1} dt\right)^{1/r}, & \text{if } 1 \leq r < \infty, \\ \sup_{t>0} t^{-s}\omega_k(f,t)_q, & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

It is possible to show that different choices of $k > s$ give equivalent norms [DeVore and Lorentz, 1993]. Thus, one can simply choose $k = \lfloor s \rfloor + 1$. Sobolev and Besov spaces are closely related to each other (see Triebel [1992] for instance). We remark that, the continuous embedding $\mathcal{B}_{q,r_1}^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{q,r_2}^s(\Omega)$ holds for $1 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \infty$. When s is not an integer, it holds that $\mathcal{B}_{q,q}^s(\Omega) = \mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ with equivalent norm. When $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the continuous embedding $\mathcal{B}_{q,q}^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{q,2}^s(\Omega)$ if $q \leq 2$ and the reverse $\mathcal{B}_{q,2}^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{q,q}^s(\Omega)$ if $q \geq 2$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{B}_{2,2}^s(\Omega) = \mathcal{W}^{s,2}(\Omega)$.

Our goal is to quantify how efficiently the neural network class $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ can approximate functions in $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)$, where $\Omega = [0, 1]^d$ is the unit cube. If the approximation error is measured in the $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm, then it is necessary to assume that $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)$ is contained in $L^p(\Omega)$. Because, we cannot get any approximation rate for $f \notin L^p(\Omega)$, since ReLU neural networks can only represent continuous functions. Indeed, we assume that the following strict Sobolev embedding condition holds

$$\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} < \frac{s}{d},$$

which guarantees that the embeddings $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ are compact. Note that, on the boundary condition $1/q - 1/p = s/d$, whether the embeddings hold depends on the precise values of s, p, q and r . Thus, this boundary case is much more subtle and we do not study it in this work. We present our main results in the following two theorems and defer the proof to Section 4.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $0 < s < \infty$ and $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$. If $1/q - 1/p < s/d$, then for sufficiently large $W, L \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)} \|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)} (WL)^{-2s/d},$$

for some constant C depending on s, p, q and d .

Theorem 2.2. *Let $0 < s < \infty$ and $1 \leq r, p, q \leq \infty$. If $1/q - 1/p < s/d$, then for sufficiently large $W, L \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)} \|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0,1]^d)} (WL)^{-2s/d},$$

for some constant C depending on s, r, p, q and d .

The approximation rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d})$ is known to be optimal up to logarithmic factors [Shen et al., 2020; Siegel, 2023; Yang et al., 2022; Yarotsky, 2017]. Specifically, Siegel [2023, Theorem 3] showed the existence of f with $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)} \leq 1$ and $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0,1]^d)} \leq 1$ such that

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)} \|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} \geq C(p, d, s) \min\{W^2 L^2 \log(WL), W^3 L^2\}^{-s/d}. \quad (2.2)$$

In particular, when the width W is bounded, we get the optimal rate $\mathcal{O}(L^{-2s/d})$, which has been proven by Siegel [2023]. We remark that the lower bound (2.2) is derived from upper bounds for the VC-dimension of ReLU neural networks (see [Bartlett et al., 2019] and inequality (3.2) below, note that VC-dimension is not larger than pseudo-dimension).

There is a series of works trying to characterize the approximation rates for deep ReLU networks in terms of the number of nonzero parameters, see [Gühring et al., 2019; Petersen and Voigtlaender, 2018; Suzuki, 2019; Yarotsky, 2017] for instance. Many of these results can be obtained by using Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Indeed, for fully connected networks with depth $L \geq 2$, the number of parameters in the network is $N = \mathcal{O}(W^2L)$. Our results give the approximation rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d}) \leq \mathcal{O}(N^{-s/d})$ for sufficiently wide and deep networks. This rate can be improved to $\mathcal{O}(N^{-2s/d})$ if the width is bounded so that $N = \mathcal{O}(L)$.

Let us denote by W^* and L^* the minimal width and depth respectively such that the approximation rate $\mathcal{O}((WL)^{-2s/d})$ holds in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Clearly, W^* and L^* depend on s, r, p, q and d . Although we do not try to estimate the values of W^* and L^* in this paper, one can get some information from related works. For instance, the result of Siegel [2023] implies that $W^* \leq 25d + 31$, while Hanin and Sellke [2017] showed that the set of ReLU neural networks with width $W \leq d$ is not dense in $C(\Omega)$. Thus, the minimal width W^* is linear on the dimension d . The recent work [Liu and Chen, 2024] proved that this result can be further improved to $W^* = d + \mathcal{O}(1)$ in certain cases. The situation is more complicated for the minimal depth L^* . It was shown by Yarotsky [2017, Theorem 6] and Safran and Shamir [2017, Theorem 4] that the approximation error in $L^2([0, 1]^d)$ for any nonlinear function $f \in C^2([0, 1]^d)$ is lower bounded by $C_f W^{-2L}$ for some constant $C_f > 0$. This lower bound implies that we must have $L^* \geq s/d$ for $p \geq 2$, in order to get the rate $\mathcal{O}(W^{-2s/d})$ for finite depth. On the other hand, Lu et al. [2021, Corollary 1.2] proved that, when the target function class is $C^s([0, 1]^d)$ with $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the depth $L = 108s^2 + 2d$ is sufficient to obtain a slightly weaker bound $\mathcal{O}((W/\log W)^{-2s/d})$. It would be an interesting problem to give more precise estimations for W^* and L^* . We think the tools developed in Section 4 would be helpful for this problem.

3 Applications to machine learning

This section illustrates how to apply Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 to study machine learning problems. We will use our approximation results to derive new learning rates for the least squares estimator in the nonparametric regression setting, which has attracted a lot of attention in recent research [Chen et al., 2022; Kohler and Langer, 2021; Nakada and Imaizumi, 2020; Schmidt-Hieber, 2020; Suzuki, 2019]. Although this paper focuses on the regression problem, we remark that similar analysis can be applied to study other learning problems, such as classification [Kim et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2024], solving partial differential equations [Duan et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2022] and distribution learning by diffusion modeling [Oko et al., 2023].

Suppose we have a data set of $n \geq 2$ samples $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, which are independent and identically distributed as a $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ -valued random vector (X, Y) . Let μ be the marginal distribution of the covariate X . We assume that μ is supported on $[0, 1]^d$ and absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure with density p_X which satisfies $0 \leq p_X(x) \leq C < \infty$ on $[0, 1]^d$. The goal of nonparametric regression problem is to estimate the so-called regression function $f(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$ from the observed data \mathcal{D}_n . One of the most popular

estimators is the least squares

$$\widehat{h}_n \in \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(X_i) - Y_i)^2, \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathcal{H} is a suitably chosen hypothesis class. For simplicity, we assume here and in the sequel that the minimum above indeed exists. In deep learning, the function class \mathcal{H} is parameterized by deep neural networks. So, we consider the case that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$, where the width W and depth L depend on the sample size n so that we can obtain convergence rate for the estimator \widehat{h}_n . The performance of the estimation is measured by the expected risk

$$\mathcal{L}(\widehat{h}_n) := \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)}[(\widehat{h}_n(X) - Y)^2].$$

It is equivalent to evaluating the estimator by the excess risk

$$\|\widehat{h}_n - f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \mathcal{L}(\widehat{h}_n) - \mathcal{L}(f).$$

In principle, the excess risk can be divided into two components: the approximation error due to the representational capacity of the model and the generalization error due to the fact that we only have finite samples. We can estimate the approximation error by Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, while the generalization error is often bounded by the covering number or pseudo-dimension of the model [Mohri et al., 2018]. Recall that the pseudo-dimension $\operatorname{Pdim}(\mathcal{H})$ of a real-valued function class \mathcal{H} defined on $[0, 1]^d$ is the largest integer m for which there exist points $x_1, \dots, x_m \in [0, 1]^d$ and constants $c_1, \dots, c_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|\{\operatorname{sgn}(h(x_1) - c_1), \dots, \operatorname{sgn}(h(x_m) - c_m) : h \in \mathcal{H}\}| = 2^m.$$

Bartlett et al. [2019, Theorems 7 and 10] showed that

$$\operatorname{Pdim}(\mathcal{NN}(W, L)) \leq C \min\{W^2 L^2 \log(WL), W^3 L^2\}. \quad (3.2)$$

In the statistical analysis of learning algorithms, we often require that the hypothesis class is uniformly bounded. We define the truncation operator \mathcal{T}_B with level $B > 0$ for real-valued functions h as

$$\mathcal{T}_B h(x) := \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } |h(x)| \leq B, \\ \operatorname{sgn}(h(x))B & \text{if } |h(x)| > B. \end{cases}$$

Note that the truncation can be implemented by the ReLU neural network $\sigma(t) - \sigma(-t) - \sigma(t - B) + \sigma(-t - B) \in \mathcal{NN}(4, 1)$. The next theorem provides a convergence rate for the truncated least squares $\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \widehat{h}_n$, where $B_n = c \log n$ for some constant $c > 0$ and the hypothesis class is a neural network.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$ satisfy $1/q - 1/2 < s/d$. Let $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ below be constants. Assume that the distribution of (X, Y) satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\exp(c_1 Y^2)] < \infty$ and that the regression function $f \in \mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d) \cap L^\infty([0, 1]^d)$ with $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)} \leq 1$ and $\|f\|_{L^\infty([0, 1]^d)} \leq B$ for some $B \geq 1$. Let \widehat{h}_n be the least squares estimator (3.1) with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{NN}(W_n, L_n)$, where $W_n \geq W^*$ and $L_n \geq L^*$ so that Theorem 2.1 can be applied with $p = 2$. If $B_n = c_2 \log n$ and*

$$c_3 n^{\frac{d}{2d+4s}} \leq W_n L_n \leq c_4 n^{\frac{d}{2d+4s}},$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_n} \|\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \hat{h}_n - f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C n^{-\frac{2s}{d+2s}} (\log n)^4,$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_n}$ indicates the expectation with respect to the training data \mathcal{D}_n and C is a constant independent of the regression function f and the sample size n .

Proof. The proof is similar to Yang and Zhou [2024, Theorem 4.2]. By the assumption on the distribution of (X, Y) , we can apply the result of Kohler and Langer [2021, Supplement B, Lemma 18], which shows that the error can be decomposed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_n} \|\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \hat{h}_n - f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C \mathcal{E}_{gen} + 2\mathcal{E}_{app},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{gen} &:= \frac{(\log n)^2 \sup_{X_{1:n} \in ([0,1]^d)^n} \log(\mathcal{N}(n^{-1}B_n^{-1}, \mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{L^1(X_{1:n})}) + 1)}{n}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{app} &:= \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|f - h\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $X_{1:n} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ denotes the sequence of sample points on $[0, 1]^d$ and $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{L^1(X_{1:n})})$ denotes the ϵ -covering number of the function class $\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H} := \{\mathcal{T}_{B_n} h, h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ in the metric $\|h_1 - h_2\|_{L^1(X_{1:n})} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |h_1(X_i) - h_2(X_i)|$.

Since the density of μ is bounded, Theorem 2.1 implies that the approximation error can be bounded as

$$\mathcal{E}_{app} = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|f - h\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C (W_n L_n)^{-4s/d} \leq C n^{-\frac{2s}{d+2s}}.$$

On the other hand, the classical result of Haussler [1992, Theorem 6] shows that the covering number can be bounded by pseudo-dimension:

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{L^1(X_{1:n})}) \leq C \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}) \log(B_n/\epsilon).$$

Using $\text{Pdim}(\mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}) \leq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{H})$ and the pseudo-dimension bound (3.2) for neural network, we get

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{T}_{B_n} \mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{L^1(X_{1:n})}) \leq C W_n^2 L_n^2 \log(W_n L_n) \log(B_n/\epsilon).$$

This implies the following bound for the generalization error

$$\mathcal{E}_{gen} \leq C \frac{(\log n)^2 W_n^2 L_n^2 \log(W_n L_n) \log(n B_n^2)}{n} \leq C n^{-\frac{2s}{d+2s}} (\log n)^4,$$

which completes the proof. \square

A completely analogous theorem holds for the unit ball of the Besov spaces, i.e. Theorem 3.1 holds with the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)$ replaced by $\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s([0, 1]^d)$. It is well-known that the convergence rate $n^{-2s/(d+2s)}$ is minimax optimal for these spaces [Donoho and Johnstone, 1998; Giné and Nickl, 2015; Stone, 1982]. Thus, deep neural networks can achieve the minimax optimal rates for Sobolev and Besov spaces up to logarithm factors. Similar result has been established in Suzuki [2019] for sparse networks. However, their result relies on the sparsity of neural networks and hence one need to optimize over different network architectures to obtain the optimal rates, which is hard to implement due to the unknown locations of the non-zero parameters. Our result show that fully connected networks are already able to achieve optimal rates.

We remark that the above convergence rates suffer from the curse of dimensionality. In practical applications of deep learning, the data distributions are often of high-dimensional but have certain low-dimensional structure [Nakada and Imaizumi, 2020]. For instance, a popular assumption is that the data distribution is concentrated around certain low-dimensional manifold [Chen et al., 2022; Jiao et al., 2023a]. In order to deal with this case, it is necessary to generalize Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 to the approximation on manifolds. We leave this as an open problem for future study.

4 Constructive proof of main approximation bounds

In this section, we give our main construction and proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Following the ideas in Lu et al. [2021]; Shen et al. [2020, 2022]; Siegel [2023], we approximate Sobolev and Besov functions by piecewise polynomials and construct deep ReLU neural networks to approximate the piecewise polynomials. To describe this construction, let us first introduce some notations, which are almost identical to those in Siegel [2023, Section 4].

Throughout this section, we let $b \geq 2$ be a fixed integer unless otherwise specified (in Subsection 4.4) and suppress the dependence on b in the following notations for convenience. Notice that it is enough to consider the approximation on the half-open cube $\Omega = [0, 1)^d$. For any integer $\ell \geq 0$, we can partition Ω into $b^{d\ell}$ subcubes:

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} \Omega_{\mathbf{i}}^\ell, \quad \Omega_{\mathbf{i}}^\ell := \prod_{j=1}^d [b^{-\ell} \mathbf{i}_j, b^{-\ell}(\mathbf{i}_j + 1)), \quad (4.1)$$

where the d -dimensional multi-index \mathbf{i} is in the index set $I_\ell := \{0, \dots, b^\ell - 1\}^d$. For any integer $k \geq 0$, we use \mathcal{P}_k to denote the space of polynomials with degree at most k . The space of piecewise polynomials (with degree at most k) subordinate to the partition (4.1) is denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_k^\ell := \left\{ f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f|_{\Omega_{\mathbf{i}}^\ell} \in \mathcal{P}_k \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in I_\ell \right\}.$$

Note that this space has a natural basis

$$\rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x) := \begin{cases} \prod_{j=1}^d (b^\ell x_j - \mathbf{i}_j)^{\gamma_j}, & x \in \Omega_{\mathbf{i}}^\ell, \\ 0, & x \notin \Omega_{\mathbf{i}}^\ell, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ is a multi-index with $|\gamma| := \sum_{j=1}^d \gamma_j \leq k$. Thus, the space \mathcal{P}_k^ℓ is of dimension $\binom{d+k}{k} b^{d\ell}$.

Since ReLU neural networks can only represent continuous piecewise linear functions, it is difficult to directly construct deep ReLU neural networks to approximate piecewise polynomials on the boundary of the partition (4.1). To overcome this difficulty, Shen et al. [2020] proposed to remove an arbitrarily small region (called trifling region) from Ω . Specially, given $\epsilon > 0$, we define

$$\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon} := \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell, \quad \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell := \prod_{j=1}^d \begin{cases} [b^{-\ell} \mathbf{i}_j, b^{-\ell}(\mathbf{i}_j + 1) - \epsilon), & \mathbf{i}_j < b^\ell - 1, \\ [1 - b^{-\ell}, 1), & \mathbf{i}_j = b^\ell - 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

We will construct deep neural networks to approximate piecewise polynomials from \mathcal{P}_k^ℓ on the good region $\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon}$ in Subsection 4.3 and then apply this result to derive bounds for the

approximations to Sobolev and Besov functions in Subsection 4.4. The trifling region can be removed by using a construction similar to the method in Lu et al. [2021]; Shen et al. [2022]; Siegel [2023]. The key technical contribution of our construction is the neural network representation of vectors presented in Theorem 4.6, which is a generalization of Siegel [2023, Theorem 14]. We collect preliminary results on neural network constructions in Subsections 4.1 for the reader’s convenience.

4.1 Basic constructions of neural networks

In this subsection, we collect several useful results on neural network constructions, which will be the building blocks of our construction of approximations to Sobolev and Besov functions. These results are well-known in the literature and we only make minor modifications. The omitted proofs are given in the Appendix for completeness.

The following proposition gives basic properties of the neural network class $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$. These properties are widely used in the approximation theory of neural networks, see DeVore et al. [2021]; Jiao et al. [2023b]; Lu et al. [2021]; Siegel [2023] for instance. The proof can be found in Jiao et al. [2023b, Proposition 2.5] and Siegel [2023, Proposition 7].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f_i \in \mathcal{NN}_{d_i, k_i}(W_i, L_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

- (1) *If $d_1 = d_2$, $k_1 = k_2$ and $W_1 \leq W_2$, $L_1 \leq L_2$, then $\mathcal{NN}_{d_1, k_1}(W_1, L_1) \subseteq \mathcal{NN}_{d_2, k_2}(W_2, L_2)$.*
- (2) **(Composition)** *If $k_1 = d_2$, then $f_2 \circ f_1 \in \mathcal{NN}_{d_1, k_2}(\max\{W_1, W_2\}, L_1 + L_2)$. The result also holds when f_1 or f_2 is affine, if we view affine maps as neural networks with width $W = 0$ and depth $L = 0$.*
- (3) **(Concatenation)** *If $d_1 = d_2$, define $f(x) := (f_1(x), f_2(x))^\top$, then $f \in \mathcal{NN}_{d_1, k_1+k_2}(W_1 + W_2, \max\{L_1, L_2\})$.*
- (4) **(Summation)** *If $d_i = d$ and $k_i = k$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \in \mathcal{NN}_{d, k}(\sum_{i=1}^n W_i, \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} L_i) \cap \mathcal{NN}_{d, k}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} W_i + 2d + 2k, \sum_{i=1}^n L_i)$.*

Note that Proposition 4.1 can be applied recursively to construct new neural networks. It is easy to see that a network can be applied to only a few components of its input, because we can use an affine map to select the coordinates. Since the identity map $\text{Id}(x) = x = \sigma(x) - \sigma(-x) \in \mathcal{NN}_{1,1}(2, 1)$, whose width can be reduced to one when the sign of x is known, we can “memorize” some components of the input and intermediate outputs of a network by concatenation. We will use these facts without comment in the rest of the paper.

We remark that, in Part (4) of Proposition 4.1, we have two ways to construct a neural network which represents the sum of a collection of smaller networks. The first is to concatenate the networks in parallel and compute the sum in the output layer. The second is to compute the sum in a sequential way, in which we use $2d$ neurons to memorize the input and $2k$ neurons to memorize the partial sum. We will mainly use the first construction in the rest of the paper. When it is necessary to use the second construction, we will mention it explicitly.

Recall that ReLU neural networks can only represent continuous piecewise linear functions. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $\text{PWL}(n)$ to denote the set of continuous piecewise linear functions $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with at most n pieces, that is, there exists at most $n + 1$ points $-\infty = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n = \infty$ such that g is linear on the interval (t_{i-1}, t_i) for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. The points, where g is not differentiable, are called breakpoints of g . The next lemma shows that we can represent any functions in $\text{PWL}(n)$ by ReLU networks with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ parameters.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $W, L, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g \in \text{PWL}(n+1)$.*

- (1) *It holds that $g \in \mathcal{NN}(n+1, 1)$. If $g'(t) = 0$ for sufficiently small t , then $g \in \mathcal{NN}(n, 1)$.*
- (2) *Assume that the breakpoints of g are in the bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta]$. If $n \leq 6W^2L$, then there exists $f \in \mathcal{NN}(6W+2, 2L)$ such that $f = g$ on $[\alpha, \beta]$.*

The key to obtain sharp approximation results for deep ReLU networks is the bit extraction technique, which was introduced to lower bound the VC dimension of neural networks with piecewise polynomial activation [Bartlett et al., 1998, 2019] and used by Yarotsky [2018]; Shen et al. [2022] to derive optimal approximation rates for deep ReLU networks. To present the technique, Let us denote the binary representation by

$$\text{Bin } x_m x_{m-1} \cdots x_0 . x_{-1} \cdots x_{-n} := \sum_{i=-n}^m 2^i x_i,$$

for $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$, $i = -n, \dots, m$. The next lemma is a minor modification of Bartlett et al. [2019, Lemma 13].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $m \leq n$. There exists $f_{n,m} \in \mathcal{NN}_{1,m+1}(2^{m+2} + 1, 1)$ such that, for any $x = \text{Bin } 0.x_1 \cdots x_n$ with $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$, we have*

$$f_{n,m}(x) = (x_1, \dots, x_m, \text{Bin } 0.x_{m+1} \cdots x_n)^\top.$$

Moreover, for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $f_{n,m,L} \in \mathcal{NN}_{1,2}(2^{\lceil m/L \rceil + 2} + 2, L)$ such that

$$f_{n,m,L}(x) = (\text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_m . 0, \text{Bin } 0.x_m \cdots x_n)^\top.$$

Using similar idea as the bit extraction technique, we can construct deep neural networks to compute the index \mathbf{i} of the good region $\Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell$ defined by (4.3).

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 < \epsilon < b^{-\ell}$. For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $q_d \in \mathcal{NN}_{d,1}(2db^{\lceil \ell/L \rceil}, L)$ such that*

$$q_d(x) = \text{ind}(\mathbf{i}) := \sum_{j=1}^d b^{\ell(j-1)} \mathbf{i}_j, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell.$$

Finally, in order to remove the trifling region, we will need the following technical construction from Siegel [2023, Corollary 13], which gives a network that selects any order statistic.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $d = 2^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each integer $1 \leq j \leq d$, there exists $\psi_j \in \mathcal{NN}_{d,1}(4d, k(k+1)/2)$ such that $\psi_j(x) = x_{(j)}$, where $x_{(j)}$ is the j -th largest entry of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

4.2 Representation of vectors

This subsection gives the main technical construction for the proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. We consider the problem of how efficiently deep ReLU neural networks can represent integer vectors. This problem has also been studied by Siegel [2023], which gave sharp result for networks with constant width. We give a generalization of this result in the next theorem, which pays more attention to the trade-off between width and depth.

Theorem 4.6. Let $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^\top \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ satisfy $\|x\|_1 \leq M$.

(1) If $N \geq M$, then for any $S, T \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with

$$W = 22 \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{M}}{S\sqrt{T+2}} \right\rceil, \left\lceil \left(\frac{N}{M} \right)^{1/T} \right\rceil \right\} + 10, \quad L = 4S(T+2),$$

such that $g(n) = x_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$.

(2) If $N \leq M$, then for any $S, T \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with

$$W = 22 \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{M}{S\sqrt{N(T+2)}} \right\rceil, \left\lceil \left(\frac{M}{N} \right)^{1/T} \right\rceil \right\} + 12, \quad L = 4 \left\lceil \frac{SN}{M} \right\rceil (T+2),$$

such that $g(n) = x_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$.

Before proving this theorem, let us make a short discussion on the result. We denote the set of integer vectors which we wish to encode by

$$\mathcal{S}_{N,M} := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^N : \|x\|_1 \leq M\}. \quad (4.4)$$

As shown by Siegel [2023], the cardinality of this set satisfies

$$\log_2 |\mathcal{S}_{N,M}| \leq C \begin{cases} M(1 + \log_2(N/M)), & \text{if } N \geq M, \\ N(1 + \log_2(M/N)), & \text{if } N \leq M. \end{cases}$$

This bound also gives an estimate on the number of bits required to encode the set $\mathcal{S}_{N,M}$. Note that we can use the parameters S and T to tune the size of network in Theorem 4.6. By choosing $T = \lceil \log_2(N/M) \rceil$ if $N \geq M$ and $T = \lceil \log_2(M/N) \rceil$ if $N \leq M$, Theorem 4.6 shows that $\mathcal{S}_{N,M}$ can be encoded by a deep neural network whose width W and depth L satisfying

$$W^2 L^2 \leq C \begin{cases} M(1 + \log_2(N/M)), & \text{if } N \geq M, \\ N(1 + \log_2(M/N)), & \text{if } N \leq M. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

With the above choice of T , if the parameter S is chosen properly, one can recover the result of Siegel [2023, Theorem 14], which corresponds to the case that W is a constant. Siegel [2023, Theorem 25] also proved a lower bound for the size of network when the set $\mathcal{S}_{N,M}$ can be encoded: there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$W^4 L^2 \geq C^{-1} \begin{cases} M(1 + \log(N/M)), & \text{if } N \geq M > C \log N, \\ N(1 + \log(M/N)), & \text{if } N \leq M < \exp(N/C). \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

When the width W is bounded, this lower bound matches the previous upper bound (4.5) and hence the construction is optimal. However, when W is not bounded, the lower bound has worse dependence on the width. In the next theorem, we provide a new lower bound, which is better in certain situations.

Theorem 4.7. Let $\mathcal{S}_{N,M}$ be the set defined by (4.4). Suppose that $W \geq 2$, $L \geq 1$ and that for any $(x_1, \dots, x_N)^\top \in \mathcal{S}_{N,M}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ such that $g(n) = x_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$.

(1) If $N \geq M \geq C_0 N^{1/p}$ for some $p \geq 1$ and constant $C_0 > 0$, then

$$W^2 L^2 \log(WL) \geq C_p M (1 + \log(N/M)),$$

for some constant C_p depending on p and C_0 .

(2) If $N \leq M \leq C_0 N^p$ for some $p \geq 1$ and constant $C_0 > 0$, then

$$W^2 L^2 \log(WL) \geq C_p N (1 + \log(M/N)),$$

for some constant C_p depending on p and C_0 .

This theorem shows that the upper bound (4.5) is sharp up to logarithmic factors in the range $cN^{1/p} \leq M \leq CN^p$. The proof of Theorem 4.7 is given in Appendix A.4. Our proof is based on the estimation of the number of sign patterns that can be matched by the neural network which fits $\mathcal{S}_{N,M}$. The analysis is similar to the derivation of the lower bound (4.6) in Siegel [2023, Theorem 25]. The main difference is that we use the method presented in Bartlett et al. [2019, Theorem 7] to upper bound the number of sign patterns.

Now, let us come back to the proof of Theorem 4.6. Following the idea of Siegel [2023], we will construct a neural network that implements a pair of encoding and decoding maps $E : \mathcal{S}_{N,M} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ and $D : \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{N,M}$ which satisfy $D(E(x)) = x$. The encoding and decoding maps are explicitly given by algorithms in Siegel [2023]. In the following lemma, we summarize the essential properties of these maps that we need in our construction.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $N, M, S \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^\top \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ satisfy $\|x\|_1 \leq M$ and $\|x\|_\infty < S$. We can encode x by the binary representation*

$$E(x) = \text{Bin } 0.f_1 t_1 f_2 t_2 \cdots f_R t_R,$$

where $f_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are encoded by certain binary sequences that satisfy the following properties.

- (1) If $N \geq M$, then we have $R \leq 2M$, $f_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lceil N/M \rceil\}$ is encoded via binary expansion with length $1 + \lceil \log_2(N/M) \rceil$ and $t_i \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ is encoded via $0 = 00$, $1 = 10$ and $-1 = 01$.
- (2) If $N \leq M$, then we have $R \leq 2N$, $f_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t_i \in \{-\lceil M/N \rceil, \dots, \lceil M/N \rceil\}$ is encoded via binary expansion with length $2 + \lceil \log_2(M/N) \rceil$, whose first bit determines its sign and the remaining bits consist of the binary expansion of its magnitude.

Furthermore, we can decode the above encoding $E(x)$ as follows. Denote $\tau := S$ if $N \geq M$ and $\tau := \lceil SN/M \rceil$ if $N \leq M$, and let $\rho := \lceil R/\tau \rceil$. Then there exist two strictly increasing sequences of integers $(i_k)_{k=0}^\rho$ and $(j_k)_{k=0}^\rho$ with $i_0 = 1$, $i_\rho = R + 1$, $j_0 = 0$, $j_\rho = N$ and $i_k - i_{k-1} < 2\tau$ such that

$$x_n = \sum_{i=i_k}^{i_{k+1}-1} t_i \delta_0 \left(n - j_k - \sum_{m=i_k}^i f_m \right), \quad \forall j_k < n \leq j_{k+1}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\delta_0(0) = 1$ and $\delta_0(z) = 0$ for $z \neq 0$.

Proof. The encoding can be implemented by Algorithms 1 and 2 in Siegel [2023] respectively. The sequences $(i_k)_{k=0}^\rho$ and $(j_k)_{k=0}^\rho$ are explicitly constructed in the proof of Propositions 15 and 17 in Siegel [2023]. \square

We prove Theorem 4.6 by constructing a neural network to implement the map $n \mapsto x_n$ given by the equality (4.7).

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $S \leq M$, because the case $S > M$ is a direct consequence of the case $S = M$. We decompose $x \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ as $x = u + v$, where

$$u_n := \begin{cases} x_n, & |x_n| \geq S, \\ 0, & |x_n| < S, \end{cases} \quad v_n := \begin{cases} 0, & |x_n| \geq S, \\ x_n, & |x_n| < S. \end{cases}$$

Notice that the large part u has small support:

$$|\{n : u_n \neq 0\}| \leq \frac{\|u\|_1}{S} \leq \frac{\|x\|_1}{S} \leq \frac{M}{S}.$$

Thus, there exists a continuous piecewise linear function with at most $3M/S$ which matches the values of u . By Lemma 4.2, for any $W_1, L_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ (which will be chosen later) satisfying $2W_1^2 L_1 \geq M/S$, there exists $g_u \in \mathcal{NN}(6W_1 + 2, 2L_1)$ such that $g_u(n) = u_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$.

It remains to construct a neural network g_v to represent the small part by applying Lemma 4.8 to $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Notice that, by equality (4.7), we only need to know $n - j_k$ and $r_k = \text{Bin } 0.f_{i_k} t_{i_k} \cdots f_{i_{k+1}-1} t_{i_{k+1}-1}$ to compute v_n . We define two continuous piecewise linear functions on $[0, N]$ by

$$J(z) = \begin{cases} z - j_k, & j_k + 1 \leq z \leq j_{k+1}, \\ \text{linear}, & j_k < z < j_k + 1, \end{cases}$$

$$R(z) = \begin{cases} r_k, & j_k + 1 \leq z \leq j_{k+1}, \\ \text{linear}, & j_k < z < j_k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, $J(n) = n - j_k$ and $R(n) = r_k$ for $j_k < n \leq j_{k+1}$. Observe that J and R has at most 2ρ pieces with

$$\rho \leq \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{2M}{S} \rceil \leq \frac{3M}{S}, & \text{if } N \geq M, \\ \lceil \frac{2N}{\lceil SN/M \rceil} \rceil \leq \lceil \frac{2N}{SN/M} \rceil = \lceil \frac{2M}{S} \rceil \leq \frac{3M}{S}, & \text{if } N < M. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 4.2, if $W_1^2 L_1 \geq M/S$, then $J, R \in \mathcal{NN}(6W_1 + 2, 2L_1)$ and

$$n \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} n - j_k \\ r_k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{NN}(12W_1 + 4, 2L_1), \quad \text{for } j_k < n \leq j_{k+1}. \quad (4.8)$$

Next, we use Lemma 4.3 to extract f_i and t_i , $i_k \leq i < i_{k+1}$, from r_k and compute v_n using (4.7).

We first consider the case $N \geq M$. Recall that $i_{k+1} - i_k < 2\tau$. We are going to construct a neural network to implement the following map

$$\begin{pmatrix} z \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_1 t_1 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} z - f_1 \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma + t_1 \delta_0(z - f_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $z, \Sigma \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is encoded via binary representation with length $\alpha := 1 + \lceil \log_2(N/M) \rceil$ and $t_i \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ is encoded via $0 = 00$, $1 = 10$ and $-1 = 01$. The construction is similar to

Siegel [2023, Lemma 16], but we pay more attention to the trade-off between width and depth. We first apply the network $f_{2\tau(\alpha+2),\alpha,T} \in \mathcal{NN}(2^{\lceil \alpha/T \rceil + 2} + 2, T)$ in Lemma 4.3 to extract f_1 from the second component. Since $2^{\lceil \alpha/T \rceil + 2} \leq 16(N/M)^{1/T}$, we have

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} z \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_1 t_1 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ \text{Bin } 0.t_1 f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \in \mathcal{NN}(16 \lceil (N/M)^{1/T} \rceil + 6, T).$$

Notice that the delta function δ_0 on \mathbb{Z} can be implemented by the following piecewise linear function

$$h(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & |z| \geq 1, \\ 1 + z, & -1 < z \leq 0, \\ 1 - z, & 0 < z < 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

which is in $\mathcal{NN}(3, 1)$ by Lemma 4.2. We apply h to the first component and use the network $f_{2\tau(\alpha+2),2} \in \mathcal{NN}(17, 1)$ in Lemma 4.3 to extract the two bits b_1, b_2 corresponding to t_1 from the second component. This gives

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ \text{Bin } 0.t_1 f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ h(z - f_1) \\ b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2\tau} t_{2\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \in \mathcal{NN}(24, 1).$$

It remains to implement the map $(a, b_1, b_2) \rightarrow at_1$, where $a = \delta_0(z - f_1) = h(z - f_1) \in \{0, 1\}$, by a network. This can be done by the observation that $t_1 = b_1 - b_2$ and

$$at_1 = ab_1 - ab_2 = \sigma(a + b_1 - 1) - \sigma(a + b_2 - 1).$$

Combining the above constructions, we obtain that the map (4.9) is in $\mathcal{NN}(16 \lceil (N/M)^{1/T} \rceil + 8, T + 2)$ by Proposition 4.1.

We compose the network in (4.8) with 2τ copies of the network in (4.9) and then use an affine map to select the last component. By equality (4.7), this gives us a network $g_v \in \mathcal{NN}(16 \max\{W_1, \lceil (N/M)^{1/T} \rceil\} + 8, 2L_1 + 2\tau(T + 2))$ satisfying $g_v(n) = v_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Note that we pads $r_k = \text{Bin } 0.f_{i_k} t_{i_k} \cdots f_{i_{k+1}-1} t_{i_{k+1}-1}$ with zeros so that it has 2τ blocks of (f_i, t_i) . The additional zero blocks have no effect on the computation of v_n . As a consequence, we get the desired network $g = g_u + g_v \in \mathcal{NN}(22 \max\{W_1, \lceil (N/M)^{1/T} \rceil\} + 10, 2L_1 + 2\tau(T + 2))$. Now, we choose

$$L_1 = \tau(T + 2) = S(T + 2).$$

Recall the requirement that $W_1^2 L_1 \geq M/S$, which implies we can choose

$$W_1 = \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{M}}{S\sqrt{T+2}} \right\rceil.$$

If $N \leq M$, we need to construct a network to implement the map (4.9), where $z, \Sigma \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t_i \in \{-\lceil M/N \rceil, \dots, \lceil M/N \rceil\}$ is encoded via binary expansion with length $\beta + 1 := \lceil \log_2(M/N) \rceil + 2$, whose first bit determines its sign and the remaining bits consist

of the binary expansion of its magnitude. For convenience, let us denote the bits of t_1 by $b_0 b_1 \cdots b_\beta$, where $b_0 = 0$ if $t_1 < 0$ and $b_0 = 1$ otherwise. We first apply the network $f_{2^\tau(\beta+2),2} \in \mathcal{NN}(17, 1)$ in Lemma 4.3 to extract f_1 and b_0 from the second component

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} z \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_1 t_1 \cdots f_{2^\tau} t_{2^\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ b_0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.b_1 \cdots b_\beta f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2^\tau} t_{2^\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \in \mathcal{NN}(21, 1).$$

Then, we can approximate the delta function by $h \in \mathcal{NN}(3, 1)$ defined as (4.10) and use the network $f_{2^\tau(\beta+2),\beta,T} \in \mathcal{NN}(2^{\lceil \beta/T \rceil + 2} + 2, T)$ in Lemma 4.3 to compute $|t_1|$ from $b_1 \cdots b_\beta$. Specifically,

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ b_0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.b_1 \cdots b_\beta f_2 t_2 \cdots f_{2^\tau} t_{2^\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} z - f_1 \\ h(z - f_1) \\ b_0 \\ |t_1| \\ \text{Bin } 0.f_1 t_1 \cdots f_{2^\tau} t_{2^\tau} \\ \Sigma \end{array} \right) \in \mathcal{NN}(16 \lceil (M/N)^{1/T} \rceil + 10, T),$$

because $2^{\lceil \beta/T \rceil + 2} \leq 16(M/N)^{1/T}$. It remains to implement the map $(a, b_0, |t_1|) \rightarrow at_1$, where $a = h(z - f_1) \in \{0, 1\}$, by a network. Observing that

$$at_1 = \begin{cases} 0, & a = 0, \\ |t_1|, & a = 1, b_0 = 1, \\ -|t_1|, & a = 1, b_0 = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $|t_1| < 2^\beta$, we have

$$at_1 = \sigma(|t_1| - 2^\beta(2 - a - b_0)) - \sigma(|t_1| - 2^\beta(1 - a + b_0)).$$

Hence, the map (4.9) is in $\mathcal{NN}(16 \lceil (M/N)^{1/T} \rceil + 10, T + 2)$ by Proposition 4.1.

As before, we compose the network in (4.8) with 2τ copies of the network in (4.9) to get $g_v \in \mathcal{NN}(16 \max\{W_1, \lceil (M/N)^{1/T} \rceil\} + 10, 2L_1 + 2\tau(T + 2))$ satisfying $g_v(n) = v_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Consequently, we get the desired network $g = g_u + g_v \in \mathcal{NN}(22 \max\{W_1, \lceil (M/N)^{1/T} \rceil\} + 12, 2L_1 + 2\tau(T + 2))$. By choosing

$$L_1 = \tau(T + 2) = \lceil SN/M \rceil (T + 2),$$

and

$$W_1 = \left\lceil \frac{M}{S\sqrt{N(T+2)}} \right\rceil,$$

we fulfill the requirement $W_1^2 L_1 \geq M/S$ and complete the proof. \square

4.3 Approximation of piecewise polynomials

Since the seminal work of Yarotsky [2017], it is well-known that polynomials can be efficiently approximated by deep ReLU neural networks. The starting point of this theory is the approximation of the product function $(x, y) \mapsto xy$. The following lemma is a modification of Lu et al. [2021, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 4.9. For any integers $k \geq 4$ and $L \geq 1$, there exists $f_{k,L} \in \mathcal{NN}(3k2^k + 3, L)$ such that $f_{k,L} : [-1, 1]^2 \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ and

$$|f_{k,L}(x, y) - xy| \leq 2^{-2kL-1}, \quad \forall x, y \in [-1, 1].$$

Once we have the approximation of the product function, we can approximate any monomials by viewing them as multi-products and hence can approximate any polynomials. This idea can be further combined with Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 4.6 to approximate piecewise polynomials on the good region $\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon}$ defined by (4.3). We prepare the following proposition for the purpose of proving Theorems 2.1 and 2.2.

Proposition 4.10. Let $\ell, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 < \epsilon < b^{-\ell}$. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{P}_k^\ell$ is expanded in terms of the bases $\rho_{\ell, i}^\gamma$ defined by (4.2),

$$f(x) = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} a_{i, \gamma} \rho_{\ell, i}^\gamma(x).$$

Let $1 \leq q \leq p \leq \infty$ and choose a parameter $\delta > 0$. The following approximation results hold for some constants $C := C(p, q, d, k, b)$ depending only on p, q, d, k and the base b .

(1) If $\delta q \leq d\ell$, then for any $S, T, W_0, L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with

$$W \leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta q/2}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(d\ell - \delta q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\},$$

$$L \leq C(ST + L_0),$$

such that (with the standard modification when $q = \infty$)

$$\|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon})} \leq C \left(b^{\delta q/p - d\ell/p - \delta} + 4^{-W_0 L_0} \right) \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} |a_{i, \gamma}|^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

(2) If $\delta q \geq d\ell$, then for any $S, T, W_0, L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with

$$W \leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta + d\ell/2 - d\ell/q}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(\delta - d\ell/q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\},$$

$$L \leq C \left(\lceil b^{-\delta + d\ell/q} S \rceil T + L_0 \right),$$

such that (with the standard modification when $q = \infty$)

$$\|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon})} \leq C \left(b^{-\delta} + 4^{-W_0 L_0} \right) \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} |a_{i, \gamma}|^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

This proposition may seem to be complicated at first glance. So let us explain the intuition and meaning of the parameters δ, S, T, W_0, L_0 . The approximation of the piecewise polynomial can be divided into two parts. The first part is the approximation of the coefficients $a_{i, \gamma}$. We will first discretize these coefficients and then encode them by using the network from Theorem

4.6, which gives us two tunable parameters S and T . The parameter δ (more precisely $b^{-\delta}$) represents the discretization level. The conditions $\delta q \leq d\ell$ and $\delta q \geq d\ell$ correspond to the sparse and dense regimes respectively in Theorem 4.6. The second part is the approximation of the base functions $\rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x)$ and the product $(a_{\mathbf{i}, \gamma}, \rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x)) \mapsto a_{\mathbf{i}, \gamma} \rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x)$. This can be done by using lemmas 4.4 and 4.9. The parameters W_0 and L_0 are used to tune the size of networks constructed in the second part. We remark that, in general, the networks in the second part can be much smaller than the encoding network in the first part, because their approximation errors decay as $4^{-W_0 L_0}$.

Proof of Proposition 4.10. Let us consider the decomposition $f = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} f_\gamma$ where

$$f_\gamma(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} a_{\mathbf{i}, \gamma} \rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x).$$

By Proposition 4.1 and the triangle inequality, it is enough to prove the result for each f_γ at the expense of larger constants. Thus, we assume that $f := f_\gamma$ and write $a_{\mathbf{i}} := a_{\mathbf{i}, \gamma}$ in the following analysis. Without loss of generality, we can further assume that

$$\|a\|_q := \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} |a_{\mathbf{i}}|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq 1$$

with the standard modification when $q = \infty$, where $a := (a_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell}$ denotes the vector of coefficients. In order to use Theorem 4.6, we will need to discretize these coefficients. Given $\delta > 0$, we can approximate a by $\tilde{a} = (\tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell}$ with

$$\tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}} := b^{-\delta} \operatorname{sgn}(a_{\mathbf{i}}) \lfloor b^\delta |a_{\mathbf{i}}| \rfloor.$$

It is easy to see that $\|a - \tilde{a}\|_\infty \leq b^{-\delta}$ and $\|a - \tilde{a}\|_q \leq \|a\|_q \leq 1$. Since $|I_\ell| = b^{d\ell}$, the uniform bound implies $\|a - \tilde{a}\|_p \leq b^{d\ell/p - \delta}$. On the other hand, since $p \geq q$,

$$\|a - \tilde{a}\|_p \leq \|a - \tilde{a}\|_q^{q/p} \|a - \tilde{a}\|_\infty^{1 - q/p} \leq b^{\delta q/p - \delta}.$$

In summary, we have

$$\|a - \tilde{a}\|_p \leq b^{-\delta} \min\{b^{d\ell/p}, b^{\delta q/p}\}. \quad (4.11)$$

To construct the desired network g , we first apply $q_1, q_d \in \mathcal{NN}(2db^{\lceil \ell/L_0 \rceil}, L_0)$ in Lemma 4.4 to compute the index of the input

$$x \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} q_1(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ q_1(x_d) \\ q_d(x) \\ x \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} b^\ell x_1 - q_1(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ b^\ell x_d - q_1(x_d) \\ q_d(x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.12)$$

This map can be implemented by a network with width $W_1 \leq Cb^{\ell/L_0}$ and depth $L_1 = L_0$. Furthermore, for $x \in \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell$, this map becomes $x \rightarrow (b^\ell x_1 - \mathbf{i}_1, \dots, b^\ell x_d - \mathbf{i}_d, \operatorname{ind}(\mathbf{i}))^\top$. Next, we construct a neural network to implement the map $\operatorname{ind}(\mathbf{i}) \mapsto b^{-\delta} u_{\operatorname{ind}(\mathbf{i})}$, where $u \in \mathbb{Z}^{b^{d\ell}}$ is the

vector defined by $u_{\text{ind}(\mathbf{i})} = b^\delta \tilde{a}_i = \text{sgn}(a_i) [b^\delta |a_i|]$. This can be done by using Theorem 4.6. We let $N = b^{d\ell}$ and estimate $\|u\|_1$ as follows. Observe that $\|u\|_q \leq b^\delta \|a\|_q \leq b^\delta$, which implies

$$|\{i : u_i \neq 0\}| \leq \min\{b^{\delta q}, N\},$$

since $u \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\|u\|_1 \leq |\{i : u_i \neq 0\}|^{1-1/q} \|u\|_q \leq b^\delta \min\{b^{\delta q}, b^{d\ell}\}^{1-1/q}.$$

Thus, we can apply Theorem 4.6 with $M = b^\delta \min\{b^{\delta q}, b^{d\ell}\}^{1-1/q}$ to the vector u and get a network $\phi \in \mathcal{NN}(W_2, L_2)$ such that $h(\text{ind}(\mathbf{i})) = \tilde{a}_i$. If $\delta q \leq d\ell$, then $M = b^{\delta q} \leq b^{d\ell} = N$ and we can choose

$$W_2 \leq C \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{b^{\delta q/2}}{S\sqrt{T}} \right\rceil, b^{(d\ell - \delta q)/T} \right\}, \quad L_2 \leq CST.$$

If $\delta q \geq d\ell$, then $M = b^{\delta + d\ell - d\ell/q} \geq b^{d\ell} = N$ and we can choose

$$W_2 \leq C \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{b^{\delta + d\ell/2 - d\ell/q}}{S\sqrt{T}} \right\rceil, b^{(\delta - d\ell/q)/T} \right\}, \quad L_2 \leq C \lceil b^{-\delta + d\ell/q} S \rceil T.$$

Composing ϕ with the last component of the network (4.12), we get a neural network $h \in \mathcal{NN}(\max\{W_1, W_2 + 2d\}, L_1 + L_2)$, which satisfies

$$h(x) = \begin{pmatrix} b^\ell x_1 - \mathbf{i}_1 \\ \vdots \\ b^\ell x_d - \mathbf{i}_d \\ \tilde{a}_i \end{pmatrix} \in [-1, 1]^{d+1}, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell.$$

The final step is to approximate the polynomial $(y, z) \mapsto z \prod_{j=1}^d y_j^{\gamma_j}$ for $y \in [-1, 1]^d$ and $z \in [-1, 1]$. By using the network $f_{W_0+3, L_0} \in \mathcal{NN}(24(W_0 + 3)2^{W_0} + 3, L_0)$ from Lemma 4.9, we define the following neural networks

$$P_j : \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} y \\ f_{W_0+3, L_0}(y_j, z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

We construct P_γ by composing γ_j copies of P_j and then applying an affine map which selects the last coordinate. Consequently, $P_\gamma \in \mathcal{NN}(W_3, L_3)$ with $W_3 \leq CW_0 2^{W_0}$ and $L_3 \leq kL_0$. Since all entries are in $[-1, 1]$, Lemma 4.9 implies that the approximation error can be bounded as

$$\left| P_\gamma(y, z) - z \prod_{j=1}^d y_j^{\gamma_j} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \gamma_j 2^{-2(W_0+3)L_0-1} \leq C 4^{-W_0 L_0}.$$

By composing P_γ with h , we obtain the desired network $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$, whose width $W \leq C \max\{W_1, W_2, W_3\}$ and depth $L = L_1 + L_2 + L_3$, such that $g(x) = P_\gamma(b^\ell x - \mathbf{i}, \tilde{a}_i)$ for $x \in \Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell$.

It remains to estimate the approximation error of g . Using the fact that the basis $\rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma$ have disjoint support, we have (with obvious modification for $p = \infty$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon})}^p &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} \int_{\Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell} \left| a_{\mathbf{i}} \prod_{j=1}^d (b^\ell x_j - \mathbf{i}_j)^{\gamma_j} - P_\gamma(b^\ell x - \mathbf{i}, \tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}}) \right|^p dx \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} \int_{\Omega_{\mathbf{i}, \epsilon}^\ell} |a_{\mathbf{i}} - \tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}}|^p + \left| \tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}} \prod_{j=1}^d (b^\ell x_j - \mathbf{i}_j)^{\gamma_j} - P_\gamma(b^\ell x - \mathbf{i}, \tilde{a}_{\mathbf{i}}) \right|^p dx \\ &\leq C b^{-d\ell} \|a - \tilde{a}\|_p^p + C 4^{-pW_0L_0}. \end{aligned}$$

By inequality (4.11),

$$\|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell, \epsilon})} \leq C \left(b^{-\delta} \min\{1, b^{\delta q/p - d\ell/p}\} + 4^{-W_0L_0} \right),$$

which completes the proof. \square

4.4 Approximation of Sobolev functions

In this subsection, we will use Proposition 4.10 to derive bounds for the neural network approximation of Sobolev functions and give a proof of Theorem 2.1. We remark that almost the same argument can be applied to obtain approximation bounds for Besov functions and prove Theorem 2.2. The main differences are given in Remark 4.12.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $1 \leq q \leq p \leq \infty$, $s > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)$ with $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0, 1]^d)} \leq 1$. Assume that the Sobolev embedding condition is strictly satisfied, i.e. $1/q - 1/p < s/d$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \epsilon < b^{-\ell^*}$, where $\ell^* = \lfloor 2\kappa(\alpha + \beta) \rfloor$ with*

$$\kappa := \frac{s}{s + d/p - d/q} \in [1, \infty).$$

Then, there exists a network $g_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with $W \leq C b^{d\alpha}$ and $L \leq C b^{d\beta}$ such that

$$\|f - g_{\alpha, \beta}\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*, \epsilon})} \leq C b^{-2s(\alpha + \beta)}.$$

Here the constants $C := C(p, q, s, d, b)$ depend only on p, q, s, d and the base b .

Proof. Let us consider the L^q -projection of $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ onto the space of piecewise polynomials of degree $k = \lfloor s \rfloor$ defined as

$$\Pi_k^\ell(f) := \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{P}_k^\ell} \|f - h\|_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

Let $f_0 = \Pi_k^0(f)$ and $f_\ell = \Pi_k^\ell(f) - \Pi_k^{\ell-1}(f)$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we have the following decomposition

$$f = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} f_\ell.$$

By expanding f_ℓ in the basis $\rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma$, we can write

$$f_\ell(x) = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, \mathbf{i} \in I_\ell} a_{\mathbf{i}, \gamma}(\ell) \rho_{\ell, \mathbf{i}}^\gamma(x).$$

By using the Bramble-Hilbert lemma, namely $\|\Pi_k^0(f) - f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}$, and a scaling argument (see Siegel [2023, Eq. (4.12)] for details), one can show that the coefficients satisfy the following bound

$$|a_{i,\gamma}(\ell)| \leq Cb^{(d/q-s)\ell}|f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell-1})},$$

where $\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell-1} \supset \Omega_{i^-}^{\ell}$ is the parent domain of $\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell}$ for $\ell \geq 1$. When $\ell = 0$, we have the modification $|a_{\mathbf{0},\gamma}(0)| \leq C\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}$. Combining this bound with the sub-additivity of the Sobolev norm

$$\sum_{i \in I_\ell} |f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell})}^q \leq |f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)}^q, \quad (4.13)$$

we get a bound for the ℓ^q -norm of the coefficients (with the standard modification for $q = \infty$)

$$\left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} |a_{i,\gamma}(\ell)|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq Cb^{(d/q-s)\ell} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} |f|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell-1})}^q \right)^{1/q} \leq Cb^{(d/q-s)\ell}, \quad (4.14)$$

because $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)} \leq 1$ and each $\Omega_{i^-}^{\ell-1}$ appears $\binom{k+d}{d}b^d$ times in the summation. As a consequence, by using the fact that the basis $\rho_{\ell,i}^\gamma$ have disjoint support,

$$\|f_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq Cb^{-d\ell/p} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k, i \in I_\ell} |a_{i,\gamma}(\ell)|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq Cb^{(d/q-d/p-s)\ell}. \quad (4.15)$$

Next, we are going to construct a neural network g_ℓ to approximate f_ℓ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L} := \{0, \dots, \ell^*\}$ by applying Proposition 4.10. The key of our proof is to choose the parameters δ, S, T, W_0, L_0 in Proposition 4.10 appropriately as functions of ℓ . For each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, we choose

$$\begin{aligned} W_0(\ell) &= \lceil (\alpha/2) \log_2 b \rceil, \\ L_0(\ell) &= \lceil 4(s + \kappa + \kappa d/q)\beta \rceil, \end{aligned}$$

which imply that (since $\ell \leq \ell^* \leq 2\kappa(\alpha + \beta)$)

$$\begin{aligned} b^{\ell/L_0} &\leq b^{2\kappa(\alpha+\beta)/(4\kappa\beta)} \leq Cb^{\alpha/2}, \\ W_0 2^{W_0} &\leq C\alpha b^{\alpha/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $\alpha\beta \geq (\alpha + \beta)/2$ for $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$, we get

$$4^{-W_0 L_0} \leq b^{-\alpha L_0} \leq b^{-4(s+\kappa d/q)\alpha\beta} \leq b^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)-d\ell^*/q}. \quad (4.16)$$

In order to choose the remaining parameters S, T and δ , we decompose the index set \mathcal{L} into four disjoint sets $\mathcal{L} = \cup_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{L}_i$, which will be given explicitly below. For each \mathcal{L}_i , we denote

$$F_i := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_i} f_\ell, \quad \text{and} \quad G_i := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_i} g_\ell.$$

By choosing S, T and δ appropriately, we are going to derive a bound for the approximation error $\|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell,\varepsilon})}$ and show that $G_i \in \mathcal{NN}(W_i, L_i)$ with $W_i \leq Cb^{d\alpha}$ and $L_i \leq Cb^{d\beta}$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Thus, we divide the analysis into four cases.

Case 1: $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_1 = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} : 0 \leq \ell \leq 2\beta\}$. We choose

$$\delta(\ell) = d\ell/q + (s+1)(2\alpha + 2\beta - \ell).$$

Since $\delta q \geq d\ell$, we apply Proposition 4.10 Part (2) to approximate f_ℓ with parameters

$$\begin{aligned} S(\ell) &= \left\lceil b^{\delta+d\ell/2-d\ell/q} \right\rceil, \\ T(\ell) &= \lceil (s+1)(2+2\beta-\ell)/d \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us a neural network $g_\ell \in \mathcal{NN}(W(\ell), L(\ell))$ with width

$$\begin{aligned} W(\ell) &\leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta+d\ell/2-d\ell/q}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(\delta-d\ell/q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\} \\ &\leq C \max \left\{ 1, b^{d(\alpha+1)}, b^{\alpha/2}, \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right\} \\ &\leq C b^{d\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and depth

$$L(\ell) \leq C \left(\left\lceil b^{-\delta+d\ell/q} S \right\rceil T + L_0 \right) \leq C \left(b^{d\ell/2} (1 + 2\beta - \ell) + \beta \right).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.10 and inequality (4.14), the approximation error satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell,\epsilon})} &\leq C \left(b^{-\delta} + 4^{-W_0 L_0} \right) b^{d\ell/q - s\ell} \\ &\leq C b^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} \left(b^{-2\alpha-2\beta+\ell} + b^{-s\ell} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where we use (4.16) in the last inequality. By Proposition 4.1, we can construct the sum $G_1 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_1} g_\ell$ in a sequential way, so that $G_1 \in \mathcal{NN}(W_1, L_1)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_1} W(\ell) + 2d + 2 \leq C b^{d\alpha}, \\ L_1 &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_1} L(\ell) \leq C \sum_{\ell=0}^{2\beta} \left(b^{d\ell/2} (1 + 2\beta - \ell) + \beta \right) \leq C b^{d\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

because the sum is bounded by convergent geometric series.

Case 2: $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2 = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} : 2\beta < \ell \leq 2\alpha + 2\beta\}$. We choose $\delta(\ell)$ as in Case 1 so that $\delta q \geq d\ell$ and we can apply Proposition 4.10 Part (2) again. But we set the parameters

$$\begin{aligned} S(\ell) &= \left\lceil b^{\delta+d\beta-d\ell/q} \right\rceil, \\ T(\ell) &= \lceil 2(s+1)/d \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us a neural network $g_\ell \in \mathcal{NN}(W(\ell), L(\ell))$ with width

$$\begin{aligned} W(\ell) &\leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta+d\ell/2-d\ell/q}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(\delta-d\ell/q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\} \\ &\leq C \max \left\{ b^{d\ell/2-d\beta}, b^{d(\alpha+\beta-\ell/2)}, b^{\alpha/2}, \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right\} \\ &\leq C b^{d\alpha} \left(b^{d(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} + b^{d(\beta-\ell/2)} + \alpha b^{-\alpha/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and depth

$$L(\ell) \leq C \left(\lceil b^{-\delta+dl/q} S \rceil T + L_0 \right) \leq C \left(b^{d\beta} + \beta \right) \leq C b^{d\beta}.$$

By Proposition 4.10 and inequality (4.14), we also get the approximation error (4.17) in this case. Using Proposition 4.1, we can construct the sum $G_2 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2} g_\ell$ in a parallel way, so that $G_2 \in \mathcal{NN}(W_2, L_2)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} W_2 &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2} W(\ell) \leq C b^{d\alpha} \sum_{\ell=2\beta+1}^{2\alpha+2\beta} \left(b^{d(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} + b^{d(\beta-\ell/2)} + \alpha b^{-\alpha/2} \right) \leq C b^{d\alpha}, \\ L_2 &= \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2} L(\ell) \leq C b^{d\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

since the first two series are convergent geometric series.

Case 3: $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_3 = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} : 2\alpha + 2\beta < \ell \leq 2\alpha + 2\beta + 2d\alpha/\tau\}$, where τ is chosen to satisfy

$$0 < \tau < \frac{s}{1/q - 1/p} - d = \frac{d}{\kappa - 1}. \quad (4.18)$$

Note that this condition can be satisfied since $q \leq p$ and the Sobolev embedding condition holds. In this case, we let

$$\delta(\ell) = 2d(\alpha + \beta)/q - \tau(\ell - 2\alpha - 2\beta)/q.$$

Since $\delta q < d(2\alpha + 2\beta) < dl$, we can apply Proposition 4.10 Part (1) to approximate f_ℓ with parameters

$$\begin{aligned} S(\ell) &= b^{d\beta}, \\ T(\ell) &= \lceil 2d/\tau \rceil + 2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\frac{dl - \delta q}{T} \leq \frac{(d + \tau)(\ell - 2\alpha - 2\beta)}{2d/\tau + 2} = \tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta).$$

This gives us a neural network $g_\ell \in \mathcal{NN}(W(\ell), L(\ell))$ with width

$$\begin{aligned} W(\ell) &\leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta q/2}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(dl-\delta q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\} \\ &\leq C \max \left\{ b^{d\alpha+\tau(\alpha+\beta-\ell/2)}, b^{\tau(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)}, b^{\alpha/2}, \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right\} \\ &\leq C \left(b^{d\alpha+\tau(\alpha+\beta-\ell/2)} + b^{\tau(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} + \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and depth

$$L(\ell) \leq C(ST + L_0) \leq C \left(b^{d\beta} + \beta \right) \leq C b^{d\beta}.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.10 and inequality (4.14), the approximation error satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell,\epsilon})} &\leq C \left(b^{\delta q/p - dl/p - \delta} + 4^{-W_0 L_0} \right) b^{dl/q - s\ell} \\ &\leq C b^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} \left(b^{\eta(\ell-2\alpha-2\beta)} + b^{-s\ell} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where $\eta := d/q - d/p - s + \tau(1/q - 1/p) < 0$ by condition (4.18) and we use (4.16) in the last inequality. By Proposition 4.1, we can construct the sum $G_3 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_3} g_\ell$ in a parallel way, so that $G_3 \in \mathcal{NN}(W_3, L_3)$ with

$$W_3 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_3} W(\ell) \leq C \sum_{\ell=2\alpha+2\beta+1}^{2\alpha+2\beta+\lceil 2d\alpha/\tau \rceil} \left(b^{d\alpha+\tau(\alpha+\beta-\ell/2)} + b^{\tau(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} + \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right) \leq C b^{d\alpha},$$

$$L_3 = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_3} L(\ell) \leq C b^{d\beta}.$$

Case 4: $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_4 = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} : 2\alpha + 2\beta + 2d\alpha/\tau < \ell \leq \ell^*\}$. By condition (4.18),

$$\ell^* - 2\alpha - 2\beta \leq 2(\kappa - 1)(\alpha + \beta) < 2d(\alpha + \beta)/\tau.$$

Hence, we can choose $\delta(\ell)$ as in Case 3 so that $\delta > 0$ and $\delta q < d\ell$. We apply Proposition 4.10 Part (1) with parameters

$$S(\ell) = \lceil b^{\delta q/2} \rceil,$$

$$T(\ell) = \lceil 2d/\tau + 2 \rceil \lceil \tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha \rceil.$$

This gives us a neural network $g_\ell \in \mathcal{NN}(W(\ell), L(\ell))$. Since

$$\frac{d\ell - \delta q}{T} \leq \frac{(d + \tau)(\ell - 2\alpha - 2\beta)}{(2d/\tau + 2)\lceil \tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha \rceil} = \frac{\tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta)}{\lceil \tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha \rceil}$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{d\alpha}{\lceil \tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha \rceil} \leq 1 + d\alpha,$$

the width $W(\ell)$ satisfies

$$W(\ell) \leq C \max \left\{ \frac{b^{\delta q/2}}{S\sqrt{T}}, b^{(d\ell - \delta q)/T}, b^{\ell/L_0}, W_0 2^{W_0} \right\}$$

$$\leq C \max \left\{ 1, b^{d\alpha+1}, b^{\alpha/2}, \alpha b^{\alpha/2} \right\}$$

$$\leq C b^{d\alpha}.$$

The depth $L(\ell)$ can be bounded as

$$L(\ell) \leq C(ST + L_0) \leq C \left(b^{d(\alpha+\beta)-\tau(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} (\tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha) + \beta \right).$$

By Proposition 4.10 and inequality (4.14), we also get the approximation error (4.19) in this case. Using Proposition 4.1, we can construct the sum $G_4 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_4} g_\ell$ in a sequential way, so that $G_4 \in \mathcal{NN}(W_4, L_4)$ with

$$W_4 = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_4} W(\ell) + 2d + 2 \leq C b^{d\alpha},$$

$$L_4 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_4} L(\ell) \leq C \sum_{\ell=2\alpha+2\beta+\lceil 2d\alpha/\tau \rceil}^{\ell^*} \left(b^{d(\alpha+\beta)-\tau(\ell/2-\alpha-\beta)} (\tau(\ell/2 - \alpha - \beta) - d\alpha) + \beta \right)$$

$$\leq C \sum_{j=\lceil 2d\alpha/\tau \rceil}^{\lceil 2d(\alpha+\beta)/\tau \rceil} \left(b^{d(\alpha+\beta)-\tau j/2} (\tau j/2 - d\alpha) + \beta \right) \leq C b^{d\beta},$$

where we use $\ell^* - 2\alpha - 2\beta < 2d(\alpha + \beta)/\tau$ and the last series is dominated by the term corresponding to $j = \lceil 2d\alpha/\tau \rceil$.

Finally, we construct the desired network as

$$g_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^4 G_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell^*} g_\ell \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L),$$

whose width $W \leq Cb^{d\alpha}$ and depth $L \leq Cb^{d\beta}$ by the above analysis. Since $\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon} \subseteq \Omega_{\ell,\epsilon}$ for $\ell \leq \ell^*$, the fact that inequality (4.17) holds for $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$ implies

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{2\alpha+2\beta} \|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon})} \leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{2\alpha+2\beta} \left(b^{-2\alpha-2\beta+\ell} + b^{-s\ell} \right) \leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)}.$$

Similarly, using inequality (4.19), we get

$$\sum_{\ell=2\alpha+2\beta+1}^{\ell^*} \|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon})} \leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} \sum_{\ell=2\alpha+2\beta+1}^{\ell^*} \left(b^{\eta(\ell-2\alpha-2\beta)} + b^{-s\ell} \right) \leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)},$$

since $\eta < 0$. As a consequence, the approximation error can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - g_{\alpha,\beta}\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon})} &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell^*} \|f_\ell - g_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon})} + \sum_{\ell=\ell^*+1}^{\infty} \|f_\ell\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell^*,\epsilon})} \\ &\leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} + C \sum_{\ell=\ell^*+1}^{\infty} b^{(d/q-d/p-s)\ell} \\ &\leq C \left(b^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)} + b^{2(d/q-d/p-s)\kappa(\alpha+\beta)} \right) \\ &\leq Cb^{-2s(\alpha+\beta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use (4.15) in the second inequality and $(d/q-d/p-s)\kappa = -s$ in the last inequality. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we need to remove the trifling region from Proposition 4.11 by using ideas from Shen et al. [2022]; Lu et al. [2021]; Siegel [2023]. Specifically, we will follow the construction in Siegel [2023], which uses different bases b_i to create multiple approximators (by using Proposition 4.11). The bases can be chosen in such a way that they create minimally overlapping trifling regions and the median of the approximators has the desired accuracy on the whole domain Ω .

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Without loss of generality, we assume that $f \in \mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)$ has been normalized so that $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}^{s,q}([0,1]^d)} \leq 1$. The case $p < q$ can be reduced to the case $p = q$ by using the inequality $\|f - g\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} \leq \|f - g\|_{L^q([0,1]^d)}$ for $p < q$. So, we can also assume that $1 \leq q \leq p \leq \infty$.

In order to remove the trifling region in Proposition 4.11, we make use of different bases b . Let k be the smallest integer such that $2^k \geq 2d + 2$ and let b_i be the i -th prime number for $i = 1, \dots, 2^k$. Thus, k and b_i only depend on the dimension d . To complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that, for any integers $m, n \geq b_{2^k}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with $W \leq Cm^d$ and $L \leq Cn^d$ such that

$$\|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(mn)^{-2s},$$

where $\Omega = [0, 1]^d$ as before.

For $i = 1, \dots, 2^k$, we denote $\alpha_i = \lfloor \log_{b_i} m \rfloor$ and $\beta_i = \lfloor \log_{b_i} n \rfloor$. Thus, we have the simple inequalities $b_i^{-1}m \leq b_i^{\alpha_i} \leq m$ and $b_i^{-1}n \leq b_i^{\beta_i} \leq n$. In order to apply Proposition 4.11, we let $\ell_i^* = \lfloor 2\kappa(\alpha_i + \beta_i) \rfloor$ where κ is defined as in Proposition 4.11. Notice that the following numbers are all distinct

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^k} \left\{ \frac{1}{b_i^{\ell_i^*}}, \dots, \frac{b_i^{\ell_i^*} - 1}{b_i^{\ell_i^*}} \right\},$$

since b_i are all pairwise relatively prime. We choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that

$$\epsilon < \min_{u \neq v \in \mathcal{A}} |u - v|.$$

This choice of ϵ has the property that any element of $[0, 1]$ is contained in at most one of the sets

$$[jb_i^{-\ell_i^*} - \epsilon, jb_i^{-\ell_i^*}), \quad j = 1, \dots, b_i^{\ell_i^*} - 1 \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, 2^k. \quad (4.20)$$

Thus, if we let $\Omega_{\ell_i^*, \epsilon}$ denote the good region (4.3) at level ℓ_i^* with base b_i , then, for any $x \in \Omega$, we have $x \notin \Omega_{\ell_i^*, \epsilon}$ for at most d different values i , because each coordinate of x can be contained in at most one set from (4.20). In other words, the following set

$$\mathcal{I}(x) := \{i : x \in \Omega_{\ell_i^*, \epsilon}\}$$

has at least $2^k - d \geq 2^{k-1} + 1$ elements, since $2^k \geq 2d + 2$.

For $i = 1, \dots, 2^k$, by applying Proposition 4.11 with parameters α_i, β_i , the base b_i and the above ϵ , we get $g_i \in \mathcal{NN}(W_i, L_i)$ with $W_i \leq Cb_i^{d\alpha_i} \leq Cm^d$ and $L_i \leq Cb_i^{d\beta_i} \leq Cn^d$ such that

$$\|f - g_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell_i^*, \epsilon})} \leq Cb_i^{-2s(\alpha_i + \beta_i)} \leq C(mn)^{-2s}.$$

Let $\psi_{2^k-1} \in \mathcal{NN}(2^{k+2}, k(k+1)/2)$ be the network in Proposition 4.5 that selects the 2^{k-1} -largest value from 2^k values. We construct the desired network g as

$$x \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} g_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ g_{2^k}(x) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \psi_{2^k-1}(g_1(x), \dots, g_{2^k}(x)).$$

Then, by Proposition 4.1, we have $g \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ with

$$W \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} W_i, 2^{k+2} \right\} \leq Cm^d,$$

$$L \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2^k} L_i + k(k+1)/2 \leq Cn^d.$$

It remains to estimate the approximation error. For each $x \in \Omega$, since $|\mathcal{I}(x)| \geq 2^{k-1} + 1$, the 2^{k-1} -largest element of $\{g_1(x), \dots, g_{2^k}(x)\}$ must be both larger and smaller than some element of $\{g_i(x) : i \in \mathcal{I}(x)\}$. In other words,

$$\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} g_i(x) \leq g(x) \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} g_i(x),$$

which implies

$$|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} |f(x) - g_i(x)|.$$

When $p = \infty$, we finish the proof by noticing that the right hand side is bounded by $C(mn)^{-2s}$ by the definition of $\mathcal{I}(x)$. When $p < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |f(x) - g(x)|^p dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} |f(x) - g_i(x)|^p dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \|f - g_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_{\ell_i^*, \epsilon}^*)}^p \\ &\leq C(mn)^{-2sp}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof by taking p -th roots. \square

Remark 4.12. Theorem 2.2 can be proven in the same way as above with minor modifications. The main differences are that we choose $k = \lfloor s \rfloor + 1$ and the Bramble-Hilbert lemma needs to be replaced by the analogous inequality $\|\Pi_k^0(f) - f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)}$, which follows from well-known bound for piecewise polynomial approximation of Besov functions [DeVore and Popov, 1988, Section 3]. Additionally, the sub-additivity (4.13) should be replaced by the corresponding inequality for Besov spaces

$$\sum_{i \in I_\ell} |f|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega_i^\ell)}^q \leq C|f|_{\mathcal{B}_{q,r}^s(\Omega)}^q.$$

We refer the reader to DeVore and Sharpley [1993] for reference.

Acknowledgments

The work described in this paper was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12371103.

A Proofs of technical results

A.1 Proof of Lemma 4.2

For the first part, we let $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m$ with $1 \leq m \leq n$ be the breakpoints of g (if g is affine, let $m = 1$ and $t_1 = 0$). Observe that g can be written as

$$g(t) = c - a_0\sigma(-t + t_1) + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i\sigma(t - t_i),$$

where a_0 and a_1 are the left and right derivatives at t_1 , the remained a_i give the jump in derivative at other breakpoints and c is set to match the value at 0. Hence, we have $g \in \mathcal{NN}(m+1, 1)$. If $a_0 = 0$, then $g \in \mathcal{NN}(m, 1)$.

The second part follows from Daubechies et al. [2021, Theorem 3.1], which showed that $g = f$ on $[\alpha, \beta]$ for some $f \in \mathcal{NN}(6W + 2, 2\lceil \frac{n}{6W^2} \rceil) \subseteq \mathcal{NN}(6W + 2, 2L)$ when $[\alpha, \beta] = [0, 1]$. We can extend their result on $[0, 1]$ to any bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ by applying an affine map on the input. Note that one can also extend the bounded interval to $(-\infty, \infty)$ by using a slightly larger network width.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.3

We modify the construction in Bartlett et al. [2019, Lemma 13]. We partition $[0, 1)$ into 2^m intervals $[j2^{-m}, (j+1)2^{-m})$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^m - 1$. The indicator function of $[j2^{-m}, (j+1)2^{-m})$ can be approximated by the following piecewise linear function

$$g_j(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq j2^{-m} - \epsilon \text{ or } t \geq (j+1)2^{-m}, \\ 1 + \epsilon^{-1}(t - j2^{-m}), & j2^{-m} - \epsilon < t < j2^{-m}, \\ 1, & j2^{-m} \leq t \leq (j+1)2^{-m} - \epsilon, \\ -\epsilon^{-1}(t - (j+1)2^{-m}), & (j+1)2^{-m} - \epsilon < t < (j+1)2^{-m}, \end{cases}$$

where we choose $\epsilon < 2^{-n}$. By Lemma 4.2, we have $g_j \in \mathcal{NN}(4, 1)$.

Observe that x_i can be computed by adding the corresponding indicator function. For instance, $x_1 = \sum_{j=2^{m-1}}^{2^m-1} g_j(x)$. Furthermore, $\text{Bin } 0.x_{m+1} \cdots x_n = 2^m x - \sum_{i=1}^m 2^{m-i} x_i$. We can construct the desired network $f_{m,n}$ as follows

$$x \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} g_0(x) \\ \vdots \\ g_{2^m-1}(x) \\ x \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \\ x \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \\ \text{Bin } 0.x_{m+1} \cdots x_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the last two maps are affine. Hence, $f_{n,m} \in \mathcal{NN}(2^{m+2} + 1, 1)$.

To construct the network $f_{n,m,L}$ with $L \leq m$, we can apply $f_{n, \lceil m/L \rceil}$ to the last component $L - 1$ times and then apply $f_{n, m - (L-1)\lceil m/L \rceil}$ to extract m bits:

$$\begin{aligned} x &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_{\lceil m/L \rceil}.0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.x_{\lceil m/L \rceil+1} \cdots x_n \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_{2\lceil m/L \rceil}.0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.x_{2\lceil m/L \rceil+1} \cdots x_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &\rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_{(L-1)\lceil m/L \rceil}.0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.x_{(L-1)\lceil m/L \rceil+1} \cdots x_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_m.0 \\ \text{Bin } 0.x_m \cdots x_n \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{NN}(2^{\lceil m/L \rceil+2} + 2, L). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for $j \leq i$, $\text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_i.0$ is a linear combination of x_j, \dots, x_i and $\text{Bin } x_1 \cdots x_j.0$. Finally, for $L > m$, we let $f_{n,m,L} = f_{n,m,m} \in \mathcal{NN}(10, m) \subseteq \mathcal{NN}(10, L)$.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.4

The result is trivial for $\ell = 0$. So we let $\ell \geq 1$ in the following. Let us first consider the one-dimensional case $d = 1$. For each $m \in [1, \ell]$, we define the piecewise linear function

$$g_m(t) := \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq b^{-m} - \epsilon, \\ j + \epsilon^{-1}(t - jb^{-m}), & jb^{-m} - \epsilon < t \leq jb^{-m}, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, b^m - 1, \\ j, & jb^{-m} < t \leq (j+1)b^{-m} - \epsilon, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, b^m - 1, \\ b^m - 1, & t > 1 - \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that g_m has $2b^m - 1$ pieces and $g_m \in \mathcal{NN}(2b^m - 2, 1)$ by Lemma 4.2.

For any $t \in [ib^{-\ell}, (i+1)b^{-\ell} - \epsilon)$, we have the b -adic representation

$$t = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k b^{-k} + c, \quad i = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k b^{\ell-k},$$

where $a_k \in \{0, \dots, b-1\}$ and $c \in [0, b^{-\ell} - \epsilon)$. Let $r := \lfloor \ell/m \rfloor \geq 1$ and $s := \ell - rm \in [0, m-1]$. We consider the following iteration with initialization $p_0 = 0$ and $t_0 = t$:

$$p_{n+1} = b^m p_n + g_m(t_n), \quad t_{n+1} = b^m t_n - g_m(t_n), \quad \text{for } n = 0, \dots, r-1.$$

Since $\sum_{k=m+1}^{\ell} a_k b^{-k} + c < b^{-m} - \epsilon$, we have $p_1 = g_m(t) = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k b^{m-k}$ and $t_1 = b^m t - g_m(t) = \sum_{k=m+1}^{\ell} a_k b^{m-k} + b^m c$. Inductively, one can check that

$$p_n = \sum_{k=1}^{nm} a_k b^{nm-k}, \quad t_n = \sum_{k=nm+1}^{\ell} a_k b^{nm-k} + b^{nm} c, \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, r.$$

If $s = 0$, we already obtain the index $i = p_r$. If $s \neq 0$, we need one more iteration step

$$p_{r+1} = b^s p_r + g_s(t_r).$$

Since $b^{rm} c < b^{-s} - b^{rm} \epsilon < b^{-s} - \epsilon$, we have $g_s(t_r) = \sum_{k=rm+1}^{\ell} a_k b^{\ell-k}$ and $p_{r+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k b^{\ell-k} = i$. Thus, we have given an iteration method to compute the index i for $t \in [ib^{-\ell}, (i+1)b^{-\ell} - \epsilon)$. In addition, for $t \in [1 - \epsilon, 1]$, the above iteration gives $p_n = b^{nm} - 1$ for $n = 1, \dots, r$. If $s \neq 0$, we get $p_{r+1} = b^{\ell} - 1$. Hence, we also compute the index correctly for $t \in [1 - \epsilon, 1]$.

Next, we construct a neural network to implement the above iteration. We begin with the affine map $t \rightarrow (0, t)^{\top}$. Then, one iteration step can be implemented by composing with the following map

$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ t \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(p) \\ \sigma(t) \\ g_m(t) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} b^m \sigma(p) + g_m(t) \\ b^m \sigma(t) - g_m(t) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{NN}(2b^m, 1).$$

If $s \neq 0$, we simply replace $g_m(t)$ by $g_s(t)$ in the $(r+1)$ -th iteration step. After the last step of the iteration, we compose with the affine map which selects the first coordinate to get the desired network $q_1 \in \mathcal{NN}_{1,1}(2b^m, \lceil \ell/m \rceil)$. For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, if we choose $m = \lceil \ell/L \rceil$, then $q_1 \in \mathcal{NN}_{1,1}(2b^{\lceil \ell/L \rceil}, L)$.

Finally, for higher dimensional case $d \geq 2$, we notice that

$$q_d(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d b^{\ell(j-1)} q_1(x_j), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{i,\epsilon}^{\ell}.$$

By Proposition 4.1, we have $q_d \in \mathcal{NN}_{d,1}(2db^{\lceil \ell/L \rceil}, L)$.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4.7

We begin with some notations for the neural network class $\mathcal{NN}_{1,1}(W, L)$. For integer $\ell \in [1, L+1]$, we use P_{ℓ} to denote the number of parameters (weights and biases) up to layer ℓ . Thus, $P := P_{L+1} = (L-1)W^2 + (L+2)W + 1$ is the number of parameters in the network. It

is easy to see that $W\ell \leq P_\ell \leq 2W^2\ell$. We use $f_a \in \mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ to denote the neural network parameterized by $a \in \mathbb{R}^P$.

Observe that, for any subset S of $\{1, \dots, \min\{N, M\}\}$, there exists $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^\top \in \mathcal{S}_{N, M}$ such that $x_i > 0$ if and only if $i \in S$. By assumption, the function class $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ must shatter the set $\{1, \dots, \min\{N, M\}\}$ and hence

$$\min\{N, M\} \leq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{NN}(W, L)) \leq CW^2L^2 \log(WL), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the second inequality is from (3.2). Thus, when $2N \geq M \geq N/2$, i.e. $p = 1$, we get the desired bound. For $p > 1$, we cannot use the pseudo-dimension directly, but we can apply an argument similar to the pseudo-dimension bound in Bartlett et al. [2019]. The main technical tool is the following form of Warren's Theorem from Bartlett et al. [2019, Lemma 17] and Anthony and Bartlett [2009, Theorem 8.3].

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $P \leq N$ and let f_1, \dots, f_N be polynomials of degree at most D in P variables. Then, the number of possible sign vectors attained by the polynomials can be bounded as*

$$|\{(\text{sgn}(f_1(a)), \dots, \text{sgn}(f_N(a))) : a \in \mathbb{R}^P\}| \leq 2(2eND/P)^P,$$

where $\text{sgn}(t) = 1$ if $t > 0$ and $\text{sgn}(t) = 0$ otherwise.

We first consider the case that $N/2 > M \geq C_0N^{1/p}$. We are going to estimate the number of sign patterns that the neural network can output on the input set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Specially, we define

$$\begin{aligned} s(a) &= (\text{sgn}(f_a(1)), \dots, \text{sgn}(f_a(N))) \in \{0, 1\}^N, \\ K &= |\{s(a) : a \in \mathbb{R}^P\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can assume that $P \leq N$, because otherwise $4W^2L \geq P > N > 2M$ already implies the desired result. So, one can apply Lemma A.1 in the following analysis. To upper bound K , we partition \mathbb{R}^P into regions where $f_a(i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, are polynomials of a . This can be done by using the method presented in the proof of Bartlett et al. [2019, Theorem 7]. By using Lemma A.1, they constructed iteratively a sequence of refined partition $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_L$ with the following two properties:

1. $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{R}^P$ and for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\ell|}{|\mathcal{A}_{\ell-1}|} \leq 2 \left(\frac{2eNW\ell}{P_\ell} \right)^{P_\ell}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

2. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, L + 1$, each element A of $\mathcal{A}_{\ell-1}$, each input $i = 1, \dots, N$, and each neuron u in the ℓ -th layer, when a varies in A , the net input to u is a fixed polynomial function in P_ℓ variables of a , with total degree at most ℓ .

In particular, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_L$, $f_a(i)$ is a polynomial of $a \in A$ with degree at most $L + 1$, since we do not have activation in the last layer. By Lemma A.1, we get

$$|\{s(a) : a \in A\}| \leq 2 \left(\frac{2eN(L+1)}{P_{L+1}} \right)^{P_{L+1}}.$$

Applying the bound (A.2) iteratively gives

$$|\mathcal{A}_L| \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^L 2 \left(\frac{2eNW\ell}{P_\ell} \right)^{P_\ell}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} K &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_L} |\{s(a) : a \in A\}| \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^{L+1} 2 \left(\frac{2eNW\ell}{P_\ell} \right)^{P_\ell} \\ &\leq 2^{L+1} (2eN)^{\sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} P_\ell} \leq (4eN)^{W^2(L+1)(L+2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $W\ell \leq P_\ell \leq 2W^2\ell$ in the last two inequalities. On the other hand, $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$ can match the values of any element in $\mathcal{S}_{N, M}$ by assumption. Since $\mathcal{S}_{N, M}$ contains every indicator function of every subset of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of size M , we have

$$\binom{N}{M} \leq K \leq (4eN)^{W^2(L+1)(L+2)}.$$

Taking logarithms shows that

$$M \log(N/M) \leq 6W^2L^2 \log(4eN).$$

Since $N/2 > M \geq C_0N^{1/p}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(1 + \log(N/M)) &\leq eM \log(N/M) \leq 6eW^2L^2 \log(4eN) \\ &\leq 6eW^2L^2 \log(4eC_0^{-p}M^p) \\ &\leq C_pW^2L^2 \log(WL), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (A.1) in the last inequality.

For the case $2N < M \leq C_0N^p$, we can assume that $P \leq M$, because otherwise $4W^2L \geq P > M > 2N$ already implies the desired result. We consider a slightly different vector of sign pattern:

$$s(a) = (\text{sgn}(f_a(i) - j))_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j \in \{0, \dots, M-1\}} \in \{0, 1\}^{NM}.$$

The only difference is that we now consider NM piecewise polynomials $a \mapsto f_a(i) - j$ indexed by (i, j) , rather than N piecewise polynomials $a \mapsto f_a(i)$ indexed by i . We can upper bound K , defined through the new sign pattern $s(a)$, in a similar manner as before and obtain

$$K \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^{L+1} 2 \left(\frac{2eNMW\ell}{P_\ell} \right)^{P_\ell} \leq (4eNM)^{W^2(L+1)(L+2)}.$$

Notice that the set $\mathcal{S}_{N, M}$ contains all vectors whose first $N - 1$ coordinates are arbitrary integers in $\{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor M/N \rfloor\}$ and whose last coordinate is chosen to make the ℓ^1 norm equal to M . By assumption, $\mathcal{S}_{N, M}$ can be represented by $\mathcal{NN}(W, L)$, which implies

$$(\lfloor M/N \rfloor + 1)^{N-1} \leq K \leq (4eNM)^{W^2(L+1)(L+2)}.$$

Taking logarithms and calculating as before, we get the desired bound.

A.5 Proof of Lemma 4.9

Following the construction in Lu et al. [2021, Lemma 5.1], we define a set of sawtooth functions $T_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by iteration $T_i = T_{i-1} \circ T_1$ for $i = 2, 3, \dots$, and

$$T_1(x) := \begin{cases} 2x, & x \in [0, 1/2], \\ 2(1-x), & x \in (1/2, 1], \\ 0, & x \notin [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that T_i has 2^{i-1} sawteeth and $T_i \in \mathcal{NN}(2^i, 1)$ by Lemma 4.2. Consequently, the symmetric function $x \mapsto T_i(|x|)$ is in $\mathcal{NN}(2^{i+1}, 1)$.

Let us first consider the approximation of the square function on $[-1, 1]$. For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, let $h_s : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the continuous piecewise linear function with breakpoints $h_s(j/2^s) = (j/2^s)^2$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [-2^s, 2^s]$. Note that h_s is a symmetric convex function. One can check that (see Lu et al. [2021, Lemma 5.1]), for any $x \in [-1, 1]$, $0 \leq h_s(x) - x^2 \leq 2^{-2s-2}$ and

$$h_s(x) = |x| - \sum_{i=1}^s 4^{-i} T_i(|x|).$$

For any integers $k \geq 4$ and $L \geq 1$, we define the network $g_{k,L}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} T_1(|x|) \\ \vdots \\ T_k(|x|) \\ |x| \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} T_{k+1}(|x|) \\ \vdots \\ T_{2k}(|x|) \\ |x| - \sum_{i=1}^k 4^{-i} T_i(|x|) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} T_{(L-1)k+1}(|x|) \\ \vdots \\ T_{Lk}(|x|) \\ |x| - \sum_{i=1}^{(L-1)k} 4^{-i} T_i(|x|) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\rightarrow |x| - \sum_{i=1}^{Lk} 4^{-i} T_i(|x|), \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies $g_{k,L}(x) = h_{kL}(x)$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$. In this construction, the width of the first layer is $2 + \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{i+1} \leq 2^{k+2}$ and the width of remained layers is $k2^k + 1$. Hence, we have $g_{k,L} \in \mathcal{NN}(k2^k + 1, L)$ because $k \geq 4$.

Observing that $xy = 2\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{x^2+y^2}{2}$, we define the desired network $f_{k,L} \in \mathcal{NN}(3k2^k + 3, L)$ by

$$f_{k,L}(x, y) := 2g_{k,L}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) - \frac{g_{k,L}(x) + g_{k,L}(y)}{2}.$$

For $x, y \in [-1, 1]$, we have $f_{k,L}(x, y) \geq -\frac{g_{k,L}(x) + g_{k,L}(y)}{2} \geq -1$ and $f_{k,L}(x, y) \leq g_{k,L}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq 1$, since $g_{k,L} = h_{kL} : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is convex. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k,L}(x, y) - xy &= 2\left(h_{kL}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)^2\right) - \frac{h_{kL}(x) - x^2}{2} - \frac{h_{kL}(y) - y^2}{2} \\ &\in [-2^{-2kL-2}, 2^{-2kL-1}], \end{aligned}$$

where we use $0 \leq h_{kL}(x) - x^2 \leq 2^{-2kL-2}$.

References

- Robert A. Adams and John J.F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Elsevier, 2003.
- Martin Anthony and Peter L. Bartlett. *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Peter L. Bartlett, Vitaly Maiorov, and Ron Meir. Almost linear VC-dimension bounds for piecewise polynomial networks. *Neural Computation*, 10(8):2159–2173, 1998.
- Peter L. Bartlett, Nick Harvey, Christopher Liaw, and Abbas Mehrabian. Nearly-tight VC-dimension and Pseudodimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(63):1–17, 2019.
- Minshuo Chen, Haoming Jiang, Wenjing Liao, and Tuo Zhao. Nonparametric regression on low-dimensional manifolds using deep ReLU networks: function approximation and statistical recovery. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11(4):1203–1253, 2022.
- George Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 2(4):303–314, 1989.
- Ingrid Daubechies, Ronald DeVore, Simon Foucart, Boris Hanin, and Guergana Petrova. Nonlinear approximation and (deep) relu networks. *Constructive Approximation*, 55(1):127–172, 2021.
- Ronald DeVore, Boris Hanin, and Guergana Petrova. Neural network approximation. *Acta Numerica*, 30:327–444, 2021.
- Ronald A. DeVore. Nonlinear approximation. *Acta Numerica*, 7:51–150, 1998.
- Ronald A. DeVore and George G. Lorentz. *Constructive Approximation*, volume 303. Springer Science & Business Media, 1993.
- Ronald A. DeVore and Vasil A. Popov. Interpolation of Besov spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 305(1):397–414, 1988.
- Ronald A. DeVore and Robert C. Sharpley. Besov spaces on domains in R^d . *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 335(2):843–864, 1993.
- Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.
- David L. Donoho and Iain M. Johnstone. Minimax estimation via wavelet shrinkage. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(3):879–921, 1998.
- Chenguang Duan, Yuling Jiao, Yanming Lai, Dingwei Li, Xiliang Lu, and Jerry Zhijian Yang. Convergence rate analysis for deep Ritz method. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 31(4):1020–1048, 2022.
- Evarist Giné and Richard Nickl. *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge university press, 2015.

- Ingo Gühring, Gitta Kutyniok, and Philipp Petersen. Error bounds for approximations with deep ReLU neural networks in $W^{s,p}$ norms. *Analysis and Applications*, 18(05):803–859, 2019.
- Boris Hanin and Mark Sellke. Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width. *arXiv: 1710.11278*, 2017.
- David Haussler. Decision theoretic generalizations of the PAC model for neural net and other learning applications. *Information and Computation*, 100(1):78–150, 1992.
- Kurt Hornik. Approximation capabilities of multilayer feedforward networks. *Neural Networks*, 4(2):251–257, 1991.
- Yuling Jiao, Guohao Shen, Yuanyuan Lin, and Jian Huang. Deep nonparametric regression on approximate manifolds: Nonasymptotic error bounds with polynomial prefactors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2), 2023a.
- Yuling Jiao, Yang Wang, and Yunfei Yang. Approximation bounds for norm constrained neural networks with applications to regression and GANs. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 65:249–278, 2023b.
- Yongdai Kim, Ilsang Ohn, and Dongha Kim. Fast convergence rates of deep neural networks for classification. *Neural Networks*, 138:179–197, 2021.
- Michael Kohler and Sophie Langer. On the rate of convergence of fully connected deep neural network regression estimates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(4):2231–2249, 2021.
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- Chenghao Liu and Minghua Chen. ReLU network with width $d + \mathcal{O}(1)$ can achieve optimal approximation rate. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Jianfeng Lu, Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. Deep network approximation for smooth functions. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 53(5):5465–5506, 2021.
- Yiping Lu, Haoxuan Chen, Jianfeng Lu, Lexing Ying, and Jose Blanchet. Machine learning for elliptic PDEs: Fast rate generalization bound, neural scaling law and minimax optimality. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2018.
- Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Rectified linear units improve restricted Boltzmann machines. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 807–814, 2010.
- Ryumei Nakada and Masaaki Imaizumi. Adaptive approximation and generalization of deep neural network with intrinsic dimensionality. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(174):1–38, 2020.
- Kazusato Oko, Shunta Akiyama, and Taiji Suzuki. Diffusion models are minimax optimal distribution estimators. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26517–26582. 2023.

- Philipp Petersen and Felix Voigtlaender. Optimal approximation of piecewise smooth functions using deep ReLU neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 108:296–330, 2018.
- Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E. Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. Depth-width tradeoffs in approximating natural functions with neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2979–2987. 2017.
- Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(4):1875–1897, 2020.
- Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. Nonlinear approximation via compositions. *Neural Networks*, 119:74–84, 2019.
- Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. Deep network approximation characterized by number of neurons. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 28(5):1768–1811, 2020.
- Zuowei Shen, Haizhao Yang, and Shijun Zhang. Optimal approximation rate of ReLU networks in terms of width and depth. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 157:101–135, 2022.
- Jonathan W. Siegel. Optimal approximation rates for deep ReLU neural networks on Sobolev and Besov spaces. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(357):1–52, 2023.
- Charles J. Stone. Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 10(4):1040–1053, 1982.
- Taiji Suzuki. Adaptivity of deep ReLU network for learning in Besov and mixed smooth Besov spaces: optimal rate and curse of dimensionality. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Hans Triebel. *Theory of Function Spaces II*. Springer Basel, 1992.
- Yunfei Yang and Ding-Xuan Zhou. Optimal rates of approximation by shallow ReLU^k neural networks and applications to nonparametric regression. *Constructive Approximation*, 2024.
- Yunfei Yang, Zhen Li, and Yang Wang. Approximation in shift-invariant spaces with deep ReLU neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 153:269–281, 2022.
- Yunfei Yang, Han Feng, and Ding-Xuan Zhou. On the rates of convergence for learning with convolutional neural networks. *arXiv: 2403.16459*, 2024.
- Dmitry Yarotsky. Error bounds for approximations with deep ReLU networks. *Neural Networks*, 94:103–114, 2017.
- Dmitry Yarotsky. Optimal approximation of continuous functions by very deep ReLU networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 639–649. 2018.
- Dmitry Yarotsky and Anton Zhevnerchuk. The phase diagram of approximation rates for deep neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 13005–13015. 2020.