On Expressive Power of Quantized Neural Networks under Fixed-Point Arithmetic

Geonho Hwang^{*†}

Yeachan Park^{*†}

ark^{*†} Sejun Park ^{‡§}

August 2024

Abstract

Research into the expressive power of neural networks typically considers real parameters and operations without rounding error. In this work, we study universal approximation property of quantized networks under discrete fixed-point parameters and fixed-point operations that may incur errors due to rounding. We first provide a necessary condition and a sufficient condition on fixed-point arithmetic and activation functions for universal approximation of quantized networks. Then, we show that various popular activation functions satisfy our sufficient condition, e.g., Sigmoid, ReLU, ELU, SoftPlus, SiLU, Mish, and GELU. In other words, networks using those activation functions are capable of universal approximation. We further show that our necessary condition and sufficient condition coincide under a mild condition on activation functions: e.g., for an activation function σ , there exists a fixed-point number x such that $\sigma(x) = 0$. Namely, we find a necessary and sufficient condition for a large class of activation functions. We lastly show that even quantized networks using binary weights in $\{-1, 1\}$ can also universally approximate for practical activation functions.

1 Introduction

Universal approximation theorems are key foundational results in neural network theory. Classical results focus on shallow networks using real parameters and exact mathematical operations. They show that such networks using any non-polynomial activation function can approximate a target continuous function within an arbitrary error [2, 5, 10, 14]. Recent works extend these results to deep networks and prove that networks using any non-affine polynomial activation function are also capable of universal approximation [9].

With the recent exponential growth in the size of state-of-the-art networks, reducing the memory and computational costs of networks has received considerable attention. Network quantization is a popular method that can reduce the memory and computation cost of networks by using low-precision fixed-point parameters and low-cost integer operations [6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20]. Surprisingly, although quantized networks using fixed-point arithmetic have discrete parameters and non-negligible rounding errors in their evaluation, they have successfully reduced memory and computation costs while preserving the performance of their unquantized counterparts.

Only a few works have investigated the expressive power of networks using discrete parameters and/or machine operations. For example, Ding et al. [3] show networks using quantized (i.e., discrete) weights and exact mathematical operations can universally approximate.

In addition, Gonon et al. [4] analyze the approximation error incurred by quantizing real network parameters through nearest rounding. However, almost all existing works consider operations without error (i.e., exact), and thus, are not applicable to quantized networks using

^{*}Korea Institute for Advanced Study, 85 Hoegi-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, 02455, Seoul, South Korea [†]Equal contribution

[‡]Department of Artificial Intelligence, Korea University, Seoul, 02841, Republic of Korea

Scorresponding author: sejun.park0000gmail.com

fixed-point operations. The only exception is a recent work that shows universal approximation property of neural networks using a ReLU or Step activation function under floating-point arithmetic (i.e., floating-point parameters and floating-point operations) [13]. Nevertheless, this result assumes floating-point arithmetic and considers ReLU and binary threshold activation functions only; thus, it does not apply to quantized networks using fixed-point arithmetic and does not extend to general activation functions. Hence, what modern quantized networks using general activation functions can or cannot express is still unknown.

In this work, we analyze universal approximation property of quantized networks using fixedpoint arithmetic only. To our knowledge, this is the first study on the expressive power of the quantized networks under fixed-point operations. Specifically, we consider networks using p-bit fixed-point arithmetic that consists of fixed-point numbers

$$\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \triangleq \left\{ k/s : k \in \mathbb{Z}, -2^p + 1 \le k \le 2^p - 1 \right\},\tag{1}$$

for some scaling factor $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and the fixed-point rounding $\lceil x \rfloor$ of $x \in \mathbb{R}$, which denotes an element in $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ closest to x (see Section 2.2 for the precise definition and a tie-breaking rule). Given such fixed-point arithmetic, a pointwise activation function σ , and affine transformations ρ_1, \ldots, ρ_L , we consider a " σ quantized network" $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ defined as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \left\lceil \rho_L \right\rfloor \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ \left\lceil \rho_{L-1} \right\rfloor \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ \cdots \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ \left\lceil \rho_1 \right\rfloor (\mathbf{x}), \tag{2}$$

where $\lceil \rho_l \rfloor$ and $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$ denote the functions that round the output elements of ρ_l and σ to $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, respectively (refer to Section 2.3 for additional information). We note that such quantized networks have been used in the network quantization literature [7, 18]. Under this setup, we study universal approximation property of σ quantized networks: σ quantized networks can universally approximate if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and continuous $f^* : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, there exists a σ quantized network $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$|f^*(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})| \le \varepsilon + \min_{z \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} |f^*(\mathbf{x}) - z|,$$
(3)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Here, the term $\min_{z \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} |f^*(\mathbf{x}) - z|$ denotes an intrinsic error incurred by fixed-point arithmetic; we cannot obtain an error below this.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We first provide a necessary condition on activation functions and fixed-point arithmetic (i.e., $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$) for universal approximation of quantized networks in Theorem 1. Unlike classical results that show networks using any non-affine continuous activation function can universally approximate under real parameters and exact mathematical operations [10, 9], our necessary condition shows that quantized networks using some non-affine continuous functions cannot universally approximate.
- We then provide a sufficient condition on activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for universal approximation in Theorem 6. We show that various practical activation functions such as Sigmoid, ReLU, ELU, SoftPlus, SiLU, Mish, and GELU¹ satisfy our sufficient condition for any $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$; that is, practical quantized networks are capable of performing a given target task. Interestingly, the identity activation function (i.e., $\sigma(x) = x$) also satisfies our sufficient condition, i.e., it is capable of universal approximation unlike networks using real parameters and exact mathematical operations.
- We show that under a mild condition on activation functions (e.g., there exists x such that $\sigma(x) = 0$), our necessary condition coincides with our sufficient condition (Corollary 8 and Lemma 9). This implies that for a large class of activation functions, our results (Theorems 1 and 6) provide a necessary and sufficient condition for universal approximation.
- We further extend our results to quantized networks with binary weights, i.e., all weights in the networks are in {-1,1}, and show that quantized networks with binary weights can universally approximate for various activation functions such as Sigmoid, ReLU, ELU, SoftPlus, SiLU, Mish, and GELU. This setup has been widely studied in network quantization literature due to the low multiplication cost with 1 and -1 [12, 16].

¹See Section 2 for the definitions of activation functions.

• We lastly discuss our main results. We show that a naïve quantization of real parameters in a network may incur a large error; hence, existing universal approximation results do not directly extend to quantized networks. We also quantitatively analyze the size of networks for approximating a target function in our results.

1.1 Organization

The problem setup and relevant notations are presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we present our principal findings on universal approximation property of quantized networks.

Specifically, we provide necessary and/or sufficient conditions on activation function and fixedpoint arithmetic for universal approximation; we then extend these results to networks with binary weights. We discuss some aspects of our main results in Section 4. We provide formal proofs of our findings in Section 5 and conclude our paper in Section 6.

2 Problem setup and notations

2.1 Notations

We begin by introducing the notations commonly used throughout this paper. We use \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{R} , and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to denote the set of natural numbers, the set of integers, the set of real numbers, and the set of positive real numbers, respectively. We also use $\mathbb{N}_0 \triangleq \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define $[n] \triangleq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, i.e., $[0] = \emptyset$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, an interval [a, b] is defined as $[a, b] \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \leq b\}$. We generally use a, b, c, \ldots to represent scalar values and $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \ldots$ to denote column vectors.

For a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an index $i \in [n]$, we use x_i to represent the *i*-th coordinate of \mathbf{x} . Likewise, for a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$, we use $f(\mathbf{x})_i$ to denote the *i*-th coordinate of $f(\mathbf{x})$. For a function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we often use σ with a vector-valued input (e.g., $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^b$) to denote its coordinate-wise application (i.e., $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = (\sigma(x_1), \ldots, \sigma(x_n))$). For a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, dim(\mathbf{x}) denotes the dimensionality of the vector \mathbf{x} , i.e., dim(\mathbf{x}) = n. For a set A, |A| denotes the number of elements of A. For a vector \mathbf{x} and a set S, we define an *indicator function* $\mathbb{1}_S(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{S}. \end{cases}$$
(4)

We define the affine transformation as follows: for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in [n]$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subset [n]$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$, aff $(\cdot; \mathbf{w}, b, \mathcal{I}) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\operatorname{aff}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{w},b,\mathcal{I}) \triangleq b + \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_{i_j} w_j.$$
(5)

For any compact $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and continuous function $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define the *modulus of continuity* $\omega_f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of f as

$$\omega_f(\delta) \triangleq \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}: \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_{\infty} \le \delta} |f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}')|, \tag{6}$$

and we define its inverse $\omega_f^{-1}:\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\cup\{\infty\}$ as

$$\omega_f^{-1}(\varepsilon) \triangleq \sup\{\delta \ge 0 : \omega_f(\delta) \le \varepsilon\}.$$
⁽⁷⁾

We lastly provide definitions of popular activation functions:

- Sigmoid $(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}},$
- $\operatorname{ReLU}(x) = \max(0, x).$
- ELU(x) = $\begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \ge 0, \\ \exp(x) 1 & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$

- SiLU(x) = $\frac{x}{1+e^{-x}}$,
- SoftPlus $(x) = \log(1 + \exp(x)),$
- $\operatorname{Mish}(x) = x \tanh(\operatorname{SoftPlus}(x)),$
- GELU(x) = $\frac{x}{2} \left(1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \right) = \frac{x}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{x/\sqrt{2}} e^{-t^2} dt \right).$ • Hardtanh(x) = $\begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \ge 1, \\ x & \text{if } 0 < x < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \le 0. \end{cases}$

2.2 Fixed-point arithmetic

In this section, we introduce fixed-point arithmetic that we focus on [7, 18]. In particular, we consider the following set of fixed-point numbers: for $p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \triangleq \begin{cases} \{q/s : q \in [-2^p + 1, 2^p - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}\} & \text{if } p < \infty, \\ \{q/s : q \in \mathbb{Z}\} & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

$$\tag{8}$$

Throughout this paper, we define $q_{p,s,max} \triangleq \max \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$, and assume $q_{p,s,max} \ge 1$, i.e., $-1, 1 \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. If p, s are apparent from the context, we drop p, s and use q_{max} to denote $q_{p,s,max}$.

For any real number $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the rounding operation $\left[\cdot\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{n}}$ as follows:

$$[x]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \triangleq \underset{y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} |x - y|. \tag{9}$$

When ties occur (i.e., there are $u, v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $u \neq v$ and $|x-u| = |x-v| = \min_{y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} |x-y|$), we choose the number with the larger absolute value in the set $\arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} |x-y|$ (i.e., $\lceil x \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} = u$ if |u| > |v|) following [7].² To simplify notation, we frequently omit $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and use $\lceil x \rfloor$ to denote $\lceil x \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}$ if $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ is apparent from the context.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, we define its quantized version $[f]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^m$ with respect to $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as follows: for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\left[f\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\left[f(\mathbf{x})_{1}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}, \dots, \left[f(\mathbf{x})_{m}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}\right).$$
(10)

Here, we frequently omit $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and use $\lceil f \rfloor$ to denote $\lceil f \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}$ if $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ is apparent from the context.

2.3 Neural networks

Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of layers, $N_0 = d \in \mathbb{N}$ be the input dimension, $N_L = 1$ be the output dimension, and N_ℓ be the number of hidden neurons (i.e., hidden dimension) at layer ℓ for all $\ell \in [L-1]$. For each $l \in [L]$ and $i \in [N_l]$, let $\mathcal{I}_{l,i} \subset [N_{l-1}]$ be the set of indices of hidden neurons in the layer l-1 that are used for computing the *i*-th neuron of the layer l via some affine map characterized by parameters $\mathbf{w}_{l,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|}$, and $b_{l,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Eq. (5)). Let $\mathcal{I} \triangleq (\mathcal{I}_{1,1}, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_{1,N_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_{L,N_L})$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^I$ be the concatenation of all $\mathbf{w}_{l,i}$, and $b_{l,i}$ where the number of parameters I is defined as

$$I \triangleq \sum_{l=1}^{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} (\dim(b_{l,i}) + \dim(\mathbf{w}_{l,i})) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} N_l + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} |\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|.$$
(11)

We define a *neural network* $g_{\theta,\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ using $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as its activation function as follows: for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$g_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \rho_L \circ \sigma \circ \rho_{L-1} \circ \sigma \circ \cdots \circ \rho_2 \circ \sigma \circ \rho_1(\mathbf{x}), \tag{12}$$

²Such a rounding scheme is often referred to as "away from zero".

where $\rho_l : \mathbb{R}^{N_{l-1}} \to \mathbb{R}^{N_l}$ is defined as

$$\rho_l(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \left(\operatorname{aff}(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{w}_{l,1}, b_{l,1}, \mathcal{I}_{l,1}), \dots, \operatorname{aff}(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{w}_{l,N_l}, b_{l,N_l}, \mathcal{I}_{l,N_l}) \right), \tag{13}$$

for all $l \in [L]$ (see Eq. (5) for the definition of aff). Under the same setup, given $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, we also define a *quantized neural network* $f_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}(\cdot;\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}):\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ that has the following properties:

- $f_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}$ has quantized weights $\mathbf{w}_{l,i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{|\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|}$ and biases $b_{l,i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ for all $l \in [L]$ and $i \in [N_l]$ in all affine transformations and
- it has quantized outputs for all affine transformations and activation functions.

Namely, a quantized network $f_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}$ can be expressed as

$$f_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \triangleq \left[\rho_{L}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \circ \left[\sigma\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \circ \left[\rho_{L-1}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \circ \cdots \circ \left[\sigma\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \circ \left[\rho_{1}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}(\mathbf{x}), \tag{14}$$

where $\left[\rho_{l}\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}$ and $\left[\sigma\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}$ are quantized versions of ρ_{l} and σ as in Eq. (10). We note that we do not perform rounding after each of the elementary operations (e.g., addition or multiplication) in an affine transformation but perform a single rounding after computing the whole affine transformation. This is because practical implementations of quantized networks typically use the fused multiply-add (FMA) in CPUs/GPUs that perform a single rounding after the affine transformation; in this case, operations before rounding are often done with high precision. In addition, since quantized networks typically use high-precision bias parameters (i.e., $b_{l,i}$) while weights are in low-precision (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_{l,i}$) to reduce multiplication costs [7], we assume high precision biases (i.e., $b_{l,i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$) and low-precision weights (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_{l,i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{|\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|}$) in our quantized network definition Eq. (14).

We call a quantized network defined in Eq. (14) as a " σ quantized network under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ ". To simplify notation, we frequently omit \mathcal{I} (and θ) and use f_{θ} (or f) to denote $f_{\theta,\mathcal{I}}$.

2.4 Universal approximation

We say " σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate" if for any continuous $f^*: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a σ quantized network $f_{\theta}(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ such that

$$|f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{x})| \leq |f^{*}(\mathbf{x}) - [f^{*}(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}| + \varepsilon,$$
(15)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Here, the error $|f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})|$ should be lower bounded by the intrinsic error $|f^*(\mathbf{x}) - [f^*(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}|$ since the output of $f_{\theta}(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ is always in $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ but $f^*(\mathbf{x})$ can have an arbitrary real value. We note that if $\varepsilon < 1/(2s)$ in Eq. (15), then $|f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| = |f^*(\mathbf{x}) - [f^*(\mathbf{x})]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}|$, i.e., the intrinsic error can be achieved if σ quantized networks can universally approximate.

3 Universal approximation via quantized networks

In this section, we analyze universal approximation property of quantized networks. In Section 3.1, we provide a necessary condition on activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for universal approximation. In Section 3.2, we provide a sufficient condition on activation functions for universal approximation and show that various practical activation functions satisfy our sufficient condition (e.g., Sigmoid, ReLU, ELU, SoftPlus, SiLU, Mish, and GELU) for any $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ with $p \geq 3$. We also show that our sufficient condition coincides with the necessary condition introduced in Section 3.1 (i.e., our sufficient condition is necessary) for a large class of practical activation functions including Sigmoid, ReLU, ELU, SoftPlus, SiLU, Mish, and GELU. We further extend our results to quantized networks with binary weights (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_{l,i} \in \{-1,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|}$) in Section 3.3. Detailed proofs are presented in Section 5. Throughout this section, we use $[\cdot]$ to denote $[\cdot]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}$ to simplify notation.

3.1 Necessary condition for universal approximation

Classical universal approximation theorems state that under real parameters and exact mathematical operations, neural networks with two layers and any non-polynomial activation function can universally approximate [10]. Furthermore, for deeper networks, it is known that networks using non-affine polynomial activation function can also universally approximate [9]. This implies that under real parameters and exact mathematical operations, any non-affine continuous activation function suffices for universal approximation. However, this is not the case for quantized networks. In this section, we show that there are non-affine activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for which quantized networks cannot universally approximate. In particular, we study such activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ by formalizing a necessary condition on the activation function σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for universal approximation.

Recall a σ quantized network $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ defined in Eq. (14):

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \lceil \rho_L \rfloor \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_{L-1} \rfloor \circ \cdots \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_1 \rfloor (\mathbf{x}).$$
(16)

Since the output of $\lceil \sigma
floo
ceil
ho_{L-1}
floo \cdots
ho \lceil \sigma
floo
ceil
ho_{L}$ is always in $\lceil \sigma
floo
floo (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$, given the last layer weights $\mathbf{w}_{L,1} = (w_{L,1,1}, \ldots, w_{L,1,N_{L-1}}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{N_{L-1}}$ and bias $b_{L,1} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ for $\lceil \rho_L
floor$, the output of f always satisfies

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \in \left\{ \left\lceil b_{L,1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{L-1}} w_{L,1,i} z_i \right\rfloor : z_i \in \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \right\},$$
(17)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. To introduce our necessary condition, for each $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, we define

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right] : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(18)

Then, by Eq. (17), one can easily observe that $f(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b_{L,1}}$, which implies that for any σ quantized network g under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, we have

$$g(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b},\tag{19}$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

We are now ready to introduce our necessary condition. Suppose that σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate. Let $f^* : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a target continuous function such that $f^*(\mathbf{x}) = \lceil f^* \rfloor (\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and $f^*(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d) = \lceil f^* \rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d) = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Since σ quantized networks can universally approximate, there exists a σ quantized network h that approximates f^* within 1/(2s) error, i.e., for each $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$,

$$|h(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| < |\lceil f^* \rfloor(\mathbf{x}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| + \frac{1}{2s} = \frac{1}{2s}.$$
(20)

Here, since the gap between two distinct numbers in $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ is at least 1/s, Eq. (20) implies $f^*(\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$. Namely, by Eq. (19), we must have

$$\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = h(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = f^*(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{p,s},$$
(21)

for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$; that is, $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, which is our necessary condition. We formally state this necessary condition in the following theorem. For completeness, we provide the detailed proof of Theorem 1 in Section 5.1.

Theorem 1. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate, then there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.\tag{22}$$

Theorem 1 states that if $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, then σ quantized networks cannot universally approximate. Using Theorem 1, we can characterize a class of activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ that cannot universally approximate, as specified in Lemma 2. We provide the proof of Lemma 2 in Section 5.2.

Lemma 2. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that there exists a natural number $3 \leq r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \times r \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and $(s \times r) \mid (s \times (\lceil \sigma \rfloor (x)))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.³ Further assume that $2 \mid p$ if r = 3. Then, $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

While any non-affine continuous activation function suffices for universal approximation under real parameters and exact mathematical operations, Lemma 2 implies that there can be non-affine σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that σ quantized networks cannot universally approximate. For example, the following corollary shows one such case.

Corollary 3. For $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $5s \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and for the activation function $\sigma(x) = 5s \times \text{Hardtanh}(x), \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

3.2 Sufficient condition for universal approximation

In this section, we introduce a sufficient condition for universal approximation of quantized networks. That is, if an activation function and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy our sufficient condition, then we can approximate any target continuous function within an arbitrary error via some quantized network (see Section 2.4). To this end, we explicitly construct indicator functions with some coefficient (say $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$), i.e.,

$$\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right) = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{C}, \end{cases}$$
(23)

for d-dimensional quantized cubes $\mathcal{C} = (\prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i]) \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ using quantized networks. We then approximate a target continuous function (say $f^* : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$) as

$$\left[f^{*}\right](\mathbf{x}) \approx \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{i} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{i}}(\mathbf{x})\right], \qquad (24)$$

for some partition $\{C_1, \ldots, C_k\}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$, where each C_i is a *d*-dimensional quantized cube of a small sidelength, and for some $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ approximating $\lceil f^* \rfloor (C_i)$.

From Eq. (24), it is easy to observe that if we can implement $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$ for arbitrary $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ using a σ quantized network, then σ quantized networks can universally approximate. However, as we observed in the necessary condition for universal approximation in Theorem 1, not all activation functions can implement every $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$ (if they could, networks using any activation function would universally approximate). Hence, in this section, we derive a sufficient condition on activation functions σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ under which we can implement $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

The rest of this section is organized as follows: we first introduce a class of activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ that we focus on; then, we characterize a class of $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that σ quantized network can implement $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$. Using this, we next formalize our sufficient condition. We also verify whether quantized networks under practical activation functions and quantization setups can universally approximate using our sufficient condition. We lastly discuss the necessity of our sufficient condition.

3.2.1 Activation functions of interest

We primarily consider activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfying the following condition.

Condition 1. For an activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \{-1, 1\}$, continuous $\rho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, and $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfying the following:

• $\sigma(x) = \alpha \rho(\beta x),$

 $^{{}^{3}}a \mid b$ denotes that b is divisible by a for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

- $z \neq \min \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$,
- $\lceil \rho \rfloor(x) = \max \lceil \rho \rfloor(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $x \ge z$, and
- $\lceil \rho \rfloor(x) < \max \lceil \rho \rfloor(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that x < z.

Condition 1 with the case $\alpha = \beta = 1$ characterizes a class of activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

- $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$ is non-constant on $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and
- the maximum of $[\sigma]$ over $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ is achieved only on $[z, \max \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}] \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

Compared to the $\alpha = \beta = 1$ case, different values of α and β change the maximum to the minimum and the interval $[z, \max \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}] \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ to the interval $[\min \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, z] \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, respectively.

It is easy to observe that any monotone activation function σ with non-constant $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$ satisfies Condition 1, e.g., ReLU, leaky-ReLU, SoftPlus, Sigmoid, etc. We formally present this observation in Lemma 4. The proof is provided in Section 5.3.

Lemma 4. Let $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is monotone and there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\lceil \sigma \rfloor(x) \neq \lceil \sigma \rfloor(y)$ (i.e., $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$ is non-constant on $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$), then σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1.

Furthermore, popular non-monotone activation functions such as GELU, SiLU, and Mish also satisfy Condition 1 for all $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

3.2.2 Implementing indicator functions via quantized networks

We implement indicator functions using σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfying Condition 1. To describe a class of implementable indicator functions, we define the following sets: for $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$,

$$\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \triangleq \left\{ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (x) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \right\},$$
(25)

$$\mathcal{S}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(26)

 $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ is a set of all gaps between possible outputs of $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$, and $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}^{\circ}$ is a set of all affine transformations of elements in $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ with a bias *b*. Using this definition, we characterize a class of indicator functions (of the form $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$) via the following lemma. We provide the proof of Lemma 5 in Section 5.4.

Lemma 5. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_d, \beta_d \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for all $i \in [d]$ and let $\mathcal{C} = (\prod_{i=1}^d [\alpha_i, \beta_i]) \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Suppose that σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. Then, for each $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ and $\gamma \in S_{\sigma,p,s,b}^\circ$, there exist $d' \in \mathbb{N}$, an affine transformation $\rho : \mathbb{R}^{d'} \to \mathbb{R}$ with quantized weights and bias (i.e., $\rho = \operatorname{aff}(\cdot; \mathbf{w}, b, \mathcal{I})$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$), and a two-layer σ quantized network $f(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{d'}$ such that

$$\rho \circ \left[\sigma\right] \circ f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.$$
(27)

Lemma 5 states that if $\gamma \in S^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, then $\gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be implemented by a composition of a σ quantized network, quantized activation, and an affine transformation ρ with quantized weights and *unquantized output*. Here, we do not quantize the output of ρ ; this is because our final quantized network construction (say f) that approximates a target function has the following form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_i \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(\mathbf{x})\right], \qquad (28)$$

as in Eq. (24). Namely, we will quantize the final output after summing the indicator functions.

3.2.3 Our sufficient condition

To describe our sufficient condition for universal approximation, we define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} z \end{bmatrix} : z \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}^{\circ} \right\}$$
⁽²⁹⁾

$$= \left\{ \left| b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right| : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(30)

Given Lemma 5 and Eq. (28), if $\{C_1, \ldots, C_k\}$ is a partition of $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ where each C_i is a quantized cube, then we can construct a σ quantized network f of the following form: for any $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in S_{\sigma,p,s,b}$,

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_i \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(\mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left[\gamma_i\right] \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(\mathbf{x}).$$
(31)

Since $\lceil \gamma_i \rfloor \in S_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for $\gamma_i \in S_{\sigma,p,s,b}^{\circ}$, one can conclude that we can construct a σ quantized network f as in Eq. (31) using Lemma 5, for any $\lceil \gamma_i \rfloor \in S_{\sigma,p,s,b}$. Namely, if $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, then σ quantized networks can universally approximate by choosing proper $\{C_1, \ldots, C_k\}$. We formally present this sufficient condition in Theorem 6, whose proof is provided in Section 5.5.

Theorem 6. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. If there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s},\tag{32}$$

then σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate.

One representative activation function that satisfies the condition in Theorem 6 for all $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$ is the identity function $\sigma(x) = x$; in this case, $S_{\sigma,p,s,0} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. This shows a gap between classical universal approximation results and ours; if a network uses real parameters and exact mathematical operations, then it can only express affine maps with the identity activation function, i.e., the network cannot universally approximate. Nevertheless, quantized networks with the identity activation function can universally approximate as stated in Theorem 6. This is because fixed-point additions and multiplications in quantized networks are non-affine due to rounding errors.

We next provide an easily verifiable condition for activation functions that guarantees $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ (i.e., universal approximation property). We provide the detailed proof of Lemma 7 in Section 5.6.

Lemma 7. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p \geq 3$. If $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and σ satisfy the one of the following conditions, then $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

1. There exist $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that, $-2^p + 1 \leq q_1 < q_2 \leq 2^p - 1$, σ is differentiable on $\left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, $|\sigma'(x)| < 1$, and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, and

$$\left|\sigma\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| \ge \frac{1}{s}.$$
(33)

2. There exist $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $-2^p + 1 \leq q_1 < q_2 \leq 2^p - 1$, σ is differentiable on $\left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$, and $0 \leq \sigma(x) \leq \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, and

$$\left|\sigma\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| \ge \frac{1}{s}.$$
(34)

3. There exist $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $-2^p + 1 \leq q_1 < q_2 \leq 2^p - 1$, σ is differentiable on $\left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, $1 \leq \sigma'(x) \leq 2$, and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(\frac{q_1}{s}, \frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, and

$$\left|\sigma\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| < \frac{2(q_2 - q_1) - 1}{s}.$$
(35)

4. σ is differentiable on $\left(0, \frac{2}{s}\right), \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma'(x) < 1$ and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(0, \frac{2}{s}\right)$.

- 5. σ is differentiable on $\left(0, \frac{2}{s}\right)$, $1 \leq \sigma'(x) < \frac{3}{2}$ and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p 1}{s}$ for $x \in \mathcal{J}$.
- 6. σ is differentiable on $\left(-\frac{2}{s}, \frac{1}{s}\right)$, $\frac{1}{3} \leq \sigma'(x) < 1$ and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(-\frac{2}{s}, \frac{1}{s}\right)$.
- 7. σ is differentiable on $\left(-\frac{3}{s},\frac{3}{s}\right)$, $\frac{1}{6} \leq \sigma'(x) < 1$ and $|\sigma(x)| \leq \frac{2^p 1}{s}$ for $x \in \left(-\frac{3}{s},\frac{3}{s}\right)$.

Many practical activation functions satisfy one of the conditions in Lemma 7. For example, ReLU, ELU, SiLU, Mish, and GELU satisfy condition 4 in Lemma 7 if $s \ge 3$. One can easily verify this by referring Table 1. SoftPlus and Sigmoid satisfy condition 6 and 7 in Lemma 7 if $s \ge 3$, which can be verified by referring Tables 2 and 3. For s = 1 and s = 2, one can also check condition 1 or 2 in Lemma 7.

Table 1: Properties of various activation functions for verifying the conditions in Lemma 7 and Condition 2. Here, we use $L_1 = \inf_{x \ge 0} \sigma'(x)$ and $L_2 = \sup_{x > 0} \sigma'(x)$.

Activation function	L_1	L_2	$\sup_{x>0} \frac{\sigma(x)}{x}$	$\operatorname{inf}_{0 < x \leq \frac{2}{3}} \sigma'(x)$	$\sup_{0 < x \le \frac{2}{3}} \sigma'(x)$
ReLU	1	1	0	1	1
ELU	1	1	1	1	1
SiLU	0.5	1.10	1	0.5	0.81
Mish	0.6	1.09	1	0.6	0.96
GELU	0.5	1.13	1	0.5	0.96

Table 2: Properties of SoftPlus for verifying the conditions of Lemma 7.

Activation function	$\sup_{-\frac{2}{3} < x < \frac{1}{3}} \sigma(x) $	$\inf_{-\frac{2}{3} < x < \frac{1}{3}} \sigma'(x)$	$\inf_{-\frac{2}{3} < x < \frac{1}{3}} \sigma'(x)$
SoftPlus	0.87	0.34	0.58

Table 3: Properties of Sigmoid for verifying the conditions of Lemma 7.

Activation function	$\sup_{-1 < x < 1} \sigma(x) $	$\inf_{-1 < x < 1} \sigma'(x)$	$ \inf_{-1 < x < 1} \sigma'(x) $
Sigmoid	0.73	0.2	0.25

3.2.4 Our necessary and sufficient condition

Theorem 6 states that $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ is *sufficient* for universal approximation, while Theorem 1 states that $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ is *necessary*. Hence, by combining these two results, one can observe that if $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all b, then $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for some b is *necessary and sufficient* for universal approximation.

Corollary 8. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. If $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, then σ quantized networks can universally approximate if and only if there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

Then, when do we have $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$? To answer this question, we provide conditions on the activation function σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ that guarantee $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$. We provide the proof of Lemma 9 in Section 5.7.

Lemma 9. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If there exists $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\lceil \sigma \rfloor(x) \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$, then, $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$. More specifically, if there exists $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\lceil \sigma \rfloor(x) = 0$, then, $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

We can easily verify that most practical activation functions whose value at zero is zero naturally satisfy the assumption of Lemma 9. Moreover, if an activation function σ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 7, then, $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, thereby satisfying the satisfies assumption of Lemma 9 as well.

3.3 Universal approximation with binary weights

Recent research has demonstrated that neural networks with parameters quantized to one-bit precision [12, 16] can achieve performance comparable to their full-precision counterparts, while significantly reducing multiplication costs. In this section, we present both a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for networks with binary weights to possess universal approximation property as in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

Recall a σ quantized network f defined as in Eq. (14):

$$f = \lceil \rho_L \rfloor \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_{L-1} \rfloor \circ \dots \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_1 \rfloor.$$
(36)

We say that "f has binary weights" if all its weights in the affine transformations ρ_l are binary. Specifically, for each l, i,

$$\mathbf{w}_{l,i} \in \{-1,1\}^{|\mathcal{I}_{l,i}|}.$$
(37)

Note that we allow non-binary bias parameters, i.e., $b_{l,i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ as in [12, 16].

As in the case of quantized networks in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we define the sets $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}^{\circ}$, and $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ \left\lceil b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right\rfloor : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \{-1,1\}, x_i \in \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}\right) \, \forall i \in [n] \right\}, \qquad (38)$$

$$\mathcal{BS}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \{-1,1\}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \ \forall i \in [n] \right\},\tag{39}$$

$$\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \{ [z] : z \in \mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \}$$

$$\tag{40}$$

$$= \left\{ \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right] : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \{-1, 1\}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma, p, s} \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$

$$(41)$$

Using these definitions, we derive a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for quantized networks with binary weights to achieve universal approximation via the following lemmas and theorems. We present their proofs in Sections 5.8–5.13, which are analogous to the results for general quantized networks.

We first present Theorem 10, Lemma 11, and Corollary 12 which describe our necessary condition.

Theorem 10. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ with binary weights can universally approximate, then there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that

$$\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.$$
(42)

Lemma 11. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that there exists a natural number $3 \leq r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $sr \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and $r \mid s \lceil \sigma \rfloor(x)$ for arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Further assume $2 \mid p$ if r = 3. Then, $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

Note that unlike Lemma 2 which requires the condition $sr | s [\sigma](x)$, Lemma 11 only requires $r | s [\sigma](x)$. This is because quantized networks with binary weights have less expressivity compared to general quantized networks with possibly non-binary weights. In other words, it is easier to find functions that cannot be approximated by quantized networks with binary weights,

compared to the non-binary weight case. Using Lemma 11, we can also show that quantized networks with binary weights and the 5Hardtanh(x) activation function may not universally approximate.

Corollary 12. For $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $5 \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and for the activation function $\sigma(x) = 5 \times \text{Hardtanh}(x)$, $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

We now present our sufficient condition for quantized networks with binary weights to achieve universal approximation via Lemma 13, Theorem 14, and Lemma 15.

Lemma 13. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_d, \beta_d \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for all $i \in [d]$ and let $\mathcal{C} = (\prod_{i=1}^d [\alpha_i, \beta_i]) \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Suppose that σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. Then, for each $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}^\circ$, there exist d', an affine transformation $\rho : \mathbb{R}^{d'} \to \mathbb{R}$ with binary weights and quantized bias, and a two-layer σ quantized network $f(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{d'}$ with binary weights such that

$$\rho \circ [\sigma] \circ f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} (\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.$$

$$(43)$$

Theorem 14. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. If there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that

$$\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s},\tag{44}$$

then σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate.

Lemma 15. Consider an activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ which satisfy one of the conditions of Lemma 7. Then, $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

Note that the assumptions in Lemma 15 are identical to those in Lemma 7; thus, all activation functions listed in the discussion of Lemma 7 also satisfy the assumption of Lemma 15. Although the expressive power of quantized networks with binary weights is constrained due to their binary nature, most activation functions are capable of universal approximation by Lemma 15.

Lastly, in Corollary 16 and Lemma 17, we provide a necessary and sufficient condition for universal approximation, and suggest a mild condition for our necessary and sufficient condition to be satisfied.

Corollary 16. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1. If $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, then σ quantized networks can universally approximate if and only if there exists $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

Lemma 17. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If there exists $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $[\sigma](x) \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$, then $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$. More specifically, if there exists $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $[\sigma](x) = 0$, then $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for all $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$.

4 Discussions

4.1 On naïve quantization of networks using real parameters

In this section, we show that naïve quantization of networks using real parameters can incur large errors. Namely, universal approximation property of quantized networks does not directly follow from existing results for networks using real parameters. Consider the following two-layer network $f : \mathbb{R}^{257} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = 2\left(\operatorname{ReLU}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{129} w_{1,i}x_i\right]\right)\right) + \operatorname{ReLU}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{257} w_{2,i}x_i\right]\right)$$
(45)

$$+ 3\left(-1 \times \operatorname{ReLU}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{129} w_{3,i} x_i\right]\right)\right) + 2\left(-1 \times \operatorname{ReLU}\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{65} w_{4,i} x_i\right]\right)\right).$$
(46)

with

$$(w_{1,1}, w_{1,2}, w_{1,3}, \dots, w_{1,129}) = \left(1, -\frac{1}{256}, \dots, -\frac{1}{256}\right),$$
 (47)

$$(w_{2,1}, w_{2,2}, w_{2,3}, \dots, w_{2,257}) = \left(-1, \frac{1}{256}, \dots, \frac{1}{256}\right),$$
 (48)

$$(w_{3,1}, w_{3,2}, w_{3,3}, \dots, w_{3,129}) = \left(-1, \frac{1}{128}, \dots, \frac{1}{128}\right),$$
 (49)

$$(w_{4,1}, w_{4,2}, w_{4,3}, \dots, w_{4,65}) = \left(-1, \frac{1}{128}, \dots, \frac{1}{128}\right).$$
 (50)

Then, we have

$$f(-1) = -1, \quad f(1) = 1$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{257}$. However, after quantization into $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ with p = 7, s = 64, we have

$$(\lceil w_{1,1} \rfloor, \lceil w_{1,2} \rfloor, \lceil w_{1,3} \rfloor, \dots, \lceil w_{1,129} \rfloor) = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0),$$
(51)

$$(\lceil w_{2,1} \rfloor, \lceil w_{2,2} \rfloor, \lceil w_{2,3} \rfloor, \dots, \lceil w_{2,257} \rfloor) = (-1, 0, 0, \dots, 0),$$
(52)

$$(\lceil w_{3,1} \rfloor, \lceil w_{3,2} \rfloor, \lceil w_{3,3} \rfloor, \dots, \lceil w_{3,129} \rfloor) = \left(-1, \frac{1}{64}, \frac{1}{64}, \dots, \frac{1}{64}\right),$$
(53)

$$(\lceil w_{4,1}
floor, \lceil w_{4,2}
floor, \lceil w_{4,3}
floor, \dots, \lceil w_{4,65}
floor) = \left(-1, \frac{1}{64}, \frac{1}{64}, \dots, \frac{1}{64}\right),$$
 (54)

where $\lceil \cdot \rfloor$ denotes $\lceil \cdot \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{7,64}}$. Note that the multiplication by integers can be implemented by networks with repeated addition of the same nodes.

Therefore, we have

$$\lceil f \mid (-1) = 1, \quad \lceil f \mid (1) = -1.$$
(55)

This implies that a naïve quantization of a network using real parameters can incur large errors, and hence, existing universal approximation theorems for real parameters do not directly extend to quantized networks.

4.2 Number of parameters in our universal approximator

In this section, we quantitatively analyze the number of parameters in our universal approximator construction that approximates a target function $f^* : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ within $\varepsilon > 0$ error. To this end, we first provide the following theorem that interprets the required number of parameters in our universal approximator. We provide the proof of Theorem 18 in Section 5.14.

Theorem 18. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $p, s, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, and $\mathcal{X} = [-q_{\max}, q_{\max}]$. Suppose that σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Condition 1, and $S_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Then, for any continuous $f^* : \mathcal{X}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with modulus of continuity ω_{f^*} and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a 3-layer σ quantized network $f(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ of at most P parameters such that

$$|f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| \le \left| f^*(\mathbf{x}) - \left\lceil f^*(\mathbf{x}) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \right| + \varepsilon,$$
(56)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ where

$$P = \begin{cases} O\left(2^{2p}s^{3}d(2q_{\max})^{d}(\omega_{f^{*}}^{-1}(\varepsilon))^{-d}\right) & \text{if } \omega_{f^{*}}^{-1}(\varepsilon) > \frac{1}{s}, \\ O\left(2^{d(p+1)+2p}s^{3}d\right) & \text{if } \omega_{f^{*}}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \le \frac{1}{s}. \end{cases}$$
(57)

As we described in Eq. (24), our universal approximator is a sum of indicator functions over quantized cubes that form a partition of $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Specifically, we choose quantized cubes so that their sidelengths are at most $\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)$; then $\Theta((2q_{max})^d(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon))^{-d})$ quantized cubes are sufficient for partitioning $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Furthermore, for each such quantized cube, our approximator incurs at most $\left|f^{*}(\mathbf{x}) - \left[f^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}\right| + \varepsilon$ error for all \mathbf{x} in that cube by the definition of the modulus of continuity (Eqs. (6) and (7)). Here, we use $O(2^{2p}s^{3}d)$ parameters for each indicator function (see Lemma 20). Hence, our universal approximator uses $O(2^{2p}s^{3}d(2q_{\max})^{d}(\omega_{f^{*}}^{-1}(\varepsilon))^{-d})$ parameters to achieve Eq. (56) in Theorem 18.

If p, s are constants, the term $2^{2p}s^3$ in Theorem 18 is also a constant. This implies that $O(d(2q_{max})^d(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon))^{-d})$ parameters in our construction is similar to existing results under floatingpoint arithmetic [13] and real parameters and exact operations for ReLU networks of O(1) layers [19]; both state that $((2q_{max})^d\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\Theta(\varepsilon)))^{-d}$ parameters are sufficient. However, $2^{2p}s^3$ can be large, especially when p is large. To reduce this term, we next introduce the following condition on activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$.

Condition 2. Suppose $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is (non-strictly) increasing for $x \ge 0$, $\frac{1}{2} \le \sigma'(x) \le 2$ and $0 \le \sigma(x) \le \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$ for $x \ge 0$, and satisfies one of the following conditions:

- 1. $\frac{1}{2} \le \sigma'(x) < 1$ for $0 < x < \frac{2}{s}$.
- 2. $1 \le \sigma'(x) < \frac{3}{2}$ for $0 < x < \frac{2}{s}$.

We note that Condition 2 is identical to the fourth and fifth conditions in Lemma 7. As we discussed in Section 3.2, various activation functions such as ReLU, ELU, GELU, SiLU, and Mish satisfy Condition 2 for $s \geq 3$. This can be verified by referring Table 1. Using Condition 2, we can effectively reduce the number of parameters in universal approximator constructions from $O\left(2^{2p}s^3d(2q_{\max})^d\left(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)\right)^{-d}\right)$ to $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}(2q_{\max})^d(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon))^{-d}\right)$, as described in Theorem 19. We provide the proof of Theorem 19 in Section 5.15.

Theorem 19. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $p, s, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$, and $\mathcal{X} = [-q_{\max}, q_{\max}]$. Suppose that σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Conditions 1 and 2. Then, for any continuous $f^* : \mathcal{X}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with modulus of continuity ω_{f^*} and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ -layer σ quantized network $f(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ of at most P parameters such that

$$|f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| \le |f^*(\mathbf{x}) - \left\lceil f^*(\mathbf{x}) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} | + \varepsilon.$$
(58)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ where

$$P = \begin{cases} O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}(2q_{\max})^d \left(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)\right)^{-d}\right) & \text{if } \omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon) > \frac{1}{s}, \\ O\left(\frac{dp2^{d(p+1)}}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right) & \text{if } \omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \le \frac{1}{s}. \end{cases}$$
(59)

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Consider a bijective function $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ defined as

$$f\left(\frac{i}{s}\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{i+1}{s} & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \text{ and } i \neq 2^p - 1, \\ \frac{i-1}{s} & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}, \\ \frac{2^p - 1}{s} & \text{if } i = 2^p - 1. \end{cases}$$
(60)

Then, $f(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. If σ quantized networks under $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ can universally approximate, then there exists a σ quantized network $g: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that g(x) = f(x) for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. As f is neither non-decreasing nor non-increasing, it is obvious that g is not an affine transformation, and g consists of at least one activation function and affine transformations. Let g(x) be represented as

$$g(x) = \lceil \rho_L \rfloor \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_{L-1} \rfloor \circ \dots \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \lceil \rho_1 \rfloor (x), \tag{61}$$

where ρ_L is an affine transformation from $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^n$ to $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$:

$$\rho_L(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i + b,$$
(62)

for $w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$. For $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ defined as

$$\mathbf{y} = \left\lceil \rho_{L-1} \right\rfloor \circ \cdots \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ \left\lceil \rho_1 \right\rfloor (x), \tag{63}$$

g(x) can be calculated as

$$g(x) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(y_i) + b\right].$$
(64)

Recall that $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \left\{ \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right] : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(65)

Obviously, $g(x) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = f\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}\right) = g\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}\right) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{p,s},\tag{66}$$

and we conclude that $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Thus, the proof is concluded.

5.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. By the assumption, there exists a function $\tilde{\sigma}: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$\lceil \sigma(x) \rfloor = sr\widetilde{\sigma}(x). \tag{67}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \left\{ \left\lceil b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right\rfloor : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, \ x_i \in \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(68)

For $i \in [n]$ and $x_i \in [\sigma](\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$, consider $y_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $x_i = [\sigma](y_i)$. Then,

$$x_i = \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(y_i) = sr\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i),\tag{69}$$

and

$$\left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i\right] = \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i s r \widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)\right] = \left[\frac{sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} r(sw_i)(s\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i))}{s}\right].$$
(70)

Then, $sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} r(sw_i)(s\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} r(sw_i)(s\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)) \equiv sb \pmod{r}.$$
(71)

We have

$$s\left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i\right] \equiv \begin{cases} 2^p - 1 \pmod{r} & \text{if } b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \ge 2^p/s, \\ -2^p + 1 \pmod{r} & \text{if } b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \le -2^p/s, \\ sb \pmod{r} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(72)

Thus,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \subset \left\{ \frac{q}{s} : q \equiv 2^p - 1, -2^p + 1, \text{ or } sb \pmod{r} \right\}.$$
(73)

If r > 3, the right-hand side cannot be $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. If r = 3 and $2 \mid p$, since $2^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, $2^p = (2^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \equiv (1)^{\frac{p}{2}} \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, we have $2^p - 1, -2^p + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r}$. Therefore, the right-hand side becomes

$$\left\{\frac{q}{s}: q \equiv 0 \text{ or } sb \pmod{3}\right\} \not\supseteq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.$$
(74)
ad the proof is concluded.

Therefore, $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, and the proof is concluded.

5.3 Proof of Lemma 4

If σ is monotonically non-increasing, $\tilde{\sigma}$ defined as $\tilde{\sigma}(x) \triangleq -\sigma(x)$ is monotonically non-decreasing and satisfies the assumption of the lemma. If $\tilde{\sigma}$ satisfies Condition 1, then, σ also does, thus we only need to consider monotonically non-decreasing σ .

As σ is monotonically non-decreasing, so does $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$. Define $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as $\min_x \lceil \sigma \rfloor (x) = \min_x \lceil \sigma \rfloor (\frac{2^p - 1}{s})$. By the assumption, $z \neq \frac{-2^p + 1}{s}$, and it satisfies the all assumption as $\lceil \sigma \rfloor$ is non-decreasing. Thus, the proof is concluded.

5.4 Proof of Lemma 5

Without loss of generality, assume that σ satisfies Condition 1 with $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. If we can construct a σ quantized network $f(x; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ satisfying the lemma when $\alpha = \beta = 1$, then, $\pm f(\pm x; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ satisfies the lemma with general α and β . Let $q_{\max} \triangleq \max \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = \frac{2^p - 1}{s}$. Define $\phi : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(-\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil x_{i} - \alpha_{i} + z \right\rfloor \right) + \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(q_{\max} \right) \right)$$
(75)

$$-\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil -x_i + \beta_i + z \right\rfloor \right) + \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(q_{\max} \right) \right).$$
(76)

Then, $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ if $\alpha_i \leq x_i \leq \beta_i$ for all $i \in [d]$, and $\phi(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ otherwise. For *m* satisfying m > 2s, define $g : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$g(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -\left[\sigma\right] \left(\left[m \times q_{\max} \times \phi(\mathbf{x}) + z - \frac{1}{s}\right] \right) + \left[\sigma\right] (q_{\max})$$

$$(77)$$

$$=\begin{cases} \left\lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(q_{\max} \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(z - \frac{1}{s} \right) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i], \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i]. \end{cases}$$
(78)

For any $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, define $F^q : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as

$$F^{q}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil q + m_{q} \left(q_{\max} \times g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\rfloor \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q),$$
(79)

where m_q is an integer satisfying $m_q q_{\max} \times \left(\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q_{\max}) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(z - \frac{1}{s} \right) \right) > 2q_{\max}$. Then, F^q can be calculated as

$$F^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \lceil \sigma \rfloor (q_{\max}) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor (q) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i}], \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i}]. \end{cases}$$
(80)

Note that the multiplication by m and m_q can be implemented by networks with repeated addition of the same nodes. By the definition of $\mathcal{S}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_j \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, and $v_j \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ for $j \in [n]$ such that

$$\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j v_j. \tag{81}$$

Let v_j be represented as

$$v_j = \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (v_{1,j}) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (v_{2,j}), \tag{82}$$

for $v_{1,j}, v_{2,j} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j \left(F^{v_{1,j}}(\mathbf{x}) - F^{v_{2,j}}(\mathbf{x}) \right) = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i] = \mathcal{C}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(83)

If we define $\rho: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{4n} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) = (w_1, -w_1, -w_1, w_1, w_2, -w_2, -w_2, w_2, w_3 \dots, w_n) \cdot \mathbf{x},$$
(84)

where \cdot is the inner product, and a two-layered σ network $f(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{4n}$ as

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \left(\left\lceil v_{1,1} + m_{v_{1,1}} \left(g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\rfloor, q, \left\lceil v_{2,1} + m_{v_{2,1}} \left(g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\rfloor, q,$$
(85)

$$|v_{1,2} + m_{v_{1,2}}(g(\mathbf{x}))|, q, |v_{2,2} + m_{v_{2,2}}(g(\mathbf{x}))|, q,$$
 (86)

$$\dots, \tag{87}$$

$$|v_{1,n} + m_{v_{1,n}}(g(\mathbf{x}))|, q, |v_{2,n} + m_{v_{2,n}}(g(\mathbf{x}))|, q),$$
 (88)

then, $\rho \circ [\sigma] \circ f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$, and the proof is concluded.

Proof of Theorem 6 5.5

For an arbitrary $f: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, f$ can be represented as the sum of indicator functions as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d} f(v) \times \mathbb{1}_{\{v\}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right).$$
(89)

Then, by the assumption that $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, we have $f(v) \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ for any $v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. By the definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, there exists $\gamma_v \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}^\circ$ such that

$$\lceil \gamma_v \rfloor = f(v). \tag{90}$$

By Lemma 5, there exist an affine transformation ρ_v and a σ quantized network ϕ_v such that

$$\rho_v \circ \left[\sigma\right] \circ \phi_v(\mathbf{x}) = \gamma_v \times \mathbb{1}_{\{v\}}(\mathbf{x}).$$
(91)

Define $g(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as

$$g(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \triangleq \left[\sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d} \rho_v \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ \phi_v(\mathbf{x}) \right] = \left[\sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d} \gamma_v \times \mathbb{1}_{\{v\}} (\mathbf{x}) \right].$$
(92)

Thus,

$$g(v; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \lceil \gamma_v \rfloor = f(v), \tag{93}$$

for any $v \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. As g is a σ quantized network, the proof is concluded.

Proof of Lemma 7 5.6

1. Define the set Σ as

$$\Sigma \triangleq \left\{ s \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} : k \in \mathbb{Z}, q_1 \le k \le q_2 \right\}.$$
(94)

Because $\left|\sigma\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| \geq \frac{1}{s}$, it follows that $\left|\left\lceil\sigma\right\rfloor\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \left\lceil\sigma\right\rfloor\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| \geq \frac{1}{s}$, and Σ has at least two elements. For integers $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ defined as $z_1 \triangleq s \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)$ and $z_2 \triangleq s \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right)$, without loss of generality, assume that $z_2 > z_1$. As $|\sigma'(x)| < 1$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $q_1 \leq k < q_2$, the following inequality holds:

$$\left|\sigma\left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{k}{s}\right)\right| < \frac{1}{s}.$$
(95)

Thus,

$$\left| \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k+1}{s} \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s} \right) \right| \le \frac{1}{s}.$$
(96)

Therefore, $\lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s}\right)$ should be one of $\frac{1}{s}$, 0, or $\frac{-1}{s}$, Then, the following relation holds: Σ

$$\Sigma \supset \{z_1, z_1 + 1, \dots, z_2\}.$$
 (97)

As

$$V \supset \left\{ \frac{z}{s} - \frac{z'}{s} : z, z' \in \Sigma \right\},\tag{98}$$

 $\frac{1}{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$, and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$. Thus, the proof is concluded.

2. The proof is almost identical to the proof of 1. The only difference is that the condition $|\sigma'(x)| < 1$ is replaced with $|\sigma'(x)| \leq 1$ and $\sigma(x) \geq 0$. Consequently, the inequality in Eq. (95) becomes

$$\left|\sigma\left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{k}{s}\right)\right| \le \frac{1}{s}.$$
(99)

Generally, we can not guarantee that

$$\left| \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k+1}{s} \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s} \right) \right| \le \frac{1}{s}, \tag{100}$$

due to the away from zero tie-breaking rule. However, as $\sigma(x) \ge 0$, we can assure that the inequality holds. The remaining part of the proof is identical to that of 1. Thus, the proof is concluded.

3. Define the set Σ as

$$\Sigma \triangleq \left\{ s \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s} \right) \in \mathbb{Z} : k \in \mathbb{Z}, q_1 \le k \le q_2 \right\}.$$
(101)

Because $\left|\sigma\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| < \frac{2(q_2-q_1)-1}{s}$, it follows that $\left|\left\lceil\sigma\right\rfloor\left(\frac{q_2}{s}\right) - \left\lceil\sigma\right\rfloor\left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)\right| \le \frac{2(q_2-q_1)-1}{s}$. As $1 < \sigma'(x) \le 2$, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $q_1 \le k < q_2$, the following inequality holds:

$$\sigma\left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(\frac{k}{s}\right) \ge \frac{1}{s}.$$
(102)

Thus,

$$\lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s}\right) \ge \frac{1}{s}.$$
(103)

Thus, there are exactly $q_2 - q_1 + 1$ elements in Σ between $s \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{q_1}{s}\right)$ and $s \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{2_1}{s}\right)$ whose difference is smaller than $\frac{2(q_2-q_1)}{s}$. Therefore, there exists at least one $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k+1}{s}\right) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\frac{k}{s}\right) = \frac{1}{s}$. We have $\frac{1}{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$, and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$. Thus, the proof is concluded.

4. As $\frac{1}{2} \le \sigma'(x) < 1$ for $0 < x < \frac{2}{s}$,

$$\sigma\left(\frac{2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(0\right) \ge \frac{1}{s},\tag{104}$$

which satisfies the assumption of 1.

5. As $1 \le \sigma'(x) < \frac{3}{2}$ for $0 < x < \frac{2}{s}$,

$$\sigma\left(\frac{2}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(0\right) \le \frac{3}{s},\tag{105}$$

which satisfies the assumption of 3 for $q_1 = 0$ and $q_2 = 2$. 6. As $\frac{1}{3} \leq \sigma'(x) < 1$ for $-\frac{2}{s} < x < \frac{1}{s}$,

$$\sigma\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(-\frac{2}{s}\right) \ge \frac{1}{s},\tag{106}$$

which satisfies the assumption of 3 for $q_1 = 1$ and $q_2 = -2$. 7. As $\frac{1}{6} \leq \sigma'(x) < 1$ for $-\frac{3}{s} < x < \frac{3}{s}$,

$$\sigma\left(\frac{3}{s}\right) - \sigma\left(-\frac{3}{s}\right) \ge \frac{1}{s},\tag{107}$$

which satisfies the assumption of 3 for $q_1 = 3$ and $q_2 = -3$.

5.7 Proof of Lemma 9

Recall that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \triangleq \left\{ \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right] : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \ \forall i \in [n] \right\},$$
(108)

$$\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \triangleq \left\{ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(x) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(y) : x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \right\},$$
(109)

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \left\{ \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right] : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s} \ \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(110)

If there exists x such that $\lceil \sigma \rfloor(x) \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$, then, there exist $y, x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$\left[\sigma\right](x) = \left[\sigma\right](y) - \left[\sigma\right](z). \tag{111}$$

Then, for any $w \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$,

$$\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (w) = \left(\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (w) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (x) \right) + \left(\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (y) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (z) \right).$$
(112)

Therefore, the integer coefficients linear span of $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ encompasses $\lceil \sigma \rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$, and thus, $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \supset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$. Obviously, $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, and we get $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$. Thus, the proof is concluded.

5.8 Proof of Theorem 10

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 1 except that w_i in Eq. (62) is binary, and $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ in Eq. (65) is replaced with $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$.

5.9 Proof of Lemma 11

Proof. By the assumption, there exists a function $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$\lceil \sigma(x) \rfloor = r \widetilde{\sigma}(x). \tag{113}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ is defined as

. -

$$\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} = \left\{ \left| b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right| : n \in \mathbb{N}_0, w_i \in \{-1,1\}, x_i \in \lceil \sigma \rfloor (\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) \; \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$
(114)

For $i \in [n]$ and $x_i \in [\sigma](\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$, consider $y_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $x_i = [\sigma](y_i)$. Then,

$$x_i = \lceil \sigma \rfloor (y_i) = r \widetilde{\sigma}(y_i), \tag{115}$$

and

$$\left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i\right] = \left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i r \widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)\right] = \left[\frac{sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} r w_i (s \widetilde{\sigma}(y_i))}{s}\right].$$
 (116)

We have $sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} rw_i(s\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and

$$sb + \sum_{i=1}^{n} rw_i(s\widetilde{\sigma}(y_i)) \equiv sb \pmod{r}.$$
 (117)

Therefore,

$$s\left[b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i\right] \equiv \begin{cases} 2^p - 1 & \text{if } b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \ge 2^p/s, \\ -2^p + 1 & \text{if } b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \le -2^p/s, \quad (\text{mod } r). \end{cases}$$
(118)
$$sb & \text{otherwise}$$

Thus, similar to the proof of Lemma 2 we can conclude that $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b} \neq \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, and the proof is concluded.

5.10 Proof of Lemma 13

We follow the proof outline of Lemma 5. First, we need to replace the constructions of ϕ , g, and F^q defined in Eq. (76), Eq. (77), and Eq. (80), respectively, with σ quantized networks with binary weights. ϕ already has binary weights. For g and F^q , if we redefine g and F^q as

$$g(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil m \times \phi(\mathbf{x}) + z - \frac{1}{s} \right\rfloor \right) + \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q_{\max}),$$
(119)

and

$$F^{q}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil q + m_{q} \times (g(\mathbf{x})) \right\rfloor \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q), \qquad (120)$$

where $m, m_q \in \mathbb{Z}$ are integers satisfying $m, m_q > 2^{p+1} - 2$, and integer multiplications $m \times$ and $m_q \times$ are implemented by repeated additions of the same value, then, g and F^q becomes networks with binary weights and the same outputs.

Then, by the definition of $\mathcal{BS}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{BS}^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$, there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, and $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ for $i \in [n]$ such that

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i v_i. \tag{121}$$

If we define ρ and f as in Eq. (84) and Eq. (85), respectively, then $\rho \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x})$, and the proof is concluded.

5.11 Proof of Theorem 14

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Theorem 6 except that $S_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ in the proof is replaced with $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ and Lemma 5 is replaced with Lemma 13.

5.12 Proof of Lemma 15

Proof. As the proof construction of Lemma 7 only uses binary coefficients, the same proof applies to Lemma 15, and the proof is concluded. \Box

5.13 Proof of Corollary 16

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Corollary 8 except that $S_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ in the proof are replaced with $\mathcal{BS}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ and $\mathcal{BN}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$.

5.14 Proof of Theorem 18

In this proof, we use Lemma 20 which is described below.

Proof. Let $\delta = \omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)$. First suppose $\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon) > 1/s$. Define $N = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq \frac{2q_{\max}}{\delta} - 1\}$, $\mathcal{G}_i = \{-q_{\max} + i\delta : i \in [N]\}$, and $\mathcal{G}^d = \prod_{i=1}^d \mathcal{G}$. Note that $|\mathcal{G}| = N + 1 \geq \frac{2q_{\max}}{\delta} + 1$ and $N \geq 2q_{\max}/\delta$. For any $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_d) \in \mathcal{G}^d$, we define the set $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}} \triangleq \{ (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d) \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d : \mathbf{p}_i \le \mathbf{x}_i < \mathbf{p}_i + \delta \quad \forall i \in [d] \}.$$
(122)

Then we have $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}\|_{\infty} \leq \delta$ for $\mathbf{x} \in C_{\mathbf{p}}$.

For each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}^d$, by Lemmas 5 and 20, we have 3-layer σ quantized network $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x}) = \left[f^*(\mathbf{p}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad (123)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(2^{2p}s^3d\right)$. Since the collection $\{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p}\in\mathcal{G}^d}$ is disjoint, we construct 3-layer σ quantized network $f(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}^d} \left[f^*(\mathbf{p}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}} (\mathbf{x}), \qquad (124)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(2^{2p}s^3d|\mathcal{G}^d|\right)$ = $O\left(2^{2p}s^3d(q_{\max})^d\left(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)\right)^{-d}\right)$. Since,

$$|f^*(\mathbf{x}) - f^*(\mathbf{p})| \le \omega_{f^*} \left(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}\|_{\infty} \right) \le \omega_{f^*}(\delta) = \varepsilon,$$
(125)

we have

$$|f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{x})| \leq |f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{p})| + |f^{*}(\mathbf{p}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{x})|$$

$$\leq \left| \left\lceil f^{*}(\mathbf{p}) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} - f^{*}(\mathbf{p}) \right| + \varepsilon \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{d}} \left| \left\lceil f^{*}(\mathbf{x}) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} - f^{*}(\mathbf{x}) \right| + \varepsilon$$
(126)

Now suppose $\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq 1/s$. In this case, note that $|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}| \leq |\mathcal{G}|$. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$, by Lemmas 5 and 20, we construct 3-layer σ quantized network $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{d}} \left[f^{*}(\mathbf{x}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{p}\}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right),$$
(127)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Then we have

$$\left|f(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right| = \left|f(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - \left\lceil f^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}\right|.$$
(128)

Since $|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}| = 2^{p+1} - 1$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(2^{2p}s^3d\left|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d\right|\right) = O\left(2^{d(p+1)+2p}s^3d\right)$.

Lemma 20. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $p, s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$. Then, The number of parameters in $\rho \circ [\sigma] \circ f$ in Lemma 5 is upper bounded by $O\left(2^{2p}s^{3}d\right)$ for all $\gamma \in S^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ such that $|\gamma| \leq 2q_{\max}$.

Proof. We count the maximum number of parameters to construct g. First, 10d parameters are required to construct $\phi(x)$. Since $m \leq 2s+1$, $m(10d)+4 \leq (2s+1)(10d)+4$ parameters are required to construct $g(\mathbf{x})$. Since $m_q \leq 2s+1$, $m_q((2s+1)(10d)+4) \leq (2s+1)((2s+1)(10d)+4) + 4 = (2s+1)^2(10d)+8s+8$ are required to construct $F^q(\mathbf{x})$. Since $|\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}| \leq 2^{p+2}-3$, by Lemma 21, we have $n \leq 4s (2^{p+2}-3) (2^p-1)$. Since $(2n) ((2s+1)^2(10d)+8s+8)$ parameters are required to construct $f(\mathbf{x})$, at most $O(2^{2p}s^3d)$ parameters are needed to construct the indicator of Lemma 5.

Lemma 21. Let $\gamma \in S^{\circ}_{\sigma,p,s,b}$ with $\gamma \leq 2q_{\max}$. Then there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \leq 4s(2^p - 1) |\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}|$, $w_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, and $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ for $i \in [n]$ such that

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i v_i. \tag{129}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\gamma \geq 0$. Let $m = |\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}|$, $v_i = \frac{x_i}{s}$ for $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma,p,s}$ and $d = \gcd(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. Then we have $|x_1|, \ldots, |x_m| \leq 2^{p+1} - 2$. By Lemma 23, there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i x_i = d$ where $|c_i| \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} |x_i| \leq 2^{p+1} - 2$. Since $|u| \leq \frac{2^{p-1}}{s}$ for $u \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, we have $u_{i,1}, u_{i,2} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^2 u_{i,j} = \frac{c_i}{s}$. Let $x_{i,1} = x_{i,2} = x_i$ for all i. Because

$$\frac{d}{s^2} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{c_i}{s} \times \frac{x_i}{s},\tag{130}$$

we have $u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, \ldots, u_{m,1}, u_{m,2}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{2} u_{i,j} = \frac{c_i}{s}$ for each *i*. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{u_{i,j}}{s} \times \frac{x_{i,j}}{s} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{c_i}{s} \times \frac{x_i}{s} = \frac{d}{s^2}.$$
(131)

Next, let $w_{2i+j} = u_{i,j}/s$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2m} w_i \times \frac{x_i}{s} = \sum_{i=1}^{2m} w_i v_i = \frac{d}{s^2}.$$
(132)

Since $d|\gamma_0$, we have

$$\frac{\gamma_0}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2m} w_i v_i \right) = \frac{\gamma_0}{d} \times \frac{d}{s^2} = \frac{\gamma_0}{s}, \tag{133}$$

where the multiplication of $\frac{\gamma_0}{d}$ are implemented by adding identical terms. Note that if $\gamma = \frac{\gamma_0}{s^2}$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $|\gamma_0| \leq 2s(2^p - 1)$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i v_i = \gamma, \tag{134}$$

where $n \le (2m) \times \frac{|\gamma_0|}{d} \le (2m) \times \frac{2s(2^p - 1)}{d} \le 4ms(2^p - 1).$

Lemma 22 (Bézout's identity [1]). Let x_1 and x_2 be integers with greatest common divisor d. Then there exist integers c_1 and c_2 such that $c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 = d$ with $|c_1| \le \left|\frac{x_1}{d}\right|$ and $|c_2| \le \left|\frac{x_2}{d}\right|$.

We can extend Bézout's identity to multiple integers.

Lemma 23. Let $x_1 < \cdots < x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ be integers with their greatest common divisors d. Then there exists $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i x_i = d,$$
(135)

where

$$|c_1| \le \frac{x_n}{d}, \quad |c_i| \le \frac{x_1}{d}, \quad \forall i = 2, \dots, n.$$
(136)

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $1 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n$ and d = 1. Since $gcd(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1$, there exists b_1, \ldots, b_n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i = 1$. Let $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|b_n + k_n x_1| \le |x_1|$ and let $c_n = b_n + k_n x_1$. Then we have

$$(b_1 - k_n x_n) x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \dots + b_{n_1} x_{n_1} + (b_n + k_n x_1) x_n = 1.$$
(137)

Next, pick $k_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|b_{n-1} + k_{n-1}x_1| \leq |x_1|$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(b_{n-1} + k_{n-1}x_1) \neq \operatorname{sgn}(c_n)$. Let $c_{n-1} = b_{n-1} + k_{n-1}x_1$. Then we have $|c_{n-1}x_{n-1} + c_nx_n| \leq \max(|c_{n-1}x_{n-1}|, |c_nx_n|) \leq |x_1||x_n|$. Recursively, for j = n - 2, ..., 2, pick $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|b_j + k_jx_1| \leq |x_1|$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(b_j + k_jx_1) \neq \operatorname{sgn}(c_{j+1})$. Let $c_j = b_j + k_jx_1$. Then we have $|\sum_{i=j}^n c_ix_i| \leq \max(|c_jx_j|, |\sum_{i=j+1}^n c_ix_i|) \leq |x_1||x_n|$. Finally let $c_1 = b_1 - \sum_{i=2}^n k_i$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i = 1.$$
(138)

Moreover, since $|c_1x_1| = |1 - \sum_{i=2}^n c_ix_i| \le 1 + |\sum_{i=2}^n c_ix_i| \le 1 + |x_1||x_n| \le |x_1|(1+|x_n|)$ we have $|c_1| \le |x_n|$.

5.15 Proof of Theorem 19 and technical lemmas

To prove Theorem 19, we use Lemma 27 which is introduced in Section 5.15.1.

Proof. We define $\delta, N, \mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}^d, \mathcal{C}_p$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 18. For each $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}^d$, by Lemma 27, we have $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ -layer σ quantized network $f: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that

$$f_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x}) = \left\lceil f^*(\mathbf{p}) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad (139)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$. Since the collection $\{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p}\in\mathcal{G}^d}$ is disjoint, we construct $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ -layer σ quantized network $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{G}^d} \left[f^*(\mathbf{p}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{p}}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right),$$
(140)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}|\mathcal{G}^d|\right)$ = $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\left(2q_{\max}\right)^d\left(\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon)\right)^{-d}\right)$. As shown in the proof of Theorem 18, we have

$$|f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^*(\mathbf{x})| \le \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d} \left| \left[f^*(\mathbf{x}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} - f^*(\mathbf{x}) \right| + \varepsilon$$
(141)

Now suppose $\omega_{f^*}^{-1}(\varepsilon) \leq 1/s$. In this case, note that $|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}| \leq |\mathcal{G}|$. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$, by Lemma 27, we construct $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ -layer σ quantized network $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s})$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d} \left[f^*(\mathbf{x}) \right]_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}} \times \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{p}\}} \left(\mathbf{x} \right),$$
(142)

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$. Then we have

$$\left|f(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - f^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right| = \left|f(\mathbf{x};\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) - \left\lceil f^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}}\right|.$$
(143)

Since $|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}| = 2^{p+1} - 1$ and the number of parameters is $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}|\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d|\right) = O\left(\frac{dp2^{(p+1)d}}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$.

5.15.1 Technical lemmas

Lemma 24. Suppose $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is (non-strictly) increasing for $x \ge 0$, $\sigma'(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \ge 0$ and satisfies Condition 1. Then, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, there exist $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that $\gamma \ge q_{\max}$, $d' \in \mathbb{N}$, an affine transformation $\rho : \mathbb{R}^{d'} \to \mathbb{R}$ with binary weights and $\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ bias (i.e., $\rho = \operatorname{aff}(\cdot; \mathbf{w}, b, \mathcal{I})$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$), and a quantized σ neural network $f : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ of $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ layers satisfying the following:

$$\rho \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ f(x) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]} \left(x \right), \tag{144}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$. Furthermore, the number of total parameters in f and ρ is $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$.

Proof. By Condition 1, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $\lceil \sigma(x) \rfloor = \lceil \sigma(q_{\max}) \rfloor$ if $x \ge \alpha$, and $\lceil \sigma(x) \rfloor < \lceil \sigma(q_{\max}) \rfloor$ if $x < \alpha$. Let $\alpha_{-} \triangleq \alpha - \frac{1}{s}$. $\lfloor x \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}}$ and $\lceil x \rceil_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}}$ are defined as the largest $\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ number such that $\lfloor x \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} \le x$ and the smallest $\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ number such that $\lceil x \rceil_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} \ge x$, respectively. Define $g_0: \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ as

$$g_0(x) \triangleq -11 \left(q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil x \right\rfloor \right) \right) + \left(\left\lceil 11 q_{\max} \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\alpha_{-} \right) \right\rceil_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} + q_{\max} \right),$$
(145)

where the multiplication by 11 can be implemented by the addition of the identical nodes. Then, g_0 can be calculated as

$$g_{0}(x) \begin{cases} = \left(\left\lceil 11q_{\max} \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(\alpha_{-}) \right\rceil_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} + q_{\max} \right) - 11 \left(q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(\left\lceil \alpha \right\rfloor) \right) & \text{if } x \ge \alpha, \\ \ge q_{\max} & \text{if } x < \alpha. \end{cases}$$
(146)

Define β_0 as

$$\beta_0 \triangleq g_0(\alpha). \tag{147}$$

Then, as $\lceil \alpha \rfloor - \lceil \alpha_- \rfloor \ge \frac{1}{s}$,

$$q_{\max} - \beta_0 = 11q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil \alpha \right\rfloor \right) - \left\lceil 11q_{\max} \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\alpha_{-}) \right\rceil_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}}$$
(148)

$$> 11q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil \alpha \right\rfloor \right) - 11q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\alpha_{-} \right) - \frac{1}{s}$$
(149)

$$\geq (11q_{\max} - 1)\frac{1}{s}.$$
 (150)

Thus since $\beta_0 < q_{\max}$, we have

$$q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_0 \rfloor \ge \lceil q_{\max} - \beta_0 \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} \ge \left(\lfloor 11q_{\max} - 1 \rfloor_{\mathbb{Z}} \right) \frac{1}{s}$$
(151)

$$\geq \left(\lfloor 11q_{\max} \rfloor_{\mathbb{Z}} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{s} \geq \frac{10}{s}.$$
(152)

Recursively define $g_i: \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as follows:

$$g_{i+1}(x) \triangleq 5\left(q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil g_i(x) \right\rfloor\right)\right) - \left(\left\lfloor 5q_{\max} \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(g_i(\alpha_-)\right)\right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} - q_{\max}\right),\tag{153}$$

where the multiplication by 5 can be implemented by the five times addition of the identical nodes.

As $\lceil g_0(x) \rfloor$ has only two values across the two domains $x \ge \alpha$ and $x < \alpha$, the same property applies to g_1 . Recursively, each function g_i also exhibits only two values. We define those two values as β_i and γ_i . Then, inductively, we have

$$g_{i+1}(x) = \begin{cases} \beta_{i+1} & \text{if } x \ge \alpha, \\ \gamma_{i+1} & \text{if } x < \alpha, \end{cases}$$

$$\beta_{i+1} \triangleq 5q_{\max} \times \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\lceil g_i(\alpha) \rfloor \right) - \left(\lfloor 5q_{\max} \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\lceil g_i(\alpha_-) \rfloor \right) \rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} - q_{\max} \right)$$

$$(154)$$

where $\gamma_i \geq q_{\max}$ which leads to $\lceil \gamma_i \rfloor = q_{\max}$. Then, under the assumption of $\beta_i \geq 0$ and $q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_i \rfloor \geq \frac{10}{s}$, we have,

$$q_{\max} - \left\lceil \beta_{i+1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor 5q_{\max} \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil g_i(\alpha_{-}) \right\rfloor \right) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}} - 5q_{\max} \times \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil g_i(\alpha) \right\rfloor \right)$$
(155)

$$> 5q_{\max} \times \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\lceil g_i(\alpha_{-}) \rfloor \right) - \frac{1}{s} - 5q_{\max} \times \lceil \sigma \rfloor \left(\lceil g_i(\alpha) \rfloor \right)$$
(156)

$$> 5q_{\max} \times \left(\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q_{\max}) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (\left\lceil \beta_i \right\rfloor) \right) - \frac{1}{s}$$
(157)

$$\geq 2q_{\max} \times (q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_i \rfloor) - \frac{1}{s},\tag{158}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 25. Therefore we have 4

$$q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_i \rfloor \ge (2q_{\max})^i \left(q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_0 \rfloor - \frac{1}{s(2q_{\max} - 1)} \right) + \frac{1}{s(2q_{\max} - 1)}$$
(159)

$$> (2q_{\max})^i \frac{9}{s}.$$
 (160)

⁴Note that the solution to the recurrence relation $a_{i+1} = ba_i + c$, where $b \neq 1$, is given by $a_i = b^i \left(a_0 + \frac{c}{b-1}\right) - \frac{c}{b-1}$.

Then, there exists a natural number $l \leq \left\lfloor \log_{2q_{\max}}(2^p - 1) \right\rfloor_{\mathbb{Z}} + 1$ such that

$$q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_l \rfloor \ge \frac{q_{\max}}{2}.$$
 (161)

Define ${\cal F}$ as

$$F(x) \triangleq 2q_{\max} + 2\left\lceil \beta_l \right\rfloor - 2\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil g_l(x+\alpha-a) \right\rfloor \right) - 2\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil g_l(-x+\alpha+b) \right\rfloor \right),$$
(162)

where the multiplication by 2 can be implemented by the addition of the identical nodes. Then, F(x) can be calculated as

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 2(q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_l \rfloor) & \text{if } a \le x \le b, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(163)

If we define a σ quantized network $f: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s} \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^4$ as

$$f \triangleq \left(\left\lceil g_l(x+\alpha-a) \right\rfloor, \left\lceil g_l(x+\alpha-a) \right\rfloor, \left\lceil g_l(-x+\alpha+b) \right\rfloor, \left\lceil g_l(-x+\alpha+b) \right\rfloor \right), \tag{164}$$

and an affine transformation with integer weights $\rho : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^4 \to \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ as

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -x_1 - x_2 - x_3 - x_4 + 2\left(q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_l \rfloor\right),\tag{165}$$

then the following equation holds:

$$\rho \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ f(x) = F(x) = 2 \left(q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_l \rfloor \right) \times \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]} \left(x \right).$$
(166)

The lemma is satisfied with $\gamma = 2(q_{\max} - \lceil \beta_l \rfloor) \ge q_{\max}$.

We count the maximum number of parameters to construct F(x). Suppose m parameters are required to construct some network N(x). Then duplicate 11 copies of N(x) with 11m parameters. Then additional 12 parameters are required to construct $g_0(N(x))$. We duplicate five $g_0(N(x))$ s with $(11m + 12) \times 5 = 55m + 60$ parameters. Suppose we construct five $g_i(N(x))$ s. Then we need additional 30 parameters to construct five $g_{i+1}(N(x))$. Therefore, (55m + 60) + 30l parameters are required to construct $g_l(x)$. Finally, $4 \times (55m + 60 + 30l) + 1 = 220m + 120l + 241$ parameters are needed to construct F(N(x)). Therefore, if N(x) = x, $120l + 461 = O(l) = O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\text{max}})}\right)$ parameters are required to construct F(x).

Lemma 25. Suppose $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sigma'(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \ge 0$. Then, for $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfying $y - x \ge \frac{10}{s}$ we have

$$\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(y) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor(x) \ge \frac{2}{5}(y - x). \tag{167}$$

Proof. Since $\sigma'(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\sigma(y) - \sigma(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}(y - x). \tag{168}$$

Therefore,

$$\left[\sigma\right](y) - \left[\sigma\right](x) \ge \sigma(y) - \sigma(x) - \frac{1}{s} \ge \frac{1}{2}(y-x) - \frac{1}{s}$$
(169)

$$\geq \frac{1}{2}(y-x) - \frac{1}{10}(y-x) = \frac{2}{5}(y-x).$$
(170)

Lemma 26. Let $a_0, a_1, \ldots a_l = 0$ be a (non-strictly) decreasing sequence of integers satisfying $a_i - a_{i+1} \leq 2$ for all $i \in [l-1]$. Suppose there is at least one pair $(a_{\kappa}, a_{\kappa+1})$ such that $a_{\kappa} - a_{\kappa-1} = 1$. Then for any $\gamma \in [0, 2a_0 + 1]$, γ is expressed as a sum of at most 4 terms of a's.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = [0, a_0]$. We consider the following cases.

Case 1-1: $\gamma \in \mathcal{I}$ In this case, since we can pick a_c such that $|a_c - \gamma| \leq \frac{1}{s}$. Since $a_{\kappa_1} - a_{\kappa_2} = 1$, we can express γ as a sum of three terms of a's.

Case 1-2: max $\mathcal{I} < \gamma \leq 2a_0 + 1$ In this case, we have

$$\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I} \triangleq \{i_1 + i_2 : i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{I}\} = [0, 2a_0].$$
(171)

Therefore, we can pick a_{c_1}, a_{c_2} such that $|a_{c_1} + a_{c_2} - \gamma| = 1$. Hence, we can express γ as a sum of four terms of a's.

Lemma 27. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, s, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d$ be a quantized cube. Suppose that σ and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ satisfy Conditions 1 and 2. Then, for each $b \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, there exist $d_{\gamma} \in \mathbb{N}$, an affine transformation $\rho_{\gamma} : \mathbb{R}^{d'} \to \mathbb{R}$ with quantized weights and bias as in Lemma 5, and a $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ layer σ quantized network $g_{\gamma}(\cdot; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^{d'}$ of $O\left(\frac{dp}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ parameters such that

$$\rho_{\gamma} \circ [\sigma] \circ g_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}) = \gamma \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}.$$
(172)

Proof. By Lemma 24, there exist $\eta \in \mathbb{Q}_{\infty,s}$ such that $\eta \geq q_{\max}$, an affine transformation ρ with binary weights and a σ quantized network $f_{a,b}$ such that

$$\rho \circ \left[\sigma\right] \circ f_{a,b}(x) = \eta \times \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(x) \,. \tag{173}$$

Define $F: \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \eta - \rho \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ f_{0,q_{\max}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(\eta - \rho \circ \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \circ f_{\alpha_{i},\beta_{i}}(\mathbf{x}_{i}) \right) \right).$$
(174)

Then, F can be calculated as

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \eta & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i], \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i]. \end{cases}$$
(175)

For any $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ such that $q \ge 0$, define $F^q : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ as

$$F^{q}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor \left(\left\lceil q + f(\mathbf{x}) \right\rfloor \right) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q),$$
(176)

Then, F^q can be calculated as

$$F^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \lceil \sigma \rfloor (q_{\max}) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor (q) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i}], \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i}]. \end{cases}$$
(177)

Let $a_i = s\left(\lceil \sigma \rfloor (q_{\max}) - \lceil \sigma \rfloor (\frac{i}{s})\right)$. Then by Condition 2, we have $a_0 \ge 2^{p-1} - 1$, $a_{i+1} - a_i \le 2$, and $a_{2^p-1} = 1$ Then the sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=0}^{2^p-1}$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 26. Thus, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$, there exists q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4 such that

$$\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{4} w_i \left(\left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q_{\max}) - \left\lceil \sigma \right\rfloor (q_j) \right), \tag{178}$$

for $w_i \in \{-1, 1\}$. Therefore, for $\phi : \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ defined as

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{4} F^{q_j}(\mathbf{x}), \tag{179}$$

 $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ can be calculated as

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i], \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \prod_{i=1}^{d} [\alpha_i, \beta_i]. \end{cases}$$
(180)

Note that ϕ can be constructed with $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ layers and $O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ parameters.

We count the maximum number of parameters to construct $\phi(\mathbf{x})$. Suppose m parameters are required to construct $\eta \times \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(x)$. By Lemma 24, d(120l + 461) + 1 parameters are required to construct $\sum_{i=1}^{d} (\eta - \rho \circ \lceil \sigma \rfloor \circ f_{\alpha_i,\beta_i}(\mathbf{x}_i))$ where $l = O\left(\frac{p}{\log_2(2q_{\max})}\right)$ is defined in Lemma 24. Again, by Lemma 24,

4(220(d(120l + 461) + 1) + 120l + 241) + 1 = O(ld) parameters are required to construct $F(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore we need O(ld) parameters to construct $\phi(\mathbf{x})$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the expressive power of quantized networks under fixed-point arithmetic. We provide a necessary condition and a sufficient condition on activation functions and $\mathbb{Q}_{p,s}$ for universal approximation of quantized networks. We compare our results with classical universal approximation theorems and show that popular activation functions and fixed-point arithmetic are capable of universal approximation. We further extend our results to quantized networks with binary weights. We believe that our findings offer insights that can enhance the understanding of quantized network theory.

References

- [1] E. Bézout. Théorie générale des équations algébriques. Ph.-D. Pierres, 1779.
- [2] G. Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems, 1989.
- [3] Y. Ding, J. Liu, J. Xiong, and Y. Shi. On the universal approximability and complexity bounds of quantized relu neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Repre*sentations, 2018.
- [4] A. Gonon, N. Brisebarre, R. Gribonval, and E. Riccietti. Approximation speed of quantized vs. unquantized relu neural networks and beyond. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [5] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Networks*, 1989.
- [6] S. Huai, D. Liu, X. Luo, H. Chen, W. Liu, and R. Subramaniam. Crossbar-aligned & integer-only neural network compression for efficient in-memory acceleration. In Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference, 2023.
- [7] B. Jacob, S. Kligys, B. Chen, M. Zhu, M. Tang, A. Howard, H. Adam, and D. Kalenichenko. Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integer-arithmetic-only inference. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018.
- [8] Q. Jin, J. Ren, R. Zhuang, S. Hanumante, Z. Li, Z. Chen, Y. Wang, K. Yang, and S. Tulyakov. F8net: Fixed-point 8-bit only multiplication for network quantization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [9] P. Kidger and T. Lyons. Universal approximation with deep narrow networks. In *Conference* on *Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2020.
- [10] M. Leshno, V. Y. Lin, A. Pinkus, and S. Schocken. Multilayer feedforward networks with a nonpolynomial activation function can approximate any function. *Neural Networks*, 1993.
- [11] Z. Li and Q. Gu. I-vit: integer-only quantization for efficient vision transformer inference. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023.
- [12] S. Ma, H. Wang, L. Ma, L. Wang, W. Wang, S. Huang, L. Dong, R. Wang, J. Xue, and F. Wei. The era of 1-bit llms: All large language models are in 1.58 bits. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17764, 2024.

- [13] Y. Park, G. Hwang, W. Lee, and S. Park. Expressive Power of ReLU and Step Networks under Floating-Point Operations. *Neural Networks*, 2024.
- [14] A. Pinkus. Approximation theory of the mlp model in neural networks. Acta Numerica, 1999.
- [15] E. Sari, V. Courville, and V. P. Nia. Irnn: Integer-only recurrent neural network. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09828, 2021.
- [16] H. Wang, S. Ma, L. Dong, S. Huang, H. Wang, L. Ma, F. Yang, R. Wang, Y. Wu, and F. Wei. Bitnet: Scaling 1-bit transformers for large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11453, 2023.
- [17] M. Wang, S. Rasoulinezhad, P. H. Leong, and H. K.-H. So. Niti: Training integer neural networks using integer-only arithmetic. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 2022.
- [18] Z. Yao, Z. Dong, Z. Zheng, A. Gholami, J. Yu, E. Tan, L. Wang, Q. Huang, Y. Wang, M. Mahoney, et al. Hawq-v3: Dyadic neural network quantization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- [19] D. Yarotsky. Optimal approximation of continuous functions by very deep ReLU networks. In Conference on Learning Theory (COLT), 2018.
- [20] H. Zhao, D. Liu, and H. Li. Efficient integer-arithmetic-only convolutional networks with bounded relu. In *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*, 2021.