

DEEP LEARNING AS THE DISCIPLINED CONSTRUCTION OF TAME OBJECTS

GILLES BAREILLES^{1*}, ALLEN GEHRET^{1,2*}, JOHANNES ASPMAN¹, JANA LEPŠOVÁ¹, AND JAKUB MAREČEK¹

ABSTRACT. One can see deep-learning models as compositions of functions within the so-called tame geometry. In this expository note, we give an overview of some topics at the interface of *tame geometry* (also known as *o-minimality*), *optimization theory*, and *deep learning theory and practice*. To do so, we gradually introduce the concepts and tools used to build *convergence guarantees* for stochastic gradient descent in a general nonsmooth nonconvex, but tame, setting. This illustrates some ways in which tame geometry is a natural mathematical framework for the study of AI systems, especially within Deep Learning.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context: Frameworks for studying AI systems and Deep Learning. The rapid evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems has allowed these systems to be applied across many fields, including high-risk applications such as credit-scoring [12], recidivism forecasting [2], and self-driving vehicles [6]. While these advances promise social benefits, they also raise pressing concerns regarding the reliability, interpretability, fairness, and safety of systems that are both novel and deployed at scale. Consequently, there is a growing consensus among scholars, policymakers, and industry stakeholders for the establishment of robust regulatory frameworks and standardized evaluation protocols to ensure a responsible and trustworthy AI deployment [35, 89]. To that end, a number of road-maps have been suggested in order to align AI systems with human preferences; see e.g., [99, 58] among others.

This prompts the question: what is a good theoretical framework to provide guarantees on current AI systems, or more precisely, on Deep Learning objects? Let us be specific: by “good framework”, we mean a framework that is both *realistic*, in that it encompasses relevant applications, such as current AI systems, and *prolific*, in that it allows to develop nontrivial theoretical guarantees that are relevant in practice.

One such widespread framework is convex analysis and close variants [84, 57, 94]. Within convex analysis, numerous optimization schemes have been designed and analyzed, in terms of where they converge to, and at what speed; see e.g., [23, 5]. Yet, these theories reach their limits with deep learning theory, where objects typically do not satisfy convexity, or close variants at every point.

¹CZECH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER, CHARLES SQUARE 13, PRAGUE 2, CZECH REPUBLIC

²UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, KURT GÖDEL RESEARCH CENTER, KOLINGASSE 14–16, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

*EQUAL CONTRIBUTION

E-mail addresses: gilles.bareilles@fel.cvut.cz, gehreall@fel.cvut.cz.

In this paper, we discuss how an interesting candidate stems from the interface of *tame geometry*, or more precisely, *o-minimality*,¹ with *optimization theory*, and *deep learning*, both in terms of how realistic and prolific they are. Let us detail these two aspects.

1.2. A realistic framework. Definability in o-minimal structures covers nearly all functions and problems occurring in Deep Learning theory and practice. It does so by providing *composability guarantees*: the objects built from definable *elementary constituents* according to certain *composition rules* will remain definable.

The list of *composition rules* that preserve definability is wide. To quote Ioffe [59],

...the class [of definable sets and functions] is closed with respect to practically all operations used in variational analysis...

In less technical terms, definability is preserved by almost all common operations in optimization, such as composition of functions, (partial) minimization, construction of dual objects, (sub)differentiation, *etc.* This feature follows directly from the first-order logic background of such structures, as discussed in [Sections 2 and 3](#). One notable exception is that solutions to differential equations may not remain definable in some o-minimal structure.

The list of *elementary constituents* which are definable in o-minimal structures is also wide. In particular, it involves nearly all activation functions and losses that are commonly used in Deep Learning. [Table 1](#) provides an overview of common activation functions and losses, and whether they are definable in three specific o-minimal structures, \mathbb{R}_{alg} , \mathbb{R}_{exp} , and $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$, defined in [Section 3.2](#). [Remark 3.19](#) provides a more in-depth discussion on the definability of activation functions in Deep Learning.

For these two reasons, nearly every object that appears in Deep Learning theory is definable in some o-minimal structure. This observation has been made a number of times, see e.g., [105, 32] to cite just a few. Note that many of the popular theoretical frameworks used to analyze Deep Learning objects fail to account for feedforward ReLU networks, arguably the simplest networks. Indeed, the vast majority of approaches developed to study optimization schemes require the functions to be either differentiable with a (globally) Lipschitz gradient, or to feature some form of convexity such as strong convexity, convexity, weak convexity, prox-regularity, or at the very least Clarke regularity, in order of decreasing strength; see e.g., [94, 27]. Yet, all these assumptions fail for the function $x \mapsto -\text{ReLU}(x) = \min(0, -x)$ at zero. This function can be seen as a ReLU Network with depth one; it reveals the nature of the difficulty of nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. These nonsmooth nonconvex features are also present in higher-dimensional and more complex networks; yet they are (nearly) always definable in some o-minimal structure.

Note that many theoretical frameworks come with *composability guarantees*. One popular such framework is convexity theory; for instance, adding two convex functions, or taking the indicator function of a convex set always maintains convexity, while subtracting two convex functions does not. Here again, building functions and sets from convex objects and according to a list of prescribed composition rules, in a “disciplined way”, is useful. It provides objects that are convex, and which are in a form suitable for optimization; see the disciplined convex programming line of work [51].

¹Here, we will not distinguish between *tame geometry* and *o-minimality*, we will often abbreviate *definable* in an o-minimal structure to just *definable*, and moreover use *tame* as a synonym for *definable* (in an o-minimal structure); we clarify these conventions in [Section 3](#). The interested reader should be aware that this usage is part of a wider usage of *tame* in the sense of Shelah’s *dividing lines* in model theory [102, 28].

Table 1: Commonly used loss and activation functions and their definability in the o-minimal structures \mathbb{R}_{alg} , \mathbb{R}_{exp} and \mathbb{R}_{Pfaf} , defined in Section 3.2. Here $\beta > 0$, $\text{erf}(t) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t e^{-s^2} ds$ is the Gaussian error function. The symbol (✓) indicates that the property is inherited from the inclusion $\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\text{exp}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaf}}$. See Remark 2.10, Lemma 3.12 and Corollary 3.18 for details.

Name	Mathematical formulation	\mathbb{R}_{alg}	\mathbb{R}_{exp}	\mathbb{R}_{Pfaf}	
Activation function	ReLU	$\rho(t) = \max(0, t)$	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Softsign	$\rho(t) = \frac{t}{ t +1}$	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Logistic	$\rho(t) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-t}}$	-	✓	(✓)
	Hyperbolic tangent	$\rho(t) = \tanh(t)$	-	✓	(✓)
	Softplus	$\rho(t) = \log(1 + e^t)$	-	✓	(✓)
	Swish	$\rho(t) = \frac{t}{1+e^{-\beta t}}$	-	✓	(✓)
	Mish	$\rho(t) = t \tanh(\log(1 + e^t))$	-	✓	(✓)
	Exponential linear unit (ELU)	$\rho(t) = \begin{cases} e^t - 1, & \text{if } t \leq 0 \\ t, & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases}$	-	✓	(✓)
	Gaussian error linear unit (GELU)	$\rho(t) = \frac{t}{2}(1 + \text{erf}(\frac{t}{\sqrt{2}}))$	-	-	✓
	Arctan	$\rho(t) = \arctan(t)$	-	-	✓
Loss function	Squared error	$\ell(y, z) = (y - z)^2$	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Absolute deviation	$\ell(y, z) = y - z $	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Hinge	$\ell(y, z) = \max\{0, 1 - yz\}$	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Huber	$\ell(y, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(y - z)^2, & \text{if } y - z \leq \beta \\ \beta(y - z - \frac{\beta}{2}), & \text{if } y - z > \beta \end{cases}$	✓	(✓)	(✓)
	Logistic	$\ell(y, z) = \log(1 + e^{-yz})$	-	✓	(✓)
	Binary cross entropy	$\ell(y, z) = -(y \log z + (1 - y) \log(1 - z))$	-	✓	(✓)

To fix ideas, let us consider the example of training a simple Deep Neural Network. Setting the stage, assume that a dataset of N observations $D = \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is available, and consider the task of finding a function f_θ such that $f_\theta(x_i) \approx y_i$. The function f_θ is a *Deep Neural Network* of depth L defined recursively, for some input x , as

$$a_0 = x, \quad a_i = \rho_i(V_i(\theta)a_{i-1}) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, L, \quad f_\theta(x) = a_L, \quad (1.1)$$

where $V_i(\cdot)$ are linear maps into the space of matrices, and ρ_i are activation functions applied coordinate-wise. The learning task is typically formulated as solving

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell(f_\theta(x_i), y_i), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a loss function. Table 1 lists common activation and loss functions. Equations (1.1) and (1.2) illustrate that DNNs and the corresponding learning problem are obtained by minimization and composition of elementary constituents, including activations, losses, sum, and product.

1.3. A prolific framework. We argued above that many of the popular theoretical frameworks are not broad enough to account for practical functions such as ReLU-based networks. We argue here that they are also too broad, in that they often include ill-behaved functions and sets, which don't actually appear in practice. Crucially, this limits their ability to allow for general, wide-ranging, results. We thus want to restrict our mathematical universe to rule out pathological objects.

Let us first give some examples of pathological objects. In topology, one can think about sets whose frontier have the same (or higher!) dimension, functions that exhibit infinitely many changes in monotonicity in a bounded set. See [Non-Examples 3.4](#) and [3.35–3.37](#). In optimization theory, there are (two-dimensional) smooth convex coercive functions with curious behavior: failure of convergence of steepest descent with exact search, of central paths, or of Newton’s flow, but also infinite length of Tikhonov path, or failure of the smooth Kurdyka–Łojasiewicz inequality [20]. Also, optimization over trigonometric functions is not decidable, even in the box-constrained case [73, 3.5.5].

In contrast with this, definability in o-minimal structures restrains the world of functions and sets to well-behaved, pathology-free objects. As such, definable functions and sets enjoy remarkable properties. The concepts that characterize a set being small in \mathbb{R} , including finiteness, countability, nowhere dense, meager, or zero Lebesgue measure become equivalent ([Small Sets Theorem 3.5](#)). There exists a definable choice lemma, which provides a constructive version of the Axiom of Choice ([Definable Choice 3.6](#)). A definable curve admits one-sided limits everywhere; this limit is also definable ([Lemma 3.21](#)). There is a unique notion of dimension of a set ([Dimension Theorem 3.32](#)), and the frontiers of definable sets have lower dimensions than the sets ([Small Frontier Theorem 3.34](#)). These results build up to various stratification theorems: any definable set partitions into “smooth” definable subsets (manifolds), which fit “nicely” together; a parallel result holds for function ([Theorem 3.39](#)).

Stratification results proved particularly prolific in optimization theory. They allowed to characterize how generalized derivatives behave on generic nonsmooth nonconvex functions [17], among other results. Eventually, this approach allowed to prove the convergence of the Stochastic Subgradient Method (SSM), also known as Stochastic Gradient Descent, on nearly any function encountered in the training of DNNs [32]. We discuss this result and its proof ideas in [Section 4](#). Focusing on tame functions and sets allowed to obtain the first theory of Automatic Differentiation (AD) on nonsmooth functions, along with a convergence proof of AD-based SSM [18, 19]; see [Section 4.4.4](#) for details.

1.4. Content and outline. In this document, we seek to provide a unified exposition of concepts at the interface of *o-minimality*, *optimization theory*, and *deep learning* theory and practice. As a motivating case-study, we expose the material that builds towards the convergence proof of the Stochastic Subgradient Method. The ideas presented in this document are not new. Rather, we have strived to provide proofs and arguments that are up-to-date, concise, and help develop intuition, based on material from three distinct fields, scattered across many articles. As such, we hope that this document, along with the many articles it references, will help people to learn and use this theoretical framework.

[Section 2](#) introduces the basic concepts and interest of definability on the familiar objects built only from (piecewise) polynomials, that is semialgebraic geometry. [Section 3](#) discusses the nice mathematical properties of objects definable in an o-minimal structure. [Section 4](#) details the key role of o-minimality in the convergence proof of SSM.

1.5. Conventions and notation. Throughout the text, m and n range over $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. $\mathbb{R}^>$ denotes the positive real numbers and \emptyset the empty set. If $S \subseteq A \times B$ and $a \in A$, we denote $S_a := \{b \in B : (a, b) \in S\}$, we call it a **fiber** and we view S as describing the family $(S_a)_{a \in A}$ of subsets of B . Usually this situation occurs where a set R is given, and $A = R^m$, $B = R^n$, and $A \times B$ is identified with R^{m+n} . We denote the distance between two subspaces T, T' of \mathbb{R}^n by $\Delta(T, T') := \sup_{v \in T, \|v\|=1} \text{dist}(v, T')$.

We adopt notions concerning manifolds from [24]. A subset M of \mathbb{R}^n is a **d -dimensional C^p -manifold** around $\bar{x} \in M$ if there exists a C^p function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$ with a surjective derivative at $\bar{x} \in M$ that satisfies for all x close enough to \bar{x} that $x \in M$ if and only if $h(x) = 0$. We let $\dim(M)$ denote the dimension of M , d here.

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote an interval. A **curve** c is a continuous map $c : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and its velocity is the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}c(t)$, also denoted $\dot{c}(t)$, wherever defined. A curve $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called **absolutely continuous** if there exists a function $y : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies $x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t y(\tau)dt$, for any $t \geq 0$. In that case, there holds $\dot{x}(t) = y(t)$ for a.e. $t \geq 0$.

2. SEMIALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY

To provide a specific, easy to visualize example, let us start with semialgebraic geometry. We also observe that some, but not all, objects in deep learning are already definable in the semialgebraic setting. Let us first provide an example of a semialgebraic set.




Figure 1: Illustration of the set S in Eq. (2.1).

Example 2.1. **Figure 1** shows a two-dimensional semialgebraic set, defined by the following equations:

$$S = S_1 \cup S_2, \quad \text{where } S_1 = \left\{ (x, y) : \begin{array}{l} |x - 3.25| \leq 0.25 \\ |y - 1.5| \leq 1 \end{array} \right\},$$

$$S_2 = \left\{ (x, y) : \begin{array}{l} 1.2^2 \leq (x+1)^2 + y^2 \leq 2^2 \\ y \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, y) : \begin{array}{l} 1.2^2 \leq (x-1)^2 + y^2 \leq 2^2 \\ y \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

2.1. Semialgebraic sets. In *semialgebraic geometry*, one studies sets defined by polynomial equalities and inequalities over real numbers, in contrast to working over complex numbers as in *classical algebraic geometry*. We begin with the notion of *semialgebraic set*.

Definition 2.2. [15, Definition 2.1.4] A **semialgebraic** subset of \mathbb{R}^n is a set of the form

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^s \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_i} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_{i,j}(x) \diamond_{i,j} 0\}$$

where $f_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ and $\diamond_{i,j} \in \{<, =\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $j = 1, \dots, r_i$.

One can show that the complement of a semialgebraic set is also semialgebraic, and thus the semialgebraic sets are precisely the boolean combinations of polynomial equalities and inequalities. **Definition 2.2** defines for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a boolean algebra \mathcal{S}_n of semialgebraic subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . In the case $n = 1$, we have the following complete description of the boolean algebra \mathcal{S}_1 : any semialgebraic set in one variable is equivalent to a semialgebraic set defined using simple equalities and inequalities “ $X = a$ ” and “ $X > a$ ”, without the need for polynomials. This is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3 (o-minimality property). [15, Proposition 2.1.7] *Every semialgebraic subset of \mathbb{R} is a finite union of intervals and points.*

In practice, the semialgebraic sets we encounter are typically subsets of \mathbb{R}^n for some $n \gg 1$. The following key theorem enables us to study \mathcal{S}_n in terms of \mathcal{S}_m for some $m < n$.

Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem 2.4. [104, 101] *For $m < n$, if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is semialgebraic, then $\pi(A) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is semialgebraic, where $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is any coordinate projection.*

For example, the following lemma can be seen as an analogue of [Lemma 2.3](#) for $n > 1$.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is semialgebraic. Then X has finitely many connected components; moreover, there exists a finite partition $\{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$ of X such that each M_i is a semialgebraic connected embedded C^1 -manifold in \mathbb{R}^n .*

Remark about proof. There are several ways to prove this; for example, this is a consequence of Verdier stratification of sets definable in o-minimal structures; see [Theorem 3.39](#). ■

Example 2.6 ([Example 2.1](#) continued.). Consider again the set S defined in [Eq. \(2.1\)](#). The fact that S has finitely many connected components is clear from the picture. A partition of S into smooth manifolds is as follows; we consider each connected component separately. The rectangle S_1 splits as the union of one manifold of dimension 2, its interior, four manifolds of dimension 1, its sides without corners, and four manifolds of dimension 0, the four points at its corners. The set S_2 splits in one manifold of dimension 2, its interior, twelve manifolds of dimension 1, and twelve manifolds of dimension 0. Note that this partition is indeed finite. In addition, it is one with the minimal number of elements such that each element is a C^1 , connected manifold of \mathbb{R}^2 .

By [Lemma 2.3](#) the 1-variable semialgebraic sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^1$ satisfy a strong dichotomy:

$$X \text{ is finite} \quad \text{or} \quad X \text{ contains an interval}$$

This can be generalized to higher variables via some notion of *dimension*, for example:

Definition 2.7. Given a semialgebraic set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, define² the:

- (1) **Krull dimension** $\dim_K(A)$ of A to be the Krull dimension of the ring $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_n]/I(A)$ (c.f., [15, 2.8.1])
- (2) **manifold dimension** $\dim_m(A)$ to be the largest dimension of any semialgebraic manifold contained in a partition of A in the sense of [Lemma 2.5](#) above; this number does not depend on the choice of partition.

As it turns out, these dimensions are always equal (c.f., [15, 2.8]):

$$\dim_K(A) = \dim_m(A) \quad \text{for every semialgebraic } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

From the point of view of the upcoming [Dimension Theorem 3.32](#), this agreement of dimension was inevitable the moment we observed the o-minimality of the semialgebraic setting ([Lemma 2.3](#)).

2.2. Semialgebraic functions. Having introduced semialgebraic sets, we now turn to semialgebraic functions. Given a function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we say that f is **semialgebraic** if its graph $\Gamma(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ is a semialgebraic set. The following two lemmas enable us to easily recognize semialgebraic functions.

Lemma 2.8 (Composability). *The composition of semialgebraic functions is semialgebraic.*

²Recall: $I(A) = \{f \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_n] : f(a) = 0 \text{ for all } a \in A\}$ is the usual vanishing ideal of A . The *Krull dimension* of a commutative ring is the maximal length of chains of prime ideals. The *dimension* of a connected C^1 -manifold is the common \mathbb{R} -linear dimension of its tangent spaces.

Proof. For simplicity, consider semialgebraic functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By definition, there exist semialgebraic subsets $\varphi(x, y)$ and $\psi(x, y)$ of \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\Gamma(f) = \varphi(x, y)$ and $\Gamma(g) = \psi(x, y)$. By shifting variables in the definition of g , we may consider $\Gamma(g)$ as defined by a semialgebraic set $\psi(y, z)$. Now, if we consider both $\Gamma(f)$ and $\Gamma(g)$ as subsets of \mathbb{R}^3 involving all three variables x, y, z , we see by the [Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem 2.4](#) that:

$$\Gamma(g \circ f) = \pi_{x,z}(\varphi(x, y) \cap \psi(y, z))$$

is also semialgebraic. Indeed, viewing this expression in “logical form” it describes the set:

$$\theta(x, z) := \exists y (f(x) = y \text{ and } g(y) = z),$$

which is just the definition of function composition. ■

Lemma 2.9 (Definition by case distinction). *Suppose the functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are semialgebraic. Then the following function is also semialgebraic:*

$$h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto h(x) := \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x \in X; \\ g(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof is left as an exercise for the reader. ■

Remark 2.10. We note that the ReLU, Softsign, Squared, Absolute deviation, Hinge and Huber functions presented in [Table 1](#) are semialgebraic. Indeed, they are defined by expressions which include polynomials, their addition, multiplication and inverse operations, and definition by case distinction. Polynomials are semialgebraic functions by [Definition 2.2](#). Then it suffices to use [Lemmas 2.8](#) and [2.9](#).

For semialgebraic functions, all one-sided limits exist in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ as is sketched in a more general setting in [Section 3.3](#); see [Lemma 3.21](#). Moreover, there is a complete description of all asymptotics which can occur, as is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.11 (Semialgebraic asymptotics). [79] *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a semialgebraic function not eventually equal to 0. Then there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $f(t) \sim ct^q$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t)/ct^q = 1$.*

It follows that many important functions in mathematics are not semialgebraic.

Lemma 2.12. *The real exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not semialgebraic.*

Proof. This follows from the observation that [Lemma 2.11](#) characterizes the available asymptotic behaviour of semialgebraic functions, and the asymptotics of \exp is not among them. ■

The need to extend the semialgebraic framework so that the exponential function is included led to what is known as Tarski’s problem.

Tarski’s Problem (approximately). *Develop versions of results from semialgebraic geometry in a setting that also includes the real exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

2.3. Moment-SOS. It is well-known that finding global minimizers of nonconvex functions is in general extremely difficult (NP-hard). Surprisingly, for certain optimization problem exclusively made of polynomials, finding global minimizers becomes less difficult. Here, we take a quick detour from the main exposition on o-minimal structures, and provide a glimpse of the *Moment / Sum Of Squares method*, as one of the major success stories in the realm of *semialgebraic optimization*. For details and references, we point the reader to [78, 68].

Consider the nonconvex optimization problem

$$f^* = \min_{x \in X} f(x), \quad \text{where } X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, g_m(x) \geq 0\}, \quad (2.2)$$

and f, g_1, \dots, g_l are real polynomials over \mathbb{R}^n .

Problem (2.2) can be cast as a linear problem over the infinite-dimensional space of probability measures:

$$f_\infty = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)_+} \left\{ \int_X f(x) d\mu(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_X d\mu = 1 \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathcal{M}(X)_+$ denotes the cone of finite Borel measures supported on X . To see that $f_\infty = f^*$, note first that a Dirac mass placed at a global minimizer of (2.2) is feasible for (2.3), which implies $f_\infty \leq f^*$. Second, note that there holds $\int_X f(x) d\mu(x) \geq \int_X f^* d\mu(x) = f^*$ for any finite Borel measure of unit mass, which implies $f_\infty \geq f^*$.

Going from formulation (2.2) to (2.3) thus replaces the (difficult) nonconvexity of f and X by the (easier) linearity of the objective of (2.3) and convexity of its feasible set. This is done at the cost of introducing a new difficulty: (2.3) is an infinite-dimensional problem, difficult to manipulate numerically.

To address this difficulty, one may consider an increasing sequence of subspaces $\mathcal{M}(X)_d$ that converges to $\mathcal{M}(X)$. The most basic choice consists in taking $\mathcal{M}(X)_d$ as the set of measures which have moments of order higher than $2d$ equal to zero. We thus obtain a sequence of optimization problems:

$$f_d = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) d\mu(x). \quad (2.4)$$

In theory, the following theoretical guarantee, first obtained by Lasserre [67] holds: if X is a bounded set,³ f_d is a nondecreasing sequence that converges to f^* . In addition, the convergence is *generically finite*, that is, for almost every problem of the form (2.2), there exists a d^* such that $f_{d^*} = f^*$. Finally, the problems (2.4) are convex conic (semidefinite) programs; they can thus be solved by off-the-shelf polynomial-time algorithms, such as Interior Point Methods.

However, here as well there is no free lunch: the problem (2.4) has $\binom{n+d}{n} = \mathcal{O}(d^n)$ variables which, in practice, only allows to solve (2.4) for $d = 1$, and sometimes $d = 2$, for industrial problem. Exploiting sparsity in the polynomials and constraints of problem (2.2) helps in solving larger instances [78]. Finite convergence may occur for surprisingly low values of d , such as $d = 1$ or 2 for Optimal Power Flow problems [107]. Another relevant topic is recovering minimizers x^* of problem (2.2) from (approximate) solutions to problems (2.4).

3. O-MINIMALITY AND TAME GEOMETRY

The arrival of *o-minimality* and *tame geometry* in 1984 can be attributed to three sources:

- First, van den Dries [36] introduced *structures of finite type* as a framework for attacking a version of Tarski's problem. The main idea, as we will see below, is to consider an axiomatic setting which assumes an analogue of the [Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem 2.4](#) and in which the o-minimality property ([Lemma 2.3](#)) holds.
- Second, Pillay and Steinhorn [91] recognized the analogy with *strongly minimal structures*, coined the term *o-minimal*, and developed much of the basic model-theoretic properties in a series of three papers [92], [62] (with Knight), and [93].
- Later, it was realized that o-minimality is a good framework for Grothendieck's desired *tame topology* from *Esquisse d'un Programme* [53]; see [95] for commentary.

³The result holds more generally under the Archimedean condition on X : there exists $N > 0$ such that the polynomial $N - \|x\|_2^2$ can be written as $\sigma_0 + \sum_i \sigma_i g_i$ where σ_i are sum-of-square polynomials.

In this section, we will give a brief introduction to o-minimality, describe some main examples of o-minimal structures, and present some of the key properties which make an o-minimal framework conducive to *convergence guarantees*.

The standard reference for o-minimality is [38]; other references include the introductions [29, 82], the surveys [39], [96], and the paper [43] which serves as an introduction for geometers.

3.1. o-minimal structures. The definition of *o-minimal structure* can be viewed as a generalization of the definition of *semialgebraic set*.

Definition 3.1. A **structure** on \mathbb{R} is a sequence $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that for each $n \geq 0$:

- (S1) \mathcal{R}_n is a boolean algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R}^n ;
- (S2) if $A \in \mathcal{R}_n$, then $\mathbb{R} \times A$ and $A \times \mathbb{R}$ belong to \mathcal{R}_{n+1} ;
- (S3) $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 = x_n\} \in \mathcal{R}_n$;
- (S4) if $A \in \mathcal{R}_{n+1}$, then $\pi(A) \in \mathcal{R}_n$, where $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the projection map on the first n coordinates.

A structure \mathcal{R} on \mathbb{R} is **o-minimal** if it satisfies:

- (O1) $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x < y\} \in \mathcal{R}_2$;
- (O2) the sets in \mathcal{R}_1 are exactly the finite unions of intervals and points.

Finally, to simplify our discussion, we shall assume all structures satisfy:

- (S5) $\{a\} \in \mathcal{R}_1$ for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (S6) \mathcal{R}_3 contains the graphs of addition and multiplication $+, \cdot : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Here are some comments and conventions concerning the definition:

- We say a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is **definable** (in the structure \mathcal{R}) if $X \in \mathcal{R}_n$.
- We say a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is **definable** if its graph is a definable set.
- We can view Axiom (S4) as imposing an analogue of Tarski-Seidenberg to hold for the definable sets.
- Axioms (S1)-(S4) secretly say that the definable sets of a structure are precisely those sets which are definable via some *first-order \mathcal{L} -formula* $\varphi(x)$ where \mathcal{L} is some *first-order language*; for more on this connection to *first-order logic*, see [3, Appendix B].
- Axiom (S5) says that all *parameters* are automatically definable.
- Axiom (S6) together with (S5) imposes the condition that the semialgebraic sets are definable in every o-minimal structure; one can also consider smaller o-minimal structures – such as “ $(\mathbb{R}; <)$ ” and “ $(\mathbb{R}; <, +)$ ” – although these are less immediately relevant for the purposes of training DNNs.
- Axiom (O1) ensures that the ordering is definable; this implies that every interval is guaranteed to be definable, thanks to (S5). In fact, in the presence of (S6) the axiom (O1) is redundant in the sense that we can definably recover the ordering from the field structure via: $x < y \Leftrightarrow \exists z(z \neq 0 \ \& \ z^2 = y - x)$ (we won’t use this fact).
- Axiom (O2) imposes an analogue of [Lemma 2.3](#) to hold for the definable sets. Note that this is the only axiom which imposes a restriction on the definable sets.
- By default, in this document the adjective *tame* when applied to some set or function in \mathbb{R}^n means *definable in some o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R}* .

The quintessential example of an o-minimal structure is the semialgebraic setting of [Section 2](#).

Example 3.2 (\mathbb{R}_{alg} : the semialgebraic sets). For each $n \geq 0$, let \mathcal{S}_n denote the collection of all semialgebraic subsets of \mathbb{R}^n ; see [Definition 2.2](#). We claim that $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} and we denote it by \mathbb{R}_{alg} . By assumptions (S5) and (S6), \mathbb{R}_{alg} is the smallest o-minimal structure we will consider.




Figure 2: Topologist’s sine curve $t \mapsto \sin t^{-1}$ over $(0, 1]$. This function exhibits infinite oscillations, it is not definable in any o-minimal structure; see also [Non-Example 3.4](#).

We note that [Lemma 2.8](#) for semialgebraic functions extends to the more general setting of functions definable in any structure.

Lemma 3.3 (Composability). *In any structure, the composition of definable functions is definable.*

Proof. The same as the proof of [Lemma 2.8](#), except replacing the role of the [Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem 2.4](#) with axiom (S4). Note that this does not require (O1), (O2), (S5) or (S6). ■

The o-minimality axiom (O2) prohibits “infinite oscillation” such as in [Fig. 2](#). Hence, sets and functions exhibiting this behavior cannot be definable in any o-minimal structure. ■

Non-example 3.4. It is clear that no o-minimal structure can define the set \mathbb{Z} or the function $\sin : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, one can show that the structures $(\mathbb{R}; <, +, \cdot, \mathbb{Z})$ and $(\mathbb{R}; <, +, \cdot, \sin)$ actually define the entire *projective hierarchy* of subsets of \mathbb{R} in the sense of descriptive set theory [61, Exercise 37.6]; see also [38, 1.2.6].

When working with subsets of \mathbb{R} , there are various notions of “smallness” one can consider. In the setting of sets definable in o-minimal structures, many of these notions coincide.

Small Sets Theorem 3.5. *Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is definable in an o-minimal structure. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is finite;
- (2) X is discrete;
- (3) X is countable;
- (4) X is nowhere dense in \mathbb{R} ;
- (5) X has cardinality less than the continuum;
- (6) X is meager in \mathbb{R} ;
- (7) X has Lebesgue measure zero;
- (8) X has empty interior in \mathbb{R} .

Proof. The proof is left as an exercise for the reader. Definitions of the relevant topological notions can be found in [47]. ■

In many arguments in classical mathematics, one often has to appeal to the *Axiom of Choice* (AC) for the existence of certain objects, e.g., a selection of a set-valued map. In the o-minimal setting, we have the following statement, where we use the fiber notation from [Section 1.5](#).

Definable Choice 3.6. [38, Chap. 6(1.2)] *If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ is definable in an o-minimal structure, then there exists a definable map $\rho : \pi_m X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that:*

- (1) $\rho(a) \in X_a$ for every $a \in \pi_m X$, and thus $\Gamma(\rho) \subseteq X$, and
- (2) for every $a, a' \in \mathbb{R}^m$, if $X_a = X_{a'}$, then $\rho(a) = \rho(a')$.

3.2. Main examples. In this subsection we present a few of the known o-minimal structures which are most relevant to training DNNs. We provide a diagram of their relations in Fig. 3.

3.2.1. \mathbb{R}_{alg} (Semialgebraic sets). Recall that the semialgebraic sets are the smallest o-minimal structure that we consider; see Example 3.2.

3.2.2. \mathbb{R}_{an} (Globally subanalytic geometry). Here we define the structure \mathbb{R}_{an} of *restricted real analytic functions*.

Definition 3.7. Let $I = [-1, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$. We say $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **restricted real analytic** if:

- (1) the restriction $f|_{I^n} : I^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real analytic, i.e., there exists an open neighbourhood $U \supseteq [-1, 1]^n$ and an extension $\tilde{f} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $f|_{I^n}$ such that \tilde{f} is real analytic on U , and
- (2) f is identically zero outside I^n .

Let \mathbb{R}_{an} denote the structure on \mathbb{R} generated by all restricted real analytic functions.

Example 3.8. The restricted functions $\exp : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\sin : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as well as the total function $\arctan : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} ; none of these are definable in \mathbb{R}_{alg} .

Theorem 3.9 (Gabrielov). *The structure \mathbb{R}_{an} is o-minimal.*

Remark about proof. This is attributed to Gabrielov who proved in 1968 a *theorem of the complement* for subanalytic sets [49]. In 1986, van den Dries noticed that o-minimality of \mathbb{R}_{an} is “almost obvious, once observed” given Gabrielov’s result [37]. A different treatment was given by Denef and van den Dries in [33]. ■

Lemma 3.10. *The exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} .*

Remark about proof. This is true for essentially the same reason as Lemma 2.12, namely, the structure \mathbb{R}_{an} is *polynomially bounded* in the sense of Definition 3.28 below. ■

3.2.3. \mathbb{R}_{exp} (subexponential geometry). We now turn to the structure from Tarski’s Problem:

$$\mathbb{R}_{\text{exp}} := \text{the smallest structure which contains } \exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 3.11 (Wilkie). [108] *The structure \mathbb{R}_{exp} is o-minimal.*

Theorem 3.11 may be regarded as an answer to a *geometric version* of Tarski’s Problem, however an answer to the original Tarski’s Problem (decidability of \mathbb{R}_{exp}) is an open question related to the *real Schanuel’s Conjecture* [77]. The first application of Theorem 3.11 to neural networks is in [76].

Lemma 3.12. *Each of the activation and loss functions in Table 1, with the exception of $\text{GELU}(x)$ and $\arctan(x)$, is definable in the structure \mathbb{R}_{exp} .*

Remark about proof. The definability of all the functions (except $\text{GELU}(x)$ and $\arctan(x)$) in \mathbb{R}_{exp} is a trivial observation that does not depend on Theorem 3.11; the argument proceeds exactly as in Remark 2.10 for the semialgebraic functions, using that we now have e^x as an additional primitive at our disposal. The non-definability of $\text{GELU}(x)$ in \mathbb{R}_{exp} is nontrivial and follows from the stronger fact that $\text{GELU}(x)$ is not even definable in the larger o-minimal structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ defined below; cf. Lemma 3.14. The non-definability of $\arctan(x)$ follows from [14], as observed in [82]. ■




Figure 3: Inclusion relations between the various o-minimal structures we consider.

Notable separations:

- \arctan is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{arctan}} := (\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}, \arctan) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ but not in \mathbb{R}_{exp} [14]; see also [82]
- $\exp|_{[0,1]}$ is definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} but not in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{arctan}}$ [14]
- $\sin|_{[0,2\pi]}$ is definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} but not in \mathbb{R}_{exp} [14]
- $x^{\sqrt{2}} : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathbb{R}}$ but not in $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ [80, 44]
- $\phi(x) := \log \Gamma(x) - (x - \frac{1}{2}) \log x + x - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) : (1, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ but not in \mathbb{R}_{an} , and $\Gamma : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{G},\text{exp}}$ but not in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$ [44, 41]
- $\text{erf}(x)$ is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ but not in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$ [41]

3.2.4. $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$ (*analytic-exponential geometry*). We now consider the amalgamation:

$\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}} :=$ the smallest structure which expands both \mathbb{R}_{an} and \mathbb{R}_{exp} .

Theorem 3.13 (van den Dries, Miller). *The structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$ is o-minimal.*

Remark about proof. This was first shown in [42] by adapting Wilkie’s proof for \mathbb{R}_{exp} . A shorter proof is given in [40] which uses *valuation theory* and *Hardy fields*; see the remark after Lemma 3.27. ■

Lemma 3.14. [41, Theorem 5.11] *The error function $\text{erf} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$.*

Remark about proof. This is similar in spirit to the proof of Lemma 3.10; namely, a characterization is given (using Hardy fields and transseries) of all possible asymptotics which can occur for functions definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},\text{exp}}$, and it is shown that the asymptotics of erf is incompatible with these. ■

Remark 3.15. One might wonder if in general the amalgamation of any two o-minimal structures is always o-minimal. The answer is “no”: Le Gal [69] constructed an o-minimal structure \mathbb{R}_h such that $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an},h}$ is not o-minimal. In particular, there is no “largest” o-minimal structure. However, by Zorn’s Lemma, every o-minimal structure is contained inside of a (not necessarily unique) maximal o-minimal structure.

One consequence of this regarding our convention of the adjective *tame* is that the following statement is technically incorrect:

The composition of tame functions is tame.

Instead, it should be understood that one actually means the following:

The composition of tame functions definable in the same o-minimal structure is tame.

This subtlety will not affect us as the tame functions we consider in this document (the activation and loss functions) are in fact definable in a common o-minimal structure; see [Remark 3.19](#).

3.2.5. $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ (the Pfaffian closure of \mathbb{R}_{alg}). It is natural to wonder whether an o-minimal structure is closed under solutions to differential equations, where the coefficients of said equation are definable in the given structure. In general, the answer is “no” since e.g. the function $\sin(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a solution to the initial value problem $y'' + y = 0$ and $y(0) = 0$.

In contrast, the following theorem by Speissegger shows that for certain differential equations – the so-called *Pfaffian equations* – the solutions always exist in some (possibly larger) o-minimal structure called the *Pfaffian closure* $\text{Pfaff}(\mathcal{R})$ of \mathcal{R} .

Theorem 3.16 (Pfaffian closure). [103] *Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal structure. Then there is an o-minimal expansion $\text{Pfaff}(\mathcal{R})$ of \mathcal{R} which is closed under solutions to Pfaffian equations in the following strong sense (where “definable” refers to definable in $\text{Pfaff}(\mathcal{R})$). If U is a definable and connected open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $\omega = a_1 dx_1 + \dots + a_n dx_n$ is a 1-form on U with definable coefficients $a_i : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^1 , and $L \subseteq U$ is a Rolle leaf of $\omega = 0$, then L is also definable.*

For our purposes, it suffices to know the following fact about the Pfaffian closure:

Corollary 3.17. [103] *Suppose $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is an open interval, $a \in I$ and $g : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in $\text{Pfaff}(\mathcal{R})$ and continuous. Then its antiderivative $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(x) := \int_a^x g(t) dt$ is also definable in $\text{Pfaff}(\mathcal{R})$.*

Let $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ denote $\text{Pfaff}(\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}})$, the Pfaffian closure of the semialgebraic structure. The following implies that $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ contains \mathbb{R}_{exp} , and moreover, defines the common activation and loss functions mentioned in [Table 1](#):

Corollary 3.18. *The following functions are definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$*

- (1) *the exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;*
- (2) *the error function $\text{erf} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;*
- (3) *the arctangent function $\arctan : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

In particular, all activation functions and loss functions in [Table 1](#) are definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$.

Proof. (1) The function $1/t : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$. Then by [Corollary 3.17](#), the natural logarithm $\ln : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$:

$$\ln(x) = \int_1^x \frac{1}{t} dt.$$

Thus the compositional inverse $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$.

(2) It follows from (1) that the function $(2/\sqrt{\pi}) \exp(-t^2) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$. Applying [Corollary 3.17](#) again shows that the error function $\text{erf} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by:

$$\text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x \exp(-t^2) dt$$

is also definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$.

(3) The definability of \arctan follows likewise using the formula:

$$\arctan(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{t^2 + 1} dt$$

The final claim now follows since GELU and \arctan are definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ by (2) and (3), and all other functions presented in Table 1 are already definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} ; see Lemma 3.12. ■

Remark 3.19. We now provide further heuristic justification for the claim:

Nearly all DNNs are definable in some o-minimal structure.

By Lemma 3.3 it suffices to consider whether the building blocks of a DNN (i.e., the activation and loss functions) are definable in some o-minimal structure; we consider the case of activation functions. In the literature there are various “long lists” of activation functions [45, 86]. The most exhaustive of these we could find was a recent survey [65] titled *Three decades of activations: a comprehensive survey of 400 activation functions for neural networks*. In that document, we roughly estimate:⁴

- (1) Around 89% of the functions which show up are definable in one of the main examples considered above. This is by direct inspection using similar reasoning as done for the activation functions listed in Table 1; see Remark 2.10, Lemma 3.12, and Corollary 3.18.
- (2) Another 5% of the functions involve the approach from [109] of considering fractional derivatives $D^\alpha f(z)$ of simpler activation functions $f(z)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is possibly a free/trainable parameter. The definability of such a situation is a bit unclear (to us at least), although we point out that the main example is the *fractional ReLU* defined as:

$$\text{FracReLU}_\alpha(z) = \frac{z^{1-\alpha}}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)}$$

If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed, then this is definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} (even in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathbb{R}}$, the expansion of \mathbb{R}_{alg} by each fixed power function $x^\alpha : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$), which is a polynomially bounded o-minimal structure [80]; see Definition 3.28). Otherwise, if we want uniformity in α , we need to work in some o-minimal structure which contains appropriate fragments of both exp and Γ . In practice, the parameter α is restricted so that $1 < 2 - \alpha \leq 2$; this uses the restriction $\Gamma|_{(1,2]}$ which is definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} , and thus $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ would suffice for FracReLU_α under this restriction. If instead we only required $0 < 2 - \alpha$, then $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ would no longer suffice [41, 5.11]. However, van den Dries and Speissegger construct in [44] a (polynomially bounded) o-minimal structure $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ consisting of so-called *Gevrey functions* such as $\phi(x) := \log \Gamma(x) - (x - \frac{1}{2}) \log x + x - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) : (1, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (a function with the asymptotics of the Stirling series), moreover they show that adjoining $\text{exp} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ produces a structure $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{G},\text{exp}}$ which is also o-minimal and contains $\Gamma : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; see [87] for more on the Γ function and o-minimality.

- (3) The remaining 6% are not definable in an o-minimal structure because they appear to use the unrestricted sine and cosine functions and thus are instances of Non-Example 3.4

⁴We take a few liberties with this count. For example, consider the Noisy ReLU $f(z) = \max(0, z + a)$ where a is a stochastic parameter [65, 3.6.6]. We consider this to be definable in an o-minimal structure since it is semialgebraic in the two variables z and a . As our definition of *definable in an o-minimal structure* only pertains to subsets and functions in \mathbb{R}^n , objects such as *random variables* (i.e., a measurable function $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where Ω is some abstract sample space, not a subset of \mathbb{R}^n) ostensibly fall outside the purview of *definable/not-definable*. Likewise, consider the locally adaptive activation function (LAAF) $f(z) = g(a \cdot z)$ where $g(z)$ is a given activation function and a is a trainable parameter [65, 4.16]. We also count this towards being definable in an o-minimal structure, since the process $g(z) \rightsquigarrow g(a \cdot z)$ can never break o-minimality; of course, if the initial $g(z)$ is not tame, then neither will be $f(z)$.

above. Examples include:

$$\text{Cosid}(z) = \cos(z) - z \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Expcos}_{a,b}(z) = \exp(-az^2) \cdot \cos(bz)$$

A standard recourse in this situation is to reason that the functions \sin and \cos are actually being evaluated on some *a priori fixed* standard domain I such as $[0, 2\pi]$, and then appeal to the fact that the restricted functions $\sin|_I$ and $\cos|_I$ are definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} whenever I is a fixed compact interval. Of course we do not claim that this must always be the case.

Consequently, $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ is sufficient for nearly all functions occurring in deep-learning; at least those built from the functions in Table 1 and considered in (1) above. This observation has been made elsewhere, e.g., [63]. If we wish to also consider FracReLU_α as in (2) above, then one of the extensions $\text{Pfaff}(\mathbb{R}_G) \supseteq \text{Pfaff}(\mathbb{R}_{\text{an}}) \supseteq \mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$ would suffice, depending on the restriction of α . The activation function FracReLU_α is of theoretical interest although not widely used in practice (to our knowledge). On the other hand, GELU is heavily used in practice: GELU was first defined in [56], first used in [34], and ultimately adopted in the GPT models; see a table in [48].

3.3. Tame asymptotics. *For the rest of Section 3, we fix an o-minimal structure \mathcal{R} , so “definable” means “definable in \mathcal{R} ”.*

In this subsection, we shall see that an o-minimality framework gives rise to a world of “tame asymptotics” and thus is a setting which is conducive to “convergence guarantees” of various kinds. The following easy statement expresses a “logical asymptotics”, i.e., any definable “property” D is either eventually true or eventually false:

Local o-minimality 3.20. *Suppose $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is definable and fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that either:*

- (1) $(a, a + \varepsilon) \subseteq D$, or
- (2) $(a, a + \varepsilon) \cap D = \emptyset$.

A similar statement holds to the left of a , as well as at $\pm\infty$.

The power and appeal of *local o-minimality* is that we can use our imagination when choosing the definable set D to obtain useful consequences. For example:

Lemma 3.21 (Existence of one-sided limits). *Suppose $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable. Then for each $c \in [a, b)$ the limit $\lim_{t \downarrow c} f(t)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}_{\pm\infty}$. Moreover, the following is also definable:*

$$[a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\pm\infty}, \quad c \mapsto \lim_{t \downarrow c} f(t).$$

Proof sketch. Suppose towards a contradiction there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\liminf_{t \downarrow c} f(t) < \ell < \limsup_{t \downarrow c} f(t)$. Then the definable set $D := \{t \in (c, b) : f(t) \geq \ell\}$ contradicts **Local o-minimality 3.20**. ■

As an application, we have the following result of Graña Drummond and Peterzil [50] which Ioffe [59] refers to as “the first study in which o-minimality was directly applied to optimization”.

Example 3.22 (Convergence of central path). Graña Drummond and Peterzil observed in [50] that under certain natural assumptions, if a semi-definite programming problem is definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$, then the central path trajectory always converges. Here we briefly recount a more general version as formulated in [59]. Assume that $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are such that f and each $g(\cdot, u)$ are convex continuous. The optimization problem reads:

$$\min_{x \in X} f(x) \quad \text{such that } g(x, u) \leq 0, \text{ for every } u \in U.$$

A common strategy is to introduce a so-called *barrier function* $\beta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, where β is finite for strictly feasible x and equal to ∞ otherwise, and to study the auxiliary problem with a parameter $\mu > 0$:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) + \mu\beta(x).$$

Let $x(\mu)$ denote a solution to the auxiliary problem (called the *central path*); this might not exist or be uniquely defined. Under this setup, the main result follows easily from [Lemma 3.21](#):

- Suppose f, g, β are definable in an o-minimal structure. If $x(\mu)$ is well-defined and bounded for sufficiently small $\mu > 0$, then the central path $x(\mu)$ converges as $\mu \downarrow 0$.

A similar result was also proved in [54] in the semialgebraic setting using the so-called *curve selection lemma*, a version of [Definable Choice 3.6](#). See [50, 54] for a further discussion of the history of this problem.

We also have a set-valued version of [Lemma 3.21](#):

Lemma 3.23 (Existence of one-sided Painlevé-Kuratowski limits). *Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is definable, viewed as a definable family $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of definable sets $X_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$). Then the one-sided Painlevé-Kuratowski limit (cf. [94, 4]) of this family exists and is definable:*

$$\liminf_{t \downarrow 0} X_t = \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} X_t.$$

As an application, two notions of *tangent cone* (cf. [94, 6A]) always coincide in the tame setting:

Lemma 3.24 (Tangent cone). *If $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is definable, then Q is geometrically derivable, i.e., the tangent cone $T_Q(x)$ of Q at a point $x \in Q$ equals the derivable tangent cone $T_Q^{\text{der}}(x)$, i.e.,*

$$\limsup_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1}(Q - x) = \liminf_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1}(Q - x).$$

Higher-order versions of this fact are true as well, for instance, every definable set is *parabolically derivable* in the sense of [94, Definition 13.11]. For more on coincidence of tangent cones in the tame setting see [66].

Thus in general we should be on the lookout for any properties of the form $\liminf_{t \downarrow 0} X_t = \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} X_t$ for some $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, as these are guaranteed to hold in the tame setting.

We now turn our attention to the nature of 1-variable definable functions.

Monotonicity Theorem 3.25. [38, 3.1.2] *If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable, then there exist points $a = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k < a_{k+1} = b$ such that each restriction $f|_{(a_i, a_{i+1})}$ is continuous, and either constant or strictly monotone.*

In fact, we can achieve an arbitrarily high finite degree of smoothness:

Smooth Monotonicity Theorem 3.26. *Given $r \geq 1$, if $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable, then there exist points $a = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k < a_{k+1} = b$ in (a, b) such that each restriction $f|_{(a_i, a_{i+1})}$ is C^r -smooth, and either constant or strictly monotone.*

In order to quickly prove the [Smooth Monotonicity Theorem 3.26](#), we recall the classical Lebesgue's Theorem (1904) from real analysis:

If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotone, then f is differentiable a.e. on (a, b) .

Proof. Let $r = 1$. By the [Monotonicity Theorem 3.25](#), we can assume f is monotone. Since the points of (non)differentiability are definable (exercise!), and measure zero by Lebesgue's Theorem, we have from the [Small Sets Theorem 3.5](#) that there are only finitely many points of non-differentiability. The case $r \geq 2$ follows by induction. ■

Here is a more subtle property. Recall from freshman calculus that *l'Hopital's rule* gives a one-direction implication, under some *indeterminate form* assumption. The reverse implication does not hold in general in the “naive” direction, as the following example shows:

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{t^2 \sin t^{-1}}{t} = 0 \quad \text{however} \quad \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{(t^2 \sin t^{-1})'}{t'} = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} (2t \sin t^{-1} - t^{-1}) \quad \text{does not exist}$$

In the tame setting we have:

Lemma 3.27 (Reverse l'Hopital's rule). *Suppose $\phi, \psi : (0, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are definable with $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \phi(t) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \psi(t) = 0$, and assume $\psi'(t) > 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$. Then for $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:*

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(t)}{\psi(t)} = \ell \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi'(t)}{\psi'(t)} = \ell.$$

Remark about Lemma 3.27. The version here is from *Tame functions are semismooth* (2009) [16, Lemma 1] by Bolte, Daniilidis, and Lewis, and was the crucial observation needed to prove their main theorem that all definable locally lipschitz functions are semismooth [16, Theorem 1]; see also Remark 3.29 below.

The history of Lemma 3.27 and its various disguised forms dates back already to the connection between o-minimality and so-called *Hardy fields*, e.g., [81, 40] (1994), see also [82, §3]. The Hardy field $H(\mathcal{R})$ of \mathcal{R} is the ordered differential field of germs at $+\infty$ of 1-variable definable functions $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Hardy fields are important invariants of o-minimal structures as they capture all possible asymptotic behavior of 1-variable definable functions.

More recently, Aschenbrenner, van den Dries and van der Hoeven have introduced an abstract setting of so-called *H-fields* designed to capture the first-order properties of Hardy fields. Their work *Asymptotic differential algebra and model theory of transseries* (2017) [3] culminates in an analogue of the [Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem 2.4](#) in a certain natural framework for asymptotic algebraic differential equations over *H-fields* (in the same way semialgebraic geometry is a natural framework for polynomial equations over \mathbb{R}).

In the theory of *H-fields*, Lemma 3.27 shows up as e.g., [3, 10.1.4]. This usage in the *H-field* setting (which includes the Hardy field setting, and thus the o-minimal setting) can be traced back to at least as early as 1979 in *On the value group of a differential valuation* [98] by Rosenlicht. ■

As already alluded to, in theory one can characterize the asymptotics which might occur in an o-minimal structure. The simplest version of this is:

Definition 3.28. [82] We say that \mathcal{R} is **polynomially bounded** if for every definable $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that eventually $|f(t)| \leq t^N$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. This is equivalent [82, Theorem 1.2] to the seemingly stronger property: for every eventually nonzero definable $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there exists an exponent $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$f(t) \sim Ct^\gamma \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty.$$

We define the **field of exponents** of \mathcal{R} to be the set of all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the function $t^\gamma : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in \mathcal{R} ; it can be checked that this is in fact a subfield of \mathbb{R} .

The structures \mathbb{R}_{alg} and \mathbb{R}_{an} are polynomially bounded with field of exponents \mathbb{Q} (see [37] for \mathbb{R}_{an}). The structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}^{\mathbb{R}}$ mentioned in (2) of Remark 3.19 is polynomially bounded with field of exponents \mathbb{R} . Any structure containing the exponential function, for instance \mathbb{R}_{exp} , $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{\text{Pfaff}}$, will not be polynomially bounded and automatically have field of exponents \mathbb{R} . To characterize the asymptotics of o-minimal structures which are not polynomially bounded, one can use *Hardy fields* and *transseries* as demonstrated in [41].

Remark 3.29. The property *polynomially bounded* has useful practical consequences in optimization. We mention two of them here:

- (1) In *Tame functions are semismooth* [16, Theorem 2] the authors essentially show that in a polynomially bounded setting, the nonsmooth Newton’s method converges superlinearly for definable locally Lipschitz functions with an error at the k th step of $O(2^{-(1+\gamma)^k})$ for some positive parameter $\gamma > 0$ coming from the field of exponents.
- (2) In [Section 4](#) below, we consider *qualitative* properties of the convergence of the subgradient method; we do not address the *rate* of convergence. To analyze the rate, one often uses the so-called *Polyak-Łojasiewicz-Kurdyka (PLK) inequalities* (also known as *KL inequalities*); in this case, a polynomially bounded setting similarly can yield an exponent which can imply the superlinear convergence of a descent algorithm. See [11] for an example of how this is done.

Remarkably, the exponential function is unavoidable in an o-minimal structure which is not polynomially bounded:

Exponential dichotomy 3.30. [81] *Exactly one of the following is true:*

- (1) \mathcal{R} is polynomially bounded, or
- (2) the exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable in \mathcal{R} .

It is unknown if one can achieve growth rates faster than every iterated exponential in an o-minimal structure, i.e., every known o-minimal structure is *exponentially bounded*:

Open Question 3.31. Does there exist an o-minimal structure which defines a *transexponential* function? I.e., a function $E : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $n \geq 1$, eventually $E(t) \geq \exp_n(t)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, where $\exp_1 := \exp$ and $\exp_{n+1} := \exp \circ \exp_n$.

Progress has been made on the *Hardy field* fragment of this question in Padgett’s thesis [88]. The existence of transexponential Hardy fields was shown by Boshernitzan in (1986) [22]. Recently, Aschenbrenner, van den Dries, and van der Hoeven proved the following remarkable result: all maximal Hardy fields (which are necessarily transexponential [22]) have the same first-order theory as differential fields, and moreover assuming the Continuum Hypothesis (CH) they are all isomorphic [4].

3.4. Dimension and stratifications. We now turn our attention to properties of definable sets of higher dimension, which commonly arise in deep learning.

The first statement partially extends the [Small Sets Theorem 3.5](#) into higher dimension and states that a coherent value of “dimension” can be assigned to every definable set. We use the fiber notation; see [Section 1.5](#).

Dimension Theorem 3.32. *Suppose \mathcal{R} is an o-minimal structure. There exists a unique function:*

$$\dim : \{\text{definable sets}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$$

such that:

- (D1) (a) $\dim(S) = -\infty \Leftrightarrow S = \emptyset$ for definable $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$;
 (b) $\dim(\{a\}) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
 (c) $\dim(\mathbb{R}) = 1$;
- (D2) $\dim(S_1 \cup S_2) = \max\{\dim(S_1), \dim(S_2)\}$ for definable $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$;
- (D3) \dim is preserved under permutation of coordinates;

(D4) if $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is definable and we set $B_i := \{a \in \mathbb{R}^n : \dim(S_a) = i\}$ for $i = 0, 1$, then B_i is definable and

$$\dim(\{(a, b) \in S : a \in B_i\}) = i + \dim(B_i), \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1.$$

Example 3.33. If $\mathcal{R} = (\mathbb{R}; <, +, \cdot)$ is the structure of semialgebraic sets, then the unique dimension function \dim on \mathcal{R} as provided by the [Dimension Theorem 3.32](#) is the dimensions \dim_K and \dim_m from [Definition 2.7](#).

Given its uniqueness, there are a variety of equivalent ways to define the function \dim on \mathcal{R} and still arrive at the same canonical dimension function. For our purposes, the most convenient is the direct generalization of *manifold dimension* \dim_m from [Definition 2.7](#). [Theorem 3.39](#) below provides the analogue of [Lemma 2.5](#) we will need later in [Section 4](#).


The following theorem from [38, Chap. 4(1.8)] concerns the dimension of the frontier of nonempty definable sets and (as pointed out in [97, §2.1]) can be regarded as an abstract topological manifestation of the principle of “no oscillation” such as in [Non-Example 3.4](#). The frontier of a set S is defined as $\text{fr } S = \text{cl } S \setminus S$.

Small Frontier Theorem 3.34. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a nonempty definable set. Then*

$$\dim \text{fr } S < \dim S.$$

In particular, $\dim \text{cl } S = \dim S$.

The following three examples illustrate how [Small Frontier Theorem 3.34](#) can fail in the non-tame setting. The graphical illustrations are shown in [Figs. 2 and 4](#).



(a) Spiral (dim. 1) with limit the unit-circle (dim. 1); (b) Spiral (dim. 1) with limit the unit sphere (dim. 2); see [Non-Example 3.36](#). see [Non-Example 3.37](#).

Figure 4: Dimension theory: the limit of a tame curve has smaller dimension than the curve. The two plots show non-tame examples, where the dimension of the limit of the curve is equal (a) or higher (b) than the dimension of the curve.

Non-example 3.35 (Topologist’s sine curve). Consider the (non-tame) function $\gamma : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $t \mapsto \sin t^{-1}$. Then $S := \gamma((0, +\infty)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a 1-dimensional C^1 -manifold such that $\text{fr } S = \{0\} \times [-1, 1]$ also contains a nonempty 1-dimensional C^1 -manifold.

Non-example 3.36 (Spiral with limit cycle). Consider the (non-tame) function: $\gamma : (1, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $t \mapsto (1+t^{-1})(\sin t, \cos t)$. Then $S := \gamma((1, +\infty)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a 1-dimensional C^1 -manifold such that $\text{fr } S$ is also a 1-dimensional C^1 -manifold. Indeed, $\text{fr } S$ is the unit circle.

Non-example 3.37 (Example of a set whose frontier has higher dimension). Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ be an irrational number. Consider the (non-tame) function $\gamma : (1, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $t \mapsto (1 - t^{-1})(\sin(t) \cos(\alpha t), \sin(t) \sin(\alpha t), \cos(t))$. Then $S := \gamma((1, +\infty)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a 1-dimensional C^1 -manifold such that $\text{fr } S$ is a 2-dimensional C^1 -manifold. Indeed, $\text{fr } S$ is the unit 2-sphere.

The functions defined by a DNN are often nonsmooth and nonconvex. However, often one may decompose the domain into finitely many regions such that the function is well-behaved on each region. See Figure 5 for an illustration of this on a two-dimensional Neural Network.




Figure 5: Left pane: a generic 2-dimensional DNN, with level lines (white) and non-smooth points (black). This is neither a convex function, nor a smooth function, although the “cells” indicate regions where the function is smooth. Right pane: piecewise polynomial approximation of the DNN, obtained from a proposed integer program with a depth-3 regression tree and degree-2 polynomials from [7].

This situation is typical for definable sets and functions in general. Indeed, higher-dimensional definable sets exhibit very nice *structural regularity* in the sense that they can be decomposed into finitely many definable pieces, and each piece is suitably nice; moreover, the pieces can be chosen so that adjacent pieces attach to each other in nice ways. There are several theorems of this form, for instance *(Smooth) Cell Decomposition* [38, Chap. 3 (2.11), Chap. 7 (3.2)] and various *Stratification Theorems* (e.g. [74, 85, 75, 25]). We mention here Loi’s theorem on *Verdier stratification*. First some definitions.

Definition 3.38. Given a definable set $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, a **(definable C^1) stratification** of Z is a finite partition \mathfrak{S} of Z into definable sets (called **strata**) such that:

- each stratum is a connected embedded C^1 -manifold in \mathbb{R}^n , and
- (frontier condition) for each $X \in \mathfrak{S}$, the relative frontier $\text{cl}_Z(X) \setminus X$ is a union of strata.

We say a stratification \mathfrak{S} is a **Verdier stratification** if for every pair (X, Y) of strata from \mathfrak{S} , we have that if $X \subseteq \text{fr}(Y)$, then for every $\bar{x} \in X$

- (w) there exists $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood U of \bar{x} in \mathbb{R}^n such that:

$$\Delta(T_X(x), T_Y(y)) \leq C\|x - y\|$$

for every $x \in X \cap U$ and $y \in Y \cap U$.

Theorem 3.39 (Loi). [75] *Every definable set has a Verdier stratification. Moreover, given $r \geq 1$, definable sets $A_1, \dots, A_k \subseteq Z$, and a definable function $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a Verdier stratification \mathfrak{S} of Z can be chosen so that:*

- (1) each strata in \mathfrak{S} is a C^r -manifold,
- (2) \mathfrak{S} partitions each A_i , i.e., for every strata $M \in \mathfrak{S}$, either $M \cap A_i = \emptyset$ or $M \subseteq A_i$, and
- (3) for each strata $M \in \mathfrak{S}$, the restriction $f|_M$ is C^r -smooth.

Example 3.40 (Set stratification). Consider again the semialgebraic set S introduced in [Example 2.1](#), and illustrated in [Fig. 1](#). A partition of S into connected C^1 manifolds was proposed in [Example 2.6](#). This partition is in fact a Verdier stratification. The Verdier property follows just from being a mere stratification, because we are in \mathbb{R}^2 where (w) always holds. Indeed, as soon as X is a zero-dimensional manifold, or Y is a full-dimensional manifold, then their tangent space are $\{0\}$, or \mathbb{R}^n , so that there holds $T_X(x) \subset T_Y(y)$, and in turn their distance $\Delta(T_X(x), T_Y(y))$ is null. Finally, note that Verdier’s condition applies only to pairs such that $X \subseteq \text{fr}(Y)$, so in particular $\dim(X) < \dim(Y)$, by [Small Frontier Theorem 3.34](#), and in two dimensions either $\dim(X) = 0$ or $\dim(Y) = 2$ and the above remark applies. A three dimensional set for which the stratifications do not automatically meet Verdier’s condition is the “Whitney cusp” [[55](#), Fig. 1].

Remark 3.41 (Verdier implies Whitney). The proof of the [Projection formula 4.5](#) below requires a so-called *Whitney-(a)* stratification. In fact, definable Verdier stratifications always have this property, as Loi shows that a Verdier stratification automatically has the Whitney-(b) property [[75](#), 1.10] in the o-minimal setting, whereas Whitney-(b) stratifications are always Whitney-(a) stratifications regardless of the setting. See [[106](#)] for more on stratifying conditions such as Verdier and Whitney-(a)/(b).

Remark 3.42 (Finite VC dimension). The above discussion presented dimension and stratification results, a form of *geometric tameness* for sets definable in an o-minimal structure. For the sake of completeness, let us also mention that (high-dimensional) definable sets also enjoy *combinatorial tameness* properties, that are relevant to statistical learning (although not needed for [Section 4](#)). Namely, o-minimal structures have the so-called *non-independence property (NIP)*, which implies that definable families always have finite *Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension* [[38](#), Chap. 5]. This implies that definable hypothesis spaces are subject to the so-called *Fundamental Theorem of Statistical Learning*, which tells us they are always *PAC learnable*. For more on this part of the story see e.g., [[26](#), [64](#)].

4. CONVERGENCE OF SUBGRADIENT METHOD

The previous section provided convergence guarantees at the elementary level of definable curves, including the existence of one-sided limits of definable curves, and the convergence of central path methods in optimization. In this section, we illustrate how the properties of definable objects yield convergence guarantees through the example of Stochastic Subgradient Method (SSM), also known as Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) (in the case where the function is differentiable). We provide in this section an exposition of known results, notably those in Davis *et al* [[32](#)], and Bolte *et al* [[17](#)].

In [Section 4.1](#), we recall some notions of variational analysis, useful when dealing with nonsmooth objects. In [Section 4.2](#), we discuss a continuous time version of SSM, as a first step towards the discrete setting. In [Section 4.3](#), we move to the setting of interest, where the iteration is discrete. Finally, we provide in [Section 4.4](#) complementary remarks that connect the discrete setting with implemented methods.

4.1. Preliminaries from variational analysis. We first recall the notion of Clarke subdifferential and provide some context on its relevance in nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. Then, we complete the notion of manifold, introduced in [Section 1.5](#), with tangent and normal spaces, tangent metric, and Riemannian gradient.

The notion of gradient, valid and useful for differentiable functions, is well extended to the nondifferentiable setting by that of Clarke subdifferential. This notion is applicable when the

points where the function is not differentiable have measure zero. Interestingly, this holds true as soon as the function is locally Lipschitz – this is Rademacher’s theorem [83], and also by the stronger and independent stratification statement [Theorem 3.39](#).

Definition 4.1. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally Lipschitz function. The **Clarke subdifferential** $\partial^c f$ is the following set-valued map:

$$\partial^c f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \mapsto \partial^c f(x) := \text{conv}\{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nabla f(x_i) : x_i \rightarrow x, x_i \in \text{Diff}(f)\},$$

where $\text{Diff}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the set of points $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where f is (Fréchet) differentiable; see [Definition A.3](#). An element of the Clarke subdifferential is called a **subgradient**.

The Clarke subdifferential captures (most of) the first-order geometry of a function. In particular, it allows to formulate a necessary condition on the local minimizers of a function, known as Fermat’s rule generalized [94, Th. 10.1]. Except in specific cases (e.g., [Section 2.3](#)), finding global, or even local minimizers of a general nonsmooth nonconvex function is too difficult. In what follows, we thus settle for finding Clarke critical points.

Proposition 4.2 (Fermat’s rule). *If \bar{x} is a local minimizer of f , then $0 \in \partial^c f(\bar{x})$.*

We summarize below some useful properties of the Clarke subdifferential.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally Lipschitz function and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

- i) *if f is definable in an o -minimal structure, then $\partial^c f$ is also definable in that structure;*
- ii) *$\partial^c f(x)$ is convex, compact, and nonempty;*
- iii) *$\partial^c f(x)$ is upper semicontinuous, i.e., for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\partial^c f(y) \subset \partial^c f(x) + B(0, \varepsilon), \quad \text{for any } y \in B(x, \eta);$$

- iv) *if $0 \notin \partial^c f(x)$, then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $0 \notin \partial^c f(y)$ for any $y \in B(x, \eta)$.*

Proof. Part i) is left as an exercise. Part ii) is proved in [27, Proposition 2.1.2(a)], using Theorem 2.5.1 [27] to connect [Definition 4.1](#) to Clarke’s subdifferential definition [27, p. 27]. Part iii) is proved in [27, Proposition 2.1.5(d)]. Part iv) is an application of part ii): since $0 \notin \partial^c f(x)$ and $\partial^c f(x)$ is a closed set, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $0 \notin \partial^c f(x) + B(0, \varepsilon)$. By part iii), there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\partial^c f(y) \subset \partial^c f(x) + B(0, \varepsilon)$ for all $y \in B(x, \eta)$. Hence, $0 \notin \partial^c f(y)$ for all $y \in B(x, \eta)$. ■

Consider a d -dimensional C^p -manifold M included in \mathbb{R}^n , and a point $x \in M$. The **tangent space** at $x \in M$, noted $T_M(x)$, is the set of all possible velocities of curves on M that go through x , evaluated at x . This is a d -dimensional linear space. The **normal space** at point $x \in M$, noted $N_M(x)$, defines as the orthogonal space to $a[x]$ in \mathbb{R}^n . We denote the orthogonal projection onto $T_M(x)$ by $\text{proj}_{T_M(x)}(\cdot)$. Finally, we equip each tangent and normal space by the (restriction of the) scalar product of the ambient euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , thus making the manifold Riemannian.

Consider a d -dimensional C^p -manifold M included in \mathbb{R}^n , a point $x \in M$, and a function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The **Riemannian differential** of f at x is the operator $Df(x) : T_M(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $Df(x)[\eta] := \left. \frac{d}{dt} f \circ c(t) \right|_{t=0}$ when that limit exists, where c is a C^1 curve on M such that $c(0) = x$ and $c'(0) = \eta$. When $Df(x)$ is a linear operator, we say that f is differentiable relative to M , and call **Riemannian gradient** is the unique vector $\nabla_R f(x)$ of $T_M(x)$ such that, for any tangent vector η , $Df(x)[\eta] = \langle \nabla_R f(x), \eta \rangle$. Finally, we say that f is **continuously differentiable, or C^1 , on M** when f is differentiable relative to M at any point of M , and when the Riemannian gradient is continuous on M . When M is definable, then so are T_M , N_M , $\text{proj}_{T_M(\cdot)}$, Df , and $\nabla_R f$.

We distinguish between the euclidean gradient $\nabla f(x)$, the definition of which we recall in [Appendix A.2](#), and the Riemannian gradient $\nabla_R f(x)$ relative to M . We choose not to include M in the notation $\nabla_R f(x)$ as the manifold is always clear from context. Moreover, if there exists a function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that g is C^1 at x , and f coincides with g on M near x , then the Riemannian gradient of f is the projection of the euclidean gradient g on the tangent space: $\nabla_R f(x) = \text{proj}_{T_M(x)}(\nabla g(x))$.

4.2. Descent of subgradient curves in continuous time. In this section, we consider a definable locally Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an absolutely continuous curve $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$x'(t) \in -\partial^c f(x(t)), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0. \quad (\text{SSM}^{\text{cont}})$$

Note that, while f and ∂^c are definable, it is not clear whether the curve x is definable; thus the following exposition does not assume x to be definable. We present the statement and proof ideas of Davis, Drusvyatskiy, Kakade and Lee [32], along with earlier results of Bolte, Daniilidis, Lewis and Shiota [17]. The purpose of this section is to show that f decreases along trajectories of [Eq. \(SSM^{cont}\)](#). Specifically, we aim to prove the following result.

Proposition 4.4 (Subgradient descent). *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a definable locally Lipschitz function and $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is an absolutely continuous curve satisfying [Eq. \(SSM^{cont}\)](#). Then,*

$$f(x(t)) = f(x(0)) - \int_0^t \text{dist}^2(0, \partial^c f(x(\tau))) d\tau.$$

In particular, $f \circ x$ is non-increasing.

The following is a stratification result for functions; it extends the basic [Lemma 2.5](#) and [Theorem 3.39](#). This result provides the existence of a partition of the space into C^1 -manifolds, over which the function behaves smoothly. In addition, any Clarke subgradient decomposes as the as a sum of two perpendicular vectors: some normal vector and the Riemannian gradient. This was first proved by Bolte *et al* [17, Proposition 4].

Projection formula 4.5. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a definable locally Lipschitz function. Then there exists a definable C^1 -stratification \mathfrak{S} of \mathbb{R}^n such that for each stratum $M \in \mathfrak{S}$, we have that $f|_M$ is C^1 and*

$$\partial^c f(x) \subset \nabla_R f(x) + N_M(x), \quad \text{for every } x \in M.$$

Proof. This result follows from [17, Proposition 4]; [31, 13] also provide similar statements. First, f is a definable function, thus it admits a Whitney stratification [17, Lemma 8]; see also [Remark 3.41](#). Second, f is locally Lipschitz continuous, thus it is lower semicontinuous. Consequently, the conclusion of [17, Proposition 4] is equivalent to the claim. ■

When [Projection formula 4.5](#) holds, we obtain a useful geometric fact summarized in the following corollary; see [Fig. 6a](#) for an illustration, and [Fig. 6b](#) for a counterexample.

Corollary 4.6. *Consider the setting of [Projection formula 4.5](#) and a point $x \in M \in \mathfrak{S}$. If there exists a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $v \in \partial^c f(x)$ and $v \in T_M(x)$, then,*

$$v = \nabla_R f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla_R f(x)\| = \text{dist}(0, \partial^c f(x)).$$

Proof. Let $V = T_M(x)$, and $C = \partial^c f(x)$. We thus have that $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$, and $C \subset \nabla_R f(x) + T_M(x)^\perp$ from [Projection formula 4.5](#). Hence [Lemma A.1](#) applies and provides the claim. ■




Figure 6: Illustration of [Projection formula 4.5](#) for two definable functions. In both cases, the stratum M is smooth, $f|_M$ is smooth, and there holds $\partial^c f(x) \subset \nabla_R f(x) + N_M(x)$. In the context of a curve satisfying [Eq. \(SSM^{cont}\)](#), the situation [\(a\)](#) is generic, while the situation [\(b\)](#) is exceptional; see [Chain rule 4.7](#).

Using this property of the Clarke subdifferential, we can now provide an expression for the derivative of f along any absolutely continuous curve $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. This property has been observed many times; see e.g., Theorem 5.8 of Davis *et al* [32], and the general theory from Bolte and Pauwels [19].

Chain rule 4.7. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a definable locally Lipschitz function and \mathfrak{S} is a definable C^1 -stratification of \mathbb{R}^n provided by [Projection formula 4.5](#). Then for every absolutely continuous curve $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ we have that, for a.e. $t \geq 0$,*

- (1) $x'(t)$ exists and $x'(t) \in T_{M_{x(t)}}(x(t))$,
- (2) $(f \circ x)'(t)$ exists and $(f \circ x)'(t) = \langle \nabla_R f(x(t)), x'(t) \rangle$,

where $M_{x(t)} \in \mathfrak{S}$ denotes the stratum that contains $x(t)$.

Before we proceed to the proof, note that we may reformulate part (2) as: for a.e. $t \geq 0$, $(f \circ x)'(t)$ exists and

$$(f \circ x)'(t) = \langle v, x'(t) \rangle, \quad \text{for any } v \in \partial^c f(x(t)).$$

This is a direct consequence of [Projection formula 4.5](#) and part (1). The derivative of $f \circ x$ thus involves the subdifferential of f and the velocity of x in a formula reminiscent of the smooth setting, hence the term “chain rule”. This is the form employed by [32] and others. While succinct, we prefer the equivalent form of item (2), that highlights the role played by the stratification, and the importance of the smoothness of $f|_M$.

Proof of Chain rule 4.7. Let \mathfrak{S} be a definable C^1 -stratification of \mathbb{R}^n provided by [Projection formula 4.5](#). Thus, the restriction of f to M is C^1 on M , for each $M \in \mathfrak{S}$. We will prove part (1) with the help of a claim using a term “bad”. We say a time $t > 0$ is *bad* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$x[(t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon) \setminus \{t\}] \cap M_{x(t)} = \emptyset.$$

Claim. *The set $B := \{t \in \mathbb{R}^> : t \text{ is bad}\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero.*

Indeed, for each $M \in \mathfrak{S}$, define the set $B_M := \{t \in \mathbb{R}^> : x(t) \in M \text{ and } t \text{ is bad}\}$. Since $B = \bigcup_{M \in \mathfrak{S}} B_M$ and \mathfrak{S} has finitely many elements, it suffices to show that B_M is discrete. The

definition of bad implies directly that B_M is a finite union of discrete sets, hence countable and of Lebesgue measure zero. This establishes the claim.

Proof of (1). We know that for almost every $t > 0$, $x'(t)$ exists – from x being an absolutely continuous curve, and t is not bad – from the above claim. Fix such a t and set $M = M_{x(t)}$. It suffices to prove that $x'(t) \in T_M(x(t))$. Since t is not bad, there is a sequence $t_i \rightarrow t$ such that $t_i \neq t$ and $x(t_i) \in M$ for each i . Since the curve x is continuous, we have that $x(t_i) \rightarrow x(t)$. Since $x'(t)$ exists, it follows that we must have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x(t) - x(t_i)}{t - t_i} = x'(t).$$

This witnesses that $x'(t)$ is in the tangent cone of M at $x(t)$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-\dim(M)}$ denote a manifold defining map near $x(t)$, that is, a mapping such that, on a neighborhood of $x(t)$, $x \in M$ is equivalent to $h(x) = 0$. Since $x(t_i) \in M$ and $x(t) \in M$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} D h(x(t))[x'(t)] &= \lim_{t_i \rightarrow t} \frac{h(x(t_i)) - h(x(t))}{t - t_i} && \text{by smoothness of } h \text{ and } x \\ &= 0 && \text{since } x(t_i) \text{ and } x(t) \text{ belong to } M. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $x'(t) \in \text{Ker } D h(x(t)) = T_M(x(t))$.

Proof of (2). Let $t > 0$ be a time such that $x'(t)$ exists and $x'(t) \in T_M(x(t))$. By definition of the tangent space, there is a C^1 curve $\gamma : (t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon) \rightarrow M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\gamma(t) = x(t)$ and $\gamma'(t) = x'(t)$; in particular, γ is a first-order approximation of x at t as per [Definition A.2](#).

Since $f|_M$ is C^1 , we have $f \circ \gamma = f|_M \circ \gamma$ is Fréchet differentiable at t_0 – see [Definition A.3](#), which implies $f \circ x$ is Fréchet differentiable at t_0 by [Lemma A.4](#). Moreover, we have $(f \circ x)'(t) = (f|_M \circ \gamma)'(t)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ x)'(t) &= (f|_M \circ \gamma)'(t) \\ &= D f|_M(\gamma(t))[\gamma'(t)] && \text{by def. of the Riemannian differential, Section 4.1} \\ &= \langle \nabla_R f(\gamma(t)), \gamma'(t) \rangle && \text{by def. of the Riemannian gradient, Section 4.1} \\ &= \langle \nabla_R f(x(t)), x'(t) \rangle && \text{by } \gamma \text{ being a first-order approximation of } x \text{ at } t. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove [Proposition 4.4](#). The main idea of this proof is that, for an absolutely continuous curve that follows the SSM dynamics [Eq. \(SSM^{cont}\)](#), the Riemannian gradient is (almost always) contained in the Clarke subdifferential. Geometrically, the situation of [Fig. 6a](#) holds generically, while the situation of [Fig. 6b](#) is exceptional.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Consider a definable locally Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an absolutely continuous curve $x : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the continuous time SSM dynamics:

$$-x'(t) \in \partial^c f(x(t)), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0.$$

Let \mathfrak{S} denote a definable C^1 -stratification of \mathbb{R}^n adapted to f provided by [Projection formula 4.5](#). Then, [Chain rule 4.7 \(1\)](#) provides

$$-x'(t) \in T_{M_{x(t)}}(x(t)), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0.$$

where $M_{x(t)} \in \mathfrak{S}$ denotes the stratum to which $x(t)$ belongs. Thus [Corollary 4.6](#) applies, and there holds for a.e. $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ x)'(t) &= \langle \nabla_R f(x(t)), x'(t) \rangle && \text{by Chain rule 4.7 (2)} \\ &= -\|\nabla_R f(x(t))\|^2 && \text{by Corollary 4.6} \\ &= -\text{dist}^2(0, \partial^c f(x(t))) && \text{by Corollary 4.6.} \end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides yields, for any $t \geq 0$

$$f(x(t)) - f(x(0)) = \int_0^t (f \circ x)'(\tau) d\tau = - \int_0^t \text{dist}^2(0, \partial^c f(x(\tau))) d\tau. \quad \blacksquare$$

4.3. Stochastic Subgradient Method converges on tame functions: a simplified, deterministic, exposition. We note that the convergence of SSM on general definable functions is a surprisingly recent result (2020, in Davis *et al* [32]), and it fundamentally depends on properties guaranteed by o-minimality. We outline the general ideas of the proof, with particular emphasis on the aspects where o-minimality plays a critical role. For the sake of clarity and length, we focus here on a noiseless full-batch setting, and discuss extensions to noisy and minibatch settings in the next section.

Setting the stage, we consider finding a Clarke critical point of a given function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that is a point \bar{x} such that $0 \in \partial^c f(\bar{x})$. To that end, we consider using the Stochastic Subgradient Method, defined as:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \gamma_k y_k, \quad \text{for } y_k \in -\partial^c f(x_k). \quad (\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}})$$

Our main application case is the training of DNNs, which involves, for example, the minimization problem Eq. (1.2). For simplicity, we consider an idealized setting where y_k is an element of the Clarke subdifferential of a full-batch of data. This simplified setting suffices to discuss the features of o-minimality. Extensions to small-batch settings and Automatic Differentiation are discussed in Sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3.

The convergence result is given below [32, Corollary 5.9].

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable, locally Lipschitz, and we have a sequence (γ_k) of step sizes in $[0, +\infty)$ and a sequence (x_k) of iterates in \mathbb{R}^n such that:*

(1) *the sequence (γ_k) is non-negative, square-summable, but not summable:*

$$\gamma_k \geq 0, \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} \gamma_k = +\infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} \gamma_k^2 < +\infty;$$

(2) *the sequence (x_k) is bounded;*

(3) *the sequence (x_k) satisfies the SSM iteration Eq. (SSM^{discrete}).*

Then every limit point \bar{x} of (x_k) is Clarke critical for f , i.e., $0 \in \partial^c f(\bar{x})$, and the sequence $(f(x_k))$ converges.

The key idea of the proof is to replace the analysis of the discrete dynamical system given by Eq. (SSM^{discrete}), which is notoriously difficult, with that of a continuous dynamical system.

Proof sketch. The continuous dynamical system is given by Eq. (SSM^{cont}).

Classical results of stochastic approximation theory guarantee that sequences (x_k) given by Eq. (SSM^{discrete}) approximate the trajectories of Eq. (SSM^{cont}), under assumptions (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.8; see e.g. [46, Th. 2] and [10, 21]. It thus remains to show that the trajectories of Eq. (SSM^{cont}) have the desired properties, namely that they converge to points \bar{x} such that $0 \in \partial^c f(\bar{x})$. Formally, this is done by proving that f is a so-called *Lyapunov function* for the trajectories of Eq. (SSM^{cont}), i.e., f fulfils:

(1) **(Weak Sard)** For a dense set of values $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{x : f(x) = r \text{ and } 0 \in \partial^c f(x)\}$ is empty.

(2) **(Descent)** For every absolutely continuous curve x satisfying Eq. (SSM^{cont}) such that $0 \notin \partial^c f(x(0))$, there exists a real $T > 0$ satisfying

$$f(x(T)) < \sup_{t \in [0, T]} f(x(t)) \leq f(x(0)).$$

O-minimality is key to proving the Weak Sard and Descent properties for functions f matching realistic settings, such as training of DNNs. Indeed, o-minimality provides an easy-to-check criterion, formalized by the composability (Lemma 3.3) and the guarantee that f admits a stratification (Projection formula 4.5).

We first consider the Weak Sard property. Recall that Projection formula 4.5 guarantees that the domain of f partitions in a finite number of connected sets M called strata, such that each stratum is a C^1 manifold and the restriction of f on each stratum is C^1 . Hence, the usual Sard property for C^1 functions on C^1 manifolds applies on each stratum [100]. Combining these results across the finite collection of strata then yields the Weak Sard property. Since all objects are definable, a stronger result holds: by the Small Sets Theorem 3.5, the set of critical values is in fact finite, rather than merely having a complement dense in \mathbb{R} . Alternatively, [30, Rem. 3.1.5] states that the number of (asymptotic) Clarke critical points for a definable C^1 function on a definable submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n is finite. This also implies that all but finitely many $r \in \mathbb{R}$ will satisfy the condition in Weak Sard, as proved by [17, Coro. 9(ii)].

To prove the Descent property, recall that Proposition 4.4 shows that a trajectory x of Eq. (SSM^{cont}) satisfies, for any $t \geq 0$,

$$f(x(t)) = f(x(0)) - \int_0^t \text{dist}^2(0, \partial^c f(x(\tau))) d\tau \quad (4.1)$$

and, in particular, $f \circ x$ is non-increasing. Consequently, $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} f(x(t)) = f(x(0))$. Assume in addition that $0 \notin -\partial^c f(x(0))$. Then by Proposition 4.3 iv), there exists $T > 0$ such that $0 \notin \partial^c f(x(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, $\int_0^t \text{dist}^2(0, \partial^c f(x(\tau))) d\tau$ increases strictly for $t \in [0, T]$. In view of Eq. (4.1), $f \circ x$ is strictly decreasing over $[0, T]$. Hence, the Descent property holds.

Thus, f is a continuous, lower-bounded function that meets the Weak Sard and Descent properties. Thus, Theorem 2 from Davis *et al* [32] applies and provides that any limit point \bar{x} of (x_k) is such that $0 \in \partial^c f(\bar{x})$, and the sequence $(f(x_k))$ converges. ■

4.4. The broader picture around Stochastic Subgradient Method. We presented above a convergence proof for a simplified version of Stochastic Subgradient Method, described in Eq. (SSM^{discrete}). Here, we discuss how the gap between this simplified setting and practice can be bridged.

4.4.1. On the need to account for nonsmoothness. Rademacher’s theorem states that, if a function f is Lipschitz continuous, then the set of points where it is nonsmooth has measure zero. Therefore optimization algorithms are unlikely to encounter such points—especially so when the iteration features noise, as is the case of Eq. (SSM^{discrete}). One might then be led to give credit to the following statement, or a variation of it.

Since with probability one, the function is differentiable at iterates, everything happens as if the function was differentiable, and thus smooth convergence arguments apply directly.

Unfortunately, things are not so simple. Indeed, methods for smooth optimization have vastly different behaviors on nonsmooth functions, as we now illustrate. Figure 7 displays the behavior of three optimization methods on a particular nonsmooth function. Overall, the behavior of the methods is driven by the nonsmoothness of the function (its stratification), and particularly so by M^* , the stratum that contains the minimizer. Stochastic Subgradient Method incurs strong oscillations perpendicular to M^* . The BFGS method, a state-of-the-art method for minimizing C^1 functions with superlinear convergence speed, incurs oscillations and ultimately converges linearly at best on nonsmooth functions [71]. The proximal gradient




Figure 7: The behavior of optimization algorithms is driven by the optimal stratum $M^\star = \{(0, u)^\top : u > 0\}$. Here, we show the iterates of noiseless full-batch SSM ($\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}}$), the nonsmooth-BFGS [71] and the Proximal Gradient [9, Chap. 10.4] algorithms, on a LASSO-type objective function $F(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_1$.

method can be applied only to a restricted class of nonsmooth functions, including that of Fig. 7 [9]. Contrary to SSM and BFGS, it generates iterates that are attracted to nonsmooth points – the cartesian axes here. Even more, the iterates belong to M^\star after a finite number of iterations; this can be used to accelerate the proximal gradient method [8].

4.4.2. *From Clarke critical points to local minimizers.* Proposition 4.8 shows that the iterates of SSM converge to the Clarke critical points. Such points include local minima, but also saddle points or even local maxima. Convergence to local minima is considered in [31], where stratifications are instrumental in proving the convergence result once more.

4.4.3. *From full-batch to small-batch iteration.* The above exposition focused on SSM in the simple setting of Eq. ($\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}}$), which assumes that a subgradient of f is computed at each iteration. Using stochastic approximation theory [46, 10, 21], this setting extends to

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \gamma_k(y_k + \xi_k), \quad \text{for } y_k \in -\partial^c f(x_k), \quad (4.2)$$

where ξ_k is a random variable with zero mean, and typically bounded variance. In the context of training DNNs (1.2), where f is written as a large sum, the extension (4.2) accounts for the more realistic version of ($\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}}$) where y_k is computed relative to one or a few elements of the sum, as opposed to all elements of the sum. This is the small-batch setting, as opposed to the full-batch setting of ($\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}}$).

4.4.4. *Automatic Differentiation of definable mappings.* In order to implement the SSM iteration Eq. ($\text{SSM}^{\text{discrete}}$), one must compute an element y_k of the (negation of the) Clarke subdifferential of f at x_k . Computing such a “derivative” is a challenging task, especially so in the context of training DNNs, where the function to optimize involves a deep neural network, which itself is a large composition of elementary functions; see Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2). We now discuss some aspects of this challenging task.

Automatic Differentiation (AD) groups methods that describe how to compute the derivative of a function that is written as a composition of elementary functions, the derivative of which are known. To fix ideas, consider a function

$$f = g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_m, \quad (4.3)$$

where g_1, \dots, g_m are elementary functions. Note that this covers the training of DNNs, as sketched in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2) in the introduction. AD methods essentially implement the chain rule: assuming that g_1 and g_2 are two differentiable mappings, their composition is also




Figure 8: Chances of evaluating an activation function at a nonsmooth point for feedforward ReLU Neural Networks of varying number of layers and layer width, for random weights and evaluation points. Probabilities are computed with 10^5 samples.

differentiable, and their Jacobian derivatives⁵ relate as $J_{g_1 \circ g_2}(x) = J_{g_1}(g_2(x))J_{g_2}(x)$. This extends directly to the composition of m functions. Thus, AD methods are guaranteed to exactly compute the derivative $J_f(x)$ as soon as all the elementary functions g_i are differentiable; see e.g., [52] and references therein.

At this stage, one may be lead to give credit to the following statement.

Given any differentiable function f , say with a compositional expression as per Eq. (4.3), an AD method provides the correct derivative at any point.

Again, things are more complex, as illustrated by the following examples.

- Consider the *nonsmooth* function defined by $f(x) = x^+ - \frac{1}{2}(-x)^+$, where $x^+ = \max(0, x)$ denotes the ReLU operator. Then, f is nonsmooth at 0, with Clarke subdifferential $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, but one implementation of AD provides derivative 0 at 0.
- Consider the *smooth* function defined by $f(x) = ((-x)^+ + x) - x^+$. Then, f is the null function, but one implementation of AD provides derivative 1 at 0 [18, Appx A.2].
- To complete the picture, we reproduce in Fig. 8 the experiment of [18], that illustrates that, given a random point x and a feedforward ReLU-based net with random weights, there is a positive probability that some ReLU be evaluated at a nonsmooth point.

We refer to [18, 60, 70] for other problematic examples. The bottom line is this: as soon as a function f contains a nonsmooth component g_i , the output of an AD method need not correspond to the usual derivative, be it the Euclidean gradient when f is smooth, or an element of the Clarke subdifferential when f is nonsmooth.

At this stage, it should be clear that the behavior of AD on functions that feature nonsmooth components is surprisingly not straightforward, and deserves investigation. To address this issue, Bolte and Pauwels introduced in 2020 a theory that formalize AD methods as instances of *Conservative Fields* [18, 19]. One key takeaway is that any definable Conservative Field applied to a definable function returns the gradient of the function almost everywhere; see Th. 8, Coro. 5 and Rem. 11 in [18]. Besides, any convex-valued conservative field contains the Clarke subdifferential. Another notable feature is that the Corollary 4.6 for Clarke's subdifferential extends to conservative fields: Lewis and Tian [72, Th. 2.2] show that, for a conservative field of a function, there exists a Whitney stratification of that function (Definition 3.38) such that, at any point, the conservative field is contained in the sum of the Clarke subdifferential of the function with the normal space to the stratum at that point. Finally, this theory allows to

⁵See Definition A.3.

give convergence guarantees for AD-based implementations of SSM, such as in Pytorch [90] or Tensorflow [1], thus bridging the gap between the convergence result detailed above and actual implementations; see e.g., [18, Th. 4].

In conclusion, the definability of the functions provide a notion of *chain rule* for a variety of notions of derivatives, including the Clarke subdifferential, recall [Chain rule 4.7](#), and AD methods, see e.g., [18, Th. 3] and [19, Coro. 5]. This observation provides theoretical understanding of AD, and guarantees of convergence for AD-based methods, under a realistic set of assumptions on the functions and the algorithms.

5. CONCLUSION

In this expository document, we have discussed ways in which tame geometry provides a good framework for the study of optimization and deep learning: it is both realistic, in that it encompasses current deep-learning architectures, and prolific, in that it allows to develop nontrivial theoretical guarantees that are relevant in practice.

The realism of o-minimality is easy to see, when one considers the composability guarantees in tame geometry. Alternate theoretical frameworks include, in increasing order of realism: convexity, weak convexity, smoothness (typically continuous differentiability with Lipschitz first derivative), subdifferential regularity, and locally Lipschitz continuity. Yet, the activation and loss functions encountered in the training of Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) (see [Table 1](#) and [Remark 3.19](#)) feature nonconvexity and nonsmoothness. Specifically, DNNs are in general not differentiable, so the smoothness assumption does not apply (gradients are discontinuous; think of absolute value), and feature nonsmoothness that cannot be accounted for by a convexity assumption, or any weakened form (e.g., weak convexity, prox-regularity, or even Clarke regularity; think of minus absolute value).

The prolific nature, while not fully realized, yet, is also becoming apparent. While optimization over trigonometric functions, for instance, is not decidable even in the box-constrained case, see e.g., [73, 3.5.5], optimization in tame geometry is computable, at least in the sense of first-order critical points, both in theory and practice. The chain rule on some generalized derivatives enables automatic differentiation in PyTorch or TensorFlow. It is consequently a key component for Deep Learning practice, while at the same time intimately tied to tame geometry. We hope that the prolific nature of o-minimality will spur much future research.

APPENDIX A. SOME FACTS USED IN THE PROOFS OF [SECTION 4](#)

A.1. A geometric property of inner product spaces. We provide a quick geometric fact about projection on subspaces, that is used in the proof of [Corollary 4.6](#).

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a linear subspace, $v \in V$ is a vector, and $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $C \subseteq v + V^\perp$. Then:*

- (1) *if $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then $V \cap C = \{v\}$*
- (2) *if $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then $\|v\| = \text{dist}(0, C)$*

Proof. (1) Write $w \in V \cap C$ as $w = w_V + w_{V^\perp} = w_V$. Since $w \in C$, using the projection formula we may also write $w = v + z_{V^\perp} = v_V + (v_{V^\perp} + z_{V^\perp}) = v_V + z_{V^\perp}$. Thus $w = w_V = v_V = v$.

(2) Let $x \in C$ be arbitrary and take $w \in V^\perp$ such that $x = v + w$. Note that:

$$\|x\|^2 = \|v + w\|^2 = \|v\|^2 + 2(v \cdot w) + \|w\|^2 = \|v\|^2 + \|w\|^2 \geq \|v\|^2.$$

Since $V \cap C \neq \emptyset$, we have $v \in C$ by (1). Thus $\|v\| = \text{dist}(0, C)$. ■

A.2. Differentiability and first-order approximations of continuous curves. In this section, we recall the definition of (Fréchet) differentiability, and prove some basic facts on first-order approximations of nonsmooth continuous curves. The main result is [Lemma A.4](#), used in the proof of [Chain rule 4.7](#).

Throughout this Section, we consider two functions $f, g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where U denotes an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , and a point $x_0 \in U$.

Definition A.2. We say that g is a **first-order approximation** of f at x_0 if $f(x_0) = g(x_0)$ and:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{|f(x) - g(x)|}{|x - x_0|} = 0.$$

The notion “ g is a first-order approximation of f at x_0 ” defines an equivalence relation on \mathbb{R} -valued functions defined on neighborhoods of x_0 in U .

Definition A.3. We say that $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is **(Fréchet) differentiable** at x_0 if there exists a linear map $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $f(x_0) + A(x - x_0)$ is a first-order approximation of f at x_0 . In this case, we define the **Jacobian** $J_f(x_0)$ of f at x_0 as the matrix of the linear mapping A , so that $J_f \cdot d = A(d)$ for every $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$. When $m = 1$, we rather consider the **gradient** $\nabla f(x_0)$ of f at x_0 , defined as the unique vector in \mathbb{R}^n such that $\nabla f(x_0)^T d = A(d)$ for every $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Note that, in particular, f is a first-order approximations of g at x_0 as soon as f and g are differentiable at x_0 , and $f'(x_0) = g'(x_0)$.

We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

Lemma A.4. Consider $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, two curves $x, \gamma : (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If x and γ are continuous at t_0 , x is a first-order approximation of γ at t_0 , and f is locally Lipschitz at $x_0 := x(t_0) = \gamma(t_0)$, then

- (1) $f \circ x$ is a first-order approximation of $f \circ \gamma$ at t_0 (and thus also vice-versa);
- (2) the following are equivalent:
 - (a) $f \circ x$ is differentiable at t_0 ,
 - (b) $f \circ \gamma$ is differentiable at t_0 .

Moreover, if either of the above holds, then $(f \circ x)'(t_0) = (f \circ \gamma)'(t_0)$.

Proof. (1) Let L be a Lipschitz modulus of f around x_0 . Then for t sufficiently close to t_0 , we have: $x(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ are sufficiently close to x_0 (by continuity) and thus we have:

$$\frac{|f(x(t)) - f(\gamma(t))|}{|t - t_0|} \leq \frac{L|x(t) - \gamma(t)|}{|t - t_0|} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow t_0$$

since x is a first-order approximation of γ at t_0 .

(2) If either (a) or (b) holds, then there is a linear map $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x_0) + A(t - t_0)$ is a first-order approximation of both $f \circ x$ and $f \circ \gamma$ at t_0 (using (1) and the fact that first-order approximations are an equivalence relation). This linear map is the derivative of both functions at t_0 . ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 10107056 (Human-compatible AI with Guarantees).

REFERENCES

1. Martín Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, et al., *{TensorFlow}: a system for {Large-Scale} machine learning*, 12th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 16), 2016, pp. 265–283.
2. Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner, *Machine bias*, Ethics of data and analytics, Auerbach Publications, 2022, pp. 254–264.
3. Matthias Aschenbrenner, Lou van den Dries, and Joris van der Hoeven, *Asymptotic differential algebra and model theory of transseries*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 195, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2017. MR 3585498
4. Matthias Aschenbrenner, Lou van den Dries, and Joris van der Hoeven, *Maximal hardy fields*, 2025.
5. Francis Bach, *Learning theory from first principles*, Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2024.
6. Mrinal R. Bachute and Javed M. Subhedar, *Autonomous Driving Architectures: Insights of Machine Learning and Deep Learning Algorithms*, Machine Learning with Applications **6** (2021), 100164.
7. Gilles Bareilles, Johannes Aspmann, Jiri Nemecek, and Jakub Marecek, *Piecewise polynomial regression of tame functions via integer programming*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13544 (2023).
8. Gilles Bareilles, Franck Iutzeler, and Jérôme Malick, *Newton acceleration on manifolds identified by proximal gradient methods*, Mathematical Programming (2022).
9. Amir Beck, *First-Order Methods in Optimization*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, October 2017.
10. Michel Benaim, Josef Hofbauer, and Sylvain Sorin, *Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions, part ii: Applications*, Mathematics of Operations Research **31** (2006), no. 4, 673–695.
11. G. C. Bento, B. S. Mordukhovich, T. S. Mota, and Yu Nesterov, *Convergence of Descent Optimization Algorithms under Polyak-Łojasiewicz-Kurdyka Conditions*, February 2025.
12. Siddharth Bhatore, Lalit Mohan, and Y. Raghu Reddy, *Machine learning techniques for credit risk evaluation: A systematic literature review*, Journal of Banking and Financial Technology **4** (2020), no. 1, 111–138.
13. Pascal Bianchi, Walid Hachem, and Sholom Schechtman, *Convergence of Constant Step Stochastic Gradient Descent for Non-Smooth Non-Convex Functions*, Set-Valued and Variational Analysis **30** (2022), no. 3, 1117–1147.
14. Ricardo Bianconi, *Nondefinability results for expansions of the field of real numbers by the exponential function and by the restricted sine function*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), no. 4, 1173–1178.
15. J. Bochnak, M. Coste, and M.F. Roy, *Real algebraic geometry*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge / A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.
16. Jérôme Bolte, Aris Daniilidis, and Adrian Lewis, *Tame functions are semismooth*, Math. Program. **117** (2009), no. 1-2, 5–19. MR 2421297
17. Jérôme Bolte, Aris Daniilidis, Adrian Lewis, and Masahiro Shiota, *Clarke subgradients of stratifiable functions*, SIAM J. Optim. **18** (2007), no. 2, 556–572. MR 2338451
18. Jérôme Bolte and Edouard Pauwels, *A mathematical model for automatic differentiation in machine learning*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **33** (2020), 10809–10819.
19. ———, *Conservative set valued fields, automatic differentiation, stochastic gradient methods and deep learning*, Mathematical Programming **188** (2021), no. 1, 19–51.
20. ———, *Curiosities and counterexamples in smooth convex optimization*, Mathematical Programming **195** (2022), no. 1, 553–603.
21. Vivek S Borkar, *Stochastic approximation: a dynamical systems viewpoint*, vol. 48, Springer, 2009.
22. Michael Boshernitzan, *Hardy fields and existence of transexponential functions*, Aequationes mathematicae **30** (1986), no. 1, 258–280.
23. Léon Bottou, Frank E. Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal, *Optimization Methods for Large-Scale Machine Learning*, SIAM Review **60** (2018), no. 2, 223–311.
24. Nicolas Boumal, *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, 2023.
25. David Bradley-Williams and Immanuel Halupczok, *Riso-stratifications and a tree invariant: D. bradley-williams, i. halupczok*, Selecta Mathematica **31** (2025), no. 3, 52.
26. Hunter Chase and James Freitag, *Model theory and machine learning*, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic **25** (2019), no. 3, 319–332.
27. Frank H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, January 1990.
28. Gabriel Conant, *Forking and dividing*, <https://www.forkinganddividing.com/>, Accessed: 2025-09-22.
29. Michel Coste, *An introduction to o-minimal geometry*, Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali Pisa, 2000.

30. Didier d'Acunto, *Sur les courbes intégrales du champ de gradient*, Ph.D. thesis, Migration - université en cours d'affectation, December 2001.
31. Damek Davis, Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy, and Liwei Jiang, *Active manifolds, stratifications, and convergence to local minima in nonsmooth optimization*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics (2025), 1–83.
32. Damek Davis, Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy, Sham Kakade, and Jason D. Lee, *Stochastic Subgradient Method Converges on Tame Functions*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **20** (2020), no. 1, 119–154.
33. Jan Denef and Lou van den Dries, *P-adic and real subanalytic sets*, Annals of Mathematics **128** (1988), no. 1, 79–138.
34. Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, *Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding*, 2019.
35. Marc-Antoine Dilhac, Catherine Régis, Christophe Abrassart, Yoshua Bengio, Guillaume Chicoisne, Nathalie De Marcellis-Warin, Sébastien Gambs, Vincent Gautrais, Martin Gibert, Lyse Langlois, François Laviolette, Pascale Lehoux, Jocelyn Maclure, Marie D. Martel, Joëlle Pineau, Peter Railton, Christine Tappolet, and Nathalie Voarino, *Montréal Declaration for a responsible development of artificial intelligence*, (2018).
36. Lou van den Dries, *Remarks on Tarski's problem concerning $(\mathbf{R}, +, \cdot, \exp)$* , Logic colloquium '82 (Florence, 1982), Stud. Logic Found. Math., vol. 112, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 97–121. MR 762106
37. ———, *A generalization of the Tarski-Seidenberg theorem, and some nondefinability results*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **15** (1986), no. 2, 189–193. MR 854552
38. ———, *Tame topology and o-minimal structures*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 248, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. MR 1633348
39. ———, *O-minimal structures and real analytic geometry*, Current developments in mathematics, 1998 (Cambridge, MA), Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 1999, pp. 105–152.
40. Lou van den Dries, Angus Macintyre, and David Marker, *The elementary theory of restricted analytic fields with exponentiation*, Ann. of Math. (2) **140** (1994), no. 1, 183–205. MR 1289495
41. ———, *Logarithmic-exponential power series*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **56** (1997), no. 3, 417–434. MR 1610431
42. Lou van den Dries and Chris Miller, *On the real exponential field with restricted analytic functions*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **85** (1994), 19–56.
43. ———, *Geometric categories and o-minimal structures*, Duke Mathematical Journal **84** (1996), no. 2, 497–540.
44. Lou van den Dries and Patrick Speissegger, *The field of reals with multisummable series and the exponential function*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **81** (2000), no. 3, 513–565.
45. Shiv Ram Dubey, Satish Kumar Singh, and Bidyut Baran Chaudhuri, *Activation functions in deep learning: A comprehensive survey and benchmark*, Neurocomputing **503** (2022), 92–108.
46. John C Duchi and Feng Ruan, *Stochastic methods for composite and weakly convex optimization problems*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **28** (2018), no. 4, 3229–3259.
47. Ryszard Engelking, *General topology*, Sigma series in pure mathematics, vol. 6, Heldermann, Berlin, 1989.
48. Haishuo Fang, Ji-Ung Lee, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, and Iryna Gurevych, *Transformers with learnable activation functions*, 2023.
49. Andrei M Gabrielov, *Projections of semi-analytic sets*, Functional Analysis and its applications **2** (1968), no. 4, 282–291.
50. L. M. Graña Drummond and Y. Peterzil, *The central path in smooth convex semidefinite programs*, Optimization **51** (2002), no. 2, 207–233. MR 1928037
51. Michael Grant, Stephen Boyd, and Yinyu Ye, *Disciplined Convex Programming*, Global Optimization: From Theory to Implementation (Leo Liberti and Nelson Maculan, eds.), Springer US, Boston, MA, 2006, pp. 155–210.
52. Andreas Griewank and Andrea Walther, *Evaluating derivatives: Principles and techniques of algorithmic differentiation*, 2nd ed ed., Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
53. A Grothendieck, *Esquisse d'un programme*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. **1** (1984), 7–48.
54. M. Halická, E. de Klerk, and C. Roos, *On the convergence of the central path in semidefinite optimization*, SIAM J. Optim. **12** (2002), no. 4, 1090–1099. MR 1922510
55. Martin Helmer and Vidit Nanda, *Conormal Spaces and Whitney Stratifications*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **23** (2023), no. 5, 1745–1780.
56. Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel, *Gaussian error linear units (gelus)*, 2016.
57. Jean-Baptiste Hiriart-Urruty and Claude Lemaréchal, *Fundamentals of Convex Analysis*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001.
58. Lê Nguyễn Hoang and El Mahdi El Mhamdi, *Le fabuleux chantier: Rendre l'intelligence artificielle robustement bénéfique*, EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, 2021.

59. A. D. Ioffe, *An invitation to tame optimization*, SIAM J. Optim. **19** (2008), no. 4, 1894–1917. MR 2486055
60. Sham M Kakade and Jason D Lee, *Provably Correct Automatic Sub-Differentiation for Qualified Programs*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
61. Alexander S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR 1321597
62. Julia F. Knight, Anand Pillay, and Charles Steinhorn, *Definable sets in ordered structures. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **295** (1986), no. 2, 593–605. MR 833698
63. Julian Kranz, Davide Gallon, Steffen Dereich, and Arnulf Jentzen, *Sad neural networks: Divergent gradient flows and asymptotic optimality via o-minimal structures*, 2025.
64. Lothar Sebastian Krapp and Laura Wirth, *Measurability in the fundamental theorem of statistical learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10243 (2024).
65. Vladimír Kunc and Jiří Kléma, *Three decades of activations: A comprehensive survey of 400 activation functions for neural networks*, 2024.
66. Krzysztof Kurdyka, Olivier Le Gal, and Xuan Viet Nhan Nguyen, *Tangent cones and C^1 regularity of definable sets*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **457** (2018), no. 1, 978–990. MR 3702738
67. Jean B. Lasserre, *Global Optimization with Polynomials and the Problem of Moments*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **11** (2001), no. 3, 796–817.
68. Jean Bernard Lasserre, *An introduction to polynomial and semi-algebraic optimization*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
69. Olivier Le Gal, *A generic condition implying o-minimality for restricted C^∞ -functions*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **19** (2010), no. 3-4, 479–492. MR 2790804
70. Wonyeol Lee, Hangyeol Yu, Xavier Rival, and Hongseok Yang, *On correctness of automatic differentiation for non-differentiable functions*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **33** (2020), 6719–6730.
71. Adrian S. Lewis and Michael L. Overton, *Nonsmooth optimization via quasi-Newton methods*, Mathematical Programming **141** (2013), no. 1, 135–163.
72. Adrian S. Lewis and Tonghua Tian, *The Structure of Conservative Gradient Fields*, SIAM Journal on Optimization **31** (2021), no. 3, 2080–2083.
73. Leo Liberti, *Undecidability and hardness in mixed-integer nonlinear programming*, RAIRO-Operations Research **53** (2019), no. 1, 81–109.
74. Ta Loi, *Whitney stratification of sets definable in the structure \mathbb{R}_{exp}* , Banach Center Publications **33** (1996), no. 1, 401–409.
75. Ta Lê Loi, *Verdier and strict Thom stratifications in o-minimal structures*, Illinois J. Math. **42** (1998), no. 2, 347–356. MR 1612771
76. Angus Macintyre and Eduardo D Sontag, *Finiteness results for sigmoidal “neural” networks*, Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, 1993, pp. 325–334.
77. Angus Macintyre and A. J. Wilkie, *On the decidability of the real exponential field*, Kreiseliana, A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1996, pp. 441–467. MR 1435773
78. Victor Magron and Jie Wang, *Sparse Polynomial Optimization: Theory and Practice*, Series on Optimization and Its Applications, vol. 05, WORLD SCIENTIFIC (EUROPE), May 2023.
79. Chris Miller, *Expansions of the real field with power functions*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **68** (1994), no. 1, 79–94. MR 1278550
80. ———, *Expansions of the real field with power functions*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **68** (1994), no. 1, 79–94.
81. ———, *Exponentiation is hard to avoid*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **122** (1994), no. 1, 257–259. MR 1195484
82. ———, *Basics of o-minimality and Hardy fields*, Lecture notes on o-minimal structures and real analytic geometry, Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 62, Springer, New York, 2012, pp. 43–69. MR 2976990
83. Aleš Nekvinda and Luděk Zajíček, *A simple proof of the Rademacher theorem*, Časopis pro pěstování matematiky **113** (1988), no. 4, 337–341.
84. Yurii Nesterov, *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, Springer Optimization and Its Applications, vol. 137, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
85. Nhan Nguyen, Saurabh Trivedi, and David Trotman, *A geometric proof of the existence of definable whitney stratifications*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics **58** (2014), no. 2, 381–389.
86. Chigozie Nwankpa, Winifred Ijomah, Anthony Gachagan, and Stephen Marshall, *Activation functions: Comparison of trends in practice and research for deep learning*, CoRR **abs/1811.03378** (2018).
87. Adele Padgett and Patrick Speissegger, *Definability of complex functions in o-minimal structures*, 2025.

88. Adele Lee Padgett, *Sublogarithmic-Transexponential Series*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2022, Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Berkeley. MR 4511519
89. European Parliament, *Artificial Intelligence Act*, 2024.
90. Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer, *Automatic differentiation in PyTorch*, (2017).
91. Anand Pillay and Charles Steinhorn, *Definable sets in ordered structures*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **11** (1984), no. 1, 159–162. MR 741730
92. ———, *Definable sets in ordered structures. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **295** (1986), no. 2, 565–592. MR 833697
93. ———, *Definable sets in ordered structures. III*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **309** (1988), no. 2, 469–476. MR 943306
94. R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J-B Wets, *Variational analysis*, vol. 317, Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
95. Jean-Philippe Rolin, *Establishing the o-minimality for expansions of the real field*, Model theory with applications to algebra and analysis. Vol. 1, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 349, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008, pp. 249–282. MR 2441383
96. ———, *A survey on o-minimal structures*, Real Algebraic Geometry (2011), 105.
97. ———, *Construction of o-minimal structures from quasianalytic classes*, Lecture Notes on O-minimal Structures and Real Analytic Geometry, Springer, 2012, pp. 71–109.
98. Maxwell Rosenlicht, *On the value group of a differential valuation*, American Journal of Mathematics **101** (1979), no. 1, 258–266.
99. Stuart Jonathan Russell, *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*, Viking, New York, 2019.
100. Arthur Sard, *The measure of the critical values of differentiable maps*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **48** (1942), no. 12, 883–890.
101. Abraham Seidenberg, *A new decision method for elementary algebra*, Annals of Mathematics **60** (1954), no. 2, 365–374.
102. Saharon Shelah, *Classification theory: and the number of non-isomorphic models*, vol. 92, Elsevier, 1990.
103. Patrick Speissegger, *The Pfaffian closure of an o-minimal structure*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **508** (1999), 189–211. MR 1676876
104. Alfred Tarski, *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1948. MR 28796
105. Marcus Tressl, *Introduction to o-minimal structures and an application to neural network learning*, Course outline for LMS and EPSRC Short Instructional Course on Model Theory at the University of Leeds (2010).
106. David Trotman, *Stratification theory*, Handbook of geometry and topology of singularities I, Springer, 2020, pp. 243–273.
107. Jie Wang, Victor Magron, and Jean B. Lasserre, *Certifying global optimality of AC-OPF solutions via sparse polynomial optimization*, Electric Power Systems Research **213** (2022), 108683.
108. A. J. Wilkie, *Model completeness results for expansions of the ordered field of real numbers by restricted Pfaffian functions and the exponential function*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 4, 1051–1094. MR 1398816
109. Julio Zamora Esquivel, Adan Cruz Vargas, Rodrigo Camacho Perez, Paulo Lopez Meyer, Hector Cordourier, and Omesh Tickoo, *Adaptive activation functions using fractional calculus*, Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision workshops, 2019, pp. 0–0.