

# Addressing common misinterpretations of KART and UAT in neural network literature

VUGAR E. ISMAILOV

Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics, Baku, Azerbaijan  
 Center for Mathematics and its Applications, Khazar University, Baku, Azerbaijan  
 e-mail: vugaris@mail.ru

**Abstract.** This note addresses the Kolmogorov-Arnold Representation Theorem (KART) and the Universal Approximation Theorem (UAT), focusing on their frequent misinterpretations found in the neural network literature. Our remarks aim to support a more accurate understanding of KART and UAT among neural network specialists. In addition, we explore the minimal number of neurons required for universal approximation, showing that the same number of neurons needed for exact representation of functions in KART-based networks also suffices for standard multilayer perceptrons in the context of approximation.

*Mathematics Subject Classifications:* 26B40, 41A30, 41A63, 68T05

*Keywords:* Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem, universal approximation theorem.

## Introduction

The increasing integration of neural networks into various fields of science and engineering has sparked significant interest in the theoretical foundations of approximation by these networks. Two central results in this context are the Kolmogorov-Arnold Representation Theorem (KART) and the Universal Approximation Theorem (UAT), both of which provide essential insights into the capacity of neural networks to approximate complicated multivariate functions. However, numerous works in the literature exhibit misunderstandings concerning the scope and limitations of these theorems.

In recent years, KART has gained considerable attention following the emergence of Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KAN), which are based on the principles established in KART. Despite their practical successes, the full implications of KART are often misunderstood or misrepresented in the literature. One major misconception is that the original KART applies to continuous functions defined on arbitrary bounded sets of the  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space, or even to all multivariate functions. Another common misunderstanding is that UAT always requires increasing the number of neurons to achieve greater approximation accuracy.

In this paper, we aim to address these misconceptions, presenting a generalization of KART that extends its applicability to discontinuous functions on the unit cube, as well as to multivariate functions (both continuous and discontinuous) defined on bounded sets beyond the unit cube. Although many works in the literature treat such extensions as if

they follow directly from the original KART, this is not the case. The original theorem applies only to continuous functions on the unit cube or, more generally, on compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The broader claims found in the literature are valid only in light of the generalization we established in our recent works — yet these claims are often incorrectly attributed to the original KART, rather than to the extended framework introduced in [15] and [17].

Furthermore, we challenge the prevailing notion that the number of hidden neurons required in neural networks always depends on the approximation error. In contrast to this belief, we show that for certain types of activation functions, a fixed number of neurons can achieve arbitrary approximation accuracy for all continuous functions.

The question of the minimum number of neurons required for universal approximation is also addressed in this paper. We show that the bounds on number of neurons required for exact representation of functions in KART-based networks also apply to standard multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) with smooth activation functions in the context of approximation, thereby providing a clearer picture of the relationship between KART-based networks and MLPs. While these bounds are known to be minimal in KART-based networks, we conjecture that they are also minimal for MLPs.

In summary, this paper seeks to provide a clearer and more accurate understanding of KART, UAT, and their applications in neural network theory. By addressing critical misconceptions and offering new theoretical insights, we aim to support more rigorous and informed use of these foundational results in future studies.

**Our contributions.** The main contributions of this paper are:

- A rigorous generalization of KART, showing that its representation power extends to all multivariate functions on bounded domains, including discontinuous ones (Theorem 1 and Corollary 1).
- Clarification of the dimensional limitations of UAT for single-hidden-layer networks, emphasizing that fixed-width universality holds only in the univariate case (Theorems 2, 3).
- Proving that single-hidden-layer networks with just one hidden neuron can approximate any continuous univariate function (Theorem 4).
- A new universality result for deep networks with fixed weights, establishing an explicit hidden neuron bound of  $3d + 1$ , sufficient for universal approximation (Theorem 6).
- A conjecture on the minimal neuron count required for universality in multivariate settings.

We stress again that these results are theoretical in nature, intending to clarify widespread misconceptions concerning KART and UAT, while establishing broader domains for KART-based networks and providing explicit neuron-count bounds for MLPs that may guide future applied research.

## Remark 1: Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem

The Kolmogorov-Arnold Representation Theorem (KART) is important for understanding the theoretical potential of neural networks. It states that for the unit cube  $\mathbb{I}^n$ ,  $\mathbb{I} = [0, 1]$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , there exist  $n(2n + 1)$  universal, continuous, one-variable functions  $\varphi_{q,p}(x_p)$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, 2n + 1$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, n$ , such that each function  $f \in C(\mathbb{I}^n)$  admits the precise representation

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi_q\left(\sum_{p=1}^n \varphi_{q,p}(x_p)\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\Phi_q$  are continuous one-variable functions depending on  $f$  (see [21]).

Formula (1) describes a feedforward neural network with the following structure:

- **Input Layer:** This layer has  $n$  neurons, which receive input signals  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ ;
- **First Hidden Layer:** This layer consists of  $n(2n + 1)$  neurons. The  $(q, p)$ -th neuron  $y_{q,p}$  ( $1 \leq q \leq 2n + 1$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq n$ ) produces an output  $\varphi_{q,p}(x_p)$ , where  $\varphi_{q,p}$  represents the activation function applied to the input  $x_p$ ;
- **Second Hidden Layer:** This layer consists of  $2n + 1$  neurons. Each neuron  $z_q$  ( $1 \leq q \leq 2n + 1$ ) in this layer produces an output  $\Phi_q\left(\sum_{p=1}^n y_{q,p}\right)$ , where  $\Phi_q$  represents the activation function applied to the sum of certain outputs from the previous layer;
- **Output Layer:** This layer has a single neuron that sums up the outputs from the second hidden layer to produce the final output  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

Thus, KART shows that every continuous multivariate function can be implemented by a feedforward neural network. It is important to address a common misinterpretation of KART found in various articles. For instance, the recent influential paper [25] introducing Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs), which are inspired by KART, states: “In a sense, KART showed that the only true multivariate function is addition, since every other function can be written using univariate functions and sum”. This or similar misinterpretations are also evident in other literature related to KANs. For example, the following sentences illustrate this misunderstanding:

(a) “This theorem tells us that any multivariate function can essentially be decomposed into the sum of functions of sums” [3].

(b) “This formulation demonstrates that multivariate functions can fundamentally be reduced to a suitably defined composition of univariate functions, where the composition only involves simple addition” [20].

(c) “This implies that addition is the only true multivariate operation, while other multivariate operations (including multiplication) can be expressed as additions combined with univariate functions” [26].

There are many other papers erroneously formulating KART for arbitrary multivariate functions (see, e.g., [4, 6, 30]).

However, it is essential to note that while the *original KART* guarantees representation for continuous multivariate functions, it does not necessarily encompass discontinuous multivariate functions. For example, KART cannot be applied to all multivariate operations as mentioned in (c) above, since such operations may include division, which is not continuous.

But can the remarkable formula (1) in KART be *extended* to discontinuous multivariate functions? The answer is, fortunately, yes. A rigorous proof of this extension can be found in [15]. Thus, while the above statements are accurate, they do not follow from the original KART; rather, the broader applicability to discontinuous functions follows from the main result of [15].

Note that the latest generalization of KART not only encompasses all multivariate functions (both continuous and discontinuous) but also replaces the outer functions  $\Phi_q$  with a single function  $\Phi$ , which inherits continuity and boundedness properties of  $f$ . More precisely, the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 1.** [17] *Assume  $n \geq 2$  is a given integer and  $\mathbb{I} = [0, 1]$ . There exist universal, continuous, one-variable functions  $\varphi_{q,p}$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, 2n + 1$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, n$ , such that each  $n$ -variable function  $f : \mathbb{I}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (not necessarily continuous) can be precisely expressed in the form*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi\left(\sum_{p=1}^n \varphi_{q,p}(x_p)\right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\Phi$  is a one-variable function depending on  $f$ . If  $f$  is continuous, then  $\Phi$  can be chosen to be continuous as well, if  $f$  is discontinuous and bounded, then  $\Phi$  is also discontinuous and bounded. If  $f$  is unbounded, then  $\Phi$  is also unbounded.

Note that  $\varphi_{q,p}(x_p)$  in (2) can be replaced by a family of functions of simpler structure. Namely, instead of  $\varphi_{q,p}(x_p)$  one can take  $\lambda_p \varphi(x_p + aq)$ , where  $\varphi$  is a single fixed continuous function,  $\lambda_p$  and  $a$  are the explicitly given real numbers (see [32] and [17]). Note also that Theorem 1 is valid not only for the unit cube  $[0, 1]^n$  but for any closed cube  $[a, b]^n$ .

**Generalization to domains different from the unit cube:** There are a large number of papers erroneously formulating KART for continuous multivariate functions defined on bounded domains. The following formulation is taken from [7]:

(F1) “Specifically, if  $f$  is a continuous function on a bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then there exist continuous functions  $\varphi_{ij}$  and  $\psi_i$  such that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{2n+1} \psi_i\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{ij}(x_j)\right),$$

where  $\varphi_{ij} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\psi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .”

The same formulation for  $f$  on a bounded domain is given in the papers [13, 22, 24, 33].

However, the original KART can only be applied to continuous functions defined on compact sets. The procedure for such a generalization is as follows: Assume  $K$  is a compact

set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $S$  is a closed cube of the form  $[-a, a]^n$  containing  $K$ . By the Tietze extension theorem [34, Theorem 15.8], any  $f \in C(K)$  can be continuously extended to  $S$ . Denote this extension by  $F$ . Since KART holds for  $F$  on  $S$ , it also holds for  $f$  on  $K$ .

The situation with a bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is completely different. Although  $D$  can be embedded into a closed cube  $S$ , not every function  $f \in C(D)$  can be continuously extended to  $S$ . Consider, for example, the function  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1 x_2 x_3^{-1}$  on the open set  $D = (0, 1)^3$ , which is a bounded domain. This function cannot be continuously extended to any closed cube  $S$  containing  $D$ . Therefore, any extension of  $f$  to  $S$ , denoted here by  $F$ , would necessarily be discontinuous (and also unbounded). Clearly, we cannot apply the original KART to  $F$ ; hence we cannot apply it to  $f$ .

However, the statement in (F1) is valid. Although it does not follow from the original KART, as erroneously indicated in the papers [7, 13, 22, 24, 33] and many other articles (which we do not mention here), this statement easily follows from Theorem 1 above by applying Theorem 1 to any (not necessarily continuous) extension of  $f$  to a closed cube  $S$  containing  $D$ . We therefore formulate this as a corollary to Theorem 1.

**Corollary 1.** *Assume  $D$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ . There exist universal continuous functions  $\varphi_{q,p} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, 2n+1$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, n$ , such that each  $n$ -variable function  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (not necessarily continuous) can be precisely expressed in the form*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi\left(\sum_{p=1}^n \varphi_{q,p}(x_p)\right),$$

where  $\Phi$  is a one-variable function depending on  $f$ .

## Remark 2: Single-hidden-layer networks

Our second remark is about the universal approximation property of single-hidden-layer neural networks. Such networks with  $n$  units in the hidden layer and input  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  compute a function of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \sigma(\mathbf{w}^i \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_i), \quad (3)$$

where the *weights*  $\mathbf{w}^i$  are vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the *thresholds*  $\theta_i$  and the *coefficients*  $c_i$  are real numbers and the *activation function*  $\sigma$  is a real one-variable function. The Universal Approximation Theorem (UAT) plays an essential role in neural network theory. This theorem says that single-hidden-layer feedforward neural networks are capable of approximating all continuous multivariate functions on compact subsets of the  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space with arbitrary accuracy. That is, for a given activation function  $\sigma$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , any compact subset  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any continuous function  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  there exist  $n(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{w}^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$\theta_i, c_i \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \left| f(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n(\epsilon)} c_i \sigma(\mathbf{w}^i \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_i) \right| < \epsilon.$$

The UAT holds for various classes of activation functions  $\sigma$  and many methods have been developed to prove it. For a brief overview of some of these methods, see [16]. Notably, the most general result in this area is due to Leshno, Lin, Pinkus and Schocken [23], who proved that single-hidden-layer neural networks with a continuous activation function  $\sigma$  have the universal approximation property if and only if  $\sigma$  is not a polynomial.

Many papers discussing and reviewing UAT emphasize that the number of hidden units  $n(\epsilon)$  always depends on the approximation tolerance  $\epsilon$ . That is, if we want to approximate continuous functions with arbitrarily small precision, we necessarily need a large number of hidden neurons. For example, the paper [1], published by IEEE, states: “Neural networks have the universal approximation property with respect to continuous functions, i.e., the ability to approximate arbitrarily correctly any continuous function, given that they have sufficiently many hidden neurons. While this result holds in principle, in practice, the required number of neurons may be excessively large”.

There are hundreds of other papers in the literature stating that UAT holds for single-hidden-layer networks, provided that the hidden layer can contain arbitrarily many neurons (i.e., its width is unrestricted).

But should the number of units  $n(\epsilon)$  really depend on  $\epsilon$ ? Actually, all known proofs for UAT are designed to validate this dependence. However, is there any rigorous proof that UAT does not hold for shallow networks with a fixed number of hidden units, implying that  $n(\epsilon)$  must necessarily depend on  $\epsilon$ ?

Such a mathematical proof can be found in [14, Section 5]. It was shown there that for  $d > 1$ , and for any natural  $N$ , single-hidden-layer networks with at most  $N$  hidden units cannot approximate all continuous  $d$ -variable functions with arbitrary precision. Conversely, it was shown that for  $d = 1$ , the situation is drastically different. Specifically, in this case, for certain activation functions and for any natural  $N$ , single-hidden-layer networks with at most  $N$  hidden units can approximate all continuous univariate functions with arbitrary precision. Hence, in this case,  $n(\epsilon)$  does not depend on  $\epsilon$ . Specifically, the following two theorems are valid.

**Theorem 2.** [14] *For any positive number  $\alpha$ , there is a  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , almost monotone, sigmoidal activation function  $\sigma_\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following property: For any finite closed interval  $[a, b]$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  and any  $f \in C[a, b]$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist three real numbers  $c_0$ ,  $c_1$  and  $\theta$  for which*

$$\left| f(x) - c_1 \sigma_\alpha \left( \frac{\alpha}{b-a} x - \theta \right) - c_0 \right| < \varepsilon$$

*for all  $x \in [a, b]$ .*

**Theorem 3.** [14] *Assume  $d \geq 2$ . For any continuous function  $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there is a  $d$ -variable continuous function which cannot be approximated arbitrarily well by neural*

networks of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \sigma(\mathbf{w}^i \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_i),$$

where we vary over all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $c_i, \theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{w}^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , but the number of pairwise independent vectors (weights)  $\mathbf{w}^i$  in each network is uniformly bounded by some positive integer  $k$  (which is the same for all networks).

Note that in Theorem 2, the parameters  $c_0$ ,  $c_1$  and  $\theta$  can be determined algorithmically for any Lipschitz continuous function  $f$  (see [10]). It follows from Theorems 2 and 3 that if the number of hidden neurons  $n$  is fixed, then UAT holds if and only if the space dimension  $d = 1$ .

For some nonsigmoidal activation functions Theorem 2 takes simpler form, in which  $c_0 = 0$  and  $c_1 = 1$ . More precisely, the following theorem is valid.

**Theorem 4.** *For any positive number  $\alpha$ , there is an infinitely differentiable activation function  $\sigma_\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for any finite closed interval  $[a, b]$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  and any  $f \in C[a, b]$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a real number  $\theta$  for which*

$$\left| f(x) - \sigma_\alpha \left( \frac{\alpha}{b-a} x - \theta \right) \right| < \varepsilon$$

for all  $x \in [a, b]$ .

**Proof.** We first consider the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\alpha$  be any positive real number. Divide the interval  $[\alpha, +\infty)$  into the segments  $[\alpha, 2\alpha]$ ,  $[2\alpha, 3\alpha]$ , .... Let  $\{p_n(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be the sequence of polynomials with rational coefficients defined on  $[0, 1]$ . Note that this sequence is dense in  $C[0, 1]$ . We construct  $\sigma_\alpha$  in two stages. In the first stage, we define  $\sigma_\alpha$  on the closed intervals  $[(2m-1)\alpha, 2m\alpha]$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  as the function

$$\sigma_\alpha(t) = p_m \left( \frac{t}{\alpha} - 2m + 1 \right), \quad t \in [(2m-1)\alpha, 2m\alpha],$$

or equivalently,

$$\sigma_\alpha(\alpha t + (2m-1)\alpha) = p_m(t), \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (4)$$

In the second stage, we extend  $\sigma_\alpha$  to the intervals  $(2m\alpha, (2m+1)\alpha)$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $(-\infty, \alpha)$ , maintaining the  $C^\infty$  property.

For any univariate function  $h \in C[0, 1]$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a polynomial  $p_m(t)$  with rational coefficients such that

$$|h(t) - p_m(t)| < \varepsilon,$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This together with (4) imply that for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$|h(t) - \sigma_\alpha(\alpha t - s)| < \varepsilon, \quad (5)$$

where  $s = (1 - 2m)\alpha$ .

Using linear transformation it is not difficult to go from  $[0, 1]$  to any finite closed interval  $[a, b]$ . Indeed, let  $f \in C[a, b]$ ,  $\sigma_\alpha$  be constructed as above and  $\varepsilon$  be an arbitrarily small positive number. The transformed function  $h(t) = f(a + (b - a)t)$  is well defined on  $[0, 1]$  and we can apply the inequality (5). Now using the inverse transformation  $t = \frac{x-a}{b-a}$ , we can write that

$$|f(x) - \sigma_\alpha(wx - \theta)| < \varepsilon,$$

for all  $x \in [a, b]$ , where  $w = \frac{\alpha}{b-a}$  and  $\theta = \frac{\alpha a}{b-a} + s$ .

### Remark 3: Deep neural networks

Regarding the universal approximation theorem for deep neural networks, it is widely believed and emphasized in many studies that achieving a high degree of accuracy in approximating multivariate functions requires large networks with a sufficient number of hidden neurons. For example, the well-known book *Deep learning* by Goodfellow, Bengio and Courville [8] states that “there exists a neural network large enough to achieve any degree of accuracy we desire, but the universal approximation theorem does not say how large this network will be” (see Chapter 6.4.1, Universal Approximation Properties and Depth in [8]). Similar statements can be found in many other books and articles.

However, there exist neural networks with very few hidden neurons that can approximate all continuous multivariate functions arbitrarily well. Moreover, the number of hidden neurons required does not depend on the desired approximation accuracy and can be determined precisely in advance. For example, for  $d$ -variable continuous functions, this number can be as small as  $3d + 2$  neurons distributed in two hidden layers. Furthermore, this property holds even if all the weights are fixed. This means that for certain activation functions, fixed weights and very few hidden neurons are sufficient to achieve the universal approximation property. More precisely, the following theorem holds:

**Theorem 5.** [11] *One can algorithmically construct an infinitely differentiable, almost monotone sigmoidal activation function  $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following property: For any natural number  $d \geq 2$ , any continuous function  $f$  on the unit cube  $[0, 1]^d$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist constants  $e_p$ ,  $c_{pq}$ ,  $\theta_{pq}$  and  $\zeta_p$  such that the inequality*

$$\left| f(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{p=1}^{2d+2} e_p \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d c_{pq} \sigma(\mathbf{w}^q \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_{pq}) - \zeta_p \right) \right| < \varepsilon$$

*holds for all  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [a, b]^d$ . Here the weights  $\mathbf{w}^q$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, d$ , are fixed as follows:*

$$\mathbf{w}^1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad \mathbf{w}^2 = (0, 1, \dots, 0), \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{w}^d = (0, 0, \dots, 1).$$

*In addition, all the coefficients  $e_p$ , except one, are equal.*

For detailed instructions on how to construct such activation functions  $\sigma$  in practice and prove their universal approximation property, consult [11] and [14]. It should be remarked that Maiorov and Pinkus [28] were the first to show that there exists an activation function for which  $9d + 3$  neurons in the hidden layers of a two-hidden-layer network are sufficient to approximate any continuous  $d$ -variable function arbitrarily well. Their proposed activation function is sigmoidal, strictly increasing, and analytic; however, they do not provide a feasible method for its practical computation.

Recall that shallow networks with any fixed number of hidden neurons cannot approximate  $d$ -variable continuous functions if  $d \geq 2$  (see Remark 2).

Note that for some nonsigmoidal activation functions, the number of hidden neurons in the second hidden layer can be further reduced and coincide with the number of outer terms in KART.

**Theorem 6.** *There exists an infinitely differentiable activation function  $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the property: For any natural number  $d \geq 2$ , any continuous function  $f$  on the unit cube  $[0, 1]^d$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist constants  $\lambda_q$ ,  $\theta_p$  and  $\zeta$ , for which the inequality*

$$\left| f(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q \sigma(\mathbf{w}^q \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_p) - \zeta \right) \right| < \varepsilon$$

holds for all  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ . Here the weights  $\mathbf{w}^q$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, d$ , are fixed as follows:

$$\mathbf{w}^1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad \mathbf{w}^2 = (0, 1, \dots, 0), \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{w}^d = (0, 0, \dots, 1).$$

**Proof.** We use the following version of KART, attributed to Lorentz [27] and Sprecher [31]: For the unit cube  $[0, 1]^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , there exist constants  $\lambda_q > 0$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $\sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q = 1$ , and nondecreasing continuous functions  $h_p: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, 2d + 1$ , such that every continuous function  $f: [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  admits the representation

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} g \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q h_p(x_q) \right) \quad (6)$$

for some  $g \in C[0, 1]$  depending on  $f$ .

Assume we are given an arbitrary continuous function  $f$  on  $[0, 1]^d$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $g$  be the outer function in (6). By Theorem 4, there exists a smooth activation function  $\sigma := \sigma_\alpha|_{\alpha=1}$  such that

$$|g(t) - \sigma(t - \zeta)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2(2d + 1)}, \quad (7)$$

for some  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$  and all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Taking into account (7) in (6), we obtain that

$$\left| f(x_1, \dots, x_d) - \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q h_p(x_q) - \zeta \right) \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad (8)$$

for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ .

Again, by Theorem 4, for each  $p = 1, 2, \dots, 2d+1$ , and any  $\delta > 0$  there exists a constant  $\theta_p$  such that

$$|h_p(x_q) - \sigma(x_q - \theta_p)| < \delta, \quad (9)$$

for all  $x_q \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $\lambda_q > 0$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $\sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q = 1$ , it follows from (9) that

$$\left| \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q h_p(x_q) - \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q \sigma(x_q - \theta_p) \right| < \delta, \quad (10)$$

for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ .

Now since the function  $\sigma(t - \zeta)$  is uniformly continuous on every closed interval, we can choose  $\delta$  to be sufficiently small, and from (10), we obtain that

$$\left| \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q h_p(x_q) - \zeta \right) - \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q \sigma(x_q - \theta_p) - \zeta \right) \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (11)$$

It follows from (8) and (11) that

$$\left| f(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{p=1}^{2d+1} \sigma \left( \sum_{q=1}^d \lambda_q \sigma(\mathbf{w}^q \cdot \mathbf{x} - \theta_p) - \zeta \right) \right| < \varepsilon,$$

where  $\mathbf{w}^q$  is the  $q$ -th coordinate vector. The theorem has been proved.

Note that Theorems 5 and 6 hold for any compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , as KART is valid not only for the unit cube but for compact sets in general.

#### **Remark 4: Minimum number of neurons for universal approximation**

In the theory of deep neural networks, the problem of determining the minimum width that guarantees the universality of networks has recently gained considerable attention from researchers. See, e.g., [5, 29], for an extensive collection of references and comparisons of various results. These results primarily focus on a critical threshold for the width that allows deep neural networks to be universal approximators. However, none of these results address the problem of finding the minimum number of neurons required to ensure universality.

In machine learning, the question often arises: how many neurons should be in a fully connected layer of a neural network to solve a given problem correctly? Investigating this question, [2], in particular, writes that for fully connected networks, KART provides an answer: specifically, KART shows that for a two-hidden-layer network, the minimum number of neurons required in the second layer is  $2N_{in} + 1$ , where  $N_{in}$  is the input dimension,  $N_{out} = 1$  is the output dimension. However, KART proposes a specific neural network structure that differs from traditional multilayer feedforward networks. Fortunately, the question of whether this holds true for conventional MLPs (multilayer perceptrons) is answered affirmatively, as shown in Theorem 6. Moreover, the activation function in this theorem is ultimately smooth, which contrasts with the activation functions in KART-induced networks, where the inner activation functions  $\varphi_{q,p}$  can be at most from the Lipschitz class  $Lip(1)$  (see [14, Chapter 4] for discussions and references).

Theorem 4 above directly implies that *the minimal number of hidden neurons needed for neural networks to approximate any continuous univariate function is exactly 1*. The situation with continuous multivariate functions is more complex, but based on Sternfeld’s results on the minimal number of terms in KART, we conjecture that Theorem 6, in particular, establishes the minimum number of neurons for universal approximation. For an overview of Sternfeld’s results concerning KART, see [19, Chapter 1].

**Conjecture.** *For a deep network with  $d$  inputs ( $d > 1$ ) and a single output, the minimum number of hidden neurons required to ensure universality is  $3d + 1$ . More precisely, neural networks with fewer than  $3d + 1$  hidden neurons cannot approximate  $d$ -variable continuous functions with arbitrary precision.*

**Comparison with related results.** The problem of determining the minimal width  $w_{\min}$  required for universal approximation has been the subject of several studies. Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  be compact, and consider continuous target functions with values in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Some representative results include the following.

Hanin and Sellke [12] showed that for ReLU networks approximating functions in  $C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$ , the minimal width is  $w_{\min} = d_x + 1$ . Park, Yun, Lee, and Shin [29] extended this to vector-valued functions in  $C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , proving that ReLU+STEP networks require  $w_{\min} = \max(d_x + 1, d_y)$ . More generally, Cai [5] established that for arbitrary activation functions,  $w_{\min} \geq \max(d_x, d_y)$ , and for ReLU+FLOOR networks one has  $w_{\min} = \max(d_x, d_y, 2)$ . Gripenberg [9] showed that if the activation function is twice differentiable at some point with nonzero second derivative, then  $w_{\min} \leq d_x + d_y + 2$ . Johnson [18] proved that for functions in  $C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$ , when the activation function is uniformly continuous and can be approximated by a sequence of one-to-one functions, one has  $w_{\min} \geq d_x + 1$ .

All of the above results require networks of arbitrarily large depth. By contrast, within the framework of this paper, Theorem 6 shows that universal approximation for functions in  $C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$  can already be achieved by networks of *fixed depth* (depth = 3) and width  $2d_x + 1$ . This establishes the upper bound  $w_{\min} \leq 2d_x + 1$  in the fixed-depth setting. In particular, for  $d_x = 1$ , Theorem 4 shows that  $w_{\min} = 1$ . Moreover, we conjecture that the exact minimal width for  $d_x > 1$  is  $w_{\min} = 2d_x + 1$ . We also note that the earlier result of Maierov and Pinkus [28] required width  $6d_x + 3$  at depth 3 for functions in  $C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$ ,

showing that our construction improves this bound.

Table 1: Summary of minimum width of neural networks that have the UAP

Functions	Activation	Minimum width	References
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$	ReLU (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} = d_x + 1$	Hanin and Sellke [12]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU+STEP (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} = \max(d_x + 1, d_y)$	Park et al. [29]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	Arbitrary (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} \geq \max(d_x, d_y)$	Cai [5]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	ReLU+FLOOR (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} = \max(d_x, d_y, 2)$	Cai [5]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	$C^2$ at some $z$ with $\sigma''(z) \neq 0$ (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} \leq d_x + d_y + 2$	Gripenberg [9]
$C([0, 1]^{d_x}, \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$	Uniformly continuous, approximable by one-to-one functions (arbitrarily large depth)	$w_{\min} \geq d_x + 1$	Johnson [18]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$	Specific analytic sigmoidal (depth = 3)	$w_{\min} \leq 6d_x + 3$	Maierov and Pinkus [28]
$C(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$	Specific $C^\infty$ (depth = 3)	$w_{\min} \leq 2d_x + 1$	<b>Ours</b> (Thm. 6)
$C([a, b], \mathbb{R})$	Specific $C^\infty$ (depth = 2)	$w_{\min} = 1$	<b>Ours</b> (Thm. 4)

*Note:* The minimal width bounds listed in the table for networks of fixed depth (2 or 3) also apply to deeper networks, as additional layers cannot increase  $w_{\min}$  and may only reduce it.

## Conclusion

In this note, we have addressed the growing misinterpretations related to the Kolmogorov-Arnold Representation Theorem (KART) and the Universal Approximation Theorem (UAT) in the context of neural network approximation. We highlighted the importance of correctly understanding the scope and limitations of KART — particularly in distinguishing its actual implications for continuous functions from the widespread misconceptions that arise when treating the theorem as if it were originally proven for arbitrary multivariate functions or for continuous functions defined on arbitrary bounded domains, which is not the case. We also discussed UAT, focusing on the number of hidden neurons required for

approximating continuous functions with arbitrary precision, and we provided a clearer understanding on how this number may depend on the dimension of the input layer. By addressing these common and frequent misconceptions, which have become increasingly prevalent in the current literature, we aim to encourage a more accurate and rigorous use of KART, UAT, and their refinements and generalizations in future research.

We also addressed a related but distinct question: what is the minimum number of neurons required to ensure the universality of deep neural networks? While much of the recent literature concentrates on the minimal width necessary for universal approximation, we examined the problem from the perspective of neuron count. Building on KART and the structural properties it suggests, we showed — through Theorem 6 — that the same number of neurons required for exact representation of functions in KART-based networks also applies to standard multilayer perceptrons in the context of universal approximation. Importantly, this holds even when the activation functions are smooth, unlike in KART, where only Lipschitz continuous activations are used.

For univariate functions, Theorem 4 confirms that only one hidden neuron is needed to achieve universality. In the multivariate case, drawing from Sternfeld’s analysis of KART, we proposed a conjecture: a network with fewer than  $3d + 1$  hidden neurons cannot approximate arbitrary continuous functions of  $d$  variables. This observation suggests a natural lower bound that complements existing results on width and offers a new understanding of the architecture of universal approximators.

**Practical relevance.** Although our results are primarily theoretical, they also carry practical significance. First, the constructive aspects of Theorems 2, 4, 5, and 6 provide explicit neuron counts and fixed-weight constructions that can guide future implementations. Second, the demonstrated generality (including discontinuous and unbounded functions) highlights the expressive power of KART-based networks, which may motivate new variants and extensions of KANs. Finally, we note that even the original KART required decades before it found practical realization in neural architectures. In the same spirit, our results, especially the generalization of KART to all possible functions, should be viewed as establishing a rigorous theoretical foundation on which future practical advances can be built, rather than as immediately implementable methods.

## Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments and constructive suggestions, which have improved the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

## References

- [1] P. Andras, High-dimensional function approximation with neural networks for large volumes of data, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.* **29** (2018), no. 2, 500–508.

- [2] O. I. Bergardt, Minimum number of neurons in fully connected layers of a given neural network (the first approximation), arXiv preprint, arXiv:2405.14147, 2024.
- [3] Z. Bozorgasl, H. Chen, Wav-KAN: Wavelet Kolmogorov-Arnold networks, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2405.12832, 2024.
- [4] R. Bresson, G. Nikolentzos, G. Panagopoulos, M. Chatzianastasis, J. Pang, M. Vazirgiannis, KAGNNs: Kolmogorov-Arnold networks meet graph learning, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.18380, 2024.
- [5] Y. Cai, Achieve the minimum width of neural networks for universal approximation, in The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, 2023.
- [6] G. De Carlo, A. Mastropietro, A. Anagnostopoulos, Kolmogorov-Arnold graph neural networks, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.18354, 2024.
- [7] C. Dong, L. Zheng, W. Chen, Kolmogorov-Arnold networks (KAN) for time series classification and robust analysis. In: Sheng, Q.Z., et al. Advanced Data Mining and Applications. ADMA 2024. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 15390 (2025). Springer, Singapore.
- [8] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, A. Courville, *Deep learning*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016.
- [9] G. Gripenberg, Approximation by neural networks with a bounded number of nodes at each level, *J. Approx. Theory* **122** (2003), no. 2, 260-266.
- [10] N. J. Guliyev, V. E. Ismailov, A single hidden layer feedforward network with only one neuron in the hidden layer can approximate any univariate function, *Neural Comput.* **28** (2016), no. 7, 1289–1304.
- [11] N. J. Guliyev, V. E. Ismailov, Approximation capability of two hidden layer feedforward neural networks with fixed weights, *Neurocomputing* **316** (2018), 262–269.
- [12] B. Hanin and M. Sellke, Approximating continuous functions by ReLU nets of minimal width, arXiv preprint, arXiv:1710.11278v2, 2018.
- [13] A. D. M. Ibrahim, Z. Shang, J.-E. Hong, How resilient are Kolmogorov–Arnold networks in classification tasks? A robustness investigation, *Appl. Sci.* **14** (2024), 10173.
- [14] V. E. Ismailov, *Ridge functions and applications in neural networks*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 263, American Mathematical Society, 2021, 186 pp.
- [15] V. E. Ismailov, A three layer neural network can represent any multivariate function, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **523** (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 127096, 8 pp.
- [16] V. E. Ismailov, Approximation error of single hidden layer neural networks with fixed weights, *Inform. Processing Lett.* **185** (2024), Paper No. 106467

- [17] A. Ismayilova, V. E. Ismailov, On the Kolmogorov neural networks, *Neural Netw.* **176** (2024), Paper No. 106333.
- [18] J. Johnson, Deep, skinny neural networks are not universal approximators, In: International Conference on Learning Representations, 2019.
- [19] S. Ya. Khavinson, *Best approximation by linear superpositions (approximate nomography)*, Translated from the Russian manuscript by D. Khavinson. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 159. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, 175 pp.
- [20] M. Kiamari, M. Kiamari, B. Krishnamachari, GKAN: Graph Kolmogorov-Arnold networks, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.06470, 2024.
- [21] A. N. Kolmogorov, On the representation of continuous functions of many variables by superposition of continuous functions of one variable and addition. (Russian), *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **114** (1957), 953–956.
- [22] N. Le, A. P. Ngo, H. T. Nguyen, Kolmogorov-Arnold networks for supervised learning tasks in smart grids, 56th North American Power Symposium (NAPS), El Paso, TX, USA, 2024, 1-6.
- [23] M. Leshno, V. Ya. Lin, A. Pinkus, S. Schocken, Multilayer feedforward networks with a non-polynomial activation function can approximate any function, *Neural Netw.* **6** (1993), 861–867.
- [24] M. Liu, D. Geibler, D. Nshimiyimana, S. Bian, B. Zhou, P. Lukowicz, Initial investigation of Kolmogorov-Arnold networks (KANs) as feature extractors for IMU based human activity recognition, Companion of the 2024 on ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, 2024, 500-506.
- [25] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, S. Vaidya, F. Ruehle, J. Halverson, M. Soljačić, T. Y. Hou, M. Tegmark, KAN: Kolmogorov-Arnold networks, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2404.19756, 2024.
- [26] Z. Liu, P. Ma, Y. Wang, W. Matusik, M. Tegmark, KAN 2.0: Kolmogorov-Arnold networks meet science, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2408.10205, 2024.
- [27] G. G. Lorentz, Metric entropy, widths, and superpositions of functions. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **69** (1962), 469–485.
- [28] V. Maiorov, A. Pinkus, Lower bounds for approximation by MLP neural networks, *Neurocomputing* **25** (1999), 81–91.
- [29] S. Park, C. Yun, J. Lee, J. Shin, Minimum width for universal approximation, In International Conference on Learning Representations, 2021.

- [30] Y. Peng, Y. Wang, F. Hu, M. He, Z. Mao, X. Huang, J. Ding, Predictive modeling of flexible EHD pumps using Kolmogorov–Arnold Networks, *Biomimetic Intell. Robot.* **4** (2024), Issue. 4, Article No. 100184.
- [31] D. A. Sprecher, On the structure of continuous functions of several variables. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **115** (1965), 340–355.
- [32] D. A. Sprecher, A numerical implementation of Kolmogorov’s superpositions, *Neural Netw.* **9** (1996), 765–772.
- [33] Z. Wang, A. Zainal, M. M. Siraj, F. A. Ghaleb, X. Hao, S. Han, An intrusion detection model based on Convolutional Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks, *Sci. Rep.* **15** (2025), Article No. 1917.
- [34] S. Willard, *General topology*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1970.