

# The Spectral Dimension of NTKs is Constant: A Theory of Implicit Regularization, Finite-Width Stability, and Scalable Estimation

Praveen Anilkumar Shukla<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MBZUAI, Abu Dhabi, UAE

## Abstract

Modern deep networks are heavily overparameterized yet often generalize well, suggesting a form of low intrinsic complexity not reflected by parameter counts. We study this complexity at initialization through the *effective rank* of the Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) Gram matrix,  $r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}) = (\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}))^2 / \|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2$ . For i.i.d. data and the infinite-width NTK  $k$ , we prove a *constant-limit law*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)]^2}{\mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2]} =: r_{\infty},$$

with sub-Gaussian concentration. We further establish *finite-width stability*: if the finite-width NTK deviates in operator norm by  $O_p(m^{-1/2})$  (width  $m$ ), then  $r_{\text{eff}}$  changes by  $O_p(m^{-1/2})$ . We design a *scalable estimator* using random output probes and a CountSketch of parameter Jacobians and prove conditional unbiasedness and consistency with explicit variance bounds. On CIFAR-10 with ResNet-20/56 (widths 16/32) across  $n \in \{10^3, 5 \times 10^3, 10^4, 2.5 \times 10^4, 5 \times 10^4\}$ , we observe  $r_{\text{eff}} \approx 1.0$ – $1.3$  and slopes  $\approx 0$  in  $n$ , consistent with the theory, and the kernel-moment prediction  $\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)]^2 / \mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2]$  closely matches fitted constants.

## 1 Introduction

Modern overparameterized networks frequently interpolate the training data yet generalize strongly. In the NTK regime, training wide networks corresponds to kernel gradient descent in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), and the *data-dependent Gram spectrum* controls optimization and generalization. What is a simple *scalar* notion of this spectral complexity that admits clean theory and can be measured at scale?

We propose the *effective rank* of the training Gram matrix

$$r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}) = \frac{(\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}))^2}{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i\right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2}, \quad (1.1)$$

which summarizes spectral concentration: small  $r_{\text{eff}}$  means few dominant eigendirections and thus a strong implicit bias. We show  $\mathbb{E}[r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)]$  *does not grow with  $n$* : it converges to a kernel moment ratio  $r_{\infty}$ .

---

<sup>\*</sup>Correspondence: [praveen.shukla@mbzuai.ac.ae](mailto:praveen.shukla@mbzuai.ac.ae)

**Toy intuition.** If  $K$  has eigenvalues  $(10, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ , its algebraic rank is 6 but  $r_{\text{eff}}(K) = \frac{10^2}{10^2+5} \approx 1.05$ , reflecting that almost all energy lies in one direction. In general,  $r_{\text{eff}}$  behaves like the “number of large eigenvalues.”

**Contributions.** (1) A constant-limit law with explicit concentration; (2) finite-width stability; (3) an unbiased, consistent, scalable estimator for  $r_{\text{eff}}$ ; (4) a power-law spectrum corollary characterizing when  $r_{\text{eff}}$  is  $O(1)$ ; and (5) CIFAR-scale evidence matching theory.

**Roadmap.** Section 2 states the setup and assumptions. Section 3 proves the constant-limit law and concentration. Section 4 develops a scalable estimator and variance bounds. Section 5 establishes finite-width stability. Section 6 connects the limit to Mercer spectra and power laws. Section 7 presents experiments; Sections 8 and 9 discuss context and limitations.

## 2 Setup and assumptions

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{D}$  on  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the infinite-width NTK for a fixed architecture and initialization scheme, and  $\mathbf{K}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with  $(\mathbf{K}_n)_{ij} = k(x_i, x_j)$ . We work at *random initialization*; training-time evolution of the NTK is not modeled here.

**Assumption 2.1** (Moment/tail conditions). (i)  $k(x, x)$  and  $k(x, x')^2$  are sub-exponential (bounded suffices).

(ii)  $0 < \mathbb{E}[k(x, x)] < \infty$  and  $0 < \mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2] < \infty$  with  $x, x' \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{D}$ ,  $x \neq x'$ .

Define  $a := \mathbb{E}[k(x, x)]$  and  $b := \mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2]$ .

**Notation and conventions.** We write  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}) = \sum_{i=1}^n K_{ii} \in \mathbb{R}$  for the trace (a *scalar*);  $\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j} K_{ij}^2$  for the squared Frobenius norm; and  $r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{K})^2 / \|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2 \in [1, \text{rank}(\mathbf{K})]$ . We use  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{K}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for the vector of diagonal entries and  $\text{Diag}(\mathbf{v})$  for the diagonal matrix with diagonal  $\mathbf{v}$ .

## 3 Constant-limit law and concentration

**Theorem 3.1** (Constant-limit effective rank). *Under assumption 2.1, with  $a = \mathbb{E}[k(x, x)]$  and  $b = \mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2]$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)] = \frac{a^2}{b} =: r_\infty \in (1, \infty).$$

*Moreover there exist  $c, C > 0$  (depending on sub-exponential norms) s.t. for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and large  $n$ ,*

$$\Pr(|r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n) - r_\infty| > \varepsilon) \leq C \exp(-cn\varepsilon^2).$$

*Proof.* Write  $T_n = \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n k(x_i, x_i)$  and  $F_n^2 = \|\mathbf{K}_n\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n k(x_i, x_i)^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} k(x_i, x_j)^2$ . By the strong law of large numbers (SLLN),  $n^{-1}T_n \rightarrow a$  almost surely (a.s.). For the off-diagonal term, define the symmetric kernel  $(u, v) \mapsto h(u, v) = k(u, v)^2$  and the U-statistic

$$U_n = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} h(x_i, x_j).$$

---

**Algorithm 1** Sketch/probe estimator of  $r_{\text{eff}}$ 

---

**Require:** data  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ; model  $f_\theta$  at init; diag samples  $M$ ; pair samples  $P$ ; output probes  $G$ ; CountSketch dim  $R$

- 1: Sample  $i_1, \dots, i_M \sim \text{Unif}([n])$  (with replacement) and set  $\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})} = \frac{n}{M} \sum_{t=1}^M \hat{k}(x_{i_t}, x_{i_t})$ .
- 2: Sample  $(a_t, b_t) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}([n] \times [n])$  and set  $\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} = \frac{n^2}{P} \sum_{t=1}^P \hat{k}(x_{a_t}, x_{b_t})^2$ .
- 3: For any  $x, x'$ , estimate

$$\hat{k}(x, x') = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \left\langle \Phi J(x)^\top g, \Phi J(x')^\top g \right\rangle, \quad g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_C) \text{ (or Rademacher)}, \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times d} \text{ CountSketch.}$$

4: **return**  $\widehat{r_{\text{eff}}} = \widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})}^2 / \widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2}$ .

---

By Hoeffding's SLLN for U-statistics (valid under assumption 2.1),  $U_n \rightarrow b$  a.s. Note

$$\frac{F_n^2}{n^2} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n k(x_i, x_i)^2}_{O_{\text{a.s.}}(1/n)} + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} k(x_i, x_j)^2 = \frac{n-1}{n} U_n + O_{\text{a.s.}}(1/n) \rightarrow b \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Hence

$$r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n) = \frac{T_n^2}{F_n^2} = \frac{(na + o_p(n))^2}{n^2b + o_p(n^2)} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{a^2}{b}.$$

Uniform integrability holds because  $r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n) \leq n$  and the tails of  $T_n$  and  $F_n$  are sub-exponential under assumption 2.1; thus  $\mathbb{E}[r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)] \rightarrow a^2/b$ .

For concentration, use Bernstein's inequality for the mean  $\bar{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_i k(x_i, x_i)$  and Hoeffding/Bernstein bounds for the U-statistic  $U_n$ . Specifically, there exist  $c_1, C_1, c_2, C_2 > 0$  with

$$\Pr(|\bar{X}_n - a| > t) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 n t^2}, \quad \Pr(|U_n - b| > t) \leq C_2 e^{-c_2 n t^2}.$$

Define  $g(x, y) = x^2/y$ . On a high-probability set where  $y \geq b/2$  and  $|x - a| \leq t$ ,  $g$  is Lipschitz with constant  $L = O(1)$  depending on  $a, b$ . A union bound and a delta-method argument give

$$\Pr(|g(\bar{X}_n, U_n) - g(a, b)| > \varepsilon) \leq C e^{-c n \varepsilon^2}.$$

But  $g(\bar{X}_n, U_n)$  differs from  $r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)$  only by  $O(1/n)$  (from the diagonal part of  $F_n^2$ ), which is absorbed for large  $n$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.1** (Mercer representation). If  $k$  admits Mercer expansion  $k(x, x') = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i \phi_i(x) \phi_i(x')$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)] = \sum_i \lambda_i$  and  $\mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2] = \sum_i \lambda_i^2$  (proof in section A). Thus  $r_\infty = \frac{(\sum_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_i \lambda_i^2}$ .

## 4 Scalable estimation: unbiasedness, variance, consistency

We approximate  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})$  and  $\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2$  by subsampling, and approximate each  $k(x, x')$  by random output probes and a CountSketch of parameter Jacobians.

**Probe identity and CountSketch.** Let  $J(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times d}$  be the parameter Jacobian of logits at  $x$ .

**Lemma 4.1** (Probe identity). *If  $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_C)$  (or Rademacher), then*

$$\mathbb{E}_g[\langle J(x)^\top g, J(x')^\top g \rangle] = \text{tr}(J(x)J(x')^\top) = k(x, x').$$

*Proof.*  $\mathbb{E}[gg^\top] = I_C$ , hence  $\mathbb{E}_g[J(x)^\top g g^\top J(x')] = J(x)^\top J(x')$  and taking trace yields  $\text{tr}(J(x)J(x')^\top)$ ; this equals  $k(x, x')$  for the NTK at initialization.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** (CountSketch inner-product preservation). *Let  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times d}$  be CountSketch with pairwise independent hash/sign functions. For any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\Phi[\langle \Phi u, \Phi v \rangle] = \langle u, v \rangle, \quad \text{Var}_\Phi[\langle \Phi u, \Phi v \rangle] \leq R^{-1} \|u\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2.$$

*Proof.* Standard: linearity and symmetry give unbiasedness. For the variance bound, expand the second moment and use pairwise independence; only terms with index collisions in the same bucket survive, contributing at most  $R^{-1} \|u\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.1** (Unbiasedness). *Condition on the data  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . With  $(i_t)$  and  $(a_t, b_t)$  sampled as in algorithm 1 and with independent  $g$  and  $\Phi$  as above,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})} | \{x\}] = \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}), \quad \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} | \{x\}] = \|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2, \quad \mathbb{E}[\hat{k}(x, x') | \{x\}] = k(x, x').$$

**Theorem 4.2** (Variance bounds). *Condition on  $\{x\}$ . There exist constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  (depending on data through bounded second/fourth moments of  $k$ ) such that*

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})} | \{x\}) \leq \frac{c_1 n^2}{M}, \quad \text{Var}(\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} | \{x\}) \leq \frac{c_2 n^4}{P} + \frac{c_3 n^4}{PG} + \frac{c_3 n^4}{PR}.$$

*Proof.* For the trace,  $\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})}$  is the mean of  $M$  i.i.d. samples of  $Z = \frac{n}{1} \hat{k}(x_I, x_I)$  with  $I \sim \text{Unif}([n])$ . Hence

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})} | \{x\}) = \text{Var}(Z | \{x\})/M \leq c_1 n^2/M,$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[Z^2 | \{x\}] \leq \frac{n^2}{n} \sum_i \mathbb{E}[\hat{k}(x_i, x_i)^2] \leq Cn$  (bounded by second moments of  $k$  and probe/sketch variance).

For the Frobenius estimator, write  $\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} = \frac{n^2}{P} \sum_{t=1}^P W_t$  with  $W_t = \hat{k}(x_{A_t}, x_{B_t})^2$ ,  $(A_t, B_t) \sim \text{Unif}([n]^2)$ . Then

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} | \{x\}) = \frac{n^4}{P} \text{Var}(W_1 | \{x\}).$$

Decompose  $W_1$  variance via the law of total variance over  $(A, B)$ , probes  $g$ , and sketch  $\Phi$ :

$$\text{Var}(W_1) = \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(W_1 | A, B, g, \Phi)] + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W_1 | A, B, g, \Phi] | A, B, \Phi)] + \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W_1 | A, B, \Phi]).$$

Given  $(A, B)$ ,  $\hat{k}(x_A, x_B)$  is an average over  $G$  probes and a sketch  $\Phi$ , with variance  $O(1/G) + O(1/R)$  by Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2. Squaring introduces a factor bounded by  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{k}^2]$ ; bounded fourth moments of  $k$  give the stated  $O(n^4/(PG))$  and  $O(n^4/(PR))$  terms. The sampling variance over  $(A, B)$  contributes  $O(n^4/P)$  from the spread of  $k(x_i, x_j)^2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3** (Consistency). *As  $M, P, G, R \rightarrow \infty$  (independently or jointly),  $\widehat{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K})} \xrightarrow{P} \text{tr}(\mathbf{K})$  and  $\widehat{\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2} \xrightarrow{P} \|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2$  conditionally on  $\{x\}$ ; hence  $\widehat{r}_{\text{eff}} \xrightarrow{P} r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K})$  by the continuous mapping theorem.*

## 5 Finite-width stability

Let  $\mathbf{K}_m = \mathbf{K}_\infty + \Delta_m$  be the width- $m$  NTK Gram matrix at a fixed dataset of size  $n$ . Assume  $\|\Delta_m\|_2 = O_p(m^{-1/2})$  (standard for NTKs at random init).

**Theorem 5.1** (Finite-width stability). *Under assumption 2.1 (which implies  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_\infty) = \Theta(n)$  and  $\|\mathbf{K}_\infty\|_F = \Theta(n)$  a.s.), if  $\|\Delta_m\|_2 = O_p(m^{-1/2})$ , then*

$$|r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_m) - r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_\infty)| = O_p(m^{-1/2}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $T(K) = \text{tr}(K)$ ,  $F(K) = \|K\|_F$ , and  $f(K) = T(K)^2/F(K)^2$ . A first-order expansion with integral remainder gives

$$f(K + \Delta) - f(K) = \langle \nabla f(K), \Delta \rangle + O\left(\frac{\|\Delta\|_F^2}{F(K)^2}\right).$$

A direct computation yields

$$\nabla f(K) = \frac{2T(K)}{F(K)^2} I - \frac{2T(K)^2}{F(K)^4} K.$$

Thus  $\|\nabla f(K)\|_F \leq \frac{2|T(K)|}{F(K)^2} \sqrt{n} + \frac{2T(K)^2}{F(K)^4} \|K\|_F \leq \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{F(K)} + \frac{2T(K)^2}{F(K)^3}$ . For NTK Grams under assumption 2.1,  $T(K) = \Theta(n)$  and  $F(K) = \Theta(n)$ , so  $\|\nabla f(K)\|_F = O(1)$  w.h.p. Moreover  $\|\Delta\|_F \leq \sqrt{n} \|\Delta\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{n} m^{-1/2})$ . Therefore

$$|f(K + \Delta) - f(K)| \leq O(1) \cdot O_p(\sqrt{n} m^{-1/2})/\Theta(n) + O\left(\frac{n m^{-1}}{n^2}\right) = O_p(m^{-1/2}),$$

since the remainder scales as  $O_p(\|\Delta\|_F^2/F(K)^2) = O_p(nm^{-1}/n^2) = O_p(m^{-1})$ . Apply with  $K = \mathbf{K}_\infty$  and  $\Delta = \Delta_m$ .  $\square$

## 6 Power-law spectra: when is the limit constant?

**Theorem 6.1** (Population spectrum controls  $r_{\text{eff}}$ ). *Suppose  $k$  has Mercer expansion  $k(x, x') = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i \phi_i(x) \phi_i(x')$ , where the  $\phi_i$  form an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\mathcal{D})$ , and  $\lambda_i \sim c i^{-\alpha}$  with  $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ . Then*

$$r_\infty = \frac{\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)]^2}{\mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2]} = \frac{(\sum_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_i \lambda_i^2} \in \begin{cases} (1, \infty) & \text{if } \alpha > 1, \\ \infty & \text{if } \alpha \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

with growth  $\Theta((\log N)^2)$  at  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\Theta(N^{2(1-\alpha)})$  for  $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ , where  $N$  truncates the spectrum.

*Proof.* By orthonormality,  $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(x)^2] = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(x) \phi_j(x)] = \delta_{ij}$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i \lambda_i \phi_i(x)^2\right] = \sum_i \lambda_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i,j} \lambda_i \lambda_j \phi_i(x) \phi_j(x) \phi_i(x') \phi_j(x')\right] = \sum_i \lambda_i^2.$$

If  $\lambda_i \sim c i^{-\alpha}$ , then  $\sum_i \lambda_i < \infty$  iff  $\alpha > 1$ , while  $\sum_i \lambda_i^2 < \infty$  iff  $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ . Therefore the ratio is finite iff  $\alpha > 1$ ; at  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\sum_{i \leq N} \lambda_i \asymp \log N$  while  $\sum_i \lambda_i^2$  converges, so  $r_\infty(N) \asymp (\log N)^2$ ; for  $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $\sum_{i \leq N} \lambda_i \asymp N^{1-\alpha}$  and  $r_\infty(N) \asymp N^{2(1-\alpha)}$ .  $\square$




Figure 1:  $r_{\text{eff}}$  vs.  $1/n$  (depth=20, widths=16 and 32). Shading denotes variability across seeds.

Table 1: Moment prediction vs. fitted constant and slope (representative).

(depth,width)	$r_{\infty}^{\text{moment}}$ (mean $\pm$ sd)	runs	$r_{\infty}^{\text{fit}}$	slope
(20,16)	$1.1150 \pm 0.0783$	13	1.1348	-16.76
(20,32)	$1.1616 \pm 0.0772$	9	1.1715	-29.56
(56,16)	$1.1129 \pm 0.0475$	7	1.0698	+61.95
(56,32)	$1.0409 \pm 0.0982$	6	1.0160	+33.93

## 7 Experiments (CIFAR-10, ResNet-20/56)

**Setup.** CIFAR-10 (50k train); ResNet-20/56 with widths  $\{16, 32\}$ ; measurement at initialization. Default  $(M, P, G, R) = (800, 3000, 16, 128)$ ; a coarse  $(200, 600, 8, 64)$  setting is close. We sweep  $n \in \{10^3, 5 \times 10^3, 10^4, 2.5 \times 10^4, 5 \times 10^4\}$ ; at 25k and 50k we average over two seeds.

**Key findings.**  $r_{\text{eff}}$  is nearly flat in  $n$  and lies in  $[1.0, 1.3]$ . Kernel-moment predictions match fitted constants from  $r_{\text{eff}}$  vs.  $1/n$  regressions.

## 8 Related work

**NTK and linearization.** The NTK characterizes gradient-flow dynamics of wide networks and has been used to analyze convergence and spectra of training kernels. Our work focuses on a *single scalar* summary of that spectrum—the effective rank—and proves a constant-limit law with concentration.

**Effective rank/dimension.** Stable/effective rank and related spectral proxies are used in linear models and as regularizers. We instead study the *NTK Gram effective rank* at initialization, derive a constant-limit law via kernel moments, and provide a scalable estimator with variance guarantees.

**Randomized linear algebra.** Hutchinson-style trace estimators and CountSketch enable scalable estimators of traces and inner products. We combine output probes with a CountSketch of Jacobians to estimate  $r_{\text{eff}}$  efficiently at CIFAR scale.

## 9 Discussion and limitations

Our theory concerns *initialization* and i.i.d. sampling. Data augmentation, labels, and training can alter  $k$  and its spectrum. Estimator variance decays with  $(M, P, G, R)$ ; our settings  $(800, 3000, 16, 128)$

Table 2:  $r_{\text{eff}}$  at large  $n$  for ResNet-20 (two seeds).

$n$	width=16	width=32
25k	$1.1797 \pm 0.0049$	$1.1472 \pm 0.0512$
50k	$1.1367 \pm 0.0208$	$1.1452 \pm 0.0395$

delivered stable estimates across seeds and match moment predictions. Understanding training-time evolution of  $r_{\text{eff}}$  and label-conditional structure are important directions.

## 10 Conclusion

We prove  $\mathbb{E}[r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n)]$  converges to a constant  $r_\infty$ , quantify finite-width stability, and provide a scalable consistent estimator. CIFAR-scale experiments support a low,  $n$ -independent spectral dimension—an interpretable form of implicit regularization in the NTK view.

## A Mercer identities used in the main text

Assume  $k$  is continuous and positive definite with Mercer expansion

$$k(x, x') = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i \phi_i(x) \phi_i(x'),$$

where  $(\phi_i)$  are orthonormal in  $L^2(\mathcal{D})$  and  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[k(x, x)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i \lambda_i \phi_i(x)^2\right] = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbb{E}[\phi_i(x)^2] = \sum_i \lambda_i,$$

and, for i.i.d.  $x, x'$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[k(x, x')^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i,j} \lambda_i \lambda_j \phi_i(x) \phi_j(x) \phi_i(x') \phi_j(x')\right] = \sum_{i,j} \lambda_i \lambda_j \mathbb{E}[\phi_i(x) \phi_j(x)] \mathbb{E}[\phi_i(x') \phi_j(x')] = \sum_i \lambda_i^2.$$

No cross-terms survive due to orthonormality.

## B Concentration details for Theorem 3.1

We record explicit bounds. Let  $X_i = k(x_i, x_i)$  with  $\psi_1$  Orlicz norm  $\|X_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq K_1$ . Bernstein's inequality gives, for  $\bar{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum X_i$ ,

$$\Pr(|\bar{X}_n - a| > t) \leq 2 \exp[-cn \min(t^2/K_1^2, t/K_1)].$$

For  $U_n$  with kernel  $h(u, v) = k(u, v)^2$  having  $\|h(x, x')\|_{\psi_1} \leq K_2$ , a Bernstein-type U-statistic inequality yields

$$\Pr(|U_n - b| > t) \leq 2 \exp[-c'n \min(t^2/K_2^2, t/K_2)].$$

Let  $\tilde{F}_n^2 = (n-1)U_n$  and note  $F_n^2 = n \cdot n(\tilde{F}_n^2/n + O(1))$  differs by  $O(n)$  from  $n^2 U_n$ . On the event

$$\mathcal{E} = \{|\bar{X}_n - a| \leq t, |U_n - b| \leq t, U_n \geq b/2\}$$

the map  $g(x, y) = x^2/y$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz with  $L \leq C(1 + a/b)$  uniformly for small  $t$ . Thus

$$\Pr(|r_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{K}_n) - r_\infty| > \varepsilon) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}^c) + \Pr(|g(\bar{X}_n, U_n) - g(a, b)| > \varepsilon/2) \leq C e^{-cn\varepsilon^2}.$$

## C CountSketch variance bound for Lemma 4.2

Let  $\Phi$  map coordinates to  $R$  buckets with random signs. Then

$$\langle \Phi u, \Phi v \rangle = \sum_{r=1}^R \left( \sum_{j:h(j)=r} s(j)u_j \right) \left( \sum_{k:h(k)=r} s(k)v_k \right).$$

Taking expectation over  $(h, s)$  removes cross-bucket terms and leaves  $\sum_j u_j v_j = \langle u, v \rangle$ . For variance, expand the second moment and use pairwise independence: only terms with index collisions in the same bucket survive, contributing at most  $\frac{1}{R} \|u\|^2 \|v\|^2$ .

## D Gradient of $f(K) = (\text{tr}(K))^2 / \|K\|_F^2$

Let  $T = \text{tr}(K)$  and  $F^2 = \|K\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(K^\top K)$ . Then by matrix calculus,

$$\nabla_K T = I, \quad \nabla_K F^2 = 2K, \quad \nabla_K f = \frac{2T}{F^2} I - \frac{2T^2}{F^4} K.$$

Hence

$$\|\nabla f(K)\|_F \leq \frac{2|T|}{F^2} \sqrt{n} + \frac{2T^2}{F^4} \|K\|_F = \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{F} + \frac{2T^2}{F^3}.$$

For NTKs on i.i.d. data,  $T = \Theta(n)$  and  $F = \Theta(n)$  a.s., giving  $\|\nabla f(K)\|_F = O(1)$ .

## E Experimental details

**Data.** CIFAR-10 (50k train). **Models.** ResNet-20/56, widths {16,32}. **Estimator.** Defaults  $(M, P, G, R) = (800, 3000, 16, 128)$ ; coarse  $(200, 600, 8, 64)$ . **Seeds.** Two seeds for  $n \in \{25\text{ k}, 50\text{ k}\}$ . **Compute.** Single-GPU; walltimes scale roughly linearly in  $M, P$ .

## Acknowledgments

I thank Professors James Brian Pitts and Velibor Bojkovic for their valuable guidance and advice.

## References

- [1] A. Jacot, F. Gabriel, and C. Hongler. Neural Tangent Kernel: Convergence and Generalization in Neural Networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- [2] W. Hoeffding. A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 19(3):293–325, 1948.
- [3] M. F. Hutchinson. A stochastic estimator of the trace of the influence matrix for Laplacian smoothing splines. *Communications in Statistics – Simulation and Computation*, 18(3):1059–1076, 1989.
- [4] M. Charikar, K. Chen, and M. Farach-Colton. Finding frequent items in data streams. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 693–703, 2002.