

The Operator Origins of Neural Scaling Laws: A Generalized Spectral Transport Dynamics of Deep Learning

Yizhou Zhang^{*1}

¹zyizhou96@gmail.com

Abstract

Modern deep networks operate in a rough, finite-regularity regime where Jacobian-induced operators exhibit heavy-tailed spectra and strong basis drift. In this work, we derive a unified operator-theoretic description of neural training dynamics directly from gradient descent. Starting from the exact evolution $\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t$ in function space, we apply Kato perturbation theory to obtain a rigorous system of coupled mode ODEs and show that, after coarse-graining, these dynamics converge to a spectral transport–dissipation PDE

$$\partial_t g + \partial_\lambda(vg) = -\lambda g + S,$$

where v captures eigenbasis drift and S encodes nonlocal spectral coupling.

We prove that neural training preserves functional regularity, forcing the drift to take an asymptotic power-law form $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$. In the weak-coupling regime—naturally induced by spectral locality and SGD noise—the PDE admits self-similar solutions with a resolution frontier, polynomial amplitude growth, and power-law dissipation. This structure yields explicit scaling-law exponents, explains the geometry of double descent, and shows that the effective training time satisfies $\tau(t) = t^\alpha L(t)$ for slowly varying L .

Finally, we show that NTK training and feature learning arise as two limits of the same PDE: $v \equiv 0$ recovers lazy dynamics, while $v \neq 0$ produces representation drift. Our results provide a unified spectral framework connecting operator geometry, optimization dynamics, and the universal scaling behavior of modern deep networks.

^{*}Corresponding Author

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks are high-dimensional, non-convex and strongly nonlinear dynamical systems. Yet, when trained in reasonably “well-behaved” configurations—with suitable architectures, data, and optimization procedures—their performance exhibits remarkably simple and robust regularities. Most prominently, a large body of empirical work has shown that training and test losses, as well as downstream metrics such as perplexity and accuracy, obey *scaling laws*: they decay approximately as power laws in model size, dataset size, or total compute budget over many orders of magnitude [Hestness et al., 2017, Kaplan et al., 2020, Henighan et al., 2020, Hoffmann et al., 2022, Hernandez et al., 2021, Wei et al., 2022]. The governing form of power laws are strikingly stable across model families and training recipes, and they provide quantitatively useful predictions for the returns of additional compute or data.

From the viewpoint of dynamical systems, this is surprising. There is no obvious reason why a complex, strongly nonlinear system evolving under stochastic gradient descent (SGD) should behave, at macroscopic scales, like a quasi-linear process with simple power-law asymptotics. Nevertheless, scaling laws appear to be extremely robust, and they extend beyond vanilla pretraining to phenomena such as precision scaling [Kumar et al., 2024], pruning and sparsification [Sorscher et al., 2022, Rosenfeld et al., 2021, Blalock et al., 2020]. More recently, even the “densification” of large language models has been reported to follow a law-like behavior [Xiao et al., 2025]. These observations strongly suggest that there exists an underlying dynamical structure which controls how error is redistributed and dissipated during training, and which manifests macroscopically as scaling laws.

Existing theories: NTK and feature-learning dynamics. Several theoretical frameworks attempt to explain (parts of) these regularities. One influential line of work is based on the neural tangent kernel (NTK) [Jacot et al., 2018b,a, Lee et al., 2019a, Bietti and Bach, 2021]. In the infinite-width or “lazy” regime, gradient descent on the parameters induces an approximately linear evolution in function space, with a fixed kernel that determines both convergence rates and the implicit inductive bias. This framework can explain early notions of spectral bias [Rahaman et al., 2019] and yields some scaling-like behavior for suitably idealized models. However, it fundamentally assumes that the feature map is frozen during training. A growing body of empirical and theoretical work has shown that, in realistic networks at finite width and realistic scales, feature representations evolve substantially during training [Vyas et al., 2023, Wang et al., 2023], and NTK predictions can break down both quantitatively and qualitatively in these regimes.

A second line of work explicitly incorporates *feature learning*. Mean-field

and tensor-program approaches [Yang, 2021, Canatar and Pehlevan, 2022] study how the effective kernel evolves during training, and recent work from the Pehlevan group has proposed dynamical models of neural scaling laws in both NTK-like and feature-learning regimes [Bordelon et al., 2024, Bordelon and Pehlevan, 2024, Wang et al., 2023]. These models can explain how feature learning can improve or modify neural scaling laws, and they capture rich behavior beyond the pure lazy regime. However, they typically rely on strong mean-field assumptions, and they treat the NTK and feature-learning regimes via distinct approximations. As a consequence, they do not provide a single, unified dynamical equation that *continuously* interpolates between lazy and rich regimes, nor do they give a fully operator-theoretic description of how features and “spectral” structure co-evolve under gradient descent.

A generalized spectral perspective on scaling and compression. In parallel, there has been substantial progress in understanding how scaling laws interact with compression and sparsification. Empirical works show that pruning and data pruning can “beat” naive scaling by implicitly exploiting structure in the task and data [Sorscher et al., 2022, Rosenfeld et al., 2021, Blalock et al., 2020], while classical and modern compression techniques [LeCun et al., 1990, Han et al., 2016b, Nagel et al., 2021, Frantar et al., 2022, Dettmers et al., 2022, Molchanov et al., 2017, Lee et al., 2019b, Wang et al., 2020] reveal that trained networks admit low-precision or sparse representations which still preserve most of their performance. These observations motivate viewing training not only as minimizing loss, but also as organizing information across a spectrum of “modes” that differ in complexity and difficulty.

Zhang [2025] proposed an effective *generalized spectral dynamics* (GSD) framework that unifies several of these phenomena. In that work, the training dynamics were modeled directly in a spectral representation of the error, and it was conjectured that:

Different observed scaling laws—in parameters, data, precision, pruning, and densification—may all be manifestations of a *single* underlying spectral dynamical equation, which admits different approximate forms in different regimes due to different parameter configurations.

The GSD framework showed that a simple, self-similar spectral evolution can simultaneously explain neural scaling laws and the empirical laws observed for quantization, pruning, and model densification. However, that model was introduced as an *effective* spectral equation: it did not derive the spectral dynamics directly from gradient descent on a neural network, and it did not yet clarify how

feature learning, basis drift, and mode coupling arise from the underlying function-space dynamics.

This work: deriving the underlying dynamical equation from gradient descent. Motivated by these observations, we take a more fundamental point of view. We ask:

If scaling laws are so stable and universal, what is the underlying dynamical equation that produces them, and how does this equation emerge from gradient descent on a neural network?

To address this, we work directly in the Hilbert space $H = L^2(p)$ induced by the data distribution, and we view the network as a time-dependent function $f_{\theta(t)} \in H$. For mean-squared error (MSE) loss with vanilla gradient descent, the error $e_t = f^* - f_{\theta(t)}$ evolves as

$$\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t,$$

where $M(t) = J_{\theta(t)} J_{\theta(t)}^*$ is a self-adjoint operator constructed from the network Jacobian. Crucially, we do *not* impose any structural assumptions such as fixed features, invariant kernels, or training occurring along a prescribed set of modes. Instead, the only operator governing the evolution is the time-dependent function-space operator induced directly by the network’s Jacobian and gradient descent. We then perform a time-dependent spectral decomposition of $M(t)$ and study the evolution of the error in this instantaneous eigenbasis.

Our first main step is to derive an *exact* system of coupled ordinary differential equations (ODEs) for the error amplitudes in this drifting eigenbasis, using Kato’s perturbation theory. This yields a fully rigorous, but highly nonlocal, mode-coupled dynamics. In particular, we index the instantaneous eigenbasis of $M(t)$ by discrete mode labels $u \in \mathcal{U}$, and write

$$M(t)\varphi_u(t) = \lambda_u(t)\varphi_u(t), \quad e_t = \sum_u g_u(t)\varphi_u(t).$$

With this notation, Kato’s perturbation theory yields the exact coupled mode ODE

$$\partial_t g_u(t) + \sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = -\lambda_u(t) g_u(t),$$

where the coupling kernel is

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}.$$

The second step is inspired by statistical physics: instead of tracking each individual mode, we consider the statistical evolution of the *total error* at a given spectral value. This coarse-graining over many discrete modes—treating densely populated regions of the spectrum as effectively continuous—naturally yields a *continuous spectral partial differential equation* (PDE) for the error density $g(\lambda, t)$:

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t)g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t) + S(\lambda, t),$$

where v encodes the drift of the eigenbasis in “resolution space” and S encodes mode coupling. The coarse-grained coupling term is given by

$$S(\lambda, t) \approx \int g(\lambda', t) \Omega(\lambda', \lambda, t) d\lambda'$$

as the continuous analogue of the discrete sum $\sum_{v \neq u} g_v \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}$.

A key structural property of Ω is that mode coupling decays as spectral separation increases: $\Omega(\lambda', \lambda, t) \rightarrow 0$ for distant modes (i.e. $|\lambda' - \lambda|$ is large). Thus the interaction is local. We show that this implies a natural notion of *weak coupling*, under which the source term S is asymptotically smaller than the local dissipation term $-\lambda g$. In the zero-coupling limit, the spectral PDE reduces to a dissipative transport equation. In this regime, we prove that regularity preservation combined with the low regularity of ReLU networks forces the drift speed to take a power-law form

$$v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b, \quad b > 0,$$

and that the resulting PDE admits a self-similar solution whose structure coincides with the GSD form proposed in Zhang [2025]. In particular, the error concentrates below a moving “learning frontier” $\lambda^{(t)}$ in resolution space, and the motion of this frontier directly yields power-law scaling of the loss as a function of an effective training time $\tau(t)$.

Contributions. Conceptually, this paper turns the GSD picture from an effective model into a dynamical theory derived directly from gradient descent. More concretely, our contributions are:

1. We formulate the training dynamics purely in function space $H = L^2(p)$ for MSE loss with vanilla gradient descent, without introducing explicit task or data operators. We derive an exact time-dependent spectral decomposition and a mode-coupled ODE system for the error amplitudes.
2. By coarse-graining over spectral shells, we obtain a rigorous spectral PDE

$$\partial_t g + \partial_\lambda (vg) = -\lambda g + S$$

that describes how error mass is transported and dissipated across a continuum of modes, with v capturing eigenbasis drift and S capturing mode coupling.

3. We show that, under mild regularity-preserving assumptions and the low differential order of ReLU networks, the spectral drift speed obeys a power law $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$. Combined with a weak-coupling condition that becomes natural in realistic deep networks, this leads to a dissipative transport equation with self-similar solutions of the GSD form.
4. We demonstrate that, in the weak-coupling limit, the spectral PDE naturally yields neural scaling laws: the loss behaves as

$$L(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-\gamma} \times (\text{slowly varying}),$$

where the exponent γ is determined by the spectral tail of the target function, the effective smoothness of the network, and the time reparameterization induced by the optimizer. Thus, scaling laws emerge as a direct consequence of the underlying spectral dynamics, rather than being postulated.

5. Our framework shows that lazy (NTK) training and feature learning arise from the same spectral transport equation, distinguished only by the presence or absence of drift. When $v(\lambda, t) = 0$, features are frozen and the dynamics reduce to NTK; when drift is active, representations move and feature learning emerges. Thus both regimes are unified as two limits of a single drift–dissipation mechanism.

In the rest of the paper, we make these statements precise.

- **Section 2** introduces the operator-theoretic formulation of neural training, including the Hilbert-space representation, the error evolution equation $\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t$, and its time-dependent spectral decomposition.
- **Section 3** applies Kato perturbation theory to derive an exact system of coupled mode ODEs and shows how coarse-graining yields the spectral PDE governing transport of error across resolutions.
- **Section 4** establishes that neural training preserves regularity and consequently induces a power-law spectral drift $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$, providing the structural foundation of the transport term.
- **Section 5** solves the resulting PDE in the weak-coupling regime, demonstrating self-similar evolution, the emergence of a resolution frontier, geometric amplitude growth $A(t)$, and the onset of double descent.

- **Section 6** proves that stable training necessarily induces a polynomial-order effective time reparameterization $\tau(t) = t^\alpha L(t)$ with $L(t)$ slowly varying in the sense of Karamata, explaining the universality and robustness of observed scaling exponents.
- **Section 7** shows that GRSD unifies NTK and feature learning by revealing both as limits of a single drift–dissipation mechanism, governed solely by whether the drift term $v(\lambda, t)$ is active.
- **Section 8** presents related works, and Section 10 outlines implications for multi-task and self-supervised learning and highlights open questions about the quantitative role of SGD noise in suppressing global coupling.

2 Preliminaries: Function-Space Dynamics and Error Evolution

We consider supervised learning with mean-squared error (MSE) loss in the Hilbert space $H = L^2(p)$ induced by the data distribution $p(x)$. All functions are identified up to sets of measure zero, and the inner product is defined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} [f(x) g(x)], \quad \|f\|_2^2 = \langle f, f \rangle.$$

2.1 Neural networks as functions in $L^2(p)$

A neural network with parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ represents a time-dependent function $f_{\theta(t)} \in H$. Given a target function $f^* \in H$, we define the error at time t as

$$e_t := f^* - f_{\theta(t)}.$$

Throughout this work, we emphasize that no structural assumptions such as fixed features, invariant kernels, or predetermined mode decompositions are imposed: the representation $f_{\theta(t)}$ is allowed to evolve freely in H , and all structure in the dynamics arises directly from gradient descent.

2.2 Gradient descent induces a linear evolution in function space

For MSE loss,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \|f^* - f_\theta\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|e\|_2^2,$$

the gradient flow in parameter space is

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = -\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta(t)).$$

By the chain rule,

$$\dot{e}_t = -J_{\theta(t)} \dot{\theta}(t),$$

where $J_{\theta}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow H$ denotes the Jacobian operator $(J_{\theta}v)(x) = \nabla_{\theta}f_{\theta}(x) \cdot v$. Substituting the gradient flow equation gives

$$\dot{e}_t = J_{\theta(t)} J_{\theta(t)}^* e_t.$$

Thus the error evolves according to a *linear* operator in function space:

$$\dot{e}_t = -M(t) e_t, \quad M(t) := J_{\theta(t)} J_{\theta(t)}^*.$$

The operator $M(t)$ is self-adjoint and positive semidefinite. It is the *only* operator that governs the evolution of the error in our analysis; its time dependence reflects the evolving representation of the network under gradient descent.

In this section we work in the continuous-time gradient flow limit,

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = -\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta(t)),$$

which corresponds to taking the learning rate to be infinitesimal. A discrete-time update with (possibly time-varying) step sizes η_k ,

$$\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \eta_k \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta_k),$$

can be viewed as a time reparameterization of this flow, where the effective training time is proportional to the accumulated step size $\sum_k \eta_k$. Thus, learning rate schedules do not change the form of the operator dynamics $\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t$; instead, they induce a non-uniform rescaling of time that will later be absorbed into the effective time variable $\tau(t)$ in our spectral analysis.

2.3 Spectral decomposition of $M(t)$

For each fixed t , the operator $M(t)$ acts on a finite-dimensional subspace of H determined by the network's Jacobian, and therefore admits a discrete spectral decomposition. We write

$$M(t) \varphi_u(t) = \lambda_u(t) \varphi_u(t), \quad u \in \mathcal{U}(t),$$

where $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is a finite or countable index set, the eigenvalues $\lambda_u(t) \geq 0$, and the eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_u(t)\}_{u \in \mathcal{U}(t)}$ form an orthonormal family in H . Expanding the error in this moving eigenbasis gives

$$e_t = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}(t)} g_u(t) \varphi_u(t).$$

The amplitudes $g_u(t)$ encode how much error lies along each instantaneous mode of $M(t)$, and the time dependence of both $\lambda_u(t)$ and $\varphi_u(t)$ reflects the evolution of the network's representation.

2.4 Why a spectral formulation?

Although $M(t)$ generally has low rank compared to the ambient dimension of H , its eigenstructure provides a natural lens on the error dynamics. The eigenvalues $\lambda_u(t)$ quantify the rate at which error aligned with mode u is dissipated, while the evolution of $\varphi_u(t)$ captures the “feature learning” aspect of training. In Section 3.1, we show that the amplitudes $g_u(t)$ satisfy a rigorous, coupled system of mode ODEs derived from Kato’s perturbation theory. In Section 3.3, we then coarse-grain these discrete modes to obtain a continuous spectral PDE that describes the statistical redistribution of error across many nearby modes.

3 From Modewise ODEs to a Spectral PDE

In this section we derive the fundamental spectral evolution equation that governs the dynamics of the error under gradient descent. Starting from the function-space evolution $\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t$ established in Section 2, we first express the dynamics in the instantaneous eigenbasis of $M(t)$, obtaining an exact system of coupled mode ODEs. We then coarse-grain over many discrete modes to obtain a continuous description in spectral space, which will later give rise to power-law drift and self-similar scaling behavior.

3.1 Exact Mode ODEs in a Drifting Eigenbasis

For each time t , the operator $M(t) = J_{\theta(t)}J_{\theta(t)}^*$ is self-adjoint and positive semidefinite, acting on a finite-dimensional subspace of $H = L^2(p)$. Thus its spectrum is discrete. Let

$$M(t)\varphi_u(t) = \lambda_u(t)\varphi_u(t), \quad u \in \mathcal{U}(t),$$

denote an orthonormal eigenbasis of $M(t)$. Expanding the error in this moving basis gives

$$e_t = \sum_u g_u(t)\varphi_u(t), \quad g_u(t) = \langle e_t, \varphi_u(t) \rangle.$$

Differentiating in time yields

$$\partial_t g_u(t) = \langle \partial_t e_t, \varphi_u(t) \rangle + \langle e_t, \partial_t \varphi_u(t) \rangle.$$

Using $\dot{e}_t = -M(t)e_t$, the first term becomes

$$\langle -M(t)e_t, \varphi_u \rangle = -\lambda_u(t)g_u(t).$$

The second term encodes the rotation of the eigenbasis. From Kato's perturbation theory [Kato, 2012, Zwibach, 2018] for differential self-adjoint operators, the evolution of the eigenfunctions satisfies

$$\langle \partial_t \varphi_v(t), \varphi_u(t) \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}, & v \neq u, \\ 0, & v = u, \end{cases}$$

where $\dot{M}(t)$ is the operator derivative of $M(t)$. Therefore

$$\langle e_t, \partial_t \varphi_u(t) \rangle = \sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}.$$

Combining both contributions, we obtain the exact coupled mode ODE:

$$\partial_t g_u(t) + \sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = -\lambda_u(t) g_u(t),$$

where the coupling coefficients are

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}.$$

This ODE system is fully rigorous and contains all aspects of the dynamics: local dissipation $-\lambda_u g_u$, nonlocal mode coupling $\sum_{v \neq u} g_v \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}$, and the drift of the feature basis through the time dependence of the eigenfunctions $\varphi_u(t)$.

3.2 Spectral-Shell Coarse-Graining and Continuization

Although the exact ODE system is mathematically correct, it is far too fine-grained to yield macroscopic laws such as scaling behavior. Each mode u has its own highly nonlinear trajectory, and the coupling coefficients $\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}$ depend on detailed microscopic information about parameter updates and Jacobian evolution.

A more meaningful description arises by grouping together many discrete modes whose eigenvalues are close. Define the *spectral shell* associated with a value λ as the set of all modes u such that $\lambda_u(t) \approx \lambda$. We then introduce a coarse-grained *spectral error density* $g(\lambda, t)$ by summing the contributions of all modes in the shell around λ . In practice, densely populated regions of the spectrum become effectively continuous, and it is natural to view λ as a continuous coordinate.

This passage from discrete modes u to a continuous spectral variable λ parallels the continuum limits of kinetic theory and statistical physics, where the fine-scale degrees of freedom are aggregated into a macroscopic distribution.

3.3 The Resulting Spectral PDE

The exact mode ODEs in Section 3.1 describe the evolution of individual coefficients $g_u(t)$ in the drifting eigenbasis $\{\varphi_u(t)\}_u$. However, our interest is not in tracking each microscopic mode, but in understanding how *total error mass* is redistributed across the spectrum as training proceeds. To this end, it is natural to work with a macroscopic spectral density.

We organize the mode amplitudes and eigenvalues into a time-dependent spectral measure

$$\mu_t := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} g_u(t) \delta_{\lambda_u(t)}.$$

In the high-rank, densely populated spectral regime, we assume that μ_t admits a density $g(\lambda, t)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure:

$$\mu_t(d\lambda) = g(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

Intuitively, $g(\lambda, t)$ records how much error energy is carried by modes whose instantaneous eigenvalues lie near λ .

The evolution of $g(\lambda, t)$ can be derived by testing against smooth compactly supported functions ϕ and differentiating

$$\int \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda = \sum_u g_u(t) \phi(\lambda_u(t))$$

in time. The first contribution comes from the change in amplitudes $g_u(t)$, governed by the exact mode ODE; the second comes from the drift of eigenvalues $\dot{\lambda}_u(t) = \langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_u(t) \rangle$ given by Kato's perturbation theory. In the dense spectral regime, both effects can be expressed in terms of *statistical averages* over modes with eigenvalue near λ .

Concretely, we introduce:

- a *mean spectral drift velocity*

$$v(\lambda, t) := \mathbb{E}[\dot{\lambda}_u(t) \mid \lambda_u(t) \approx \lambda],$$

capturing the average rate at which eigenvalues near λ move along the spectral axis;

- a *mean coupling term*

$$S(\lambda, t) := \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) \mid \lambda_u(t) \approx \lambda\right],$$

which summarizes nonlocal interactions among modes at the same spectral location.

Under mild regularity and locality assumptions on $\dot{M}(t)$ and the coupling coefficients $\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t)$, one finds that g satisfies the weak identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda = \int \phi'(\lambda) v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda - \int \lambda \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda + \int \phi(\lambda) S(\lambda, t) d\lambda,$$

for all smooth compactly supported test functions ϕ . An integration by parts in λ then yields the weak form of a first-order spectral transport equation; we formalize this in Theorem 6 in Appendix A.

In the smooth setting, the weak formulation is equivalent to the following spectral PDE, which we take as the starting point for our subsequent analysis:

$$\boxed{\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda(v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t) + S(\lambda, t).} \quad (1)$$

This equation has a direct physical interpretation: error mass in spectral space drifts with velocity $v(\lambda, t)$, decays locally at rate λ , and is replenished or depleted by nonlocal spectral coupling encoded in $S(\lambda, t)$. In Section 3.5 we will show that, under a weak-coupling condition, $S(\lambda, t)$ becomes asymptotically negligible in the high-resolution regime, leading to a simplified transport equation that admits self-similar solutions and scaling laws.

3.4 Spectral Coupling Decay and the Emergence of Weak Coupling

The nonlocal term $S(\lambda, t)$ in the spectral transport equation reflects interactions between distinct spectral modes. In modern neural networks, however, these interactions decay rapidly with spectral separation. Indeed, the coupling kernel

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}$$

is small whenever $|\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)|$ is large: the numerator decays because $\dot{M}(t)$ acts locally on functions of different resolution, and the denominator explicitly suppresses long-range mixing. Moreover, SGD noise further damps cross-resolution interactions. Consequently, most of the coupling mass is concentrated near the diagonal in spectral space, and $S(\lambda, t)$ becomes negligible in the high-resolution regime. This *weak-coupling* structure justifies the simplified transport equation derived in Section 3.5.

For completeness, a detailed operator-level explanation of spectral locality and SGD-induced coupling decay is provided in Appendix B.

3.5 Weak Coupling and the Zero-Coupling Limit

We say that the evolution is in the *weak-coupling regime* if

$$S(\lambda, t) = o(\lambda g(\lambda, t)) \quad \text{uniformly over large } \lambda.$$

In this regime, dissipation dominates over long-range coupling in spectral space, and the PDE simplifies to

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t).$$

This zero-coupling limit is the starting point for the analysis of self-similar spectral flow and scaling laws presented in Section 6.

4 Regularity Preservation and the Power-Law Structure of Spectral Drift

The spectral transport equation developed in Section 3.3 shows that, in the weak-coupling regime, the macroscopic redistribution of error across the spectrum is governed by

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t),$$

where the drift velocity

$$v(\lambda, t) = \langle \varphi_\lambda(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_\lambda(t) \rangle$$

captures the rate at which the eigenvalue associated with mode φ_λ moves along the resolution axis. In this section we show that, for modern neural networks trained by gradient descent or stochastic gradient descent, the drift term $v(\lambda, t)$ necessarily exhibits a power-law structure in the high-resolution regime:

$$v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t) \lambda^b, \quad b > 0.$$

This characterization plays a central role in the emergence of self-similar spectral dynamics and scaling laws.

4.1 Regularity Preservation in Neural Training

A key structural observation is that the learning dynamics does not increase the differential order or “regularity class” of the functions represented by the network. More precisely:

- **Activation functions such as ReLU are piecewise linear.** Forward propagation produces functions of bounded piecewise-linear regularity, and back-propagation via the network Jacobian $J_{\theta(t)}$ does not introduce higher-order derivatives.
- **The MSE loss gradient lives in the same Hilbert space $L^2(p)$.** The gradient update $\dot{\theta} = -\nabla_{\theta} L$ cannot generate higher-resolution structure than that already encoded in the model and data distribution.
- **SGD noise does not smooth or amplify high-frequency content.** The stochastic perturbation is a finite-difference sampling effect, not a differential operator; it increases variance but does not add new high-order modes.

Together, these facts imply that the model and its evolution preserve the regularity class of the function space: the operator $\dot{M}(t)$ is of the same effective differential order as $M(t)$ itself. We refer to this phenomenon as *regularity preservation*.

4.2 Spectral Consequences of Regularity Preservation

In classical functional analysis and kernel methods, an operator whose kernel or action has fixed regularity exhibits a characteristic spectral decay. For a broad class of neural architectures and data distributions, the eigenvalues of $M(t)$ obey

$$\lambda_k(t) \sim k^{-\beta}, \quad \beta > 0,$$

reflecting the underlying roughness of the data distribution and network representation. Since the update $\dot{M}(t)$ cannot increase the differential order, its high-resolution action obeys a comparable law.

Projecting $\dot{M}(t)$ onto the instantaneous spectral basis yields

$$v(\lambda, t) = \langle \varphi_{\lambda}(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_{\lambda}(t) \rangle \sim C(t) \lambda^b, \quad b > 0,$$

for sufficiently large λ . The time-dependent prefactor $C(t)$ reflects learning rate scheduling, gradient norms, and other slowly varying training factors.

Thus we obtain the structural conclusion:

$$\boxed{v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t) \lambda^b, \quad b > 0.} \quad (2)$$

The negative sign indicates that modes drift toward lower resolution as training progresses, consistent with empirical observations and the bias of gradient descent toward smoother solutions.

4.3 Interpretation and Implications for Training Dynamics

The power-law drift structure has several important consequences:

- **High-resolution modes drift faster.** Spectral components with large λ collapse rapidly under the dynamics, explaining the observed prioritization of low-resolution structure early in training.
- **Low-resolution modes drift slowly and persist.** These modes dominate the long-term learning behavior, creating a natural ordering of learned features.
- **A predictable transport geometry emerges.** The characteristic curves of the PDE satisfy

$$\frac{d\lambda}{dt} = -c(t)\lambda^b,$$

a differential equation with a unique self-similar scaling solution.

This self-similar geometry underpins the generalized spectral dynamics described in Section 3.5 and ultimately yields the scaling laws observed in modern deep learning.

4.4 Summary

Regularity preservation implies that the operator $\dot{M}(t)$ inherits the same spectral roughness as $M(t)$. Consequently, the drift velocity in the spectral transport equation exhibits an asymptotic power-law form, independent of architectural details or parameter dimension. This power-law drift is the foundation for the scaling behavior analyzed in the remainder of the paper.

5 Weak-Coupling Limit and Generalized Spectral Dynamics

In this section, we simplify the exact spectral transport equation derived in Section 3 and show that, under weak coupling and power-law spectral drift, the reparameterized spectral density admits a universal tail structure. A key object is the geometric amplitude factor $A(t)$, whose polynomial growth plays a central role in double descent and in the onset of scaling-law decay.

5.1 Exact Transport Equation in Reparameterized Coordinates

Recall the exact PDE for the spectral density:

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t) + S(\lambda, t), \quad (3)$$

where $v(\lambda, t) = \langle \phi_\lambda(t), \dot{M}(t) \phi_\lambda(t) \rangle$ is the drift velocity and S encodes nonlocal mode coupling.

To factor out dissipation, we introduce the reparameterization

$$g(\lambda, t) = e^{-\phi(\lambda, t)} \tilde{g}(\lambda, t), \quad (4)$$

where ϕ solves the dissipative characteristic equation

$$\partial_t \phi(\lambda, t) + v(\lambda, t) \partial_\lambda \phi(\lambda, t) = \lambda, \quad \phi(\lambda, 0) = 0. \quad (5)$$

Substituting (4) into (3), we obtain

$$\partial_t \tilde{g} + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) \tilde{g}(\lambda, t)) = \tilde{S}(\lambda, t), \quad \tilde{S}(\lambda, t) = e^{\phi(\lambda, t)} S(\lambda, t). \quad (6)$$

This equation is free of local dissipation; \tilde{g} evolves purely through spectral drift and coupling.

5.2 Weak Coupling in the High-Resolution Tail

As shown in Section 3.4, the coupling kernel

$$\Omega(\lambda', \lambda, t) = \frac{\langle \phi_\lambda(t), \dot{M}(t) \phi_{\lambda'}(t) \rangle}{\lambda' - \lambda}$$

decays sharply with spectral separation due to locality of $M(t)$ and the damping effect of SGD noise. In the high-resolution tail, nonlocal interactions satisfy

$$|\tilde{S}(\lambda, t)| \ll |\partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) \tilde{g}(\lambda, t))| \quad \text{for sufficiently large } \lambda. \quad (7)$$

Under this weak-coupling condition, (6) reduces to the pure transport equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{g}(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) \tilde{g}(\lambda, t)) = 0. \quad (8)$$

5.3 Characteristic Flow Under Power-Law Drift

Section 4 established that regularity preservation forces the drift velocity to obey

$$v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t) \lambda^b, \quad b > 1, \quad (9)$$

where $c(t) > 0$ is slowly varying.

The characteristics of (8) satisfy

$$\frac{d\lambda}{dt} = -c(t) \lambda^b. \quad (10)$$

Solving (10) (for slowly varying $c(t)$) yields

$$\lambda(t)^{1-b} = \lambda_0^{1-b} + (b-1) \int_0^t c(s) ds. \quad (11)$$

Thus spectral mass flows monotonically from high to low resolution.

5.4 Amplitude Evolution and the Factor $A(t)$

Along a characteristic curve, \tilde{g} satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{g}(\lambda(t), t) = -(\partial_\lambda v)(\lambda(t), t) \tilde{g}(\lambda(t), t). \quad (12)$$

Using $\partial_\lambda v = -c(t) b \lambda^{b-1}$, integration gives

$$\tilde{g}(\lambda(t), t) = \tilde{g}_0(\lambda_0) \exp\left(\int_0^t c(\tau) b \lambda(\tau)^{b-1} d\tau\right). \quad (13)$$

A direct evaluation of the integral in (13), using (11), yields the closed-form identity

$$\exp\left(\int_0^t c(\tau) b \lambda(\tau)^{b-1} d\tau\right) = \lambda_0^b \lambda(t)^{-b}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore the exact tail solution is

$$\tilde{g}(\lambda, t) = A(t) \lambda^{-b}, \quad A(t) := \lambda_0^b \lambda(t)^{-b}. \quad (15)$$

The function $A(t)$ is a geometric amplitude induced by spectral drift: it reflects Jacobian expansion of spectral mass under the characteristic flow.

5.5 Growth Rate of the Amplitude

Using (11), one obtains the asymptotic form

$$\lambda(t) \sim \left((b-1)\tau(t) \right)^{-1/(b-1)}, \quad \tau(t) = \int_0^t c(s) ds. \quad (16)$$

Substituting into (15) yields

$$A(t) \sim C \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}, \quad (17)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on the initial spectrum.

Thus the amplitude grows polynomially with effective training time $\tau(t)$:

$$A(t) \propto \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}. \quad (18)$$

This growth is monotone and slower than exponential but strong enough to temporarily increase the global loss before dissipation dominates, forming the basis of double descent (Section 6).

5.6 Universal Tail Structure

Combining the above results, the weak-coupling transport equation enforces the universal tail law

$$\tilde{g}(\lambda, t) \sim A(t) \lambda^{-b}, \quad A(t) \sim \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}. \quad (19)$$

Thus the full spectral density is

$$g(\lambda, t) = e^{-\phi(\lambda, t)} A(t) \lambda^{-b}. \quad (20)$$

5.7 Dissipation and the Resolution Frontier

From the characteristic equation $\partial_t \phi + v \partial_\lambda \phi = \lambda$, and the drift law $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$, Section 4 showed that the dissipation exponent takes the scaling form

$$\phi(\lambda, t) \sim K \lambda^{b-1} \tau(t), \quad (21)$$

for some constant $K > 0$ depending on architecture and initialization.

The exponential suppression $e^{-2\phi(\lambda, t)}$ localizes the loss integral near the solution of

$$\lambda^{b-1} \tau(t) \approx 1,$$

which defines the *resolution frontier*

$$\lambda^*(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-1/(b-1)}. \quad (22)$$

Modes with $\lambda \gg \lambda^*(t)$ decay rapidly, whereas modes with $\lambda \ll \lambda^*(t)$ are only weakly dissipated. The frontier determines the location of the dominant contribution to the loss.

Thus the full spectral density is

$$g(\lambda, t) = e^{-K \lambda^{b-1} \tau(t)} \lambda^{-b} \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}. \quad (23)$$

This structure — a universal power-law tail modulated by a geometric amplitude and dissipative exponent — is the foundation of scaling-law decay and the transient error growth analyzed in Section 6.

Besides, regarding the effective time $\tau(t)$, we have the following theorem to present that it is at most polynomial if the training of the network is stable:

Theorem 1 (Polynomial Growth of the Effective Time). *Let the drift strength $c(t)$ of the spectral velocity $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$ be determined by the gradient statistics of a neural network trained with a stable optimizer (SGD, AdamW, momentum SGD) under bounded gradient norms and non-exploding learning-rate schedules. Then the effective time*

$$\tau(t) = \int_0^t c(s) ds$$

satisfies

$$\tau(t) = t^\alpha L(t), \quad \alpha > 0,$$

where $L(t)$ is a slowly varying function in the sense of Karamata:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(kt)}{L(t)} = 1 \quad \forall k > 0.$$

In particular, $\tau(t)$ is asymptotically polynomial up to a slowly varying correction.

6 Self-Similar Spectral Dynamics and the Origin of Double Descent

Building on the weak-coupling solution in Section 5, we now analyze the full spectral density

$$g(\lambda, t) = e^{-K \lambda^{b-1} \tau(t)} \lambda^{-b} \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}. \quad (24)$$

The structure (24) contains two competing effects:

- (i) **Geometric expansion via drift.** The term $A(t) = \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}$ grows polynomially in time. This expansion originates purely from spectral transport: basis drift compresses spectral coordinates, and the associated Jacobian factor increases the mass density of the reparameterized spectrum.
- (ii) **Dissipation via $\phi(\lambda, t)$.** The factor $e^{-\phi(\lambda, t)} = e^{-K \lambda^{b-1} \tau(t)}$ suppresses high-resolution components at a rate that increases with both λ and t .

The tension between these two mechanisms induces a characteristic *rise-then-fall* behavior of the global loss $L(t)$, giving rise to double descent.

6.1 Early-Time Regime: Amplitude-Driven Growth of the Loss

At small $\tau(t)$, dissipation is negligible:

$$e^{-2\phi(\lambda, t)} \approx 1.$$

Thus the global loss

$$L(t) = \int_0^\infty g(\lambda, t)^2 d\lambda$$

is dominated by

$$L(t) \approx A(t)^2 \int_0^\infty \lambda^{-2b} d\lambda. \quad (25)$$

Since $A(t) \sim \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}$, we obtain the early-time scaling

$$L(t) \propto \tau(t)^{2b/(b-1)}. \quad (26)$$

Interpretation. The polynomial growth of $A(t)$ is a purely geometric effect: drift compresses high-resolution coordinates, and the corresponding Jacobian boosts spectral density. This effect *increases* the loss at early times, even though gradient descent is running.

Thus,

the average loss of each eigen value will initially increase.

This provides the first half of the double-descent curve.

6.2 Intermediate and Late-Time Regimes: Frontier-Dominated Decay

Once $\phi(\lambda, t)$ becomes significant, the tail of the spectrum is sharply suppressed and the loss localizes near $\lambda^*(t)$:

$$L(t) \approx A(t)^2 (\lambda^*(t))^{1-2b}. \quad (27)$$

Substituting $A(t) \sim \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}$ and $\lambda^*(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-1/(b-1)}$ gives

$$L(t) \sim \left(\tau^{b/(b-1)} \right)^2 \left(\tau^{-1/(b-1)} \right)^{1-2b} \quad (28)$$

$$= \tau^{2b/(b-1)} \tau^{-(1-2b)/(b-1)} \quad (29)$$

$$= \tau^{-(2b-1)/(b-1)}. \quad (30)$$

Thus the asymptotic scaling-law exponent is

$$\gamma = \frac{2b-1}{b-1}, \quad L(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-\gamma}. \quad (31)$$

Interpretation. Dissipation eventually dominates the geometric expansion encoded in $A(t)$. The resolution frontier slides to lower and lower resolutions, eliminating high-frequency error and forcing the loss into a power-law decay regime.

6.3 Double Descent as a Competition Between Amplitude and Dissipation

Combining the early- and late-time behaviors, we obtain the complete trajectory:

$$L(t) \propto \begin{cases} \tau(t)^{2b/(b-1)}, & \text{early rise,} \\ \tau(t)^{-(2b-1)/(b-1)}, & \text{late decay.} \end{cases}$$

Because $2b/(b-1) > 0$ and $(2b-1)/(b-1) > 0$, there must exist a unique t_{peak} such that $dL/dt = 0$. Thus:

Double descent is a natural consequence of spectral transport (i.e. feature learning).

The initial rise is driven by the polynomial growth of the geometric amplitude $A(t)$, while the eventual decay is driven by exponential suppression via $\phi(\lambda, t)$ and the migration of the resolution frontier $\lambda^*(t)$.

6.4 Summary

The key mechanism is the decomposition

$$g(\lambda, t) = A(t)\lambda^{-b}e^{-\phi(\lambda, t)},$$

in which $A(t) \propto \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}$ *always grows*, while $e^{-\phi(\lambda, t)}$ *always decays*. The intersection of these two monotone forces produces the universal rise-then-fall profile of the loss and yields the scaling-law exponent $\gamma = (2b-1)/(b-1)$ in the late-time regime.

7 A Unified View of NTK and Feature Learning Through Spectral Transport

A striking implication of the spectral transport equation derived in Sections 3–6 is that the classical “lazy training” (or NTK) regime and the feature-learning regime correspond to two limiting behaviors of the same dynamical object: the drift velocity

$$v(\lambda, t) = \langle \phi_\lambda(t), \dot{M}(t) \phi_\lambda(t) \rangle. \quad (32)$$

In this section we show that setting $v \equiv 0$ recovers the NTK kernel flow, whereas any nontrivial drift $v(\lambda, t)$ produces feature learning; the two extremes form a continuous spectrum of behaviors unified by the generalized spectral dynamics framework.

7.1 The NTK/Lazy Regime as the Zero-Drift Limit

If the feature map is frozen during training, the kernel operator $M(t)$ is constant and thus

$$\dot{M}(t) = 0 \quad \implies \quad v(\lambda, t) \equiv 0.$$

In this case, the spectral transport equation

$$\partial_t g + \partial_\lambda(vg) = -\lambda g$$

reduces to the purely dissipative flow

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t), \quad (33)$$

which has the closed-form solution

$$g(\lambda, t) = e^{-\lambda t} g(\lambda, 0).$$

No transport occurs in the spectral domain; all eigenfunctions remain fixed and the training dynamics depend only on the initial kernel $M(0)$, reproducing the classical NTK behavior. In particular:

- the model learns each spectral mode independently,
- no resolution frontier is formed,
- the loss decays exponentially for each mode,
- the model operates in the lazy regime with no representation learning.

Thus the NTK limit corresponds exactly to the *zero-drift* regime of generalized spectral dynamics.

7.2 Feature Learning as Transport-Dominated Dynamics

When the feature map evolves, $\dot{M}(t) \neq 0$ and the drift velocity

$$v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t) \lambda^b$$

becomes nonzero. The spectral PDE then takes the full transport–dissipation form

$$\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t).$$

In this regime, spectral mass *moves across scales*. Several phenomena emerge:

- a geometric amplitude factor $A(t) \sim \tau(t)^{b/(b-1)}$ develops from the Jacobian of the drift flow;
- a resolution frontier $\lambda^*(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-1/(b-1)}$ forms, separating learned and unlearned modes;
- the loss may initially *increase* due to amplitude growth (a geometric effect), producing double descent;
- dissipation eventually dominates, enforcing the universal scaling law $L(t) \sim \tau(t)^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma = (2b - 1)/(b - 1)$.

These effects are impossible in the NTK regime because drift vanishes: feature learning *requires* nonzero spectral transport.

7.3 A Continuous Spectrum: From Lazy NTK to Full Feature Learning

The framework described here reveals a continuum between the two extremes:

- If $v(\lambda, t)$ is small compared to λ , dissipation dominates and the system behaves almost lazily (NTK-like).
- If $v(\lambda, t)$ dominates the dissipation term, transport injects nontrivial geometry and the system performs representation learning.
- Intermediate regimes correspond to *partial* feature learning, where some modes remain NTK-like while others are shaped by drift.

Thus, generalized spectral dynamics unifies both paradigms:

$$\boxed{\text{NTK regime} \iff v(\lambda, t) \equiv 0} \quad (34)$$

$$\boxed{\text{Feature learning regime} \iff v(\lambda, t) \text{ dominates spectral evolution}} \quad (35)$$

This interpretation gives a precise and operator-theoretic description of the transition between lazy training and representation learning.

7.4 Summary

The drift velocity $v(\lambda, t)$ serves as a single scalar “order parameter” determining whether the network operates in the NTK regime or the feature-learning regime. Generalized spectral dynamics provides a unified PDE framework in which both behaviors arise as special cases, and all intermediate behaviors interpolate smoothly between them. This unification highlights the operator-level geometry underlying neural representation learning and positions spectral transport as a fundamental mechanism governing modern deep learning dynamics.

8 Related Work

Neural scaling laws. Empirical studies have established that neural networks display remarkably regular power-law relationships between compute, model size, dataset size, and achievable loss [Kaplan et al., 2020, Henighan et al., 2020, Hestness et al., 2017, Hoffmann et al., 2022, Hernandez et al., 2021]. Recent work has

investigated both the emergence of such scaling behavior and its theoretical underpinnings, including dynamical models of loss evolution [Bordelon et al., 2024] and the role of data pruning [Sorscher et al., 2022]. Precision scaling laws have also been explored in the context of architectural and quantization constraints [Kumar et al., 2024].

Feature learning and spectral bias. A major line of work studies how neural networks acquire hierarchical representations and exhibit spectral preference [Rahaman et al., 2019, Bordelon and Pehlevan, 2024]. Kernel-based analyses of learning dynamics [Bietti and Bach, 2021, Canatar and Pehlevan, 2022] and infinite-width approximations [Jacot et al., 2018a, Lee et al., 2019a, Yang, 2021] have contributed significantly to understanding the transition between lazy training and representation learning. Recent studies have also revealed consistency of learned features across widths [Vyas et al., 2023] and the spectral evolution of networks [Wang et al., 2023].

Optimization dynamics and stability. The geometry of optimization landscapes, the effect of batch size, and training stability have been examined extensively [Keskar et al., 2017, Ghorbani et al., 2019]. Work on pruning and compression [Rosenfeld et al., 2021, Han et al., 2016a, Blalock et al., 2020, LeCun et al., 1990, Molchanov et al., 2017, Lee et al., 2019b, Wang et al., 2020, Han et al., 2016b, Nagel et al., 2021, Frantar et al., 2022, Dettmers et al., 2022] has illuminated how spectral structure interacts with parameter sparsity and low-precision computation. Theoretical connections between spectral evolution, implicit bias, and neural dynamics continue to be an active area of research [Dominé et al., 2024, Zhang, 2025].

Perturbation theory and adiabatic analysis. Our spectral formulation draws on classical operator perturbation theory [Kato, 2012] and its analogues in quantum adiabatic evolution [Zwiebach, 2018]. These tools formalize how eigenfunctions and eigenvalues evolve under smooth or weakly coupled updates, providing a principled foundation for the drift–dissipation dynamics developed in this work.

9 Conclusion

This work introduced a generalized spectral framework for understanding neural scaling laws, feature learning, and compression phenomena through a unified partial differential equation governing the evolution of spectral coefficients. The key

insight is that neural training dynamics naturally decompose into a transport term—driven by feature learning and encoded by the drift velocity $v(\lambda, t)$ —and a dissipative term determined by the eigenvalues of the task operator. Under weak coupling, the resulting dynamics admit self-similar solutions with power-law structure, providing a principled explanation for a wide range of empirical scaling behaviors, including the emergence of resolution frontiers, double-descent phenomena, and the robustness of scaling exponents.

Our analysis also demonstrates that NTK/lazy training and feature learning arise as two limiting regimes of the same spectral PDE, distinguished only by whether the drift term vanishes. Moreover, we establish that stable training necessarily induces an effective time reparameterization of polynomial order, $\tau(t) = t^\alpha L(t)$, with $L(t)$ slowly varying in the sense of Karamata; this explains the empirical universality of scaling exponents despite variations in optimizers, schedules, and architectures.

Future directions. Several important extensions remain open for future research:

1. **Multi-task and multi-distribution learning.** Our analysis primarily considers the single-task, single-distribution setting. Extending spectral dynamics to multi-task systems—where task operators may not share eigenbases and may interact through shared representation drift—could reveal new forms of interference, transfer, and modular generalization.
2. **Quantitative weak coupling.** The weak-coupling assumption in this paper is qualitative. A more precise, quantitative theory would clarify how architectural choices, initialization scales, and data distributions determine the strength of spectral coupling. In particular, while SGD suppresses global coupling and promotes local transport, the dependence of this effect on batch size and optimizer noise remains poorly understood.
3. **Modeling optimizers and learning-rate schedules.** Our spectral PDE is derived for vanilla SGD. Momentum, Adam-type pseudo-second-order methods, and natural or approximate Newton methods can substantially modify the drift and dissipation structure. Developing spectral characterizations of these optimizers—and the influence of cosine, step, or adaptive learning-rate schedules—is a promising direction toward a complete operator-theoretic theory of training dynamics.
4. **Connecting J_θ to network architecture.** The Jacobian operator J_θ encodes how parameters generate features, but its structural dependence on architecture is not yet understood. Clarifying how depth, width, and parameter

count control the spectral shape of J_θ could illuminate how model scaling influences achievable loss, compression limits, and representation geometry. Such a theory would bridge architectural design with the spectral regimes identified in this work.

Overall, our framework highlights spectral transport as a fundamental mechanism underlying the empirical regularities of modern deep learning. We hope it provides a foundation for a broader, unified theory connecting optimization, architecture, and scaling phenomena.

References

- Alberto Bietti and Francis Bach. The inductive bias of neural tangent kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Davis Blalock, Jose Javier Gonzalez Ortiz, Jonathan Frankle, and John Guttag. What is the state of neural network pruning? *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2020.
- Blake Bordelon and Cengiz Pehlevan. How feature learning can improve neural scaling laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17858*, 2024.
- Blake Bordelon, Alexander Atanasov, and Cengiz Pehlevan. A dynamical model of neural scaling laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01092*, 2024.
- Abdulkadir Canatar and Cengiz Pehlevan. A kernel analysis of feature learning in deep neural networks. In *2022 58th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2022.
- Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Sam Shleifer, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 8-bit optimizers via block-wise quantization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Clémentine CJ Dominé, Nicolas Anguita, Alexandra M Proca, Lukas Braun, Daniel Kunin, Pedro AM Mediano, and Andrew M Saxe. From lazy to rich: Exact learning dynamics in deep linear networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14623*, 2024.
- Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Torsten Hoefer, and Dan Alistarh. Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17323*, 2022.

- Behrooz Ghorbani, Shankar Krishnan, and Ying Xiao. An investigation into neural net optimization via hessian eigenvalue density. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016a.
- Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J. Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.00149>.
- Tom Henighan, Jared Kaplan, Mayank Katz, Mark Chen, Christopher Hesse, Jacob Jackson, Heewoo Jun, Tom Brown, Prafulla Dhariwal, Scott Gray, et al. Scaling laws for autoregressive generative modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14701*, 2020.
- Danny Hernandez, Jared Kaplan, Tom Henighan, and Sam McCandlish. Scaling laws and interpretability of learning from diverse data sources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07437*, 2021.
- Joel Hestness, Sharan Narang, Newsha Ardalani, Greg Diamos, Heewoo Jun, Hassan Kianinejad, Mostofa Patwary, Yang You Ali, Yanqi Zhou, and Paulius Micekevicius. Deep learning scaling is predictable, empirically. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Workshop on ML Systems*, 2017.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022.
- Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018a.
- Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 8571–8580, 2018b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.07572>.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.

- Tosio Kato. *A short introduction to perturbation theory for linear operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Nitish Shirish Keskar, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Jorge Nocedal, Mikhail Smelyanskiy, and Ping Tak Peter Tang. On large-batch training for deep learning: Generalization gap and sharp minima. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- Tanishq Kumar, Zachary Ankner, Benjamin F Spector, Blake Bordelon, Niklas Muennighoff, Mansheej Paul, Cengiz Pehlevan, Christopher Ré, and Aditi Raghunathan. Scaling laws for precision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04330*, 2024.
- Yann LeCun, John S Denker, and Sara A Solla. Optimal brain damage. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1990.
- Jaehoon Lee, Lechao Xiao, Samuel S Schoenholz, Yasaman Bahri, Roman Novak, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Jeffrey Pennington. Wide neural networks of any depth evolve as linear models under gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019a.
- Namhoon Lee, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip H.S. Torr. Snip: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019b.
- Dmitry Molchanov, Arsenii Ashukha, and Dmitry Vetrov. Variational dropout sparsifies deep neural networks. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- Markus Nagel, Raja Amjad, Mart van Baalen, Tijmen Blankevoort, and Max Welling. Up or down? adaptive rounding for post-training quantization. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- Nasim Rahaman, Aristide Baratin, Devansh Arpit, Felix Draxler, Min Lin, Fred Hamprecht, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. On the spectral bias of neural networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2019.
- Jonathan S Rosenfeld, Jonathan Frankle, Michael Carbin, and Nir Shavit. On the predictability of pruning across scales. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 9075–9083. PMLR, 2021.
- Ben Sorscher, Robert Geirhos, Shashank Shekhar, Surya Ganguli, and Ari Morcos. Beyond neural scaling laws: beating power law scaling via data pruning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19523–19536, 2022.

- Nikhil Vyas, Alexander Atanasov, Blake Bordelon, Depen Morwani, Sabarish Sainathan, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Feature-learning networks are consistent across widths at realistic scales. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:1036–1060, 2023.
- Alexander Wang, Niranjan Vyas, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Spectral evolution and invariance in linear-width neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06506>.
- Chaoqi Wang, Guodong Zhang, and Roger Grosse. Picking winning tickets before training by preserving gradient flow. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- Chaojun Xiao, Jie Cai, Weilin Zhao, Biyuan Lin, Guoyang Zeng, Jie Zhou, Zhi Zheng, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Densing law of llms. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–11, 2025.
- Greg Yang. Tensor programs iv: Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14522>.
- Yizhou Zhang. A generalized spectral framework to expain neural scaling and compression dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.07892*, 2025.
- Barton Zwiebach. Mit 8.06 quantum physics iii: Chapter 6 – the adiabatic approximation. <https://ocw.mit.edu>, 2018. See Eq. (3.9).

A Derivation of the Spectral Transport Equation

This appendix provides a complete derivation of the spectral transport equation used in the main text. We begin by formalizing the regularity and density assumptions needed for the passage from discrete mode dynamics to a continuum spectral PDE.

A.1 Regularity Assumptions

We consider a family of self-adjoint positive semidefinite operators $M(t) : H \rightarrow H$ on $H = L^2(p)$ with discrete spectrum

$$M(t)\varphi_u(t) = \lambda_u(t) \varphi_u(t), \quad u \in \mathcal{U}.$$

The error at time t admits an instantaneous eigen-expansion

$$e_t = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} g_u(t) \varphi_u(t).$$

The dynamics of the coefficients $g_u(t)$ is given by the exact mode ODE

$$\partial_t g_u(t) + \sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = -\lambda_u(t) g_u(t), \quad (36)$$

where the coupling kernel is

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}, \quad u \neq v.$$

We introduce the spectral error measure

$$\mu_t := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} g_u(t) \delta_{\lambda_u(t)}.$$

To pass to a continuous spectral description, we impose the following assumptions.

Assumption 2 (Spectral Density). For each t , the measure μ_t admits a density with respect to Lebesgue measure:

$$\mu_t(d\lambda) = g(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

Moreover, $g(\lambda, t)$ is locally integrable in λ and measurable in t .

Assumption 3 (Regularity and Integrability). The functions $g(\lambda, t)$, the spectral drift velocity $v(\lambda, t)$ (defined below), and the coupling term $S(\lambda, t)$ admit sufficient smoothness and decay so that all integrals and integrations by parts performed in the proof are justified. In particular,

$$\lim_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t) = 0.$$

Assumption 4 (Local Spectral Averaging). There exists a function $v(\lambda, t)$ such that

$$v(\lambda, t) := \mathbb{E}[\dot{\lambda}_u(t) \mid \lambda_u(t) \approx \lambda]$$

is well defined and satisfies the identity

$$\sum_u g_u(t) \phi'(\lambda_u(t)) \dot{\lambda}_u(t) = \int \phi'(\lambda) v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda$$

for all smooth compactly supported ϕ .

Assumption 5 (Mean Coupling Closure). There exists $S(\lambda, t)$ such that

$$-\sum_u \phi(\lambda_u(t)) \sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \int \phi(\lambda) S(\lambda, t) d\lambda$$

for all smooth compactly supported test functions ϕ .

These assumptions encapsulate the idea that, in the large-rank regime, both eigenvalue drift and inter-mode interactions depend smoothly on the spectral location and admit stable statistical limits.

A.2 Spectral Transport Theorem

Theorem 6 (Spectral Transport Equation). *Under Assumptions 2–5, the spectral density $g(\lambda, t)$ satisfies the weak identity*

$$\int \phi(\lambda) \left(\partial_t g + \partial_\lambda (v g) + \lambda g - S \right) (\lambda, t) d\lambda = 0 \quad \text{for all smooth compactly supported } \phi. \quad (37)$$

If g , v , and S are smooth, then g satisfies the spectral transport equation in the strong sense:

$$\boxed{\partial_t g(\lambda, t) + \partial_\lambda (v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t)) = -\lambda g(\lambda, t) + S(\lambda, t).} \quad (38)$$

A.3 Proof of Theorem 6

Let ϕ be a smooth compactly supported test function. By the definition of μ_t and its density,

$$\int \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda = \int \phi(\lambda) \mu_t(d\lambda) = \sum_u g_u(t) \phi(\lambda_u(t)).$$

Differentiating in time yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_u g_u(t) \phi(\lambda_u(t)) = \sum_u \partial_t g_u(t) \phi(\lambda_u(t)) + \sum_u g_u(t) \phi'(\lambda_u(t)) \dot{\lambda}_u(t).$$

Drift term. Using Assumption 4,

$$\sum_u g_u(t) \phi'(\lambda_u(t)) \dot{\lambda}_u(t) = \int \phi'(\lambda) v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

Amplitude dynamics. Substituting the mode ODE (36) into the first sum yields

$$\sum_u \partial_t g_u(t) \phi(\lambda_u(t)) = \sum_u \left(-\lambda_u g_u - \sum_{v \neq u} g_v \Omega_{v \rightarrow u} \right) \phi(\lambda_u).$$

The dissipation term reduces to

$$-\sum_u \lambda_u g_u \phi(\lambda_u) = -\int \lambda \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

The coupling term is handled by Assumption 5:

$$-\sum_u \phi(\lambda_u) \sum_{v \neq u} g_v \Omega_{v \rightarrow u} = \int \phi(\lambda) S(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

Combining terms. We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda = \int \phi'(\lambda) v(\lambda, t) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda - \int \lambda \phi(\lambda) g(\lambda, t) d\lambda + \int \phi(\lambda) S(\lambda, t) d\lambda.$$

By Assumption 3, integration by parts yields

$$\int \phi'(\lambda) v g d\lambda = -\int \phi(\lambda) \partial_\lambda (v g) d\lambda.$$

Thus

$$\int \phi(\lambda) \partial_t g(\lambda, t) d\lambda = \int \phi(\lambda) \left(-\partial_\lambda (v g) - \lambda g + S \right) d\lambda.$$

Rearranging gives the weak formulation (37). If g , v , and S are smooth, the integrand must vanish pointwise, yielding the strong PDE (38). \square

B Operator-Theoretic Origin of Spectral Coupling Decay

This appendix expands on the structural reasons why spectral coupling

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) = \frac{\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle}{\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)}$$

decays sharply as $|\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)|$ increases, thereby leading to the weak-coupling regime used in the main text.

B.1 Locality of $\dot{M}(t)$

The operator

$$\dot{M}(t) = \dot{J}_{\theta(t)} P_t J_{\theta(t)}^* + J_{\theta(t)} \dot{P}_t J_{\theta(t)}^* + J_{\theta(t)} P_t \dot{J}_{\theta(t)}^*$$

is assembled from the network Jacobian $J_{\theta(t)}$ and the data-induced multiplication operator P_t . Both are *local* operators acting on functions of the input space. Eigenfunctions with widely separated eigenvalues differ strongly in resolution, and thus become nearly orthogonal under local perturbations. Consequently,

$$|\langle \varphi_u(t), \dot{M}(t) \varphi_v(t) \rangle| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } |\lambda_u(t) - \lambda_v(t)| \rightarrow \infty.$$

B.2 Spectral denominator

The denominator $(\lambda_v - \lambda_u)$ further suppresses long-range interactions, giving

$$|\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t)| \lesssim \frac{|\langle \varphi_u, \dot{M} \varphi_v \rangle|}{|\lambda_v - \lambda_u|} \rightarrow 0.$$

This produces a near-diagonal structure for the coupling matrix in spectral space, analogous to the decay of Fourier interactions between smooth and highly oscillatory components.

B.3 Effect of SGD noise

Stochastic gradient descent adds a zero-mean perturbation

$$\dot{M}(t) = \dot{M}_{\text{GD}}(t) + \Xi_t,$$

where the fluctuation term Ξ_t has covariance aligned with the data distribution. High-resolution eigenfunctions oscillate rapidly and average out the random perturbations, yielding

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \varphi_u, \Xi_t \varphi_v \rangle] \approx 0 \quad \text{whenever } |\lambda_u - \lambda_v| \text{ is large.}$$

Thus SGD further narrows the effective interaction bandwidth.

B.4 Consequence: natural weak coupling

Combining locality of perturbations, spectral separation, and SGD averaging, we obtain

$$\Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) \approx 0 \quad \text{unless } |\lambda_v(t) - \lambda_u(t)| \text{ is small.}$$

Therefore the aggregate coupling term

$$S(\lambda, t) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{v \neq u} g_v(t) \Omega_{v \rightarrow u}(t) \mid \lambda_u(t) \approx \lambda \right]$$

is negligible in the high-resolution regime, justifying the weak-coupling approximation used in Section 3.5.

C The polynomial bound of effective time $\tau(t)$

Theorem 7 (Polynomial Growth of the Effective Time). *Let the drift strength $c(t)$ of the spectral velocity $v(\lambda, t) \sim -c(t)\lambda^b$ be determined by the gradient statistics of a neural network trained with a stable optimizer (SGD, AdamW, momentum SGD) under bounded gradient norms and non-exploding learning-rate schedules. Then the effective time*

$$\tau(t) = \int_0^t c(s) ds$$

satisfies

$$\tau(t) = t^\alpha L(t), \quad \alpha > 0,$$

where $L(t)$ is a slowly varying function in the sense of Karamata:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(kt)}{L(t)} = 1 \quad \forall k > 0.$$

In particular, $\tau(t)$ is asymptotically polynomial up to a slowly varying correction.

Proof. The drift amplitude $c(t)$ is determined by

$$v(\lambda, t) = -c(t)\lambda^b, \quad c(t) = \langle \phi_\lambda(t), \dot{M}(t) \phi_\lambda(t) \rangle \lambda^{-b}.$$

The operator derivative $\dot{M}(t)$ equals the expected gradient outer product

$$\dot{M}(t) = \mathbb{E} [\nabla_\theta f(x; \theta(t)) \nabla_\theta f(x; \theta(t))^\top] \cdot \eta(t),$$

where $\eta(t)$ is the learning rate.

Under standard stability conditions of deep learning:

- bounded gradient norms: $\|\nabla_\theta f(x; \theta(t))\| \leq C$,
- non-exploding learning rates,
- Lipschitz continuity of the gradient field,

- noise-controlled SGD (bounded variance),

the quantity $c(t)$ is positive and satisfies

$$c_{\min} t^{\alpha-1} \leq c(t) \leq c_{\max} t^{\alpha-1} L(t),$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and a slowly varying function L . This follows from classical results on stochastic approximation and ODE–SDE averaging, which imply that gradient magnitudes evolve according to polynomially bounded envelopes and admit slowly varying corrections through learning-rate modulation and noise.

Integrating $c(t)$, we obtain

$$\tau(t) = \int_0^t c(s) ds = t^\alpha L(t),$$

where the same $L(t)$ (up to asymptotic equivalence) is slowly varying because integration preserves slow variation.

Thus the effective time is asymptotically a polynomial multiplied by a slowly varying factor. \square