

A Duality Analysis of Kernel Ridge Regression in the Noiseless Regime

Jihao Long* Xiaojun Peng† Lei Wu‡

February 27, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of generalization properties of Kernel Ridge Regression (KRR) in the noiseless regime, a scenario crucial to scientific computing, where data are often generated via computer simulations. We prove that KRR can attain the minimax optimal rate, which depends on both the eigenvalue decay of the associated kernel and the relative smoothness of target functions. Particularly, when the eigenvalue decays exponentially fast, KRR achieves the *spectral accuracy*, i.e., a convergence rate faster than any polynomial. Moreover, the numerical experiments well corroborate our theoretical findings. Our proof leverages a novel extension of the duality framework introduced by [CLW23], which could be useful in analyzing kernel-based methods beyond the scope of this work.

Keywords: Kernel ridge regression, Reproducing kernel Hilbert space, Convergence rate, Duality

1 Introduction

In supervised learning for regression tasks, we work with n *i.i.d.* training samples $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ with $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y_i = f^*(x_i) + \epsilon_i$ for $i \in [n]$. Here $f^* : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ represents the target function and ϵ_i denotes the label noise. The primary objective in regression is to recover f^* as accurately as possible using these samples, aiming to minimize the generalization error:

$$\|\hat{f} - f^*\|_\rho^2 = \int |\hat{f}(x) - f^*(x)|^2 d\rho(x), \quad (1)$$

where \hat{f} denotes our model. This stands as a cornerstone problem across the fields of statistics, machine learning, and applied mathematics. For a comprehensive overview of the methods related to this problem, we direct readers to [GKK⁺02].

Kernel-based methods, one of the most popular methods in practice, use a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) [Aro50] as the hypothesis space. Specifically, in this paper, we consider the kernel ridge regression (KRR) which estimates f^* by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - y_i)^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (2)$$

*Institute for Advanced Algorithms Research, Shanghai, longjh1998@gmail.com

†University of Science and Technology of China, pengxiaojun@mail.ustc.edu.cn

‡Peking University, leiwu@math.pku.edu.cn

where λ is a regularization hyperparameter and \mathcal{H} denotes the RKHS associated to a kernel function k defined over \mathcal{X} . Over the past decades, theories surrounding KRR have been extensively developed, especially regarding the convergence rate of the generalization error. Specifically, [CDV07] shows that KRR can achieve the minimax optimal rate $O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ for target functions within a general RKHS and even the *fast rate* $O(n^{-1})$ if the RKHS is small enough measured by the eigenvalue decay or the effective dimension [MGH04, Zha05]. We refer to works like [SC08, SHS09, DFH17, FS20, LZL23] for the subsequent refined analysis in this line of research.

Nevertheless, existing analyses have primarily centered on scenarios with significant label noise. This focus is well-founded in traditional statistics and machine learning. However, the landscape is changing as now machine learning methods have been increasingly applied in scientific computing. In many such applications, e.g., numerical approximation of partial differential equation (PDE) solutions [SS18, HJE18, RPK19, EY18, CCEY22], the data are generated via computer simulations where noise can effectively be considered negligible. This shift necessitates a refined analysis of KRR in the noiseless regime, particularly to assess whether conclusions drawn under the noisy regime remain valid.

1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we present a detailed analysis of the generalization error of KRR in the noiseless regime. To be precise, we consider $f^* \in \mathcal{H}^s$, where \mathcal{H}^s is an interpolation space with s quantifying the smoothness relative to \mathcal{H} (see Definition 2.1) and satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{s_1} \subset \mathcal{H}^1 = \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}^{s_2}$ for $s_1 \leq 1 \leq s_2$. Therefore, $s > 1$ means f^* has extra smoothness, while $s < 1$ corresponds to a misspecified case as the model $\hat{f}_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ resides outside of \mathcal{H}^s . Also, denote by $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ the eigenvalues of the associated kernel in a decreasing order. Then, we show:

- For polynomial eigenvalue decay, $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$, KRR can achieve a rate of $\tilde{O}(n^{-\max(s,2)t})$ for $s \in (t^{-1}, +\infty)$. This implies that KRR can leverage the relative smoothness of target functions up to $s = 2$, beyond which increasing smoothness does not further improve the convergence rate. We also establish a lower bound, indicating KRR is, up to logarithmic factors, mini-max optimal for $s \in (t^{-1}, 2]$.
- For exponential eigenvalue decay, $\mu_j \sim c^j$ with $c \in (0, 1)$, KRR can attain a rate of $e^{-\tilde{O}(n)}$ for any $s \in (0, +\infty)$, which is known as *spectral accuracy* in numerical analysis [Tre00]. Thus, logarithmic samples suffice for learning functions in the corresponding RKHS.

Numerical experiments also corroborate well with our theoretical findings. These results imply that the convergence rate of KRR in the noiseless case can substantially exceed $O(n^{-1})$, which is the fastest rate typically expected in the noisy regime.

It is worth noting that our proofs of these results are through a novel extension of the duality framework proposed by [CLW23]. Specifically, we establish a dual equivalence between the generalization error of KRR and the approximation error of random feature methods (RFMs) [RR07] (see Proposition 4.4). Hence, we analyze the generalization of KRR by studying the approximation of RFMs. We believe that this technique holds the potential for broader applications in analyzing kernel methods beyond the scope of our current work.

1.2 Related Works

The noisy regime. Pioneering works by [CDV07] and [SHS09] have established that KRR can achieve the minimax optimal rate $O(n^{-\frac{st}{st+1}})$ for $s \in [1, 2]$. Subsequent works like [FS20] extend the analysis to the

misspecified case, where $s \in (0, 1)$, by employing the embedding property (EMB): $\|\mathcal{H}^\gamma \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\rho)\| < \infty$ for some $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{t}$. To be precise, let

$$\gamma_0 = \inf\{\gamma : \|\mathcal{H}^\gamma \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\rho)\| < \infty\}. \quad (3)$$

Notably, [FS20] shows that when $s \in (\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{t}, 1)$, the rate $O(n^{-\frac{st}{st+1}})$ is still minimax optimal for target functions in $\mathcal{H}^s \cap L^\infty(\rho) \neq \mathcal{H}^s$. This target function condition is later relaxed to $\mathcal{H}^s \cap L^q(\rho)$ for some $q > 2$ in [ZLLL23]. Moreover, [ZLLL23] shows for Sobolev RKHSs, $\mathcal{H}^s \cap L^q(\rho) = \mathcal{H}^s$ and $s_0 = \frac{1}{t}$, by which they establish the minimax optimality of KRR for Sobolev RKHSs when $s \in (0, 1)$. As for the case of $s > 2$, works like [BPR07, DFH17] and [LZL22] show that KRR can only attain the rate $O(n^{-\frac{2t}{2t+1}})$ and is thus not minimax optimal. In other words, a ‘‘saturation phenomenon’’ occurs: the KRR’s adaptivity to the relative smoothness does not extend beyond $s = 2$.

The noiseless regime. The refined analysis of KRR in the noiseless regime has recently emerged in conjunction with studies on KRR’s learning curves [SGW20, BCP20, CLKZ21, LZL23]. In studies such as [BCP20] and [CLKZ21], non-rigorous approaches are employed under Gaussian design. [LZL23] removes the Gaussian assumption but requires the target function f^* to satisfy a modified source condition: $f^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \mu_j^{\frac{s}{2}} j^{-\frac{1}{2}} e_j$ with $s > 0$ and $|a_j| \leq C$. In contrast, we stick to the standard source condition: $f^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \mu_j^{\frac{s}{2}} e_j$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 < +\infty$. Evidently, the modified source condition in [LZL23] is more restrictive due to the additional $j^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ term. Moreover, we establish the minimax optimal rate for $s \in (t^{-1}, 2]$, while [LZL23] only gives the optimal rate for $s \in [1, 2]$. By introducing a weighted sampling strategy, we also remove the embedding index assumption ($\gamma_0 = \frac{1}{t}$) required in [LZL23].

1.3 Notations

We shall use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote an operator norm without specifying the input and output space for brevity. Let $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ denote the set of probability measures over Ω . We use \mathcal{I} to denote a general identity operator without specifying the domain for brevity and I_d the $d \times d$ identity matrix. For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, let $\langle f, g \rangle_\gamma = \int f(x)g(x) d\gamma(x)$ for any $f, g \in L^2(\gamma)$ and $\|\cdot\|_\gamma$ be the induced norm. Given two Banach spaces \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} with $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, we denote by $\|\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}\| := \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{A}}=1} \|x\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ the norm of the inclusion operator. We use big-O notations like $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$ and $\Theta(\cdot)$ to hide constants and $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to further hide logarithmic factors. We also use $a \lesssim b$ to mean $a = O(b)$ and $a \gtrsim b$ is defined analogously. We use $a \sim b$ if $a = \Theta(b)$.

2 Preliminaries

A function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a (positive definite) kernel if $k(x, x') = k(x', x), \forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\forall n \geq 1, x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{X}$, the kernel matrix $(k(x_i, x_j))_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive semidefinite. Given a kernel $k(\cdot, \cdot)$, there exists a unique Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that $k(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = f(x), \forall f \in \mathcal{H}, x \in \mathcal{X}$. The second property is known as the reproducing property and this Hilbert space is often referred to as the RKHS.

To characterize the RKHS, we consider the integral operator $\mathcal{T} : L^2(\rho) \mapsto L^2(\rho)$ given by

$$\mathcal{T}f = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\cdot, x') f(x') d\rho(x'). \quad (4)$$

Throughout this paper, we assume that $\int k(x, x) d\rho(x) < \infty$ and $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous. Under this condition, the Mercer’s theorem [Mer09] guarantees that the kernel $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ has the spectral decomposition:

$$k(x, x') = \sum_j \mu_j e_j(x) e_j(x'), \quad (5)$$

where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are the eigenvalues in a decreasing order and $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions satisfying $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle_\rho = \delta_{i,j}$ and $\mathcal{T}e_j = \mu_j e_j$. Then, $\sum_j \mu_j = \int k(x, x) d\rho(x) < \infty$. Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathcal{T} does not have zero eigenvalues, otherwise we can always focus on the subspace spanned by the eigenfunctions associated with nonzero eigenvalues. Accordingly, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{T}^s : L^2(\rho) \mapsto L^2(\rho)$ is defined as $\mathcal{T}^s f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s \langle f, e_j \rangle e_j$.

Definition 2.1 (Interpolation space). For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, for any $f \in L^2(\rho)$, define $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} := \|\mathcal{T}^{-\frac{s}{2}} f\|_\rho = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^{-s} \langle f, e_j \rangle_\rho^2}$.

This type of interpolation spaces are proposed in [CDV07] and later systematically investigated in [FS20]. By the definition, we have that for any $s \geq 0$, \mathcal{H}^s is a well-defined Hilbert space. Particularly, $\mathcal{H}^1 = \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}^0 = L^2(\rho)$, and \mathcal{H}^s provides a natural interpolation between them, and beyond (i.e., $s \geq 1$). For the case of $s < 0$, \mathcal{H}^s as a function space may not be well-defined. However, for functions in $L^2(\rho)$, the “ \mathcal{H}^s norm” is always well-defined and weaker than the $L^2(\rho)$ norm. In general, the index s quantifies the smoothness relative to \mathcal{H} .

For more details about RKHS, we direct to [Wai19, Chapter 12]. Additionally, we provide a concise overview of bounded linear operators over Hilbert spaces in Appendix A.

3 Main Results

Recall that we use ρ to denote the distribution used to evaluate the estimator’s performance. We suppose, instead of drawn from ρ , $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are drawn from $\rho' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with ρ' given by $\frac{d\rho'}{d\rho} = p > 0$. Accordingly, we consider the following KRR:

$$\hat{f}_\lambda = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{H}_k} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p(x_i)} (f(x_i) - y_i)^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right], \quad (6)$$

where the weighted empirical risk is an unbiased estimate of the true risk (1). This includes the standard setup where $p(x) \equiv 1$. Additionally, we show that weighted sampling can be instrumental in controlling generalization error, especially in scenarios where the data-generating process can be manipulated. Note that when $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$, \hat{f}_λ converges to the following minimum-norm solution (see Lemma B.1):

$$\hat{f}_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{H}, f(x_i) = y_i, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

Assumption 1 (Source condition). Suppose $\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} < \infty$ for some $s \in (0, \infty)$.

When $s = 1$, it corresponds to the common RKHS assumption $f^* \in \mathcal{H}$. For the case of $s > 1$, the target function f^* has extra smoothness relative to \mathcal{H} . The case of $s < 1$ corresponds to a *misspecified* case, as f^* resides outside the hypothesis space \mathcal{H} . To ensure the well-posedness of KRR in this misspecified case, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 2. $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s < \infty$.

This assumption naturally holds when $s \geq 1$ as $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j < \infty$. For the misspecified case, where $s < 1$, it holds for any $s \in (\frac{1}{t}, +\infty)$ if $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$ and for any $s > 0$ if $\mu_j \sim c^{-j}$ for some $c \in (0, 1)$.

Note that $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s |e_j(x)|^2 d\rho(x) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s$. Thus, Assumption 2 implies that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s |e_j(x)|^2 < \infty$ holds ρ -a.s.. This is equivalent to the ρ -a.s. boundedness of the evaluation functional $L_x : \mathcal{H}^s \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ given by $L_x f = f(x)$ due to

$$\|L_x\| = \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq 1} |L_x f| = \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq 1} |f(x)| = \sup_{\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^{-s} a_j^2 \leq 1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j e_j(x) \right| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^s |e_j(x)|^2},$$

where the last step uses the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

It is worth noting that Assumption 2 is related to the commonly-adopted γ_0 -EMB property (3) in previous works [SHS09, FS20, ZLLL23]. First, γ_0 -EMB is equivalent to the uniform boundedness:

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^\gamma |e_j(x)|^2 < \infty$$

for any $\gamma > \gamma_0$ (see Theorem 6.1 in [FS20]). In contrast, Assumption 2 only requires the average boundedness: $\int \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^s |e_j(x)|^2 d\rho(x) < \infty$.

To measure the complexity of \mathcal{H}^s functions, we use the degree of freedom (DoF) given by

Definition 3.1 (Maximal DoF). $F_p^s(\lambda) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{p(x)} \|\mathcal{T}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\mathcal{T} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} k(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$.

We remark that the case of $s = 1$ has been adopted in [Bac17] to study the uniform approximability of RKHS functions with random features. Maximal DoF is closely related to another DoF: $N^s(\lambda) = \operatorname{Tr}((\mathcal{T} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s} \mathcal{T}^s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_i^s}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^s}$, for which, the special case of $s = 1$ has been extensively adopted in analyzing kernel methods [Zha05, CDV07]. It follows from the eigen decomposition (5) that

$$F_p^s(\lambda) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{p(x)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} |e_j(x)|^2. \quad (7)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_p^s(\lambda) &\geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{p(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_i^s}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^s} |e_i(x)|^2 d\rho'(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_i^s}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^s} |e_i(x)|^2 d\rho(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_i^s}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^s} = N^s(\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In addition, $N^s(\lambda)$ can also serve as an upper bound of $F_p^s(\lambda)$, as we now explain. Let $q^s(x, \lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} |e_j(x)|^2$. Then, $\int q^s(x, \lambda) d\rho(x) = N^s(\lambda)$. Hence, taking $p = p^* := q^s(\cdot, \lambda)/N^s(\lambda)$ gives $F_p^s(\lambda) = N^s(\lambda)$. However, this requires access to the kernel's spectrum, which may not be feasible in all cases. Even so, for the standard case where $\rho = \rho'$, we can draw similar conclusions under certain conditions:

- *Uniform boundedness of eigenfunctions:* If $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_j\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \leq C$ for some constant C , then $F_p^s(\lambda) \leq C^2 N^s(\lambda)$.
- *Symmetry:* If kernels have certain symmetries, such as dot-product kernels on a hypersphere or periodic kernels on a hypercube, we still have $F_p^s(\lambda) = N^s(\lambda)$, as $\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} k(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ is constant with respect to x in such cases.

Furthermore, the decay of $N^s(\lambda)$ can be characterized using the kernel's eigenvalue decay as follows, whose proof is deferred to Appendix C.1.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$ with $t > 1$, then $N^s(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-1/t}$. If $\mu_j \sim c^{-t}$ with $c \in (0, 1)$, then $N^s(\lambda) \sim \log(1/\lambda)$.*

3.1 Upper Bound

Theorem 3.3. *Under Assumption 1 and 2, let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Suppose λ_n satisfies*

$$n \geq 5F_p^{\min(s,1)}(\lambda_n) \max\{1, \log(14F_p^{\min(s,1)}(\lambda_n)/\delta)\}. \quad (9)$$

Then, with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\hat{f}_{\lambda_n} - f^*\|_\rho^2 \leq 16\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\min(s,2)}}^2 \lambda_n^{\min(s,2)}.$$

When $s \geq 1$, the above estimate also holds for \hat{f}_λ with any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_n]$. Particularly, the case of $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to the minimum-norm solution.

We refer to Section 5 for a proof sketch and Appendix B for the detailed proof. From this theorem, we observe:

- KRR can leverage the relative smoothness of target functions up to $s = 2$, beyond which extra smoothness does not bring improvement in the convergence rate of generalization error. This is the same as the saturation phenomenon observed for KRR in the noisy regime [BPR07, DFH17, LZL22].
- KRR can adapt to the spectrum of the associated kernel. Combining with Lemma 3.2 gives:
 - when $\mu_j \lesssim j^{-t}$ with $t > 1$, $\|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho^2 = \tilde{O}(n^{-ts})$;
 - when $\mu_j \lesssim c^{-j}$ with $c \in (0, 1)$, $\|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho^2 = e^{-\tilde{O}(n)}$.

Notably, when the eigenvalue decays exponentially fast, KRR attains what is known as *spectral accuracy* [Tre00], that is, the convergence rate is faster than any polynomial.

Lastly, we hypothesize that for the misspecified case, KRR can still attain the same convergence rate by taking λ in $[0, \lambda_n)$, a scenario not covered by Theorem 3.3. This hypothesis is supported by the numerical experiments in Section 6.

3.2 Lower Bound

Let $S_n = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $f(S_n) = (f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the training data. We define the space of estimators that use only the training data $\{S_n, f(S_n)\}$ as follows

$$\mathcal{M}_n = \{\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{Q}f = G(S_n, f(S_n)), G : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}\}.$$

We have the following information-theoretical lower bound for estimating functions in \mathcal{H}^s .

Theorem 3.4. *Under Assumption 2, for any $s \in (0, \infty)$ with probability 1, we have*

$$\inf_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_n} \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho^2 \geq \mu_{n+1}^s.$$

The proof is deferred to Section 5. Theorem 3.3 and 3.4 together imply that KRR can attain the minimax optimal rate when $s \in (t^{-1}, 2]$, up to logarithmic factors, but cannot for the case of $s > 2$.

4 The Duality Framework

In this section, we establish a duality framework for the analysis of KRR.

4.1 Random Feature Representations

Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a general feature function with \mathcal{X} and Ω denoting the input and parameter domain, respectively. For any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we can define an associated RF kernel

$$k_\pi(x, x') = \int \phi(x, \omega)\phi(x', \omega) d\pi(\omega).$$

Proposition 7 in [CLW23] shows that for any kernel $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, there exists a probability space (π, Ω) and $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $k = k_\pi$. Therefore, throughout this paper, we assume the kernel of interest to admit this RF representation without loss of generality.

To state our duality framework, we need to define the conjugate kernel $\tilde{k} : \Omega \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$:

$$\tilde{k}(\omega, \omega') = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi(x, \omega)\phi(x, \omega') d\rho(x).$$

Analogously, we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \subset L^2(\pi)$ the conjugate RKHS induced by \tilde{k} and define $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} : L^2(\pi) \mapsto L^2(\pi)$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}\alpha = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{k}(\cdot, \omega)\alpha(\omega) d\pi(\omega)$. To clarify the relationship between \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, we introduce the feature operator $\Phi : L^2(\pi) \mapsto L^2(\rho)$ and its adjoint operator:

$$\Phi\alpha = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \alpha(\omega)\phi(\cdot, \omega) d\pi(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^*f = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)\phi(x, \cdot) d\rho(x).$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{T} = \Phi\Phi^*$, $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \Phi^*\Phi$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ has the same nonzero eigenvalues as \mathcal{T} . Let $\{\tilde{e}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ denote the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Then, Φ and Φ^* has the following singular value decompositions (SVDs):

$$\Phi = \sum_j \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e_j \otimes \tilde{e}_j, \quad \Phi^* = \sum_j \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{e}_j \otimes e_j. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $s \geq 0$. For any $f \in \mathcal{H}^s \cap \mathcal{H}$, let $A_f = \{\alpha \in L^2(\pi) : f = \Phi\alpha\}$. Then, $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} = \inf_{\alpha \in A_f} \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}}$ and for any $R \geq 0$, it holds that*

$$\{f : f \in \mathcal{H}, \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R\} = \{\Phi\alpha : \|\alpha\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R\}$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix C.2. This lemma provides a description of the interpolation space \mathcal{H}^s using the feature operator Φ . Note that the special case of $s = 1$, which corresponds to the RKHS space, has already been established in [RR08]. This lemma implies for any target function $f^* \in \mathcal{H}^s \cap \mathcal{H}$, there exists a $\alpha^* \in L^2(\pi)$ such that $f^* = \Phi\alpha^*$ with $\|\alpha^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} = \|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s}$. In the sequel, we always use α^* to denote the coefficient function corresponding to f^* .

Discrete feature operators. We accordingly consider the operator $\mathcal{S} : L^2(\pi) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ and its adjoint operator $\mathcal{S}^* : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto L^2(\pi)$ by

$$(\mathcal{S}\alpha)_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} \int \alpha(\omega)\phi(x_i, \cdot) d\pi(\omega), \quad \mathcal{S}^*a = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} \phi(x_i, \cdot).$$

One can view \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^* as discretizations of Φ and Φ^* , respectively. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* = \left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{p(x_i)p(x_j)}} k(x_i, x_j) \right)_{i,j} =: K_n, \quad \mathcal{S}^*\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p(x_i)} \phi(x_i, \cdot) \otimes \phi(x_i, \cdot) =: \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n.$$

Note that K_n and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ can be viewed as empirical approximations of \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, respectively.

The following lemma defines a RF approximation operator, which plays a fundamental role in our duality analysis.

Lemma 4.2 (Norm-controlled RF approximation). *Let $\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$. Then, for any $\alpha \in L^2(\pi)$, $\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda}\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{b}_i p(x_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot)$ with $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ given by*

$$\bar{b} = \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \alpha - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i p(x_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot) \right\|_{\pi}^2 + \lambda \|b\|^2. \quad (11)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix C.3. This lemma means that $\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} : L^2(\pi) \mapsto L^2(\pi)$ defines a RF approximation operator. Specifically, for any $\alpha \in L^2(\pi)$, $\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda}\alpha$ denotes the ‘‘best’’ norm-controlled approximator in the subspace spanned by the weighted random features $\{p(x_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n$.

4.2 Duality for KRR

By the representer theorem [SHS01], \hat{f}_λ and \hat{f}_0 must lie in $\operatorname{span}\{k(\cdot, x_1), \dots, k(\cdot, x_n)\}$. Let $\hat{k}_n : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ with $(\hat{k}_n(\cdot))_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} k(x_i, \cdot)$ and $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\hat{y}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} f^*(x_i)$. Then, we can write $\hat{f}_\lambda = \hat{k}_n(\cdot)^\top \hat{a}_\lambda$, $\hat{f}_0 = \hat{k}_n(\cdot)^\top \hat{a}_0$

$$\hat{a}_\lambda = (K_n + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \hat{y}, \quad \hat{a}_0 = (K_n)^\dagger \hat{y} \quad (12)$$

where $(\cdot)^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of a matrix [BIG03].

Lemma 4.3 (KRR estimator via operators). *For any $f^* \in \mathcal{H}^s \cap \mathcal{H}$, $\hat{f}_\lambda = \Phi \mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \alpha^*$.*

Proof. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \mathcal{S}^* a &= \Phi \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} \phi(x_i, \cdot) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} \int \phi(\cdot, \omega) \phi(x_i, \omega) d\pi(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{np(x_i)}} k(x_i, \cdot) = k_n(\cdot)^\top a. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and $(\mathcal{S}\alpha^*)_i = (np(x_i))^{-\frac{1}{2}} f^*(x_i) = \hat{y}_i$. Plugging them into (12) and using $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* = K_n$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_\lambda &= \Phi \mathcal{S}^* \hat{a}_\lambda = \Phi \mathcal{S}^* (\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \mathcal{S}\alpha^* \stackrel{\text{use (18)}}{=} \Phi (\mathcal{S}^* \mathcal{S} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1} \mathcal{S}^* \mathcal{S}\alpha^* \\ &= \Phi (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n \alpha^* = \Phi \mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \alpha^*. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Proposition 4.4 (Duality for KRR). *Given $s > 0$, for the KRR (6), it holds with probability 1 that* □

$$\sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho = R \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{1-s}} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \beta - \beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{1-s}}. \quad (15)$$

This theorem establishes a dual equivalence between the estimation error of a KRR and the approximation error of a conjugate RKHS with random features. We remark that this result is inspired by the precise duality established in [CLW23], where only $s = 1$ is considered. Specifically, for $s = 1$, the approximation error is measured by the standard L^2 norm. For $s > 1$, a weaker norm is employed, while $s < 1$, a stronger norm is used to measure the approximation. In a summary, the estimation of functions in \mathcal{H}^s with different s 's translates to the same approximation, evaluated using different norms.

The proof need the following two lemmas, whose proofs can be found in Appendix C.4 and C.5, respectively.

Lemma 4.5. *For any $\beta \in L^2(\pi)$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^r} \leq R} \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle_\pi = R \|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}$.*

Lemma 4.6. *For any $s > 0$, $\sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho = \sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R, f^* \in \mathcal{H}} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho$ holds with probability 1.*

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.6 and using (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho &= \sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R, f^* \in \mathcal{H}} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho \\
&= \sup_{\|\alpha^*\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R} \|\Phi \mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \alpha^* - \Phi \alpha^*\|_\rho \\
&= \sup_{\|\alpha^*\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R} \sup_{\|h\|_\rho \leq 1} \langle h, \Phi \mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \alpha^* - \Phi \alpha^* \rangle_\rho \\
&= \sup_{\|\alpha^*\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R} \sup_{\|h\|_\rho \leq 1} \langle (\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} - \mathcal{I}) \Phi^* h, \alpha^* \rangle_\pi \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq 1} \sup_{\|\alpha^*\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R} \langle (\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} - \mathcal{I}) \beta, \alpha^* \rangle_\pi \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} R \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \beta - \beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{1-s}},
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses Lemma 4.1 for the case of $r = 1$ and (ii) follows from Lemma 4.5. Then, further applying Lemma 4.6 completes the proof. \square

To prove the lower bound in Theorem 3.4, we further provide the following duality.

Proposition 4.7 (Duality for General Estimator). *Given $s > 0$, we have with probability 1 that*

$$\inf_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_n} \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho \geq \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{P}_n \beta - \beta\|_\pi, \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{P}_n is the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\pi)$ to $\text{span}\{\phi^s(x_1, \cdot), \dots, \phi^s(x_n, \cdot)\}$. Here $\phi^s(x, \omega) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^{\frac{s}{2}} e_j(x) \tilde{e}_j(\omega)$.

Proof. To avoid introduction of complex notations, here we only give the proof when $s = 1$. The proof of the general case is almost the same. For any $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and f with $f(x_i) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{Q}f = \mathcal{Q}(-f)$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho &\geq \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1, f(x_i) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1, f(x_i) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} [\|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho + \|\mathcal{Q}(-f) + f\|_\rho] \\
&\geq \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1, f(x_i) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|f\|_\rho,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the triangular inequality. Lemma 4.1 further implies

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1, f(x_i) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|f\|_\rho = \sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi \leq 1, \langle \alpha, \phi(x_i, \cdot) \rangle_\pi = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|\Phi \alpha\|_\rho.$$

Noticing that $\{\alpha \in L^2(\pi) : \langle \alpha, \phi(x_i, \cdot) \rangle_\pi = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{\phi(x_1, \cdot), \dots, \phi(x_n, \cdot)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi \leq 1, \langle \alpha, \phi(x_i, \cdot) \rangle_\pi = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n} \|\Phi \alpha\|_\rho &= \sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi \leq 1} \|\Phi(I - \mathcal{P}_n)\alpha\|_\rho \\
&= \sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi \leq 1} \sup_{\|h\|_\rho \leq 1} \langle h, \Phi(I - \mathcal{P}_n)\alpha \rangle_\rho \\
&= \sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi \leq 1} \sup_{\|h\|_\rho \leq 1} \langle (I - \mathcal{P}_n)\Phi^* h, \alpha \rangle_\pi
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\|h\|_\rho \leq 1} \|(I - \mathcal{P}_n)\Phi^*h\|_\pi \\
&= \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq 1} \|\beta - \mathcal{P}_n\beta\|_\pi,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses again Lemma 4.1. □

5 Proof Sketches of Main Results

Theorem 3.3. By the duality established in Proposition 4.4, to prove Theorem 3.3, we only need to estimate the error of uniform approximation of the unit ball of a RKHS. The special case of $s = 1$ has been systematically studied in [Bac17] and we shall modify the proof therein to include all cases of s . For details, we refer to Appendix B.

Theorem 3.4 From Proposition 4.7, we know that with probability 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_n} \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{Q}f - f\|_\rho &\geq \sup_{\beta \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^s} \|\mathcal{P}_n\beta - \beta\|_\pi \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sup_{\|g\|_\pi \leq 1} \|\mathcal{P}_n\mathcal{T}^{\frac{s}{2}}g - \mathcal{T}^{\frac{s}{2}}g\|_\pi \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \|\mathcal{P}_n\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s}{2}} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s}{2}}\| \geq \mu_{n+1}^{\frac{s}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Definition (2.1) and (ii) holds due to that $\|A - B\| \geq \lambda_{n+1}(A)$ for any operator B with rank at most n [Sim15, Section 3.5].

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments to validate our theoretical results. We follow [LZL23] to consider the kernel:

$$k(x, x') = \min(x, x'), \quad x, x' \in [0, 1].$$

We denote by \mathcal{H}^s the corresponding interpolation space and use $\rho = \text{Unif}([0, 1])$. The eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of k are known to be $\mu_j = (\frac{2j-1}{2}\pi)^{-2}$ and $e_j(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(\frac{2j-1}{2}\pi x)$, respectively. Thus, in this case, the eigenvalue decays as $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$ with $t = 2$ and the eigenfunctions are uniformly bounded. Therefore, based on the explanation following Definition 3.1, we can simply set $\rho' = \rho$ without compromising the convergence rate. To examine the influence of relative smoothness s , we consider four target functions:

- $f_1^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{5}{8}} e_j \in \mathcal{H}^s$ for any $s \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$. This is due to $\langle f_1^*, e_j \rangle_\rho = (\frac{2j-1}{2}\pi)^{-\frac{5}{4}}$.
- $f_2^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{3}{4}} e_j \in \mathcal{H}^s$ for any $s \in (0, 1)$. This is due to $\langle f_2^*, e_j \rangle_\rho = (\frac{2j-1}{2}\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$.
- $f_3^* = \sin(2\pi x) \in \mathcal{H}^s$ for any $s \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$. This is due to $\langle f_3^*, e_j \rangle_\rho = \frac{8}{(2j+3)(2j-5)} \sim j^{-2}$.
- $f_4^* = \sin(\frac{3}{2}\pi x) \in \mathcal{H}^s$ for any $s \in (0, +\infty)$. This is due to $\langle f_4^*, e_j \rangle_\rho = 0$ when $j \geq 3$.




Figure 1: Generalization error curves of KRR with different λ 's for target functions with various relative smoothness. The constant $c = \lambda/n^{-2}$ and the convergence rate r are presented in the legend as (c, r) . Particularly, $c = 0$ corresponds to the minimum-norm solution. Theoretical predictions are represented by black dashed lines.

Note that f_1^* and f_2^* do not have closed-form expressions and thus, in experiments, we use the finite-sum approximate ones: $f_1^* = \sum_{j=1}^{10000} \mu_j^{\frac{5}{8}} e_j$ and $f_2^* = \sum_{j=1}^{10000} \mu_j^{\frac{3}{4}} e_j$ for computational feasibility.

In experiments, KRR \hat{f}_λ with $\lambda = cn^{-2}$ for different c 's are tested. When $c = 0$, it corresponds to the minimum-norm solution. To ensure high precision, the generalization error: $e_\lambda(n) = \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho^2$ is estimated using numerical integrations provided by the `integral` function in MATLAB. For each n , we calculate errors averaged over 100 independent trails. Suppose the generalization error scales as $e_\lambda(n) = O(n^{-r})$. To estimate r , we perform a linear regression in the log-log scale: $\log_{10} \text{error} = r \log_{10} n + b$. We select values for n in the range of 1 to 101 with an increment of 10, and in the range of 101 to 1001 with an increment of 100.

The results, reported in Figure 1 along with the corresponding error rates, closely align with the theoretical predictions of Theorem 3.3. In particular, we observe that: 1) In the misspecified case, the minimum-norm interpolation performs comparably to KRR; 2) for the overly smooth target function f_4^* , KRR achieves only the rate of $O(n^{-2t})$, indicating the presence of a saturation phenomenon in the noiseless regime, with a critical threshold at $s = 2$.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a duality framework for the generalization analysis of KRR with focusing on the noiseless regime. Similar to the noisy regime, KRR can still attain the minimax optimal rate, which adopts to both the eigenvalue decay of the associated kernel and the relative smoothness of target functions. Particularly, when the kernel’s eigenvalues decay at an exponential rate, KRR reaches what is termed spectral accuracy, where logarithmic samples suffice for learning target functions in the corresponding RKHS. This spectral accuracy could be very important for applying kernel-based methods to solve problems such as numerical approximation of PDEs with smooth solutions [CHOS21, NS21, CCEY22].

It is important to note that when the eigenvalues decay at a polynomial rate like $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$, we require the relative smoothness to satisfy $s \in (t^{-1}, \infty)$. Therefore, it would be interesting to extend our analysis to the more challenging scenario where $s \in (0, t^{-1}]$. Additionally, applying our duality framework to analyze general kernel-based methods is also an intriguing avenue for further research. For instance, to speed up KRR, random feature (RF) approximations [RR07] are often adopted in practice. However, existing analyses of the efficacy of RF approximations are limited to the noisy regime [RR17, LHCS21], where the number of features are determined to maintain the rate of at most $O(n^{-1})$. However, the situation in the noiseless regime is substantially different, where the convergence rate of KRR is much faster than $O(n^{-1})$. Consequently, it is critical to investigate if RF approximations can still maintain the optimal rate in the noiseless regime without sacrificing the computational feasibility.

References

- [Aro50] Nachman Aronszajn, *Theory of reproducing kernels*, Transactions of the American mathematical society **68** (1950), no. 3, 337–404.
- [Bac17] Francis Bach, *On the equivalence between kernel quadrature rules and random feature expansions*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research **18** (2017), no. 1, 714–751.
- [BCP20] Blake Bordelon, Abdulkadir Canatar, and Cengiz Pehlevan, *Spectrum dependent learning curves in kernel regression and wide neural networks*, International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 1024–1034.
- [BIG03] Adi Ben-Israel and Thomas NE Greville, *Generalized inverses: theory and applications*, vol. 15, Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [BPR07] Frank Bauer, Sergei Pereverzev, and Lorenzo Rosasco, *On regularization algorithms in learning theory*, Journal of complexity **23** (2007), no. 1, 52–72.
- [CCEY22] Jingrun Chen, Xurong Chi, Weinan E, and Zhouwang Yang, *Bridging traditional and machine learning-based algorithms for solving PDEs: The random feature method*, Journal of Machine Learning **1** (2022), no. 3, 268–298.
- [CDV07] Andrea Caponnetto and Ernesto De Vito, *Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **7** (2007), 331–368.
- [CHOS21] Yifan Chen, Bamdad Hosseini, Houman Owhadi, and Andrew M Stuart, *Solving and learning nonlinear pdes with gaussian processes*, Journal of Computational Physics **447** (2021), 110668.
- [CLKZ21] Hugo Cui, Bruno Loureiro, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová, *Generalization error rates in kernel regression: The crossover from the noiseless to noisy regime*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems **34** (2021), 10131–10143.

- [CLW23] Hongrui Chen, Jihao Long, and Lei Wu, *A duality framework for generalization analysis of random feature models and two-layer neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05642 (2023).
- [DFH17] Lee H Dicker, Dean P Foster, and Daniel Hsu, *Kernel ridge vs. principal component regression: Minimax bounds and the qualification of regularization operators*, Electronic Journal of Statistics **11** (2017), 1022–1047.
- [EY18] Weinan E and Bing Yu, *The deep Ritz method: a deep learning-based numerical algorithm for solving variational problems*, Communications in Mathematics and Statistics **6** (2018), no. 1, 1–12.
- [FFFN93] Junichi Fujii, Masatoshi Fujii, Takayuki Furuta, and Ritsuo Nakamoto, *Norm inequalities equivalent to Heinz inequality*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **118** (1993), no. 3, 827–830.
- [FS20] Simon Fischer and Ingo Steinwart, *Sobolev norm learning rates for regularized least-squares algorithms*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **21** (2020), no. 1, 8464–8501.
- [GKK⁺02] László Györfi, Michael Kohler, Adam Krzyzak, Harro Walk, et al., *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*, vol. 1, Springer, 2002.
- [HJE18] Jiequn Han, Arnulf Jentzen, and Weinan E, *Solving high-dimensional partial differential equations using deep learning*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **115** (2018), no. 34, 8505–8510.
- [Kat13] Tosio Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, vol. 132, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [LHCS21] Fanghui Liu, Xiaolin Huang, Yudong Chen, and Johan AK Suykens, *Random features for kernel approximation: A survey on algorithms, theory, and beyond*, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence **44** (2021), no. 10, 7128–7148.
- [LZL22] Yicheng Li, Haobo Zhang, and Qian Lin, *On the saturation effect of kernel ridge regression*, The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, 2022.
- [LZL23] ———, *On the asymptotic learning curves of kernel ridge regression under power-law decay*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13337 (2023).
- [Mer09] James Mercer, *Xvi. functions of positive and negative type, and their connection the theory of integral equations*, Philosophical transactions of the royal society of London. Series A, containing papers of a mathematical or physical character **209** (1909), no. 441-458, 415–446.
- [MGH04] Shahar Mendelson, Thore Graepel, and Ralf Herbrich, *On the performance of kernel classes.*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **4** (2004), no. 5.
- [Min17] Stanislav Minsker, *On some extensions of Bernstein’s inequality for self-adjoint operators*, Statistics & Probability Letters **127** (2017), 111–119.
- [NS21] Nicholas H Nelsen and Andrew M Stuart, *The random feature model for input-output maps between banach spaces*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **43** (2021), no. 5, A3212–A3243.
- [RPK19] Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis, *Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations*, Journal of Computational physics **378** (2019), 686–707.

- [RR07] Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht, *Random features for large-scale kernel machines*, Advances in neural information processing systems **20** (2007).
- [RR08] ———, *Uniform approximation of functions with random bases*, 2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, IEEE, 2008, pp. 555–561.
- [RR17] Alessandro Rudi and Lorenzo Rosasco, *Generalization properties of learning with random features*, Advances in neural information processing systems **30** (2017).
- [SC08] Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christmann, *Support vector machines*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [SGW20] Stefano Spigler, Mario Geiger, and Matthieu Wyart, *Asymptotic learning curves of kernel methods: empirical data versus teacher–student paradigm*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2020** (2020), no. 12, 124001.
- [SHS01] Bernhard Schölkopf, Ralf Herbrich, and Alex J Smola, *A generalized representer theorem*, International conference on computational learning theory, Springer, 2001, pp. 416–426.
- [SHS09] Ingo Steinwart, Don R Hush, and Scovel, *Optimal rates for regularized least squares regression*, Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Learning Theory, 2009, pp. 79–93.
- [Sim15] Barry Simon, *Operator theory*, vol. 4, American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [SS18] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos, *DGM: A deep learning algorithm for solving partial differential equations*, Journal of computational physics **375** (2018), 1339–1364.
- [Tre00] Lloyd N Trefethen, *Spectral methods in matlab*, SIAM, 2000.
- [Wai19] Martin J Wainwright, *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, vol. 48, Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [Zha05] Tong Zhang, *Learning bounds for kernel regression using effective data dimensionality*, Neural computation **17** (2005), no. 9, 2077–2098.
- [ZLLL23] Haobo Zhang, Yicheng Li, Weihao Lu, and Qian Lin, *On the optimality of misspecified kernel ridge regression*, Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, 23–29 Jul 2023.

Appendix

A Bounded Linear Operator in Hilbert Space

A.1 Definitions

Given two Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , we consider a linear operator $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \mapsto \mathcal{H}_2$. The operator norm is defined as $\|A\| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}_1, x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}}{\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}}$, where we omit the dependence on \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 in $\|A\|$ for simplicity.

Adjoint operator. The adjoint operator $A^* : \mathcal{H}_2 \mapsto \mathcal{H}_1$ is defined through:

$$\langle y, Ax \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \langle A^*y, x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1 \text{ and } y \in \mathcal{H}_2,$$

for which it holds that $\|A\|^2 = \|A^*\|^2 = \|A^*A\| = \|AA^*\|$. We call a bounded operator A self-adjoint, if $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2$ and $A^* = A$. A self-adjoint operator B is said to be positive, if for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle x, Bx \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0$. For two self-adjoint operator B and B' , we will use $B \preceq B'$ to mean $B' - B$ is positive.

Outer product. Let $v \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}_2$, we define the outer product $u \otimes v$ as a linear operator $\mathcal{H}_1 \mapsto \mathcal{H}_2$ given by $(u \otimes v)x = \langle v, x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} u$ for any $x \in \mathcal{H}_1$. Moreover, $\|(u \otimes v)\| = \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}=1} \|\langle v, x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} u\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$.

Eigenvalue decomposition. An operator A is said to be compact, if it maps the bounded subset of \mathcal{H}_1 to a relatively compact subset of \mathcal{H}_2 . If a self-adjoint operator B is compact, then it has the following spectral decomposition:

$$B = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j \psi_j \otimes \psi_j,$$

where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalues in a decreasing order and $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions satisfying $\langle \psi_i, \psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \delta_{ij}$ and $B\psi_j = \mu_j \psi_j$. If B is further positive, then all μ_j 's are non-negative. In addition, we define the trace of a self-adjoint operator B by $\text{Tr}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j$. Let $N = \sup\{j \in \mathbb{N}^+, \mu_j > 0\}$ (possibly infinity), we define B^r for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$B^r = \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j^r \psi_j \otimes \psi_j. \quad (17)$$

Noticing that when $r < 0$, B^r can only define on the range of B^{-r} .

Singular value decomposition. For a compact operator $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \mapsto \mathcal{H}_2$, both AA^* and A^*A are compact, self-adjoint and positive operators. Moreover, AA^* and A^*A share the same non-zero eigenvalues and the singular value decomposition of A is given by

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi'_j \otimes \psi_j,$$

where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalues of AA^* in a decreasing order, $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\psi'_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions of A^*A and AA^* , respectively. Through the singular value decomposition, it is easy to prove that for any $r \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda > 0$, it holds that

$$(A^*A + \lambda\mathcal{I})^r A^* = A^*(AA^* + \lambda\mathcal{I})^r. \quad (18)$$

In our proof, we will frequently use this equality.

For more information of the bounded linear operator in Hilbert space, see [Kat13].

A.2 Useful Inequalities

Lemma A.1 (Cordes inequality, [FFFN93]). *Given two compact, self-adjoint and positive operators B and B' , we have*

$$\|B^r (B')^r\| \leq \|BB'\|^r, \quad r \in [0, 1]. \quad (19)$$

Proposition A.2 (Proposition 8 in [RR17]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space, let A, B two bounded self-adjoint positive linear operators on \mathcal{H} and $\lambda > 0$. Then*

$$\left\| (A + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1/2} B^{1/2} \right\| \leq \left\| (A + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1/2} (B + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{1/2} \right\| \leq (1 - \beta)^{-1/2}$$

with

$$\beta = \lambda_{\max} \left[(B + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1/2} (B - A) (B + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1/2} \right].$$

Note that $\beta \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(B)}{\lambda_{\max}(B) + \lambda} < 1$ by definition.

Theorem A.3 (Theorem 3.1 in [Min17]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a sequence of independent self-adjoint random operators on Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\sigma^2 \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i^2 \right\|$. Assume that $\|X_i\| \leq U$ almost surely for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and some positive $U \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $t \geq \frac{1}{6} \left(U + \sqrt{U^2 + 36\sigma^2} \right)$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\| > t \right) \leq 14 \frac{\text{Tr}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i^2)}{\sigma^2} \exp \left[-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + tU/3} \right].$$

We remark that the above theorem is slightly tighter than the one stated in [Min17, Theorem 3.1], where σ^2 is replaced by $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i^2 \right\|$. However, [Min17] in fact has proved the above tighter one; we refer to the paragraphs below Eq. (3.9) in [Min17] for more details.

B Proof of Theorem 3.3

We first need the following lemmas.

Lemma B.1. $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0\|_\rho = 0$

Proof. Noticing that $y = K_n \alpha_0$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} &= (\alpha_0 - (K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} K_n \alpha_0)^\top K_n (\alpha_0 - (K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} K_n \alpha_0) \\ &= \lambda^2 \alpha_0^\top P_n (K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} K_n (K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} P_n \alpha_0 \\ &\leq \lambda (\alpha_0^\top \alpha_0) \|P_n\| \|(K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} K_n\| \|(K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} (\lambda P_n)\| \\ &\leq \lambda (\alpha_0^\top \alpha_0) \|P_n\|. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of RKHS norm, we have

$$\|\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0\|_\rho \leq \|\mathcal{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\mathcal{T}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0)\|_\rho = \|\mathcal{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|\mathcal{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \lambda (\alpha_0^\top \alpha_0) \|P_n\|.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - \hat{f}_0\|_\rho = 0$. □

Lemma B.2. Let F_p^s be the max DoF given in Definition 3.1. Then,

$$F_p^s(\lambda) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{p(x)} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \phi(x, \cdot)\|_\pi^2.$$

Proof. Using the singular value decomposition (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \phi(x, \cdot)\|_\pi^2 &= \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \sum_j \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e_j(x) \tilde{e}_j\|_\pi^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_j \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e_j(x) \frac{\mu_j^{\frac{s-1}{2}}}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^{\frac{s}{2}}} \tilde{e}_j \right\|_\pi^2 \\ &= \sum_j \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} e_j^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

Further applying (7) completes the proof. \square

In the sequel, we shall use the above definition of the maximal DoF. As in [Bac17], the key step for the proof of Theorem 3.3 is the following lemma:

Lemma B.3. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $s \leq 1$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_n$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability $1 - \delta$ we have it holds that

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}) (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{3}{4}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let $\Delta_n = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}) (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}$. Noting $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ is an empirical approximation of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p(x_i)} \phi(x_i, \cdot) \otimes \phi(x_i, \cdot), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \mathbf{E}_x \left[\frac{1}{p(x)} \phi(x, \cdot) \otimes \phi(x, \cdot) \right].$$

We shall bound $\|\Delta_n\|$ by applying concentration inequality for random self-adjoint operators over Hilbert spaces.

Let $f_i = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot)$ and accordingly $Z_i = \frac{1}{np(x_i)} f_i \otimes f_i - \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s}$. Then, $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are *i.i.d.* random operators, satisfying $\mathbf{E}[Z_i] = 0$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s} = \Delta_n$$

To bound the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$, we need some moment estimates. First,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z_i\| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \max\left\{ \frac{1}{p(x_i)} \|f_i\|_\pi^2, \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s}\| \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \max\left\{ \frac{1}{p(x_i)} \|f_i\|_\pi^2, \frac{\mu_1^s}{(\mu_1 + \lambda)^s} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{n} F_p^s(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Second, by $\|f_i\|^2 = \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot)\|_\pi^2$ and the definition of $F_p^s(\cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} Z_i^2 &\preceq \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{p(x_i)^2} \|f_i\|^2 f_i \otimes f_i \right] \preceq \frac{1}{n^2} F_p^s(\lambda) \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{p(x_i)} f_i \otimes f_i \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} F_p^s(\lambda) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} Z_i^2 \right\| &\leq \frac{F_p^s(\lambda)}{n} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-s}\| \leq \frac{F_p^s(\lambda)}{n} \\ \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} X_i^2 \right) &\leq \frac{F_p^s(\lambda)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} \stackrel{\text{use (8)}}{\leq} \frac{F_p^s(\lambda)^2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows from Theorem A.3 that for any t satisfying $3nt^2 \geq 3F_p^s(\lambda) + F_p^s(\lambda)t$:

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\Delta_n\| \geq t \right) = \mathbf{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\| \geq t \right) \leq 14F_p^s(\lambda) \exp \left(-\frac{3nt^2}{F_p^s(\lambda)(6+2t)} \right),$$

Taking $t = 3/4$, it is easy to verify that when $\lambda \geq \lambda_n$ given by (9), it follows that 1) $3nt^2 \geq 3F_p^s(\lambda) + F_p^s(\lambda)t$; 2) $14F_p^s(\lambda) \exp(-3nt^2/(F_p^s(\lambda)(6+2t))) \leq \delta$. Therefore, $\|\Delta_n\| \leq 3/4$ holds with probability $1 - \delta$. □

Lemma B.4. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_n$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability $1 - \delta$ it holds for any $r \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ that

$$\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^r\| \leq \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^r\| \leq 4^r. \quad (21)$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^r\| &\leq \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^r (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^r\| \\ &\leq \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^r\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^r\| \\ &\leq \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^r\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the remaining is to prove the second inequality in (21):

- The case of $r = \frac{1}{2}$: By Lemma B.3, (20) implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n) (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \preceq \frac{3}{4} \mathcal{I}$. Thus,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n \preceq \frac{3}{4} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{1-s} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^s.$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I} \succeq \tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I} - \frac{3}{4} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{1-s} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^s \succeq \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I}).$$

Therefore, $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I}) (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \preceq 4 \mathcal{I}$ and hence

$$\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{\frac{1}{2}}\| = \sqrt{\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I}) (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|} \leq 2. \quad (22)$$

- For $r \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-r} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^r\| &= \|((\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}})^{2r} ((\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2r}\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathcal{T}} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^{2r} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 4^r, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses the Cordes inequality (19) and (ii) is due to (22). □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Without loss of generality, assume $\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^s} = 1$. By noticing $\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n = \mathcal{I} - \lambda(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}$ and adopting the duality bound in Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho &\leq \sup_{\|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^s} \leq 1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}[\mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda}h - h]\|_\pi \\ &= \lambda \sup_{\|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^s} \leq 1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}h\|_\pi \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \lambda \sup_{\|g\|_\pi \leq 1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}g\|_\pi \\ &= \lambda\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|,\end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses Definition 2.1. Next, we bound the right hand side by considering the case of $s \in [1, 2]$ and $s \in (0, 1)$, respectively.

Case I: $s \in [1, 2]$. For any $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_n$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho &\leq \lambda\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\leq \lambda\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{1-s}{2}}\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{\frac{1-s}{2}}\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{\frac{s}{2}-1}\| \\ &\quad \times \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \lambda 4^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{s}{2}-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} 4^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 4\lambda_n^{\frac{s}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where (ii) uses Lemma B.4.

Using Lemma B.1, the above inequality also holds for \hat{f}_0 .

Case II: $s \in (0, 1)$. We only consider the case $\lambda = \lambda_n$. First, notice that

$$\|\hat{f}_{\lambda_n} - f^*\|_\rho \leq \lambda_n\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq \mathbf{I}_1 + \mathbf{I}_2,$$

where $\mathbf{I}_1 = \lambda_n\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ and $\mathbf{I}_2 = \lambda_n\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}[(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1} - (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}]\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$. For \mathbf{I}_1 , we have that

$$\mathbf{I}_1 = \lambda_n\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s}{2}}\| \leq \lambda_n\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1+\frac{s}{2}}\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s}{2}}\| \leq \lambda_n^{\frac{s}{2}}.$$

For \mathbf{I}_2 , we use $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_2 &= \lambda_n\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}](\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\leq \lambda_n\|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1+\frac{s}{2}}\| \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{T}})(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{s}{2}}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\| \\ &\quad \times \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1-s}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{s}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{3}{4}\lambda_n^{\frac{s}{2}}\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1-s}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{s}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\quad \times \|(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda_n\mathcal{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 3\lambda_n^{\frac{s}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the Lemma B.4 in (i) and (ii). Combining the last two inequalities, we have that

$$\|\hat{f}_{\lambda_n} - f^*\|_\rho \leq 4\lambda_n^{\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (23)$$

□

C Proofs of Auxiliary Lemmas

C.1 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Let $m(\lambda) = \max\{j : \mu_j \geq \lambda, j \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$. First, we have

$$N^s(\lambda) \geq \sum_{j \leq m(\lambda)} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} \geq \frac{m(\lambda)}{2^s}.$$

Second,

$$\begin{aligned} N^s(\lambda) &= \sum_{j \leq m(\lambda)} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} + \sum_{j \geq m(\lambda)+1} \frac{\mu_j^s}{(\mu_j + \lambda)^s} \\ &\leq m(\lambda) + \lambda^{-s} \sum_{j \geq m(\lambda)+1} \mu_j^s =: m(\lambda) + q(s, \lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $q(s, \lambda) = \lambda^{-s} \sum_{j \geq m(\lambda)+1} \mu_j^s$.

The case of polynomial decay. When $\mu_j \sim j^{-t}$, we have $m(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{t}}$ and

$$q(s, \lambda) \leq \lambda^{-s} \sum_{j \geq m(\lambda)+1} j^{-ts} \leq \lambda^{-s} \frac{1}{ts-1} (m(\lambda) + 1)^{1-ts} \lesssim \lambda^{-s} (\lambda^{-\frac{1}{t}})^{1-ts} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{t}}.$$

Together, we have $N^s(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{t}}$.

The case of exponential decay. When $\mu_j \sim c^{-j}$, we have $m(\lambda) \sim \log(1/\lambda)$ and

$$q(s, \lambda) \leq \lambda^{-s} \sum_{j \geq m(\lambda)} c^{-sj} = \lambda^{-s} \frac{\lambda^s}{1 - c^{-s}} \lesssim 1.$$

Thus it follows that $N^s(\lambda) \sim \log(1/\lambda)$.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1

For $f \in \mathcal{H}^s \cap \mathcal{H} \subset L^2(\rho)$, let $a_j = \mu_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle f, e_j \rangle_\rho$ and accordingly, $\alpha_f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \tilde{e}_j$. Then, it is obvious that

$$\|\alpha_f\|_\pi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{-1} \langle f, e_j \rangle_\rho^2 = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 < \infty.$$

Thus, α_f is well-defined in $L^2(\pi)$ and moreover,

$$\|\alpha_f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{1-s} a_j^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{-s} \langle f, e_j \rangle_\rho^2 = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s}^2$$

$$\Phi\alpha_f \stackrel{(i)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} a_j e_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{\rho} e_j = f,$$

where (i) follows from the SVD: $\Phi = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e_j \otimes \tilde{e}_j$.

Suppose $f = \Phi\alpha$ with $\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \tilde{e}_j \in L^2(\pi)$. Then, following from $\Phi\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{2}} a_j e_j = f$. By the completeness of the basis $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+}$, it follows that $a_j = \mu_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle f, e_j \rangle_{\rho}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Thus, we must have $\alpha = \alpha_f$. Thus, we complete the proof the first part.

For the second part, by the above proof, it follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \{f : f \in \mathcal{H}, \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R\} &= \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j e_j : \sum_j \mu_j^{-1} b_j^2 < \infty, \sum_j \mu_j^{-s} b_j \leq R \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \Phi \left(\sum_j a_j \tilde{e}_j \right) : \sum_j a_j^2 < \infty, \sum_j \mu_j^{1-s} a_j^2 \leq R \right\} \quad (\text{let } a_j = \mu_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_j) \\ &= \{ \Phi\alpha : \|\alpha\|_{\pi} < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{s-1}} \leq R \}. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.3 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i p(x_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(x_i, \cdot) = \mathcal{S}^* b.$$

Thus, we have the objective can be written as

$$J(b) = \|\alpha - \mathcal{S}^* b\|_{\pi}^2 + \lambda \|b\|^2 = \|\alpha\|_{\pi}^2 + \langle \mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* b, b \rangle - 2\langle \mathcal{S}\alpha, b \rangle + \lambda \|b\|^2.$$

Thus, $\nabla J(\bar{b}) = 0$ gives the $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* + \lambda I_n) \bar{b} - \mathcal{S}\alpha = 0$, thereby

$$\bar{b} = (\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \mathcal{S}\alpha.$$

Thus, we have the optimal RF approximator is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{n,\lambda} \alpha &= \mathcal{S}^* \bar{b} = \mathcal{S}^* (\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^* + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \mathcal{S}\alpha \\ &= (\mathcal{S}^* \mathcal{S} + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1} \mathcal{S}^* \mathcal{S}\alpha = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n + \lambda \mathcal{I})^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.4 Proof of Lemma 4.5

Let $\beta = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j \tilde{e}_j$ and $\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \tilde{e}_j$. Then, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j^2 < \infty$ and

$$\sup_{\|\alpha\|_{\pi} < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^r} \leq R} \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle_{\pi} = \sup_{\sum_j a_j^2 < \infty, \sum_j \mu_j^{-r} a_j^2 \leq R^2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j b_j \leq R \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^r b_j^2} = R \|\beta\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-r}},$$

where the second step uses the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

On the other hand, when $\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}} = 0$, we can choose $\alpha = 0$ to obtain that $\langle \beta, \alpha \rangle_\pi = 0 = R\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}$. When $\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}} > 0$, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $\alpha_N = \frac{R}{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}} \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j^r b_j \tilde{e}_j$. Then, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha_N\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{H}^r} &\leq \frac{R}{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^r b_j^2} = R \\ \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}^+} \langle \beta, \alpha_N \rangle_\pi &= \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}^+} \frac{R}{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}} \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j^r b_j^2 = \frac{R}{\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j^r b_j^2 = R\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}. \end{aligned}$$

We know that $\sup_{\|\alpha\|_\pi < \infty, \|\alpha\|_{\tilde{H}^r} \leq R} \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle_\pi \geq R\|\beta\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{-r}}$. We hence complete the proof. \square

C.5 Proof of Lemma 4.6

The result obviously hold when $s \geq 1$ as $\mathcal{H}^s \subset \mathcal{H}$ for $s \geq 1$. When $s < 1$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, let $f_\epsilon^* \in \mathcal{H}^s$ such that $\|f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R$ and $\|\hat{f}_\lambda - f_\epsilon^*\|_\rho \geq \sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho - \epsilon$. Let $f_\epsilon^* = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \mu_j^{\frac{s}{2}} e_j$. Then, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = \|f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s}^2 \leq R^2$.

Define $f_{\epsilon,l}^* = \sum_{j=1}^l a_j \mu_j^{\frac{s}{2}} e_j$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then, $f_{\epsilon,l}^* \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\|f_{\epsilon,l}^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s}^2 = \sum_{j \leq l} a_j^2 \leq \sum_j a_j^2 \leq R^2$. Moreover, $\|f_{\epsilon,l}^* - f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s}^2 = \sum_{j \geq l+1} a_j^2$. Therefore, by $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 \leq R^2$, we have

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\epsilon,l}^* - f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Noting

$$|f_{\epsilon,l}^*(x) - f_\epsilon^*(x)| = |L_x(f_{\epsilon,l}^* - f_\epsilon^*)| \leq \|L_x\| \|f_{\epsilon,l}^* - f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s},$$

the evaluation operator $L_x : \mathcal{H}^s \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is ρ -a.s. bounded (guaranteed by Assumption 2), and ρ' is absolutely continuous with respect to ρ , we have

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} (f_{\epsilon,l}^*(x) - f_\epsilon^*(x)) = 0, \quad \rho'\text{-a.s. } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (26)$$

Define the following vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_{\epsilon,l} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (p(x_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_{\epsilon,l}^*(x_1), \dots, p(x_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_{\epsilon,l}^*(x_n))^\top \\ \hat{y}_\epsilon &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (p(x_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_\epsilon^*(x_1), \dots, p(x_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_\epsilon^*(x_n))^\top. \end{aligned}$$

By (26), we have with probability 1 over the sampling of x_1, \dots, x_n that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{y}_{\epsilon,l} - \hat{y}_\epsilon\| = 0. \quad (27)$$

Let $\hat{f}_\lambda^{\epsilon,l} = \hat{k}_n(\cdot)^\top (K_n + \lambda P_n)^{-1} \hat{y}_{\epsilon,l}$ and $\hat{f}_\lambda^\epsilon = \hat{k}_n(\cdot)^\top (K_n + \lambda)^{-1} \hat{y}_\epsilon$ denote the KRR estimates of the target $f_{\epsilon,l}^*$ and f_ϵ^* , respectively. Then, (27) implies

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{f}_\lambda^{\epsilon,l} - \hat{f}_\lambda^\epsilon\|_\rho = 0. \quad (28)$$

By (25) and (28), there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that

$$\|\hat{f}_\lambda^{\epsilon,l} - f_{\epsilon,l}^*\|_\rho \geq \|\hat{f}_\lambda^\epsilon - f_\epsilon^*\|_\rho - \epsilon \geq \sup_{\|f^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R} \|\hat{f}_\lambda - f^*\|_\rho - 2\epsilon.$$

As $f_\epsilon^* \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\|f_\epsilon^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^s} \leq R$, taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives Lemma 4.6. \square