

# CONVERGENCE BOUNDS FOR EMPIRICAL NONLINEAR LEAST-SQUARES

MARTIN EIGEL, REINHOLD SCHNEIDER, AND PHILIPP TRUNSCHKE

**ABSTRACT.** We consider best approximation problems in a (non-linear) subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  of a Banach space  $(\mathcal{V}, \|\bullet\|)$  where only an empirical estimate  $\|\bullet\|_n$  of the norm can be computed. The norm is assumed to be of the form  $\|v\| := \mathbb{E}_Y[|v|_Y^2]^{1/2}$  for some (parametric) seminorm  $|\bullet|_Y$  depending on a random variable  $Y$ . The objective is to approximate an unknown function  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  by  $v \in \mathcal{M}$  by minimizing the empirical norm  $\|u - v\|_n^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |u - v|_{y_i}^2$  w.r.t.  $n$  random samples  $\{y_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ . It is well-known that such least squares approximations can become inaccurate and unstable when the number of samples  $n$  is too close to the number of parameters  $m \propto \dim(\mathcal{M})$ . We review this statement in the light of adapted distributions for the samples  $y_i$  and establish error bounds of the empirical best approximation error based on a restricted isometry property (RIP)  $(1 - \delta)\|v\|^2 \leq \|v\|_n^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|v\|^2 \forall v \in \mathcal{M}$  which holds in probability. These results are closely related to [1] and show that  $n \geq sm$  is sufficient for the RIP to be satisfied with high probability. The factor  $s$  represents the variation of the empirical norm  $\|\bullet\|_n$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Several model classes are examined and numerical experiments illustrate some of the obtained stability bounds.

## 1. INTRODUCTION, SCOPE, CONTRIBUTIONS

We consider the problem of estimating an unknown function  $u : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  from noiseless observations of  $u$  at points  $(y_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$  from the Borel set  $Y$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For this problem to be well-posed, some prior information about  $u$  has to be assumed, which often takes the form of regularity assumptions. To make this notion more precise, we assume that  $u$  is an element of some Banach space  $(\mathcal{V}, \|\bullet\|)$  that can be well approximated in a given (non-linear) subset  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ . Examples to which the theory applies are for instance finite dimensional vector spaces, spaces of  $k$ -sparse vectors for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set of CP tensors of rank  $r$  for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and the set of ReLU Neural Networks with  $L$  layers for  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The approximation error is measured in the norm

$$\|v\| := \left( \int_Y |v|_y^2 d\rho(y) \right)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

where  $|\cdot|_y$  is a given  $y$ -dependent seminorm and  $d\rho$  is a given probability measure on  $Y$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *The seminorm  $|v|_y$  (1) represents the (noiseless) observation of the function  $v$  measured at  $y \in Y$ . Two illustrative examples and the respective induced norms are:*

- $|v|_y^2 := |v'(y)|^2$  induces the  $H_0^1(Y)$ -norm.
- Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the Fourier transform. Then  $|v|_y^2 := (1 + \|y\|_2^2)^k |\mathcal{F}v(y)|^2$  induces a norm equivalent to the  $H^k(Y)$ -norm where the measurements  $y$  are now taken in frequency rather than time space. This holds since by Plancherel's theorem we may write

$$\|u\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^k |\mathcal{F}u(\omega)|^2 d\omega$$

and since  $H^k(Y)$  can be embedded isometrically into  $H^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (for reasonably regular  $Y$ ).

*This example also highlights another important fact.  $H^1$ -minimization does not necessarily require more computational effort than  $L^2$ -minimization. In Fourier space Monte-Carlo estimates of both norms use exactly the same number of evaluations of  $\mathcal{F}u$ .*

Denote the best approximation of  $u$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  by

$$u_{\mathcal{M}}^* \in \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \|u - v\|. \quad (2)$$

In general, this estimator is not computable from a finite number of observations. The best approximation error

$$\|u - u_{\mathcal{M}}^*\| = \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \|u - v\|$$

thus serves as a baseline for a numerical method founded on a finite set of samples.

One objective of numerical methods for this problem hence is to devise an estimator that approaches the accuracy  $\|u - u_{\mathcal{M}}^*\|$  by using a sample set of minimal possible size. We propose a construction of such an estimator that is based on the weighted least-squares method

$$u_{\mathcal{M},n}^* \in \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \|u - v\|_n, \quad (3)$$

where the discrete seminorm is defined by

$$\|v\|_n := \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(y_i) |v|_{y_i}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for a given weight function  $w$  and a sample set  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$  with  $y_i \sim w^{-1}\rho$ .

**Definition 1.2** (Weight function). *A weight function is any non-negative function  $w > 0$  such that  $w^{-1} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ .*

Note that  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $\|\cdot\|_n$  are still well defined even if  $|v|_y$  is not defined pointwise for all  $y$ . We define the non-linear best-approximation operators and henceforth assume that they exist.

**Definition 1.3.** *The best-approximations w.r.t. norms  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $\|\cdot\|_n$  are defined by*

$$Pu := u_{\mathcal{M}}^* \quad \text{and} \quad P_n u := u_{\mathcal{M},n}^*$$

by choosing  $u_{\mathcal{M}}^*$  and  $u_{\mathcal{M},n}^*$  arbitrarily but fixed.

Given this definition we can optimize the weight function to maximize the rate of convergence  $\|\cdot\|_n \rightarrow \|\cdot\|$  as  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ . To bound the error of the resulting estimator uniformly, we also introduce the norm

$$\|v\|_{w,\infty} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} (w(y) |v|_y^2)^{1/2}.$$

The task to devise optimal sampling distributions for the empirical approximation problem (3) was thoroughly examined in [1] for linear model spaces. We recall a main result which serve as a motivation for the present analysis. It leads to several estimates for the error of the empirical minimization problem. However, the approach cannot be transferred directly to the nonlinear high-dimensional settings considered here.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{B} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be a vector of  $m$  orthogonal basis functions in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \rho)$ ,  $w > 0$  be a weight function and  $(y^i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$  be drawn i.i.d. from  $w^{-1}d\rho$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{G} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(y^i) \mathbf{B}(y^i) \mathbf{B}(y^i)^\top$  the Monte Carlo estimate of the Gram matrix  $\mathbf{I}_m$  and define*

$$K_{\mathbf{B},w} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} w(y) \mathbf{B}(y)^\top \mathbf{B}(y) .$$

If  $K_{\mathbf{B},w} < \infty$  then

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I}_m\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} > \delta] \leq 2m \exp\left(-\frac{c_\delta n}{K_{\mathbf{B},w}}\right)$$

with  $c_\delta := \delta + (1 - \delta) \ln(1 - \delta)$ .

**Corollary 1.5.** *To satisfy  $\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I}_m\|_2 > \delta] \leq p$ , at least*

$$n = \frac{\ln(2m) - \ln(p)}{c_\delta} K_{\mathbf{B},w}$$

*many samples are required.*

In high-dimensional applications, using a linear representation of the solution is infeasible. Hence, the theorem cannot be applied directly to such a model class. Moreover, the exact bound stated in Theorem 1.4 requires the use of an orthonormal basis (ONB)  $\mathbf{B}$ . In many cases however, the problem of orthogonalizing a given basis (w.r.t. a problem dependent inner product) is as hard as solving the original problem. A bound which does not require this assumption is given in [2]. It is however not obvious how to generalize this bound to non-linear spaces in a straightforward manner.

In what follows, we generalize the cited results to more general norms and non-linear model classes. For this, we re-examine the condition  $\|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I}_m\| \leq \delta$  which is in fact equivalent to the restricted isometry property (RIP)

$$(1 - \delta)\|u\|^2 \leq \|u\|_n^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|u\|^2 \quad \forall u \in \text{span}(\mathbf{B}). \quad (4)$$

This notion was first introduced in the context of compressed sensing [3]. It expresses the well-posedness of the problem by ensuring that  $\|\cdot\|_n$  is indeed a norm and thus a convergence of the empirical norm implies a convergence in the real norm.

One of the key insights of [1] is that for estimating the error of  $\|(1 - P_n^m)u\|$  it suffices to ensure that (4) holds. In this work we directly bound the probability of the RIP

$$\text{RIP}_A(\delta) :\Leftrightarrow (1 - \delta)\|u\|^2 \leq \|u\|_n^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|u\|^2 \quad \forall u \in A.$$

This has the advantage that it is independent of the chosen basis and can be generalized to nonlinear model classes

We proceed as follows: Section 2 develops the central results of this work based on an equivalence of a restricted isometry property (RIP) and a quadrature error. The RIP holds with high probability on the model class  $\mathcal{M}$ . Using this, we can prove bounds on the error  $\|(1 - P_n)u\|$  which are satisfied whenever the RIP is satisfied. We then investigate the influence of the norm and the model class on the sample complexity. Section 3 is devoted to some model classes for which the developed results can be applied. Numerical experiments illustrate the theoretical predictions. We begin by considering linear spaces in

Sections 3.1 and 3.2. In Section 3.3 linear spaces of high dimension which allow a low-rank approximation are examined. Since the low-rank structure does not necessarily lead to small  $K$ , we propose a remedy to this problem in Section 3.4. The connection to our related work [4] is discussed in Section 4 where we emphasize the improvements over the previous analysis. Some remarks about some numerical observations in Section 5 conclude the paper.

## 2. MAIN RESULT

To measure the rate of convergence with which  $\|v\|_n$  approaches  $\|v\|$  as  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ , we introduce the *variation constant*

$$K := \sup_{u \in A} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} w(y) |u|_u^2 = \sup_{u \in A} \|u\|_{w, \infty}^2.$$

This is the analog of  $K_{\mathcal{B}, w}$  in Theorem 1.4 and constitutes an upper bound for the value of  $\|v\|_n$  for all realizations of  $\|\bullet\|_n$  and all choices of functions  $v \in A$ . We usually omit the parameters  $A$ ,  $n$ ,  $w$  and  $Y$  on which  $K$  depends to simplify notation. When a distinction between two different choices for the parameters is necessary we will add subscripts to  $K$  so that the chosen parameters should be obvious from the context. Note that it is the aim to choose the weight  $w$  such that  $K$  can be controlled (or ideally minimized) on  $Y$ . This is illustrated in Figure 1 for polynomials on  $[-1, 1]$ .

The constant  $K = K_{A, n, w}$  is a fundamental parameter in many concentration inequalities that are used to provide bounds for the rate of convergence of the *quadrature error*.


**Definition 2.1** (Quadrature Error). *The quadrature error of the empirical norm  $\|\bullet\|_n^2$  on the model set  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is defined by*

$$\mathcal{E}_A := \sup_{u \in A} \left| \|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2 \right|.$$

This error is closely related to the RIP. In order to see this relation, we introduce a *normalization* from which the subsequent lemma follows almost immediately.

**Definition 2.2** (Normalization). *The normalization operator  $U : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$  acts on a set  $A$  by*

$$U(A) := \left\{ \frac{u}{\|u\|} : u \in A \setminus \{0\} \right\} \subset \mathcal{V}.$$



**Figure 1.** Upper bound of  $K = \|w\hat{b}\|_{L^\infty(Y,\rho)}$  with  $\hat{b}(y) := \sup_{u \in A} |u|_y^2$  as defined in Theorem 3.1 for two weight functions  $w$ . In both cases  $\mathcal{V} := L^2([-1, 1])$  and  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is the set of all polynomials with degree at most 6 and  $L^2$ -norm 1. It is easy to see that using the semicircle weight function  $w(y) \propto \sqrt{1-y^2}$  results in a smaller variation constant by compensating the growth at the boundaries of  $Y$ .

**Lemma 2.3** (Equivalence of RIP and generalization error bound). *The RIP with  $\delta > 0$  on a set  $A$  is equivalent to a bound of the quadrature error on  $U(A)$  by  $\delta$ , i.e.*

$$\text{RIP}_A(\delta) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{U(A)} \leq \delta$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\|\alpha u\|_n = |\alpha| \|u\|_n$  for all  $u \in A$  and  $\|u\| = 1$  for all  $u \in U(A)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \delta) \|u\|^2 &\leq \|u\|_n^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \|u\|^2 \quad \forall u \in A \\ \Leftrightarrow (1 - \delta) &\leq \left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} \right\|_n^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \quad \forall u \in A \\ \Leftrightarrow -\delta &\leq \|u\|_n^2 - \|u\|^2 \leq \delta \quad \forall u \in U(A), \end{aligned}$$

which holds exactly if  $\sup_{u \in U(A)} |\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2| \leq \delta$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.4.** *If  $|\cdot|_y$  satisfies the polarization identity (5) then  $\mathcal{V}$  is a Hilbert space. Let  $\mathbf{v}$  be the coefficient vector of  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  with respect to a fixed basis and denote by  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_n$  the Gramian and the empirical Gramian for the same basis. Then  $\|v\|^2 = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{v}$  and  $\|v\|_n^2 = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{G}_n \mathbf{v}$ .*

Consequently,  $\mathcal{E}_{U(A)} = \sup_{u \in U(\mathcal{V})} \mathbf{u}^\top (\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}_n) \mathbf{u}$  can be seen as a generalization of the spectral radius of  $\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}_n$ .

We introduce the notion of a covering number to provide a well-known bound for the quadrature error in the following.

**Definition 2.5** (Covering Number). *The covering number  $\nu(A, \varepsilon)$  of a subset  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is the minimal number of  $\|\cdot\|$ -open balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  needed to cover  $A$ .*

To simplify the proofs of Lemma 2.6 and Theorem 2.7, we require that  $|\cdot|_y$  in (1) satisfies the polarization identity. This means that the seminorm depending on  $y \in Y$  is induced by a bilinear form  $b_y(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|v|_y^2 = b_y(v, v). \quad (5)$$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  be a bounded set,  $\|\cdot\|_n$  a parametric seminorm satisfying the polarization identity (5) and  $w$  a weight function s.t.  $K = K_{A,n,w} < \infty$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U(A)} \geq \delta] \leq 2\nu\left(U(A), \frac{1}{4} \frac{\delta}{K}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{K}\right)^2\right).$$

The proof of this lemma can be found in Appendix A. With the preceding preparations we can derive a central result:

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_n$  a parametric seminorm satisfying the polarization identity (5) and  $w$  a weight function s.t.  $K = K_{U(A),n,w} < \infty$ . Then  $\text{RIP}_A(\delta)$  holds for any  $\delta > 0$  with probability at least*

$$1 - p := 1 - 2\nu\left(U(A), \frac{1}{4} \frac{\delta}{K}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{K}\right)^2\right).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3 it suffices to bound the quadrature error on  $U(A)$ . Lemma 2.6 provides a bound for the probability of the converse event. ■

**Remark 2.8.** *In Theorem 2.7, the bias-variance trade-off amounts to the fact that the convergence bound does not depend on  $\delta$  alone but on the fraction  $\frac{\delta}{K}$ . Enlarging the model set  $A$  reduces the approximation error  $\delta$  but at the same time increases the variation constant  $K_A$  and thereby decreases the rate of convergence of the empirical norm on  $A$ .*

**Corollary 2.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a model class with  $\nu(U(\mathcal{M}), r) \leq \frac{1}{2}r^{-M}$  for some  $M > 0$  and let  $p$  be defined as in Theorem 2.7. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.7 with  $K = K_{U(\mathcal{M}),n,w}$ , to satisfy  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$*

with probability at least  $1 - p$  requires at least

$$n = 2 \left( M \ln \left( 4 \frac{K}{\delta} \right) - \ln(p) \right) \left( \frac{K}{\delta} \right)^2$$

many samples.

*Proof.* To obtain  $\text{RIP}_{U(\mathcal{M})}(\delta)$  with a probability of at least  $1 - p$  it suffices that

$$\begin{aligned} p &= 2\nu(U(\mathcal{M}), \frac{1}{4} \frac{\delta}{K}) \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{K}\right)^2\right) \\ &= \exp\left(M \ln\left(4 \frac{K}{\delta}\right) - \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{K}\right)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$


or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} \ln p &= M \ln\left(4 \frac{K}{\delta}\right) - \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{K}\right)^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad n &= 2 \left( M \ln\left(4 \frac{K}{\delta}\right) - \ln p \right) \left(\frac{K}{\delta}\right)^2. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

All spaces mentioned in the introduction satisfy the requirements of this corollary with  $M$  depending linearly on the number of parameters of the model [5, 6]. The corollary states that in these cases  $n \in \mathcal{O}(MG)$  depends linearly on the number of parameters  $M$  with a factor  $G := \ln(K)K^2$  representing the variation of  $\|\cdot\|_n$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Remark 2.10.** *Note that the dependence of the bound on  $U(\mathcal{M})$  rather than  $\mathcal{M}$  implies that the results also hold for non-compact  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

**Remark 2.11** ( $K$  represents regularity and not dimension). *One might think that the convergence of  $\|\cdot\|_n \rightarrow \|\cdot\|$  should only depend on the interior dimension of the model set  $\mathcal{M}$  and not on the dimension of the ambient space  $\mathcal{V}$ . Using the preceding results, a sphere-filling curve is given as a simple counter-example in Figure 2 and another one is provided in Section 3.3.*



**Figure 2.** A sphere-filling curve  $\gamma$  with bounded curvature  $\kappa$  has interior dimension 1 but  $K_{U(\gamma)} = K_\gamma \rightarrow K_{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})} = K_{U(\mathcal{V})}$  in the limit  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$  with sphere denoted by  $\mathcal{S}(V)$  (see [7] for a classification of such curves).



We derive an estimate of the error due to the empirical evaluation of the projection which can be obtained when a RIP is satisfied. Note that for the sake of a simpler notation we henceforth use  $u + \mathcal{M} := \{u\} + \mathcal{M}$  for a single element  $u$ .

**Theorem 2.12.** *Assume that  $\text{RIP}_{P_{u+\mathcal{M}}}(\delta)$  holds. Then*

$$\|(P - P_n)u\| \leq 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} \|(1-P)u\|_{w,\infty}.$$

*If in addition  $\text{RIP}_{\{(1-P)u\}}(\delta)$  is satisfied<sup>1</sup> then*

$$\|(P - P_n)u\| \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}} \|(1-P)u\|.$$

*Proof.* First observe that  $P_n u \in \mathcal{M}$  and therefore  $(P - P_n)u \in Pu - \mathcal{M}$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P - P_n)u\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} \|(P - P_n)u\|_n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} [\|(P - 1)u\|_n + \|(1 - P_n)u\|_n] \\ &\leq 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} \|(1 - P)u\|_n, \end{aligned}$$

where each inequality follows from  $\text{RIP}_{P_{u-\mathcal{M}}}(\delta)$ , the triangle inequality and the definition of  $P_n$ , respectively.

The first assertion holds since  $\|v\|_n \leq \|v\|_{n,\infty}$  is satisfied for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and in particular for  $(1 - P)u$ . The second assertion follows by an application of  $\text{RIP}_{\{(1-P)u\}}(\delta)$ . ■

Note that the projection error can be split into an approximation and an estimation error by the triangle inequality and it immediately follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - P_n)u\| &\leq \|(1 - P)u\| + \|(P - P_n)u\| \\ &\leq \left(1 + 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}}\right) \|(1 - P)u\|_n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, under suitable assumptions the empirical projection is quasi optimal. Depending on the considered problem, the best approximation error  $\|(1 - P)u\|$  is usually covered by results in functional and numerical analysis.

**Remark 2.13.** *The presented theory is also valid for deterministic instead of random samples, e.g. determined by some quadrature formula.*

---

<sup>1</sup>meaning the RIP for the single function  $(1 - P)u$

In this case, it has to be verified that the chosen sample set satisfied the RIP.

**Remark 2.14.** Since  $(1 - P)u \in \mathcal{M}^c$  the probability of  $\text{RIP}_{\{(1-P)u\}}(\delta)$  may be unacceptably low. A way to alleviate this problem is discussed in Remark 3.5 by using the RKHS setting of Section 3.1.

**Remark 2.15.** In an adaptive scheme the estimation error  $\|(P - P_n)u\|$  only has to be minimized to the same extent as the approximation error  $\|(1 - P)u\|$  in order to equilibrate error contributions. Corollary 2.9 implies that it suffices to use a fixed  $\delta$  and raise the number of samples  $n$  only to increase the probability of  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$ .

To find the number of samples that are necessary for reconstruction recall that when  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$  holds, Theorem 2.12 ensures that the error  $\|u_{\mathcal{M}} - u_{\mathcal{M},n}\|$  decreases with a rate of  $\sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}}$ . Moreover, by Theorem 2.7 the probability of the  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$  failing is bounded by  $p \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2 n}{K^2}\right)$ . Thus, to guarantee the  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$  with fixed probability  $1 - p$  we may bound

$$\sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}} \leq 1 + 2\delta \leq 1 + cn^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  with  $c \propto K\sqrt{-\log(p)}$ . When this regime is reached additional sampling unnecessary since the error is equivalent to the approximation error and the error only decreases with the classical Monte Carlo rate. This behaviour is illustrated in Figure 3.

This also highlights that the model class only influences the speed with which the RIP is satisfied. As soon as the RIP holds, any further convergence of the error only achieves the slow Monte Carlo rate.

To estimate the probability of  $\text{RIP}_{P_u + \mathcal{M}}(\delta)$  we can employ the following two lemmas in conjunction with Theorem 2.7 to show that for any  $s \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{RIP}_{P_u + \mathcal{M}}(\delta)] \geq \mathbb{P}[\text{RIP}_{\frac{P_u}{s} + \mathcal{M}}(\delta)]$$

and


$$\mathbb{P}[\text{RIP}_{\frac{P_u}{s} + \mathcal{M}}(\delta)] \searrow 1 - 2\nu \left( U(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}), \frac{1}{8} \frac{\delta}{K_{U(\mathcal{M})}} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{n}{8} \left( \frac{\delta}{K_{U(\mathcal{M})}} \right)^2 \right)$$

in the limit  $s \rightarrow \infty$  where  $U(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}) := \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} U\left(\frac{P_u}{s} + \mathcal{M}\right)$ .

**Definition 2.16** (Balanced set).  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is called balanced if  $sA \subseteq A$  for all  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ .

**Lemma 2.17.** Let  $s \geq 1$ ,  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  be a balanced set and  $u \in A$ , then

$$\text{RIP}_{\frac{u}{s} + A}(\delta) \Rightarrow \text{RIP}_{u + A}(\delta).$$



**Figure 3.** This figure shows the error of an empirical approximation in the  $m = 10$ -dimensional model space  $\mathcal{M}$  of polynomials of degree less than 9 in relation to  $n$ , the number of samples that are used. The hatched area at the left marks a range of  $n$  where the approximation problem is underdetermined and any error can be reached. When  $n \geq m$  the approximation problem has a unique solution in the least squares sense. From this point until the gray and dashed line an exponential decay of the error can be observed. This decay results from the exponentially fast convergence of the probability for the RIP w.r.t.  $n$ . The gray and dashed line at  $n = 2K \ln(4m) = 2m^2 \ln(4m)$  marks the point where Corollary 1.5 predicts  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$  to hold with probability  $p \approx \frac{1}{2}$ . From there on the RIP holds with a high probability and most of the error comes from the predicted Monte-Carlo rate.

*Proof.* Let  $s \geq 1$  and recall that since  $A$  is balanced  $\frac{1}{s}A \subseteq A$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{RIP}_{\frac{u}{s}+A}(\delta) &\Leftrightarrow \left| \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|_n^2 - \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|^2 \right| - \delta \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|^2 \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in A \\
 &\Rightarrow \left| \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|_n^2 - \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|^2 \right| - \delta \left\| \frac{u}{s} + v \right\|^2 \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in \frac{1}{s}A \\
 &\Leftrightarrow \left| \left\| \frac{u+v}{s} \right\|_n^2 - \left\| \frac{u+v}{s} \right\|^2 \right| - \delta \left\| \frac{u+v}{s} \right\|^2 \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in A \\
 &\Leftrightarrow \left| \|u + v\|_n^2 - \|u + v\|^2 \right| - \delta \|u + v\|^2 \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in A \\
 &\Leftrightarrow \text{RIP}_{u+A}(\delta). \quad \blacksquare
 \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.18.** *Let  $u_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , then*

$$K_{U(\frac{u_{\mathcal{M}}}{s} + \mathcal{M})} \leq 2 \left( 2 \frac{\|u_{\mathcal{M}}\|}{s} + 1 \right)^2 K_{U(\mathcal{M})} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} 2K_{U(\mathcal{M})}.$$

The proof of this lemma is provided in Appendix B.

### 3. EXAMPLES AND NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

In this section, we examine some exemplary model spaces to which the developed theory can be applied. More specifically, we consider reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS), finite dimensional linear spaces and tensors with fixed rank. Moreover, an example of spaces of functions of a certain regularity in terms of the decay of the representation coefficients is described. The following theorem is central to the further considerations.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let the ambient vector space  $\mathcal{V}$  be separable. Then the pointwise supremum  $\hat{b}(y) := \sup_{v \in A} |v|_y^2$  with respect to  $y \in Y$  is measurable and*

$$K = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} w(y) \hat{b}(y).$$


*With this, an optimal optimal (a priori) weight function is given by  $w = \|\hat{b}\|_{L^1(Y, \rho)} \hat{b}^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix C. ■

**Remark 3.2.** *If  $Y$  is compact,  $\mathcal{M}$  is equicontinuous and  $K < \infty$  then the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem guarantees that  $\hat{b}$  is continuous. This means that  $\hat{b}$  can be approximated by an interpolation which is illustrated in Figure 4. Moreover, if  $\rho$  is a product measure and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a product of one-dimensional model sets then the supremum in the definition of  $\hat{b}$  factors into a product of one-dimensional suprema. This means that  $\hat{b}$  can be computed in each dimension separately and that the optimal sampling measure is a product measure as well.*

Based on this, a suitable model class  $\mathcal{M}$  with controlled  $\hat{b}$  can be devised which then allows the computation of the optimal weighting function  $w$ . This is done in the following where we also examine the choice of seminorm which as yet is assumed to be  $|v|_y := |v(y)|$  for  $y \in Y$ .

**3.1. Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces.** For the class of function spaces defined by RKHS, the map  $\hat{b}$  can be computed explicitly. To see



**Figure 4.** A piecewise linear interpolation  $\hat{b}_h$  of  $\hat{b}$  at equidistant points.

this recall that a RKHS  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  on  $Y$  is a space on which the evaluation operator  $L_y : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded pointwise, namely

$$|u(y)|^2 = |L_y u|^2 \leq \|K_y\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R})}^2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (6)$$

This bound is tight due to the definition of the induced operator norm. This can be generalized in a straight-forward manner to all seminorms of the form

$$|u|_y := \|L_y u\|_2$$

for a family of bounded linear operators  $L_y \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ . Analogously to equation (6) we obtain

$$|u|_y^2 = \|L_y u\|_2^2 \leq \|L_y\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H}.$$

We call a seminorm satisfying this property to be bounded. For bounded seminorms let  $\varkappa(y) := \|L_y\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2$  and observe that for any  $A \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$K_{\varkappa, A} \leq \|w \varkappa\|_{\infty} \sup_{u \in A} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Note that for  $K_{\varkappa, U(A)} < \infty$  the supremum  $\sup_{u \in U(A)} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$  has to be bounded which may require  $A$  to be a proper subspace of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Example 3.3.** Let  $Y$  be a Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and consider the space  $\mathcal{H} := H^z(Y)$  for a fixed  $z \geq \frac{d}{2} + m$ . The seminorm

$$|v|_y := \sqrt{\sum_{|k| \leq m} |v^{(k)}(y)|^2}$$

is bounded by

$$\varkappa_{z,m} := \varkappa(y) \equiv (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^{m-z} d\omega.$$

The proof is provided in Appendix D.

**Example 3.4** (Counterexample). *The seminorm  $|v|_y := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} |v^{(k)}(y)|$  cannot be represented by a linear operator  $L_y : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Remark 3.5.** *If a bounded seminorm is used, applying Theorem 2.12 leads to*

$$\|(1 - P_n)u\| \leq \left( \|\varkappa\|_{L^1(Y,\rho)} + 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} \|\varkappa\|_{L^\infty(Y,\rho)} \right) \|(1 - P)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

whenever  $\text{RIP}_{P_u+\mathcal{M}}(\delta)$  holds. This has the advantage that  $\text{RIP}_{\{(1-P)u\}}(\delta)$  does not have to be verified.


**The choice of seminorm.** Depending on the properties of the problem at hand, the standard seminorm  $|v|_y := |v(y)|$  might not be the most appropriate choice for optimizing (2). Spaces with higher regularity can be endowed with stronger norms which may lead to a lower sample complexity. Example 3.3 illustrates that the  $L^2$ -seminorm  $|v|_y := |v(y)|$  and the  $H^1$ -seminorm  $|v|_y := \sqrt{|v(y)|^2 + \|\nabla v(y)\|_2^2}$  are bounded when defined on  $H^z(Y)$  and  $H^{z+1}(Y)$  with  $z \geq \frac{d}{2}$ , respectively. It is hence straightforward to compute the variation constants  $K_{H^0}$  and  $K_{H^1}$ . They are given by

$$K_{H^m} = \varkappa_{z+m,m} \|w\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \sup_{\substack{u \in H^{m+k}(Y) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|u\|_{H^{m+k}(Y)}^2}{\|u\|_{H^k(Y)}^2} \quad \text{for } m \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Note that  $\varkappa_{z+m,m} = \varkappa_{z,0}$ . Thus, if we consider a model class  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \text{span}(\mathbf{B})$  for a polynomial basis  $\mathbf{B}$  with degree  $s-1$  and  $z+m \geq s$ , it follows from  $\|v\|_{H^{z+m}(Y,\rho)} \geq \|v\|_{H^s(Y,\rho)}$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{M}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{H^0} &= \varkappa_{z,0} \|w\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{M} \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|u\|_{H^s(Y)}^2}{\|u\|_{H^0(Y)}^2} \\ &\geq \varkappa_{z,0} \|w\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \sup_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{M} \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|u\|_{H^s(Y)}^2}{\|u\|_{H^1(Y)}^2} = K_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that an approximation with respect to the  $H^1$  norm converges faster than an approximation with respect to the  $L^2$ -norm. Since  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} \leq \|\cdot\|_{H^1}$ , we can also expect the  $L^2$ -norm of the  $H^1$ -approximation to converge faster than the  $L^2$ -norm of the  $L^2$ -approximation. This behaviour is illustrated numerically in Figure 5.



**Figure 5.** Numerical experiment (I) from [4, Section 6]. Shown is the relative  $L^2(Y)$ -error of the empirical solution in relation to the number of samples  $n$  used for reconstruction. The black line shows the error for minimization w.r.t. the  $L^2(Y)$ -norm (as done in [4]). The red line shows the error for minimization w.r.t. the  $H^1(Y)$ -norm.


For Sobolev spaces of mixed regularity one obtains  $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\cdot\|_{H_{\text{mix}}^1}$  by the Sobolev Embedding Theorem. Thus, we also expect the  $L^\infty$ -norm to converge faster when comparing  $H^1$  and  $L^2$  approximations. This behaviour is illustrated numerically in Figure 6.

To summarise, we find that the choice of the seminorm can be separated from the choice of the model class as long as the model class is contained in a normed space on which the seminorm is bounded. We hence keep using  $|\cdot|_y := |v(y)|$  in the following.

**3.2. Finite dimensional Vector Spaces.** The preceding section indicates that model classes defined as subsets of RKHS  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  exhibit beneficial properties. However, we can not always choose  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}$  since  $U(\mathcal{H}) = S(\mathcal{H})$  may not necessarily be compact and therefore  $\nu(U(\mathcal{M}), r) = \infty$ , see [8]<sup>2</sup>. Additionally, handling elements of a RKHS is computationally expensive.

These problems can be alleviated by considering an  $m$ -dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{V}_m \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  which again is a RKHS. The reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{V}_m$  is given by  $k(x, y) := \mathbf{B}^\top(x)\mathbf{B}(y)$  where  $\mathbf{B} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a vector

<sup>2</sup>Obvious exceptions are cases where the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem applies and the  $\mathcal{H}$ -balls are compact in  $\mathcal{V}$ .



**Figure 6.** Numerical experiment (I) from [4, Section 6]. Shown is the relative  $L^\infty(Y)$ -error of the empirical solution in relation to the number of samples  $n$  used for reconstruction. The black line shows the error for minimization w.r.t. the  $L^2(Y)$ -norm (as done in [4]). The red line shows the error for minimization w.r.t. the  $H^1(Y)$ -norm.

of  $\mathcal{H}$ -orthonormal basis functions. By choosing  $\mathcal{V}_m$  as the span of the first  $m$  eigenfunctions of the integral operator

$$[T_k f](\cdot) := \int_Y k(\cdot, y) f(y) \, d\mu(y),$$

one obtains a space where the  $\mathcal{V}_m$ -norm of the projected elements  $u \in \mathcal{H}$  provides an optimal approximation of the  $\mathcal{H}$ -norm. This is known as principal component analysis in statistics and as Karhunen–Loève expansion in the theory of stochastic processes. We point out that this is the special case considered in [1] and it is easy to see that

$$K_{U(\mathcal{V}_m), b, w} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} w(y) \mathbf{B}^\top(y) \mathbf{B}(y) = K_{\mathbf{B}, w}.$$

According to Theorem 3.1, choosing  $w(y) := m(\mathbf{B}^\top(y) \mathbf{B}(y))^{-1}$  yields  $K_{U(\mathcal{V}_m), b, w} = m$ . Note, that although  $K$  is independent of the concrete basis  $\mathbf{B}$ , the condition number of the corresponding linear problem is not.

**3.3. Tensors of rank  $r$ .** Vectors in high-dimensional linear spaces cannot be represented numerically due to their unfavourable computational complexity. As an example, consider the  $m$ -dimensional linear subspace



$\mathcal{V}_m \subseteq L^2([-1, 1])$  and define  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_m^{\otimes M}$  for  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . Here,  $\mathcal{V}$  is a linear space of dimension  $m^M$  which scales exponentially with respect to  $M$ . It has proven useful in applications to use the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{V} \simeq (\mathbb{R}^m)^{\otimes M}$$

and restrict the model class to functions  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  for which the corresponding coefficient tensors  $\mathbf{v} \in (\mathbb{R}^m)^{\otimes M}$  exhibit a small rank. We define the set of tensors of rank  $r$  recursively as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 &:= \{v \in \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{v}_M \text{ with } \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M \in \mathbb{R}^m\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{r+1} &:= \mathcal{T}_r + \mathcal{T}_1. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that  $\mathcal{T}_r \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  as  $r \rightarrow m^M$ . The next lemma uses the product structure of  $\mathcal{V}$  to express the variation constant for  $\mathcal{T}_1$  with respect to the variation constants of its factors  $\mathcal{V}_m$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Assume that  $w = \prod_{j=1}^d w_j$ . Then*

$$K_{U(\mathcal{T}_1), w} = \prod_{j=1}^M K_{U(\mathcal{V}_m), w_j}.$$

*Proof.* By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{U(\mathcal{T}_1), w} &= \sup_{\substack{u_j \in \mathcal{V}_m \\ \|u_j\|=1}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x_j \in X_j} \prod_{j=1}^d w_j(x_j) |u_j(x_j)|^2 \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^d K_{U(\mathcal{V}_m), w_j}. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

We hence conclude that the curse of dimensionality can only be avoided when  $K_{U(\mathcal{V}_m), w} \leq 1$ . This imposes a severe restriction on the linear subspace. For the  $L^2$ -seminorm for example this requires the orthonormal basis functions of  $\mathcal{V}_m$  to be bounded by 1 almost everywhere<sup>3</sup>. The bases that satisfy these simultaneous orthogonality and boundedness conditions are investigated in [9].

**Remark 3.7.** *The important observation in this subsection is that restricting the space may reduce the number of parameters but does not decrease  $K$ . Put differently, regularity may induce low-rank structure but low-rank structure does not provide regularity.*

<sup>3</sup>Since these basis functions are contained in  $U(\mathcal{V}_m)$ .

**3.4. Enforcing regularity.** According to the observations of the preceding section, the variation constant  $K$  is of greater importance for the sample complexity than the number of parameters  $M$  characterising the model set  $\mathcal{M}$ . In fact, a reduction of  $K$  can be achieved by exploiting additional regularity or sparsity of  $\mathcal{M}$ . This is also motivated by the fact that the sample complexity does not directly<sup>4</sup> depend on the approximated function  $u$ . Thus, a diligent choice of  $\mathcal{M}$  is required, reflecting the properties of  $u$ .

To illustrate this, we fix a  $m$ -dimensional basis  $\mathbf{B} : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of orthogonal functions in  $L^2(Y)$  and consider the following bound of the modulus of  $u \in \text{span}(\mathbf{B})$ ,

$$w(y)|u(y)|^2 = \mathbf{u}^\top (w(y)\mathbf{B}^\top(y)\mathbf{B}(y))\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{u}^\top C\mathbf{u} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

A construction of such a matrix  $C$  and bounds of its eigenvalues are detailed in Appendix E. We define the model class

$$\mathcal{D}_{C/\sigma^2} := \{u \in \mathcal{H} : \|u\|_C \leq \sigma \|u\|\} \quad \text{with } \|u\|_C^2 := \frac{1}{\sigma} \mathbf{u}^\top C\mathbf{u}.$$

To obtain an intuition for the functions of this space, we observe that

$$\|u\|_C \leq \sum_{k=1}^m c_k |\mathbf{u}_k| =: \|u\|_c \quad \text{with } c_k := \|\mathbf{B}_k\|_{L^\infty(Y,\rho)}.$$

For  $u \in \mathcal{D}_{C/\sigma^2}$  this means that the modulus of the coefficient  $|\mathbf{u}_k|$  must be smaller for basis functions with larger  $\mathbf{c}_k$ . Thus, the condition  $\|u\|_C := \mathbf{u}^\top C\mathbf{u}$  effectively enforces a decay in the basis coefficients of  $u$  and results in the estimate

$$K_{U(\mathcal{D}_{C/\sigma^2})} \leq \sigma^2.$$

Note that this is a model class for which  $K < m$  can be achieved.

Based on the definition of  $\mathcal{D}_{C,\sigma}$ , one can specify an entire class of closely related model sets, each defined by its own matrix  $C$ . An even stronger concept of coefficient decay is obtained by directly enforcing a bound on each coefficient by defining

$$C_k = (\delta_{ik}\delta_{jk})_{\substack{i=1,\dots,d \\ j=1,\dots,d}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_\sigma := \bigcap_{k=1}^m \mathcal{D}_{C_k/k^{-2\sigma}}. \quad (7)$$

This yields the estimate

$$K_{U(\mathcal{D}_\sigma)} \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^m k^{-\sigma} c_k \right)^2.$$

---

<sup>4</sup>but indirectly via  $\mathcal{M}$  and the respective  $K$

Numerical evidence for the fact that these classes are well-suited for empirical approximation is provided in Figure 7.

**Remark 3.8.** *The optimization in  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$  requires the use of an adapted optimization scheme to ensure that the result lies in  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ . Enforcing this condition during optimization acts as a regularizer and may speed up convergence by reducing the influence of noise on the coefficients of basis functions with high frequencies.*

#### 4. CONNECTION WITH EMPIRICAL RISK MINIMISATION

The devised results are closely related to the analysis of the Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) method presented in [4]. Most notably, the statistical bound of the generalization error can be improved substantially which is indicated in the following.

In *empirical risk minimisation* (ERM) an empirical risk functional

$$\mathcal{J}_n(v) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(v, y_i) \approx \mathbb{E}_Y[\ell(v, Y)] =: \mathcal{J}(v)$$

is minimised. We consider the minimisers

$$v^* := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{J}(v), \quad v_{\mathcal{M}}^* := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{J}(v), \quad v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{J}_n(v).$$

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded,  $\mathcal{J}$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{M}$  as well as Lipschitz smooth<sup>5</sup> and strongly convex on  $\mathcal{V}$ , it is shown in [4] that the empirical optimum is quasi-optimal with high probability, i.e.<sup>6</sup>

$$\|v^* - v_{\mathcal{M},n}^*\| \lesssim \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|.$$

Assume that  $\mathcal{J}_n$  is Lipschitz smooth, strongly convex and that  $v^*$  is also a global minimum for  $\mathcal{J}_n$ . Then for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$


$$\|v - v^*\|_n^2 \stackrel{(4a)}{\lesssim} \mathcal{J}_n(v) - \mathcal{J}_n(v^*) \stackrel{(4b)}{\lesssim} \|v - v^*\|_n^2.$$

Assuming  $\text{RIP}_{\{\mathcal{M}-P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\}}(\delta)$  and  $\text{RIP}_{\{P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*-v^*\}}(\delta)$  we can employ Theorem 2.12 to derive two estimates. First, by the triangle inequality and  $\text{RIP}_{\{\mathcal{M}-P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - v^*\|^2 &\lesssim \|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\|^2 + \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\|_n^2 + \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

<sup>5</sup>i.e. Lipschitz continuity of the gradient

<sup>6</sup>Note that we hide multiplicative constants in “ $\lesssim$ ”.



**Figure 7.** Empirical probability of  $\|(1 - P^k)u\| \leq \delta\|u\|$  from 0 (black) to 1 (white) for  $u \in \partial\mathcal{D}_\sigma$  and  $\sigma \in \{0.5, 1, 2\}$  where  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$  is defined as in (7). The probabilities are estimated by computing the empirical approximation for 100 independent samples of  $\|\cdot\|_n$ . As conjectured in (8) the red curve represents a convex combination of the predicted phase transitions at  $n = (1 - \frac{1}{100})n_{\mathcal{M}}(m) + \frac{1}{100}n_{\text{span}(\mathbf{B})}(m)$  for  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\text{span}(\mathbf{B})$  respectively.

Another triangle inequality and (4a) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\|_n^2 &\lesssim \|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - v^*\|_n^2 + \|(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}})v^*\|_n^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_n(v_{\mathcal{M},n}^*) - \mathcal{J}_n(v^*) + \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of  $v_{\mathcal{M},n}^*$  and using (4b) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_n(v_{\mathcal{M},n}^*) - \mathcal{J}_n(v^*) &\leq \mathcal{J}_n(P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*) - \mathcal{J}_n(v^*) \\ &\lesssim \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\text{RIP}_{\{P^{\mathcal{M}}v^* - v^*\}}$  and combining the preceding estimates, we obtain

$$\|v_{\mathcal{M},n}^* - v^*\| \lesssim \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|.$$

**Remark 4.1.** *A qualitatively similar bound was derived in [4]. However, while the previous quasi-optimality result followed from a concentration inequality with Monte Carlo convergence of the empirical approximation error [4, Remark 4.13], the results of this work are based on directly ensuring the RIP, and hence the quasi-optimality with a fixed factor.*

Second, using (4b),  $\text{RIP}_{\{\mathcal{M} - P^{\mathcal{M}}v^*\}}(\delta)$  and  $\text{RIP}_{\{P^{\mathcal{M}}v^* - v^*\}}(\delta)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(P_n^{\mathcal{M}}v^*) - \mathcal{J}(v^*) &\lesssim \|(P_n^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \|(P^{\mathcal{M}} - 1)v^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with the definition of  $v_{\mathcal{M}}^*$  and (4a) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(P_n^{\mathcal{M}}v^*) - \mathcal{J}(v^*) &\lesssim \|v_{\mathcal{M}}^* - v^*\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{J}(v_{\mathcal{M}}^*) - \mathcal{J}(v^*). \end{aligned}$$

This means that we can estimate an error in two ways: either by minimizing a norm or by minimizing a more general cost functional  $\mathcal{J}$ . In both cases, we obtain a quasi-optimal bound.

## 5. REFINED ESTIMATE FOR LINEAR PROJECTIONS

An observation in [4] was that although no problem-dependent weight was used for generating samples in the tensor regression, the numerical convergence significantly exceeded the theoretical statements, which would only predict the standard Monte Carlo rate. In the following we provide some thoughts on the relation of the best approximations of  $u \in \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  in the  $M$ -dimensional linear subspace  $\mathcal{V}_M \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  independent from  $\mathcal{M}$ .

According to our theory it would be optimal to approximate  $u$  in the intersection  $\mathcal{M}_M := \mathcal{V}_M \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Optimization over  $\mathcal{M}_M$  can however be very difficult. We derive the statement that the projection error in the (larger) linear space  $\mathcal{V}_M$  behaves like the approximation error in the

(smaller) intersection  $\mathcal{M}_M$  up to some (vanishing) additive term. By triangle inequality

$$\|(1 - P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M})u\| \leq \underbrace{\|(1 - P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\|}_{=:I} + \underbrace{\|(P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M})u\|}_{=:II}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{M}_M \subseteq \mathcal{V}_M$  implies  $P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M} = P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - 1)$  it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - 1)u\| \\ &\leq \|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| + \|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(P^{\mathcal{M}_M} - 1)u\| \\ &= \|(P_n^{\mathcal{M}_M} - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| + \|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\|. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming  $\text{RIP}_{\mathcal{M}_M}(\delta)$ , the combination of the preceding bounds yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M})u\| &\leq c\|(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| + \|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| \\ &\leq (c + L_{M,n})\|(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with  $c := 3 + 2\sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}}$  and Lipschitz constant  $L_{M,n}$  of  $P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}$ . This suggests that the phase shift for the linear projection of  $u$  should occur between the theoretical predictions of  $\mathcal{V}_M$  and  $\mathcal{M}_M$  depending on how close  $\|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\|$  is to 0. Figure 7 illustrates this behaviour. The crucial point is that  $u \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $P^{\mathcal{M}_M}u = P^{\mathcal{V}_M}u$  which in turn implies  $(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u = P^{\mathcal{V}_M}u$  and thus

$$\|P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M}(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| \approx \|P^{\mathcal{V}_M}(1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u\| = 0.$$

To bound this expression we choose an orthonormal basis  $\{B_j\}_{j=1,\dots,M}$  for  $\mathcal{V}_m$  and define the empirical projection operator

$$M_n : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M, \quad (M_n v)_j := (B_j, v)_n,$$

and the empirical Gramian  $(G_n)_{j,k} := M_n B_k$ . Then the projection operator is given by

$$P_n^{\mathcal{V}_M} = \mathbf{B}^\top G_n^{-1} M_n,$$

where  $\mathbf{B}_j = B_j$  and

$$\mathbb{P}[\|M_n v\| \geq \xi] \leq 2M \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\xi}{K}\right)^2\right)$$

with  $v := (1 - P^{\mathcal{M}_M})u$  and  $K := \max_{j=1,\dots,M} \|v B_j\|_{L^\infty}$ .

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

M. Eigel acknowledges support by the DFG SPP 1886. R. Schneider was supported by the Einstein Foundation Berlin. P. Trunschke acknowledges support by the Berlin International Graduate School in Model and Simulation based Research (BIMoS). We would like to thank Henryk Gerlach for his help in generating 3D plots with povray. We also thank Leon Sallandt, Mathias Oster and Michael Götte for fruitful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Cohen and G. Migliorati. *Optimal weighted least-squares methods*. 2016. eprint: [arXiv:1608.00512](https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.00512).
- [2] B. Bohn. “On the convergence rate of sparse grid least squares regression”. In: *Sparse Grids and Applications-Miami 2016*. Springer, 2018, pp. 19–41.
- [3] E. J. Candès, J. K. Romberg, and T. Tao. “Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 59.8 (2006 ), pp. 1207–1223. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpa.20124>.
- [4] M. Eigel, R. Schneider, P. Trunschke, and S. Wolf. “Variational Monte Carlo—bridging concepts of machine learning and high-dimensional partial differential equations”. In: *Advances in Computational Mathematics* (10/2019 ).
- [5] H. Rauhut, R. Schneider, and Ž. Stojanac. “Low rank tensor recovery via iterative hard thresholding”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 523 (2017 ), pp. 220–262.
- [6] J. Berner, P. Grohs, and A. Jentzen. *Analysis of the generalization error: Empirical risk minimization over deep artificial neural networks overcomes the curse of dimensionality in the numerical approximation of Black-Scholes partial differential equations*. 09/2018.
- [7] H. Gerlach and H. von der Mosel. “On Sphere-Filling Ropes”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 118 (05/2010 ).
- [8] J. Connett. “On Covering the Unit Ball in a Banach Space”. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* s2-7.2 (1973 ), pp. 291–294.

- eprint: [\url{https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1112/jlms/s2-7.2.291}](https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1112/jlms/s2-7.2.291).
- [9] E. Kowalski. “POINTWISE BOUNDS FOR ORTHONORMAL BASIS ELEMENTS IN HILBERT SPACES”. In: 2011.
- [10] V. Burenkov. “Extension theorems for Sobolev spaces”. In: *The Maz’ya Anniversary Collection*. Ed. by J. Rossmann, P. Takáč, and G. Wildenhain. Basel: Birkhäuser Basel, 1999, pp. 187–200.

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.6

Let  $\mathcal{W} = U(\mathcal{M})$  and fix  $\delta > 0$ . The proof consists of two steps. We first derive Lemma A.1 which allows (with  $\nu$  and  $u_j$  chosen as in the assumptions) to estimate

$$\mathbb{P}[\sup_{u \in \mathcal{W}} |\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2| > \delta] \leq \mathbb{P}[\max_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| > \frac{\delta}{2}],$$

since the event on the right-hand side is necessary but not sufficient for the left-hand side. Using a union bound argument it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\max_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| > \frac{\delta}{2}] &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} \mathbb{P}[|\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| > \frac{\delta}{2}] \\ &\leq \nu \max_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} \mathbb{P}[|\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| > \frac{\delta}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

The second step relies on Lemma A.3 which allows to bound the probability on the right-hand side for each  $1 \leq j \leq \nu$  by a standard concentration inequality and yields

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} \mathbb{P}[|\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| > \frac{\delta}{2}] \leq 2 \exp(-\frac{\delta^2 n}{2C_1^2}).$$

In the following we are concerned with proving Lemmas A.1 and Lemma A.3.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\nu := \nu(\mathcal{W}, \frac{\delta}{8K})$  and  $\{u_j\}_{j \in [\nu]}$  be the centres of the corresponding covering. Then almost surely*

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{W}} |\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2|.$$

*Proof.* First we will verify that the map  $\ell_y : u \mapsto w(y)|u|_y^2$  is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $2K_{\mathcal{W},w}$  for all  $y \in Y$ . For this recall that  $|\cdot|_y$  satisfies the polarization identity (5) and thus  $|u|_y^2 = b_y(u, u)$ . The Lipschitz continuity follows from bilinearity via

$$\begin{aligned} |b_y(u, u) - b_y(v, v)| &\leq |b_y(u, u - v)| + |b_y(u - v, v)| \\ &= \left( |b_y(u, \frac{u-v}{\|u-v\|})| + |b_y(\frac{u-v}{\|u-v\|}, v)| \right) \|u - v\| \\ &\leq 2K_{\mathcal{W},w} \|u - v\|. \end{aligned}$$



Let  $u \in \mathcal{W}$  be given. Then by definition of the  $\{u_j\}_{j \in [v]}$ , there is a specific  $u_j$  with  $\|u - u_j\|_2 < \frac{\delta}{8K}$ . The Lipschitz continuity of  $\ell_y$  implies  $|\|u\|^2 - \|u_j\|^2| \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$  and almost surely  $|\|u\|_n^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ . Therefore, by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2| &\leq |\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2 - (\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2)| + |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| \\ &\leq |\|u\|^2 - \|u_j\|^2| + |\|u\|_n^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| + |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + |\|u_j\|^2 - \|u_j\|_n^2| \quad \text{almost surely.} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the maximum concludes the proof.  $\square$

To prove Lemma A.3 we first recall a standard concentration result from statistics.

**Lemma A.2** (Hoeffding 1963). *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in [N]}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. bounded random variables  $|X_i| \leq M$  and define  $\bar{X} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ , then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}] - \bar{X}| \geq \varepsilon\right] \leq 2e^{-2\varepsilon^2 N/M^2}.$$

The proof of Lemma A.3 is a mere application of Lemma A.2.

**Lemma A.3.** *The probability for the statistical error  $|\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2|$  to become larger than  $\varepsilon > 0$  can be bounded like*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\|u\|^2 - \|u\|_n^2| \geq \varepsilon\right] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2 n}{K_{\mathcal{W},b,w}^2}\right).$$

*Proof of Lemma A.3.* Recall that by definition the map  $\ell_x : u \mapsto w(x)|u_x|^2$  is bounded in absolute value by  $K_{\mathcal{W},b,w}$  for all  $x \in X$ . The samples  $x_i$  are i.i.d. and consequently  $\ell_{x_i}(u)$  are i.i.d. Since  $|\ell_{x_i}(u)| \leq K_{\mathcal{W},b,w}$  holds almost surely for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the assumptions for Lemma A.2 are satisfied.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.18

To prove this Lemma we first define

$$B_r(A) := \{\lambda a : a \in A \wedge \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \wedge \lambda \|a\| \in [0, r]\},$$

and prove the following six properties of  $K$  and  $B_r$ .

(I) For all subsets  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{U(A)} &= \sup_{u \in A \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \|\sqrt{w}u\|_{L^\infty(Y)}^2 \\ &= \sup_{u \in A} \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1/\|u\|} \lambda^2 \|\sqrt{w}u\|_{L^\infty(Y)}^2 \\ &= K_{B_1(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

(II) For  $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $r > 0$  the reverse triangle inequality implies

$$\|u + v\| \leq r \Rightarrow \|v\| \leq \|u\| + r.$$

Thus  $B_r(u + A) \subseteq u + B_{\|u\|+r}(A)$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  and all subsets  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ .

(III) By definition of  $K_A := \sup_{u \in A} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} |u|_y^2$  it holds that

$$K_A \leq K_B \quad \text{for all } A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{V}.$$

(IV) Jensen's inequality implies

$$|u + v|_y^2 = 4 \left| \frac{1}{2}u + \frac{1}{2}v \right|_y^2 \leq 4 \left( \frac{1}{2}|u|_y^2 + \frac{1}{2}|v|_y^2 \right) = 2(|u|_y^2 + |v|_y^2)$$

and thus, for all  $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$K_{A+B} \leq 2(K_A + K_B).$$

(V) For all subsets  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  it holds that

$$B_r(A) = \{r\lambda a : a \in A \wedge \lambda \|a\| \in [0, 1]\} = rB_1(A).$$

(VI) Due to the homogeneity of the seminorm  $|\cdot|_y$  for any  $y \in Y$ ,  $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  and  $\lambda > 0$  it holds that

$$K_{\lambda A} = \sup_{u \in A} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{y \in Y} |\lambda u|_y^2 = \lambda^2 K_A.$$

We can now derive that for all  $u \in A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$

$$\begin{aligned} K_{U(u+A)} &= K_{B_1(u+A)} && \text{(I)} \\ &\leq K_{u+B_{\|u\|+1}(A)} && \text{II \& (III)} \\ &\leq 2(K_{\{u\}} + K_{B_{\|u\|+1}(A)}) && \text{(IV)} \\ &\leq 2(K_{B_{\|u\|}(A)} + K_{B_{\|u\|+1}(A)}) && \text{(III)} \\ &\leq 2(\|u\|^2 K_{B_1(A)} + (\|u\| + 1)^2 K_{B_1(A)}) && \text{(V) \& (VI)} \\ &\leq 2(2\|u\| + 1)^2 K_{B_1(A)} \\ &= 2(2\|u\| + 1)^2 K_{U(A)}. && \text{(I)} \end{aligned}$$


Applying this to  $u = \frac{P^k u}{s} \in \mathcal{M} = A$  and taking the limit yields the assertion.

### APPENDIX C. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

To prove the first assertion it suffices to show that  $\hat{b}$  is measurable. For this let  $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  be a countable dense subset in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then

$$\hat{b}(y) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{M}} |u|_y^2 = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |u_j|_y^2.$$

is the supremum over a countable set of measurable functions and as such it is measurable.



**Figure 8.** The set of feasible vectors  $v$  satisfying  $v > 0$  and  $\int_X \hat{b}v \, d\rho = 1$  is displayed in red. The contour lines  $\|\frac{1}{v}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} = t_{1/2/\text{opt}}$  for  $t_1 < t_2$  (left) and for the optimal value  $t_{\text{opt}}$  (right) are drawn in black.

We only sketch the proof of the second assertion. By substituting  $w = (v\hat{b})^{-1}$  the minimization problem

$$\min_w K_w \quad \text{s.t.} \quad w \geq 0 \text{ and } \|w^{-1}\|_{L^1(Y,\rho)} = 1$$

is equivalent to

$$\min_v \|v^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad v > 0 \text{ and } \int_Y \hat{b}v \, d\rho = 1,$$

which is a non-convex optimization problem under linear constraints. The assertion is then equivalent to the statement that the minimal  $v$  is a constant function. Why this must be the case is illustrated in Figure 8 where the function  $v$  is split as  $v = \alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2$  with  $v_1, v_2 > 0$  having disjoint support and  $\|v_1^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} = \|v_2^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} = 1$ . Then  $\|v^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} = \|(\alpha_1 v_1)^{-1} + (\alpha_2 v_2)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Y)} = \alpha_1^{-1} \vee \alpha_2^{-1}$ .

#### APPENDIX D. EXAMPLE 3.3

The seminorm  $|v|_y = \sqrt{\sum_{|k| \leq m} |v^{(k)}(y)|^2}$  can be represented by the family of linear operators  $L_{y,k} \in \mathcal{L}(H^z(Y, \rho), \mathbb{R})$  for  $y \in Y$  and  $|k| \leq m$  defined by

$$L_{y,k}v := v^{(k)}(y).$$

In the following we compute the corresponding operator norms.

In [10] it is shown that  $H^z(Y)$  can be embedded isometrically into  $H^z(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with an embedding constant depending on  $z$ ,  $d$  and  $Y$ . For  $z \geq \frac{d}{2} + 1$  the inner product of  $H^z(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is given by

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H^z(\mathbb{R}^d)} = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^z \mathcal{F}f(\omega) \overline{\mathcal{F}g(\omega)} \, d\omega,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}f$  denotes the Fourier transform of  $f$  and  $\bar{g}$  denotes the complex conjugate of  $g$ . Using this formula as well as the translation property

$$\mathcal{F}(f(\bullet - y))(\omega) = \mathcal{F}f(\omega)e^{-y^\top\omega}$$

and the differentiation property

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}f\right)(\omega) = -i\omega_j\mathcal{F}f(\omega)$$

of the Fourier transform it is easy to compute the Riesz representatives  $r_{y,k}$  of  $L_{y,k}$  w.r.t. the  $H^z$ -inner product as

$$r_{y,k}(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(i^{|k|}\omega^k(1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^{-z}\right)(x - y).$$

Computing the norm  $\|L_y\| = \sqrt{\sum_{|k|\leq m}\|r_{y,k}\|_{H^z(Y,\rho)}^2}$  is now only a matter of technicalities which result in

$$\varkappa(y) \equiv (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^{m-z} d\omega.$$

#### APPENDIX E. MATRIX $C$ IN SECTION 3.4

Let  $\mathbf{G}(y) = w(y)\mathbf{B}(y)\mathbf{B}(y)^\top$  and observe that  $w(y)|u(y)|^2 = \mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{G}(y)\mathbf{u}$ . The goal is to find a matrix  $C$  such that for all  $y \in Y$  and  $u \in \mathcal{V}$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{G}(y)\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{C}\mathbf{u}.$$

A loose upper bound is provided by the matrix

$$\mathbf{C} := \left[ \text{ess sup}_{y \in Y} w(y)\mathbf{B}_i(y)\mathbf{B}_j(y) \right]_{\substack{i=1,\dots,m \\ j=1,\dots,m}},$$

which satisfies the stronger condition

$$\mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{G}(y)\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{C}\mathbf{v} \quad \text{for all } y \in Y, u, v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

To obtain a tight upper bound we define the maximum of two symmetric matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  as  $\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} + |\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}|)$  where  $|C|$  is defined via the spectral decomposition of  $C = U^\top D U$  as  $|C| := U^\top |D| U$ . Using the identity  $\max\{a, b\} = \frac{1}{2}(a + b + |a - b|)$ , it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{u}^\top(\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B})\mathbf{u} \geq \max\{\mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}\}$ .

When  $\mathbf{G}$  is continuous and  $Y$  is compact we can use a grid of  $n$  equidistant points  $y_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) to obtain an approximation

$$C_n := \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}(y_i).$$

By continuity,  $C_n \rightarrow C$  in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

WEIERSTRASS INSTITUTE, MOHRENSTRASSE 39, D-10117 BERLIN, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* [martin.eigel@wias-berlin.de](mailto:martin.eigel@wias-berlin.de)

TU BERLIN, STRASSE DES 17. JUNI 136, D-10623 BERLIN, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* [schneidr@math.tu-berlin.de](mailto:schneidr@math.tu-berlin.de)

TU BERLIN, STRASSE DES 17. JUNI 136, D-10623 BERLIN, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* [ptrunschke@mail.tu-berlin.de](mailto:ptrunschke@mail.tu-berlin.de)