
GAUSSIAN PROCESS REGRESSION IN THE FLAT LIMIT

A PREPRINT

Simon Barthelmé, Pierre-Olivier Amblard, Nicolas Tremblay, Konstantin Usevich

October 27, 2023

ABSTRACT

Gaussian process (GP) regression is a fundamental tool in Bayesian statistics. It is also known as kriging and is the Bayesian counterpart to the frequentist kernel ridge regression. Most of the theoretical work on GP regression has focused on a large- n asymptotics, characterising the behaviour of GP regression as the amount of data increases. Fixed-sample analysis is much more difficult outside of simple cases, such as locations on a regular grid.

In this work we perform a fixed-sample analysis that was first studied in the context of approximation theory by Driscoll & Fornberg (2002), called the “flat limit”. In flat-limit asymptotics, the goal is to characterise kernel methods as the length-scale of the kernel function tends to infinity, so that kernels appear flat over the range of the data. Surprisingly, this limit is well-defined, and displays interesting behaviour: Driscoll & Fornberg showed that radial basis interpolation converges in the flat limit to polynomial interpolation, if the kernel is Gaussian. Subsequent work showed that this holds true in the multivariate setting as well, but that kernels other than the Gaussian may have (polyharmonic) splines as the limit interpolant.

Leveraging recent results on the spectral behaviour of kernel matrices in the flat limit, we study the flat limit of Gaussian process regression. Results show that Gaussian process regression tends in the flat limit to (multivariate) polynomial regression, or (polyharmonic) spline regression, depending on the kernel. Importantly, this holds for both the predictive mean and the predictive variance, so that the posterior predictive distributions become equivalent.

For the proof, we introduce the notion of prediction-equivalence of semi-parametric models, which lets us state flat-limit results in a compact and unified manner. Our results have practical consequences: for instance, they show that optimal GP predictions in the sense of leave-one-out loss may occur at very large length-scales, which would be invisible to current implementations because of numerical difficulties.

Gaussian processes are a cornerstone of modern Bayesian methods, used almost wherever one may require nonparametric priors. Quite naturally, the theory of Gaussian Process methods is well-developed. Aside from limited special cases in which Fourier analysis is applicable, GP-based methods have mostly been studied under large- n asymptotics (see, *e.g.* [45, 43, 35, 49, 41]), which apply when the number of measurements is high. In this paper we report intriguing theoretical results obtained under a different asymptotic, one that treats the data as fixed, rather than random, with fixed sample size. The limit we look at is the so-called “flat limit”, pioneered by [11] in 2002. The flat limit consists in letting the spatial width of the kernel function go to infinity, which results in the covariance function becoming flat over the range of the data.

Studying Gaussian processes under the flat limit may seem at first sight to be entirely pointless - does that not correspond to a prior that contains only flat functions? The answer is no, because covariance functions have a second hyperparameter that sets the vertical scale (pointwise variance). When one lets pointwise variance grow as the covariance becomes wider, the actual function space spanned by Gaussian processes remains interesting and useful. In the cases studied here, they are (multivariate) polynomials and (polyharmonic) splines.

A first hint that such would be the case was obtained in [11], where Driscoll & Fornberg examined Radial Basis Function interpolation in the flat limit, a popular method in approximation theory that corresponds to noiseless GP regression. Driscoll & Fornberg found that under certain conditions, the RBF interpolant tends to the Lagrange polynomial interpolant in the flat limit. The result is very surprising, since the RBF interpolation problem may seem at first

sight to become ill-defined in the flat limit. Subsequent papers generalised this result to multivariate interpolation [22], and finitely-smooth kernels [44]. Our contribution can be seen as an extension of these results, since RBF interpolation features as a special case.

Further evidence that GPs may be interesting in the flat limit comes from the study of the spectrum and eigenvectors of kernel matrices performed in [4]. The full story is complicated, but the key phenomenon is that the eigenvectors of kernel matrices tend in the flat limit to orthogonal multivariate polynomials or polyharmonic spline bases. Based on these results, we have been able to study the flat limit of determinantal point processes (DPPs), a type of point process that is in some sense dual to Gaussian processes [5].

To give some highlights, we show the following:

1. GP regression tends in the flat limit to either polynomial regression or (polyharmonic) spline regression.
2. Which it is depends on the smoothness of the kernel, and on the amount of regularisation enforced by the prior
3. The specific kernel has only a minor influence on the limit, influencing only the part of the function space that is most heavily regularised.
4. There is nothing *in theory* that prevents the optimal GP model (according to hyperparameter selection criteria) from being arbitrarily close to the flat limit. Such solutions are invisible in practice because of numerical issues, or because they are obscured by a nugget term.
5. In some cases, we show empirically that the flat limit is a good approximation for GP regression *even when the actual kernel is far from flat*.

Gaussian processes are used throughout machine learning and statistics, for many other tasks than just regression. For instance, they are also used for classification [52], density estimation [31], certain numerical methods [8], as emulators in inverse problems [46] and Bayesian optimisation (starting with [20]), etc. We show in the appendices that our results can be extended to the general setting of so-called “latent Gaussian models”, with non-Gaussian likelihoods and observations that are arbitrary linear functionals. The message is the same: a GP prior in a statistical model turns (effectively) in the flat limit into a polynomial or a spline.

There are some important practical consequences of our results, that we discuss in detail in section 5. In particular, if the data presents strong polynomial trends, then caution should be observed when performing hyperparameter selection. Overall our results argue in favour of using polyharmonic (eg., thin plate, [12, 27]) splines as priors, at least for functions in spaces of dimension ≤ 3 . These splines occur as flat limits of GP models, eliminating a bothersome hyperparameter, and efficient tools are available (for instance the highly-popular R package *mgcv*, [53]).

We shall now introduce our results informally, by way of a few pictures. Fig. 1 shows a synthetic dataset, fitted using various methods. A very classical way of fitting such data is to use polynomials, which results in the curves on panel (a). Another classical way is to use smoothing splines, which results in panel (c), where the different curves correspond to different values of the regression parameter. A more modern way of producing a fit is to use a Gaussian process, which results in a Bayesian version of Radial Basis Function interpolation [41]. Gaussian process regression requires a covariance function, which determines the behaviour of the fit. The ever-popular Gaussian or “squared-exponential” covariance function is

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \gamma \exp\left(-\varepsilon^2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2\right) \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are two points in \mathbb{R}^d . In this definition γ and ε are hyperparameters. ε sets the horizontal scale (the width of the Gaussian), and γ sets the vertical scale (its height). For a fixed value of ε , changing the value of γ produces different fits. Increasing γ increases the amount of variation allowed in the fitted function (the *effective degrees of freedom*), resulting in a tighter fit to the data. Decreasing γ decreases the degrees of freedom, as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ the fit goes to a horizontal line at 0. Panel (b) shows the fits for a few different values of γ , for a fixed value of $\varepsilon = 0.5$. Panel (d) is the same, but for a different covariance function, specifically one in the Matérn family (see eq. (5) for the definition), which has the property of being only once differentiable at 0. For reasons that cannot be succinctly explained, differentiability of the kernel function plays a large role – see [4].

Our analysis consists in letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, making the covariance functions “flat” over the range of the data. One outcome is that in the flat limit, to put things very roughly, panel (a) \rightarrow panel (b) and panel(c) \rightarrow panel (d).

The next set of figures should explain this a bit better. For a given value of ε and γ , the fit produced by a Gaussian process is a function from (in this case) $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} . Call it $\hat{f}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}(x)$. If we leave ε fixed and vary γ , we obtain a family of functions $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \left\{ \hat{f}_{\varepsilon, \gamma} \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+ \right\}$. Panel (b) of fig.1 shows a few elements from \mathcal{F}_ε for the Gaussian kernel. A




Figure 1: Various fits of the same data. a. Polynomials of degree 0 to 3. b. Gaussian process regression, with a Gaussian kernel, $\varepsilon = 0.5$ and different values of γ (see text). c. Quadratic smoothing splines. d. GP regression, with a Matérn kernel (see text).

polynomial fit is another function from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} , this time parametrised by the degree of the polynomial. Call $\hat{p}_r(x)$ the polynomial fit of degree r . An implication of our results (theorem 4.2) is that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the set \mathcal{F}_ε intersects (goes through) the polynomial fits. This is best understood graphically. We cannot plot \mathcal{F}_ε , but we can plot the following: we choose two locations on the x-axis (at $x_a = 0.2$ and $x_b = 0.8$), and plot the value of the fit at these locations. For fixed ε , we can think of the pair $(\hat{f}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}(x_a), \hat{f}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}(x_b))$ as a parametric curve in \mathbb{R}^2 , parameterised by γ . The curves on fig. 2 are two such parametric curves, for the Gaussian kernel and two different values of ε . The predictions of the polynomial fits at x_a and x_b are just a set of points in \mathbb{R}^2 . What theorem 4.2 implies is that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the parametric curves will go through each polynomial fit (and more than that, interpolate linearly between these points).

For the Matérn kernel, following again theorem 4.2, the comparison should be to another parametric curve, corresponding to the smoothing splines for all possible values of the regularisation parameter. Barring very high values of γ (for which the behaviour of the GP becomes polynomial), the GP fit should behave like a spline and therefore tend to the parametric curve produced by the smoothing splines. That is exactly the behaviour observed on fig. 3.

Theorem 4.2 is actually a bit more informative than what we have just shown, since it deals for instance with the predictive variance as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Theorem 6.2 generalises the result to fits in \mathbb{R}^d with $d > 1$. It is stated abstractly in terms of asymptotically equivalent models, but figs. 2 and 3 are useful to keep in mind to visualise what happens to GP fits as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Organisation of the paper

Section 1 introduces GP regression, the main formulas and notation. Taking GPs to the flat limit produces improper, *semi-parametric* GP models which have a penalised and an unpenalised part. Section 2 introduces some notation and useful facts on semi-parametric models for GP regression. Section 3 sets the main theoretical framework, where we develop an equivalence relation on semi-parametric models from the point of view of prediction-equivalence. Roughly, two models are prediction-equivalent if they lead to the same predictive distributions. Subsequent results are stated in terms of prediction equivalence.

Section 4 contains our core results on limits of GP regressions in the univariate case, which are generalised in section 6 to the multivariate case. Section 5 contains additional results on hyperparameter selection and degrees of freedom.




Figure 2: Predictions at $x = 0.2$ and $x = 0.8$ from different models. The numbered dots correspond to the polynomial fits with degree 0 to 6. The continuous curves are the predictions from GP regression with Gaussian kernel, fixing ε but letting γ vary. We show the two limits $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$, which correspond respectively to a maximally penalised fit and to a minimally constrained one (an interpolation). The two individual curves are for two different values of ε . Theorem 4.2 states that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the continuous curve goes through the blue dots in a piecewise linear manner.




Figure 3: Predictions at $x = 0.2$ and $x = 0.8$ from different models. The dashed line corresponds to smoothing spline fits for all possible values of the regularisation parameter. The continuous curves are the predictions from GP regression with a once-differentiable Matérn kernel, fixing ε but letting γ vary. The two individual curves are for two different values of ε . Theorem 4.2 states that as ε the continuous curve tends to the dashed curve.

Section 5.5 shows how to construct *matched flat-limit approximations* to GP regressions, and includes numerical results. The discussion in section 7 highlights some limitations and directions for future work. The appendices contain some deferred proofs, various results on Wronskian matrices, and the outline of two proofs extending our results to general linear observations and non-Gaussian likelihoods.

1 Background on GP regression and related methods

Gaussian processes are used in a variety of statistical models, but the simplest and most elegant is GP regression, also known as kriging. GP regression is a Bayesian procedure for non-parametric regression, in which we assume that a function $f(x)$ has been measured (with noise) at n locations x_1, \dots, x_n and the goal is to infer f given these measurements and some vague prior knowledge, for instance that f is smooth. The procedure is called non-parametric because we do not assume that f has some parametric form. Instead, a Gaussian process prior is used to capture some basic prior knowledge about f , for instance its smoothness or its periodicity.

A Gaussian process is a random function $f(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that has multivariate Gaussian marginals. For simplicity we take $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ in this introduction, but higher dimensions are dealt with further down. We note $f \sim GP(\mu, \kappa)$, where $\mu(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a mean function and $\kappa(x, y) : \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a covariance function, if for all finite subsets $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1 \dots x_n\}$ of Ω , the random vector $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}} = [f(x_1) \dots f(x_n)]^T$ has a multivariate Gaussian distribution, specifically $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}})$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{X}} = [\mu(x_1) \dots \mu(x_n)]^T$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} = [\kappa(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j=1}^n$. In most cases, the covariance $\kappa(x, y)$ is a decreasing function of the distance between x and y , which ensures that $f(x_i)$ and $f(x_j)$ have similar values if x_i is close to x_j and so that the random function is smooth (the smoothness order of f is in fact a function of the smoothness order of κ). In GP regression the GP plays the role of a prior. The assumption is that $f \sim GP(0, \kappa)$ and in addition that the measurements are i.i.d. and Gaussian, namely

$$y_i \sim N(f(x_i), \sigma^2) \quad (2)$$

for i in $1, \dots, n^1$. Then the posterior distribution $f|\mathbf{y}$ is also a Gaussian process. This can be verified by writing the joint distribution of \mathbf{y} and $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}'}$ for any finite set $\mathcal{X}' \subset \Omega$. By hypothesis, that joint distribution is a multivariate Gaussian, and so the (posterior) conditional $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}'}|\mathbf{y}$ is Gaussian as well. The posterior mean and covariance functions can be easily derived by applying the usual Gaussian conditioning formulas, and read:

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{k}_{x,\mathcal{X}} (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} \quad (3)$$

with $\mathbf{k}_{x,\mathcal{X}} = [\kappa(x, x_1) \dots \kappa(x, x_n)]$, and

$$\text{Cov}(f(x), f(x')|\mathbf{y}) = \kappa(x, x') - \mathbf{k}_{x,\mathcal{X}} (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{X},x'} \quad (4)$$

The posterior expectation, $\tilde{f}(x) = \mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$ is naturally used as an estimator for $f(x)$. Two remarks are in order:

1. when the hyperparameters are fixed, \tilde{f} is a linear function of \mathbf{y} , which makes GP regression a member of the family of *linear smoothers* studied by, e.g., [7]².
2. \tilde{f} can be written as $\tilde{f}(x) = \sum \kappa(x, x_i) \alpha_i$, so that \tilde{f} belongs to the reproducing kernel Hilbert space generated by κ , which relates GP regression to classical kernel methods [42]

In fact, most of the results given below apply (with appropriate modifications) to related methods like kernel ridge regression or support vector regression.

1.1 Covariance functions, and the problem of hyperparameters

So far, we have not defined our covariance function. We shall focus on radial-basis kernel functions, meaning that $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \gamma \psi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2)$ for some function ψ , i.e. the covariance only depends on the (Euclidean) distance between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . For κ to be a valid covariance function, it needs to be positive definite, and for stationary covariance functions this is equivalent (by Bochner's theorem) to requiring that ψ be the Fourier transform of a non-negative measure.

¹A different derivation of the same estimator is used in the kriging literature, via minimum variance arguments [41]. Note that here we are just stating the usual assumptions used to derive classical GP regression. In our analysis we make no assumptions on the true function f or the distribution of the measurements \mathbf{y} . We describe what happens to the GP estimator for a given, fixed dataset.

²When the hyperparameters are themselves selected based on the data, the final fit is generally a non-linear function of \mathbf{y} , however.

The prototypical choice in machine learning is to use the squared-exponential (also known as Gaussian) covariance function, eq. (1). In this formulation ε acts like an inverse *horizontal* scale (an inverse bandwidth) while γ acts like an inverse *vertical* scale (a gain parameter). These parameters are usually unknown and must be estimated from the data, using one of the methods outlined below in section 1.4. In addition, the noise variance σ^2 (see eq. (85)) may not be known either, in which case it needs to be estimated too, bringing the number of hyperparameters to three: $\varepsilon, \gamma, \sigma^2$.

The goal here is to characterise the flat limit of GP regression, which is the regime where $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This essentially fixes ε and leaves only two hyperparameters to be estimated. We describe later (section 5) how to understand this limit in the context of hyperparameter selection.

While in machine learning the squared-exponential kernel is the most popular, in spatial statistics the Matérn class of kernels [45] is very often preferred. These kernels feature an additional hyperparameter $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^+$ which determines regularity, and have a somewhat unwieldy expression ([52], p. 83):

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \gamma \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} \left(\sqrt{2\nu}(\varepsilon \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) \right)^\nu K_\nu \left(\sqrt{2\nu}(\varepsilon \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) \right) \quad (5)$$

where K_ν is a modified Bessel function. The expression simplifies when 2ν is an integer. For instance, with $\nu = 1/2$ we obtain the exponential kernel:

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \gamma \exp(-\varepsilon \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) \quad (6)$$

The value of ν determines the regularity of f in the sense that if f is drawn from a Matérn kernel with parameter ν , f is $\lfloor \nu \rfloor$ times mean-square (m.s.) differentiable. This implies for instance that if f is drawn from an exponential kernel it is continuous but nowhere differentiable.

More generally, and beyond Matérn kernels, the regularity of f is determined by the differentiability of the covariance $\kappa(x, y)$ in both variables. Heuristically, it is easy to see that f is m.s. differentiable if and only if $\kappa(x, y)$ is differentiable in both x and y . M.s. differentiability is equivalent to requiring that $\frac{f(x+\delta) - f(x)}{\delta}$ has finite variance in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$. By writing the covariance of $f(x + \delta)$ and $f(x)$ one can check that $\text{Var}\left(\frac{f(x+\delta) - f(x)}{\delta}\right) = \delta^{-2}(\kappa(x + \delta, x + \delta) + \kappa(x, x) - 2\kappa(x + \delta, x))$ which has a finite limit if and only if $\kappa(x, y)$ is differentiable in both variables at $y = x$. Repeating the argument we see that m.s. differentiability of order s requires that the kernel be s times differentiable in both variables at $y = x$.

The regularity of the kernel essentially determines its flat limit behaviour. We use the following definition:

Definition 1.1 (Regularity parameter). *We say a kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ has regularity parameter r if it is $(r - 1)$ -times differentiable in both \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} at $\mathbf{x} = 0, \mathbf{y} = 0$, but not r -times differentiable.*

Example 1.1. *The exponential kernel (eq. (6)) is not differentiable at $y = x$, because the distance function is not. It therefore has regularity parameter $r = 1$. In dimension $d = 1$, one can check directly that the Matérn kernel*

$$k(x, y) = (1 + |x - y|) \exp(-|x - y|)$$

is once-differentiable and therefore has $r = 2$. The Gaussian kernel is infinitely differentiable in both variables, and therefore has $r = \infty$.

For stationary kernels, the regularity parameter is easy to determine based on the power spectral density, see [45] or appendix 8.3.1.

1.2 Other linear smoothers

In this section we introduce other linear smoothers which are related to GP regression in the flat limit. The first is polynomial regression, which is very simple when $d = 1$ (the multivariate case introduces some complexity, dealt with in section 6). Here we assume f is a polynomial of degree s , noted $f \in \mathcal{P}_s$, i.e. $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^s \alpha_i x^i$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{s+1}$. f is estimated by maximum likelihood, i.e. via least-squares:

$$\hat{f}_s(\cdot) = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{P}_s} \sum (y_i - f(x_i))^2 = \mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(\cdot)^\top (\mathbf{V}_{\leq s}^\top \mathbf{V}_{\leq s})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{\leq s}^\top \mathbf{y} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(x) = [x^0 \ x^1 \ \dots \ x^s]^\top$ is the column vector in \mathbb{R}^{s+1} that contains the first s order monomials at x , and where the Vandermonde matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\leq s} = [\mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(x_1), \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(x_n)]^\top$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times (s+1)}$ collects these vectors at the locations x_1, \dots, x_n . This matrix and the space it spans are fundamental objects in the paper. Eq. (7) shows that \hat{f}_s depends linearly on \mathbf{y} , so that polynomial regression is a linear smoother.

The only hyperparameter in this case is the degree s . The polynomial regression fit can also be thought of as a Bayesian *a posteriori* estimate, specifically $E(f|\mathbf{y})$ under a (improper), flat prior over the coefficients α . In this case the posterior variance equals:

$$\text{Var}(f|\mathbf{y}) = \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(x)^\top (\mathbf{V}_{\leq s}^\top \mathbf{V}_{\leq s})^{-1} \mathbf{v}_{\leq s}(x). \quad (8)$$

A different and very popular family of smoothers are the smoothing splines, which generalise to the polyharmonic splines when $d > 1$. Here f is only assumed to be p -times differentiable, and estimated using penalised maximum likelihood. The penalty equals the energy of the p -th derivative of f :

$$\hat{f} = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in C_p(\Omega)} \sum (y_i - f(x_i))^2 + \eta \int_{\Omega} (f^{(p)}(x))^2 dx \quad (9)$$

where the optimisation is over $C_p(\Omega)$, the space of p -times differentiable functions on Ω .

An important feature of the $\int_{\Omega} (f^{(p)}(x))^2 dx$ regulariser is that it has a null space, since any polynomial of degree $(p - 1)$ has zero penalty.

A famous result known as the ‘‘representer theorem’’ ([50, 42]) states that this variational optimisation problem collapses to a finite-dimensional optimisation problem: the solution \hat{f} belongs to a finite dimensional space of functions, the splines of order p with knots at $x_1 \dots x_n$. The argument is quite simple [42]. Without using the RKHS formalism, it can be sketched as follows: the error $\sum (y_i - f(x_i))^2$ is indifferent to the values of f outside of the measurements \mathcal{X} , so we need to look for the function that minimises the penalty given certain values $f_{\mathcal{X}}$. The solution turns out to be a spline of order p with knots at \mathcal{X} , and so the solution of the overall optimisation problem is just to find the optimal such spline.

Classical results on splines [12] show that a basis for this space is given by functions of the form:

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n |x - x_i|^{2p-1} \alpha_i + \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} x^j \beta_j. \quad (10)$$

Here g is a sum of a piecewise polynomial term and a polynomial term. Note that the latter spans the null space of the regulariser. This form has $n + p$ degrees of freedom, but the regularisation term imposes $\mathbf{V}_{<p}^\top \alpha = 0$, which removes p degrees of freedom.

We can inject eq. (10) into the smoothing splines optimisation problem (eq. (9)) to turn into a finite dimensional problem over α and β . Some calculus shows that the problem is equivalent to inverting the following ‘‘saddle-point’’ system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} (-1)^p \mathbf{D}^{(2p-1)} + \eta \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V}_{<p} \\ \mathbf{V}_{<p}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{D}^{(2p-1)}$ is a symmetric matrix with entries $\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{(2p-1)} = |x_i - x_j|^{2p-1}$.

Recall that η is a regularisation parameter: the smaller η , the closer f must fit the data. In the $\eta \rightarrow 0$ limit, regularisation turns into interpolation, and the system above turns into:

$$\begin{pmatrix} (-1)^p \mathbf{D}^{(2p-1)} & \mathbf{V}_{<p} \\ \mathbf{V}_{<p}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

which is the classical system for polyharmonic spline interpolation [6, 51]. On the other hand, letting η go to ∞ in the optimisation problem (eq. (9)) effectively imposes that the solution belongs to the null space of the regulariser, *i.e.* the space of polynomials of degree up to $p - 1$. In this limit we therefore recover polynomial regression. The same sort of relationships are present in the flat limit of GP regression. The limit is sometimes a spline, sometimes a polynomial, sometimes a regression and sometimes an interpolant. Exactly what happens depends on n , on the regularity of the kernel, and on how much regularisation is applied.

1.3 Degrees of freedom of a linear smoother

The notion of *effective degrees of freedom* is important in the analysis of linear smoothers (see [7]). If $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y}$, where \mathbf{M} is the smoother matrix, the number of effective degrees of freedom is simply defined as $\text{Tr } \mathbf{M}$. For instance, if \mathbf{M} is a projection (as in the case of polynomial regression), then $\text{Tr } \mathbf{M}$ is just the dimension of the space \mathbf{y} is projected to (the image space). For regularised regressions, the matrix \mathbf{M} is not a projection but the eigenvalues are in $[0, 1]$, and summing these eigenvalues, which is what the trace does, is a natural way of defining a ‘‘dimension’’ for the image space.

In the case of polynomial regression of degree p , the number of degrees of freedom of the smoother simply equals $p + 1$, the dimension of the space of polynomials of degree p . In the case of GP smoothers, the number of degrees of freedom equals (from eq. (4)):

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{K} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \sigma^2} \quad (13)$$

where the λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of \mathbf{K} . On the right-hand side, each term in the sum is between 0 and 1. If λ_i is much larger than σ^2 , then the term is close to 1. If λ_i is much smaller than σ^2 , then the term is close to 0. If there is an index j such that $\lambda_j \gg \lambda_{j+1}$, and $\lambda_j > \sigma^2 > \lambda_{j+1}$, then the smoother matrix is close to a projection matrix. Such a scenario arises in the flat limit.

The number of degrees of freedom of (polyharmonic) spline interpolants are a bit more intricate to work out, because the smoothing matrix does not take a very convenient form. The result can be obtained either by a brute-force calculation or by noticing that the problem is the same as computing the expected size of an extended L-ensemble [47, Eq. (17)], yielding the following figure:

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}) = p + \sum_{i=1}^{n-p} \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \eta} \quad (14)$$

where here the λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of the matrix $(-1)^r \mathbf{Q}_\perp^\top \mathbf{D}^{(2p-1)} \mathbf{Q}_\perp$, \mathbf{Q}_\perp being an orthonormal basis of the orthogonal of span $\mathbf{V}_{<p}$. Recall that when η goes to 0 regression turns into interpolation, so that $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}$. One can verify from eq. (14) that the number of degrees of freedom indeed goes to n . In the other limit, when $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ we perform a polynomial regression of degree $p - 1$, and accordingly the number of degrees of freedom goes to p .

1.4 Hyperparameter selection

There are several methods available for hyperparameter selection in GP regression. The most satisfactory is certainly to avoid hyperparameter selection entirely by computing the marginal posterior expectation (integrating over the hyperparameters). This is not tractable analytically and somewhat expensive in practice, so alternative methods are often preferred. Let us set up more appropriate notation. The vector of hyperparameters is $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\gamma, \epsilon, \sigma^2)$ if σ^2 is unknown, and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\gamma, \epsilon)$ if σ^2 is considered known.

A method for hyperparameter selection popularised by [25], but equivalent to a form of Empirical Bayes [34], is to set $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to its maximum-likelihood value. The probability of the observations \mathbf{y} given the hyperparameters (marginalising over \mathbf{f}) is:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \det(2\pi(\mathbf{K}_\boldsymbol{\theta} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}))^{-1/2} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top (\mathbf{K}_\boldsymbol{\theta} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1/2} \mathbf{y}) \quad (15)$$

The maximum likelihood estimate of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is obtained by maximising eq. (15). For our purposes here it is not very fruitful to compute the asymptotics of eq. (15) in the flat limit because it is divergent, as the prior becomes improper. We therefore focus our efforts on other selection criteria which are not divergent, as we show in section 5.

The non-divergent criteria we focus on in this paper are also very popular, and consist of

1. L00-MSE: leave-one-out cross-validation with a squared-loss
2. L00-NLL: leave-one-out cross-validation with a negative log-likelihood
3. SURE: Stein's Unbiased Risk Estimator.

We believe AIC [1] and Generalised Cross-Validation [17] should show qualitatively the same behaviour, but we do not study them here.

For all these three criteria, the smoother matrix plays a central role. Recall that the smoother matrix $\mathbf{M}_\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is defined *via* the posterior expectation at the sampled locations which equals :

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{f}_\mathcal{X}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \gamma \mathbf{K}_\epsilon (\gamma \mathbf{K}_\epsilon + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{K}_\epsilon \left(\mathbf{K}_\epsilon + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{M}_\boldsymbol{\theta} \mathbf{y} \quad (16)$$

Cross-validation is a natural way of picking hyperparameters, but one needs to pick a cost function and a way of splitting the datasets. Leave-one-out (LOO) is popular with GPs because there are closed-form formulas for two loss functions. One is the squared-loss. LOO cross-validation with the squared-loss reads:

$$C_{\text{loo-mse}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbb{E}(f(x_i)|\mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \quad (17)$$

Here $\mathbb{E}(f(x_i)|\mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the posterior expectation of $f(x_i)$ conditional on all the data except y_i . Standard calculations using the Woodbury lemma show that an alternative formula for the LOO loss is [16] :

$$C_{\text{loo-mse}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{y_i - (\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{y})_i}{1 - \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(i, i)} \right)^2 \quad (18)$$

Evident from this formula is that LOO squared-error loss only depends on the smoother matrix. A different choice, one that takes uncertainty into account, is to use the negative log-likelihood as a cost:

$$C_{\text{loo-nll}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(y_i | \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \log (2\pi \text{Var}(y_i | \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta})) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(y_i - \mathbb{E}(y_i | \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))^2}{\text{Var}(y_i | \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \right\} \quad (19)$$

Eq. (19) also has an equivalent form that is faster to compute and involves the smoother matrix, see [52] (p. 117).

Finally, another way of selecting a hyperparameter, popular in the signal processing community, is Stein’s Unbiased Risk Estimate (SURE, [23]), which assumes that σ^2 is known.

$$C_{\text{SURE}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - (\mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{y})_i)^2 + \frac{2\sigma^2}{n} \text{Tr } \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad (20)$$

SURE is quite similar to AIC in that it features a loss term corrected by a measure of model complexity, quantified here by the degrees of freedom of the smoother matrix $\text{Tr } \mathbf{M}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

2 Semi-Parametric models

The goal of this section is to introduce some notation to unify linear smoothers like GP regression, polynomial regression and polyharmonic spline regression; we shall describe them all as “semi-parametric” GP models. Semi-parametric regression [37], known in geostatistics as “universal kriging” [26], is not a new concept, and the results in this section are not novel. However, we introduce some notation that allows us to describe what happens in the flat limit in a compact and unified way.

Semi-parametric Gaussian process models assume the unknown function $f(x)$ to be of the form:

$$f(x) = g(x) + \sum_i \alpha_i v_i(x) \quad (21)$$

where $g(x)$ is non-parametric and $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1(x) \dots v_m(x)\}$ is a set of basis functions forming the parametric part. $g(x)$ is given a zero-mean Gaussian process prior, and the prior on the weights α_i is the improper uniform prior $p(\alpha_i) \propto 1$. We will see later that these improper priors can be viewed as a GP with infinite variance along certain directions. Despite the improper prior, the posterior is well-defined under mild conditions (see below), and the resulting fit has useful properties. Of course, if no basis functions are included, then the model is a (non-parametric) GP regression, and if no non-parametric term is included, then we have a parametric model.

We use the following notation for describing semi-parametric models:

Definition 2.1 (Semi-parametric model). *A semi-parametric model (SPM) over $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V})$, where $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a (conditionally)-positive definite kernel (see def. 2.2) on Ω , and $\mathcal{V} = v_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, v_m(\mathbf{x})$ is a set of linearly-independent basis functions.*

Example 2.1. *The following describes a SPM over \mathbb{R} : $\mathcal{M} = (\exp(-(x-y)^2); \{1, x, x^2\})$. The non-parametric part is a Gaussian kernel, and the parametric part are the basis functions $1, x, x^2$. It corresponds to a standard GP regression with a Gaussian kernel, except that polynomial trends of degree ≤ 2 are unpenalised.*

A parametric model over \mathbb{R} is the special case where the kernel is uniformly 0 or (equivalently) missing, e.g. $\mathcal{M} = (0; \{\sin(x), \cos(x)\})$ is a parametric model with two sinusoidal basis functions. A purely non-parametric model has $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, e.g. $\mathcal{M} = (\exp(-(x-y)^2); \emptyset)$ is a standard GP model with Gaussian covariance.

A “conditionally positive-definite” kernel is a kernel that is only positive definite on a subspace, as we explain below. The possibility for the non-parametric kernel to be conditionally positive definite rather than positive definite is probably non-obvious to the reader. An example where conditionally positive-definite kernels are used is smoothing spline regression with linear splines. This prior may be cast as $\mathcal{M} = (-|x-y|; \{1\})$, i.e. with a single basis function,

namely the constant function. The function $l(x, y) = -|x - y|$ is not positive definite, as can be easily verified. For instance, if we evaluate the kernel matrix for l at the locations $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1$, we find $\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, which has eigenvalues equal to -1 and 1 , whereas a positive definite kernel would give non-negative eigenvalues. Nonetheless, the smoothing splines SPM is well-defined, because, as we shall explain soon, kernels only need to be positive definite along the directions orthogonal to the span of the basis functions.

Definition 2.2 (unisolvent sets, conditional positive-definiteness). *A set of locations $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\} \subset \Omega$ is said to be unisolvent for the SPM $\mathcal{M} = (l; \{v_1, \dots, v_m\})$ if the matrix*

$$\mathbf{V} = [v_j(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{i=1, j=1}^{n, m} \quad (22)$$

has rank m . \mathbf{V} corresponds to the evaluation of the m basis functions (along columns) at the points in \mathcal{X} (along rows). We call it the basis matrix. It has a QR decomposition $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$, where \mathbf{Q} is an orthonormal basis for $\text{span } \mathbf{V}$.

The kernel matrix equals

$$\mathbf{L} = [l(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)]_{i=1, j=1}^{n, n} \quad (23)$$

and we use “kernel matrix” rather than covariance matrix because \mathbf{L} may not be positive definite.

The condition that the kernel l be conditionally positive-definite (see [51], ch. 8) with respect to \mathcal{V} corresponds to the requirement that for all unisolvent \mathcal{X} , the matrix

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)$$

be positive definite. Note that $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ is a projector on the space orthogonal to $\text{span } \mathbf{V}$; the requirement is therefore that \mathbf{L} be positive semi-definite on the space orthogonal to $\text{span } \mathbf{V}$.

Example 2.2. *We return to $\mathcal{M} = (-|x - y|; \{1\})$, linear smoothing splines, on the set $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$. Here $\mathbf{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which has (trivially) full column rank, so that \mathcal{X} is unisolvent. The orthonormal form of the basis matrix is $\mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} / \sqrt{2}$. As before $\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & -1/2 \\ -1/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}$, so that $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ is indeed positive semi-definite. More generally, since in this case there is only one basis function, all sets $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}$ of size at least 1 are unisolvent. The fact that $l(x, y) = -|x - y|$ is conditionally positive-definite w.r.t. the constant function is shown in [28].*

The requirement that the measurement locations \mathcal{X} be unisolvent is necessary when using a SPM, because it essentially states that the basis functions need to be identifiable from \mathcal{X} , or equivalently that the posterior distribution be proper, despite the improper prior on the parametric part. We do not wish to linger too much on unisolvent sets, except to note that there are non-trivial sets in \mathbb{R}^d that are not unisolvent w.r.t. polynomial basis functions. For instance, if $\mathcal{V} = \{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2\}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 (where x_1 and x_2 represent the first two coordinates), then choosing a point set where $x_1 = x_2$ will lead to trouble, since the matrix \mathbf{V} will have linearly-dependent columns. There are more surprising examples to be found, but these examples are all algebraic sets, and thus occur with probability 0 when sampling \mathcal{X} independently from Ω [39].

A useful way of thinking about SPMs is to view them as limits of standard non-parametric GP models when the prior covariance along the span of the basis functions goes to infinity (so that they become unpenalised). The details can be found in appendix 8.1, but the gist is that we may define a family of kernels indexed by ε ,

$$k_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^m v_i(\mathbf{x})v_i(\mathbf{y})$$

which represents the prior covariance of a model

$$f_\varepsilon(x) = g(x) + \sum_i \alpha_i v_i(x)$$

where $g(x)$ is a GP with covariance l and $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ are sampled i.i.d. from a $\mathcal{N}(0, \varepsilon^{-1})$ Gaussian. We let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to make the parametric part unpenalised, and appendix 8.1 shows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (k_\varepsilon; \emptyset) = (l; \mathcal{V})$$

i.e. the non-parametric model becomes semi-parametric in the limit. This explains why we are allowed to build “improper” models based on conditionally-positive definite l : if the directions of³ “negative variance” are all along

³These directions correspond to the space spanned by the eigenvectors associated with negative eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} .

the span of the basis functions, then they will be swamped for ε large enough by the $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ positive-definite term. A tidier construction would use “intrinsic” priors, as in [36].

We end this section with some concrete formulas for inference in SPMs, derived from the limit viewpoint in appendix 8.1. These formulas can be used for implementation.

Proposition 2.3. *The conditional expectation in a SPM $(l; \mathcal{V})$ has the following form:*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where $\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} = [l(x, x_1) \quad \dots \quad l(x, x_n)]$ and $\mathbf{v}_x = [v_1(x) \quad \dots \quad v_m(x)]$.

Proof. In appendix 8.1. □

One may check that this generalises the non-parametric case by removing the basis functions, and the parametric case by setting $l = 0$ (which implies $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{0}$). In addition, we can see in eq. (24) that a SPM results in a linear smoother (in the sense that the fit is a linear function of \mathbf{y}), and that the fit takes the form

$$\hat{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i l(x, x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j v_j(x)$$

where the coefficients α and β depend on \mathbf{y} and σ^2 . Although the fit seems to take its value in a $n + m$ -dimensional space of functions, eq. (24) actually implies the condition $\mathbf{V}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$ which removes m degrees of freedom. This generalises the case of smoothing splines introduced earlier (eq.see (10)).

An expression for the smoother matrix can be derived either by taking $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i$ in eq. (24), or by using the correspondence between SPMs and extended-L-ensembles [47, 13] to get

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\tilde{\mathbf{L}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \quad (25)$$

where \mathbf{Q} is an orthonormal basis for \mathbf{V} and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)$. Eq. (25) is the sum of a projection matrix (as arises in a least-squares fit of a parametric model), and a regularised fit (as arises in a non-parametric GP model), limited to the subspace orthogonal to \mathbf{V} .

The conditional variance takes a similar form to eq. (24), namely:

Proposition 2.4. *The conditional variance in a semi-parametric model $(l; \mathcal{V})$ equals:*

$$\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} - (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{l}_{\mathcal{X},x} \\ \mathbf{v}_x^\top \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

Proof. In appendix 8.1. □

Here again the parametric and non-parametric special cases can be recovered by setting $l = 0$ or removing the basis functions.

3 Prediction-equivalence of semi-parametric models

In the flat limit, standard GP models become equivalent to certain semi-parametric models (SPMs), in the sense that they give the same predictions (conditional expectation and conditional variance) regardless of what the value of σ^2 is, where the measurements \mathcal{X} occur and where the prediction is sought. The aim of this section is to formalise the notion of predictive-equivalence of SPMs, and to exhibit a simple criterion for proving equivalence based on the smoother matrix.

Definition 3.1 (Prediction-equivalence for semiparametric models). *Two semi-parametric models $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (l'; \mathcal{V}')$ are said to be prediction-equivalent over a domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, noted $\mathcal{M} \sim \mathcal{M}'$, if $|\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{V}'|$, and for any finite $\mathcal{X} \subset \Omega$ unisolvant for \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' , for all $x \in \Omega$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$:*

1. *The predictive expectations (eq. (24)) are equal: $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$*
2. *The predictive variances (eq. (26)) are equal: $\text{Var}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \text{Var}_{\mathcal{M}'}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$*

i.e., the predictive distributions are equal.

In some cases the predictive-equivalence of two models is easy enough to establish. For instance, if \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' are two sets of basis functions for the same function space, then whatever l , $(l; \mathcal{V}) \sim (l; \mathcal{V}')$. To take a concrete example, $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, x_2\}$ spans the same space as $\mathcal{V}' = \{x_1 - x_2, x_1 + x_2\}$ and so using one rather than the other changes nothing to the model (theoretically, if not numerically). If the intuitive argument does not convince, one can also check equivalence directly via eq. (24) and (26).

A more subtle source of prediction-equivalence is the following: if $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$, then, for any α :

$$(l(x, y) + \alpha v_i(x) v_i(y); \mathcal{V}) \sim (l(x, y); \mathcal{V})$$

This form of prediction-equivalence follows directly from the argument outlined in section 8.1, or again can be checked via eqs. (24) and (26). By extension, for any set of coefficients (α_i) ,

$$\left(l(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i v_i(x) v_i(y); \mathcal{V} \right) \sim (l(x, y); \mathcal{V})$$

In our flat limit computations however, we cannot show equivalence so directly. What we have access to are smoother matrices, but it turns out that this is enough. The next lemma is essential for our proofs, and concerns prediction-equivalence of two *non-parametric* models.

Lemma 3.2. *These two statements are equivalent:*

- a) *The nonparametric models with covariance k and k' are prediction-equivalent on Ω , i.e. $(k; \emptyset) \sim (k'; \emptyset)$.*
- b) *For all finite $\mathcal{X} \subset \Omega$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the smoother matrices $M_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}$ and $M'_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{K}'_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{K}'_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}$ are equal*

Proof. We prove each implication separately. (a) \implies (b) is straightforward. Since $(k; \emptyset) \sim (k'; \emptyset)$, then $\mathbb{E}_k(x|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{k'}(x|\mathbf{y})$ for all x , including $x \in \mathcal{X}$, implying that:

$$\delta_i M_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{y} = \delta_i M'_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{y}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{X}|\}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$. This implies equality of $M_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $M'_{\mathcal{X}}$ (*i.e.*, take \mathbf{y} to be any δ_j).

(b) \implies (a) is less direct, but essentially the same as the derivation for the fast formula for leave-one-out cross-validation.

The main trick is that the prediction mean and variance at x given observations at \mathcal{X} can be computed from the smoother matrix for $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \cup x$. Let $|\mathcal{Y}| = n$. We begin with the variance. The predictive variance at x for kernel k equals

$$v_x = k_{x,x} - \mathbf{k}_{x,\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{X},x}$$

which is a Schur complement in the block matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{X}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{X},x} \\ \mathbf{k}_{x,\mathcal{X}} & k_{x,x} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} - \sigma^2 \delta_n \delta_n^\top \quad (27)$$

i.e., we have

$$\frac{1}{v_x} = \delta_n^\top (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} - \sigma^2 \delta_n \delta_n^\top)^{-1} \delta_n$$

Applying the Woodbury lemma, we have

$$\frac{1}{v_x} = \delta_n^\top \left(\mathbf{P} + \frac{\sigma^2 \mathbf{P} \delta_n \delta_n^\top \mathbf{P}}{1 - \sigma^2 \delta_n^\top \mathbf{P} \delta_n} \right) \delta_n$$

where $\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} = \sigma^{-2}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Noting $c = \delta_n^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{Y}} \delta_n$ and simplifying, we obtain:

$$v_x = \sigma^2 \frac{c}{1 - c}$$

By equality of the smoother matrices $M_{\mathcal{Y}} = M'_{\mathcal{Y}}$ for any \mathcal{Y} , we have $c' = c$ and $v'_x = v_x$, thus the predictive variances are equal. For the predictive means, one can repeat a similar computation with the following formula:

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \sigma^{-2} \delta_n^\top (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{-1} + \sigma^{-2} \mathbf{I} - \sigma^{-2} \delta_n \delta_n^\top)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which is obtained from the conditional posterior over $f_{\mathcal{X}}, f(x)$ given \mathbf{y} . Applying the Woodbury lemma again, we see that the expectation depends only on the smoother matrix for \mathcal{Y} . The calculation is equivalent to proving formula (5.26) in [16].

An alternative way of proving the same result uses the block inverse formula for the matrix of the l.h.s in equation (27), since we have

$$-\frac{\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})}{v_x} = \boldsymbol{\delta}_n^\top (\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} - \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{\delta}_n \boldsymbol{\delta}_n^\top)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which leads using the previous calculations to

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}_n^\top \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{Y}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}}{1 - c}$$

which shows again that the *a posteriori* mean at x only depends on the full smoother matrix $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. \square

With the above lemma in hand, extension to semi-parametric models is straightforward: As with standard kernels, predictive equivalence can be assessed from equality of smoother matrices:

Proposition 3.3. *These two statements are equivalent: letting $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V})$, $\mathcal{M}' = (l'; \mathcal{V}')$*

a) $\mathcal{M} \sim \mathcal{M}'$.

b) *For all finite $\mathcal{X} \subset \Omega$ unisolvent for \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' , $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the smoother matrices for \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' at \mathcal{X} are equal.*

Proof. The proof is a variant of lemma 3.2. (a) \implies (b) follows from the same argument.

For (b) \implies (a), we use the characterisation of semi-parametric models as limits. $k_\varepsilon(x, y) = l(x, y) + \varepsilon^{-1} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} v(x)v(y)$ converges in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to the semi-parametric model S , and similarly $k'_\varepsilon(x, y) = l'(x, y) + \varepsilon^{-1} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}'} v'(x)v'(y)$ goes to S' , in the sense that the predictive means and variances converge to that of S and S' . By corollary 8.4, we know that the smoother matrix if k_ε equals $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{M}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, its counterpart $\mathbf{M}'_\varepsilon = \mathbf{M}'_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and, by assumption, since the smoother matrices for S and S' are equal then $\mathbf{M}_0 = \mathbf{M}'_0$. From the proof of lemma 3.2, we know that the predictive means and variances for k_ε and k'_ε are continuous functions of $\mathbf{M}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathbf{M}'(\varepsilon)$, and therefore have the same limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

In practice, as mentioned in section 1.4, a ‘‘vertical scale’’ hyperparameter is present in GP models. For semiparametric models, this means that we consider the family $\mathcal{M}(\gamma) = (\gamma l; \mathcal{V})$ indexed by $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and γ is set by minimising a hyperparameter selection criterion like those in section 1.4. The marginal likelihood cannot be used here (unmodified, at least), because the prior is improper. This leaves us with cross-validation and SURE⁴. An important property of predictive-equivalent models is that two equivalent models remain equivalent post-selection: the value of these selection criteria are equal for all values of σ^2 and γ .

Proposition 3.4 (Post-selection equivalence). *Let $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V}) \sim \mathcal{M}' = (l'; \mathcal{V})$ on Ω , and consider the families of models $\mathcal{M}(\gamma) = (\gamma l; \mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{M}'(\gamma) = (\gamma l'; \mathcal{V})$. Then for any data \mathbf{y} and noise variance σ^2 , the value of the selection criteria given by eq. (17), eq. (19) and eq. (20) are the same for $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ and $\mathcal{M}'(\gamma)$. Consequently, if γ^* is the optimal value of the criterion for \mathcal{M} , it equals the optimal value for \mathcal{M}' , and the selected models $\mathcal{M}(\gamma^*)$ and $\mathcal{M}'(\gamma^*)$ are prediction-equivalent.*

Proof. First, it is easy to check that if $(l; \mathcal{V}) \sim (l'; \mathcal{V})$ then $(\gamma l; \mathcal{V}) \sim (\gamma l'; \mathcal{V})$. The leave-one-out criteria rely on predictive means and variances so the result follows directly from the definition of predictive equivalence. For the SURE criterion, the result follows because eq. (20) only depends on the smoother matrix. \square

Remark 3.5. *The result can be extended to selection of σ^2 as well, if σ^2 is unknown and selected via eq. (19).*

Because the vertical scale hyperparameter γ is always present in practice in a SPM, it is useful to introduce a notion of equivalence ‘‘up to a constant’’:

Definition 3.6. *We say that $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (l'; \mathcal{V}')$ are equivalent up to a constant, noted $\mathcal{M} \propto \mathcal{M}'$, if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $(l; \mathcal{V}) \sim (\alpha l'; \mathcal{V}')$.*

⁴AIC and Generalised Cross Validation would work as well

This relaxed form of equivalence also holds post-selection. By prop. 3.4, if γ^* is the optimal value of γ for the family $\mathcal{M}(\varepsilon)$, then $\frac{\gamma^*}{\alpha}$ is the optimal value for the family $\mathcal{M}'(\gamma)$, and $\mathcal{M}(\gamma^*) \sim \mathcal{M}'(\frac{\gamma^*}{\alpha})$. Therefore, because two models $\mathcal{M} \propto \mathcal{M}'$ define effectively the same family of models up to a change of scale, we shall use the \propto notation in our results to hide irrelevant multiplicative factors.

4 Main result in the univariate case

We use the notation $a_\varepsilon \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} \mathcal{M}$ to denote models that become prediction-equivalent in the flat limit, in the sense that the predictive distributions of a_ε converge to that of \mathcal{M} . The precise definition we use is an asymptotic variant of definition 3.1. Here k_ε denotes a family of kernels indexed by a parameter ε .

Definition 4.1 (Asymptotic prediction-equivalence). *k_ε is said to be asymptotically prediction-equivalent to a fixed (semi)-parametric model $\mathcal{M} = (l; \mathcal{V})$ over a domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, noted $k_\varepsilon \overset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\rightsquigarrow} \mathcal{M}$, if $|\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{V}'|$, and for any finite $\mathcal{X} \subset \Omega$ such that $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathbf{V}'_{\mathcal{X}}$ have full column rank, for all $x \in \Omega$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$:*

1. *The predictive expectations are such that: $\mathbb{E}_{k_\varepsilon}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$*
2. *The predictive variances are such that: $\text{Var}_{k_\varepsilon}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \text{Var}_{\mathcal{M}}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$*

We use the short-hand $k_\varepsilon \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} \mathcal{M}$ if there exists $\mathcal{M}' \propto \mathcal{M}$ such that $k_\varepsilon \overset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\rightsquigarrow} \mathcal{M}'$.

We are now ready to state our main result in the one-dimensional case. We look at models of the form $k_\varepsilon(x, y)\varepsilon^{-p}$, where the vertical scale hyperparameter (γ) grows as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This lets us control the degrees of freedom of the fit in the flat limit; the higher the value of p , the more degrees of freedom we allow. A more thorough discussion of degrees of freedom can be found below (section 5). What the equivalent model turns out to be in the flat limit depends on p and r , the regularity of the kernel, and nothing else.

In the statement of the theorem, k_ε designates a family of kernels indexed by a inverse-scale parameter ε , of the form

$$k_\varepsilon(x, y) = \kappa(\varepsilon x, \varepsilon y)$$

The required assumptions are:

1. κ is stationary; i.e. there exists ψ such that $\kappa(x, y) = \psi(|x - y|)$
2. ψ is analytic in a neighbourhood of 0.

The second assumption can be removed, but doing so in general requires handling non-integer p , as we explain in the appendix (section 8.7).

Theorem 4.2. *Let $k_\varepsilon(x, y)$ a family of kernels with inverse-scale parameter ε , verifying the assumptions above. Let κ have regularity parameter r , and let p be an integer. Then the following asymptotic equivalence holds:*

$$k_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-p} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} (l_p; \mathcal{V}_p)$$

where $l_p(x, y)$ and \mathcal{V}_p depend on the interplay between p and r . There are four different cases:

- $p < 2r - 1$ and p is even, i.e., $\exists m < r$ s.t. $p = 2m$. Then $l(x, y) = x^{m+1}y^{m+1}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{x^0, x^1, \dots, x^m\}$. This case amounts to penalised polynomial regression.
- $p < 2r - 1$ and p is odd, i.e., $\exists m < r - 1$ s.t. $p = 2m + 1$. Then $l(x, y) = 0$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{x^0, x^1, \dots, x^{m+1}\}$. This case amounts to unpenalised polynomial regression (eq. (7)).
- $p = 2r - 1$. In this case, $l(x, y) = (-1)^r |x - y|^{2r-1}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{x^0, x^1, \dots, x^{r-1}\}$, which amounts to smoothing spline regression (eq. (9)).
- $p > 2r - 1$. This case leads to an interpolant independently of the value of σ^2 . The interpolant is either a spline of degree r or a polynomial (infinite r).

Proof. A full proof is given in appendix 8.2. The bulk of the proof consists in obtaining the limit of the smoother matrix corresponding to model $k_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-p}$ in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We can work this out from the results in [4], which provide the asymptotic eigenvalues and eigenvectors of \mathbf{K}_ε . From this we obtain an expression for the smoother matrix as $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{M}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

where M_0 depends on p and r . The proof is completed by appealing to lemma 3.2 and proposition 3.3, which allows us to deduce equivalence of models from equality of smoother matrices.

Examining the proof of lemma 3.2 and proposition 3.3, we see that the predictive mean and variance depend smoothly on M_ε and so we have asymptotic predictive equivalence in the sense of definition 4.1. The different cases are the different cases for smoother matrices. \square

Example 4.1. If $k_\varepsilon(x, y)$ is the exponential kernel, which has $r = 1$, then $\varepsilon^{-1}k_\varepsilon(x, y)$ is asymptotically equivalent to the model $(-|x - y|; 1)$, i.e. the parametric part is the constant function and the non-parametric part is the kernel $l(x, y) = -|x - y|$. By eq. (24), it implies that $\hat{f} = E(f|\mathbf{y})$ tends to:

$$\hat{f}(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i |x - x_i| + \alpha + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

The kernel functions $|x - x_i|$ are piecewise linear and so the fit goes in the limit to a linear spline. Recall that β is constrained: $\mathbf{V}^\top \beta = 0$, which here simplifies to $\sum \beta_i = 0$. This sets the boundary conditions, as one may easily check by looking at derivatives outside the range of the data: $\frac{d}{dx} \hat{f}(x) = 0$ if x is to the left or right of the observations \mathcal{X} , so that the fit has a built-in, implicit Neumann boundary condition. Generalising further, if $k_\varepsilon(x, y)$ is a kernel with finite r , and setting $p = 2r - 1$, $\varepsilon^p k_\varepsilon(x, y)$ is asymptotically equivalent to the model $S = ((-1)^r |x - y|^{2r-1}; \{1, x, \dots, x^{r-1}\})$, which leads to the asymptotic fit:

$$\hat{f}(x) = (-1)^r \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i |x - x_i|^{2r-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \alpha_j x^j + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

with the constraint $\mathbf{V}^\top \beta = 0$.

The multivariate counterpart of theorem 4.2 can be found in section 6. The multivariate theorem resembles the univariate one, but requires quite a bit of notation. Instead of going directly to multivariate equivalent models, we take a look instead at degrees of freedom and hyperparameter selection in the flat limit.

5 Degrees of freedom, hyperparameter selection, and practical consequences

In this section we study the behaviour of the degrees of freedom, and the various hyperparameter selection methods as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. All results are applicable to the multivariate case even though the numerical examples concern the univariate case.

Since degrees of freedom play such an important role in hyperparameter selection, we also look at their asymptotics and show that scaling γ as $\gamma_0 \varepsilon^{-p}$ for some well-chosen γ_0 and p keeps the degrees of freedom constant as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We stress two practical implications of these results.

First, for certain datasets, very low values of ε may be appropriate or even optimal (in terms of prediction performance). In section 5.3 we show an empirical example of this phenomenon, where solutions at very low values of ε are selected in the hyperparameter selection procedure, because the data contain a linear trend.

Second, that there is a good solution in small ε may not be visible to practitioners, because common practice is to use a ‘‘nugget term’’ (a diagonal perturbation to the kernel matrix). As we show in section 5.4 the use of a nugget term increases numerical stability, at the cost of distorting the results of hyperparameter selection.

We would argue that a good alternative for many datasets is to directly use the flat limit models instead. In particular, splines are well-established, work well in low dimensions, and benefit from solid implementations (in the R `mgcv` package, for instance, [53]).

It turns out that flat-limit models can approximate the results of a GP fit even when ε is relatively large. In section 5.5 we use the theoretical results on degrees of freedom to formulate a ‘‘matched approximation’’ for a given GP model. The matched approximation to a kernel k_ε is the flat limit model with the same regularity and degrees of freedom for the measurement locations \mathcal{X} . An interpretation of theorem 4.2 is that the matched approximation becomes exact as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The empirical results we obtain show that the matched approximation is sometimes very good, especially for Matérn models.

Finally, the flat limit is also valid in more complicated models with non-Gaussian likelihoods, and observations that depend on general linear functionals of f (rather than just pointwise evaluation). We show such an example in section 5.6.




Figure 4: Isofreedom curves (see section 5.1) of a smoother matrix as a function of ε and γ . The set \mathcal{X} was generated by sampling $n = 8$ points from the unit interval. We show the contours of $\text{Tr}(\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon (\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1})$ as a function of γ and ε for the Gaussian and exponential kernels. Notice that the contours become linear in small ε .

5.1 Degrees of freedom and isofreedom curves

As explained in section 1.3, the degrees of freedom of a linear smoother measure in some sense the “dimension” of the range of the smoother matrix. Given a GP model defined by a kernel k and measurements at \mathcal{X} , the degrees of freedom typically increase with larger ε and larger γ . We show an example in figure 4, where the degrees of freedom are displayed as a function of γ and ε for a randomly drawn point set \mathcal{X} in \mathbb{R} . Because degrees of freedom decrease as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, in section 4 we let γ increase as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ so that a nontrivial smoother matrix could arise in the limit. The particular form chosen is $\gamma = \gamma_0 \varepsilon^{-p}$, which looks like a choice of convenience but actually has a deeper motivation. What one might notice on figure 4, which has log-log axes, is that the contours become lines in small ε . We dub these contours “iso-freedom curves”, because they correspond to sets of the form

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \{(\varepsilon, \gamma) \mid \text{Tr}(\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon (\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}) = m\}$$

for fixed values of m . Given m, σ^2 and ε , we can solve for the value of γ such that the degrees of freedom equal m . γ should verify:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon (\gamma \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}) &= m \\ \Leftrightarrow \sum \frac{\gamma \lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\gamma \lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \sigma^2} - m &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Eq. (28) is a rational equation in γ , and the eigenvalues of $\lambda_i(\varepsilon)$ are analytic in ε . Call $\gamma_m(\varepsilon)$ the solution of eq. (28) as a function of ε , and note that it is a parametrisation of the iso-freedom curve, giving γ as a function of ε . The Newton-Puiseux theorem implies that $\gamma_m(\varepsilon)$ can be expanded as a Puiseux series in small ε (see [5]), *i.e.* that there exist $\gamma_0, l \in \mathbb{Z}, s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that:

$$\gamma_m(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{\frac{l}{s}} (\gamma_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{s}})) \quad (29)$$

A Puiseux series is just a power series in $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{s}}$, and if $s = 1$ it is actually a power series. Notice that $\log \gamma_m(\varepsilon) \approx \frac{l}{s} \log \varepsilon + \log \gamma_0$, which explains why the iso-freedom curves look linear in log-log coordinates. In equation (29), l, s and γ_0 depend on m (the desired number of degrees of freedom), and the kernel function. They can actually be determined in closed-form using the Newton polygon [30], but that would carry us outside the scope of this manuscript. Among other things, it is not too hard to show that $s = 1$ here, so that the iso-freedom curves have integer slopes in small ε .

5.2 Hyperparameter selection in the flat limit

In section 1.4, we introduced three hyperparameter selection methods: the SURE criterion, and two criteria based on leave-one-out cross-validation. Given the results above, one can verify that all three criteria are *constant in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ along isofreedom lines*. Figure 5 gives a visual illustration of this fact.




Figure 5: Asymptotics of hyperparameter selection. A synthetic dataset is shown in the upper-left panel. The three other panels are contour plots for three different hyperparameter selection criteria. We set $\sigma^2 = (0.1)^2$ and used a Gaussian kernel. Note that these three criteria are mostly constant along lines, which have asymptotically constant degrees of freedom (see fig. 4).

To see why the three criteria are asymptotically constant along iso-freedom lines, consider theorem 4.2 and equation (29) jointly. We shall state the result informally. Following a contour with constant degrees of freedom to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we need to set $\gamma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-p}(\gamma_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ (by eq. (29)). This is identical in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to setting $\gamma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-p}\gamma_0$ (up to negligible terms), and we may apply theorem 4.1, which tells us that the predictive mean and variance converge to finite quantities. It is clear from the formulas of the two leave-one-out criteria (eq. (17) and (19)) that they must then converge to finite quantities as well. The SURE criterion (eq. (20)) must converge as well since the degrees of freedom are asymptotically constant and the smoother matrix converges.

5.3 Flat-limit solutions are sometimes optimal

One implication of the fact that selection criteria do not diverge is that, for some datasets, the *optimal solutions may be in small ε* . This is the case if the data contain strong polynomial trends that become unpenalised in the flat limit. For instance, when using a kernel with regularity order $r = 3$, trends up to quadratic order are unpenalised in the flat limit. If such a trend is present in the data, and the signal-to-noise ratio is sufficiently low, then the flat limit solution may be optimal.

Let us offer a concrete example of this phenomenon. In this example the true latent function is the sum of a sinusoid and a linear trend, specifically:

$$f(x) = 0.1 \sin(2\pi x) + x$$

We use a $r = 3$ Matérn kernel, and perform hyperparameter selection for ε and γ the classical way, using numerical optimisation. We use box constraints to constrain the search to regions where the matrices can be inverted, but to reflect normal practice we use standard floating point arithmetic and not arbitrary-precision. Since hyperparameter-selection criteria are known to have multiple minima, we use 10 different random initialisations for the optimisation. We show the results for the C_{11} criterion (eq. (19)), but similar results hold for the other two criteria.




Figure 6: Flat-limit solutions can be optimal in certain scenarios. The data are shown on the left in light blue, the true function is the dotted black line, and the GP fit corresponding to the selected hyperparameters is in red. The contour plot represents the optimisation landscape for criterion C_{ll} . The optimum was obtained numerically and is shown as the dot.




Figure 7: Same as in fig. 6, but with lower noise variance. Here two different optima emerge, corresponding to a linear fit for the one, and to a fit that follows the sinusoid for the other.

The results appear on fig. 6 and 7. If the noise level is larger than a certain threshold (depending on n), then a single optimum shows up, with a very low value of ε . It corresponds to fitting just the linear trend. At intermediate signal-to-noise ratios, two optima are present, one that fits just the linear trend, and one that tries to follow the sinusoid as well. Finally, at low noise, only the latter is present. It is noteworthy that in these simulations *both* minima are at low values of ε , showing that flat-limit solutions can indeed emerge in practice.

5.4 Why low ε solutions are frequently invisible in practice

However, these solutions may be invisible or unattainable when using naïve numerical methods, especially when the Gaussian kernel is used. The main source of numerical difficulty arises when computing the smoother matrix:

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon (\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma} \mathbf{I})^{-1}$$

Since γ becomes very large as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}$ is small, and one must invert a poorly conditioned matrix. A Cholesky decomposition in standard floating point precision may fail, so that the small- ε part of the space is inaccessible. In practice sometimes a “nugget term” is used to alleviate numerical difficulties: one replaces \mathbf{K}_ε with $\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \nu \mathbf{I}$, where




Figure 8: Effect of a nugget term on hyperparameter selection as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. A “nugget term” is a small multiple of the identity that is added to the kernel matrix to get around numerical issues. We show the degrees of freedom (top row) and the LOO-NLL criteria (bottom row) with and without the nugget term (left and right columns). The nugget term equals $10^{-6}\mathbf{I}$, we use the Gaussian kernel and the same data as in figure 5.

ν is small. However, once the nugget term is added, increasing γ beyond ν has no effect. Some useful eigenvectors are made invisible by the nugget term and this has the effect of “clipping” the surface of hyperparameter selection criteria, as shown in fig. 8. Since this is clearly undesirable, a better option in the future may be to adapt existing methods for stable RBF interpolation (e.g., [15, 14]) to GP regression problems.

5.5 Towards practical approximations

Our limit results are not directly applicable when faced with the question: “what is a useful approximation of a particular GP model at a particular value of ε ”? We do not claim to have a universal recipe, but we shall present in this section a particular approximation that gives surprisingly good results in certain cases.

This approximation is best understood graphically. We take as input a certain kernel function, and a certain value for σ^2 , γ and ε . We can think of it as occupying a certain position in the space of hyperparameters as shown on figure 4 or 5 for example. The approximation we suggest, which we call the *matched approximation*, consists in following the iso-freedom line from that point to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Following theorem 4.2, the matched approximation will be either a polynomial or a spline regression, with the same number of degrees of freedom as the original GP regression. The process is illustrated graphically in figure 9 and 10 for two different kernels.

Let us sketch a concrete algorithm for kernels with $r = \infty$ and degrees of freedom set to $m \in \mathbb{R}^+$. By theorem 4.2, the equivalent semiparametric models are of the form $S = (\gamma x^p y^p; \{x^0, \dots, x^{p-1}\})$ for some degree p . The corresponding fit will have between p and $p + 1$ degrees of freedom, where the former is attained with $\gamma = 0$ and the latter with $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. We therefore need to set $p = \lfloor m \rfloor$ and adjust γ such that the m -th eigenvalue of the smoother matrix equals $m - p$. A similar algorithm applies for finite r .




Figure 9: The matched approximation. The fit in green on the left-hand panel is a GP regression with $\varepsilon = 4$ and 5 degrees of freedom. The kernel is Gaussian. The other coloured curves are other models along the isofreedom curve, with lower values of ε . The isofreedom curve is shown on the right-hand panel. The matched approximation is the limit obtained by following the isofreedom curve all the way to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The corresponding fit is the dashed black curve on the left. See fig. 10 for the same thing with a Matern kernel.




Figure 10: Same as fig. 9, but the kernel used is a Matern kernel with regularity order $r = 2$. The other parameters are identical. Note that the matched approximation fit is now very close to the original fit (even though the original fit has $\varepsilon = 4$).

The matched approximation is illustrated on figs. 9 to 12, for kernels with different regularities, and for different values of ε . For the Matern kernel the quality of the approximation is excellent even though $\varepsilon = 2$; it is hard to account for this fact in our current perturbative framework.

5.6 An example with non-Gaussian likelihood

Gaussian processes are used in myriad applications, and most of them involve non-Gaussian likelihood functions. In appendix 8.5, we sketch how our results extend to non-Gaussian likelihoods. Here, we illustrate these results numerically, via an application that involves logistic likelihoods.

A classical example of combining a Gaussian process prior with a non-Gaussian likelihood is GP classification, where the data $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are independent binary outcomes and the model is:

$$p(y_i = 1 | f(\mathbf{x}_i)) = \Phi(f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_n$ are “feature vectors” or covariates in \mathbb{R}^d , f is a non-parametric function modelled as a Gaussian process, and Φ is a sigmoidal link function. Often, Φ is chosen to be the logistic function $\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-x)}$. Compared to the case of Gaussian likelihoods, an additional difficulty is that the posterior distribution over f is not a Gaussian process (lack of conjugacy). This makes it necessary to approximate the posterior, using some form of




Figure 11: GP regression compared to its matched approximation (dashed curve). Here we use the Gaussian kernel and $\varepsilon = 2$. The bands around the fit show \pm the standard deviation of the predictive distribution. We denote by δ the degrees of freedom for the different fits.




Figure 12: Same as fig. 11, but with a Matérn kernel with regularity $r = 3$.




Figure 13: Reconstruction of a function from noisy observations of the sign of its derivative. In this example the measurements are binary, $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, with $E(y_i) = \Phi(f'(x_i))$ and Φ the logistic function. We take $f(x) = x + \frac{1}{1.8+x}$. $f'(x)$ is shown as a solid red line, and the simulated measurements as blue dashes at the bottom and at the top. Fitting a degree-2 polynomial to f' results in the dashed green line. Integrating the estimated $f'(x)$ results in an estimator of $f(x)$.

MCMC method or approximate inference. In the numerical illustration shown below, we use Expectation Propagation (EP, [29]), which provides a Gaussian approximation to the posterior. EP converges to the correct posterior in the large- n limit [10], and is known empirically to be extremely accurate in finite samples [52].

An additional direction for extending our results consists in letting the likelihood depend on arbitrary linear functionals of the Gaussian process f . This lets model cases where observations depend on derivatives of f , or mean values of f over some area [38]. We sketch that extension in appendix 8.4.

Our numerical example brings together these two features (see fig. 13): we assume that the observations correspond to the sign of the derivative of $f(x)$ (up to noise). Concretely, the model is as follows: $f(x)$ is a univariate function, and we observe $y_1 \dots y_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with

$$p(y_i = 1 | f'(x_i)) = \Phi(f'(x_i)) \quad (31)$$

where $x_1 \dots x_n$ are a set of locations in $[-1, 1]$. The goal is to reconstruct f from these observations. Following [38], if f is a Gaussian process with covariance $k(x, y)$, then f' is a Gaussian process with covariance $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} k(x, y)$. Accordingly, eq. (31) is just an instance of GP classification with a specific kernel. We can run a standard version of EP for Gaussian process classification to obtain an approximation of $p(\mathbf{f}' | \mathbf{y})$, where $\mathbf{f}' = [f'(x_1) \dots f'(x_n)]^t$.

The quantity of interest is however f , not f' . We can use $p(f(x) | \mathbf{y}) \propto p(f | \mathbf{f}') p(\mathbf{f}' | \mathbf{y})$ and standard Gaussian conditioning formulas to obtain:

$$E(f(x) | \mathbf{y}) = b(x)^t \mathbf{M}^{-1} E(\mathbf{f}' | \mathbf{y}) \quad (32)$$

with $b(x) = [\frac{\partial}{\partial y} k(x, y) |_{y=x_i}]_{i=1}^n$ a vector of first derivatives of the kernel function, and

$$\mathbf{M} = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a} \frac{\partial}{\partial b} k(a, b) |_{a=x_i, b=x_j} \right]_{i=1, j=1}^n$$

a matrix of second derivatives. In equation 32, $b(x)^t \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ is best viewed as an integration operator, that converts observations of a derivative into an approximation of the function at x . A similar equation can be derived for the




Figure 14: Results of fitting a GP model with Gaussian covariance to the problem outlined in fig. 13 (same data, $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$), compared to matching flat-limit results. The GP fits are shown as solid lines, and polynomial fits as dashed lines. a. Estimated value of $f'(x)$, with different d.o.f., matched to polynomial fits b. Corresponding estimates for $f(x)$.

posterior variance of $f(x)$ as a function of the variance of $\mathbf{f}'|y$. Since no information is available on the mean value of f over the interval, we plot below the results for $f - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 f(x) dx$. Equivalently, we condition on $\int_{-1}^1 f(x) dx = 0$.

If we use the Gaussian kernel for f , then the flat limit behaviour should match that of a polynomial model. Let us briefly work out what that polynomial model looks like. Assuming $f(x) = \sum \alpha_{i=0}^m x^i$, then $f'(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m (i+1) \alpha_{i+1} x^i$. If we use a flat prior on the coefficients α , eq. 32 turns into a classical Bayesian logistic regression with m covariates, and we can use EP to approximate the posterior over $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_m$ given \mathbf{y} . Numerically, a better alternative is to use the Legendre polynomials (instead of the monomial basis) to improve conditioning, and that is what we do in our implementation.

If instead of the Gaussian kernel we use a kernel with finite smoothness, the flat limit behaviour corresponds to fitting a smoothing spline. We need f to be at least once differentiable, which implies that the order of smoothness should be at least one (which precludes the exponential kernel). In our illustrations we use a Matérn kernel with $r = 3$. The matching semi-parametric model is of the form $S = (-|x - y|^5; \{1, x, x^2\})$. This corresponds to a spline of degree 3 (for $f(x)$), and the corresponding model for $f'(x)$ is then a spline of degree 2. Stating this in terms of kernels exaggerates the complexity of what we are doing: the procedure consists in fitting a smoothing spline to the data, which produces an estimate for $f'(x)$, and integrating that estimate to get an estimate of $f(x)$.

It remains to compare the results of fitting a GP to directly fitting an equivalent flat-limit model. In the regression case, we made use of the effective degrees of freedom to match GP fits to flat-limit results. When observations are non-Gaussian, an additional source of difficulty arises, because the estimate is not linear in the observations (which in our case or binary anyways). Different generalisations can be found in the literature, and here we follow [32] and define the effective d.o.f. from a Gaussian approximation to the posterior distribution. Specifically, the approximation produced by Expectation Propagation for the posterior $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$ takes the following form:

$$q(\mathbf{f}) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{f}^t (\mathbf{K}^{-1} + \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{r}^t \mathbf{f}\right) \quad (33)$$

where \mathbf{H} is a diagonal matrix, \mathbf{r} a vector, and both depend (non-linearly) on the data \mathbf{y} . In [32] the Gaussian approximation at the mode is used implicitly, and here we can define analogously the d.o.f. as

$$dof(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{y}) = \text{Tr}((\mathbf{K}^{-1} + \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}) \quad (34)$$

One can check that this definition generalises the case of (heteroskedastic) Gaussian observations, and [32] outline asymptotic arguments in terms of model selection. We will not repeat them here but note that they carry over to the Gaussian approximation formed by Expectation Propagation, by the results in [10].

Figures 14 and 15 show the results for Gaussian and Matérn kernels, respectively, with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. The approximate d.o.f. given by eq. 34 succeeds in matching the GP fits to very close flat-limit equivalents. The match is markedly better with higher d.o.f., even at higher values of ε (not shown). We suspect that this has to do with faster convergence of the eigenvectors associated with smaller eigenvalues to their flat limit, but our theory is currently insufficient to properly explain this phenomenon.

6 Results in the multivariate case

To deal with the multivariate case, we require a bit of background on multivariate polynomials and polyharmonic splines.




Figure 15: Same as fig. 14, with a $r = 3$ Matérn kernel. The matching flat limit models are smoothing splines. The GP fits are shown as solid lines, and the smoothing spline fits as dashed lines.

6.1 Preliminaries and notation

Much of the material here is drawn from [5, 4], please refer to these papers for a more extensive background. Much information can also be found in *e.g.* [51].

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A monomial in \mathbf{x} is a function of the form:

$$\mathbf{x}^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^d x_i^{\alpha_i}$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ (a multi-index). The degree of a monomial is defined $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$. For instance: $\mathbf{x}^{(1,3,1)} = x_1^1 x_2^3 x_3^1$ has degree 5.

A multivariate polynomial in \mathbf{x} is a weighted sum of monomials in \mathbf{x} , and its degree is equal to the maximum of the degrees of its component monomials. As an example, $-\mathbf{x}^{(1,2,1)} + \mathbf{x}^{(0,1,1)} + 2.2\mathbf{x}^{(1,0,0)} - 1$ is a multivariate polynomial of degree 4 in \mathbb{R}^3 :

An important difference between the univariate and the multivariate case is that when $d > 1$, there are several monomials of any given degree, instead of just one. For instance, with $d = 2$, the first few monomials are $\mathbf{x}^{(0,0)}$ of degree 0; $\mathbf{x}^{(1,0)}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(0,1)}$ of degree 1; $\mathbf{x}^{(2,0)}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(1,1)}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(0,2)}$ of degree 3. The number of monomials of degree k in dimension d is :

$$\mathcal{H}_{k,d} = \binom{k+d-1}{d-1}. \quad (35)$$

The notation $\mathcal{H}_{k,d}$ comes from the notion of *homogeneous polynomials*.

A homogeneous polynomial is a polynomial made up of monomials with equal degree. Therefore, the set of homogeneous polynomials of degree k has dimension $\mathcal{H}_{k,d}$. The set of polynomials of degree k is spanned by the sets of homogenous polynomials up to k , and has dimension:

$$\mathcal{P}_{k,d} = \mathcal{H}_{0,d} + \mathcal{H}_{1,d} + \dots + \mathcal{H}_{k,d} = \binom{k+d}{d}. \quad (36)$$

Note that $\mathcal{P}_{0,d} = 1$ and $\mathcal{P}_{1,d} = d + 1$. By convention, we will also set $\mathcal{P}_{-1,d}$ to be equal to 0.

The fact that there are several monomials for each degree in dimension d is reflected in the structure of the eigenvalues in the flat limit. Previously, in the $r = \infty$ case, each eigenvalue had a different order in ε . In the multivariate case, there are blocks of eigenvalues with the same order in ε , corresponding to a block of homogeneous polynomials of a given degree m . For instance, in $d = 2$, there is one monomial of degree 0, two monomials of degree 1 (x_1 and x_2), three monomials of degree 2 (x_1^2 , $x_1 x_2$ and x_2^2), and in general $m + 1$ monomials of order m . As first shown in [40], these give rise to a single eigenvalue of order ε^0 , two eigenvalues of order ε^2 , three eigenvalues of order ε^4 , etc.

6.1.1 Polynomial bases and orderings

The multivariate flat limit is more complicated than the univariate case, even though the results are substantially the same. The reason why the results are more complicated is fairly deep and boils down to the lack of a natural order on the set of multivariate monomials.

We use in section 4 the fact that eigenvectors of smooth kernel matrices tend to discrete polynomials. In dimension $d = 1$, there is an obvious way to construct a basis of orthogonal polynomials, which is just to apply the Gram-Schmidt process to the monomials $(1, x, x^2, x^3, \dots)$. The monomials in dimension 1 are naturally ordered by increasing degree. In dimension two, the degree only gives a partial order. For instance, at degree one, even though the constant polynomial is a consensus starting point, we have to decide at degree 1 which of x_1 or x_2 should come first in the Gram-Schmidt process. Depending on which we pick, we get a different orthogonal basis spanning polynomials of degree ≤ 1 . We could also decide to orthogonalise $x_1 + x_2$ followed by $x_1 - x_2$, and get yet another basis. Multivariate orthogonal polynomials are non-unique, and therefore both richer and more complicated than univariate orthogonal polynomials.

To state our results, we need to pick an ordering on the monomials, even though the ordering is immaterial to the actual limits (kernel matrices do not care how we order monomials). The need for an ordering is an annoyance that can probably be lifted by finding a representation that is intrinsically invariant, but we have not found one as yet.

In any event, given an ordering, for an ordered set of points $\Omega = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$, all in \mathbb{R}^d , we define the multivariate Vandermonde matrix as:

$$\mathbf{V}_{\leq k} = [\mathbf{V}_0 \quad \mathbf{V}_1 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{V}_k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \mathcal{P}_{k,d}}, \quad (37)$$

where each block $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \mathcal{H}_{i,d}}$ contains the monomials of degree i evaluated on the points in Ω . As an example, consider $n = 3$, $d = 2$ and the ground set

$$\Omega = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ z_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} y_2 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} y_3 \\ z_3 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

One has, for instance for $k = 2$:

$$\mathbf{V}_{\leq 2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 & z_1 & y_1^2 & y_1 z_1 & z_1^2 \\ 1 & y_2 & z_2 & y_2^2 & y_2 z_2 & z_2^2 \\ 1 & y_3 & z_3 & y_3^2 & y_3 z_3 & z_3^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the ordering within each block is arbitrary.

We will use $\mathbf{V}_{\leq k}(\mathcal{X})$ to denote the matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\leq k}$ reduced to its lines indexed by the elements in \mathcal{X} . As such, $\mathbf{V}_{\leq k}(\mathcal{X})$ has $|\mathcal{X}|$ rows and $\mathcal{P}_{k,d}$ columns. The QR decomposition of $\mathbf{V}_{\leq k}$ inherits a natural block structure from $\mathbf{V}_{\leq k}$ corresponding to the degrees of the monomials, *i.e.* we may split $\mathbf{Q}_{\leq k}$ into blocks $\mathbf{Q}_0, \mathbf{Q}_1$, etc. where \mathbf{Q}_i comes from the Gram-Schmidt process applied to monomials of degree i onto monomials of lower degree.

What this means for kernel matrices is that the particular limiting eigenbasis that appears as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ depends more strongly on the kernel than in the univariate case. In a sense, the kernel implicitly selects a particular family of orthogonal polynomials. The specific basis is determined by the so-called *Wronskian matrix* of the kernel, defined as:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\leq k} = \left[\frac{k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}! \boldsymbol{\beta}!} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| \leq k, |\boldsymbol{\beta}| \leq k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_{k,d} \times \mathcal{P}_{k,d}}. \quad (38)$$

$k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}$ being the partial derivatives of $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to $\mathbf{x}^\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{x}^\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Here we index the matrix using multi-indices (equivalently, monomials), so that an element of $\mathbf{W}_{\leq k}$ is *e.g.*, $\mathbf{W}_{(0,2),(2,1)}$ which is a scaled derivative of $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of order $(0, 2)$ in \mathbf{x} and $(2, 1)$ in \mathbf{y} . For example, for $d = 2$ and $k = 2$ we may write

$$\mathbf{W}_{\leq 2} = \begin{bmatrix} k^{((0,0),(0,0))} & k^{((0,0),(1,0))} & k^{((0,0),(0,1))} & \frac{k^{((0,0),(2,0))}}{2} & k^{((0,0),(1,1))} & \frac{k^{((0,0),(0,2))}}{2} \\ k^{((1,0),(0,0))} & k^{((1,0),(1,0))} & k^{((1,0),(0,1))} & \frac{k^{((1,0),(2,0))}}{2} & k^{((1,0),(1,1))} & \frac{k^{((1,0),(0,2))}}{2} \\ k^{((0,1),(0,0))} & k^{((0,1),(1,0))} & k^{((0,1),(0,1))} & \frac{k^{((0,1),(2,0))}}{2} & k^{((0,1),(1,1))} & \frac{k^{((0,1),(0,2))}}{2} \\ \frac{k^{((2,0),(0,0))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((2,0),(1,0))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((2,0),(0,1))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((2,0),(2,0))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((2,0),(1,1))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((2,0),(0,2))}}{2} \\ k^{((1,1),(0,0))} & k^{((1,1),(1,0))} & k^{((1,1),(0,1))} & \frac{k^{((1,1),(2,0))}}{4} & \frac{k^{((1,1),(1,1))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((1,1),(0,2))}}{4} \\ \frac{k^{((0,2),(0,0))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((0,2),(1,0))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((0,2),(0,1))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((0,2),(2,0))}}{4} & \frac{k^{((0,2),(1,1))}}{2} & \frac{k^{((0,2),(0,2))}}{4} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_{2,2} \times \mathcal{P}_{2,2}}$$

for a given ordering of the monomials, and where all the derivatives are taken at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$. Eq. (38) makes Wronskian matrices look more daunting to compute than they really are. We explain in the appendix how the Wronskian may easily be computed in the stationary case from the Fourier transform of the kernel.

6.1.2 Polyharmonic splines

Polyharmonic splines [12] generalise smoothing splines in $d > 1$, and play the same role in the flat limit. For our purposes here, the space of polyharmonic splines of order r in dimension d for a point set \mathcal{X} is given by functions of the form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^{2r-1} + \sum_{|\gamma| < k} \alpha_\gamma \mathbf{x}^\gamma \quad (39)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{<k}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$.

We recognise the general form of semi-parametric models (eq. (54)), where here the parametric part is played by monomials of degree less than r , and the non-parametric part by the radial basis function $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^{2r-1}$. In our notation, polyharmonic spline models are therefore semiparametric models given by

$$\mathcal{M}_r = \left((-1)^r \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^{2r-1}; \{ \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mid |\alpha| < r \} \right)$$

Note that polyharmonic splines generalise splines to $d > 1$, but they are not piecewise polynomials. The fact that $l(\mathbf{x}) = (-1)^r \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^{2r-1}$ is conditionally positive-definite is proved in [28]⁵.

6.2 Smoother matrices in $d > 1$

The smoother matrices in $d > 1$ have the same kind of limit as in the univariate case. Depending on the growth rate of γ , n and the regularity of the kernel, sometimes one has polynomials, sometimes splines. The next lemma gives a complete picture, and reexpresses theorem 5.2 from [5] in a form adapted to the GP context. To lighten the notation in the lemma, we define the following matrices, which appear in the flat limit of the eigenvectors:

$$P_l = \mathbf{Q}_l \mathbf{Q}_l^\top \mathbf{V}_l \bar{\mathbf{W}}_l \mathbf{V}_l^\top \mathbf{Q}_l \mathbf{Q}_l^\top \quad (40)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{H}_{l,d} \times \mathcal{H}_{l,d}}$ is the Schur complement:

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}}_l = \mathbf{W}_\perp - \mathbf{W}_\perp (\mathbf{W}_{\leq l-1})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_\perp \quad (41)$$

in the block description of $\mathbf{W}_{\leq l}$ or

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{W}_{\leq l-1} & \mathbf{W}_\perp \\ \hline \mathbf{W}_\perp & \mathbf{W}_\perp \end{array} \right)$$

We recall that $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)}$ is the matrix $\mathbf{D}^{(2r-1)} = \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^{2r-1} \right]_{i,j}$ with monomials of degree $< r$ projected out, *i.e.*

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{<r} \mathbf{Q}_{<r}^\top) \mathbf{D}^{(2r-1)} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{<r} \mathbf{Q}_{<r}^\top) \quad (42)$$

The following lemma is not particularly easy to read and the reader may skip ahead to the theorem at no great loss. It generalizes to the multivariate setting the first steps in the proof of theorem 4.2 in the univariate case (see Th. 8.9 and subsections 8.2.2 and 8.2.3).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with a set of $|\mathcal{X}| = n$ measurement locations, k_ε a kernel with regularity r , p an integer and $\gamma(\varepsilon) = \gamma_0 \varepsilon^{-p}$. Then the smoother matrix*

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon \left(\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1}$$

has the following expansion in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{B}^\top + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (43)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a projection matrix, $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A} = 0$, and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is diagonal (and in some cases null). \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ depend on r , n and p . First, p is either even or odd, meaning that only one out of the two following values $\frac{p}{2}$, $\frac{p+1}{2}$ is an integer. We call that integer l . The possible limits are:

- If $\mathcal{P}_{l-1,d} \geq n$ or $r < \frac{p+1}{2}$ then $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{I} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
- If $r > \frac{p+1}{2}$ and p is odd, then $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = 0$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_{<l} \mathbf{Q}_{<l}^\top$

⁵More precisely, it is a minor variant of the functions actually studied.

- If $r > \frac{p+1}{2}$ and p is even, then $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_{<l} \mathbf{Q}_{<l}^\top$, \mathbf{B} are the (non-null) eigenvectors of \mathbf{P}_l (defined above) and $\gamma_{ii} = \frac{\gamma_0 \tilde{\lambda}_i}{1 + \gamma_0 \tilde{\lambda}_i}$, where $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ is the i -th eigenvalue of \mathbf{P}_l .
- If $r = \frac{p+1}{2}$, then $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_{\leq r-1} \mathbf{Q}_{\leq r-1}^\top$ and \mathbf{B} are the non-null eigenvectors of $f_{2r-1} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ its eigenvalues, and $\gamma_{ii} = \frac{\gamma_0 \tilde{\lambda}_i}{1 + \gamma_0 \tilde{\lambda}_i}$.

In a nutshell, the smoother matrices are in the limit either projection matrices, or the sum of a projection matrix and a smoother matrix. This indicates that the limiting models are generally semi-parametric and occasionally parametric.

6.3 Main result in $d > 1$

The generalisation of theorem 4.2 to the multivariate case requires the following assumptions.

In the statement of the theorem, k_ε designates a family of kernels indexed by an inverse-scale parameter ε , of the form

$$k_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \kappa(\varepsilon \mathbf{x}, \varepsilon \mathbf{y})$$

The required assumptions are:

1. κ is stationary and radial (isotropic); i.e. there exists ψ such that $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \psi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2)$
2. ψ is analytic in a neighbourhood of 0.

The first assumption is for simplicity, and because the most common types of kernels are radial. Non-radial kernels can be dealt with using the tools in [4], but at the cost of greater complexity. As before, the second assumption can be removed in some cases, with some subtleties involved, see appendix 8.7.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $k_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \kappa(\varepsilon(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}))$ a family of kernels with inverse-scale parameter ε . Let κ be a stationary positive-definite kernel for \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} in \mathbb{R}^d , with regularity parameter r , and p an integer. Then the following asymptotic equivalence holds:*

$$k_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-p} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} (l_p; \mathcal{V}_p)$$

where $l_p(x, y)$ and \mathcal{V}_p depend on the interplay between p and r . There are four different cases:

- $p < 2r - 1$ and p is even, i.e., $\exists m < r$ s.t. $p = 2m$. Then $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=m, |\beta|=m} \bar{W}_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mathbf{y}^\beta$, $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| < m\}$. This case amounts to penalised polynomial regression.
- $p < 2r - 1$ and p is odd, i.e., $\exists m < r - 1$ s.t. $p = 2m + 1$. Then $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$, $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| < m\}$. This case amounts to unpenalised polynomial regression.
- $p = 2r - 1$. In this case, $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (-1)^r \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^{2r-1}$, $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| < r\}$, which amounts to polyharmonic spline regression.
- $p > 2r - 1$. This case leads to an interpolant, if it exists, independently of the value of σ^2 . The interpolant is either a polyharmonic spline (finite r) or a polynomial (infinite r). The interpolant may not exist; this depends on the number of points in \mathcal{X} and its geometry.

Proof. Nearly identical to the proof of 4.2. The only difference is that lemma 6.1 is used in the part labelled ‘‘Final step of the proof’’. \square

We show in appendix 8.3.5 that for separable kernels the Schur complements of the Wronskian (eq. (41)) are actually diagonal. For the Gaussian kernel a further simplification is possible, and gives a very compact limit result. The ‘‘polynomial kernel’’ of order m is

$$\rho_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y})^m$$

and its associated reproducing kernel Hilbert space is the set of monomials in \mathbb{R}^d of degree m .

Corollary 6.3 (Flat limit of Gaussian kernels). *For the Gaussian kernel in \mathbb{R}^d , the following equivalence holds as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:*

1. For even $p = 2m$,

$$k_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-p} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} (\rho_m; \{\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| < m\})$$




Figure 16: Gaussian process fits in $d = 2$ and their matched approximations. a. Gaussian process fit with a Gaussian kernel (the measurement locations are plotted with value y_i as a colour scale) b. Matched approximation for the Gaussian kernel. c. Gaussian process fit with a Matérn kernel ($r = 3$). d. Matched approximation (polyharmonic splines).

2. For odd $p = 2m + 1$

$$k_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{-p} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\propto} (0; \{\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| < m\})$$

The proof is given in section 8.3.5. The corollary states that in the flat limit, depending on the level of regularisation, the GP model is either plain (multivariate) polynomial regression, or a SPM with a parametric part of polynomials of degree $< m$, and a “non-parametric” part which is given by the polynomial kernel of degree m .

6.4 Numerical results

We illustrate our results with a few simulations in dimension 2. We generated a set of 30 random locations in $[0, 1]^2$ (sampled uniformly and independently), and noiseless observations y_i from the function $f(x_1, x_2) = \exp(-3((x_1 - 0.5)^2 + (x_2 - 0.5)^2)) \sin(3(x_1 + x_2))$. Fig. 16 shows (on the left) the contour lines of two GP regressions with $\varepsilon = 1$, one with a Gaussian kernel, the other with a Matérn kernel with $r = 3$. γ has been adjusted so that the degrees of freedom equal approximately 12 in both cases. On the right, the corresponding matched approximations (as in section 5.5), respectively multivariate polynomials and polyharmonic splines. Over this range and for this value of ε the agreement is excellent (but see later for caveats).

While the matched approximation may be surprisingly accurate close to the measurement locations, polynomials and polyharmonic splines generally diverge as $\|\mathbf{x}\| \rightarrow \infty$, unlike GP models, which return to a baseline of 0. Consequently, the matched approximations are very inaccurate far from the data, as shown in fig. 17, which is just a zoomed-out version of fig. 16. There are ways of tapering the matched approximation to prevent divergence, but we leave the details for future work.

Finally, in the introduction we described the flat limit in terms of the family of fits, seen as a parametric curve (parameterised by γ). The predictions for the GP with a Gaussian kernel “go through” the polynomial predictions in the limit. The same holds true in the multidimensional case, as per theorem 6.2. For some appropriate value of γ , the prediction of the GP will come to match that of the model $(0; \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha)$, a multivariate polynomial model of




Figure 17: Same contents as in fig. 16, but over a broader domain, to show the divergence in the matched approximations.

degree k . We show this on fig. 18, which is similar to fig. 2: the prediction of the model at locations $\mathbf{x}_a = (0.2, 0.1)$ and $\mathbf{x}_b = (0.8, 0.8)$ are plotted for different values of γ and fixed ε .

For kernels with finite regularity index, theorem 6.2 shows that the behaviour in the flat limit depends on γ . For low values of γ , they behave like polynomial models. For high values, like polyharmonic splines. This is the behaviour that appears on fig. 19.

7 Conclusion

The flat limit of Gaussian process regression highlights the very strong connections GP methods share with classical methods like polynomial regression and smoothing splines. The fact that, at least in certain cases, the flat limit gives a very good approximation for large values of ε shows that it may be useful in practice once the limits of the approximation are better understood.

We conclude with some open questions and directions. First, while smoothing splines in $d = 1$ can be implemented at cost $\mathcal{O}(n)$ [33], polyharmonic splines in $d > 1$ have cost $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. On the other hand, for Matérn models with low regularity coefficient, there exist efficient (approximate) methods based on a stochastic PDE formulation [24]. Since such GP models have polyharmonic splines as their flat limit, this suggests that stochastic PDE methods should be applicable.

Finally, if a tractable “sharp limit” ($\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$) expansion were available, there might be a way of finding good approximations that work over a broad range of values of ε , for instance via matched asymptotic approximations. Such an approximation would be both interesting theoretically and practically useful.




Figure 18: Prediction of GP model (with Gaussian kernel) vs. polynomial models. We show the predictions of the model for the data shown on fig. 16 for a range of values of γ (continuous curves), and two different values of ε . The labelled points are the prediction of the polynomial models of degree 0 to 5. As per theorem 6.2, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the continuous curve must go through the labelled points.




Figure 19: Prediction of GP model (with Matérn covariance, $r = 3$) vs. polynomial models and polyharmonic spline kernels. The figure uses the same data and principle as in fig. 18, but according to theorem 6.2, this GP model matches polynomials of degree up to 2 at low γ , and polyharmonic splines at higher values of γ . Accordingly, we show the polynomial predictions for degree up to two (labelled points). The three curves are for decreasing values of ε , $\varepsilon = 0.5$ is in red, $\varepsilon = 0.15$ in green and $\varepsilon = 0.05$ in purple. The panel to the right shows a zoomed-in version of the rectangle highlighted in the first panel. The dotted curve corresponds to the polyharmonic splines.

8 Appendix

8.1 Semi-parametric models as limits

In this section we introduce SPMs as a limit (we do not claim that this is particularly original). This section parallels section 4 in [47]. Readers familiar with DPPs may be interested to note that extended L-ensembles are to semi-parametric GPs what L-ensembles are to GPs, see [13]⁶.

Our definition of regression with semi-parametric Gaussian fields is as follows: let $l(x, y)$ be a kernel (not necessarily positive definite, as we will see), and $v_1(x), \dots, v_r(y)$ a set of basis functions. Then semi-parametric GP regression is just GP regression with the kernel

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(x, y) = l(x, y) + \varepsilon^{-1} \sum_i^p v_i(x)v_i(y)$$

⁶Sampling measurement locations from the appropriate extended L-ensemble guarantees for instance that the posterior distribution is proper (integrable).

in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Even though the prior variance goes to infinity along some directions, the posterior distribution is generally well-defined, and quantities like the smoother matrix tend to finite limits. Although the construction naturally works for $l(x, y)$ positive definite, recall that this is not a requirement, and $l(x, y)$ may have negative eigenvalues, so long as they align with the subspace spanned by the v_i 's.

We introduce some notation, borrowed from [47], that will be used throughout this section. A non-negative pair is the discrete counterpart to a SPM $(l; \mathcal{V})$.

Definition 8.1. A Nonnegative Pair, noted $(\mathbf{L}; \mathbf{V})$ is a pair $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $0 \leq p \leq n$, such that \mathbf{L} is symmetric and conditionally positive semi-definite with respect to \mathbf{V} , and \mathbf{V} has full column rank. Wherever a NNP $(\mathbf{L}; \mathbf{V})$ appears below, we consistently use the following notation:

- $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\text{span } \mathbf{V}$, such that $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ is a projector on $\text{orth } \mathbf{V}$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is also symmetric and thus diagonalisable. From [47, Prop. 2.3] we know that all its eigenvalues are non-negative. We will denote by q the rank of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$. Note that $q \leq n - p$ as the p columns of \mathbf{Q} are trivially eigenvectors of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ associated to 0. We write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top$$

its truncated spectral decomposition; where $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \text{diag}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_q) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ are the diagonal matrix of nonzero eigenvalues and the matrix of the corresponding eigenvectors of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$, respectively.

Saddle-point systems feature prominently in our formulas:

Definition 8.2. The saddle-point system associated with a NNP $(\mathbf{L}; \mathbf{V})$ is the $(2n) \times (n + p)$ matrix:

$$S(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{V}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$$

It has the same form as the system that appears in polyharmonic spline interpolation, and this is no accident. Our first step will be to find the limit of the smoother matrix, which here reads:

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = (\mathbf{L} + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I} + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1} = (\varepsilon\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)(\varepsilon(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1} \quad (44)$$

To do so we use matrix perturbation theory (treating $\varepsilon\mathbf{L}$ as a perturbation), and specifically the approach of [3]. The difficulty lies in dealing with $(\varepsilon(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1}$, which is divergent as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ since $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top$ is not invertible. Because of that, it does not admit a power series. However, it does admit a Laurent series, which is an expansion involving negative orders of ε . We do not need the theory developed in [3] in its full generality for our purposes here. We introduce a simplified version tailored to our needs.

Theorem 8.3. Let $\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top + \varepsilon\mathbf{C}$, invertible for $\varepsilon > 0$, with $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ symmetric and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $p < n$, so that $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top$ is non-invertible. Then:

$$\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{B}_0 + \varepsilon\mathbf{B}_1 + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{B}_2 + \dots) \quad (45)$$

This is a Laurent expansion around $\varepsilon = 0$, and its terms $\mathbf{B}_0, \mathbf{B}_1, \dots$ are the solutions of the following equation, called the ‘‘master equation’’:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_2 + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}_1 &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_3 + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}_2 &= \mathbf{0} \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently:

$$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_i + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}_{i-1} = \delta_{i,1}\mathbf{I} \quad (46)$$

for i going from 1 to ∞ . In addition, all the terms $\mathbf{B}_0, \mathbf{B}_1, \dots$ are symmetric.

The proof can be found in [3] but straightforward to sketch. The existence of the Laurent expansion (eq. (45)) is a consequence of Cramer’s rule. The master equation is obtained by plugging eq. (45) into $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{I}$ and matching terms by order.

Using the Laurent expansion we find:

Corollary 8.4. *Let $(\mathbf{L}; \mathbf{V})$ a NNP. The smoother matrix \mathbf{M}_ε has the following expansion in small ε :*

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (47)$$

$$= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{L}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{L}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (48)$$

Proof. We use theorem 8.3 with $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}$ in eq. (44), which gives

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = (\varepsilon\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)(\varepsilon(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)(\mathbf{B}_0 + \varepsilon\mathbf{B}_1 + \dots) \quad (49)$$

where \mathbf{B}_0 and \mathbf{B}_1 verify the master equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1 + (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbf{I} \end{aligned}$$

Expanding in eq. (50), we find:

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0) + (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (50)$$

The diverging term $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0$ is null by the master equation. Again by the master equation, the constant-order term equals $\mathbf{I} - \sigma^2\mathbf{B}_0$. We now solve for \mathbf{B}_0 . Note that $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ implies $\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ (\mathbf{V} is n times p and has full rank). Therefore, \mathbf{B}_0 is orthogonal to span \mathbf{V} and we may express \mathbf{B}_0 in a basis that spans the complement of span \mathbf{V} . Recall that the notation we introduced, \mathbf{Q} is an orthogonal basis for \mathbf{V} , $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top)\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and so $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ lies in the complement of span \mathbf{V} . The (non-null) eigenvectors of $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ may therefore be taken as a basis for the complement of span \mathbf{V} , and we have that $\mathbf{B}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{Z}_0$ for some matrix \mathbf{Z}_0 . Inserting this form into the master equation (in the second term), we have:

$$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1 + (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{Z}_0 = \mathbf{I}$$

Multiplying to the left by $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{Z}_0 &= \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \\ \iff \mathbf{Z}_0 &= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \\ \iff \mathbf{B}_0 &= \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top\right)^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

by analogy with $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top\mathbf{L}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top\right)^\dagger$, we have $\mathbf{B}_0 = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{L}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^\dagger = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{L}} + \sigma^2\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top\right)^\dagger = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top$. Inserting this result in eq. (50), we obtain $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{I} - \sigma^2\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Then observe that \mathbf{M}_ε diagonalises in $(\mathbf{Q}; \tilde{\mathbf{U}})$ to finally obtain:

$$\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top + \sigma^2\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

hence completing the proof. \square

The expression for the smoother matrix has a simple interpretation: anything in the span of \mathbf{V} goes through unpenalised (for instance, constant and linear trends), and the rest is penalised in the usual way. This fits in with the ‘‘semi-parametric regression’’ interpretation.

Next, we examine the conditional expectation at an unobserved location:

Corollary 8.5. *The conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$ has the following expansion in the semi-parametric limit:*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (51)$$

Proof. We start with:

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{v}_x\mathbf{V}^\top)(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I} + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{y}$$

and insert the Laurent expansion as previously, to obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{v}_x\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_0\mathbf{y}) + (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}}\mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{v}_x\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1)\mathbf{y} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (52)$$

As previously, the diverging term disappears since $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_0 = 0$. The master equation for \mathbf{B}_0 can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_0 \\ \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (53)$$

We may rewrite eq. (52) as:

$$E(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_0 \\ \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

and eq. 24 is obtained by solving eq. 53 and injecting the result. \square

Remark 8.6. By setting $\sigma^2 = 0$ in the equation, we recover the interpolation case. One may also verify that setting $x \in \mathcal{X}$ recovers a column of the smoother matrix. In addition, eq. 24 implies that the function $\hat{f} = E(f|\mathbf{y})$ belongs in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to a specific function space:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i l(x, x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j v_j(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (54)$$

This looks at first sight like a function space of dimension $n + p$ but by eq. (24) $\mathbf{V}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$, which removes p degrees of freedom. The first term corresponds to the non-parametric part, the second to the parametric part. The spline basis of eq. (10) is a special case of this general form.

Finally, we may also obtain the asymptotic predictive variance using the same technique (although it requires going a step further in the master equation):

Corollary 8.7. The conditional expectation $\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$ has the following expansion in the semi-parametric limit:

$$\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} - (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathbf{v}_x^\top \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (55)$$

Proof. We follow the same steps as above, starting with:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) &= \mathbf{l}_{x,x} + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{v}_x^\top + (\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top) (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top)^{-1} (\mathbf{l}_{\mathcal{X},x} + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top) \\ &= \mathbf{l}_{x,x} + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{v}_x^\top + \varepsilon^{-2} (\varepsilon \mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} + \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top) (\mathbf{B}_0 + \varepsilon \mathbf{B}_1 + \varepsilon \mathbf{B}_2 + \dots) (\varepsilon \mathbf{l}_{\mathcal{X},x} + \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top) \end{aligned}$$

We now extract the terms in the expansion, starting with the lowest valuation:

$$[\varepsilon^{-2}] \text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = -\mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top$$

This term is zero by the master equation. The next order is:

$$[\varepsilon^{-1}] \text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{v}_x^\top - \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top - 2\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top \quad (56)$$

The master equation implies $\mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{V} = 0$, so the last term drops out. We also have $\mathbf{B}_0 (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top = \mathbf{I}$, and multiplying to the left by $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top$ yields $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top$. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ any vector such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{v}_x$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top = \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x = \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{v}_x^\top$$

This shows that $[\varepsilon^{-1}] \text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = 0$, and therefore that the conditional variance is not divergent as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We now compute the constant-order term:

$$[\varepsilon^0] \text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{l}_{x,x} - \mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top - 2\mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top - \mathbf{l}_{x,\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{l}_{\mathcal{X},x} \quad (57)$$

The next order in the master equation is:

$$\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_2 + (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{B}_1 = 0$$

Multiplying to the right by $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top$, we have:

$$\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top = -(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top$$

Again using $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{v}_x$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{v}_x \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top = -\boldsymbol{\alpha} (\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_x^\top$$

We now inject this result in eq. (57), and re-express it in the following form:

$$[\varepsilon^0]\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = l_{x,x} + \alpha(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_x^\top - 2l_{x,\mathcal{X}}\mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_x^\top - l_{x,\mathcal{X}}\mathbf{B}_0l_{\mathcal{X},x}$$

We already note that the master equation for \mathbf{B}_0 is equivalent to 53. Solving for \mathbf{B}_0 and $\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1$ is easy and gives in particular $\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1 = (\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1})$. Thus the term containing α equals $\alpha(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_x^\top = \mathbf{v}_x(\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{v}_x^\top$.

Collecting the different terms, we can write

$$[\varepsilon^0]\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = l_{x,x} + (l_{x,\mathcal{X}} \quad \mathbf{v}_x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_0 & \mathbf{B}_1\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{B}_1 & -(\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{V})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_{x,\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathbf{v}_x^\top \end{pmatrix} \quad (58)$$

Now, using block inverse formula allows to show that if $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an invertible matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $p \leq n$ is full rank, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1} & \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B})^{-1} \\ (\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1} & -(\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Using this result, we observe that the matrix involved in Eq. (58) is the inverse of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix},$$

hence finishing the proof. \square

Remark 8.8. *It is interesting to develop the inverse of the saddle point matrix,. The a posteriori mean then reads*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{v}_x\beta + l_{x,\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{V}\beta) \quad (59)$$

where $\beta = (\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\top(\mathbf{L} + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{y}$. The estimation is performed after the polynomial trend has been removed. Note that the preceding results corresponds to the Bayesian approach in which g admits a Gaussian prior and β s are chosen Gaussian with an infinite variance, an uninformative prior which however leads to a proper posterior (see e.g. [18]).

8.2 Proof of theorem 4.2

As stated in the proof sketch, most of the proof consists in working out what the limiting smoother matrices are. These results can be found implicitly in [5]. The approach we use here is much more direct, however, and hopefully easier to follow.

We start by recalling results from [4] on eigenvalues and eigenvectors in the flat limit. There are two essential facts to keep in mind. One is that most eigenvalues of kernel matrices go to 0 in the flat limit, but they do so at different speeds. The other is that the eigenvectors go to orthogonal polynomials or splines, depending on the regularity of the kernel and the magnitude of the associated eigenvalues.

8.2.1 Asymptotics of the eigenvalues

In the cases we examine, the smoother matrix reads:

$$M_\varepsilon = \mathbf{K}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}\mathbf{I})^{-1} = \mathbf{U}_\varepsilon \text{diag}\left(\frac{\lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}}\right)\mathbf{U}_\varepsilon^\top$$

We will review the behaviour of the eigenvectors \mathbf{U}_ε later. An interpretation that is helpful to keep in mind is that the smoother matrix acts like a filter: the measurement \mathbf{y} is transformed to the eigenbasis, then (by analogy with the Fourier transform) each discrete ‘‘frequency’’ is scaled by $\frac{\lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}}$, after which the data is transformed back to its original space. The function $s(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}}$ is analogous to a filter response function. It is an increasing function of λ , and maps \mathbb{R}^+ to $[0, 1]$. Notably, if λ is small compared to $\frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}$, then $s(\lambda) \approx 0$, and if it is large $s(\lambda) \approx 1$. In a nutshell, what happens in the flat limit is that eigenvalues grow apart (by orders of magnitude), so that the eigenvalues separate into three groups. A first group is much larger than $\frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}$, and these have $s(\lambda) \approx 1$; a second has approximately the same

magnitude as $\frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}$, and finally a third group is much smaller, and have $s(\lambda) \approx 0$. That explains why GPs behave in the flat limit like semiparametric regression (like intrinsic GPs): some directions in \mathbf{y} go through the smoother matrix unchanged, some are penalised, and some are clamped down to 0.

The asymptotics of the eigenvalues of kernel matrices in the flat limit are as follows. If the kernel matrix is analytic in ε , then the eigenvalues can also be written as analytic functions⁷ of ε , *i.e.* $\lambda_i(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{\nu_i}(\tilde{\lambda}_i + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$. The coefficient ν_i is the valuation of the i -th eigenvalue, and gives the rate at which it vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In a log-log plot of eigenvalues versus ε , it defines the limiting slope. When $d = 1$, the valuation of the eigenvalues is given by the following result (from [4])

$$\nu_i = \begin{cases} 2(i-1) & \text{if } i \leq r \\ 2r-1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note the dependency on r , the smoothness order of the kernel. Two extreme cases are the Gaussian kernel ($r = +\infty$), for which the eigenvalues are $\mathcal{O}(1), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^6), \dots$ and the exponential kernel, which has $r = 1$ and eigenvalues that are $\mathcal{O}(1), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \dots$. Kernels with $r > 1$ behave like the Gaussian kernel for the first r eigenvalues, then the next $n - r$ eigenvalues are all of the same order.

Now consider the asymptotics of terms of the form $\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}}$, as they appear in the spectral form of the smoother matrix.

If γ is constant as a function of ε , then, for all kernels with $r \leq 1$,

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\tilde{\lambda}_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

and for all $i > 1$

$$\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$$

All but the first term go to 0 in $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In the filtering interpretation, that means the smoothing matrix will only let through the part of \mathbf{y} that is proportional to the first eigenvector and everything else will be clamped down to zero. The associated eigenvector is the constant vector, so that the output of the smoother is a constant function. In addition, there will be some regularisation, given by

$$0 < \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\tilde{\lambda}_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}} < 1$$

The smoother matrix for constant γ then becomes effectively the smoother matrix for a (penalised) polynomial regression of degree 0.

Thus, taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ while keeping γ fixed does not lead to very interesting results, since the GP fit tends in that case to a constant function. Precise examination of the asymptotics (more on which below) leads to the conclusion that γ must scale as ε^{-p} for the number of degrees of freedom to stay constant as ε .

As an example, we may take $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma}\varepsilon^{-1}$. There are two cases we need to distinguish: $r = 1$ and $r > 1$. If $r > 1$, one may check that $\frac{\lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma(\varepsilon)}}$ goes to 1 for $i = 1$, and goes to 0 for $i > 1$. Thus, the fit will now correspond to an

unpenalised polynomial regression of degree 0. If $r = 1$, then $\frac{\lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma(\varepsilon)}}$ goes to 1 for $i = 1$, then all subsequent terms

(from 2 to n) equal $\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_i}{\tilde{\lambda}_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma}} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. From the filtering point of view, the first eigenvector goes through unpenalised, then everything goes through with a penalty. This is the signature of a semiparametric model, and indeed it is. As we will see later, in this case the parametric part is the constant function, and the non-parametric part is made up of linear splines.

The general pattern of the results has much in common with what we have seen so far. γ needs to rise as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and by controlling the ratio γ/ε , we control how many eigenvectors go through unpenalised, penalised, or not at all. Asymptotically we need $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma}\varepsilon^{-p}$, and the asymptotics will depend on the parity of p .

In the theorems stated here we take $\gamma = \varepsilon^{-p}\tilde{\gamma}$. The first result concerns the smoother matrix and follows directly from the spectral asymptotics in [4]. We introduce $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)}$ the matrix $\mathbf{D}^{(2r-1)} = \left[\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^{2r-1} \right]_{i,j}$ with monomials of degree $< r$ projected out, *i.e.* obtained using a QR decomposition.

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{<r}\mathbf{Q}_{<r}^\top)\mathbf{D}^{(2r-1)}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{<r}\mathbf{Q}_{<r}^\top) \quad (60)$$

⁷The requirement that \mathbf{K}_ε be analytic is probably artificial, see [2]

$\mathbf{Q}_{<r}$ being and orthogonal basis for $\mathbf{V}_{<r}$, e. g. obtained using a QR decomposition. We can state:

Theorem 8.9. *Let κ a stationary kernel with regularity order $r \in \mathbb{N}^+$, given n observations on the real line $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ the smoother matrix $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \gamma \mathbf{K}(\gamma \mathbf{K} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}$ has the following expansion as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$: $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{F}_\varepsilon \mathbf{U}^\top + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ where \mathbf{U} is the matrix of limiting eigenvectors and \mathbf{F}_ε is a diagonal (“filter”) matrix with entries*

$$\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_i}{\tilde{\lambda}_i + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \sigma^2 \varepsilon^{p-2(i-1)}} & \text{if } i \leq r \\ \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_i}{\tilde{\lambda}_i + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \sigma^2 \varepsilon^{p-(2r-1)}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

The limiting eigenvectors are similarly partitioned as:

$$\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{Q}_{\leq \min(n, r)} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{U}}]$$

where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}$ is the QR decomposition of \mathbf{V} and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ are the eigenvectors of $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{(2r-1)}$, as defined above. If $r > n$ then $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{Q}$.

Proof. This follows directly from noting that (by Rellich’s theorem) $\gamma \mathbf{K}(\gamma \mathbf{K} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} = \mathbf{U}(\varepsilon) \mathbf{F}_\varepsilon \mathbf{U}(\varepsilon)^\top$ with $\mathbf{U}(\varepsilon)$ analytic, and $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} = \frac{\lambda_i(\varepsilon)}{\lambda_i(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma(\varepsilon)}}$ and filling in the results of [4]. \square

Note that the theorem includes the case $r \geq n$. In this case, the result is independent of the regularity parameter r and is equivalent to the infinite smooth case.

We can now study the flat limit when ε goes to 0.

8.2.2 Smooth case, or $r > n$

In this case all the eigenvalues are $O(\varepsilon^{2(i-1)})$. Thus we get :

- $p \geq 2n - 1$, then $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} \rightarrow_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1, \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \mathbf{M}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon) \rightarrow n$.
This corresponds to the polynomial interpolation of n points by a polynomial of order $n - 1$.
- p odd and $p < 2n - 1$: $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} \rightarrow_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1, \forall i = 1, \dots, l = \lfloor p/2 + 1 \rfloor, 0$ otherwise and thus $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_{\leq l} \mathbf{Q}_{\leq l}^\top$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon) \rightarrow l$.
This corresponds to a (unpenalised) regression by a polynomial of order $l - 1$.
- p even and $p < 2n - 1$: $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} \rightarrow_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1, \forall i = 1, \dots, l = p/2, \Delta_{l+1, l+1} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{l+1}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{l+1} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tilde{\gamma}}}, 0$ otherwise. Thus
 $\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_{\leq l} \mathbf{Q}_{\leq l}^\top + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{p/2+1}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{p/2+1} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tilde{\gamma}}} \mathbf{q}_{p/2+1} \mathbf{q}_{p/2+1}^\top$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}_\varepsilon) \rightarrow p/2 + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{p/2+1}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{p/2+1} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tilde{\gamma}}}$.
This corresponds to a penalised polynomial regression (the order is controlled by a balance between the observation noise and the importance (as measured by the eigenvalue) of a higher order monomial).

8.2.3 Non-smooth case or $r < n$

In the non-smooth case, all eigenvalues have order at most $2r - 1$ in ε .

- for $p > 2r - 1$, we obtain an interpolation, since all eigenvalues of the smoother matrix go to 1.
- for $p = 2r - 1$, $\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon i, i} \rightarrow_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1, \forall i = 1, \dots, r$ and $\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_i}{\tilde{\lambda}_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tilde{\gamma}}}, \forall i = r + 1, \dots, n$.

$$\text{Thus, } \mathbf{M}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_{\leq r} \mathbf{Q}_{\leq r}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon \geq r+1} (\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon \geq r+1} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tilde{\gamma}} \mathbf{I})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top$$

Here we obtain the smoothing splines solutions, for which the splines of order r are added to the polynomial regression of order $r - 1$.

- for $p < 2r - 1$, we recover the two last cases of the smooth-case above, depending on the parity of p .

Remark 8.10. *Some examples will clarify the meaning of this result. For the Gaussian kernel, $r = \infty$ and so for every odd r the smoother matrix goes to $\mathbf{Q}_{\leq l} \mathbf{Q}_{\leq l}^\top$ ($l = (r - 1)/2$), the smoother matrix of a polynomial regression of degree l . For the exponential kernel, $r = 1$, and so for $p = 1$ the smoother matrix goes to the smoother matrix of a polyharmonic spline regression of degree 1. For p larger than 1 all eigenvalues go to 1 and so the limit is an interpolation.*

8.2.4 Final step of the proof, equivalent asymptotic models

The final step of the proof uses the results of section 3. The limit of smoother matrices, which is always of the form $M_\varepsilon = M_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Examining the proof of lemma 3.2 and proposition 3.3, we see that the predictive mean and variance depend smoothly on M_ε and so we have asymptotic predictive equivalence in the sense of definition 4.1. Then we obtain, using the results of the two preceding sections, and restricting to the the case $r < n$:

- p even: The model converges to $(l_p; \mathcal{V}_p)$ where the kernel associated is $l_p(x, y) = x^{p/2+1}y^{p/2+1}$ and the basis functions given by the monomials up to order $p/2$, or $\mathcal{V}_p = (1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{p/2})$.
- p odd: The model converges in this case to $(l_p; \mathcal{V}_p)$ where the kernel associated is $l_p(x, y) = 0$ and the basis functions given by the monomials up to order $\lfloor p/2 + 1 \rfloor$, or $\mathcal{V}_p = (1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{\lfloor p/2 + 1 \rfloor})$.
- $p = 2r - 1$: The model converges to $(l_p; \mathcal{V}_p)$ where the kernel associated is $l_p(x, y) = (-1)^r |x - y|^{2r-1}$ and the basis functions given by the monomials up to order $r - 1$, or $\mathcal{V}_p = (1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{r-1})$.

This concludes the proof.

8.3 Wronskians

8.3.1 Wronskian matrices from spectral representation

In this section we derive some properties of the Wronskian matrices of stationary kernel functions from their spectral representation. For stationary kernels, we may write $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$.

Bochner's theorem [45] tells us that κ may be written as:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(\iota \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) d\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \quad (62)$$

where μ is a positive measure (the spectral measure). In fact, there is a one-to-one correspondence between measures and kernel functions. Assume further that μ has a density (*i.e.* is absolutely continuous relative to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d). Then eq. (62) can be rewritten as:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(\iota \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) d\boldsymbol{\omega} \quad (63)$$

where $q = \mu'$ is the density corresponding to the spectral measure μ , called the spectral density. Eq. (63) implies that in this case κ and q are Fourier transform pairs. Since integrable functions have continuous Fourier transforms, if κ is integrable it has a spectral density.

We follow the normalisation convention of [45] and note:

$$q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(-\iota \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top \mathbf{x}) \kappa(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (64)$$

the spectral density of the kernel. The spectral representation of k lets us link the Wronskian matrix to moments of q . Partial derivatives $k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}$ of k may be computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^\boldsymbol{\alpha} \partial \mathbf{y}^\boldsymbol{\beta}} k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \frac{\partial^{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^\boldsymbol{\alpha} \partial \mathbf{y}^\boldsymbol{\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(\iota \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) d\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \iota^{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\beta}} \exp(\iota \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) d\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ element of the Wronskian matrix equals:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}! \boldsymbol{\beta}!} k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}(0, 0) \\ &= \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}! \boldsymbol{\beta}!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \iota^{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\beta}} d\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}! \boldsymbol{\beta}!} \iota^{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{\beta}|} \mathbb{E}_\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \end{aligned}$$

where E_μ designates expectation under q (note that q is not normalised). In general, not all moments of q exist, which is an equivalent way of stating that not all derivatives exist [45]. The fact that q is symmetric around the origin immediately yields that $E_\mu(\omega^{\alpha+\beta}) \neq 0$ if and only if $|\alpha + \beta|$ is even. We obtain the following compact expression:

$$W_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha!\beta!}(-1)^{p+|\beta|}E_\mu(\omega^{\alpha+\beta}) & \text{if } |\alpha + \beta| = 2p, p \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

Remark 8.11. *In certain cases further simplification is possible. If the kernel function is separable (which is the case for instance for the squared-exponential kernel), then q is a product distribution: $q(\omega) = \prod_{j=1}^d p(\omega_j)$, and $E_\mu(\omega^{\alpha+\beta}) = \prod_{j=1}^d E_p(\omega_j^{\alpha_j+\beta_j})$. In the special case of Matérn kernels, q is a multivariate Student's t distribution, and a simple expression for the moments can be found in [21].*

We now use eq. (65) to prove that Wronskians are positive-definite. The positive-definiteness is strict as long as the spectral density exists.

Lemma 8.12. *Let $\mathbf{W}_m = [W_{\alpha,\beta}]_{\alpha,\beta \in \mathbb{P}_m}$ the Wronskian (of order m) of a stationary kernel of order $r \geq m$. Then $\mathbf{W}_m \geq 0$. Further, if the kernel has a spectral density then $\mathbf{W}_m > 0$.*

Proof. We will show that \mathbf{W}_m is a Gram matrix, which implies positive-definiteness. Consider the following sequence of functions: $\Psi_\gamma(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma!}(\iota\omega)^\gamma$ where γ runs over \mathbb{P}_m . We define a dot product from q :

$$\langle \phi, \eta \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\omega) \overline{\eta(\omega)} d\mu(\omega)$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_\alpha, \psi_\beta \rangle &= \int \frac{1}{\alpha!}(\iota\omega)^\alpha \overline{\frac{1}{\beta!}(\iota\omega)^\beta} d\mu(\omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha!\beta!}(-1)^{|\beta|} \int (\iota)^{|\alpha+|\beta|} \omega^{\alpha+\beta} d\mu(\omega) \\ &= W_{\alpha,\beta} \end{aligned}$$

which verifies that \mathbf{W} is indeed a Gram matrix, and implies $\mathbf{W} \geq 0$. To go further and prove positive-definiteness, we now assume that the spectral density exists. Consider the quadratic form $\mathbf{p}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}$, with $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p} &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} p_\alpha W_{\alpha,\beta} p_\beta \\ &= \sum p_\alpha \langle \psi_\alpha, \psi_\beta \rangle p_\beta \\ &= \langle \sum p_\alpha \psi_\alpha, \sum p_\beta \psi_\beta \rangle \\ &= \left\| \sum p_\alpha \psi_\alpha \right\|_\mu^2 \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where $\|f\|_\mu^2$ is the norm induced by the dot product we have defined, *i.e.*:

$$\|f\|_\mu^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\omega) \overline{f(\omega)} q(\omega) d\omega \quad (67)$$

Obviously, $\|f\|_\mu^2 = 0$ if and only if f vanishes almost everywhere on the support of μ .

Recall that the set of functions ψ_α are a subset of the monomials (up to scaling). In eq. (66) $\eta_p(\omega) = \sum p_\alpha \psi_\alpha(\omega)$ is a complex-valued polynomial of degree m , so $\|\eta_p(\omega)\|_\mu^2 \neq 0$ unless $\eta_p(\omega) = 0$ almost everywhere on the support of μ . Since μ is absolutely continuous w.r.t the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d , the support of μ is a d -dimensional subset of \mathbb{R}^d . Polynomials in \mathbb{R}^d can only vanish on a subspace of dimension less than d , so $\|\eta_p(\omega)\|_\mu^2 > 0$ for all non-zero \mathbf{p} . \square

8.3.2 Expressions for the Wronskian in some special cases

The Wronskian for the squared exponential kernel can be worked out directly from eq. (65) and known formulas for Gaussian moments. The spectral density of the squared exponential kernel equals:

$$q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(-i\boldsymbol{\omega}^\top \mathbf{x}) \exp(-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2) d\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{(2\sqrt{\pi})^d} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2}{4}\right) \quad (68)$$

which is the (normalised) density of a d -dimensional Gaussian vector with independent entries of variance $\sigma^2 = 2$. The p -th moment of a univariate, centered Gaussian variate z equals $E(z^p) = \sigma^p(p-1)!!$ if p is even, and 0 otherwise. Here $n!!$ designates the so-called ‘‘double factorial’’, which if n is odd, equals the product $n(n-2)(n-4)\dots 1$. Since q is separable, we have:

$$E_\mu(\boldsymbol{\omega}^\gamma) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^d 2^{\gamma_i/2} (\gamma_i - 1)!! & \text{if } \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d \text{ even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

Injecting eq. (68) into eq. (65), we obtain:

$$W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \begin{cases} \frac{(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta} - 1)!!}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}! \boldsymbol{\beta}!} (-2)^{\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}}{2}} (-1)^\beta & \text{if } \alpha_1 + \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_d + \beta_d \text{ even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

8.3.3 The Wronskian matrix and orthogonal polynomials

Let h_0, \dots, h_s denote the first s orthogonal polynomials of the spectral measure. There is a close relationship between the orthogonal polynomials and the matrix of moments:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= E(\boldsymbol{\omega}^\alpha \boldsymbol{\omega}^\beta) \\ &= E\left(\left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq |\alpha|} A_{\gamma, \alpha} h_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\omega})\right) \left(\sum_{|\gamma'| \leq |\beta|} A_{\gamma', \beta} h_{\gamma'}(\boldsymbol{\omega})\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{\beta, \beta'} A_{\gamma, \beta} A_{\gamma', \beta} E(h_\gamma h_{\gamma'}) \\ &= \sum_{\beta} A_{\gamma, \alpha} A_{\gamma, \beta} E(h_\gamma^2) \\ &= (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{A}^\top)_{\alpha, \beta} \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

which gives an LDLt decomposition of the matrix of moments (\mathbf{H} is diagonal and its diagonal values are the energies of the orthogonal polynomials). Using the same trick as in the previous section, and defining $B_{\alpha, \gamma} = \frac{(\alpha)^\gamma}{\alpha!} A_{\alpha, \gamma}$, we find the LDL* decomposition of \mathbf{W} , specifically:

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B}^* \quad (72)$$

In certain cases the elements of \mathbf{B} are available in closed-form. For example in the squared-exponential case the orthogonal polynomials of the measure are the Hermite polynomials.

8.3.4 Wronskian matrix of Matérn kernels

In this section we consider Matérn kernels with regularity parameter ν , with spectral density as in [52], p.84:

$$q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{(2\sqrt{\pi})^d \Gamma(\nu + d/2) (2\nu)^\nu}{\Gamma(\nu)} \left(2\nu + 4\pi^2 \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2\right)^{-\nu - d/2} \quad (73)$$

One may verify that this is also the density of a multivariate t -distribution, with degrees of freedom 2ν . The t -distribution has finite moments of order $2\nu - 1$, so that the order of regularity r of the kernel equals 2ν . For instance, if $\nu = 1/2$, then $q(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ is integrable but has no other finite moments exist, meaning equivalently the kernel function is not differentiable. The Matérn kernel with $\nu = 1/2$ is actually the exponential kernel. The moments of q are given in [21], p. 11.

The Wronskian matrix for the Matérn kernels (and others) can be obtained from the expression for the Gaussian kernel. In the expansion:

$$\mathbf{K}(\epsilon) = f_0 \mathbf{D}^0 + f_2 \epsilon^2 \mathbf{D}^{(2)} + \dots + f_{2r-1} \epsilon^{2r-1} \mathbf{D}^{2r-1}$$

the coefficients f_0, f_2, \dots depend on the kernel but the distance matrices do not, and it is the latter that can be expressed in the monomial basis. For radial kernels it is enough to expand the radial function at 0 to obtain the correct coefficients.

8.3.5 Inverse and Schur complements of Wronskian matrices for separable kernels

Theorem 6.2 involves Schur complements in the Wronskian matrix (eq. (41)). A result in [19] shows that these Schur complements are diagonal for separable kernels. Indeed, rephrased for our need, we have:

Theorem 8.13 (Th. 3.1 in [19]). *Consider a random vector X with values in \mathbb{R}^d and with product measure $p(X) = \prod_i p(X_i)$. Let $M_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_{k,d} \times \mathcal{P}_{k,d}}$ be the moment matrix with entries $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \mathbb{E}_p[X^\alpha X^\beta]$. Note that the maximal degree of the multiindexes considered is k .*

Then $M_{\alpha,\beta}^{-1}$ can be different from 0 if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^d \max(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \leq k$.

Alternately, $M_{\alpha,\beta}^{-1}$ is necessarily zero (called a congenital zero in [19]) iff $\sum_{i=1}^d \max(\alpha_i, \beta_i) > k$

As an example, consider $d = 2$ and k up to 3. The pattern provided by the theorem is depicted in the following matrices: all the entries \star can take different values from zero, all the others are necessarily 0:

$$M_1^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} & (0,0) & (1,0) & (0,1) \\ \hline (0,0) & \star & \star & \star \\ (1,0) & & \star & 0 \\ (0,1) & & & \star \end{array} \right)$$

$$M_2^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|cccccc} & (0,0) & (1,0) & (0,1) & (2,0) & (1,1) & (0,2) \\ \hline (0,0) & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ (1,0) & & \star & \star & \star & \star & 0 \\ (0,1) & & & \star & 0 & \star & \star \\ (2,0) & & & & \star & 0 & 0 \\ (1,1) & & & & & \star & 0 \\ (0,2) & & & & & & \star \end{array} \right)$$

$$M_3^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|cccccccc} & (0,0) & (1,0) & (0,1) & (2,0) & (1,1) & (0,2) & (3,0) & (2,1) & (1,2) & (0,3) \\ \hline (0,0) & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ (1,0) & & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & 0 \\ (0,1) & & & \star & \star & \star & \star & 0 & \star & \star & \star \\ (2,0) & & & & \star & \star & 0 & \star & \star & 0 & 0 \\ (1,1) & & & & & \star & \star & 0 & \star & \star & 0 \\ (0,2) & & & & & & \star & 0 & 0 & \star & \star \\ (3,0) & & & & & & & \star & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ (2,1) & & & & & & & & \star & 0 & 0 \\ (1,2) & & & & & & & & & \star & 0 \\ (0,3) & & & & & & & & & & \star \end{array} \right)$$

Since the Schur complements we need are diagonal subblocks $M_{\alpha,\alpha}^{-1}$ for $|\alpha| = k$, Th. 3.1 in [19] directly shows that these are diagonal! This result allows to prove corollary 6.3.

8.3.6 Proof of corollary 6.3

We just have to prove that the flat limit kernel for the Gaussian kernel rescaled by ε^{-p} is $\rho_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y})^{p/2}$ for even p .

From the main result 6.2 we know that the limiting kernel in this case is $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=m, |\beta|=m} \bar{W}_m(\alpha, \beta) \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mathbf{y}^\beta$. Since $\bar{W}_m(\alpha, \beta)$ is diagonal this reduces to $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \mathcal{H}_{m,d} \bar{W}_m(\alpha, \alpha) \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mathbf{y}^\alpha$, where we recall that $\mathcal{H}_{m,d}$ is the number of monomials of degree m in dimension d .

$\bar{W}_m(\alpha, \alpha)$ are the diagonal terms of the Schur complement discussed above. From elementary block inverses lemma, we know that the Schur complement needed is the inverse of the corresponding block in the inverse of \mathbf{W}_m .

Let Δ_α be a diagonal matrix with elements $\iota^{|\alpha|}/\alpha!$. Then $\mathbf{W}_m = \Delta_\alpha M_m \Delta_\beta^*$. Thus $\mathbf{W}_m^{-1} = \Delta_\beta^{-*} M_m^{-1} \Delta_\alpha^{-1}$. Since the block we are interested in is diagonal, we end up with $\bar{W}_m(\alpha, \alpha) = 1/(\alpha!^2 M_m^{-1}(\alpha, \alpha))$. We thus need to calculate the diagonal terms in the inverse of the moment matrix.

To do so, a trick is to use the orthonormal polynomials associated we the measure at end (here the isotropic Gaussian, see above). Writing the orthonormal polynomials as $p_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma \leq \alpha} d_{\alpha,\gamma} \mathbf{x}^\gamma$, we obtain $\mathbb{E} p_\alpha p_\beta = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{\gamma \leq \alpha, \rho \leq \beta} d_{\gamma,\rho} M_m(\gamma, \rho) d_{\beta,\rho}$. Note that the matrix \mathbf{D} with entries $d_{\alpha,\beta}$ is lower triangular (orthogonality) and

invertible. Therefore, $I = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{M}_m\mathbf{D}^\top$ so that $\mathbf{M}_m^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^\top\mathbf{D}$. Thus, $\mathbf{M}_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\alpha \leq \gamma} d_{\gamma, \alpha}^2 = d_{\alpha, \alpha}^2$ since in the block of order m all terms but the diagonal terms are equal to zero. Now, $d_{\alpha, \alpha}$ may be found using the norm of the polynomial p_α which writes $\mathbb{E}p_\alpha p_\alpha = 1 = \sum_{\gamma \leq \alpha} d_{\alpha, \gamma} \mathbb{E}p_\alpha x^\gamma = d_{\alpha, \alpha} \mathbb{E}p_\alpha x^\alpha$ again because d is diagonal for the term of maximal degree. The final twist here uses the fact that the measure is a product measure $\mu = \prod \mu_i$, which implies that the orthonormal polynomials p_α associated are products of the orthonormal polynomials p_{α_i} of the measures μ_i . This implies that $d_{\alpha, \alpha} = \prod d_{\alpha_i, \alpha_i}$. In the Gaussian case considered, d_{α_i, α_i} is thus simply the norm of the Hermite polynomial of degree α_i . For our case, $d_{\alpha_i, \alpha_i}^2 = 1/(2^{\alpha_i} \alpha_i!)$ so that $d_{\alpha, \alpha}^2 = 1/(2^{|\alpha|} \alpha!)$ and $\bar{W}_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 2^{|\alpha|} / \alpha!$. Thus $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \propto \sum_{|\alpha|=m} m! / \alpha! \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mathbf{y}^\alpha = (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y})^m$. Since proportionality here leads to prediction-equivalence, this ends the proof of corollary 6.3.

8.4 Extension to general linear measurements

Here we sketch the extension of our results to general linear measurements of a GP, as used in linear inverse problems. As a concrete example, suppose we take Fourier measurements of an unknown function f :

$$y_k = \int_0^1 f(x) e^{2\pi i k x} dx + v_i \quad (74)$$

with $v_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The goal is to reconstruct f from $y_1 \dots y_n$. We do so by assuming f is sampled from a Gaussian process, and estimating $f(x)$ via its posterior expectation $\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$.

Let us first set up some notation. To generalise beyond eq. (75), we assume that each measurement is the output of a linear functional acting on f :

$$y_i = \langle \phi_i | f \rangle + \nu_i \quad (75)$$

Here the linear functional may be for instance an integral operator (as in eq. (75)), or a differential operator. We recover the usual setup (point evaluation of f) with $\phi_i = \delta_{x_i}$, the Dirac delta at x_i .

Assume that $f \sim GP(0, k)$ with $k(x, y)$ a kernel function. Then one can show [38] that the vector $[\langle \phi_i, f \rangle]_i$ has a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean $\mathbb{E} \langle \phi_i | f \rangle = \langle \phi_i | \mathbb{E}(f) \rangle = 0$ and covariance

$$M_{ij} = \langle \phi_j | \langle \phi_i | k \rangle_x \rangle_y = \langle \phi_i | k | \phi_j \rangle \quad (76)$$

where $\langle \phi | f(x, y) \rangle_x = \langle \phi | f(\cdot, y) \rangle$ evaluates the operator along x with y fixed, and similarly for $\langle \phi | f(x, y) \rangle_y$.

Note for later that

$$\langle \phi_i | f + g | \phi_j \rangle = \langle \phi_i | f | \phi_j \rangle + \langle \phi_i | g | \phi_j \rangle$$

and if $h(x, y) = f(x)g(y)$ is a separable function, then

$$\langle \phi_i | h | \phi_j \rangle = \langle \phi_i | f \rangle \langle g | \phi_j \rangle \quad (77)$$

The expectation of $f(x)$ given \mathbf{y} by noting that f, \mathbf{y} are jointly Gaussian again, and by the usual conditioning formulas

$$\mathbb{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{m}_x^t (\mathbf{M} + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} \quad (78)$$

with $\mathbf{m}_x^t = [\langle \phi_1 | k(x, \cdot) \rangle \dots \langle \phi_n | k(x, \cdot) \rangle]$.

On the other hand, we may also try to solve the problem using polynomials (of fixed degree $s \leq n$). In this case the natural thing to do is to solve:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{P}_s} \sum_i (y_i - \langle \phi_i | f \rangle)^2 \quad (79)$$

where \mathcal{P}_s is the set of polynomials of degree $\leq s$. That is a simple, finite-dimensional least-squares problem. Noting

$$S_{ij} = \langle \phi_i | x^j \rangle \quad (80)$$

we have the estimate $\tilde{f}(x) = \mathbf{v}_x^t (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^t)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^t \mathbf{y}$ with $\mathbf{v}_x^t = [x^0 \dots x^s]$.

We can now proceed with the flat limit expansion. For brevity, we do this for $d = 1$ and $r = \infty$ but the general case proceeds along the same lines. If we inject the expansion

$$k_\epsilon(x, y) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 \epsilon^2 (x - y)^2 + \beta_4 \epsilon^4 (x - y)^4 + \dots \quad (81)$$

into the definition of the matrix \mathbf{M} (eq. (76)) we find

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij}(\epsilon) &= \langle \phi_i | k_\epsilon | \phi_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_i | \beta_0 + \beta_2 \epsilon^2 (x-y)^2 + \beta_4 \epsilon^4 (x-y)^4 | \phi_j \rangle \\ &= \beta_0 \langle \phi_i | 1 | \phi_j \rangle + \epsilon^2 \beta_2 \langle \phi_i | (x-y)^2 | \phi_j \rangle + \epsilon^4 \beta_4 \langle \phi_i | (x-y)^4 | \phi_j \rangle + \dots \end{aligned}$$

If we now use the binomial expansion, along with eq. (77), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij}(\epsilon) &= \beta_0 \langle \phi_i | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | \phi_j \rangle + \epsilon^2 \beta_2 \{ \langle \phi_i | x^2 \rangle \langle \phi_j | 1 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_i | x \rangle \langle \phi_j | y \rangle + \langle \phi_i | 1 \rangle \langle \phi_j | y^2 \rangle \} + \dots \\ &= \beta_0 S_{i,0} S_{j,0} + \beta_2 \epsilon^2 \{ S_{i,2} S_{j,0} - 2 S_{i,1} S_{j,1} + S_{i,0} S_{j,2} \} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to write \mathbf{M} in the form

$$\mathbf{M}(\epsilon) = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{S}^t + \dots \quad (82)$$

With this in hand, all the results from [4] follow in a modified form, with \mathbf{S} playing the role of the Vandermonde matrix \mathbf{V} . For instance, $\mathbf{M}(\epsilon)$ will have eigenvalues of order $0, \epsilon^2, \epsilon^4, \dots$ and its limiting eigenvectors are given by Gram-Schmidt applied to \mathbf{S} .

If we now apply the expansion to the conditional mean (eq. (78)), we find:

$$\mathbf{m}_x = \mathbf{v}_x^t \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{S} + \dots$$

Assuming \mathbf{S} has full rank, we may write $\mathbf{v}_x^t = \mathbf{v}_x^t \mathbf{S}$. Eq. (78) takes the following form

$$\mathbf{E}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{v}_x^t \mathbf{S} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{S}^t (\mathbf{S} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon) \mathbf{S}^t + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} + \dots \quad (83)$$

where we recognise a regularised inverse (smoother matrix). This generalises the smoother matrices we have already studied, with \mathbf{S} generalising \mathbf{V} . By scaling the kernel matrix appropriately, we recover all the usual results. In the flat limit of inverse problems, the GP model becomes equivalent to the usual parametric or semi-parametric models. See section 5.6 for a detailed example.

8.5 Extension to non-Gaussian likelihoods

Although the results are entirely analogous, going beyond Gaussian likelihoods requires a very substantial change to the proof techniques. In the Gaussian case, the posterior mean of $f(x)$ given the data \mathbf{y} is a linear function of \mathbf{y} . This allows us to rely on linear algebra for the proofs, but if we now wish to generalise to non-Gaussian likelihoods this avenue is no longer open.

Instead, what we may do is directly express posterior expectations as integrals and use asymptotic formulae for these integrals. In the Gaussian case, we relied on a reduction (in section 3) that let us study smoothing matrices only. Here we rely on a more general result, in the form of a Bayesian variant of the representer theorem, that lets us focus on the finite dimensional posterior for the values of f at the measured location. That posterior can itself be tackled using asymptotic integrals, as we show.

We give only the barest sketch here, with apologies to the reader. There are many tedious details to be worked out, in particular in specifying the exact class of likelihood functions for which the results hold (some form of regularity is required).

8.5.1 Assumptions

An example of a non-Gaussian likelihood is the Bernoulli likelihood introduced in section 5.6. Each datapoint y_i is a class label in $\{0, 1\}$ and we assume

$$p(y_i = 1 | f(\mathbf{x}_i)) = \Phi(f(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad (84)$$

where f is our Gaussian process. If $f(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ then points at \mathbf{x} are more likely to be in class 1, if $f(\mathbf{x}) < 0$ it's the opposite and the separating surface is at the level set $f(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

Again we have $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1 \dots x_n\}$ the measurement locations and $\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{X}} = [f(x_1) \dots f(x_n)]$ the vector of function values. The goal of GP classification is to form predictions at an arbitrary location, from the posterior predictive distribution $p(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$. To perform prediction, we compute the posterior expectation of $f(x)$ given the data \mathbf{y} , and if that expectation is positive we predict class 1. Contrary to the Gaussian case, computing these expectations cannot be done analytically.

We can assume a model in a more general form, where the measurements y_i at each location x_i only depend on the value of f at x_i , and the measurements are independent, i.e.:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|f) = \prod_i l_i(y_i|f(x_i)) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{y}}(f_{\mathcal{X}}) \quad (85)$$

We can also extend this to general linear observations on f , as in the previous section, but that requires burdensome notation so we stick to pointwise evaluation for simplicity.

The gist of the proof is as follows: first, we reduce the problem from looking at the posterior predictive at $f(x)$ for any x to just looking at the finite-dimensional posterior $p(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y})$. Next, we compute asymptotics of the moments of $p(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y})$ essentially by doing multivariate integrals in the right basis.

8.5.2 The Bayesian representer theorem

The paper [9] contains a result which can be seen as a Bayesian counterpart of the representer theorem; and indeed you can use it to prove the classical representer theorem. The representer theorem shows that a functional (i.e., infinite-dimensional) optimisation problem actually collapses to a finite-dimensional optimisation problem. The Bayesian representer theorem shows something similar for the posterior expectation of $f(x)$ given the data, in a very general setting.

Consider $\hat{f}(x) = E(f(x)|\mathbf{y})$ as a function of x . We know that f belongs to the RKHS generated by the kernel, but can we be more specific? The results in [9] show that we can:

$$E(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{k}(x, \mathcal{X})\mathbf{K}^{-1}E(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n k(x, x_i)\alpha_i(\mathbf{y}) \quad (86)$$

so that \hat{f} actually belongs to an n dimensional subspace spanned by the kernel functions $\{k(x, x_1) \dots k(x, x_n)\}$. The kinship with the classical representer theorem should be obvious.

Importantly, by eq. (86), we can think of the posterior expectation at x as an interpolation at x from observations at \mathcal{X} with value $E(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y})$ (to see that it is an interpolation, consider $x \in \mathcal{X}$). In addition, a similar result holds for conditional variance:

$$\text{Var}(f(x)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{k}(x, \mathcal{X})\mathbf{K}^{-1}\text{Var}(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y}) \quad (87)$$

which again is an interpolation of the posterior variance at the measured locations.

Since the flat limit of interpolation is well-characterised, we can focus on the behaviour of $E(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y})$.

8.5.3 Asymptotic integrals

We would like to find asymptotic formulas for posterior expectations in the flat limit, of the form

$$E(f_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\int \mathbf{f} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{f}) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{f}^t(\gamma_0\epsilon^{-p}\mathbf{K}_{\epsilon})^{-1}\mathbf{f})d\mathbf{f}}{\int \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{f}) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{f}^t(\gamma_0\epsilon^{-p}\mathbf{K}_{\epsilon})^{-1}\mathbf{f})d\mathbf{f}} \quad (88)$$

Recall that the role of the $\gamma_0\epsilon^{-p}$ scaling (with $p \leq 0$) is to get a nontrivial limit. To look at what happens to eq. (88) in $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we will perform a linear change of variable, after which some dimensions will drop out and others will simplify.

8.5.4 Some asymptotic formulas

Consider the following (univariate) integral:

$$I(\epsilon) = \int s(x) \exp(-\frac{\epsilon^{\beta}}{2}x^2)dx \quad (89)$$

which we seek to evaluate in $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ for different values of the exponent β .

If $\beta > 0$, and $s(x)$ is integrable, then

$$I(\epsilon) = \int s(x)dx + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{\beta}) \quad (90)$$

If $\beta < 0$, and $s(x)$ is differentiable at 0, then

$$I(\epsilon) = \sqrt{2\epsilon^{-\beta}}(f(0) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-\beta})) \quad (91)$$

which can be obtained from Laplace's method or just by thinking of 89 as an expectation under an (unnormalised) Gaussian and Taylor expanding f at 0.

We can combine these formulas in multivariate integrals, such as

$$J(\epsilon) = \int f(x, y, z) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\epsilon x^2 + y^2 + \frac{z^2}{\epsilon})\right) dx dy dz \quad (92)$$

$$\approx \int \sqrt{2\epsilon^{-\beta}} f(x, y, 0) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\epsilon x^2 + y^2)\right) dx dy \quad \approx \sqrt{2\epsilon^{-\beta}} f(x, y, 0) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(y^2)\right) dx dy \quad (93)$$

Assume that $f(x, y, z) \leq 0$ represents a likelihood function, and that $f(x, y, z) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\epsilon x^2 + y^2 + \frac{z^2}{\epsilon})\right) dx dy dz$ is a posterior density. We can compute the expectation of x, y, z via a modification of $J(\epsilon)$, similar to eq. (88). If we apply the same process of asymptotic simplification and take the ratio, we'll see that as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the expectation is the same as if we had (a) clamped z at 0 and (b) treated x as unpenalised. That is in a sense, all that is going on in the flat limit: under the right change of basis, some dimensions are clamped at 0, some are unpenalised, and the remaining still have some penalisation by the prior.

8.6 Putting it all together

Let us derive the right change of basis so that the prior in eq. (88) can be treated as a product of Gaussians with variances in different orders in ϵ .

For now, consider the $d = 1$, smooth case. It will come as no surprise that the correct change of basis is to go to the orthonormal polynomials, so that $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{g}$ where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$ is the QR decomposition of the full Vandermonde matrix (degree $n - 1$). Note that the change-of-variable has determinant one (it's a rotation). We also note $\mathbf{g} = [g_0 \dots g_{n-1}]$, starting the indexing at 0 because of the association with monomial degrees.

As usual we can write \mathbf{K}_ϵ as

$$\mathbf{K}_\epsilon = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)\mathbf{W}\mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)\mathbf{V}^t + \dots \quad (94)$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)$ is diagonal with $\mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)_{i,i} = \epsilon^i$. A quadratic form in \mathbf{K}^{-1} can be expanded as:

$$\mathbf{f}^t \mathbf{K}_\epsilon^{-1} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g} \mathbf{Q}^t \mathbf{V}^{-t} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{g} + \dots = \mathbf{g} \mathbf{R}^{-t} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{g} + \dots \quad (95)$$

The matrix \mathbf{R}^{-1} is lower-triangular, and so with some algebra you can convince yourself that in the quadratic form

$$\mathbf{g} \mathbf{Q}^t \mathbf{V}^{-t} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{\Delta}(\epsilon)^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{g}$$

the term in g_0^2 has valuation 0 in ϵ , the term in g_1^2 has valuation -2 , the term in g_2^2 has valuation -4 , etc. This means we can rewrite the prior as effectively proportional to:

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\gamma_0 \epsilon^p}{2} (c_0 g_0^2 + \epsilon^{-2} c_1 g_1^2 + \dots)\right)$$

At this stage we can apply our asymptotic integral formulas and we are done. Depending on p some dimensions become unpenalised, some are clamped to 0 and the one that (potentially) remains is penalised. We have a semiparametric prior, the exact nature of which depends on the expansion of the kernel matrix at 0. To identify this model, we repeat the arguments of the linear-Gaussian case.

8.7 Non-analytic kernels

As it stands our results are limited to kernels that are analytic at 0. This limitation is frustrating because, e.g. not all Matérn kernels are analytic. In particular, numerical evidence suggests that thin-plate splines [53] do appear in the flat limit of Matérn kernel, but this is slightly beyond what we can prove using the current tools. In this section we explain the problem and sketch a direction for the proof.

To explain the issue, let us consider the Matérn kernel in dimension 1, as defined in [45], eq. 14. Let $k(x, y) = \psi(x - y)$, with

$$\psi(t) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2^{\nu-1} \Gamma(\nu + \frac{1}{2})} |t|^\nu \mathcal{K}_\nu(|t|) \quad (96)$$

where \mathcal{K}_ν is a modified Bessel function. Recall that ν determines the m.s. differentiability of the process: a sample from a GP with Matérn covariance is m times differentiable if and only if $\nu > m$. Using the tools in this article,

we can only handle the cases where ν is half-integer, because in these cases $\psi(t) = \exp(-|t|)p(t)$ where $p(t)$ is a polynomial [45].

Stein [45] gives asymptotic series for the Matérn kernel (eqs. 15 and 16, p. 32) which shed light on the behaviour of $\psi(t)$ in small t . For simplicity, we only consider $\nu \leq 1$. If $0 < \nu < 1$, then ψ has an expansion of the form:

$$\psi(t) = b_0 - b_1 t^{2\nu} + \mathcal{O}(|t|^2)$$

where b_0 and b_1 are coefficients depending on ν . Note that 2ν is not an integer, so ψ is not asymptotic to a power series. If $\nu = 1$, then ψ has expansion:

$$\psi(t) = 2 + t^2 \log |t| + \mathcal{O}(t^2)$$

where $t^2 \log |t|$ is not a monomial.

In terms of kernel matrices, this implies that if $0 < \nu < 1$, \mathbf{K}_ε can be expanded as:

$$\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon = b_0 \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t - \varepsilon^{2\nu} b_1 \mathbf{D}^{(2\nu)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$$

where $\mathbf{D}^{(2\nu)} = [|x_i - x_j|^{2\nu}]_{i,j}$. If $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$, we recover the special case of the exponential kernel. If ν is any other real number, we need to deal with a non-analytic matrix perturbation. This creates a problem because we use Rellich's theorem, which assumes that the perturbation is analytic. The same problem arises when $\nu = 1$, in which case:

$$\mathbf{K}_\varepsilon = 2\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t + (\varepsilon^2 \log \varepsilon) \mathbf{L} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$$

where $\mathbf{L} = [|x_i - x_j|^2 \log |x_i - x_j|]_{i,j}$. Again we cannot use Rellich's theorem.

It is relatively easy to see what should happen here: the scaling of γ needs to be adapted to scale as $\varepsilon^{-2\nu}$ or $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \log \varepsilon}$ when $\nu = 1$. What we need is a version of the results in [4] that does not rely on Rellich's theorem. There is a possibility of obtaining the same results using linear algebra in the field of transseries [48], and we hope to pursue this in the future.

References

- [1] Hirotugu Akaike. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 19(6):716–723, 1974.
- [2] Marianne Akian, Ravindra Bapat, and Stéphane Gaubert. Non-archimedean valuations of eigenvalues of matrix polynomials. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 498:592–627, 2016.
- [3] Konstantin E Avrachenkov, Jerzy A Filar, and Phil G Howlett. *Analytic perturbation theory and its applications*, volume 135. SIAM, 2013.
- [4] Simon Barthelmé and Konstantin Usevich. Spectral properties of kernel matrices in the flat limit. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 42(1):17–57, 2021.
- [5] Simon Barthelmé, Nicolas Tremblay, Konstantin Usevich, and Pierre-Olivier Amblard. Determinantal point processes in the flat limit. *Bernoulli*, 29(2):957–983, 2023.
- [6] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [7] Andreas Buja, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Linear smoothers and additive models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 453–510, 1989.
- [8] Jon Cockayne, Chris J Oates, Timothy John Sullivan, and Mark Girolami. Bayesian probabilistic numerical methods. *SIAM review*, 61(4):756–789, 2019.
- [9] Lehel Csato and Manfred Opper. Sparse online gaussian processes. *Neural computation*, 14(3):641–668, 2002.
- [10] Guillaume Dehaene and Simon Barthelmé. Expectation propagation in the large data limit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80(1):199–217, 2018.
- [11] Tobin A Driscoll and Bengt Fornberg. Interpolation in the limit of increasingly flat radial basis functions. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 43(3-5):413–422, 2002.
- [12] Jean Duchon. Splines minimizing rotation-invariant semi-norms in sobolev spaces. In *Constructive theory of functions of several variables*, pages 85–100. Springer, 1977.
- [13] Michaël Fanuel, Joachim Schreurs, and Johan AK Suykens. Determinantal point processes implicitly regularize semi-parametric regression problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06964*, 2020.

- [14] Bengt Fornberg and Cécile Piret. A stable algorithm for flat radial basis functions on a sphere. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 30(1):60–80, 2008.
- [15] Bengt Fornberg, Elisabeth Larsson, and Natasha Flyer. Stable computations with Gaussian radial basis functions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33(2):869–892, 2011.
- [16] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer, 2001.
- [17] Gene H Golub, Michael Heath, and Grace Wahba. Generalized cross-validation as a method for choosing a good ridge parameter. *Technometrics*, 21(2):215–223, 1979.
- [18] Chong Gu. Penalized likelihood regression: a bayesian analysis. *Statistica Sinica*, 2:255–264, 1992.
- [19] J. William Helton, Lasserre Jean-Bernard, and Mihai Putinar. Measures with zeros in the inverse of their moment matrix. *The Annals of Probability*, 36(4):1453–1471, 2008.
- [20] Donald R Jones. A taxonomy of global optimization methods based on response surfaces. *Journal of global optimization*, 21(4):345–383, 2001.
- [21] Samuel Kotz and Saralees Nadarajah. *Multivariate t-distributions and their applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [22] Elisabeth Larsson and Bengt Fornberg. Theoretical and computational aspects of multivariate interpolation with increasingly flat radial basis functions. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 49(1):103–130, 2005.
- [23] Ker-Chau Li. From stein’s unbiased risk estimates to the method of generalized cross validation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1352–1377, 1985.
- [24] Finn Lindgren, Håvard Rue, and Johan Lindström. An explicit link between gaussian fields and gaussian markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73(4):423–498, 2011.
- [25] David JC MacKay. Comparison of approximate methods for handling hyperparameters. *Neural computation*, 11(5):1035–1068, 1999.
- [26] Georges Matheron. *Le krigeage universel*, volume 1. École nationale supérieure des mines de Paris Paris, 1969.
- [27] Jean Meinguet. Multivariate interpolation at arbitrary points made simple. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP*, 30(2):292–304, 1979.
- [28] Charles A Micchelli. Interpolation of scattered data: Distance matrices and conditionally positive definite functions. *Constructive Approximation*, 2(1):11–22, 1986.
- [29] Thomas Peter Minka. *A family of algorithms for approximate Bayesian inference*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001.
- [30] Julio Moro and Froilán M Dopico. First order eigenvalue perturbation theory and the newton diagram. In *Applied Mathematics and Scientific Computing*, pages 143–175. Springer, 2002.
- [31] Iain Murray, David MacKay, and Ryan P Adams. The gaussian process density sampler. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 21, 2008.
- [32] Finbarr O’sullivan, Brian S Yandell, and William J Raynor Jr. Automatic smoothing of regression functions in generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(393):96–103, 1986.
- [33] Christian H Reinsch. Smoothing by spline functions. *Numerische mathematik*, 10(3):177–183, 1967.
- [34] Herbert Robbins et al. An empirical bayes approach to statistics. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*. The Regents of the University of California, 1956.
- [35] Judith Rousseau. On the frequentist properties of bayesian nonparametric methods. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 3:211–231, 2016.
- [36] Håvard Rue and Leonhard Held. *Gaussian Markov random fields: theory and applications*. CRC press, 2005.
- [37] David Ruppert, Matt P Wand, and Raymond J Carroll. *Semiparametric regression*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [38] Simo Särkkä. Linear operators and stochastic partial differential equations in gaussian process regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 151–158. Springer, 2011.
- [39] Tomas Sauer. Polynomial interpolation in several variables: lattices, differences, and ideals. *Studies in Computational Mathematics*, 12:191–230, 2006.

- [40] Robert Schaback. Multivariate interpolation by polynomials and radial basis functions. *Constructive Approximation*, 21(3):293–317, 2005.
- [41] Michael Scheuerer, Robert Schaback, and Martin Schlather. Interpolation of spatial data—a stochastic or a deterministic problem? *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 24(4):601–629, 2013.
- [42] Bernhard Schölkopf, Alexander J Smola, Francis Bach, et al. *Learning with kernels: support vector machines, regularization, optimization, and beyond*. MIT press, 2002.
- [43] Peter Sollich and Christopher KI Williams. Using the equivalent kernel to understand gaussian process regression. In *NIPS*, volume 17, pages 1313–1320, 2004.
- [44] Guohui Song, John Riddle, Gregory E Fasshauer, and Fred J Hickernell. Multivariate interpolation with increasingly flat radial basis functions of finite smoothness. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 36(3):485–501, 2012.
- [45] Michael L Stein. *Interpolation of Spatial Data: Some Theory for Kriging*. Springer, 1999.
- [46] Aretha L Teckentrup. Convergence of gaussian process regression with estimated hyper-parameters and applications in bayesian inverse problems. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 8(4):1310–1337, 2020.
- [47] Nicolas Tremblay, Simon Barthelmé, Konstantin Usevich, and Pierre-Olivier Amblard. Extended l-ensembles: a new representation for determinantal point processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06345*, 2021.
- [48] Joris Van der Hoeven. *Transseries and real differential algebra*, volume 1888. Springer, 2006.
- [49] Aad W van der Vaart and J Harry van Zanten. Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on gaussian process priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(3):1435–1463, 2008.
- [50] Grace Wahba. *Spline models for observational data*. SIAM, 1990.
- [51] Holger Wendland. *Scattered data approximation*, volume 17. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [52] Christopher KI Williams and Carl Edward Rasmussen. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT press Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- [53] Simon N Wood. *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. chapman and hall/CRC, 2006.