

Hypercontractivity Meets Random Convex Hulls: Analysis of Randomized Multivariate Cubatures

Satoshi Hayakawa, Harald Oberhauser, Terry Lyons
Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford
{hayakawa, oberhauser, tlyons}@maths.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Given a probability measure μ on a set \mathcal{X} and a vector-valued function φ , a common problem is to construct a discrete probability measure on \mathcal{X} such that the push-forward of these two probability measures under φ is the same. This construction is at the heart of numerical integration methods that run under various names such as quadrature, cubature, or recombination. A natural approach is to sample points from μ until their convex hull of their image under φ includes the mean of φ . Here we analyze the computational complexity of this approach when φ exhibits a graded structure by using so-called hypercontractivity. The resulting theorem not only covers the classical cubature case of multivariate polynomials, but also integration on pathspace, as well as kernel quadrature for product measures.

1 Introduction

Let X be a random variable that takes values in a set \mathcal{X} , and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ a linear, finite dimensional space of integrable functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} . A cubature formula for (X, \mathcal{F}) is a finite set of points $(x_i) \subset \mathcal{X}$ and weights $(w_i) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(x_i) \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (1)$$

If the function class \mathcal{F} is infinite-dimensional one can not hope for equality in (1) and instead aims to find an approximation that holds uniformly over \mathcal{F} . We also denote $\mu = \text{Law}(X)$ and refer to $\hat{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \delta_{x_i}$ as the cubature measure for (X, \mathcal{F}) . The existence of such a cubature formula that further satisfies $n \leq 1 + \dim P$, $w_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$ is guaranteed by what is often referred to as Tchakaloff's theorem although a more accurate nomenclature would involve Wald, Richter, Rogosinski, and Rosenbloom [62, 57, 49, 50, 51]; see [17] for a historical perspective. Arguably the most famous applications concerns the case when \mathcal{X} is a subset of \mathbb{R}^d and \mathcal{F} is the linear space of polynomials up to a certain degree, that is \mathcal{F} is spanned by monomials up to a certain degree. However, more recent applications include the case when \mathcal{X} is a space of paths and \mathcal{F} is spanned by iterated Ito–Stratonovich integrals [39], or kernel quadrature [33, 27] where \mathcal{X} is a set that carries a positive definite kernel and \mathcal{F} is a subset of the associated reproducing kernel Hilber space that is spanned by eigenfunctions of the integral operator induced by a kernel.

Convex Hulls. If \mathcal{F} is spanned by m functions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we can denote $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and see that (1) is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \varphi(x_i).$$

If we restrict attention to non-negative weights that sum up to one (equivalently, $\hat{\mu}$ is a probability measure) this is equivalent to that statement that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] \in \text{conv}\{\varphi(x_1), \dots, \varphi(x_n)\}, \quad (2)$$

where we denote for an $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ its convex hull as

$$\text{conv } A = \left\{ c_1 a_1 + \dots + c_k a_k \mid k \geq 1, a_i \in A, c_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^k c_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Random Convex Hulls. A natural and general approach to find points $(x_i) \subset \mathcal{X}$ for which (2) holds was recently proposed in [24]: draw $N \gg n$ independent random samples $(X_j)_{j=1}^N$ from μ and subsequently try to select a subset of n points (x_i) . The success of this approach amounts the event that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] \in \text{conv}\{\varphi(X_1), \dots, \varphi(X_N)\}, \quad (3)$$

since then simple linear programming (LP) allows select the subset of x_i 's resp. compute the remaining weights that determine a cubature formula. The following guarantees that for large enough N this event occurs with high probability

Proposition 1 ([24]). *If X_1, X_2, \dots are independent copies of X , then the probability of the event (3) tends to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Empirically, this approach turns out to work well already for “reasonable” magnitudes of N [24, 27]. The aim of this article is to fill this gap and provide theoretical guarantees for the number of samples N for which this approach leads with high probability to a successful cubature construction; that is to provide a quantitative version of Proposition 1 that applies to common cases.

Hypercontractivity. Our main tool is hypercontractivity. This allows to prove the existence of a constant C'_m satisfying (mainly for $p = 4$)

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(X)|^p] \leq C'_m \mathbb{E}[|f(X)|^2]^{p/2}$$

uniformly for a large class of functions f , and where X follows the product measure $\mu^{\otimes d}$. While hypercontractivity is classically studied for Gaussian, discrete, and uniform probability measures on hypercubes or hyperspheres [11, 43, 6, 7]. We generalize it to function classes that have a certain graded structure.

Contribution. Our main result is to provide an upper bound for the number of samples N such that an N -point i.i.d. sample of random vectors contains the expectation in its convex hull, i.e. the event (3) occurs, with a reasonable probability. Although the connection between the bound for N and the hypercontractivity of the given random vector/function class has implicitly been proven in a preceding study [26] in the form of Theorem 3, generic conditions for having a good hypercontractivity constant and why the magnitude of required N becomes reasonably small in practice have not been established or understood.

In this paper, we address these questions by

- extending the hypercontractivity for the Wiener chaos to what we call generalized random polynomials (Section 3) and
- showing that this extension naturally applies to important examples in numerical analysis including classical cubature, cubature on Wiener space, and kernel quadrature (Section 4).

We explain the intuition behind these points by introducing Theorem 1 and Example 1:

Theorem 1 (informal). *Let μ be a probability measure on \mathcal{X} . Suppose we have a “natural” function class*

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 1} \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_{d,m},$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{d,m}$ denotes a set of functions from \mathcal{X}^d to \mathbb{R} of “degree” up to m . Then, under some integrability assumptions, there exists for every m a constant $C_m = C_m(\mu, \mathcal{F}) > 0$ such that the following holds:

Let d and D be two positive integers and $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_D) : \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ with $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_D \in \mathcal{F}_{d,m}$. Then, for all integers $N \geq C_m D$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] \in \text{conv}\{\varphi(X_1), \dots, \varphi(X_N)\}) \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

where X, X_1, \dots, X_N are i.i.d. samples from the product measure $\mu^{\otimes d}$ on \mathcal{X}^d .

Example 1. Although the “assumption” in the above statement is somewhat abstract, this applies to important examples as follows:

- **Classical Cubature** [56]: μ is a probability measure with finite m moments and $\mathcal{F}_{d,m}$ is the space of d -variate polynomials up to degree m .
- **Cubature on Wiener space** [39]: μ is the Wiener measure and $\mathcal{F}_{d,m}$ is spanned by up to m -times iterated Ito–Stratonovich integrals.
- **Kernel quadrature** [33, 27]: μ is a probability measure on set \mathcal{X} that carries a positive definite kernel k and $\mathcal{F}_{d,m}$ is spanned by the eigenfunctions (down to some eigenvalue) of the integral operator $g \mapsto \int k^{\otimes d}(\cdot, x)g(x) d\mu^{\otimes d}(x)$, where $k^{\otimes d}$ is a tensor product kernel.

Related work. If the measure μ has finite support, the problem (1) is also known as recombination. While in this case, the existence follows immediately from Caratheodory’s theorem, the design of efficient algorithms to compute the cubature measure is more recent; we mention efficient deterministic algorithms [37, 58, 40] and randomized speedups [15]. For non-discrete measures, the majority of the cubature constructions are typically limited to algebraic approaches that cannot apply to general situations. Related to our convex hull approach but different, is a line of research aiming at constructing general cubature formulas with positive weights by using least-squares instead of the random convex hull approach [21, 42]. As their theory is on the positivity of the resulting cubature formula given by solving a certain least squares problem, requires more (or efficiently selected) points than that needed for simply obtaining a positively weighted cubature.

Hypercontractivity is the key technical tool for our estimates and its use seems to be novel in the context of cubature resp. random convex hull problems. Somewhat related to the special case of kernel quadrature, [41] proves a generalization error bound for kernel ridge regression with random features, however hypercontractivity is simply adopted as a technical assumption. Further, for low-degree polynomials of a sequence of random variables, Kim and Vu [34], Schudy and Sviridenko [53] give similar estimates on their higher order moments, but they mainly estimate the concentration of the moments, and do not generally analyze the kurtosis-type values appearing in the hypercontractivity.

Outline. In Section 2, we give briefly explain recent results on random convex hulls, and give some assertions that additionally follow from them. In Section 3, we introduce the Gaussian hypercontractivity and show its generalization that is suitable for multivariate cubatures. Section 4 gives some applications of Gaussian/generalized hypercontractivity to random convex hulls with product structure, including cubature on Wiener space and kernel quadrature. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 5. All the omitted proofs are given in Appendix B.

2 Random Convex Hulls

Our main interest is the probability of the event (3) but it turns out to be more convenient to study a more general problem. Therefore we define

Definition 1. Let X be a D -dimensional random vector and X_1, X_2, \dots be iid copies of X . For every integer $N > 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ define

$$p_{N,X}(\theta) := \mathbb{P}(\theta \in \text{conv}\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}) \text{ and } N_X(\theta) := \inf\{N \mid p_{N,X}(\theta) \geq 1/2\}.$$

Both of these quantities are classically studied for symmetric X by Wendel [63], but more recently sharp inequalities for general X [60, 26] as well as calculations on the Gaussian case [31] have been established. Using this notation, our main interests is the choice $\theta = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)]$. In the following two paragraphs we briefly discuss how bounds on $N_X(\theta)$ can be derived with previous approaches; in Section 3 we then discuss the approach via hypercontractivity.

Bounds via Tukey Depth. It turns out that a classical quantity from statistics, the so-called Tukey depth [59, 52], is closely related to the two quantities.

Definition 2. The Tukey depth of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ with respect to the distribution of X is defined as

$$\alpha_X(\theta) := \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}^D \setminus \{0\}} \mathbb{P}(c^\top (X - \theta) \leq 0). \quad (4)$$

The relation between the above quantities is

Theorem 2 ([26]). Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and X be an arbitrary D -dimensional random vector. Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\alpha_X(\theta)} \leq N_X(\theta) \leq \left\lceil \frac{3D}{\alpha_X(\theta)} \right\rceil.$$

The above can be used to provide a novel bound on $N_X(\mathbb{E}[X])$ for a general class of distributions called *log-concave*,

Proposition 2. If X is a D -dimensional log-concave random vector, we have $N_X(\mathbb{E}[X]) \leq \lceil 3eD \rceil$.

Bounds via Moments. Theorem 2 gives a good intuition behind the random convex hulls, but computing the Tukey depth $\alpha_X(\theta)$ itself is in general a difficult task [16, 64]. In [26] an alternative way to bound $N_X(\theta)$ is provided by using the Berry–Esseen theorem [10, 20, 36].

Theorem 3 ([26]). Let X be an arbitrary D -dimensional random vector with $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|^3] < \infty$. If a constant $K > 0$ satisfies $\|c^\top (X - \mathbb{E}[X])\|_{L^3} \leq K \|c^\top (X - \mathbb{E}[X])\|_{L^2}$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}^D$, then we have

$$N_X(\mathbb{E}[X]) \leq 17(1 + 9K^6/4)D.$$

This result still recovers a sharp bound $N_X(\mathbb{E}[X]) = \mathcal{O}(D)$ up to constant for a Gaussian, where we have detailed information about the marginals. The sort of inequality assumed in the statement is also called Khintchin’s inequality (see e.g., [35, 19]) and there are known values of B for a certain class of X such as a Rademacher vector. Indeed, we can easily show the following estimate under a clear independence structure:

Proposition 3. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_D)^\top$ be a D -dimensional random vector whose coordinates are independent and identically distributed. If $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ and $\|X_1\|_{L^4} \leq K \|X_1\|_{L^2}$ holds for a constant $K > 0$, then we have $\|c^\top X\|_{L^4} \leq K \|c^\top X\|_{L^2}$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}^D$.

3 Hypercontractivity

The previous section provides bounds on N_X but the assumptions—log-concavity or coordinate-wise independence—are too strong for many applications. We now develop an approach via hypercontractivity; this results in bounds that apply under much less strict assumptions.

Hypercontractivity: the Gaussian case. It is instructive to briefly review the classical results for Gaussian measures by following Janson [30] since we need several generalizations of this.

Theorem 4 (Wiener Chaos Decomposition). *Let H be a Gaussian Hilbert space¹ and let $\sigma(H)$ be the σ -algebra generated by H . Then*

$$L^2(\Omega, \sigma(H), \mathbb{P}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H^{(n)},$$

where $H^{(n)} := \overline{P_n(H)} \cap P_{n-1}(H)^\perp$ with

$$P_n(H) := \{f(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \mid f \text{ is a polynomial of degree } \leq m, Y_1, \dots, Y_m \in H, m < \infty\}$$

with $P_{-1}(H) := \{0\}$ and $\overline{P_n(H)}$ denotes the completion in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

Hence, for each $X \in L^2(\Omega, \sigma(H), \mathbb{P})$, we have a unique decomposition $X = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X_n$ such that $X_n \in H^{(n)}$.

Theorem 5 (Hypercontractivity, [30], Theorem 5.8). *For $r \in [0, 1]$ denote*

$$T_r : L^2(\Omega, \sigma(H), \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \sigma(H), \mathbb{P}), \quad X \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n X_n.$$

If $p > 2$ and $0 < r \leq (p-1)^{-1/2}$, then we have

$$\|T_r(X)\|_{L^p} \leq \|X\|_{L^2}.$$

From this, we have the following moment bound on $\overline{P_n(H)}$, which is also referred to as hypercontractivity, see for example [45].

Theorem 6. *Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer. For each $p > 2$, we have*

$$\|X\|_{L^p} \leq (p-1)^{n/2} \|X\|_{L^2}, \quad X \in \overline{P_n(H)}.$$

Proof. Let $X = \sum_{m=0}^n X_m$ with $X_m \in H^{(m)}$. For $0 < r \leq (p-1)^{-1/2}$, by Theorem 5, we have

$$\|X\|_{L^p}^2 = \left\| T_r \left(\sum_{m=0}^n r^{-m} X_m \right) \right\|_{L^p}^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{m=0}^n r^{-m} X_m \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{m=0}^n r^{-2m} \|X_m\|_{L^2}^2 \leq r^{-2n} \|X\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We obtain the conclusion by letting $r = (p-1)^{-1/2}$. □

We included the proof since we are going to generalize it in the next section.

3.1 Hypercontractivity for Generalized Random Polynomials

The phenomenon of hypercontractivity is not limited to the Gaussian setting. Indeed, the hypercontractivity of operators on the space of boolean functions (i.e., $\{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) associated with the uniform measure was established even before the Gaussian case [11, 54]. Our focus is to obtain estimates analogous to Theorem 6 when a graded class of test function is given; we refer to such a class as generalized random polynomials.

¹A Gaussian Hilbert space is a closed linear subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$ whose elements all follow Gaussian distributions.

Generalized Random Polynomials.

Definition 3. Under a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$, a triplet $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ is called GRP if it satisfies the following conditions:

- Y is a random variable taking values in a topological space \mathcal{X} .
- $Q = (Q_m)_{m=0}^{\infty}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of linear spaces of $L^2(\mathbb{P}_Y)$ -integrable functions $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Namely, if we let $Q_m(Y) := \{f(Y) \mid f \in Q_m\}$, then each Q_m is a linear subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{P})$, with $Q_0 \subset Q_1 \subset \dots \subset L^2(\mathbb{P})$. We additionally assume Q_0 is the set of constant functions.
- $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies $1 = \lambda_0 > \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$.

If G is a GRP, we also define $\widetilde{\deg}_G X := \inf\{1/\lambda_m \mid m \geq 0, X \in \overline{Q_m(Y)}\}$.

Intuitively, each Q_m is a generalization of degree- m polynomials and $\widetilde{\deg}_G$ indicates the “degree” of such functions (though Y plays a role in the latter). In the setting of actual polynomials like Wiener chaos, we can define $\lambda_m = b^{-m}$ for a certain $b > 1$, and then we have $\deg X = \log_b \widetilde{\deg}_G X$ for the usual degree of X as a random polynomial.

Definition 4. Let $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ be a GRP. We define

$$H_m(Y) := \overline{Q_m(Y)} \cap Q_{m-1}(Y)^\perp$$

in terms of $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ where $Q_{-1}(Y) := \{0\}$ and

$$H_\infty := L^2(\Omega, \sigma(Y), \mathbb{P}) \cap \left(\bigcup_{m=0}^M Q_m(Y) \right)^\perp.$$

We refer

$$L^2(\Omega, \sigma(Y), \mathbb{P}) = \left(\bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} H_m(Y) \right) \oplus H_\infty(Y)$$

as the orthogonal decomposition associated with G .

Definition 5. Let $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ be a GRP. The operator $T(G)$ is defined as

$$T(G) : L^2(\Omega, \sigma(Y), \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \sigma(Y), \mathbb{P}), \quad X \mapsto \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda_m X_m,$$

where $(X_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty}$ with $X_m \in H_m(Y)$ is the orthogonal decomposition of X associated with the GRP G . We say that a GRP $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ is $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractive if

$$\|T(G)^s X\|_{L^p} \leq \|X\|_{L^2}, \quad X \in L^2(\Omega, \sigma(Y), \mathbb{P}).$$

Thus,

$$T(G)^s X = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda_m^s X_m \text{ for } s > 0$$

and if G is $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractive, it is $(2, p; t)$ -hypercontractive for all $t \geq s$ as $T(G)^{t-s}$ is a contraction in L^2 . The formulation of G associated with “degree” concept given by λ then naturally extends to the multivariate case.

Definition 6. We call a set of d GRPs, $G^{(i)} = (Y^{(i)}, Q^{(i)}, \lambda^{(i)})$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$ independent, if the $Y^{(i)}$'s are independent random variables taking values in $\mathcal{X}^{(i)}$'s. For d independent GRPs, their product is a GRP $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ that is defined as follows

- $Y = (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(d)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}^{(d)}$.
- λ_m is the $(m+1)$ -th largest value in the set $\left\{ \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_{m_i}^{(i)} \mid \lambda_{m_i}^{(i)} \in \lambda^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, d \right\}$.
- $Q_m = \text{span} \left\{ f : (x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^d f_i(x_i) \mid f_i \in Q_{m_i}^{(i)}, \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_{m_i}^{(i)} \leq \lambda_m \right\}$.

As $Q_m(Y) \subset L^2$ it follows from independence for each m that $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ is indeed a GRP. We also denote it by $G = G^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes G^{(d)}$.

Example 2. Consider the case when $Q_m^{(i)}$ are degree- m polynomials of $Y^{(i)}$ and $\lambda_m^{(i)} = t^m$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$ independent of i . This shows that the product GRP generalizes the multivariate random polynomials. Also, when $Y^{(i)}$ are i.i.d. and $(Q^{(i)}, \lambda^{(i)})$ are the same for all $i = 1, \dots, d$, then we say $G^{(i)}$ are i.i.d. and we can particular write $G \simeq (G^{(1)})^{\otimes d}$.

A straightforward generalization follows from the classical way of proving hypercontractivity. Nevertheless, it turns out to be very useful for treating multivariate hypercontractivity of our GRP setting.

Theorem 7. Let $r \in (0, 1]$ and $p > 2$. If d independent GRPs $G^{(1)}, \dots, G^{(d)}$ are all $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractive, then their product $G = G^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes G^{(d)}$ is also $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractive.

Remark 1. We only use the $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractivity in this paper, but we can also deduce the same results for the general $(q, p; s)$ -hypercontractivity with $1 \leq q \leq p < \infty$ (for the operator norm of $L^q \rightarrow L^p$), analogous to e.g. Janson [30].

The following is a parallel result of Theorem 6 and the proof is almost identical.

Proposition 4. Let $s > 0$ and $p > 2$. If G is a GRP that is $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractive, then we have $\|X\|_{L^p} \leq (\widetilde{\text{deg}}_G X)^s \|X\|_{L^2}$ for all $X \in L^2$.

Remark 2. Although we have treated general GRPs $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ in these propositions, we are basically only interested in the moment inequality for X up to some “degree” fixed beforehand (in the case of Wiener chaos, it suffices to treat $P_n(H)$ for some finite n to obtain Theorem 6). Thus, our main interest is in “finite” GRPs, satisfying $Q_n = Q_{n+1} = \dots$ for some n , and their product in practice, which the might be better for readers to have in mind when reading the next proposition.

We next show the following “converse” result for the relation of the hypercontractivity and moment estimate for a (truncated) GRP when $p = 4$.

Proposition 5. Let $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ be a GRP. Suppose there exists a $s > 0$ such that

$$\|X_m\|_{L^4} \leq \lambda_m^{-s} \|X_m\|_{L^2}, \quad X_m \in H_m(Y)$$

holds for all m . If $t > s$ satisfies

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{t-s} \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$$

and $\lambda_1^t \leq 1/2$, then G is $(2, 4; t)$ -hypercontractive.

By using this, we can also prove the following as a non-quantitative result.

Theorem 8. Let $K > 0$ and G be a GRP such that the space $\{X \in L^2 \mid \widetilde{\text{deg}}_G X \leq K\}$ is included in $L^4(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and finite-dimensional. Then, there exists a constant $C = C(G, K)$ such that for an arbitrary d , $\|X\|_{L^4} \leq C \|X\|_{L^2}$ holds if we have $\widetilde{\text{deg}}_{G^{\otimes d}} X \leq K$.

4 Applications

The generality of Proposition 5 and Theorem 8 allows to quantify the number of samples resp. probability of success of the random convex hull approach to the problem of cubature. Concretely, we give formal statements of Theorem 1 for (i) Classical Cubature, (ii) Cubature on Wiener Space, (iii) Kernel Quadrature. various cubature constructions.

4.1 Classical Polynomial Cubatures

When the GRP G are actual random polynomials, we recover the following result

Corollary 1. *Let m be a positive integer and $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots$ be i.i.d. real-valued random variables with $\mathbb{E}[|X^{(1)}|^{4m}] < \infty$. Then, there exists a constant $C_m > 0$ such that*

$$\|f(X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(d)})\|_{L^4} \leq C_m \|f(X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(d)})\|_{L^2}$$

for any positive integer d and any polynomial $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with degree up to m .

Proof. By introducing a truncated GRP given by a random variable $X^{(1)}$, function spaces Q_i of univariate polynomials up to degree i , and $\lambda_i = 2^{-i}$ for $0 \leq i \leq m$, we can apply Theorem 8 to obtain the desired result. \square

If we combine this with Theorem 3, we obtain the following result for polynomial cubatures:

Corollary 2. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer and $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots$ be i.i.d. real-valued random variables with $\mathbb{E}[|X^{(1)}|^{4m}] < \infty$. Then, there exists a constant $C_m > 0$ such that the following holds:*

Let $d \geq 1$ be an integer and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ be a D -dimensional vector-valued function such that each coordinate is given by a polynomial up to degree m . If we let $\mathbf{X}_1^{(1:d)}, \mathbf{X}_2^{(1:d)}, \dots$ be independent copies of $\mathbf{X}^{(1:d)} = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(d)})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(\mathbf{X}^{(1:d)})\right] \in \text{conv}\{\varphi(\mathbf{X}_1^{(1:d)}), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{X}_N^{(1:d)})\}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for all integers $N \geq C_m D$.

4.2 Cubature on Wiener Space

Cubature on Wiener space [39] is a weak approximation scheme for stochastic differential equations; at the heart of it is the construction of a finite measure on pathspace, such that the expectation of their first m -times iterated integrals matches those of Brownian motion. Some algebraic constructions are known for degree $m = 3, 5$ [39] as well as $m = 7$ [44]. The random convex hull approach applies in principle for any m , however, a caveat is that the discretization of paths becomes an issue in particular for high values of m ; some experimental results are available in [25] for constructing them by using random samples of piecewise linear approximations of Brownian motion. In this section, we use hypercontractivity to estimate the number of samples needed in this approach to cubature via sampling.

Random Convex Hulls of Iterated Integrals. For a bounded-variation (BV) path $x = (x^0, \dots, x^d) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion $B = (B^1, \dots, B^d)$ with $B_t^0 := t$, we define the iterated integrals as

$$I^\alpha(x) := \int_{0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k < 1} dx_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots dx_{t_k}^{\alpha_k}, \quad I^\alpha(B) := \int_{0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k < 1} \circ dB_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \circ dB_{t_k}^{\alpha_k},$$

where the latter is given by the Stratonovich stochastic integral. Then, a degree m cubature formula on Wiener space for d -dimensional Brownian motion is a set of BV paths $x_1, \dots, x_n :$

$[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and convex weights w_1, \dots, w_n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i I^\alpha(x_i) = \mathbb{E}[I^\alpha(B)]$ for all multi-indices $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \bigcup_{\ell \geq 1} \{0, 1, \dots, d\}^\ell$ with $\|\alpha\| := k + |\{j \mid \alpha_j = 0\}| \leq m$.

Indeed, if we consider the Gaussian Hilbert space given by

$$H := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 f_i(t) dB_t^i \mid f_1, \dots, f_d \in L^2([0, 1]) \right\},$$

the iterated integral $I^\alpha(B)$ with $\|\alpha\| \leq m$ is in the m -th Wiener chaos $\overline{P_m(H)}$ (see Section 3) as it can be expressed as a limit of polynomials of increments of B . We thus have the hypercontractivity given in Theorem 6 and the following assertion:

Corollary 3. *Let $d, m \geq 1$ be integers and B be a d -dimensional Brownian motion. Then, for an arbitrary linear combination $X = \sum_{\|\alpha\| \leq m} c_\alpha I^\alpha(B)$ with $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\|X\|_{L^3} \leq 2^{m/2} \|X\|_{L^2}$.*

As the bound is independent of the dimension d of the underlying Brownian motion, we have the following version of Theorem 1 by combining it with Theorem 3 as follows:

Corollary 4. *Let $d, m \geq 1$ be integers and B, B_1, B_2, \dots be independent standard d -dimensional Brownian motions. Then, if $\varphi(B)$ is a D -dimensional random vector such that each coordinate is given by a linear combination of $(I^\alpha(B))_{\|\alpha\| \leq m}$, then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[\varphi(B)] \in \text{conv}\{\varphi(B_1), \dots, \varphi(B_N)\}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for all integers $N \geq 17(1 + 18 \cdot 8^{m-1})D$.

The above allows to choose the number of candidate paths that need to be sampled. However, as mentioned above, one challenge that is specific to cubature on pathspace is that one cannot sample a true Brownian trajectory which leads to an additional discretization error. However, we conjecture that the number of random samples divided by D and the number of time partitions for piecewise linear approximation in constructing cubature on Wiener space can be independent of the underlying dimension d .

Remark 3. One can also apply these estimates to fractional Brownian motion [48], though we also need to obtain the exact expectations of iterated integrals of fractional Brownian motion (we can find some results on the Ito-type iterated integrals without the time integral by $B_t^0 = t$ in the literature [5, Theorem 31]).

4.3 Kernel Quadrature for Product Measures

Let \mathcal{X} be a topological space and $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive definite kernel with the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) \mathcal{H}_k [9]. A *kernel quadrature* for a random variable X or equivalently a Borel probability measure μ (i.e., $X \sim \mu$) on \mathcal{X} is a cubature formula for (\mathcal{H}_k, μ) ; that is, a set of points $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and weights $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}_n = \sum w_i \delta_{x_i}$ minimizes worst-case error

$$\text{wce}(\tilde{\mu}_n; \mathcal{H}_k, \mu) := \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(x_i) \right|, \quad (5)$$

which we might just denote by $\text{wce}(\tilde{\mu}_n)$, has been widely studied from the viewpoint of optimization [14, 4, 29] as well as sampling [3, 8, 27].

Tensor Product Kernels. When there are d pairs of space and kernel $(\mathcal{X}_1, k_1), \dots, (\mathcal{X}_d, k_d)$, the *tensor product kernel* on the product space $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_d$ is defined as

$$(k_1 \otimes \dots \otimes k_d)(x, y) := \prod_{i=1}^d k_i(x_i, y_i), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_d), y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_d.$$

This is indeed the reproducing kernel of the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{k_d}$ in terms of RKHS [9]. The most important example of this construction is when the underlying d kernels are the same, $k^{\otimes d} = k \otimes \cdots \otimes k$. Given a probability measure μ in the (conceptually univariate) space \mathcal{X} , constructing a kernel quadrature for $\mu^{\otimes d}$ with respect to $k^{\otimes d}$ is a natural multivariate extension of kernel quadrature that is widely studied in the literature [47, 32, 3, 33], and corresponds to high-dimensional QMCs [18].

Mercer Expansions and Quadrature. The convergence rate of $\text{wce}(\tilde{\mu}_n)$ is typically described by using the Mercer expansion:

$$k(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sigma_{\ell} e_{\ell}(x) e_{\ell}(y), \quad (6)$$

where $(\sigma_{\ell}, e_{\ell})_{\ell=1}^{\infty}$ are eigenpairs of the integral operator $\mathcal{K} : f \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\cdot, y) f(y) d\mu(y)$ in $L^2(\mu)$ with $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq 0$ and $\|e_{\ell}\|_{L^2(\mu)} = 1$.

Assumption A. *The kernel k satisfies that the expansion (6) converges pointwise, $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sigma_{\ell} < \infty$, and $(\sqrt{\sigma_{\ell}} e_{\ell})_{\ell=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_k .*

Mild conditions already imply that Assumption A applies, e.g., $\text{supp } \mu = \mathcal{X}$, k is continuous, and $x \mapsto k(x, x)$ is in $L^1(\mu)$ is sufficient, see [55]. Under this assumption, an n -point kernel quadrature rule that exactly integrates the first $n - 1$ eigenfunctions satisfies the following theoretical guarantee:

Proposition 6 ([27]). *Under Assumption A, let $\tilde{\mu}_n = (w_i, x_i)_{i=1}^n$ be a kernel quadrature with convex weights satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{X}} e_{\ell}(x) d\mu(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i e_{\ell}(x_i)$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, n - 1$. Then, by letting $r_n(x) := \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \sigma_m e_m(x)^2$, we have $\text{wce}(\tilde{\mu}_n)^2 \leq 4 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r_n(x)$.*

We have more favorable bounds on $\text{wce}(\tilde{\mu}_n)$ by assuming more, but the important fact here is that the event (3) for a vector-valued φ given by eigenfunctions e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} enables us to construct an interesting numerical scheme. A similar approach, specialized to a Gaussian kernel over a Gaussian measure can be found in [33]. As the construction of such $\tilde{\mu}_n$ for general k and μ relies on random sampling, we want to estimate $N_{\varphi(X)}(\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)])$ for $X \sim \mu$ and $\varphi = (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1})$.

From RKHS to GRP. To make it compatible with the framework of GRPs introduced in the previous section, we further assume the following condition, which ensures that the kernel is in an appropriate scaling.

Assumption A'. *The kernel k satisfies Assumption A, $\sigma_1 \leq 1$, and the strict inequality $\sigma_{\ell} < 1$ holds if $e_{\ell} \in L^2(\mu)$ is not constant.*

Under Assumption A', we can naturally define a GRP $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ with Y following μ , $Q_m = \text{span}\{1, e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ and $\lambda_m = \sigma_m$ for $m \geq 1$. Note that it violates the condition $\lambda_1 < 1$ if $\sigma_1 = 1$ and e_1 is constant, but in that case we can simply decrement all the indices of (Q_m, λ_m) by one. We call it the *natural GRP* for k and μ and denote it by $G = G_{k, \mu}$.

Remark 4. The scaling given in Assumption A' is essential to the hypercontractivity under the framework of tensor product kernels when considering ‘‘eigenspace down to some eigenvalue.’’ Indeed, if $\sigma_{\ell} \geq 1$ for some nonconstant eigenfunction e_{ℓ} , we have, for $p > 2$,

$$\frac{\|e_{\ell}^{\otimes d}\|_{L^p(\mu^{\otimes d})}}{\|e_{\ell}^{\otimes d}\|_{L^2(\mu^{\otimes d})}} = \left(\frac{\|e_{\ell}\|_{L^p(\mu)}}{\|e_{\ell}\|_{L^2(\mu)}} \right)^d$$

which increases exponentially as d grows, whereas the corresponding eigenvalue is lower bounded by 1. So the hypercontractivity in our sense never gets satisfied if $\sigma_{\ell} \geq 1$ for a nonconstant e_{ℓ} .

The following statement, written without GRPs, is what we can prove by using the hypercontractivity of GRPs.

Proposition 7. *Let k satisfy Assumption A' and Y_1, Y_2, \dots independently follow μ . For each $\delta > 0$, define a set of random variables as*

$$S(\delta) := \text{span}(\{1\} \cup \{e_{\ell_1}(Y_{m_1}) \cdots e_{\ell_k}(Y_{m_k}) \mid k \geq 1, m_1 < \cdots < m_k, \sigma_{\ell_1} \cdots \sigma_{\ell_k} \geq \delta\}).$$

Then, if $\|e_\ell(Y_1)\|_{L^4} < \infty$ holds for all ℓ with $\sigma_\ell \geq \delta$, then there is a constant $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that $\|X\|_{L^4} \leq C\|X\|_{L^2}$ for all $X \in S(\delta)$.

Proof. The finiteness of the dimension of eigenspace for Y_1 , i.e, the finiteness of ℓ satisfying $\sigma_\ell \geq \delta$ follows from $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sigma_\ell < \infty$ in Assumption A. Thus, Theorem 8 gives the conclusion. \square

This assertion, of course, includes a hypercontractivity statement for an eigenspace of $k^{\otimes d}$ and $\mu^{\otimes d}$ for a fixed d , but we can go further to a quantitative statement by imposing another assumption.

Assumption B. *The kernel k can be written as $k = 1 + k_0$, where $k_0 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a positive definite kernel satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k_0(x, y) d\mu(y) = 0$ for (μ -almost) all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Under Assumption A, this is simply equivalent to e_1 being constant. This assumption might seem artificial, but naturally arises in the following situations:

- (a) \mathcal{X} is a compact group and μ is its Haar measure. k is a positive definite kernel given as $k(x, y) = g(x^{-1}y)$, where $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x) d\mu(x) = 1$.
- (b) k_0 is a kernel called Stein kernel [46, 2] with appropriate scaling.

One theoretically sufficient condition for these assumptions can be described as follows:

Proposition 8. *Let \mathcal{X} be compact metrizable and path-connected, $\text{supp } \mu = \mathcal{X}$, and k be continuous and nonnegative. If $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x, y) d\mu(y) = 1$ holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, Assumption A' and B hold.*

From this proposition, for instance, an appropriately scaled exponential/Gaussian kernel over the n -sphere with the uniform measure satisfies Assumption A' and B.

Under these two assumptions, the operator $T(G_{k, \mu})$ in terms of GRPs corresponds to the integral operator $\mathcal{K} : f \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\cdot, y) f(y) d\mu(y)$, so the situation becomes even simpler. We can directly apply Proposition 5 by replacing λ 's with σ 's, but we also have the following sufficient conditions for the hypercontractivity without explicitly using the eigenvalue sequence. In the following, $\|\mathcal{K}_0\| := \sigma_2 < 1$ is the operator norm of $\mathcal{K}_0 : f \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} k_0(\cdot, y) f(y) d\mu(y)$ on $L^2(\mu)$, and $\text{tr}(\mathcal{K}_0) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} k_0(x, x) d\mu(x)$. We may have the following quantitative condition for hypercontractivity.

Proposition 9. *Let $k = 1 + k_0$ satisfy Assumption A' and B. When $\|\mathcal{K}_0\| > 0$, if $r, s \geq 1$ satisfy*

$$\|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{-(r+s)} \geq 2, \quad \|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{-(r-1)} \geq \sqrt{3} \text{tr}(\mathcal{K}_0), \quad \|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{-(s-1)} \geq \|k_0\|_{L^4(\mu \otimes \mu)},$$

then $G_{k, \mu}$ is $(2, 4; r + s)$ -hypercontractive. In particular, if we have $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |k_0(x, x)| \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$, then $G_{k, \mu}$ is $(2, 4; 2)$ -hypercontractive.

Example 3 (Periodic Sobolev spaces over the torus.). *Following Bach [3], we consider periodic kernels over $[0, 1]$. Therefore let $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$, μ be the uniform distribution on \mathcal{X} , and define*

$$k_{r, \delta}(x, y) = 1 + \delta \cdot \frac{(-1)^{r-1} (2\pi)^{2r}}{(2r)!} B_{2r}(|x - y|) \tag{7}$$

for each positive integer s and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, where B_{2r} is the $2r$ -th Bernoulli polynomial [61]. $\delta = 1$ is assumed in the original definition, but it violates Assumption A' (see also Remark 4). Albeit this slight modification, the kernel $k_{r,\delta}$ gives an equivalent norm to the periodic Sobolev space in the literature. For $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $k_{r,\delta}$ satisfies Assumption A' and B. The eigenvalues and eigenfunctions with respect to the uniform measure are known [3]; the eigenvalues are: 1 for the constant function, and δm^{-2r} for $c_m(\cdot) := \sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi m \cdot)$ and $s_m(\cdot) := \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi m \cdot)$ for $m \geq 1, 2, \dots$. We now apply Proposition 5 with (for sake of concreteness) $\delta = 1/3$. This gives $\|c_m\|_{L^4(\mu)} = \|s_m\|_{L^4(\mu)} = (3/2)^{1/4}$. Thus, to satisfy the condition of Proposition 5, it suffices for $s < t$ to satisfy $3^s \geq (3/2)^{1/4}$, $\delta^{t-s} \zeta(2r(t-s))$, $3^t \geq 2$, where ζ is Riemann's zeta function. Hence a simple numerical sufficient condition for this is $s = 0.1$ and $t = 1.1$ for $r = 1$, and $t = \log_3 2 \leq 0.631$ for $r \geq 2$, which can be derived by letting $2r(t-s) \geq 2$. To sum up, in the case $r \geq 2$, we only need $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-0.631} D)$ times of sampling for meeting (3) with probability over a half, if $X \sim \mu^{\otimes d}$ and each coordinate of $\varphi : \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ is in the eigenspace of the eigenvalue λ .

5 Concluding remarks

We investigated the number of samples needed for the expectation vector to be contained in their convex hull from the viewpoint of product/graded structure. We showed that the fact that we empirically only need $\mathcal{O}(D)$ times of sampling for the D -dimensional random vector in practical examples can partially be explained by the hypercontractivity in the Gaussian case as well as the generalized situation including random polynomials and product kernels. There are also interesting questions for further research; for example, although in the asymptotic $d \rightarrow \infty$ we established that the required number of sampling divided by D is independent of d , the constants are larger than what purely empirical estimates given in [24, 27] (where $10D$ is sufficient in practice). Another direction, is the case of cubature of Wiener space, as one cannot actually sample from Brownian motion and discretization errors propagate to higher order m ; an promising research direction could be to study ‘‘approximate sampling’’ or consider unbiased simulations [28] for the iterated integrals.

Acknowledgments

Harald Oberhauser and Terry Lyons are supported by the DataSig Program [EP/S026347/1], the Alan Turing Institute [EP/N510129/1], the Oxford-Man Institute, and the CIMDA collaboration by City University Hong Kong and the University of Oxford.

References

- [1] M. Y. An. Log-concave probability distributions: Theory and statistical testing. *Duke University Dept of Economics Working Paper*, 1997.
- [2] A. Anastasiou, A. Barp, F.-X. Briol, B. Ebner, R. E. Gaunt, F. Ghaderinezhad, J. Gorham, A. Gretton, C. Ley, Q. Liu, L. Mackey, C. J. Oates, G. Reinert, and Y. Swan. Stein’s method meets statistics: A review of some recent developments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03481*, 2021.
- [3] F. Bach. On the equivalence between kernel quadrature rules and random feature expansions. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):714–751, 2017.
- [4] F. Bach, S. Lacoste-Julien, and G. Obozinski. On the equivalence between herding and conditional gradient algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1355–1362, 2012.

- [5] F. Baudoin and L. Coutin. Operators associated with a stochastic differential equation driven by fractional Brownian motions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 117(5):550–574, 2007.
- [6] W. Beckner. Inequalities in Fourier analysis. *Annals of Mathematics*, 102(1):159–182, 1975.
- [7] W. Beckner. Sobolev inequalities, the Poisson semigroup, and analysis on the sphere s^n . *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 89(11):4816–4819, 1992.
- [8] A. Belhadji, R. Bardenet, and P. Chainais. Kernel quadrature with DPPs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 12907–12917, 2019.
- [9] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer, 2004.
- [10] A. C. Berry. The accuracy of the Gaussian approximation to the sum of independent variates. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 49(1):122–136, 1941.
- [11] A. Bonami. Étude des coefficients de Fourier des fonctions de $L^p(G)$. *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, 20(2):335–402, 1970.
- [12] S. Boyd, S. P. Boyd, and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [13] A. Caplin and B. Nalebuff. Aggregation and social choice: A mean voter theorem. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1–23, 1991.
- [14] Y. Chen, M. Welling, and A. Smola. Super-samples from kernel herding. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 109–116, 2010.
- [15] F. Cosentino, H. Oberhauser, and A. Abate. A randomized algorithm to reduce the support of discrete measures. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 15100–15110, 2020.
- [16] J. A. Cuesta-Albertos and A. Nieto-Reyes. The random Tukey depth. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(11):4979–4988, 2008.
- [17] P. J. di Dio and K. Schmudgen. The multidimensional truncated moment problem: The moment cone. *arXiv: Functional Analysis*, 2018.
- [18] J. Dick, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. High-dimensional integration: The quasi-Monte Carlo way. *Acta Numerica*, 22:133–288, 2013.
- [19] A. Eskenazis, P. Nayar, and T. Tkocz. Sharp comparison of moments and the log-concave moment problem. *Advances in Mathematics*, 334:389–416, 2018.
- [20] C.-G. Esseen. On the Liapunoff limit of error in the theory of probability. *Arkiv for Matematik, Astronomi och Fysik, A: 1–19*, 1942.
- [21] J. Glaubitz. Stable high-order cubature formulas for experimental data. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 447:110693, 2021.
- [22] B. Grünbaum. Partitions of mass-distributions and of convex bodies by hyperplanes. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 10(4):1257–1261, 1960.
- [23] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- [24] S. Hayakawa. Monte Carlo cubature construction. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 38:561–577, 2021.

- [25] S. Hayakawa and K. Tanaka. Monte Carlo construction of cubature on Wiener space. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 39(2):543–571, 2022.
- [26] S. Hayakawa, T. Lyons, and H. Oberhauser. Estimating the probability that a given vector is in the convex hull of a random sample. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04250*, 2021.
- [27] S. Hayakawa, H. Oberhauser, and T. Lyons. Positively weighted kernel quadrature via sub-sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2107.09597.
- [28] P. Henry-Labordere, X. Tan, and N. Touzi. Unbiased simulation of stochastic differential equations. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(6):3305–3341, 2017.
- [29] F. Huszár and D. Duvenaud. Optimally-weighted herding is Bayesian quadrature. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 377–386, 2012.
- [30] S. Janson. *Gaussian Hilbert spaces*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [31] Z. Kabluchko and D. Zaporozhets. Absorption probabilities for Gaussian polytopes and regular spherical simplices. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 52(2):588–616, 2020.
- [32] M. Kanagawa, B. K. Sriperumbudur, and K. Fukumizu. Convergence guarantees for kernel-based quadrature rules in misspecified settings. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29:3296–3304, 2016.
- [33] T. Karvonen and S. Särkkä. Gaussian kernel quadrature at scaled Gauss–Hermite nodes. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 59(4):877–902, 2019.
- [34] J. H. Kim and V. H. Vu. Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications. *Combinatorica*, 20(3):417–434, 2000.
- [35] H. König. On the best constants in the Khintchine inequality for Steinhaus variables. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 203(1):23–57, 2014.
- [36] V. Korolev and I. Shevtsova. An improvement of the Berry–Esseen inequality with applications to Poisson and mixed Poisson random sums. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 2012(2):81–105, 2012.
- [37] C. Litterer and T. Lyons. High order recombination and an application to cubature on Wiener space. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 22(4):1301–1327, 2012.
- [38] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. The geometry of logconcave functions and sampling algorithms. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 30(3):307–358, 2007.
- [39] T. Lyons and N. Victoir. Cubature on Wiener space. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A*, 460:169–198, 2004.
- [40] A. Maalouf, I. Jubran, and D. Feldman. Fast and accurate least-mean-squares solvers. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 8305–8316, 2019.
- [41] S. Mei, T. Misiakiewicz, and A. Montanari. Generalization error of random feature and kernel methods: hypercontractivity and kernel matrix concentration. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2021.
- [42] G. Migliorati and F. Nobile. Stable high-order randomized cubature formulae in arbitrary dimension. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, page 105706, 2022.
- [43] E. Nelson. The free Markoff field. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 12(2):211–227, 1973.

- [44] S. Ninomiya and Y. Shinozaki. On implementation of high-order recombination and its application to weak approximations of stochastic differential equations. In *Proceedings of the NFA 29th Annual Conference*, 2021.
- [45] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati, and G. Reinert. Invariance principles for homogeneous sums: universality of Gaussian Wiener chaos. *The Annals of Probability*, 38(5):1947–1985, 2010.
- [46] C. Oates, M. Girolami, and N. Chopin. Control functionals for Monte Carlo integration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79:695–718, 2017.
- [47] A. O’Hagan. Bayes–Hermite quadrature. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 29(3):245–260, 1991.
- [48] R. Passeggeri. Some results on the signature and cubature of the fractional Brownian motion for $H > \frac{1}{2}$. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07352*, 2016.
- [49] H. Richter. Parameterfreie abschätzung und realisierung von erwartungswerten. *Blätter der DGVMF*, 3(2):147–162, 1957.
- [50] W. W. Rogosinski. Moments of non-negative mass. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 245(1240):1–27, 1958.
- [51] P. C. Rosenbloom. Quelques classes de problèmes extrémaux. ii. *Bulletin de la societe mathematique de France*, 80:183–215, 1952.
- [52] P. J. Rousseeuw and I. Ruts. The depth function of a population distribution. *Metrika*, 49(3):213–244, 1999.
- [53] W. Schudy and M. Sviridenko. Concentration and moment inequalities for polynomials of independent random variables. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 437–446. SIAM, 2012.
- [54] B. Simon and R. Høegh-Krohn. Hypercontractive semigroups and two dimensional self-coupled Bose fields. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 9(2):121–180, 1972.
- [55] I. Steinwart and C. Scovel. Mercer’s theorem on general domains: On the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constructive Approximation*, 35(3):363–417, 2012.
- [56] A. H. Stroud. *Approximate calculation of multiple integrals*. Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [57] V. Tchakaloff. Formules de cubature mécanique à coefficients non négatifs. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 81:123–134, 1957.
- [58] M. Tchernychova. *Carathéodory cubature measures*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2015.
- [59] J. W. Tukey. Mathematics and the picturing of data. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vancouver, 1975*, volume 2, pages 523–531, 1975.
- [60] U. Wagner and E. Welzl. A continuous analogue of the upper bound theorem. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 26(2):205–219, 2001.
- [61] G. Wahba. *Spline Models for Observational Data*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1990.
- [62] A. Wald. Limits of a distribution function determined by absolute moments and inequalities satisfied by absolute moments. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2):280–306, 1939.

- [63] J. G. Wendel. A problem in geometric probability. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 11(1):109–111, 1963.
- [64] Y. Zuo. A new approach for the computation of halfspace depth in high dimensions. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 48(3):900–921, 2019.

A Log-concave distributions

A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called *log-concave* if it satisfies

$$f(tx + (1-t)y) \geq f(x)^t f(y)^{1-t}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. A probability distribution with a log-concave density is also called log-concave, and this class includes the multivariate Gaussian/exponential/Wishart distributions, the uniform distribution over a convex domain, and many more univariate common distributions [1, 12]. For the log-concave random vectors, the following result is known:

Theorem 9 ([13]). *If X is a d -dimensional random vector with log-concave density, then we have $\alpha_X(\mathbb{E}[X]) \geq 1/e$.*

Here, $\alpha_X(\mathbb{E}[X])$ is the Tukey depth of $\mathbb{E}[X]$ with respect to the distribution of X which is defined as (4). The case when X is uniform over a convex set is proven in Grünbaum [22], and Lovász and Vempala [38, Section 5] gives simpler proofs than the original result in Caplin and Nalebuff [13].

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $\|X_1\|_{L^4} < \infty$. If we write $c = (c_1, \dots, c_D)^\top$, then by using independence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|c^\top X\|_{L^4}^4 &= \mathbb{E}[(c^\top X)^4] = \sum_{i=1}^D c_i^4 \mathbb{E}[X_i^4] + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq D} c_i^2 c_j^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \\ &\leq K^4 \sum_{i=1}^D c_i^4 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2]^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq D} c_i^2 c_j^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \\ &\leq K^4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^D c_i^2 \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \right)^2 \leq K^4 \mathbb{E}[(c^\top X)^2]^2, \end{aligned}$$

as we clearly have $K \geq 1$ (or $X = 0$ almost surely). □

B.2 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. We give the proof by generalizing the proof of Lemma 5.3 in Janson [30].

It suffices to prove the statement for $d = 2$, as the product of GRPs is associative. Let $G^{(i)} = (Y^{(i)}, Q^{(i)}, \lambda^{(i)})$ for $i = 1, 2$ be independent GRPs. Let $H_m^{(i)}(Y^{(i)}) := \overline{Q_m^{(i)}(Y^{(i)})} \cap Q_{m-1}^{(i)}(Y^{(i)})^\perp$ for $i = 1, 2$. If we denote the product by $G = G^{(1)} \otimes G^{(2)}$. Then, for a random variable $X = \sum_{\ell, m} X_{\ell, m}$ with $X_{\ell, m} \in H_\ell^{(1)} \otimes H_m^{(2)}$, the operator $T(G)$ acts as

$$T(G)X = \sum_{\ell, m} \lambda_\ell^{(1)} \lambda_m^{(2)} X_{\ell, m}.$$

If each $X_{\ell,m}$ can be written as a finite sum $X_{\ell,m} = \sum_k X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)}$ with $X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} \in H_\ell^{(1)}(Y^{(1)})$ and $X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)} \in H_m^{(2)}(Y^{(2)})$, then by using Minkowski's integral inequality [23] and the $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractivity of $G^{(1)}$ and $G^{(2)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T(G)^s X\|_{L^p} &= \mathbb{E}_{Y^{(1)}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y^{(2)}} \left[\left\| \sum_{\ell,m} (\lambda_\ell^{(1)} \lambda_m^{(2)})^s X_{\ell,m} \right\|^p \right] \right]^{1/p} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y^{(1)}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y^{(2)}} \left[\left\| \sum_{k,\ell,m} (\lambda_\ell^{(1)})^s X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} (\lambda_m^{(2)})^s X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)} \right\|^p \right] \right]^{1/p} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{Y^{(1)}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y^{(2)}} \left[\left\| \sum_{k,\ell,m} (\lambda_\ell^{(1)})^s X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)} \right\|^2 \right]^{p/2} \right]^{1/p} && \text{(by } G^{(2)}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{Y^{(2)}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y^{(1)}} \left[\left\| \sum_{k,\ell,m} (\lambda_\ell^{(1)})^s X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)} \right\|^p \right]^{2/p} \right]^{1/2} && \text{(by Minkowski)} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{Y^{(2)}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y^{(1)}} \left[\left\| \sum_{k,\ell,m} X_{k,\ell,m}^{(1)} X_{k,\ell,m}^{(2)} \right\|^2 \right] \right]^{1/2} = \|X\|_{L^2}. && \text{(by } G^{(1)})
\end{aligned}$$

The general case follows from the limit argument. \square

B.3 Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. Let $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$. Suppose $\widetilde{\deg}_G X < \infty$ and let n be the minimum integer satisfying $X \in \overline{Q_n(Y)}$. Then, by decomposing $X = \sum_{m=0}^n X_m$ with $X_m \in H_m(Y)$, we obtain

$$\|X\|_{L^p} = \left\| T(G)^s \sum_{m=0}^n \lambda_m^{-s} X_m \right\|_{L^p} \leq \left\| \sum_{m=0}^n \lambda_m^{-s} X_m \right\|_{L^2} \leq \lambda_m^{-s} \|X\|_{L^2},$$

where we have used the $(2, p; s)$ -hypercontractivity in the second inequality. \square

B.4 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. It suffices to consider X having the decomposition $X = \sum_m X_m$ with $X_m \in H_m(Y)$. Recall that we have assumed that Q_0 is the space of constant functions, so X_0 is a constant. First, we consider the case $X_0 = 0$. In this case, for $t > s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T(G)^t X\|_{L^4}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^t X_m \right\|_{L^4}^2 \leq \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{t-s} \lambda_m^s \|X_m\|_{L^4} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{t-s} \|X_m\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{2(t-s)} \right) \|X\|_{L^2}^2. && \text{(Cauchy-Schwarz)}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when $\sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{2(t-s)} \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$ we have

$$\|T(G)^t X\|_{L^4} \leq 3^{-1/4} \|X\|_{L^2} \tag{8}$$

for all X satisfying $X_0 = 0$.

In the case $X_0 \neq 0$, we can assume $X_0 = 1$ without loss of generality. Let $W = X - 1$ and $Z = T(G)^t W = T(G)^t X - 1$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$ holds by the orthogonality. We can explicitly expand the L^4 norm as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(G)^t X\|_{L^4}^4 &= 1 + 6\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + 4\mathbb{E}[Z^3] + \mathbb{E}[Z^4] \\ &\leq 1 + 8\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + 3\mathbb{E}[Z^4]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{AM-GM})$$

We also have

$$\|X\|_{L^2}^4 = \mathbb{E}[(1+W)^2]^2 = (1 + \mathbb{E}[W^2])^2 = 1 + 2\mathbb{E}[W^2] + \mathbb{E}[W^2]^2.$$

So it suffices to show $4\mathbb{E}[Z^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[W^2]$ and $3\mathbb{E}[Z^4] \leq \mathbb{E}[W^2]^2$, but the latter immediately follows from (8). The former holds when $\lambda_1^t \leq 1/2$:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] = \sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_m^{2t} \mathbb{E}[X_m^2] \leq \lambda_1^{2t} \mathbb{E}[W^2].$$

Therefore, we have completed the proof. \square

B.5 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof. Let $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ and \mathcal{X} be the space in which Y takes values. By truncating Q and λ (i.e., ignoring Q_m with $1/\lambda_m > K$), we can assume that $Q(Y) = \{X \in L^2 \mid \widetilde{\text{deg}}_G X \leq K\}$. Then, as $\dim Q < \infty$, we can take a vector-valued measurable function

$$\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N)^\top : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$$

such that $(\varphi_i(Y))_{i=1}^N$ is an orthonormal basis of $Q(Y)$. Then, we have

$$\sup_{X \in Q(Y) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|X\|_{L^4}}{\|X\|_{L^2}} = \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|c^\top \varphi(Y)\|_{L^4}}{\|c^\top \varphi(Y)\|_{L^2}} = \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|c\|=1} \|c^\top \varphi(Y)\|_{L^4} < \infty,$$

where the right-hand side is the supremum of a continuous functions over a compact domain, and so is indeed finite. Hence, we can apply Proposition 5, and there exists a constant $s > 0$ such that

$$\|T(G)^t X\|_{L^4} \leq \|X\|_{L^2}, \quad X \in Q(Y),$$

because $\lambda_1 < 1$ and $(\lambda_m)_m$ is of finite length now. So $G = (Y, Q, \lambda)$ (with truncation by K) is actually $(2, p; t)$ -hypercontractive and it extends to $G^{\otimes d}$ for any d by Theorem 7 (note that the truncation does not affect the random variables with $\widetilde{\text{deg}}_{G^{\otimes d}} X \leq K$). Then, we finally use Proposition 4 to obtain the desired result with $C = K^t$. \square

B.6 Proof of Proposition 8

Proof. Let $f \in L^2(\mu)$ be an eigenfunction with eigenvalue $\lambda \geq 0$ of the integral operator, i.e., it satisfies $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y) = \lambda f(x)$ (assume this equality holds for all x , not just μ -almost all). As Assumption A is met from the general theory [55], it suffices to show $\lambda \geq 1$ if and only if f is constant. Note that $f = 1$ is an eigenfunction for $\lambda = 1$ by assumption.

Assume $\lambda \geq 1$. Since k is bounded from the assumption, for an $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converging to x , we have $f(x_n) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x_n, y) f(y) d\mu(y) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y) = f(x)$ by the dominated convergence theorem. Thus, f is continuous. Let $F = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. If $x^* \in f^{-1}(\{F\})$, then

$$0 = F - f(x^*) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x^*, y) \left(F - \frac{1}{\lambda} f(y) \right) d\mu(y).$$

As $k(x^*, \cdot)$ is a probability density (recall $k \geq 0$ from the assumption) with respect to μ and $\text{supp } \mu = \mathcal{X}$, we must have $\lambda \leq 1$ and $k(x^*, y) = 0$ for all $y \notin f^{-1}(\{F\})$. Now, it suffices to prove $f^{-1}(\{F\}) = \mathcal{X}$ actually holds when $\lambda = 1$. Let $K = \max_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} k(x, y)$. By taking an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mu(f^{-1}([F - \varepsilon, F])) \leq 1/(2K)$, we have, for $x \notin f^{-1}(\{F\})$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x, y) f(y) \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \int_{f^{-1}((-\infty, F - \varepsilon))} k(x, y) f(y) \, d\mu(y) + \int_{f^{-1}([F - \varepsilon, F])} k(x, y) f(y) \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq (F - \varepsilon) \int_{f^{-1}((-\infty, F - \varepsilon))} k(x, y) \, d\mu(y) + F \int_{f^{-1}([F - \varepsilon, F])} k(x, y) \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq (F - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \int_{f^{-1}([F - \varepsilon, F])} k(x, y) \, d\mu(y) \leq (F - \varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = F - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $f^{-1}(\{F\}) = \mathcal{X}$, f is disconnected (because \mathcal{X} is path-connected), and it is contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

B.7 Proof of Proposition 9

We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *For $p > 2$, we have $\|\mathcal{K}_0 f\|_{L^p} \leq \|k_0\|_{L^p(\mu \otimes \mu)} \|f\|_{L^2}$ for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$.*

Proof. By Minkowski's integral inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{K}_0 f\|_{L^p} &= \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} k_0(x, y) f(y) \, d\mu(y) \right|^p \, d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |k_0(x, y) f(y)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |k_0(x, y)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} |f(y)| \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |k_0(x, y)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right)^{2/p} \, d\mu(y) \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2} \quad (\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}) \\ &\leq \|k_0\|_{L^p(\mu \otimes \mu)} \|f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

From this lemma, we have

$$\|e_m\|_{L^p} = \frac{1}{\sigma_m} \|\mathcal{K}_0 e_m\|_{L^p} \leq \frac{\|k_0\|_{L^p(\mu \otimes \mu)}}{\sigma_m} \|e_m\|_{L^2} \quad (9)$$

for each $m \geq 2$.

Proof of Proposition 9. It suffices to consider the case $\|k_0\|_{L^4(\mu \otimes \mu)} < \infty$. Note that $\lambda_{\ell-1} = \sigma_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$ for the GRP $G_{k, \mu}$, so $\lambda_1 = \sigma_2 = \|\mathcal{K}_0\|$.

Let r_0 be the minimum nonnegative number satisfying $\|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{-r_0} \geq \sqrt{3} \, \text{tr}(\mathcal{K}_0)$. Then, for $r := 1 + r_0$, we have

$$\sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} \sigma_\ell^r \leq \sigma_2^{r_0} \sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} \sigma_\ell = \|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{r_0} \text{tr}(\mathcal{K}_0) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \quad (10)$$

Let s_0 be the minimum nonnegative number satisfying $\|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{-s_0} \geq \|k_0\|_{L^4(\mu \otimes \mu)}$. As $\|\mathcal{K}_0\| \in (0, 1)$ from Assumption A', s_0 is well-defined. Then, for $s := 1 + s_0$ and $m \geq 2$, from (9), we have

$$\|e_m\|_{L^4} \leq \frac{\|k_0\|_{L^4(\mu \otimes \mu)}}{\sigma_m} \|e_m\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_m \|\mathcal{K}_0\|^{s_0}} \|e_m\|_{L^2} \leq \sigma_m^{-1-s_0} \|e_m\|_{L^2}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, the condition for s and $t := r + s$ of Proposition 5 is satisfied, and so we have the desired conclusion. \square