

Higher Order Lipschitz Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method (HOLGRIM)

Terry Lyons and Andrew D. McLeod

June 6, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we introduce the *Higher Order Lipschitz Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method* (HOLGRIM) for finding sparse approximations of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions, in the sense of Stein, given as a linear combination of a (large) number of simpler $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions. HOLGRIM is developed as a refinement of the *Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method* (GRIM) in the setting of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions. HOLGRIM combines dynamic growth-based interpolation techniques with thinning-based reduction techniques in a data-driven fashion. The dynamic growth is driven by a greedy selection algorithm in which multiple new points may be selected at each step. The thinning reduction is carried out by *recombination*, the linear algebra technique utilised by GRIM. We establish that the number of non-zero weights for the approximation returned by HOLGRIM is controlled by a particular packing number of the data. The level of data concentration required to guarantee that HOLGRIM returns a good sparse approximation is decreasing with respect to the regularity parameter $\gamma > 0$. Further, we establish complexity cost estimates verifying that implementing HOLGRIM is feasible.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Lipschitz Functions and Sandwich Theorems	6
3	Sparse Approximation Problem Formulation	9
4	Extension to Compact Domains	11
5	Pointwise Values Via Linear Functionals	13
6	The HOLGRIM Algorithm	23
7	Complexity Cost	26
8	Theoretical Guarantees Inherited from GRIM	30
9	Point Separation Lemma	32
10	The HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem	34

1. Introduction

Approximating the behaviour of a complex system via a linear combination of simpler functions is a central challenge within machine learning. Models following this guiding ethos have, for example, been used for facial recognition [BGLT97], COVID-19 deaths prediction [BS22], image recognition [HRSZ15, HKR15, KTT18], language translation [CDLT18], anomaly detection [CCFLS20, ACLLN24], landmark-based action recognition [JLNSY17,

JNYZ24], emotion recognition [LLNNSW19], early sepsis detection [HKLMNS19, HKLMNS20], Bipolar and Borderline Personality Disorder classification [AGGLS18, LLNSTWW20, LLSVWW21], longitudinal language modelling [BKCLLT24], and learning solutions to differential equations [FKLM20, FKLMS21, FKLLO21, FKLL21, CLLMQW24].

A priori, considering a larger number of simple functions enables one to capture the affects of more complicated systems. However, a large number of simple functions can lead to a linear combination with a high computational complexity. One approach to reducing this computational complexity is to find a sparse approximation of the linear combination of functions. Sparse representations have been applied to tasks including, for example, image processing [EMS08, BMPSZ08, BMPSZ09], data assimilation [MM13], sensor placement in nuclear reactors [ABGMM16, ABCGMM18], DNA denoising [KK20], and inference within machine learning [ABDHP21, NPS22].

Numerous techniques have been developed for finding sparse approximations, including *Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator* (LASSO) regression [CM73, SS86, Tib96, LY07, DGOY08, GO09, XZ16, TW19], the Empirical Interpolation Method [BMNP04, GMNP07, MNPP09], its subsequent generalisation the Generalised Empirical Interpolation Method (GEIM) [MM13, MMT14], Pruning [Ree93, AK13, CHXZ20, GLSWZ21], Kernel Herding [Wei09a, Wei09b, CSW10, BLL15, BCGMO18, TT21, PTT22], Convex Kernel Quadrature [HLO21], and Kernel Thinning [DM21-I, DM21-II, DMS21]. In this paper we focus on the *Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method* (GRIM) introduced in [LM22-I].

GRIM is a technique for finding sparse approximations of linear combinations of functions that combines dynamic growth-based interpolation techniques with thinning-based reduction techniques to inductively refine a sequence of approximations. Theoretical guarantees for the performance of GRIM are established in Section 6 of [LM22-I], whilst empirical demonstrations of its performance are provided by the numerical examples covered in Section 7 of [LM22-I]. It is established in [LM22-I] that GRIM can be applied in several familiar settings including kernel quadrature and approximating sums of continuous functions; see Section 2 in [LM22-I].

For the readers convenience, we briefly recall the general sparse approximation problem that GRIM is designed to tackle [LM22-I]. Let X be a real Banach space and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be a (large) positive integer. Assume that $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset X$ is a collection of non-zero elements, and that $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Consider the element $\varphi \in X$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Let X^* denote the dual of X and suppose that $\Sigma \subset X^*$ is a finite subset with cardinality $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. We adopt the same terminology as used in [LM22-I] that the set \mathcal{F} consists of the *features* whilst the set Σ consists of *data*. Then GRIM is designed to tackle the following sparse approximation problem. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, find an element $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset X$ such that the cardinality of the set $\{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\} : b_i \neq 0\}$ is *less* than \mathcal{N} and that u is close to φ throughout Σ in the sense that, for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we have $|\sigma(\varphi - u)| \leq \varepsilon$.

We briefly recall the strategy of the **Banach GRIM** algorithm developed in [LM22-I] to tackle this problem. The **Banach GRIM** algorithm is a hybrid combination of the dynamic growth of a greedy selection algorithm, in a similar spirit to GEIM [MM13, MMT14, MPPY15], with the thinning reduction of recombination that underpins the successful convex kernel quadrature approach of [HLO21]. A collection of linear functionals $L \subset \Sigma$ is greedily grown during the **Banach GRIM** algorithm. After each extension of L , recombination is applied to find an approximation of φ that coincides with φ throughout L (cf. the *Recombination Thinning Lemma 3.1* in [LM22-I]). The subset L is extended by first fixing an integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, and then adding to L the m linear functionals from Σ achieving the largest absolute value when applied to the difference between φ and the current approximation of φ (cf. Section 4 of [LM22-I]). These steps are iteratively applied a set number of times during the **Banach GRIM** algorithm detailed in Section 4 of [LM22-I].

In this article we consider the use of the **Banach GRIM** algorithm for finding sparse approximations of sums of continuous functions. That is, we assume that the Banach space X in the formulation above can be embedded into a space of continuous functions. We assume that X embeds into a space of continuous functions rather than assuming X is itself a space of continuous functions since continuity alone is insufficient regularity for interpolation methods. Interpolation methods, broadly speaking, work on the premise that knowing the value of a function at a point informs one about the functions values at nearby points.

However, this is *not* true for continuous functions. Indeed, suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f \in C^0(\Omega)$ is a real-valued continuous function $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $p \in \Omega$ and $f(p) = 0$. Then, regardless of how close a point $q \in \Omega \setminus \{p\}$ is to p , we cannot obtain any better bound for the value $f(q)$ than the immediate naive estimate that $|f(q)| \leq \|f\|_{C^0(\Omega)}$. Knowing that f vanishes at p does not enable us to conclude that f must remain small on some definite neighbourhood of the point p .

A consequence of this simple observation is that the theoretical guarantees for the performance of the **Banach**

GRIM algorithm established in Theorem 6.2 in [LM22-I] are essentially useless for the case that $X = C^0(\Omega)$ and Σ is taken to be the finite collection of point masses in the dual-space $C^0(\Omega)^*$ associated to a finite subset of Ω . Given $p, q \in \Omega$ with $p \neq q$, the existence of a continuous function $f \in C^0(\Omega)$ with $\|f\|_{C^0(\Omega)} = 1$ and $f(p) = 1$ and $f(q) = -1$ means that the point masses $\delta_p, \delta_q \in C^0(\Omega)^*$ satisfy

$$\|\delta_p - \delta_q\|_{C^0(\Omega)^*} = \sup \{ |(\delta_p - \delta_q)(f)| : f \in C^0(\Omega) \text{ with } \|f\|_{C^0(\Omega)} = 1 \} = 2. \quad (1.1)$$

Consequently, if $\varepsilon/2C < 2$ then (1.1) means that the upper bound N on the maximum number of steps the **Banach GRIM** algorithm can complete without terminating established in Theorem 6.2 in [LM22-I] is simply the cardinality of Σ , i.e. $N = \#(\Sigma)$. Thus Theorem 6.2 in [LM22-I] provides only the obvious (and essentially useless) guarantee that the **Banach GRIM** algorithm will return an approximation that is within ε of φ at every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ once we have grown the collection of linear functionals $L \subset \Sigma$ at which we require the approximation to match φ (see Section 4 in [LM22-I]) to be the entirety of Σ .

In this article we overcome the limitations outlined above by achieving the following main goals.

MAIN GOALS

- (1) Fix a choice of a Banach space X of functions exhibiting an appropriate level of regularity from the perspective of interpolation.
- (2) Adapt the **Banach GRIM** algorithm from [LM22-I] to the setting of the particular choice of the Banach space X determined in **MAIN GOALS** (1).

From the perspective of interpolation, we want the notion of regularity determined by our choice of Banach space X to ensure, in a quantified sense, that for $f \in X$ the knowledge of the value of f at a point determines its values at nearby points up to an arbitrarily small error. Moreover, given our machine learning motivations, we want the notion of regularity determined by our choice of Banach space X to make sense on finite subsets.

The class of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions, for some $\gamma > 0$, in the sense of Stein [Ste70] exhibit an appropriate level of regularity. This notion of regularity is central to the study of *rough paths* initiated by the first author in [Lyo98]; an introduction to the theory of rough paths may be found in [CLL04], for example. Rough path theory has subsequently underpinned numerous machine learning techniques developed through the use of the *signature* of a path as a feature map; an introductory coverage of such signature methods may be found in the survey articles [CK16] and [LM22-II], for example. Moreover, $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ regularity is essential in the recent efforts to extend the theory of rough paths to the setting of manifolds [CLL12, BL22], has been combined with classical ODE techniques to obtain the terminal solutions of *Rough Differential Equations* (RDEs) [Bou15, Bou22], and is central to the introduction of *Log Neural Controlled Differential Equations* (Log-NCDEs) in [CLLMQW24].

We consider the notion of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ regularity in similar generality to that considered in [LM24]. In particular, we let V and W be finite-dimensional real Banach spaces, $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be an arbitrary closed subset, $\gamma > 0$, and consider $X := \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ to be the space of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions from \mathcal{M} to W defined, for example, in Definition 2.2 of [LM24] (cf. Definition 2.2 in this paper). The class $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ is a generalisation of the more familiar notion of γ -Hölder continuous functions $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$ in the following sense. For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ the space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ coincides with the space of bounded γ -Hölder continuous functions $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$. That is, $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ means that $\psi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that whenever $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ we have both $\|\psi(x)\|_W \leq C$ and $\|\psi(y) - \psi(x)\|_W \leq C\|y - x\|_V^\gamma$. For $\gamma > 1$ the space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ gives a sensible higher-order Hölder continuity condition. If $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$ and $O \subset V$ is open, then the space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, O, W)$ coincides with the space $C^{k, \gamma-k}(O; W)$ of k -times Fréchet differentiable functions $O \rightarrow W$ with $(\gamma - k)$ -Hölder continuous k^{th} derivative (cf. Remark 2.6). Stein's notion of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ regularity extends this notion to arbitrary closed subsets. For any $\gamma > 0$ and a general closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ there is a natural embedding map $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W) \hookrightarrow C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)$ (cf. Remark 2.4).

The choice $X := \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ satisfies both our desired properties. Firstly, the class $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ is well-defined for *any* closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$, and hence the class $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is well-defined for a finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$. Secondly, the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* established in [LM24] yield that the value of $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ determines the behaviour of ψ , up to arbitrarily small errors, at points that are sufficiently close to p . The *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.1* and the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.11* in [LM24] exhibit quantified statements of this phenomena in which both the sense in which the behaviour of ψ is determined and the notion of sufficiently close to the point p are made precise (cf. Theorems 2.9 and 2.10 in this paper).

There are additional properties that make the class $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions an attractive choice from a learning perspective. Given a closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$, a function in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ is defined only through its values at the points in \mathcal{M} . No knowledge of its behaviour outside \mathcal{M} is required; we do not need to even define their value at *any* point in the complement $V \setminus \mathcal{M} \subset V$ of \mathcal{M} .

Further, any function in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ admits an extension to the entirety of V possessing the same regularity. That is, if $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ then there exists $\Psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ with $\Psi \equiv \psi$ throughout \mathcal{M} . When $V = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W = \mathbb{R}$ this is a consequence of the Stein-Whitney extension theorem presented as Theorem 4 in Chapter VI of [Ste70]. Often referred to as the Stein extension theorem, we include Whitney to reflect the reliance of Stein’s proof on the machinery introduced by Whitney in his own extension theorems in [Whi34, Whi44]. Since V is finite dimensional, a verbatim repetition of the argument presented in [Ste70] establishes the extension result we claim above. Modulo defining a $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ -norm (cf. Definition 2.2), it follows that the resulting extension operator $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W) \rightarrow \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ is a bounded linear operator.

This extension property ensures that $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions are well-suited for inference on unseen data. That is, suppose we know that $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ well-approximates a system on a finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$. Then, given an unseen point $p \in V \setminus \Sigma$, we can extend ψ to $\Psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ and use the evaluation of the extension Ψ at p for the purpose of inferring the systems response to the unseen input p . Moreover, if we know that the underlying system satisfies some global $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ regularity, then we can quantify how well Ψ approximates the system at p in terms of how well ψ approximates the system on Σ and the V -distance from the point p to the subset Σ (cf. Remark 10.8).

With our choice of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ regularity fixed, we turn our attention to considering the **Banach GRIM** algorithm from [LM22-I] in the case that $X = \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ for a finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$. For this purpose we develop the *Higher Order Lipschitz Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method* (HOLGRIM) as a modification of the GRIM tailored to the setting that $X := \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. In particular, the **HOLGRIM** algorithm, detailed in Section 6, is designed to seek a sparse approximation of a given linear combination φ of $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ functions. For a fixed choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, The approximation is required to be close to φ throughout Σ in an “order q ” pointwise sense; this is made precise in Section 6, and is analogous to requiring the derivatives up to order q or the approximation to be close to the derivatives up to order q of φ at every point in Σ .

The **HOLGRIM** algorithm dynamically grows a subset $P \subset \Sigma$ of the data at which we require approximations of the target φ to coincide with φ . As in the case of the **Banach GRIM** algorithm in [LM22-I], after each extension of the subset P , the thinning or recombination is used to find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ coinciding with φ throughout P . This is achieved via an application of the *Recombination Thinning Lemma 3.1* from [LM22-I] (cf. the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Section 6).

The applicability of the *Recombination Thinning Lemma 3.1* from [LM22-I] to find such an approximation of φ is a consequence of the following correspondence established in Section 5. Given a point $p \in \Sigma$ there is a subset $\mathcal{T}_{p,k} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ of bounded linear functionals $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the value of any $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ at the point p is determined by the set of real numbers $\{\sigma(\psi) : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The set $\mathcal{T}_{p,k}$ is defined carefully in Section 5, and a quantified estimate regarding the sense in which the value set $\{\sigma(\psi) : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ determines the value of ψ at p is provided by Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5. This observation allows us to associate the finite collection of bounded linear functionals $\Sigma_k^* := \cup_{p \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{p,k}$ to the finite subset of data $\Sigma \subset V$.

Both the dynamic growth of the subset $P \subset \Sigma$, governed by the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** detailed in Section 6, and the use of recombination to obtain an approximation coinciding with φ throughout P , detailed in the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Section 6, are reliant on the correspondence established in Section 5. Indeed, the dynamic growth detailed in the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** in Section 6 is done in a similar spirit to the **Modified Extension Step** appearing in Section 7 of [LM22-I].

Heuristically, to grow the subset P we find the linear functional $\sigma \in \Sigma_k^*$ returning the largest absolute value when applied to the difference between φ and the current approximation, and then extend P by addition of the point $p \in \Sigma$ for which $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}$. In the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** in Section 6 we allow for the extension of P by more than a single new point and we only consider a particular subset of the linear functionals Σ_k^* determined by the strength of approximation we seek (cf. the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** in Section 6). The number of new points to be added at each step gives a parameter that may be optimised.

After each extension of the subset P we apply the *Recombination Thinning Lemma 3.1* from [LM22-I] to the collection of linear functionals $L := \cup_{p \in P} \mathcal{T}_{p,k}$ to find a new approximation that coincides with φ throughout P ; see the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Section 6 for full details. As in [LM22-I], we optimise our use of recombination over multiple permutations of the ordering of the equations determining the linear system to which recombination is applied (cf. the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Section 6). The number of permutations to

be considered at each step gives a parameter that may be optimised.

HOLGRIM inherits the same data-driven benefits enjoyed by GRIM. The growth in HOLGRIM is data-driven rather than feature-driven. The extension of the data to be interpolated with respect to in HOLGRIM does not involve making any choices of features from \mathcal{F} . The new information to be matched is determined by examining where in Σ the current approximation is furthest from the target φ (cf. Section 6). Only a subset $P \subset \Sigma$ of data is dynamically grown; there is no corresponding subset $F \subset \mathcal{F}$ of functions that is dynamically grown. The functions that an approximation will be a linear combination of are *not* predetermined; they are determined by recombination (cf. the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Section 6). Besides an upper bound on the number of functions used to construct an approximation at a given step (cf. Section 6), we have no control over the functions used. Moreover, as is the case for GRIM, there is no requirement that any of the functions used at a specific step must be used in any of the subsequent steps.

The **HOLGRIM** algorithm detailed in Section 6 is designed to approximate a given linear combination of $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ functions when $\Sigma \subset V$ is a finite subset. However, a consequence of the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* established in [LM24] is that a $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ function defined throughout a compact subset can be well-approximated throughout the compact subset provided one can well-approximate the $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ function on a particular finite subset. (cf. Section 4 in [LM24]). In Section 4 of this paper we outline how this observation enables the case of compact domains to be tackled via the case of finite domains that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is designed to solve. Moreover, we additionally illustrate in Section 4 how the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.1* in [LM24] can be used to strengthen the pointwise closeness of an approximation u to φ to an estimate on the $\text{Lip}(\eta)$ norm of the difference $\varphi - u$ for a fixed $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$.

The complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is analysed in Section 7. The **HOLGRIM** algorithm is designed to be a one-time tool that is applied a single time to find a sparse approximation of the target φ . Repeated use of the returned approximation, which will be more cost-effectively computed than the original target φ , for inference on new inputs will recover the up-front cost of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm's implementation. Models, such as recognition models or classification models, that will be repeatedly computed on new inputs for the purpose of inference or prediction are ideal candidates for HOLGRIM to approximate.

Consequently, the primary aim of our complexity cost considerations in Section 7 is to verify that implementing the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is feasible. This is verified by proving that, at worst, the complexity cost of running the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(scD(d, k)MN\Lambda + sc^2D(d, k)^2MN\Lambda^2 + sc^3D(d, k)^3M \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{cD(d, k)} \right) \Lambda^3 \right) \quad (1.2)$$

where \mathcal{N} is the number of functions in \mathcal{F} , Λ is the number of points in Σ , M is the maximum number of steps for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm will be run, s is the maximum number of shuffles considered during each application of recombination, c is the dimension of W , d is the dimension of V , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is the integer for which $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$, and $D = D(d, k)$ is an integer that depends only on d and k and whose precise definition may be found in (5.2) in Section 5. The upper bound on the complexity cost stated in (1.2) is a consequence of the complexity cost bounds established in Lemma 7.3 in Section 7.

Performance guarantees for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm are considered in Sections 8, 9, and 10. The approach adopted in [LM22-I] leads to guarantees in terms of specific geometric properties of the linear functionals $\Sigma_k^* \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ (cf. Section 8). In order to obtain guarantees involving the geometry of the data Σ itself, we utilise the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* established in [LM24].

Theoretical guarantees in terms of a particular packing number of Σ in V are established for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm in which a single new point is chosen at each step in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1*. Packing numbers, and the closely related notion of covering numbers, were first considered by Kolmogorov [Kol56], and have subsequently arisen in contexts including eigenvalue estimation [Car81, CS90, ET96], Gaussian Processes [LL99, LP04], and machine learning [EPP00, SSW01, Zho02, Ste03, SS07, Kuh11, MRT12, FS21]. The main technical result underpinning the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1* is the *HOLGRIM Point Separation Lemma 9.1* which establishes that points chosen during the **HOLGRIM** algorithm are a definite V distance apart.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we rigorously define the notion of a $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ function for an arbitrary closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$, and additionally record variants of the particular *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* from [LM24] that will be used within this article.

In Section 3 we rigorously formulate the sparse approximation problem that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is

designed to tackle.

In Section 4 we outline how being able to solve the sparse approximation problem detailed in Section 3 for a finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$ enables one to solve the same sparse approximation problem for a compact subset $\Omega \subset V$. Both a strategy utilising the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.11* of [LM24] (cf. Theorem 2.10 in this paper) to obtain a pointwise approximation throughout Ω and a strategy utilising the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.1* of [LM24] (cf. Theorem 2.9 in this paper) to obtain, for a fixed $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$, a $\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)$ -norm approximation throughout Ω are covered.

In Section 5, given an arbitrary closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ and a point $z \in \mathcal{M}$, we define a finite subset $\mathcal{T}_{z,k} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ of the dual-space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ of bounded linear functionals $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ the value of ψ at z is determined by the values $\sigma(\psi)$ for the linear functionals $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z,k}$ (cf. Lemma 5.5).

In Section 6 we present and discuss the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. We formulate both the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** governing how we extend an existing collection of points $P \subset \Sigma$ and the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** governing the *Recombination Thinning Lemma 3.1* in [LM22-I] is used in the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. Additionally, we establish an upper bound on the number of functions used to construct the approximation at each step of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm.

In Section 7 we analyse the complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. We prove Lemma 7.3 establishing the complexity cost of any implementation of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. We further record an upper bound for the complexity cost of the most expensive implementation.

In Section 8 we discuss both the performance guarantees inherited by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm from the *Banach GRIM Convergence Theorem 6.2* in [LM22-I] and the limitations/issues of the results obtained via this approach.

In Section 9 we prove the *HOLGRIM Point Separation Lemma 9.1* establishing that the points selected during the **HOLGRIM** algorithm in which a single new point is chosen at each step are guaranteed to be a definite V -distance apart from one and other.

In Section 10 we prove the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1*. This result establishes that a particular packing number of the data Σ in V provides an upper bound for the maximum number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete before an approximation of φ possessing the desired level of accuracy is returned. We subsequently discuss the consequences of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1*. We convert the assertions of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1* into a reversed implication establishing how well the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can approximate φ under a restriction on the maximum number of functions that can be used to construct the approximation (cf. Remark 10.4). We verify that the data concentration required to guarantee that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm returns a good approximation of φ using strictly less than \mathcal{N} of the functions in \mathcal{F} decreases as the regularity parameter $\gamma > 0$ increases (cf. Remark 10.7). We establish a robustness property satisfied by the returned approximation (cf. Remark 10.8). We show that the guarantees of Theorem 10.1 can be both extended to the setting of a compact subset $\Omega \subset V$ and have the conclusion strengthened to, for a given $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$, a $\text{Lip}(\eta)$ -norm estimates on the difference between the target φ and the returned approximation u following the strategies outlined in Section 4 (cf. Remarks 10.9, 10.10, 10.11, and 10.12). Finally we illustrate a number of these consequences of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1* via an explicit example in the Euclidean setting $\Omega := [0, 1]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (cf. Remark 10.13).

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the DataSig Program under the EPSRC grant ES/S026347/1, the Alan Turing Institute under the EPSRC grant EP/N510129/1, the Data Centric Engineering Programme (under Lloyd's Register Foundation grant G0095), the Defence and Security Programme (funded by the UK Government) and the Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Commission (InnoHK Project CIMDA). This work was funded by the Defence and Security Programme (funded by the UK Government).

2. Lipschitz Functions and Sandwich Theorems

In this section we provide a rigorous definition of a $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ function in the sense of Stein [Ste70] in the same generality considered in [LM24]. Additionally, we record the particular *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* from [LM24] that will be useful within this article.

Let V and W be real Banach spaces and assume that $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ is a closed subset. Throughout this article we adopt the convention that balls denoted by \mathbb{B} are taken to be open, whilst those denoted by $\overline{\mathbb{B}}$ are taken to be closed.

To define $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ functions, we must first make a choice of norm on the tensor powers of V . We restrict to considering norms that are *admissible* in the following sense.

Definition 2.1 (Admissible Norms on Tensor Powers). Let V be a Banach space. We say that its tensor powers are endowed with admissible norms if for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ we have equipped the tensor power $V^{\otimes n}$ of V with a norm $\|\cdot\|_{V^{\otimes n}}$ such that the following conditions hold.

- For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ the symmetric group S_n acts isometrically on $V^{\otimes n}$, i.e. for any $\rho \in S_n$ and any $v \in V^{\otimes n}$ we have

$$\|\rho(v)\|_{V^{\otimes n}} = \|v\|_{V^{\otimes n}}. \quad (2.1)$$

The action of S_n on $V^{\otimes n}$ is given by permuting the order of the letters, i.e. if $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \in V^{\otimes n}$ and $\rho \in S_n$ then $\rho(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) := a_{\rho(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{\rho(n)}$, and the action is extended to the entirety of $V^{\otimes n}$ by linearity.

- For any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and any $v \in V^{\otimes n}$ and $w \in V^{\otimes m}$ we have

$$\|v \otimes w\|_{V^{\otimes(n+m)}} \leq \|v\|_{V^{\otimes n}} \|w\|_{V^{\otimes m}}. \quad (2.2)$$

- For any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and any $\phi \in (V^{\otimes n})^*$ and $\sigma \in (V^{\otimes m})^*$ we have

$$\|\phi \otimes \sigma\|_{(V^{\otimes(n+m)})^*} \leq \|\phi\|_{(V^{\otimes n})^*} \|\sigma\|_{(V^{\otimes m})^*}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, given any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{(V^{\otimes k})^*}$ denotes the dual-norm induced by $\|\cdot\|_{V^{\otimes k}}$.

A consequence of having *both* the inequalities (2.2) and (2.3) being satisfied is that we may conclude that there is actually equality in both estimates (see [Rya02]). Thus if the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible tensor norms in the sense of Definition 2.1, we have equality in both (2.2) and (2.3).

We next use this notion of admissible tensor norm to rigorously define a $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ function within this setting (cf. Definition 2.2 in [LM24]).

Definition 2.2 ($\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ functions). Let V and W be Banach spaces, $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ a closed subset, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms. Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. Then let $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \psi^{(1)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)})$ where $\psi^{(0)} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$ is a function taking its values in W and, for each $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $\psi^{(l)} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ is a function taking its values in the space of symmetric l -linear forms from V to W . Then ψ is a $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ function if there exists a constant $M \geq 0$ for which the following is true.

- For each $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and every $z \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that

$$\|\psi^{(l)}(z)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)} \leq M \quad (2.4)$$

- For each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $R_j^\psi : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$ for $z, p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ by

$$R_j^\psi(z, p)[v] := \psi^{(j)}(p)[v] - \sum_{s=0}^{k-j} \frac{1}{s!} \psi^{(j+s)}(z) [v \otimes (p-z)^{\otimes s}]. \quad (2.5)$$

Then whenever $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ we have

$$\left\| R_l^\psi(x, y) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)} \leq M \|y - x\|_V^{-l}. \quad (2.6)$$

We sometimes say that $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ without explicitly mentioning the functions $\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}$. Furthermore, given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we introduce the notation that $\psi_{[l]} := (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(l)})$. The $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ norm of ψ , denoted by $\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}$, is the smallest $M \geq 0$ satisfying the requirements (2.4) and (2.6).

Remark 2.3. Assuming the same notation as in Definition 2.2, we adopt the same convention as used in [LM24] regarding the choice of norm on the space $\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ for each $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. That is, recall that $V^{\otimes 0} := \mathbb{R}$ so that

$\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes 0}; W) = W$. Hence we take $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)}$ to be the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ given on W . Further, given $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we equip $\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ with its operator norm determined by

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)} := \sup \{ \|\mathbf{A}[v]\|_W : v \in V^{\otimes l} \text{ and } \|v\|_{V^{\otimes l}} = 1 \}. \quad (2.7)$$

This results in the same notion of a $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ function as considered in [LM24]. Consequently, it is the case that an upper bound on the resulting $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ -norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}$ is a stronger restriction than the same upper bound on the corresponding notion of $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ -norm considered in the works [Bou15, Bou22, BL22].

Remark 2.4. Assuming the same notation as in Definition 2.2, suppose $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. Let $C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)$ denote the space of continuous maps $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$ and for $f \in C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)$ take $\|f\|_{C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)} := \sup \{ \|f(x)\|_W : x \in \mathcal{M} \}$. Then $\psi^{(0)} \in C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)$ and $\|\psi^{(0)}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)} \leq \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}$. Consequently, the mapping $\psi \mapsto \psi^{(0)}$ gives an embedding of $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ into the space $C^0(\mathcal{M}; W)$.

Remark 2.5. Assuming the same notation as in Definition 2.2, suppose $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, and that $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$ with $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\eta \in (q, q+1]$. Then it follows that $\psi_{[q]} = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(q)}) \in \text{Lip}(\eta, \mathcal{M}, W)$ and there exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, \eta) \geq 1$ for which $\|\psi_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \mathcal{M}, W)} \leq C\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}$; see, for example, Lemma 6.1 in [LM24]. Consequently, the mapping $\psi \mapsto \psi_{[q]}$ gives an embedding of $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ into the space $\text{Lip}(\eta, \mathcal{M}, W)$.

Remark 2.6. Suppose that $O \subset V$ is open and that $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, O, W)$. Then the expansions (2.5) and the estimates (2.4) and (2.6) yield that $\psi^{(0)} : O \rightarrow W$ is k -times Fréchet differentiable with, for $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, l^{th} Fréchet derivative given by $\psi^{(l)}$. Hence the k^{th} Fréchet derivative of $\psi^{(0)}$ is $(\gamma - k)$ -Hölder continuous so that $\psi^{(0)} \in C^{k, \gamma-k}(O; W)$. Consequently, the mapping $\psi \mapsto \psi^{(0)}$ gives an embedding of $\text{Lip}(\gamma, O, W)$ into the space $C^{k, \gamma-k}(O; W)$. Moreover, Taylor's theorem establishes that this mapping is in fact a one-to-one correspondence.

Remark 2.7. A helpful way to think about $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ functions is that they “locally looks like a polynomial function”. To elaborate, assume the same notation as in Definition 2.2 and let $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. For each point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ we can define a polynomial $\Psi_x : V \rightarrow W$ for $v \in V$ by

$$\Psi_x(v) := \sum_{s=0}^k \frac{1}{s!} \psi^{(s)}(x) [(v-x)^{\otimes s}]. \quad (2.8)$$

For each $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and any point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ the element $\psi^{(l)}(x) \in \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ is the l^{th} Fréchet derivative of the polynomial Ψ_x evaluated at the point $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, the polynomial Ψ_x provides a proposal, based at the point $x \in \mathcal{M}$, for how $\psi^{(0)}$ could be extended to the entirety of V . The expansions (2.5) and the estimates (2.6) ensure that for points $y \in \mathcal{M}$ that are close, in the $\|\cdot\|_V$ norm sense, to x that the values $\psi^{(0)}(y)$ and $\Psi_x(y)$ must be close in a quantifiable $\|\cdot\|_W$ sense. In fact, (2.5) and (2.6) ensure that if $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ are close in the $\|\cdot\|_V$ sense, then the polynomial proposals Ψ_{x_1} and Ψ_{x_2} must be close as functions $V \rightarrow W$ in a pointwise sense. A precise estimate giving quantifiable meaning to the notion of closeness can be found in Section 2 of [LM24].

Remark 2.8. Assuming the same notation as in Definition 2.2, and suppose $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. To ease notation, given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we define $\Lambda_\psi^l : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by setting, for $x \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\Lambda_\psi^l(x) := \max_{j \in \{0, \dots, l\}} \left\| \psi^{(j)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)}. \quad (2.9)$$

A consequence of (2.9) is that for any $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and any $z \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that $\Lambda_\psi^l(z) \leq \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{A}, W)}$ for any subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ with $z \in \mathcal{A}$.

We end this subsection by stating the various *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* from [LM24] that we will use in this article. We first record a variant of the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 3.1 in [LM24] in which both the constants K_1 and K_2 of that result are equal to the same constant $K_0 > 0$.

Theorem 2.9 (Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.1 in [LM24]). *Let V and W be Banach spaces, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume that $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ is non-empty and closed. Let $\varepsilon, K_0 > 0$, and $\gamma > \eta > 0$ with $k, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$ and $\eta \in (q, q+1]$. Then there exist constants $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon, K_0, \gamma, \eta) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\varepsilon, K_0, \gamma, \eta) > 0$ for which the following is true.*

Suppose $B \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a closed subset that is a δ_0 -cover of \mathcal{M} in the sense that

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup_{x \in B} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(x, \delta_0) = B_{\delta_0} := \{v \in V : \text{There exists } z \in B \text{ such that } \|v - z\|_V \leq \delta_0\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Suppose $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)})$, $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ with $\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}, \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)} \leq K_0$. Then, if $\psi_{[q]} := (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(q)})$ and $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$, we have that

$$\sup_{z \in B} \Lambda_{\psi - \phi}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \implies \quad \|\psi_{[q]} - \phi_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2.11)$$

The following result records a variant of the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 3.11 in [LM24] in which both the constants K_1 and K_2 of that result are equal to the same constant $K_0 > 0$.

Theorem 2.10 (Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 3.11 in [LM24]). *Let V and W be Banach spaces, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume that $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ is closed. Let $K_0, \gamma, \varepsilon > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$ and $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon \leq K_0$. Then given any $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, there exists a constant $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, K_0, \gamma, l) > 0$, defined by*

$$\delta_0 := \sup \{\theta > 0 : 2K_0\theta^{\gamma-l} + \varepsilon_0 e^\theta \leq \varepsilon\} \in (0, 1] \quad (2.12)$$

for which the following is true.

Suppose $B \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a δ_0 -cover of \mathcal{M} in the sense that

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup_{x \in B} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(x, \delta_0) = B_{\delta_0} := \{v \in V : \text{There exists } z \in B \text{ such that } \|v - z\|_V \leq \delta_0\}. \quad (2.13)$$

Suppose $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)})$, $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ with $\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}, \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)} \leq K_0$. Then we have that

$$\sup_{z \in B} \Lambda_{\psi - \phi}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \implies \quad \sup_{z \in \mathcal{M}} \Lambda_{\psi - \phi}^l(z) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2.14)$$

We end this subsection by recording the following explicit estimates pointwise estimates for $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ under the assumption that, at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\Lambda_{\psi}^k(p) \leq \varepsilon_0$. These estimates are contained in the *Pointwise Estimates Lemma* 7.1 in [LM24] under the choices of the Γ, F, A, r_0, ρ , and q in that result as $\mathcal{M}, \psi, K_0, \varepsilon_0, \gamma$, and k here. The precise result is the following lemma.

Lemma 2.11 (Variant of Pointwise Estimates Lemma 7.1 in [LM24]). *Let V and W be Banach spaces, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ is closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $K_0, \gamma > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \geq 0$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$. Let $\psi = (\psi^{(0)}, \dots, \psi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ with $\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)} \leq K_0$. Then if $\Lambda_{\psi}^k(p) \leq \varepsilon_0$ we may conclude, for any $z \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, that*

$$\|\psi^{(l)}(z)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)} \leq \min \left\{ K_0, K_0 \|z - p\|_V^{\gamma-l} + \varepsilon_0 \sum_{j=0}^{k-l} \frac{1}{j!} \|z - p\|_V^j \right\}. \quad (2.15)$$

3. Sparse Approximation Problem Formulation

In this section we rigorously formulate the sparse approximation problem that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm will be designed to tackle. For this purpose we again let V and W be real Banach spaces, but we now additionally impose that both V and W are finite dimensional. In particular, we assume that V has dimension $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, and that W has dimension $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Whilst we do not do so in this article, one could work modulo isometric isomorphism and assume that $V = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W = \mathbb{R}^c$. Instead, we work directly with V and W and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible tensor norms in the sense of Definition 2.1.

We now formulate the sparse approximation problem that we consider in this article. Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$. Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be (large) positive integers. Let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset of cardinality Λ . For every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we assume that $f_i = (f_i^{(0)}, \dots, f_i^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is non-zero, and set $\mathcal{F} := \{f_i : i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. Fix a choice of scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Fix a choice of non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and consider $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ defined by

$$\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i \quad \text{so that for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \text{ we have } \varphi^{(l)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i^{(l)}. \quad (3.1)$$

We consider the following sparse approximation problem. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and a fixed $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, find an element $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying the following properties.

Finite Domain Approximation Conditions

- (1) There exists an integer $M \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N} - 1\}$ for which the set

$$\text{support}(u) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\} : b_i \neq 0\} \quad \text{satisfies that} \quad \#(\text{support}(u)) \leq M. \quad (3.2)$$

- (2) The coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |b_i| A_i \leq C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i. \quad (3.3)$$

- (3) The function $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ well-approximates φ throughout Σ in the pointwise sense that

$$\max_{p \in \Sigma} \left\{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(p) \right\} \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \max_{p \in \Sigma} \left\{ \max_{j \in \{0, \dots, l\}} \left\{ \left\| \varphi^{(j)}(p) - u^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \right\} \right\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3.4)$$

The choice of $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ provides a gauge for the strength of approximation we seek. Loosely, the condition $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(p) \leq \varepsilon$ generalises the notion of approximating the derivatives of φ up to order l at the point p . Indeed, if we have the situation that $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, O, W)$ for some open subset $O \subset V$ satisfying $\Sigma \subset O$, then each $f_i^{(0)}$ is k times continuously Fréchet differentiable at p with, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, $f_i^{(j)}(p) = D^j f_i^{(0)}(p)$. Consequently, the condition that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(p) \leq \varepsilon$ requires $\varphi^{(0)}$ and $u^{(0)}$ to be close in the C^l -sense that their j^{th} derivatives, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, at p are within ε of one and other as elements in $\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$. In the general case that the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ are defined only on the finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$, the condition $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(p) \leq \varepsilon$ is a generalisation in which we require, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, that at $p \in \Sigma$ the functions $\varphi^{(j)}(p), u^{(j)}(p) \in \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$ are within ε of one and other in the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)}$ norm sense.

Observe that the choice $u := \varphi$, so that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we have $b_i := a_i$, satisfies both **Finite Domain Approximation Conditions** (2) and (3). However, from the perspective of reducing computational complexity, this trivial approximation of φ is useless. **Finite Domain Approximation Condition** (1) is imposed avoid this trivial solution. The upper bound on the cardinality of $\text{support}(u)$ required in (3.2) in **Finite Domain Approximation Condition** (1) ensures that an approximation is acceptable only if it is a linear combination of strictly less than \mathcal{N} of the functions in \mathcal{F} .

Perhaps the strangest requirements are those imposed on the coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ by (3.3) in **Finite Domain Approximation Condition** (2). There are two main reasons for this restriction. Firstly, the requirement (3.3) in **Finite Domain Approximation Condition** (2) ensures that the $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ norm of the approximation u is bounded above by the fixed constant C . Secondly, **Finite Domain Approximation Condition** (2) will enable us to tackle this sparse approximation problem when the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ have a compact domain $\Omega \subset V$ rather than a finite domain $\Sigma \subset V$. We provide the details of this extension in Section 4.

It is primarily for the purpose of tackling the compact domain sparse approximation problem specified in Section 4 that we introduce the scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ satisfying, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq$

A_i , rather than simply taking $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$. If we are only interested in approximating φ on the finite subset Σ then this choice is arguably the most natural one to make. Under this choice, the $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ norm of the approximation is constrained to be no worse than the best a priori upper bound we have for the $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ norm of φ . When we happen to know that the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ are additionally defined at points *not* in Σ then we consider scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ that are not necessarily equal to $\|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}, \dots, \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$. This situation is illustrated in the extension to compact domains presented in Section 4.

As stated, there is of course no guarantee that a solution to our sparse approximation problem satisfying conditions (1), (2), and (3) exists. Thus the strategy we adopt in this paper is as follows. Firstly, we define the **HOLGRIM** algorithm in Section 6 that is designed to find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ satisfying conditions (2) and (3). We then subsequently establish conditions in Section 10 under which the approximation returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to additionally satisfy condition (1) (cf. the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 in Section 10).

4. Extension to Compact Domains

In this section we illustrate how being able to solve the sparse approximation problem detailed in Section 3 for a finite domain $\Sigma \subset V$ enables one to solve the same sparse approximation problem in the setting that the finite domain $\Sigma \subset V$ is replaced by a compact domain $\Omega \subset V$. This is achieved by utilising the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* obtained in [LM24] and stated in Section 2 of this paper.

For this purpose we let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V is a d -dimensional real Banach space and that W is a c -dimensional real Banach space. Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be a (large) positive integer, $\Omega \subset V$ a non-empty compact subset, and $\mathcal{F} := \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ be a finite collection of non-zero $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ functions. Fix a choice of non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and consider $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Define $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} > 0$ so that $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. We first consider a sparse approximation problem analogous to the sparse approximation problem specified in Section 3. That is, find an element $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying the following properties.

Compact Domain Approximation Conditions

- (1) There exists an integer $M \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N} - 1\}$ for which the set

$$\text{support}(u) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\} : b_i \neq 0\} \quad \text{satisfies that} \quad \#(\text{support}(u)) \leq M. \quad (4.1)$$

- (2) The coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |b_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}. \quad (4.2)$$

- (3) The function $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ well-approximates φ throughout Ω in the pointwise sense that

$$\sup_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(z)\} \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \sup_{z \in \Sigma} \left\{ \max_{j \in \{0, \dots, l\}} \left\{ \left\| \varphi^{(j)}(z) - u^{(j)}(z) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \right\} \right\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

Observe that if $C \leq \varepsilon$ then the zero function in $\text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ is an approximation of φ satisfying **Compact Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3). Thus we restrict to the meaningful setting in which $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$.

In this case, fix a choice of $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and define a constant $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, l) > 0$ by (cf. (2.12))

$$r := \sup \{\theta > 0 : 2C\theta^{\gamma-l} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\theta} \leq \varepsilon\} \in (0, 1]. \quad (4.4)$$

Subsequently define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, l) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := \min \left\{ a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_a \in \Omega \text{ for which } \Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^a \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_s, r) \right\}. \quad (4.5)$$

A consequence of $\Omega \subset V$ being compact is that the integer $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ defined in (4.5) is finite. Choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset \Omega \subset V$ such that $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(p_s, r)$.

It is evident that, by restriction, we have that $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ with, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the norm estimate $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$. Thus we may consider the sparse approximation problem detailed in Section 3 for the ε there as ε_0 here, finite subset $\Sigma \subset V$ there as the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega \subset V$ here, the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ there as the restriction of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ here to the finite subset Σ here, the scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ there as $\|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ here, and the integer $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there as k here. We assume that we are able to find a solution $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ to this sparse approximation problem satisfying **Finite Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 3.

That is, we assume that we can find coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (cf. (3.2))

$$\#\{b_s \neq 0 : s \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \leq M < \mathcal{N}, \quad (4.6)$$

with (cf. (3.3))

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |b_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} = C, \quad (4.7)$$

and such that $u := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i$ satisfies that (cf. (3.4))

$$\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z)\} \leq \varepsilon_0. \quad (4.8)$$

A particular consequence of (4.7) is that $u \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ satisfies $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$. Therefore, together with (4.8), this yields the required hypotheses to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10. Indeed, observe that the constant r defined in (4.4) coincides with the constant δ_0 defined in (2.12) for the constants $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, K_0, \gamma$, and l there as $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, C, \gamma$, and l here respectively. Moreover, the definition of Λ in (4.5) ensures that Σ is a r -cover of Ω in the sense required in (2.13) for the subsets B and \mathcal{M} there as Σ and Ω here respectively. Consequently we are able to apply the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the subsets B and \mathcal{M} of that result as Σ and Ω here respectively, the constants $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, K_0, \gamma$, and l of that result as $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, C, \gamma$, and l here respectively, and the functions ψ and ϕ of that result as φ and u here respectively. By doing so we may conclude via the implication in (2.14) that $\sup_{z \in \Omega} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^l(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$. Consequently, the function $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ is an approximation of φ on Ω that satisfies **Compact Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3).

Moreover, at the cost of the involved constants becoming less explicit, the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 from [LM24] can be utilised to strengthen the sense in which the returned approximation u is required to approximate φ throughout Ω in **Compact Domain Approximation Condition** (3). To be more precise, we now consider the following problem. For a fixed $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$, find an element $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying the following properties.

Compact Domain Lipschitz Approximation Conditions

- (1) There exists an integer $M \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N} - 1\}$ for which the set

$$\text{support}(u) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\} : b_i \neq 0\} \quad \text{satisfies that} \quad \#(\text{support}(u)) \leq M. \quad (4.9)$$

- (2) The coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |b_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} =: C. \quad (4.10)$$

(3) The function $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ well-approximates φ throughout Ω in the $\text{Lip}(\eta)$ sense that

$$\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)} \leq \varepsilon \quad (4.11)$$

where $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ is such that $\eta \in (q, q+1]$. Recall that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$.

Observe that if $C \leq \varepsilon$ for the constant C defined in (4.10) then the zero function in $\text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ is an approximation of φ satisfying **Compact Domain Lipschitz Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3). Therefore we again restrict to the meaningful setting in which $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$.

Retrieve the constants $r = r(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ arising as δ_0 and ε_0 respectively in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively. Note we are not actually applying Theorem 2.9, but simply retrieving constants in preparation for its future application. Subsequently define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := \min \left\{ a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_a \in \Omega \text{ for which } \Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^a \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_s, r) \right\}. \quad (4.12)$$

The subset $\Omega \subset V$ being compact ensures that Λ defined in (4.12) is finite. Choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset \Omega \subset V$ such that $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(p_s, r)$.

As before, we assume that we are able to find a solution $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ to this sparse approximation problem for the finite subset Σ satisfying **Finite Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 3. That is, we assume that we can find coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_N \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (4.6) and (4.7), and such that $u := \sum_{i=1}^N b_i f_i$ satisfies (4.8) for the constant ε_0 retrieved from the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 above. It is again a consequence of (4.7) that $u \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ satisfies that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$, and so the pointwise estimates (4.8) now provide the required hypothesis to appeal to the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9.

Indeed we have specified that the constants r and ε_0 here coincide with the constants δ_0 and ε_0 arising in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9, for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η and ε there as C, γ, η and ε here, respectively. Further, the subset Σ is chosen to be a r -cover of Ω in the sense required in (2.10). Consequently we are able to apply the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* for the choices of the subsets B and \mathcal{M} there as Σ and Ω here respectively, the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there are C, γ, η , and ε here respectively, and for the choices of the functions ψ and ϕ there as φ and u here respectively. By doing so we may conclude via the implication (2.11) that $\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)} \leq \varepsilon$. Consequently, the function $u = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ is an approximation of φ on Ω that satisfies **Compact Domain Lipschitz Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3).

5. Pointwise Values Via Linear Functionals

In this section, given a closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ and a point $z \in \mathcal{M}$, we define a finite subset $\mathcal{T}_{z,k} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ of the dual-space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ of bounded linear functionals $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\psi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ the value of ψ at z is determined, up to a quantifiable error, by the values $\sigma(\psi)$ for the linear functionals $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z,k}$. We begin by introducing the following particularly useful quantities.

For integers $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, define $\beta(a, b)$ by

$$\beta(a, b) := \binom{a+b-1}{b} = \frac{(a+b-1)!}{(a-1)!b!} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = 0 \\ \frac{1}{b!} \prod_{s=0}^{b-1} (a+s) & \text{if } b \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Further, for integers $a, b, i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ define $D(a, b)$ and $Q(i, j, a, b)$ by

$$D(a, b) := \sum_{l=0}^b \beta(a, l) \quad \text{and} \quad Q(i, j, a, b) := 1 + ijD(a, b) = 1 + ij \sum_{l=0}^b \beta(a, l) \quad (5.2)$$

respectively.

Let $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and V be a real d -dimensional Banach space with $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ a closed subset. Assume that the tensor powers of V are equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Fix a choice of a unit V -norm basis v_1, \dots, v_d of V . Then, recalling that the tensor powers of V are assumed to be equipped with admissible tensor norms in the sense of definition 2.1, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ the set

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \quad (5.3)$$

is a unit $V^{\otimes n}$ -norm basis for $V^{\otimes n}$. Consequently, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ a symmetric j -linear form $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$ is determined by its action on the subset $\mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \subset \mathcal{V}_j$ defined by

$$\mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_j} : (l_1, \dots, l_j) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^j \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_j\} \subset \mathcal{V}_j. \quad (5.4)$$

That is, the collection of values $\mathbf{B}[v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_j}]$ for every $(l_1, \dots, l_j) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^j$ with $l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_j$ determine the value $\mathbf{B}[v]$ for every $v \in V^{\otimes j}$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$ is given by $\beta(d, j)$ defined in (5.1). The following lemma records how the bases \mathcal{V}_n for the tensor powers $V^{\otimes n}$ interact with a choice of admissible tensor norms for the tensor powers $V^{\otimes n}$ (cf. Definition 2.1).

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that V is a Banach space of dimension $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and that the tensor powers of V are equipped with admissible tensor norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Suppose that $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ is a basis of V normalised so that $\|v_1\|_V = \dots = \|v_d\|_V = 1$. Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and consider the basis \mathcal{V}_m of $V^{\otimes m}$ given by*

$$\mathcal{V}_m := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_m} : (l_1, \dots, l_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m\}. \quad (5.5)$$

Then for any $v \in V^{\otimes m}$ there exist coefficients $\{C_{j_1 \dots j_m} : (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m\}$ for which

$$v = \sum_{j_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{j_m=1}^d C_{j_1 \dots j_m} v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_m}. \quad (5.6)$$

Moreover, if $A \geq 0$ and $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes m}} \leq A$, then

$$\sum_{j_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{j_m=1}^d |C_{j_1 \dots j_m}| \leq Ad^m. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Assume that V is a Banach space of dimension $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and that the tensor powers of V are equipped with admissible tensor norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Suppose that $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ is a basis of V normalised so that $\|v_1\|_V = \dots = \|v_d\|_V = 1$. We first verify the claims made in (5.6) and (5.7) in the case that $m = 1$.

Let $v \in V$; the existence of coefficients $C_1, \dots, C_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v = \sum_{j=1}^d C_j v_j$ is an immediate consequence of $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ being a basis of V . Now assume $A \geq 0$ and that $\|v\|_V \leq A$. It is convenient to consider the dual-basis $v_1^*, \dots, v_d^* \in V^*$ corresponding to $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$. This means that whenever $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ we have $v_j^*(v_i) = \delta_{ij}$, and that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ we have $\|v_j^*\|_{V^*} = 1$. Here, for $\sigma \in V^*$, we have $\|\sigma\|_{V^*} = \sup \{|\sigma(u)| : u \in V \text{ and } \|u\|_V \leq 1\}$.

Being a finite dimensional Banach space means V is reflexive. A particular consequence of this is, for any $u \in V$, that $\|u\|_V = \|u\|_{V^{**}}$ where we view u as an element in V^{**} by defining its action on an element $\sigma \in V^*$ by $u(\sigma) := \sigma(u)$. Further, since $\|u\|_{V^{**}} = \sup \{|\sigma(u)| : \sigma \in V^* \text{ and } \|\sigma\|_{V^*} \leq 1\}$, we have, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, that $|C_j| = |v_j^*(v)| \leq \|v\|_{V^{**}} = \|v\|_V \leq A$. It is now immediate that $\sum_{j=1}^d |C_j| \leq Ad$, verifying that (5.7) is valid in the case that $m = 1$.

It remains only to verify that (5.6) and (5.7) are valid in the case that $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. For this purpose fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and let $v \in V^{\otimes m}$. The existence of coefficients $\{C_{j_1 \dots j_m} : (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m\}$ for which (5.6) is true is a consequence of the fact that the set $\mathcal{V}_m := \{v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_m} : (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m\}$ defined in (5.5) is a basis for $V^{\otimes m}$. Moreover, since the tensor powers of V are equipped with admissible tensor norms, we have, for every $(j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m$, that (cf. Definition 2.1)

$$\|v_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_m}\|_{V^{\otimes m}} = \|v_{j_1}\|_V \dots \|v_{j_m}\|_V = 1. \quad (5.8)$$

Now assume that $A \geq 0$ and that $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes m}} \leq A$. A consequence of the tensor powers of V being equipped with

admissible norms is that for any $u \in V^{\otimes m}$ we have (cf. Proposition 2.1 in [Rya02])

$$\|u\|_{\text{inj}(V^{\otimes m})} \leq \|u\|_{V^{\otimes m}} \leq \|u\|_{\text{proj}(V^{\otimes m})}. \quad (5.9)$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{\text{inj}(V^{\otimes m})}$ denotes the *injective cross norm* on $V^{\otimes m}$ defined by

$$\|u\|_{\text{inj}(V^{\otimes m})} := \sup \{ |\phi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_m(u)| : \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m \in V^* \text{ with } \|\phi_1\|_{V^*} = \dots = \|\phi_m\|_{V^*} = 1 \}, \quad (5.10)$$

and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{proj}(V^{\otimes m})}$ denotes the *projective cross norm* on $V^{\otimes m}$ defined by

$$\|u\|_{\text{proj}(V^{\otimes m})} := \inf \left\{ \sum_i \|a_{1,i}\|_V \dots \|a_{m,i}\|_V : u = \sum_i a_{1,i} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{m,i} \right\}. \quad (5.11)$$

If we let $v_1^*, \dots, v_d^* \in V^*$ denote the dual-basis to $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ then, for each $(j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m$, it follows that

$$A \geq \|v\|_{V^{\otimes m}} \stackrel{(5.9)}{\geq} \|v\|_{\text{inj}(V^{\otimes m})} \stackrel{(5.10)}{\geq} |v_{j_1}^* \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_m}^*(v)| \stackrel{(5.6)}{=} |C_{j_1 \dots j_m}|. \quad (5.12)$$

Summing over $(j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m$ in (5.12) yields (5.7), which completes the proof of Lemma 5.1. \blacksquare

Let $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and W be a real c -dimensional Banach space. Fix a choice of a unit W -norm basis w_1, \dots, w_c of W , and consider its corresponding dual basis w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* of W^* . Then whenever $a, b \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ we have

$$w_a^*(w_b) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = b \\ 0 & \text{if } a \neq b. \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

A particularly useful consequence is that any $w \in W$ can be decomposed as

$$w = \sum_{s=1}^c w_s^*(w) w_s. \quad (5.14)$$

We use these bases for V , W , and the tensor powers of V to define, for each point in \mathcal{M} , an associated collection of bounded linear functionals in the dual-space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$.

For $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ define $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by setting, for $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$,

$$\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi) := w_s^*(\phi^{(0)}(p)). \quad (5.15)$$

For $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $v \in V^{\otimes j}$, and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ define $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by setting, for $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$,

$$\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi) := w_s^*(\phi^{(j)}(p)[v]). \quad (5.16)$$

Then for a given $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.17)$$

It follows from (5.1) and (5.17) that

$$\#(\mathcal{M}_{p,j}) = c\beta(d, j). \quad (5.18)$$

For a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_{p,l} := \bigcup_{j=0}^l \mathcal{M}_{p,j}. \quad (5.19)$$

It follows from (5.19) that, since the union in (5.19) is disjoint we have

$$\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,l}) = \sum_{j=0}^l \#(\mathcal{M}_{p,j}) \stackrel{(5.18)}{=} c \sum_{j=0}^l \beta(d,j) \stackrel{(5.2)}{=} cD(d,l). \quad (5.20)$$

Finally, for a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{M}_l^* \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_l^* := \bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{T}_{z,l}. \quad (5.21)$$

A consequence of the union in (5.21) being disjoint is that when $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ is finite with cardinality $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ we have

$$\#(\mathcal{M}_l^*) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{M}} \#(\mathcal{T}_{z,l}) \stackrel{(5.20)}{=} \sum_{s=1}^{\Lambda} cD(d,l) = cD(d,l)\Lambda. \quad (5.22)$$

In the remainder of this section we establish several lemmata in order to provide a precise quantified meaning to the statement that the value of a $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ function $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is determined by the set $\{\sigma(\phi) : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The first result records estimates relating the values $|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)|$ for $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ to the value $\|\phi^{(0)}\|_W$ and, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the values $|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)|$ for $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ and $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ to the value $\|\phi^{(j)}(v)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)}$. The precise result is the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2 (Linear Functional Inequalities). *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. Given $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in V^{\otimes j}$, define linear functionals $\delta_{p,0,s}, \delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, setting (cf. (5.15) and (5.16)).*

$$\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p)) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v]). \quad (5.23)$$

Suppose that $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. Then, for any $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we have that

$$|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| \leq \|\phi^{(0)}\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,0,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.24)$$

Now suppose that $k \geq 1$ and fix $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then, for any $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ and any $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we have that

$$|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq \|\phi^{(j)}(p)[v]\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,j,v,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.25)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. Given $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in V^{\otimes j}$, define linear functionals $\delta_{p,0,s}, \delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, setting (cf. (5.23)).

$$\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p)) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v]). \quad (5.26)$$

Suppose that $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ and fix $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$. Then, since $\|w_1^*\|_{W^*} = \dots =$

$\|w_c^*\|_{W^*} = 1$, we have

$$|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| = \left| w_s^* \left(\phi^{(0)}(p) \right) \right| \leq \left\| \phi^{(0)}(p) \right\|_W = \left\| \sum_{a=1}^c w_a^* \left(\phi^{(0)}(p) \right) w_a \right\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c \left| w_a^* \left(\phi^{(0)}(p) \right) \right| = \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,0,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.27)$$

The arbitrariness of $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ means that the estimates established in (5.27) are precisely those claimed in (5.24).

Now suppose that $k \geq 1$ and fix $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Fix $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$. Then, again since $\|w_1^*\|_{W^*} = \dots = \|w_c^*\|_{W^*} = 1$, we have

$$|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| = \left| w_s^* \left(\phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right) \right| \leq \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right\|_W = \left\| \sum_{a=1}^c w_a^* \left(\phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right) w_a \right\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c \left| w_a^* \left(\phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right) \right| = \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,j,v,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.28)$$

The arbitrariness of $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $v \in V^{\otimes j}$, and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ mean that the estimates established in (5.28) are precisely those claimed in (5.25). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. \blacksquare

We can use the inequalities established in Lemma 5.2 to establish the following dual norm estimates for linear functionals in $\mathcal{T}_{p,l}$ (cf. (5.19)).

Lemma 5.3 (Dual Norm Estimates). *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.3))*

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.29)$$

and (cf. (5.4))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.30)$$

Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. For a given $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.31)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)). For a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $\mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by (cf. (5.19))

$$\mathcal{T}_{p,l} := \bigcup_{j=0}^l \mathcal{M}_{p,j}. \quad (5.32)$$

Then for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}$ and any $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ we have

$$|\sigma(\phi)| \leq \Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}. \quad (5.33)$$

Consequently, for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}$, we have

$$\|\sigma\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*} \leq 1 \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \overline{\mathbb{B}}_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*}(0, 1). \quad (5.34)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.29))

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.35)$$

and (cf. (5.30))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.36)$$

Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. For a given $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by (cf. (5.31))

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.37)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)). For a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $\mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by (cf. (5.32))

$$\mathcal{T}_{p,l} := \bigcup_{j=0}^l \mathcal{M}_{p,j}. \quad (5.38)$$

Now fix $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Consider $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}$. It follows from (5.37) and (5.38) that either $\sigma = \delta_{p,0,s}$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, or $\sigma = \delta_{p,j,v,s}$ for some $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, some $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, and some $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$.

If $\sigma = \delta_{p,0,s}$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ then, given any $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, we may appeal to Lemma 5.2 to deduce that (cf. (5.24))

$$|\sigma(\phi)| = |\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| \leq \left\| \phi^{(0)}(p) \right\|_W \leq \Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}. \quad (5.39)$$

If $\sigma = \delta_{p,j,v,s}$ for some $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, some $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, and some $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, then we first note that $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes j}} = 1$. Thus, given any $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, we may appeal to Lemma 5.2 to deduce that (cf. (5.25))

$$|\sigma(\phi)| = |\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right\|_W \leq \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq \Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)}. \quad (5.40)$$

Together, (5.39) and (5.40) establish the claim made in (5.33). Since the $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ norm of σ is given by $\|\sigma\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*} := \sup \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W) \text{ with } \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)} = 1\}$, the claims made in (5.34) are an immediate consequence of (5.33). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.3. \blacksquare

We now use the inequalities established in Lemma 5.2 to establish, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, that the symmetric j -linear form from V to W given by $\phi^{(j)}(p) \in \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$ is determined, in a quantified sense, by the set real numbers $\{\sigma(\phi) : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$ is defined in (5.17). The precise result is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4 (Linear Functionals Determine Pointwise Value). *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis*

of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.3))

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.41)$$

and (cf. (5.4))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.42)$$

Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. For a given $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.43)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)).

Suppose that $A \geq 0$ and $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. Then for any $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we have that the following implications are valid. Firstly,

$$\left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq A \implies \max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A. \quad (5.44)$$

Secondly,

$$\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A \implies \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq cd^j A. \quad (5.45)$$

Consequently, in the case that $A = 0$, the combination of (5.44) and (5.45) yields that

$$\phi^{(j)}(p) \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W) \iff \max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} = 0. \quad (5.46)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and assume that V and W are real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be closed with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.41))

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.47)$$

and (cf. (5.42))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.48)$$

A consequence of the tensor powers of V being equipped with admissible norms in the sense of Definition 2.1 is that $\mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}$ is a unit $V^{\otimes n}$ -norm basis of $V^{\otimes n}$. Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. For a given $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by (cf. (5.43))

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.49)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)).

Suppose that $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. Observe that if (5.44) and (5.45) are both valid for any $A \geq 0$, then the equivalence claimed in (5.46) is an immediate consequence of invoking both for the particular

choice of $A := 0$. Thus we need only verify that both the implications (5.44) and (5.45) are valid for any $A \geq 0$. Thus, for the remainder of the proof, we fix an arbitrary choice of $A \geq 0$.

We begin with the case that $j = 0$ so that (cf. (5.49)) $\mathcal{M}_{p,0} = \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$. By appealing to Lemma 5.2 we may conclude that, for each $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we have (cf. (5.24))

$$|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| \leq \left\| \phi^{(0)}(p) \right\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)|. \quad (5.50)$$

If $\left\| \phi^{(0)}(p) \right\|_W \leq A$ then, for any $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, a consequence of (5.50) is that $|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. Therefore, since $\mathcal{M}_{p,0} = \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\}$, we deduce that $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,0}\} \leq A$. Thus, recalling that $\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes 0}; W) = W$ and we choose to equip this space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ on W (cf. Remark 2.3), the implication claimed in (5.44) is valid when $j = 0$.

If $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,0}\} \leq A$, then since $\mathcal{M}_{p,0} = \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\}$ we have, for every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, that $|\delta_{p,0,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. Therefore, via an application of (5.50), it follows that $\left\| \phi^{(0)}(p) \right\|_W \leq cA$. Thus, recalling that $\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes 0}; W) = W$ and we choose to equip this space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ on W (cf. Remark 2.3), the implication claimed in (5.45) is valid when $j = 0$.

Hence we have established that the lemma is true when $j = 0$.

We next establish that the lemma is true when $j = 1$. In this case, since $\mathcal{V}_1^{\text{ord}} = \mathcal{V}_1$, we have $\mathcal{M}_{p,1} = \{\delta_{p,1,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_1 \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$. Given $v \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we can appeal to Lemma 5.2 to conclude that (cf. (5.25))

$$|\delta_{p,1,v,s}(\phi)| \leq \left\| \phi^{(1)}(p)[v] \right\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,1,v,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.51)$$

If $\left\| \phi^{(1)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V;W)} \leq A$ then, since $v \in \mathcal{V}_1$ means $\|v\|_V = 1$, it follows from (5.51) that $|\delta_{p,1,v,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. The arbitrariness of $v \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ means we can deduce that $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,1}\} \leq A$. Thus the implication (5.44) is valid when $j = 1$.

If $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,1}\} \leq A$ then, for every $v \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we have that $|\delta_{p,1,v,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. Now suppose that $v \in V$ with $\|v\|_V = 1$. Then, since \mathcal{V}_1 is a basis of V , there are coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v = \sum_{m=1}^d b_m v_m$. Moreover, by appealing to Lemma 5.1, we have (cf. (5.7) for $m = 1$) that $\sum_{j=m}^d |b_m| \leq d$. Therefore, via an application of (5.51), we have

$$\left\| \phi^{(1)}(p)[v] \right\|_W \leq \sum_{m=1}^d |b_m| \left\| \phi^{(1)}(p)[v_m] \right\|_W \stackrel{(5.51)}{\leq} \sum_{m=1}^d |b_m| \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,1,v_m,a}(\phi)| \leq \sum_{m=1}^d |b_m| \sum_{a=1}^c A \leq cdA. \quad (5.52)$$

By taking the supremum over $v \in V$ with $\|v\|_V = 1$ in (5.52), we obtain that $\left\| \phi^{(1)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V;W)} \leq cdA$. Thus the implication (5.45) is valid when $j = 1$.

Hence we have established that the lemma is true when $j = 1$.

We complete the proof by establishing that, when $k \geq 2$, the lemma is true for an arbitrary fixed $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} = \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$. Given $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, we can appeal to Lemma 5.2 to conclude that (cf. (5.25))

$$|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right\|_W \leq \sum_{a=1}^c |\delta_{p,j,v,a}(\phi)|. \quad (5.53)$$

If $\left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j};W)} \leq A$, since $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$ means $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes j}} = 1$, it follows from (5.53) that $|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. The arbitrariness of both $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ means we can deduce that $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A$. Thus the implication (5.44) is valid for arbitrary $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$.

Now suppose that $\max\{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A$. We first claim that this means, given any $v \in \mathcal{V}_j$ and any $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, that $|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq A$. Indeed, if $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \subset \mathcal{V}_j$ then this is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$. And it follows for general $v \in \mathcal{V}_j$ as follows. Fix $v \in \mathcal{V}_j$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$. Then there exists a permutation $\rho \in S_j$ such that $\rho(v) \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$; see Definition 2.1 for the details of how the permutation group S_j acts

on the tensor product $V^{\otimes j}$. But $\phi^{(j)}(p) \in \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)$ is a j -symmetric linear form from V to W ; so, in particular, $\phi^{(j)}(p)[\rho(v)] = \phi^{(j)}(p)[v]$. Hence $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi) = \delta_{p,j,\rho(v),s}(\phi)$ from which it is immediate that $|\delta_{p,j,v,s}(\phi)| \leq A$ as claimed.

Let $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ with $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes j}} = 1$. Then, by appealing to Lemma 5.1, we have that there are coefficients $\{C_{l_1 \dots l_j} : (l_1, \dots, l_j) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^j\}$ for which (cf. (5.6))

$$v = \sum_{l_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{l_j=1}^d C_{l_1 \dots l_j} v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_j}, \quad (5.54)$$

and such that (cf. (5.7) for A there as 1)

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{l_j=1}^d |C_{l_1 \dots l_j}| \leq d^j. \quad (5.55)$$

Consequently, via an application of (5.53), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p)[v] \right\|_W &\leq \sum_{l_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{l_j=1}^d |C_{l_1 \dots l_j}| \left\| \phi^{(j)}(p)[v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_j}] \right\|_W \\ &\stackrel{(5.53)}{\leq} \sum_{l_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{l_j=1}^d |C_{l_1 \dots l_j}| \sum_{a=1}^c \left| \delta_{p,j,v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_j}, a}(\phi) \right| \leq cA \sum_{l_1=1}^d \dots \sum_{l_j=1}^d |C_{l_1 \dots l_j}| \stackrel{(5.55)}{\leq} cd^j A. \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

By taking the supremum over $v \in V^{\otimes j}$ with $\|v\|_{V^{\otimes j}} = 1$ in (5.56), we obtain that $\|\phi^{(j)}(p)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq cd^j A$. Thus the implication (5.45) is valid for arbitrary $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.4. \blacksquare

We conclude this section by using Lemma 5.4 to establish that the value of a $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ function $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$ at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is determined, in a quantified sense, by the set of real numbers $\{\sigma(\phi) : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{T}_{p,k}$ is defined in (5.19). The precise result is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5 (Determining Lipschitz Functions at Points). *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be a closed subset, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.3))*

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.57)$$

and (cf. (5.4))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.58)$$

Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and let $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. For each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.59)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^*(F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by

$\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^* (F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)). Further, for a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_{p,l} := \bigcup_{j=0}^l \mathcal{M}_{p,j}. \quad (5.60)$$

Recall the notation introduced in Remark 2.8 that, for each point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we set

$$\Lambda_\phi^j(x) := \max_{s \in \{0, \dots, j\}} \left\{ \left\| \phi^{(s)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes s}; W)} \right\}. \quad (5.61)$$

Then, given $A \geq 0$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, the following implications are valid. Firstly,

$$\Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq A \implies \max \{ |\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l} \} \leq A. \quad (5.62)$$

Secondly,

$$\max \{ |\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l} \} \leq A \implies \Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq cd^l A. \quad (5.63)$$

Consequently, in the case that $A = 0$, the combination of (5.62) and (5.63) yields that

$$\Lambda_\phi^l(p) = 0 \iff \max \{ |\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l} \} = 0. \quad (5.64)$$

Therefore the condition that $\phi(p) = (\phi^{(0)}(p), \dots, \phi^{(k)}(p))$ vanishes at $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to the system of equations generated by requiring, for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}$, that $\sigma(\phi) = 0$; that is, to a system of

$$\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,k}) = c \sum_{j=0}^k \beta(d, j) \quad (5.65)$$

real valued equations. Here, for integers $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\beta(a, b)$ is defined by (cf. (5.1))

$$\beta(a, b) := \binom{a+b-1}{b} = \frac{(a+b-1)!}{(a-1)!b!} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = 0 \\ \frac{1}{b!} \prod_{s=0}^{b-1} (a+s) & \text{if } b \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.66)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.5. Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset V$ be a closed subset, and assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V$ be a unit V -norm basis of V . For each integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define (cf. (5.57))

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n\} \subset V^{\otimes n} \quad (5.67)$$

and (cf. (5.58))

$$\mathcal{V}_n^{\text{ord}} := \{v_{l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{l_n} : (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^n \text{ such that } l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}_n \subset V^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.68)$$

Further, let $w_1, \dots, w_c \in W$ be a unit W -norm basis of W , and let $w_1^*, \dots, w_c^* \in W^*$ be the corresponding dual basis of W^* .

Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and let $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$. For each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ define $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by (cf. (5.59))

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,j} := \begin{cases} \{\delta_{p,0,s} : s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ \{\delta_{p,j,v,s} : v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, c\}\} & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.69)$$

For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,0,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,0,s}(F) := w_s^* (F^{(0)}(p))$ (cf. (5.15)). For every $s \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}$, the linear functional $\delta_{p,j,v,s} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ is defined, for $F = (F^{(0)}, \dots, F^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)$, by $\delta_{p,j,v,s}(F) := w_s^* (F^{(j)}(p)[v])$ (cf. (5.16)). Further, for a given $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $\mathcal{T}_{p,l} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, W)^*$ by

(cf. (5.60))

$$\mathcal{T}_{p,l} := \bigcup_{j=0}^l \mathcal{M}_{p,j}. \quad (5.70)$$

Recall the notation introduced in Remark 2.8 that, for each point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we set (cf. (5.61))

$$\Lambda_\phi^j(x) := \max_{s \in \{0, \dots, j\}} \left\{ \left\| \phi^{(s)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes s}; W)} \right\}. \quad (5.71)$$

We now turn our attention to verifying that both the implications (5.62) and (5.63) are valid. For this purpose let $A \geq 0$ and fix $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$.

First assume that $\Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq A$. A consequence of (5.71) is that, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, we have the bound $\left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq A$. In turn, by appealing to Lemma 5.4, we deduce, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, that (cf. (5.44)) $\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A$. It now follows from (5.70) that $\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}\} \leq A$. Thus the implication (5.62) is valid as claimed. We could alternatively have established (5.62) via use of the inequality (5.33) established in Lemma 5.3.

Now assume that $\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}\} \leq A$. A consequence of (5.70) is that, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, we have $\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\} \leq A$. In turn, by appealing to Lemma 5.4, we deduce, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, that (cf. (5.45)) $\left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} \leq cd^j A$. It now follows from (5.71) that $\Lambda_\phi^l(p) \leq cd^l A$. Thus the implication (5.63) is valid as claimed.

The combination of the implication (5.62) for $A := 0$ and the implication (5.63) for $A := 0$ yield that $\Lambda_\phi^l(p) = 0$ if and only if $\max \{|\sigma(\phi)| : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,l}\} = 0$ as claimed in (5.64).

To complete the proof, we consider imposing the condition that ϕ vanishes at the point p . In particular, this is equivalent to having, for every $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, that $\left\| \phi^{(j)}(p) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}; W)} = 0$. Consequently, by appealing to (5.64), this is equivalent to having, for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{p,k}$, that $\sigma(\phi) = 0$. This is a system of $\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,k})$ real-valued equations. The proof will be complete if we can establish that $\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,k}) = c \sum_{j=0}^k \beta(d, j)$ as claimed in (5.65) where, for integers $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\beta(a, b)$ is given by (cf. (5.66))

$$\beta(a, b) := \binom{a+b-1}{b} = \frac{(a+b-1)!}{(a-1)!b!} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = 0 \\ \frac{1}{b!} \prod_{s=0}^{b-1} (a+s) & \text{if } b \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.72)$$

We first note via (5.70) that $\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,k}) = \sum_{j=0}^k \#(\mathcal{M}_{p,j})$. Moreover, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, it follows from (5.69) that

$$\#(\mathcal{M}_{p,j}) := \begin{cases} c & \text{if } j = 0 \\ c\#(\mathcal{V}_j^{\text{ord}}) & \text{if } j \geq 1 \end{cases} \stackrel{(5.72)}{=} c\beta(d, j). \quad (5.73)$$

Hence $\#(\mathcal{T}_{p,k}) = c \sum_{j=0}^k \beta(d, j)$ as claimed in (5.65). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.5. \blacksquare

6. The HOLGRIM Algorithm

The following **HOLGRIM Extension Step** is used to dynamically grow the collection of points $P \subset \Sigma$ at which we require our next approximation of φ to agree with φ .

HOLGRIM Extension Step

Assume $P' \subset \Sigma$. Let $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ such that $\#(P') + m \leq \Lambda := \#(\Sigma)$.

$$\Sigma_q^* := \bigcup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*. \quad (6.1)$$

First take

$$\sigma_1 := \operatorname{argmax} \{|\sigma(\varphi - u)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}, \quad (6.2)$$

and then take $z_1 \in \Sigma$ to be the point for which $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{T}_{z_1,q}$.

Inductively for $j = 2, 3, \dots, m$ take

$$\sigma_j := \operatorname{argmax} \left\{ |\sigma(\varphi - u)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^* \setminus \bigcup_{s=1}^{j-1} \mathcal{T}_{z_s, q} \right\} \quad (6.3)$$

and then take $z_j \in \Sigma$ to be the point for which $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{T}_{z_j, q}$.

Once $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \Sigma$ have been defined, we extend P' to $P := P' \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$.

The following **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** details how, for a given subset $P \subset \Sigma$ and a given $\varepsilon_0 \geq 0$, we use recombination to find a function $u \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying, for every point $z \in P$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

HOLGRIM Recombination Step

Assume $P \subset \Sigma$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ such that $m = \#(P)$. For integers $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, let $\beta(a, b)$ be as defined in (5.1). That is,

$$\beta(a, b) := \binom{a+b-1}{b} = \frac{(a+b-1)!}{(a-1)!b!} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = 0 \\ \frac{1}{b!} \prod_{s=0}^{b-1} (a+s) & \text{if } b \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

Let $Q = Q(m, c, d, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be as defined in (5.2). That is,

$$Q := 1 + mc \sum_{r=0}^k \beta(d, r). \quad (6.5)$$

Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and define $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z, q}$. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ we do the following.

(A) Define $L(k) \subset \operatorname{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ by

$$L(k) := \bigcup_{z \in P} \mathcal{T}_{z, k} \subset \operatorname{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*. \quad (6.6)$$

By appealing to Lemma 5.5 we see that, the cardinality of $L(k)$ is (cf. (5.65))

$$\#(L(k)) = \sum_{z \in P} \#(\mathcal{T}_{z, k}) = mc \sum_{j=0}^k \beta(d, j) \stackrel{(6.5)}{=} Q - 1. \quad (6.7)$$

(B) Let $L_j(k) \subset \operatorname{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ be the subset resulting from applying a random permutation to the ordering of the linear functionals in $L(k)$.

(C) Apply recombination via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I], with the Banach space X , the integers $\mathcal{N}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the subset $L \subset X^*$, the finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subset X$, and the target $\varphi \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset X$ in that result as $\operatorname{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$, $\mathcal{N}, Q - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $L_j(k)$, and $\varphi \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \operatorname{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ here respectively, to find $u_j \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying

$$\max \{ |\sigma(\varphi - u_j)| : \sigma \in L_j(k) \} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k}. \quad (6.8)$$

Since $L_j(k)$ is a re-ordering of $L(k)$, the combination of (6.6) and Lemma 5.5 for the subset \mathcal{M} there as P here (specifically implication (5.63)) yields, for each point $z \in P$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_j}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

(D) Compute

$$E[u_j] := \max \{ |\sigma(\varphi - u_j)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^* \}. \quad (6.9)$$

After obtaining the functions $u_1, \dots, u_s \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ we define $u \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ by

$$u := \operatorname{argmin} \{ E[u_j] : j \in \{1, \dots, s\} \}. \quad (6.10)$$

Then $u \in \operatorname{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ is returned as our approximation of φ that satisfies, for every $z \in P$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Theoretically, there is no problem choosing $\varepsilon_0 := 0$ in the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**. The use of recombination in Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] does theoretically find an approximation u of φ such that, for every $\sigma \in L_j(k)$,

we have $\sigma(\varphi - u) = 0$. Hence, via Lemma 5.5 (cf. (5.64) for l there are k here), we may theoretically conclude that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) = 0$ for all points $z \in P$ for the given subset $P \subset \Sigma$. However, implementations of recombination inevitably result in numerical errors. That is, the returned coefficients will only solve the equations modulo some (ideally) small error term. Similarly to [LM22-I], we account for this in our analysis by only assuming in (6.8) that the resulting approximation $u_j \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ only satisfies, for every $\sigma \in L_j(k)$, that $|\sigma(\varphi - u_j)| \leq \varepsilon_0/cd^k$ for some (small) constant $\varepsilon_0 \geq 0$. The inclusion of the cd^k factor on the denominator is to ensure that, via an application of implication (5.63) in Lemma 5.5 for the subset \mathcal{M} there as P here, for every point $z \in P$ we have that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

We exploit the potential advantage offered by shuffling the order of the inputs for recombination that is utilised in [LM22-I]. That is, if recombination is applied to a linear system of equations corresponding to a matrix A , then a Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) of the matrix A is used to find a basis of the kernel $\ker(A)$ (see Section 3 in [LM22-I], for example). Consequently, re-ordering the rows of the matrix (i.e. changing the order in which the equations are considered) can potentially result in a different basis for $\ker(A)$ being selected. Hence shuffling the order of the equations can affect the approximation returned by recombination via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I]. As done in [LM22-I], we exploit this by optimising the approximation returned by recombination over a chosen number of shuffles of the equations forming the linear system.

We now detail our proposed **HOLGRIM** algorithm to find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of $\varphi \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ that is close to φ throughout Σ in the sense that, for a given $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$ for every point $z \in \Sigma$.

HOLGRIM

- (A) Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ as the *target accuracy threshold*, $\varepsilon_0 \in [0, \varepsilon)$ as the *acceptable recombination error*, $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ as the *maximum number of steps*, and $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ as the *order level*. Choose integers $s_1, \dots, s_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ as the *shuffle numbers*, and integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with

$$\kappa := k_1 + \dots + k_M \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N} - 1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}. \quad (6.11)$$

Choose *scaling factors* $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$.

- (B) For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, if $a_i < 0$ then replace a_i and f_i by $-a_i$ and $-f_i$ respectively. This ensures that $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ whilst leaving the expansion $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$ unaltered. Additionally, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ replace f_i by $h_i := f_i/A_i$ so that $h_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ with $\|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq 1$, and that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i h_i$ where $\alpha_i := a_i A_i$.
- (C) Apply the **HOLGRIM Extension Step**, with $P' := \emptyset$, $u \equiv 0$ and $m := k_1$, to obtain a subset $\Sigma_1 = \{z_{1,1}, \dots, z_{1,k_1}\} \subset \Sigma$. Apply the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**, with $P := \Sigma_1$ and $s := s_1$, to find a function $u_1 \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying, for every point $z \in \Sigma_1$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_1}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

If $M = 1$ then the algorithm terminates here and returns u_1 as the final approximation of φ .

- (D) If $M \geq 2$ then we proceed inductively for $t \geq 2$ as follows. If $|\sigma(\varphi - u_{t-1})| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}$ for every linear functional $\sigma \in \Sigma_q^*$ then we stop and return u_{t-1} as the final approximation of φ . Otherwise, we apply the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** with $P' := \Sigma_{t-1}$, $u := u_{t-1}$ and $m := k_t$, to obtain a subset $\Sigma_t = \Sigma_{t-1} \cup \{z_{t,1}, \dots, z_{t,k_t}\} \subset \Sigma$. Apply the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**, with $P := \Sigma_t$ and $s := s_t$, to find a function $u_t \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying, for every point $z \in \Sigma_t$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_t}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

The algorithm ends either by returning u_{t-1} for $t \in \{2, \dots, M\}$ for which the stopping criterion was triggered as the final approximation of φ , or by returning u_M as the final approximation of φ if the stopping criterion is never triggered.

We claim that if $M \geq 2$ and the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates *before* the final M^{th} step is completed, then the resulting approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ satisfies, for every $z \in \Sigma$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$. To see this, let $m \in \{2, \dots, M\}$ and suppose that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates during the m^{th} step, i.e. that the m^{th} step is not completed. Then $u_{m-1} \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ is the approximation of φ returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm.

It follows from Step (D) in the **HOLGRIM** algorithm that this requires that $|\sigma(\varphi - u_{m-1})| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_q^*$. Recall that $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Thus, for any $z \in \Sigma$, we must have that $|\sigma(\varphi - u_{m-1})| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$ for

every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Consequently, by appealing to Lemma 5.5 (specifically to the implication (5.63)), we conclude that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_{m-1}}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$. Since $z \in \Sigma$ was arbitrary we have established that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \left\{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u_{m-1}}^q(z) \right\} \leq \varepsilon$ as claimed.

7. Complexity Cost

In this section we establish an estimate for the complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm detailed in Section 6. We first record the complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM Extension Step**.

Lemma 7.1 (HOLGRIM Extension Step Complexity Cost). *Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, m, t, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset with cardinality Λ . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Define $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Assume that the subset $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the subset $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ have already been computed. Then for any subset $P' \subset \Sigma$ with $\#(P') + m \leq \Lambda$ and any $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ with $\#\text{support}(u) = t$, the complexity cost of applying the **HOLGRIM Extension Step**, with the P' , u , and m there as the P' , u , and m here respectively, is $\mathcal{O}(c(m+t)\Lambda D(d, q))$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, m, t, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset with cardinality Λ . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Define $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Assume that the subset $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the subset $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ have already been computed. Suppose that $P' \subset \Sigma$ with $\#(P') + m \leq \Lambda$ and $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ with $\#\text{support}(u) = t$. Recall our convention that $\text{support}(u)$ is the set of the functions f_i that correspond to a non-zero coefficient in the expansion of u in terms of the f_i . That is, $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} u_i f_i$ for real numbers $u_1, \dots, u_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\text{support}(u) := \{f_j : j \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\} \text{ and } u_j \neq 0\}. \quad (7.1)$$

Consider carrying out the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** with the P' , u , and m there are P' , u , and m here respectively. Since we have access to $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$ and $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ without additional computation, and since $\#\text{support}(u) = t$, the complexity cost of computing the set $\{|\sigma(\varphi - u)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$ is no worse than $\mathcal{O}(t\#(\Sigma_q^*)) = \mathcal{O}(ct\Lambda D(d, q))$. Each of the m argmax values are found from a list of no greater than $\#(\Sigma_q^*) = c\Lambda D(d, q)$ real numbers, and so the complexity cost of extracting these m argmax values is no worse than $\mathcal{O}(cm\Lambda D(d, q))$. Moreover, for $j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$, the list from which we extract the next the j^{th} argmax value is obtained by removing $cD(d, q)$ values from the previous list, i.e. for every linear functional $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z_{j-1}, q}$ we remove the value $\sigma(\varphi - u)$, which results in removing $cD(d, q)$ values in total since this is the cardinality of $\mathcal{T}_{z_{j-1}, q}$ (cf. (5.20)). Thus the complexity cost of the discarding is, in total, no worse than $\mathcal{O}(cmD(d, q))$. The complexity cost of appending the resulting m points $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \Sigma$ to the collection P' is $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Therefore the entire **HOLGRIM Extension Step** has a complexity cost no worse than $\mathcal{O}(c(m+t)\Lambda D(d, q))$ as claimed. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.1. \blacksquare

We next record the complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**.

Lemma 7.2 (HOLGRIM Recombination Step Complexity Cost). *Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, m, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset with cardinality Λ . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Define $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$ and $\Sigma_k^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,k}$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Assume that the subset $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the subset $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ have already been computed. Then for any $P \subset \Sigma$ with cardinality $\#(P) = m$ the complexity cost of applying the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**, with the subset P , the integer s , and the order level $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there as P , s , and q here*

respectively, is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(smcD(d, k)(\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q)\Lambda) + sm^3c^3D(d, k)^3 \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{mcD(d, k)} \right) \right). \quad (7.2)$$

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, m, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let V and W be real Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset with cardinality Λ . Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$, and let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Define $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z, q}$ and $\Sigma_k^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z, k}$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Assume that the subset $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the subset $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ have already been computed. Let $P \subset \Sigma$ have cardinality $\#(P) = m$.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** with the subset P the integer s , and the order level $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there as P , s , and q here respectively. Define (cf. (6.6)) $L(k) := \cup_{z \in P} \mathcal{T}_{z, k} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$. Since $\#(P) = m$, it follows that (cf. (6.7)) the cardinality of $L(k)$ is $\#(L(k)) = mcD(d, k)$.

Consider a fixed $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. The complexity cost of shuffling of the elements in $L(k)$ to obtain $L_j(k)$ in **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** (B) is $\mathcal{O}(mcD(d, k))$.

In **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** (C), recombination is applied via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I]. In particular, Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] is applied with the Banach space X , the integers $\mathcal{N}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the subset $L \subset X^*$, the finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subset X$, and the target $\varphi \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset X$ in that result as $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$, \mathcal{N} , $mcD(d, k) + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $L_j(k)$, and $\varphi \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ here respectively, to find $u_j \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying

$$\max \{ |\sigma(\varphi - u_j)| : \sigma \in L_j(k) \} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k}. \quad (7.3)$$

It is established in Lemma 3.1 [LM22-I] that the complexity cost of this application is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\mathcal{N}mcD(d, k) + m^3c^3D(d, k) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{mcD(d, k)} \right) \right). \quad (7.4)$$

Further, since $\#(L_j(k)) = mcD(d, k)$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] that the cardinality of $\text{support}(u_j)$ satisfies $\#\text{support}(u_j) \leq mcD(d, k) + 1$. Thus, since we already have access to $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the subset $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ without additional computation and $\Sigma_q^* \subset \Sigma_k^*$, the complexity cost of computing $E[u_j] := \max \{ |\sigma(\varphi - u_j)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^* \}$ is

$$\mathcal{O}(mcD(d, k)\#(\Sigma_q^*)) = \mathcal{O}(mc^2\Lambda D(d, k)D(d, q)). \quad (7.5)$$

Therefore, the combination of (7.4) and (7.5) yields that the complexity cost of carrying out **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** (A), (B), (C), and (D) for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O} \left(smc^2\Lambda D(d, k)D(d, q) + s\mathcal{N}mcD(d, k) + sm^3c^3D(d, k) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{mcD(d, k)} \right) \right) = \\ & \mathcal{O} \left(smcD(d, k)(\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + sm^3c^3D(d, k) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{mcD(d, k)} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

The complexity cost of the final selection of $u := \text{argmin} \{E[w] : w \in \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}\}$ is $\mathcal{O}(s)$. Combined with (7.6), this yields that the complexity cost of the entire **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(smcD(d, k)(\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + sm^3c^3D(d, k) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{mcD(d, k)} \right) \right). \quad (7.7)$$

as claimed in (7.2). This completes the proof of Lemma 7.2. \blacksquare

We now establish an upper bound for the complexity cost of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm via repeated use of Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2. This is the content of the following result.

Lemma 7.3 (HOLGRIM Complexity Cost). *Let $\mathcal{N}, M, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0 \geq 0$. Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*

such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$. Let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Take $s_1, \dots, s_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with

$$\kappa := k_1 + \dots + k_M \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N} - 1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}. \quad (7.8)$$

For $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ let $\tau_j := \sum_{i=1}^j k_i$. Let V and W be real finite-dimensional Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1), and let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset of cardinality Λ . Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Fix a choice of $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Then the complexity cost of applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ , with ε as the target accuracy, ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error, M as the maximum number of steps, q as the order level, s_1, \dots, s_M as the shuffle numbers, the integers k_1, \dots, k_M as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A), and the real numbers $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A), is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(cD(d, k)\mathcal{N}\Lambda + \sum_{j=1}^M c s_j \tau_j D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q)\Lambda) + s_j \tau_j^3 c^3 D(d, k)^3 \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c \tau_j D(d, k)} \right) \right). \quad (7.9)$$

Proof of Lemma 7.3. Let $\mathcal{N}, M, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0 \geq 0$. Let $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$. Let $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Take $s_1, \dots, s_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with

$$\kappa := k_1 + \dots + k_M \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N} - 1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}. \quad (7.10)$$

For $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ let $\tau_j := \sum_{i=1}^j k_i$. Let V and W be real finite-dimensional Banach spaces of dimensions d and c respectively. Assume that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1), and let $\Sigma \subset V$ be a finite subset of cardinality Λ . Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Fix a choice of $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and define $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ with ε as the target accuracy, ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error, M as the maximum number of steps, q as the order level, s_1, \dots, s_M as the shuffle numbers, the integers k_1, \dots, k_M as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A), and the real numbers $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Since the cardinality of \mathcal{F} is \mathcal{N} , the complexity cost of the rescaling and sign alterations in Step (B) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{N})$. The complexity cost of computing the sets $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ is $\mathcal{O}(c\mathcal{N}\Lambda D(d, k))$. Subsequently, having access to the sets $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ means that the complexity cost of computing the set $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\}$ is $\mathcal{O}(c\mathcal{N}\Lambda D(d, k))$. Consequently, the total complexity cost of performing these computations is $\mathcal{O}(c\mathcal{N}\Lambda D(d, k))$.

We appeal to Lemma 7.1 to conclude that the complexity cost of performing the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** as in Step (C) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm (i.e. with $P' := \emptyset$, $u := 0$, and $m := k_1$) is $\mathcal{O}(ck_1\Lambda D(d, k))$. An application of Lemma 7.2, yields that the complexity cost of the use of the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Step (C) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm (i.e. with the subset $P := \Sigma_1$ and the shuffle number $s := s_1$) is $\mathcal{O}(cs_1 k_1 D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + s_1 c^3 k_1^3 D(d, k)^3 \log(\mathcal{N}/ck_1 D(d, k)))$. Hence the complexity cost of Step (C) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is $\mathcal{O}\left(cs_1 k_1 D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + s_1 c^3 k_1^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{ck_1 D(d, k)}\right)\right)$.

In the case that $M = 1$ we can already conclude that the complexity cost of performing the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(cD(d, k)\mathcal{N}\Lambda + cs_1 k_1 D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + s_1 c^3 k_1^3 D(d, k)^3 \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{ck_1 D(d, k)} \right) \right) \quad (7.11)$$

as claimed in (7.9). Now suppose that $M \geq 2$. We assume that all M steps of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm are completed without early termination since this is the case that will maximise the complexity cost. Under this assumption, for $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ let $u_j \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the approximation of φ returned after step j of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is completed. Recall that $\tau_j := \sum_{i=1}^j k_i$. The approximation u_j is obtained by applying

recombination via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] to find an approximation that is within ε_0 of φ on a subset of $c\tau_j D(d, k)$ linear functionals from Σ_k^* (cf. Step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm). Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] therefore ensures that $\#\text{support}(u_j) \leq 1 + c\tau_j D(d, k)$. In order to establish an upper bound for the maximal complexity cost, we assume that we are in the most costly situation in which $\#\text{support}(u_j) = 1 + c\tau_j D(d, k)$.

Let $t \in \{2, \dots, M\}$ and consider Step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm for the s there as t here. Since $\#\text{support}(u_{t-1}) = 1 + c\tau_{t-1} D(d, k)$ and we have already computed the set $\{\sigma(\varphi) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\}$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the set $\{\sigma(f_i) : \sigma \in \Sigma_k^*\}$, the complexity cost of computing the set $\{|\sigma(\varphi - u_{t-1})| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$ for the purpose of checking the termination criterion is $\mathcal{O}((1 + c\tau_{t-1} D(d, k))\#(\Sigma_q^*)) = \mathcal{O}(c^2 \tau_{t-1} D(d, q) D(d, k) \Lambda)$. Since $\#\text{support}(u_{t-1}) = 1 + c\tau_{t-1} D(d, k)$, Lemma 7.1 tells us that the complexity cost of performing the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** as in Step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm (i.e. with $P' := \Sigma_{t-1}$, $u := u_{t-1}$, and $m := k_t$) is $\mathcal{O}(c(k_t + c\tau_t D(d, k)) \Lambda D(d, q)) = \mathcal{O}(c^2 \tau_t D(d, k) D(d, q) \Lambda)$. Lemma 7.2 yields that the complexity cost of the use of the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** in Step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm (i.e. with $P := \Sigma_t$ and $s := s_t$) is $\mathcal{O}(c\tau_t s_t D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + c\Lambda D(d, q)) + s_t c^3 \tau_t^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c\tau_t D(d, k)}\right))$. Hence the entirety of Step (D) (for t here playing the role of s there) has a complexity cost of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(c s_t \tau_t D(d, k) \mathcal{N} + c^2 s_t \tau_t D(d, q) D(d, k) \Lambda + s_t \tau_t^3 c^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c\tau_t D(d, k)}\right)\right). \quad (7.12)$$

Summing together the complexity costs arising in (7.12) for each $t \in \{2, \dots, M\}$ yields that the complexity cost of carrying out step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm for every $t \in \{2, \dots, M\}$ is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{j=2}^M c s_j \tau_j D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q) \Lambda) + s_j \tau_j^3 c^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c\tau_j D(d, k)}\right)\right). \quad (7.13)$$

Having previously established the complexity cost of carrying out Steps (A), (B), and (C) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm in (7.11), the combination of (7.11) and (7.13) yields that the complexity cost of performing the entire **HOLGRIM** algorithm is (recalling that $\tau_1 := k_1$)

$$\mathcal{O}\left(cD(d, k) \mathcal{N} \Lambda + \sum_{j=1}^M c s_j \tau_j D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q) \Lambda) + s_j \tau_j^3 c^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c\tau_j D(d, k)}\right)\right) \quad (7.14)$$

as claimed in (7.9). This completes the proof of Lemma 7.3. \blacksquare

We end this section by explicitly recording the complexity cost upper bound arising in Lemma 7.3 for some particular parameter choices. In both examples we assume that $1 + cD(d, k) \Lambda < \mathcal{N}$.

First consider the choices that $M := 1$, $k_1 := \Lambda$ and $s_1 := 1$. This corresponds to making a single application of recombination to find an approximation u of φ that is within ε_0 of φ throughout Σ in the pointwise sense that, for every $z \in \Sigma$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$. Lemma 7.3 yields that the complexity cost of doing this is $\mathcal{O}\left(cD(d, k) \mathcal{N} \Lambda + c^2 D(d, q) D(d, k) \Lambda^2 + c^3 D(d, k)^3 \Lambda^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{cD(d, k) \Lambda}\right)\right)$.

Secondly consider the choices that $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$, and arbitrary fixed $s_1, \dots, s_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let $P \subset \Sigma$ denote the collection of points that is inductively grown in the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. These choices correspond to adding a single new points from Σ to P at each step of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ we have $\tau_j := \sum_{i=1}^j k_i = j$. Lemma 7.3 yields that the complexity cost of doing this is $\mathcal{O}\left(cD(d, k) \mathcal{N} \Lambda + \sum_{j=1}^M c s_j j D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q) \Lambda) + s_j c^3 j^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c j D(d, k)}\right)\right)$. If we further restrict to only allowing a single application of recombination at each step (i.e. impose that $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$) then the complexity cost is $\mathcal{O}\left(cD(d, k) \mathcal{N} \Lambda + cM^2 D(d, k) (\mathcal{N} + cD(d, q) \Lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^M c^3 j^3 D(d, k)^3 \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{c j D(d, k)}\right)\right)$.

In particular, if we take $M := \Lambda$ (which corresponds to allowing for the possibility that the subset P eventually

becomes the entire set Σ) then the complexity cost is

$$\mathcal{O} \left(cD(d, k)\mathcal{N}\Lambda^2 + c^2D(d, q)D(d, k)\Lambda^3 + \sum_{j=1}^{\Lambda} c^3j^3D(d, k)^3 \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{cjD(d, k)} \right) \right). \quad (7.15)$$

If the integer \mathcal{N} is large enough that $e^{1/3}cD(d, k)\Lambda < \mathcal{N}$ then for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \Lambda\}$ we have the estimate $c^3j^3D(d, k)^3 \log(\mathcal{N}/cjD(d, k)) \leq c^3D(d, k)^3\Lambda^3 \log(\mathcal{N}/cD(d, k)\Lambda)$. Thus, under these assumptions, the complexity cost in (7.15) is no worse than

$$\mathcal{O} \left(cD(d, k)\mathcal{N}\Lambda^2 + c^2D(d, q)D(d, k)\Lambda^3 + c^3D(d, k)^3\Lambda^4 \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}}{cD(d, k)\Lambda} \right) \right). \quad (7.16)$$

8. Theoretical Guarantees Inherited from GRIM

In this section we discuss the convergence guarantees that can be established for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm by directly appealing to the convergence theory for the **Banach GRIM** algorithm developed in Section 6 of [LM22-I]. We discuss the limitations of this approach and motivate the distinct approach using the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* established in [LM24] to obtain convergence results for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm that is adopted in Section 10.

Let $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, V be a d -dimensional real Banach space, and W be a c -dimensional real Banach space. Suppose that the tensor powers of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1) and that $\Sigma \subset V$ is a finite subset of cardinality $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$. Let $D = D(d, k)$ be the constant defined in (5.2); that is $D(d, k) := \sum_{l=0}^k \beta(d, l)$ where $\beta(d, 0) := 1$ and, for each $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ if $k \geq 1$, $\beta(d, l) := \frac{(d+l-1)\dots d}{l!}$ (cf. (5.1)).

Suppose, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $f_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is not identically zero and define a finite subset $\mathcal{F} := \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. For non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ consider $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ fix a choice of $A_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Finally, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, and fix a choice of $\varepsilon_0 \in [0, \varepsilon/cd^q]$.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ throughout Σ with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A) as ε , the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A) as ε_0 , the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A) as q , $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ as the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers k_1, \dots, k_M in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as the scaling factors in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Following **HOLGRIM** (B), for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ replace a_i and f_i by $-a_i$ and $-f_i$ if the original a_i satisfies $a_i < 0$. Subsequently, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, define $h_i := f_i/A_i$ so that $h_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ with $\|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq 1$. If, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we now define $\alpha_i := a_i A_i > 0$, then $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i h_i$.

We briefly outline how one could directly apply the convergence results for the **Banach GRIM** algorithm established in Section 6 of [LM22-I]. For this purpose momentarily assume, for some integer $n \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$, that $L = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subset \Sigma$ is the collection of points in Σ that have been selected during the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. Let $u_n \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the approximation found by recombination, via the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**, at step n . Then we have that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and for every linear functional $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z_j, k} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ that $|\sigma(\varphi - u_n)| \leq \varepsilon_0/cd^k$. Moreover, since the cardinality of $T_n := \cup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{z_j, k}$ is $ncD(d, k)$ (cf. (5.20)), it follows from Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] that, for $Q_n := 1 + ncD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{Q_n} \geq 0$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_n) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ for which $u_n = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_n} b_s h_{e(s)}$, and such that $\sum_{s=1}^{Q_n} b_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i = C$. Consequently $\|u_n\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq C$.

Thus we have all the hypotheses required to apply Lemma 6.4 in [LM22-I] for the choices of L , C , θ , and θ_0 there as $T_n := \cup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{z_j, k}$, C , ε/cd^q , and ε_0/cd^k here respectively. By doing so, we conclude that whenever $\sigma \in \text{Reach}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}}(T_n, 2C, \varepsilon/cd^q, \varepsilon_0/cd^k)$ we have $|\sigma(\varphi - u_n)| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$. Here we use the notation from

Subsection 6.1 in [LM22-I] that

$$\text{Reach}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} \left(T_n, 2C, \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} \right) := \begin{cases} \bigcup_{0 < r < \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0} d^{k-q}} \overline{\text{Span}}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} (T_n, r) \frac{1}{2C} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} r \right) & \text{if } \varepsilon_0 \neq 0 \\ \text{Span}(T_n) \frac{\varepsilon}{2Ccd^q} & \text{if } \varepsilon_0 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (8.1)$$

with

$$\text{Span}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} (T_n, r) := \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in T_n} a(\sigma) \sigma : \forall \sigma \in T_n \text{ we have } a(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{\sigma \in T_n} |a(\sigma)| \leq r \right\}. \quad (8.2)$$

Finally, the subscripts in (8.1) denote the fattening of the subset in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$. To elaborate, this means that $\overline{\text{Span}}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} (T_n, r) \frac{1}{2C} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} r \right)$ denotes the collection of linear functionals $\sigma \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ for which there exists a linear functional $\rho \in \overline{\text{Span}}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} (T_n, r)$ whose distance to σ in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ is no greater than $\frac{1}{2C} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} r \right)$. Similarly, $\text{Span}(T_n) \frac{\varepsilon}{2Ccd^q}$ denotes the collection of linear functionals $\sigma \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ for which there exists $\rho \in \text{Span}(T_n)$ whose distance to σ in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ is no greater than $\frac{\varepsilon}{2Ccd^q}$.

Consider the choice of the next point $z_{n+1} \in \Sigma$ made by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. An examination of Step (D) of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm reveals that if the algorithm does not terminate before the next point is selected, then there is a linear functional $\sigma_{n+1} \in \Sigma_q^* := \bigcup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$ for which $|\sigma_{n+1}(\varphi - u_n)| > \varepsilon/cd^q$, and the point $z_{n+1} \in \Sigma$ is chosen to be such that $\sigma_{n+1} \in \mathcal{T}_{z_{n+1},q}$. As a consequence, we have that $\sigma_{n+1} \notin \text{Reach}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_n-1})}} (T_n, 2C, \varepsilon/cd^q, \varepsilon_0/cd^k)$

Therefore, by following the strategy of Section 6 in [LM22-I] verbatim, we could establish that the integer

$$N := \max \left\{ d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists } z_1, \dots, z_d \in \Sigma \text{ such that for every } j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\} \\ \text{there exists } \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z_{j+1},q} \text{ with } \sigma \notin \text{Reach}_{\|\cdot\|_{l^1(\mathbb{R}^{Q_{j-1})}} (T_j, 2C, \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k}) \end{array} \right\} \quad (8.3)$$

is an upper bound for the maximum number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete before terminating. The upper bound given in (8.3) suffers the following issues.

Firstly, the integer N defined in (8.3) is determined by geometrical properties of the subset $\Sigma_k^* := \bigcup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,k}$ of the dual space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$. Computing N , or computing any of the geometric quantities that are established to provide upper bounds for N in Subsection 6.2 of [LM22-I], requires computing the distance between the linear functionals in Σ_k^* in the dual space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$. An immediate issue is how to compute such distances. The distance in the dual space $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ between $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ is given by

$$\sup \{ |\sigma_1(\phi) - \sigma_2(\phi)| : \phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \text{ with } \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq 1 \}. \quad (8.4)$$

It is not immediately clear how to compute the supremum in (8.4) in a cost-effective way.

Secondly, it is not clear how the distance in (8.4) for $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_k^*$ relates to the distance between the points $z_1, z_2 \in \Sigma$ for which $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{T}_{z_1,k}$ and $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{z_2,k}$. The data of interest in our problem is the points in Σ ; the linear functionals in Σ_k^* are introduced to enable our use of recombination (cf. **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**). Consequently we would prefer upper bounds for the number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete before terminating to depend on the geometry of the points $\Sigma \subset V$ rather than the geometry of the linear functionals $\Sigma_k^* \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$. But it is not clear how the $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)^*$ distances involved in the definition of N in (8.3) can be converted to distances between the points in Σ themselves.

In Section 10, we circumvent both these issues by utilising the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems* established in [LM24] to obtain an upper bound on the maximum number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete without terminating that both depends on the geometry of the points Σ rather than the linear functionals Σ_k^* , and can be estimated knowing only the distances between the points in Σ .

9. Point Separation Lemma

In this section we establish that the points selected during the **HOLGRIM** algorithm, under the choices that $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD(d,k)}, \Lambda \right\}$ and, for every integer $t \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, that $s_t := 1$ and $k_t := 1$, have to be a definite V -distance apart. This is the content of the following result.

Lemma 9.1 (HOLGRIM Point Separation). *Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and fix a choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0 \geq 0$ be real numbers such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}$. Assume V and W are finite dimensional real Banach spaces, of dimensions d and c respectively, with $\Sigma \subset V$ a finite subset of cardinality Λ . Assume that the tensor products of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ the element $f_i = (f_i^{(0)}, \dots, f_i^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is non-zero and define $\mathcal{F} := \{f_i : i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. Choose scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Given $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, define $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and $C > 0$ by*

$$(I) \quad \varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \varphi^{(l)} := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (II) \quad C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i > 0. \quad (9.1)$$

Then there exists a positive constant $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$, given by

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \right\}, \quad (9.2)$$

for which the following is true.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ throughout Σ with the choices of $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD(d,k)}, \Lambda \right\}$, the target accuracy threshold in **HOLGRIM** (A) as θ , the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A) as θ_0 , the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A) as b , the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A) as $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$, the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A) as $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$, and the scaling factors in **HOLGRIM** (A) as $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$. Given $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, if the algorithm reaches and carries out the m^{th} step without terminating, let $u_m = (u_m^{(0)}, \dots, u_m^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ denote the approximation found at the m^{th} step and $\Sigma_m := \{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \subset \Sigma$ denote the points selected such that at every $z \in \Sigma_m$ we have $\Lambda_{\varphi - u_m}^k(z) \leq \varepsilon_0$ (cf. **HOLGRIM** (C) and (D)). Then for every $z \in \Sigma$, the quantity $\Lambda_{\varphi - u_m}^q(z) := \max_{s \in \{0, \dots, q\}} \left\| \varphi^{(s)}(z) - u_m^{(s)}(z) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes s}; W)}$ satisfies

$$\Lambda_{\varphi - u_m}^q(z) \leq \min \left\{ 2C, 2C \max_{h \in \{0, \dots, q\}} \left\{ \text{dist}_V(z, \Sigma_m)^{\gamma-h} \right\} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\text{dist}_V(z, \Sigma_m)} \right\}. \quad (9.3)$$

Moreover, whenever $s, t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $s \neq t$ we have that

$$\|z_s - z_t\|_V > r. \quad (9.4)$$

Proof of Lemma 9.1. Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and fix a choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0 \geq 0$ be real numbers such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}$. Assume V and W are finite dimensional real Banach spaces, of dimensions d and c respectively, with $\Sigma \subset V$ a finite subset of cardinality Λ . Assume that the tensor products of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ the element $f_i = (f_i^{(0)}, \dots, f_i^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is non-zero and define $\mathcal{F} := \{f_i : i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. Choose scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Given $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, define $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and $C > 0$ by

$$(I) \quad \varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \varphi^{(l)} := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (II) \quad C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i > 0. \quad (9.5)$$

With a view to applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ let $\tilde{a}_i := |a_i|$ and \tilde{f}_i be given by f_i if $a_i > 0$ and $-f_i$ if $a_i < 0$. Observe that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we have that $\|\tilde{f}_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} = \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$. Moreover, we also have that $\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ and that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{f}_i$. Further, we rescale \tilde{f}_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ to have unit $\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ norm. That is (cf. **HOLGRIM (B)**), for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ set $h_i := \tilde{f}_i / A_i$ and $\alpha_i := \tilde{a}_i A_i$. A particular consequence is that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we have $\|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq 1$. Additional consequences are that C satisfies

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{a}_i A_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i, \quad (9.6)$$

and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $\alpha_i h_i = \tilde{a}_i \tilde{f}_i = a_i f_i$. Thus the expansion for φ in **(I)** of (9.5) is equivalent to

$$\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i h_i, \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \stackrel{(9.6)}{=} C. \quad (9.7)$$

Let $D = D(d, k)$ be the constant defined in (5.2); that is

$$D \stackrel{(5.2)}{=} \sum_{s=0}^k \beta(d, s) \stackrel{(5.1)}{=} \sum_{s=0}^k \binom{d+s-1}{s}. \quad (9.8)$$

Finally, define $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$ by (cf. (9.2))

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \right\}. \quad (9.9)$$

Now consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ throughout Σ with the choices of $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}$, the target accuracy threshold in **HOLGRIM (A)** as ε , the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM (A)** as ε_0 , the order level in **HOLGRIM (A)** as q , the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM (A)** as $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$, the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM (A)** as $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$, and the scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the scaling factors in **HOLGRIM (A)**

Suppose that $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm reaches and carries out the m^{th} step without terminating. Let $\Sigma_m = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \subset \Sigma$ denote the points chosen after the m^{th} step is completed. Then for every $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, if we let $\Sigma_l := \{z_1, \dots, z_l\} \subset \Sigma$, we have, recalling **HOLGRIM (C)** and **(D)**, that recombination, via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I], has found an approximation $u_l = (u_l^{(0)}, \dots, u_l^{(n)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ of φ satisfying, for each $s \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi - u_l}^k(z_s) \leq \varepsilon_0$. That is, given any $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and any $s \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, we have $\left\| \varphi^{(j)}(z_s) - u_l^{(j)}(z_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes j}, W)} \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Let $Q_l := 1 + clD(d, k)$. Then in the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** at step l of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm, recombination is applied, via Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I], to a system of Q_l real-valued equations (cf. (6.7)). Therefore recombination returns non-negative coefficients $b_{l,1}, \dots, b_{l,Q_l} \geq 0$ and indices $e_l(1), \dots, e_l(Q_l) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ for which

$$u_l = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_l} b_{l,s} h_{e_l(s)} \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} u_l^{(j)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_l} b_{l,s} h_{e_l(s)}^{(j)} \\ \text{for every } j \in \{0, \dots, n\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s=1}^{Q_l} b_{l,s} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i. \quad (9.10)$$

A consequence of (9.10) is that

$$\|u_l\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{s=1}^{Q_l} b_{l,s} \|h_{e_l(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{s=1}^{Q_l} b_{l,s} \stackrel{(9.10)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \stackrel{(9.6)}{=} C. \quad (9.11)$$

Consider a point $x \in \Sigma$ and let $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ be such that $\text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l) = \|x - z_j\|_V = \text{dist}_V(x, z_j)$. Consider $h \in \{0, \dots, q\}$. By applying Lemma 2.11 to the function $\varphi - u_l$, with the Σ , K_0 , ε_0 , p , γ , l , and k of that result as

$\Sigma, 2C, \varepsilon_0, z_j, \gamma, h, k$ here respectively, we deduce that (cf. (2.15))

$$\left\| \varphi^{(h)}(x) - u_l^{(h)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes h}; W)} \leq \min \left\{ 2C, 2C \|x - z_j\|_V^{\gamma-h} + \varepsilon_0 \sum_{s=0}^{k-h} \frac{1}{s!} \|x - z_j\|_V^s \right\}. \quad (9.12)$$

Recalling that $\|x - z_j\|_V = \text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l)$, it follows from (9.12) that

$$\left\| \varphi^{(h)}(x) - u_l^{(h)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes h}; W)} \leq \min \left\{ 2C, 2C \text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l)^{\gamma-h} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l)} \right\}. \quad (9.13)$$

The arbitrariness of $h \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ and $x \in \Sigma$ allows us to conclude that (9.13) is valid for every $h \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ and every $x \in \Sigma$. As a result we have that

$$\max_{x \in \Sigma} \left\{ \Lambda_{\varphi - u_l}^q(x) \right\} \leq \min \left\{ 2C, 2C \max_{h \in \{0, \dots, q\}} \left\{ \text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l)^{\gamma-h} \right\} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\text{dist}_V(x, \Sigma_l)} \right\}. \quad (9.14)$$

The estimate claimed in (9.3) is obtained by taking $l := m$ in (9.14).

It remains only to establish the separation of the points z_1, \dots, z_m as claimed in (9.4). For this purpose, consider distinct $s, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and without loss of generality assume $s < j$. By assumption the **HOLGRIM** algorithm does not terminate on any of the first m steps. Therefore $\sigma_j := \arg \max_{\sigma \in \Sigma_q^*} |\sigma(\varphi - u_{j-1})|$ must satisfy that

$$|\sigma_j(\varphi - u_{j-1})| > \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}. \quad (9.15)$$

Recall from the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** that $z_j \in \Sigma$ is taken to be the point for which $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{T}_{z_j, q}$. It is then a consequence of Lemma 5.3 that (cf. (5.33))

$$|\sigma_j(\varphi - u_{j-1})| \leq \Lambda_{\varphi - u_{j-1}}^q(z_j). \quad (9.16)$$

Thus we have that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \stackrel{(9.15)}{<} |\sigma_j(\varphi - u_{j-1})| \stackrel{(9.16)}{\leq} \Lambda_{\varphi - u_{j-1}}^q(z_j). \quad (9.17)$$

Note that $\varphi, u_{j-1} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and, via (9.5) and (9.11), we have $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}, \|u_{j-1}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq C$. Further, for any $t \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi - u_{j-1}}^k(z_t) \leq \varepsilon_0$. Observe that the definition of r here in (9.9) matches the specification of the constant δ_0 in (2.12) of the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 for the choices of the constants $K_0, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$ and l in that theorem as $C, \gamma, \varepsilon/cd^q, \varepsilon_0$ and q here respectively. Thus, for each $t \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$, we can apply the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the choices that $B := \{z_t\}$, $\psi := \varphi$, and $\phi := u_{j-1}$ to conclude that for every $x \in \mathbb{B}_V(z_t, r) \cap \Sigma$ we have (cf. (2.14))

$$\Lambda_{\varphi - u_{j-1}}^q(x) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}. \quad (9.18)$$

The arbitrariness of $t \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$ allows us to conclude that (9.18) is valid for every $t \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$. Together, (9.17) and (9.18) mean that for every $t \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$ we must have that $z_j \notin \mathbb{B}_V(z_t, r) \cap \Sigma$. Since $s \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$, we conclude that $z_j \notin \mathbb{B}_V(z_s, r) \cap \Sigma$, i.e. that $\|z_j - z_s\|_V > r$ as claimed in (9.4). This completes the proof of Lemma 9.1. \blacksquare

10. The HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem

In this section we establish a convergence result for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm and discuss its consequences. The following theorem is our main convergence result for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm under the choices that $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD(d, k)}, \Lambda \right\}$ and, for every $t \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, that $s_t := 1$ and $k_t := 1$.

Theorem 10.1 (HOLGRIM Convergence). *Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and fix a choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$ be real numbers such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}$. Let V and W be finite dimensional real Banach spaces, of dimensions d and c respectively, with $\Sigma \subset V$ finite. Assume that the tensor*

products of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $f_i = (f_i^{(0)}, \dots, f_i^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is non-zero and define $\mathcal{F} := \{f_i : i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. Fix a choice of $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Given $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, define $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and constants $C, D > 0$ by

$$\text{(I)} \quad \varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i, \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \varphi^{(l)} := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{(II)} \quad C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i > 0 \quad (10.1)$$

and (cf. (5.2))

$$D = D(d, k) := \sum_{s=0}^k \beta(d, s) = \sum_{s=0}^k \binom{d+s-1}{s}. \quad (10.2)$$

Then there is a positive constant $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$,

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \right\} \quad (10.3)$$

and a non-negative integer $N = N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, given by the r -packing number of Σ

$$N := \max \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Sigma \text{ for which } \|z_a - z_b\|_V > r \text{ if } a \neq b\}, \quad (10.4)$$

for which the following is true.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD}, \Lambda \right\}$, ε as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), q as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and the real numbers $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A). Suppose that the integer N in (10.4) satisfies $N \leq M$. Then after at most N steps, the algorithm terminates. That is, there is some integer $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Consequently, if we define $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| A_{e(s)} = C, \quad (10.5)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ defined by

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (10.6)$$

Finally, if the coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to φ (cf. (I) of (10.1)) are all positive (i.e. $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$) then the coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to u (cf. (10.6)) are all non-negative (i.e. $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \geq 0$).

Remark 10.2. By invoking Lemma 9.1 (cf. (9.3)) we can establish pointwise estimates for the sequence of approximations returned at each step of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. That is, suppose $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after step m , and for each $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ let $u_l \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the approximation found at step l via the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step**. Then Lemma 9.1 yields that, for each $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have, for every point $z \in \Sigma$, that

$$\Lambda_{\varphi-u_l}^q(z) \leq \min \left\{ 2C, 2C \max_{h \in \{0, \dots, q\}} \{ \text{dist}_V(z, \Sigma_l)^{\gamma-h} \} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\text{dist}_V(z, \Sigma_l)} \right\} \quad (10.7)$$

where Σ_l denotes the subset formed of the l points in Σ that have been selected once step l is completed.

Remark 10.3. Recall that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to terminate after M steps. Consequently the

case that $N \leq M$ contains all the situations in which terminating after, at most, N steps induces non-trivial conclusions. If the integer N defined in (10.4) satisfies $N < M$ then Theorem 10.1 guarantees that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm will return an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ of φ that is a linear combination of *less* than \mathcal{N} of the elements $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$, and is within ε of φ throughout Σ in the pointwise sense that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$. Consequently, in this case the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to return an approximation u of φ satisfying **Finite Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 3.

The integer N defined in (10.4) depends both on the features \mathcal{F} through the constant C and the data Σ . The constant C itself depends only on the values of the coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and the values of the scaling factors $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$. The scaling factors depend on the values of the norms $\|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}, \dots, \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$ through the requirement, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. No additional constraints are imposed on the collection of features \mathcal{F} ; in particular, we do not assume the existence of a linear combination of fewer than \mathcal{N} of the features in \mathcal{F} giving a good approximation of φ throughout Σ .

The integer N defined in (10.4) is, for the positive number $r > 0$ determined in (10.3), the r -packing number of the subset Σ in V as introduced by Kolmogorov [Kol56]. Consequently the $r/2$ -covering number $N_{\text{cov}}(\Sigma, V, r/2)$ of Σ in V is an upper bound for the integer N . Here we use the same notation as used in [LM22-I] (see, specifically, Subsection 6.2 in [LM22-I]). That is, for any $\rho > 0$, we have

$$N_{\text{cov}}(\Sigma, V, \rho) := \min \left\{ s \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \text{ for which we have the inclusion } \Sigma \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^s \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_j, \rho) \right\}. \quad (10.8)$$

Recall our convention that balls denoted by \mathbb{B} are taken to be open whilst those denoted by $\overline{\mathbb{B}}$ are taken to be closed. Thus the maximum number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete before terminating (cf. (10.4)) is bounded above by the $r/2$ -covering number of Σ in V . Moreover, this geometric property of the subset Σ provides an upper bound on the number of functions from the collection \mathcal{F} appearing in the approximation returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. Explicit estimates of this covering number provide *worst-case* bounds for the performance of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm. We illustrate a particular example of this in Remark 10.13.

Remark 10.4. The *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 fixes $\varepsilon > 0$ as the accuracy we desire for an approximation, and then provides an upper bound on the number of functions from the collection \mathcal{F} that are used by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to construct an approximation u of φ satisfying, for every $z \in \Sigma$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$. But the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 can also be used, for a fixed $n_0 \in \{2, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, to determine how well the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can approximate φ throughout Σ using no more than n_0 of the functions from \mathcal{F} .

Consider a fixed $n_0 \in \{2, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ and a fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. For $\lambda > 0$ use the notation

$$N_\lambda := \max \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Sigma \text{ with } \|z_a - z_b\|_V > \lambda \text{ if } a \neq b\} \quad (10.9)$$

for the λ -packing number of Σ in V . Define $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(n_0, c, d, \Sigma, \gamma) > 0$ and $\beta = \beta(n_0, c, d, \Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$ by

$$\lambda_0 := \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : N_\lambda \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{cD} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0 := cd^q (2C\lambda_0^{\gamma-q} + \varepsilon_0 e^{\lambda_0}) > 0. \quad (10.10)$$

A first consequence of (10.10) is that $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \beta_0/cd^q$. Hence we can consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ with $M := \min\{N_{\lambda_0}, \Lambda\}$, β_0 as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ as the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers k_1, \dots, k_M in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}}$ as the scaling factors in **HOLGRIM** (A).

The definitions of λ_0 and β_0 in (10.10) ensure that the positive constant r and the integer N arising respectively in (10.3) and (10.4) of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 for these choices are given by λ_0 and N_{λ_0} respectively. Consequently the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 tells us that this application of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm returns an approximation u of φ that is a linear combination of at most n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} , and that is within β_0 of φ on Σ in the sense that for every $z \in \Sigma$ we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \beta_0$.

In this way, given any $n_0 \in \{2, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with $n_0 \geq 1 + cD$, the relation given in (10.10) provides a guaranteed accuracy $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n_0, c, d, \Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$ for how well the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can approximate φ with the additional constraint that the approximation is a linear combination of no greater than n_0 of the features in \mathcal{F} . This guarantee ensures both that there is a linear combination of at most n_0 of the features in \mathcal{F} that is within β_0 of φ throughout Σ and that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm will find such a linear combination. This idea is detailed further

in Remarks 10.10 and 10.12, whilst an explicit example of such guarantees is provided in Remark 10.13.

Remark 10.5. One can think of the order level $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ as determining the order of “derivatives” of φ that we seek to approximate throughout Σ . For example, if we choose $q := 0$ then the **HOLGRIM** algorithm seeks only to approximate the function $\varphi^{(0)} : \Sigma \rightarrow W$ in a pointwise sense throughout Σ . And, in this case, Theorem 10.1 establishes conditions under which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to return an approximation $u = (u^{(0)}, \dots, u^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ for which the function $u^{(0)} : \Sigma \rightarrow W$ is close to $\varphi^{(0)}$ throughout Σ in the sense that $\|\varphi^{(0)} - u^{(0)}\|_{C^0(\Sigma; W)} \leq \varepsilon$ (cf. (10.6)). On the other hand, if we choose $q := k$ then the **HOLGRIM** algorithm seeks to approximate the function $\varphi^{(l)} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ in a pointwise sense throughout Σ for every $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. And, in this case, Theorem 10.1 establishes conditions under which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to return an approximation $u = (u^{(0)}, \dots, u^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ for which, for every $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, the function $u^{(l)} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)$ is close to $\varphi^{(l)}$ throughout Σ in the sense that for every $z \in \Sigma$ we have $\|\varphi^{(l)}(z) - u^{(l)}(z)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^{\otimes l}; W)} \leq \varepsilon$ (cf. (10.6)).

Remark 10.6. The order level $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ in the **HOLGRIM** algorithm determines the order to which we seek to approximate the function $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. A particular consequence of (10.3) is that a larger value of the order level $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ leads to a larger upper bound for the maximum number of steps the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete before terminating. That is, for fixed values of the parameters C, γ, ε , and ε_0 the function $q \mapsto r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q)$, for the r defined in (10.3), is decreasing on $\{0, \dots, k\}$. Hence, again for fixed values of the parameters C, γ, ε , and ε_0 , the function $q \mapsto N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q)$, for the integer N defined in (10.4), is increasing on $\{0, \dots, k\}$. Consequently, seeking only to approximate φ to order $q := 0$ results in the smallest upper bound for the maximum number of steps before the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates, whilst seeking to approximate φ to order $q := k$ results in the largest upper bound. Larger values of q result in the algorithm finding an approximation of φ in a stronger sense throughout Σ , at the cost of a worse upper bound for the maximum number of steps the algorithm runs for before terminating.

Remark 10.7. As the regularity parameter $\gamma > 0$ increases, the integer N in (10.4) giving an upper bound on the maximum number of steps completed by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm before termination decreases. To be more precise we adopt the same notation as that of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 and fix the values of the parameters $C, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$, and fix a choice of $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then consider varying the regularity parameter γ in the range (q, ∞) ; requiring $\gamma > q$ ensures that we can apply the **HOLGRIM** algorithm as in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1. The mapping $\gamma \mapsto r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q)$ for the constant r defined in (10.3) determines an increasing function on (q, ∞) since the assumption that $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$ means that $r \leq 1$. Consequently the mapping $\gamma \mapsto N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q)$ for the integer N defined in (10.4) determines a decreasing function on (q, ∞) . Hence the data concentration required to guarantee that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm returns an approximation u of φ satisfying that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$ and that u is a linear combination of *strictly less* than N of the functions in \mathcal{F} is decreasing as the regularity parameter γ increases. That is, a larger value of $\gamma > 0$ results in a smaller upper bound N on the maximum number of steps completed by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm before it returns an approximation of φ satisfying **Finite Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 3.

Remark 10.8. The approximation u returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm satisfying the accuracy properties guaranteed by Theorem 10.1 additionally satisfies the following *robustness* property. To illustrate this robustness, assume the notation of Theorem 10.1 and fix a choice of a finite $\xi \in (\varepsilon, \infty)$. Suppose that $K \geq 1$ and that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, the function $f_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ admits an extension $F_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ satisfying the norm estimate $\|F_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)} \leq K \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$.

The existence of such an extension is guaranteed by the Stein-Whitney extension theorem (Theorem 4 in Chapter VI of [Ste70]). Whilst that result is stated for the case that $V = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W = \mathbb{R}$, the proof carries over to our setting verbatim. In this result, a method of constructing an extension of an element $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ to an element in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ is presented. Moreover, the resulting operator $\mathbf{E} : \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W) \rightarrow \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ mapping an element $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ to its extension to an element in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ is established to be a bounded linear operator.

This extension operator is *not* unique; the construction of an extension of $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ to an element in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ in the proof of the Stein-Whitney extension theorem in [Ste70] involves making several particular choices of parameters, and varying each choice results in a different extension. However, after fixing a particular choice of each parameter, a verbatim repetition of the arguments of Stein in Chapter VI of [Ste70] establishes the existence of a constant $K_{\mathbf{E}} = K_{\mathbf{E}}(\gamma, d) \geq 1$ such that for any $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ we have the norm estimate that

$\|\mathbf{E}[\phi]\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)} \leq K_{\mathbf{E}} \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$. Consequently, we could take $K := K_{\mathbf{E}}$ above.

Recalling that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$, it follows that $\tilde{\varphi} := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i F_i$ determines an extension of φ to an element $\tilde{\varphi} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$. It follows that $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)} \leq K \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq CK$. Similarly, since $u = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}$, it follows that $\tilde{u} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s F_{e(s)}$ determines an extension of u to an element $\tilde{u} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$. It follows, via (10.5), that $\|\tilde{u}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)} \leq K \|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq CK$. Moreover, since $\tilde{\varphi}$ and \tilde{u} coincide with φ and u respectively throughout Σ , the second part of (10.6) yields that

$$\max_{z \in \Sigma} \left\{ \Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{u}}^q(z) \right\} = \max_{z \in \Sigma} \left\{ \Lambda_{\varphi - u}^q(z) \right\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (10.11)$$

Fix a choice of $l \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ and define a constant $r = r(C, K, q, \varepsilon, \xi, l) > 0$ by

$$r := \begin{cases} \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2CK\lambda^{\gamma-l} + \varepsilon e^\lambda \leq \xi \right\} & \text{if } q = k \\ \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2eCK\lambda^{q+1-l} + \varepsilon e^\lambda \leq \xi \right\} & \text{if } q < k. \end{cases} \quad (10.12)$$

Set $\Omega := \Sigma_r := \{v \in V : \exists u \in \Sigma \text{ with } \|u - v\|_V \leq r\}$ to be the r -fattening of Σ in V . We claim that the extensions $\tilde{\varphi}$ and \tilde{u} of φ and u respectively remain close throughout Ω in the sense that

$$\sup_{z \in \Omega} \left\{ \Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{u}}^l(z) \right\} \leq \xi. \quad (10.13)$$

We first verify (10.13) in the case that $q = k$. In this case, an examination of r as defined in (10.12) reveals that it coincides with the specification of the constant δ_0 in (2.12) of the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 for the choices of $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, K_0, \gamma$, and l there as $\xi, \varepsilon, CK, \gamma$, and l here respectively. Therefore (10.11) provides the required hypothesis to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with $B := \Sigma$, $\psi := \tilde{\varphi}$, and $\phi := \tilde{u}$. By applying this result, we conclude, for every $z \in \Omega$, that $\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{u}}^l(z) \leq \xi$ as claimed in (10.13).

We now consider the case that $q < k$ so that $k \geq 1$ and $q \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. Recall the notation that for any $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and any $n \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ that $\phi_{[n]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(n)})$. We use the analogous notation for elements in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$.

Since $q+1 \leq k < \gamma$ we can invoke Lemma 6.1 in [LM24] to deduce that $\tilde{\varphi}_{[q]}, \tilde{u}_{[q]} \in \text{Lip}(q+1, \Sigma, W)$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(q+1, \Sigma, W)} \leq e \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq eCK$ and $\|\tilde{u}_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(q+1, \Sigma, W)} \leq e \|\tilde{u}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq eCK$. An examination of r as defined in (10.12) reveals that it coincides with the specification of the constant δ_0 in (2.12) of the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 for the choices of $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, K_0, \gamma$, and l there as $\xi, \varepsilon, eCK, q+1$, and l here respectively. Therefore (10.11) provides the required hypothesis to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with $B := \Sigma$, $\psi := \tilde{\varphi}_{[q]}$, and $\phi := \tilde{u}_{[q]}$. By doing so, we conclude, for every $z \in \Omega$, that $\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{u}}^l(z) \leq \xi$ as claimed in (10.13).

Thus the extension \tilde{u} is a linear combination of Q_m of the functions $F_1, \dots, F_{\mathcal{N}}$ that is within ξ of the extension $\tilde{\varphi}$ throughout Ω in the pointwise sense that $\sup_{z \in \Omega} \left\{ \Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{u}}^l(z) \right\} \leq \xi$. Loosely speaking, the approximation on Σ found by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm remains a good approximation on points in V that are not too far away from Σ . To be more precise, provided we are given, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, an extension $F_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, V, W)$ of $f_i \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$, the weights $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and the indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm, determining a good approximation of φ throughout Σ via the linear combination $u = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}$ of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$, additionally determine a good approximation of the extension $\tilde{\varphi}$ of φ throughout Ω via the linear combination $\tilde{u} = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s F_{e(s)}$ of the extensions $F_1, \dots, F_{\mathcal{N}}$ of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$.

Remark 10.9. Following the strategy outlined in Section 4, we may combine the theoretical guarantees for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm provided by Theorem 10.1 with the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 (cf. Theorem 3.11 in [LM24]) to extend the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to the setting in which the $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ are defined throughout an arbitrary non-empty compact subset $\Omega \subset V$ rather than a finite subset. To make this precise, let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and suppose that $\Omega \subset V$ is a fixed non-empty compact subset with $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$. As in Theorem 10.1 we consider $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$ for non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} > 0$, and take $D = D(d, k)$ to be as defined in (10.2). We now illustrate how the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can be used to obtain an approximation of φ throughout the compact subset $\Omega \subset V$.

Fix choices of $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$ and $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon/2cd^k$ and $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Define a positive constant $\delta =$

$\delta(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, c, d, q) > 0$ by

$$\delta := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}e^\lambda \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (10.14)$$

Next we define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, c, d, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := \min \left\{ s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Omega \text{ such that } \Omega \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^s \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_j, \delta) \right\}. \quad (10.15)$$

The compactness of the subset $\Omega \subset V$ ensures that the integer Λ defined in (10.15) is finite.

Choose a finite subset $\Sigma = \{z_1, \dots, z_\Lambda\} \subset \Omega$ of cardinality Λ for which $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_s, \delta)$. With the finite subset Σ fixed, define a positive constant $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, c, d) > 0$ by (cf. (10.3))

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-k} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2cd^k} \right\}, \quad (10.16)$$

and define an integer $N = N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, c, d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by (cf. (10.4))

$$N := \max \{s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Sigma \text{ for which } \|z_a - z_b\|_V > r \text{ if } a \neq b\}. \quad (10.17)$$

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{N-1}{cd}, \Lambda \right\}$, $\varepsilon/2$ as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_N := \|f_N\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

If the integer N defined in (10.17) satisfies that $N \leq M$, then Theorem 10.1 guarantees that there is some integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} = C, \quad (10.18)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \text{ satisfies } \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (10.19)$$

Observe that the condition (10.18) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of Ω in the sense that $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{z \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z, \delta)$. Therefore the definition of δ in (10.14) and the estimates in (10.19) provide the hypotheses required to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the K_0 , γ , ε , ε_0 , l , Σ , B , ψ , and ϕ of that result as C , γ , ε , $\varepsilon/2$, q , Ω , Σ , φ , and u here respectively. Indeed the definition of δ here in (10.14) coincides with the definition of δ_0 in (2.12) for the choices specified above. Thus we may invoke the implication (2.14) to conclude that

$$\sup_{z \in \Omega} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (10.20)$$

Consequently the **HOLGRIM** algorithm has returned an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ of φ that has the sparsity properties as outlined in Remark 10.3 and is within ε of φ throughout Ω in the pointwise sense that, for every point $z \in \Omega$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$. That is, in this case the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to return an approximation u of φ satisfying **Compact Domain Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 4.

Remark 10.10. Following the approach outlined in Remark 10.4, we illustrate the theoretical guarantees available for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm when used as in Remark 10.9 but with an additional restriction on the maximum number of functions from \mathcal{F} that may be used to construct the approximation u .

To make this precise, let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, and suppose that $\Omega \subset V$ is a fixed non-empty compact subset with $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$. As in Theorem 10.1 we con-

sider $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$ for non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} > 0$, and take $D = D(d, k)$ to be as defined in (10.2). Fix a choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and, assuming that $\mathcal{N} > 1 + cD$, fix a choice of integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ such that $n_0 \geq 1 + cD$. We consider the guarantees available for the pointwise quantity $\sup_{z \in \Omega} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\}$ for the approximation returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm with the restriction that u is a linear combination of at most n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} .

For this purpose we fix $\theta \geq 0$ and define $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(n_0, c, d, \gamma) > 0$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\lambda_0 := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : N_{\text{pack}}(\Omega, V, t) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{cD} \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0 := 2cd^k \left(2C\lambda_0^{\gamma-k} + \theta e^{\lambda_0} \right) > 0. \quad (10.21)$$

With the value of $\beta_0 > 0$ fixed, define a positive constant $\delta = \delta(n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \theta, q) > 0$ and an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \theta, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\delta := \sup \left\{ t > 0 : 2Ct^{\gamma-q} + \frac{\beta_0}{2} e^t \leq \beta_0 \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := N_{\text{cov}}(\Omega, V, \delta). \quad (10.22)$$

Since $\Omega \subset V$ is compact, we have that Λ defined in (10.22) is finite. Choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_{\Lambda}\} \subset \Omega \subset V$ for which $\Omega \subset \cup_{s=1}^{\Lambda} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(p_s, \delta)$. Moreover, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq N_{\text{pack}}(\Omega, V, \lambda_0)$, we have via (10.21) that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0-1}{cD}$. Furthermore, it additionally follows from (10.21) that $0 \leq \theta < \beta_0/2cd^k$.

Therefore we may apply the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{n_0-1}{cD}, \Lambda \right\}$, $\beta_0/2$ as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), θ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|\mathcal{N}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Observe that λ_0 defined in (10.52) coincides with the positive constant $r > 0$ arising in (10.3) in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 for the constants $C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$, and q there as $C, \gamma, \beta_0/2, \theta$ and k here. Thus, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0-1}{cD}$, the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 tells us that there is an integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} = C, \quad (10.23)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z)\} \leq \frac{\beta_0}{2}. \quad (10.24)$$

The condition (10.23) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of Ω in the sense that $\Omega \subset \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z, \delta)$. Therefore the definition of δ in (10.53) and the estimates in (10.56) provide the hypotheses required to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the $K_0, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, l, \Sigma, B, \psi$, and ϕ of that result as $C, \gamma, \beta_0, \beta_0/2, q, \Omega, \Sigma, \varphi$, and u here respectively. Indeed the definition of δ here in (10.53) coincides with the definition of δ_0 in (2.12) for the choices specified above. Thus we may invoke the implication (2.14) to conclude that

$$\sup_{z \in \Omega} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \beta_0. \quad (10.25)$$

Moreover, we have that $Q_m \leq 1 + cMD \leq n_0$ so that u is guaranteed to be a linear combination of no greater than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus given an integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ satisfying $n_0 \geq 1 + cD(d, k)$, we are guaranteed that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ that is a linear combination of no more than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} , and is within β_0 , for β_0 defined in (10.21), of φ throughout Ω in the pointwise sense detailed in (10.25).

Remark 10.11. Following the strategy outlined in Section 4, we may combine the theoretical guarantees for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm provided by Theorem 10.1 with the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 (cf. Theorem 3.1

in [LM24]) to extend the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to the setting in which the $\text{Lip}(\gamma)$ functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ are defined throughout an arbitrary non-empty compact subset $\Omega \subset V$ rather than a finite subset, and strengthen the sense in which the returned approximation u approximates φ throughout Ω to a $\text{Lip}(\eta)$ sense for a given $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$.

To make this precise, let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$ with $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that $\eta \in (q, q+1]$, and suppose that $\Omega \subset V$ is a fixed non-empty compact subset with $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$. As in Theorem 10.1 we consider $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$ for non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$. Making the choices $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ in (10.1), take $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} > 0$, and take $D = D(d, k)$ to be as defined in (10.2). We now illustrate how the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can be used to obtain an approximation u of φ throughout the compact subset $\Omega \subset V$ in the sense that the $\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)$ norm of the difference $\varphi - u$ is small.

Fix a choice of $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$. Retrieve the constants $\delta = \delta(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ arising as δ_0 and ε_0 respectively in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively. Note we are not actually applying Theorem 2.9, but simply retrieving constants in preparation for its future application. Subsequently define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ as the δ -covering number of Ω in V ; that is

$$\Lambda := \min \left\{ a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_a \in \Omega \text{ for which } \Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^a \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_s, \delta) \right\}. \quad (10.26)$$

The subset $\Omega \subset V$ being compact ensures that Λ defined in (10.26) is finite. Choose $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_{\Lambda}\} \subset \Omega \subset V$ such that $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^{\Lambda} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(p_s, \delta)$.

With the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega \subset V$ fixed, we now define $r = r(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ by

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-k} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2cd^k} e^{\lambda} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} \right\}. \quad (10.27)$$

Subsequently define an integer $N = N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$N := \max \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Sigma \text{ for which } \|z_a - z_b\|_V > r \text{ if } a \neq b\}. \quad (10.28)$$

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{cD}, \Lambda \right\}$, ε_0 as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), $\varepsilon_0/2cd^k$ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

If the integer N defined in (10.17) satisfies that $N \leq M$, then Theorem 10.1 guarantees that there is some integer $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} = C, \quad (10.29)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \text{ satisfies } \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \} \leq \varepsilon_0. \quad (10.30)$$

Observe that the condition (10.29) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of Ω in the sense that $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{z \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z, \delta)$. Therefore, recalling how the constants δ and ε_0 here were retrieved from the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9, we have the required hypotheses in order to appeal to the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively, the subsets B and Σ there are Σ and Ω here respectively, and the functions ψ and ϕ there as φ and u here respectively. By doing so, we may conclude via the implication (2.11) that

$$\|\varphi|_q - u|_q\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)} \leq \varepsilon \quad (10.31)$$

where we use the notation that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$. Consequently the **HOLGRIM** algorithm has returned an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ of φ that has the sparsity properties as outlined in Remark 10.3 and is within ε of φ in the $\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)$ norm sense detailed in (10.31). That is, in this case the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to return an approximation u of φ satisfying **Compact Domain Lipschitz Approximation Conditions** (1), (2), and (3) from Section 4.

Remark 10.12. Following the approach outlined in Remark 10.4, we illustrate the theoretical guarantees available for the **HOLGRIM** algorithm when used as in Remark 10.11 but with an additional restriction on the maximum number of functions from \mathcal{F} that may be used to construct the approximation u .

To make this precise, let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$ with $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that $\eta \in (q, q+1]$, and suppose that $\Omega \subset V$ is a fixed non-empty compact subset with $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}} \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$. As in Theorem 10.1 we consider $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$ for non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} > 0$, and take $D = D(d, k)$ to be as defined in (10.2). Assuming that $\mathcal{N} > 1 + cD$, fix a choice of integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ such that $n_0 \geq 1 + cD$. We consider the guarantees available for the quantity $\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)}$ for the approximation returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm with the restriction that u is a linear combination of at most n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . Here we use the notation that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$. We will see that the stronger sense in which u approximates φ throughout Ω comes at a cost of less explicit constants.

Fix $\theta \geq 0$ and define $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(n_0, c, d, \gamma) > 0$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\lambda_0 := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : N_{\text{pack}}(\Omega, V, t) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{cD} \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0 := cd^k \left(2C\lambda_0^{\gamma-k} + \theta e^{\lambda_0} \right) > 0. \quad (10.32)$$

It follows from (10.32) that $0 \leq \theta < \beta_0/cd^k$. With the value of $\beta_0 > 0$ fixed, determine a positive constant $\xi = \xi(n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \eta, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\xi := \inf \{ \varepsilon > 0 : \beta_0 \leq \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \} \quad (10.33)$$

where, given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ denotes the constant ε_0 retrieved from the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively. After the value of $\xi > 0$ is fixed, retrieve the constant $\delta = \delta(n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \eta, \theta) > 0$ arising as the constant δ_0 in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here respectively. Finally, define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(\Omega, n_0, C, c, d, \gamma, \theta, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := N_{\text{cov}}(\Omega, V, \delta). \quad (10.34)$$

Since the subset $\Omega \subset V$ is compact, the integer Λ defined in (10.60) is finite. Choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_{\Lambda}\} \subset \Omega$ for which $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^{\Lambda} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(p_s, \delta)$. Moreover, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq N_{\text{pack}}(\Omega, V, \lambda_0)$, (10.32) ensures that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0-1}{cD}$.

Apply the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{n_0-1}{cD}, \Lambda \right\}$, β_0 as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), θ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Observe that λ_0 defined in (10.32) coincides with the positive constant $r > 0$ arising in (10.3) in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 for the constants $C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$, and q there as $C, \gamma, \beta_0, \theta$ and k here. Thus, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, V, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0-1}{cD}$, the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 tells us that there is an integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} = C, \quad (10.35)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \text{ satisfies } \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z)\} \leq \beta_0. \quad (10.36)$$

The condition (10.35) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of Ω in the sense that $\Omega \subset \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z, \delta)$. Further recall that δ is the constant δ_0 arising in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 2.9* for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here. Finally, recall that $\xi > 0$ was chosen in (10.59) so that $\beta_0 \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ where ε_0 is the constant ε_0 arising in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 2.9* for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here.

Therefore, we have the required hypotheses to appeal to the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 2.9* for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here respectively, the subsets B and Σ there are Σ and Ω here respectively, and the functions ψ and ϕ there as φ and u here respectively. By doing so, we may conclude via the implication (2.11) that

$$\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)} \leq \xi \quad (10.37)$$

where we use the notation that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$.

Moreover, we have that $Q_m \leq 1 + cMD \leq n_0$ so that u is guaranteed to be a linear combination of no greater than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus given an integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with $n_0 \geq 1 + cD(d, k)$, we are guaranteed that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ that is a linear combination of no more than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} , and is within ξ , for ξ defined in (10.33), of φ throughout Ω in the $\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)$ norm sense detailed in (10.37).

Remark 10.13. We now provide an illustrative example of several of the previous remarks regarding the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem 10.1*. For this purpose consider a fixed $\gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k+1]$, a fixed $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$ with $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that $\eta \in (q, q+1]$, a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, and a fixed $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Take $V := \mathbb{R}^d$ equipped with its usual Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, take $\Omega := [0, 1]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d , and take $W := \mathbb{R}$. The norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ is induced by the standard Euclidean dot product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ on \mathbb{R}^d . Equip the tensor powers of \mathbb{R}^d with admissible norms in the sense of Definition 2.1 by extending the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ to the tensor powers, and subsequently taking the norm induced by the resulting inner product on each tensor power (see, for example, Section 2 in [LM24] for details of this construction). Introduce the notation, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, that $\mathbb{B}^d(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\|_2 < r\}$.

Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Then we have that

$$N_{\text{cov}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \rho) \leq N_{\text{pack}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \rho) \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho}\right)^d \quad (10.38)$$

where ω_d denotes the Euclidean volume of the unit-ball $\mathbb{B}^d(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The first inequality in (10.38) is a consequence of the fact that the ρ -covering number of a set is always no greater than its ρ -packing number. The second inequality in (10.38) is a consequence of a volume comparison argument, the details of which may be found, for example, in Remark 4.4 in [LM24].

Fix $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and consider a collection $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ of non-zero functions in $\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$. Fix a choice of non-zero coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and define $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i$. Set $C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} > 0$ and $D = D(d, k)$ to be the constant defined in (10.2).

We first consider the use of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ satisfying that $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(x)\} \leq \varepsilon$ by following the strategy detailed in Remark 10.9. Define a positive constant $\delta = \delta(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, q) > 0$ and an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(C, d, \gamma, \varepsilon, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by (cf. (10.14))

$$\delta := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} e^\lambda \leq \varepsilon \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.39)$$

A consequence of (10.38) and (10.39) is that $N_{\text{cov}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \delta) \leq \Lambda$, and so we may choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset [0, 1]^d$ for which $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{s=1}^{\Lambda} \overline{\mathbb{B}}^d(p_s, \delta)$.

Now fix a choice of $\varepsilon_0 \in [0, \varepsilon/2d^k)$ and define a positive constant $r = r(C, d, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0) > 0$ and an integer

$N = N(C, d, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by (cf. (10.16))

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-k} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2d^k} \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad N := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.40)$$

It is then a consequence of (10.38) and (10.40) that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, r) \leq N$.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{N-1}{D}, \Lambda \right\}$, $\varepsilon/2$ as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), ε_0 as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

If the integer N defined in (10.40) satisfies that $N \leq M$, then Theorem 10.1 guarantees that there is some integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} = C, \quad (10.41)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{z \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(z) \} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (10.42)$$

Observe that the condition (10.41) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset [0, 1]^d$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of $[0, 1]^d$ in the sense that $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{x \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}^d(x, \delta)}$. Therefore the definition of δ in (10.39) and the estimates in (10.42) provide the hypotheses required to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the $K_0, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, l, \Sigma, B, \psi$, and ϕ of that result as $C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon/2, q, [0, 1]^d, \Sigma, \varphi$, and u here respectively. Indeed the definition of δ here in (10.39) coincides with the definition of δ_0 in (2.12) for the choices specified above. Thus we may invoke the implication (2.14) to conclude that

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(x) \} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (10.43)$$

Consequently the **HOLGRIM** algorithm has returned an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ of φ that is within ε of φ throughout $[0, 1]^d$ in the pointwise sense that, for every point $x \in [0, 1]^d$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(x) \leq \varepsilon$. Moreover, u is a linear combination of $Q_m = 1 + mD(d, k)$ of the \mathcal{N} functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus, if we are in the setting that $D\Lambda \leq \mathcal{N} - 1$, then (10.39) yields the worst-case upper bound of

$$Q_m \leq 1 + \Lambda D \leq 1 + D + \frac{2^d D}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^d \quad (10.44)$$

for the number of functions from \mathcal{N} that are used to construct the approximation u returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm.

We next consider the use of the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ satisfying that $\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon$ by following the strategy detailed in Remark 10.11. Retrieve the constants $\delta = \delta(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ arising as δ_0 and ε_0 respectively in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively. Note we are not actually applying Theorem 2.9, but simply retrieving constants in preparation for its future application. Subsequently define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(C, d, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.45)$$

A consequence of (10.38) and (10.45) is that $N_{\text{cov}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \delta) \leq \Lambda$, and so we may choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset [0, 1]^d$ for which $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}}^d(p_s, \delta)$.

With the finite subset $\Sigma \subset [0, 1]^d$ fixed, we now first define $r = r(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ by

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-k} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2cd^k} e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{cd^k} \right\} > 0 \quad (10.46)$$

and then an integer $N = N(C, d, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$N := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.47)$$

It is then a consequence of (10.38) and (10.47) that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, r) \leq N$.

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{N}-1}{D}, \Lambda \right\}$, ε_0 as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), $\varepsilon_0/2cd^k$ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

If the integer N defined in (10.47) satisfies that $N \leq M$, then Theorem 10.1 guarantees that there is some integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} = C, \quad (10.48)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{x \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^k(x) \} \leq \varepsilon_0. \quad (10.49)$$

Observe that the condition (10.48) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset [0, 1]^d$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of $[0, 1]^d$ in the sense that $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{x \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}}^d(x, \delta)$. Therefore, recalling how the constants δ and ε_0 here were retrieved from the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 2.9*, we have the required hypotheses in order to appeal to the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem 2.9* for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ε here respectively, the subsets B and Σ there are Σ and $[0, 1]^d$ here respectively, and the functions ψ and ϕ there as φ and u here respectively. By doing so, we may conclude via the implication (2.11) that

$$\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, \Omega, W)} \leq \varepsilon \quad (10.50)$$

where we use the notation that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$. Consequently the **HOLGRIM** algorithm has returned an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ of φ that is within ε of φ in the $\text{Lip}(\eta, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ norm sense detailed in (10.50). Moreover, u is a linear combination of $Q_m = 1 + mD(d, k)$ of the \mathcal{N} functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus, if we are in the setting that $D\Lambda \leq \mathcal{N} - 1$, then (10.45) yields the worst-case upper bound of

$$Q_m \leq 1 + \Lambda D \leq 1 + D + \frac{2^d D}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^d \quad (10.51)$$

for the number of functions from \mathcal{N} that are used to construct the approximation u returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm.

Assume now that $\mathcal{N} > 1 + 2^d D / \omega_d$. We fix an integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with $n_0 \geq 1 + 2^d D / \omega_d$ and consider how well the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can approximate φ throughout $[0, 1]^d$ using at most n_0 functions from \mathcal{F} (cf. Remark 10.4). We first consider the guarantees available for the pointwise quantity $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(x) \}$ for the approximation u returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm with the restriction that u is a linear combination of at most

n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . We follow the approach proposed in Remark 10.10.

For this purpose we fix $\theta \geq 0$ and define $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(n_0, d, \gamma) > 0$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\lambda_0 := \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n_0 - 1}{D} \omega_d \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} - 1 \right)^{-1} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0 := 2d^k \left(2C\lambda_0^{\gamma-k} + \theta e^{\lambda_0} \right) > 0. \quad (10.52)$$

With the value of $\beta_0 > 0$ fixed, define a positive constant $\delta = \delta(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \theta, q) > 0$ and an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \theta, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\delta := \sup \left\{ t > 0 : 2Ct^{\gamma-q} + \frac{\beta_0}{2} e^t \leq \beta_0 \right\} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.53)$$

A consequence of (10.38) and (10.53) is that $N_{\text{cov}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \delta) \leq \Lambda$, and so we may choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset [0, 1]^d$ for which $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}^d}(p_s, \delta)$. Moreover, (10.52) ensures that

$$\frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \right)^d \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D} \quad (10.54)$$

so that, via (10.38), we have that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}$. Furthermore, it follows from (10.52) that $0 \leq \theta < \beta_0 / 2d^k$.

Therefore we may apply the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}, \Lambda \right\}$, $\beta_0 / 2$ as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), θ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} := \|f_{\mathcal{N}}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Observe that λ_0 defined in (10.52) coincides with the positive constant $r > 0$ arising in (10.3) in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 for the constants $C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$, and q there as $C, \gamma, \beta_0/2, \theta$ and k here. Thus, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}$, the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 tells us that there is an integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} = C, \quad (10.55)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{x \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi - u}^k(x) \} \leq \frac{\beta_0}{2}. \quad (10.56)$$

The condition (10.55) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset [0, 1]^d$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of $[0, 1]^d$ in the sense that $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{x \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}^d}(x, \delta)$. Therefore the definition of δ in (10.53) and the estimates in (10.56) provide the hypotheses required to appeal to the *Pointwise Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.10 with the $K_0, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, l, \Sigma, B, \psi$, and ϕ of that result as $C, \gamma, \beta_0, \beta_0/2, q, [0, 1]^d, \Sigma, \varphi$, and u here respectively. Indeed the definition of δ here in (10.53) coincides with the definition of δ_0 in (2.12) for the choices specified above. Thus we may invoke the implication (2.14) to conclude that

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi - u}^q(x) \} \leq \beta_0. \quad (10.57)$$

Moreover, we have that $Q_m \leq 1 + MD \leq n_0$ so that u is guaranteed to be a linear combination of no greater than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus given an integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ for which $n_0 \geq 1 + 2^d D / \omega_d$, we are guaranteed that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ that is a linear combination of no more than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} , and is within β_0 , for β_0 defined in (10.52), of φ throughout $[0, 1]^d$ in the pointwise

sense detailed in (10.57).

We next consider the guarantees available for the quantity $\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0,1]^d, \mathbb{R})}$ for the approximation u returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm with the restriction that u is a linear combination of, at most, n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . We follow the approach proposed in Remark 10.12. As observed in Remark 10.12, the stronger sense in which u approximates φ throughout $[0, 1]^d$ comes at a cost of less explicit constants.

Fix $\theta \geq 0$ and define $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(n_0, d, \gamma) > 0$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\lambda_0 := \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n_0 - 1}{D} \omega_d \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} - 1 \right)^{-1} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_0 := d^k \left(2C\lambda_0^{\gamma-k} + \theta e^{\lambda_0} \right) > 0. \quad (10.58)$$

It follows from (10.58) that $0 \leq \theta < \beta_0/d^k$. With the value of $\beta_0 > 0$ fixed, determine a positive constant $\xi = \xi(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \eta, \theta) > 0$ by

$$\xi := \inf \{ \varepsilon > 0 : \beta_0 \leq \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) \} \quad (10.59)$$

where, given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(C, \gamma, \eta, \varepsilon) > 0$ denotes the constant ε_0 retrieved from the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0 , γ , η , and ε there as C , γ , η , and ε here respectively. After the value of $\xi > 0$ is fixed, retrieve the constant $\delta = \delta(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \eta, \theta) > 0$ arising as the constant δ_0 in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0 , γ , η , and ε there as C , γ , η , and ξ here respectively. Finally, define an integer $\Lambda = \Lambda(n_0, C, d, \gamma, \theta, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\Lambda := \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq \frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^d \right\}. \quad (10.60)$$

A consequence of (10.38) and (10.60) is that $N_{\text{cov}}([0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d, \delta) \leq \Lambda$, and so we may choose a subset $\Sigma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\Lambda\} \subset [0, 1]^d$ for which $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{s=1}^\Lambda \overline{\mathbb{B}^d}(p_s, \delta)$. Moreover, (10.58) ensures that

$$\frac{2^d}{\omega_d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \right)^d \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D} \quad (10.61)$$

so that, via (10.38), we have that $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}$.

Apply the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}, \Lambda \right\}$, β_0 as the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A), θ as the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A), k as the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A), $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$ the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A), $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$ as the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A), and $A_1 := \|f_1\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}, \dots, A_N := \|f_N\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Omega, W)}$ as the scaling factors chosen in **HOLGRIM** (A).

Observe that λ_0 defined in (10.58) coincides with the positive constant $r > 0$ arising in (10.3) in the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 for the constants C , γ , ε , ε_0 , and q there as C , γ , β_0 , θ and k here. Thus, since $N_{\text{pack}}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda_0) \leq \frac{n_0 - 1}{D}$, the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1 tells us that there is an integer $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after completing m steps. Thus, if $Q_m := 1 + mD(d, k)$, there are coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ with (cf. (10.5))

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| \|f_{e(s)}\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0,1]^d, \mathbb{R})} = C, \quad (10.62)$$

and such that $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ defined by (cf. (10.6))

$$u := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)} \left(\begin{array}{l} u^{(l)} := \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} c_s f_{e(s)}^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \max_{x \in \Sigma} \{ \Lambda_{\varphi - u}^k(x) \} \leq \beta_0. \quad (10.63)$$

The condition (10.62) means that $\|u\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, [0,1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq C$. Recall that the finite subset $\Sigma \subset [0, 1]^d$ was chosen to be a δ -cover of $[0, 1]^d$ in the sense that $[0, 1]^d \subset \cup_{x \in \Sigma} \overline{\mathbb{B}^d}(x, \delta)$. Further recall that δ is the constant δ_0 arising in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0 , γ , η , and ε there as C , γ , η , and ξ here.

Finally, recall that $\xi > 0$ was chosen in (10.59) so that $\beta_0 \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ where ε_0 is the constant ε_0 arising in the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the choices of the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here.

Therefore, we have the required hypotheses to appeal to the *Lipschitz Sandwich Theorem* 2.9 for the constants K_0, γ, η , and ε there as C, γ, η , and ξ here respectively, the subsets B and Σ there are Σ and $[0, 1]^d$ here respectively, and the functions ψ and ϕ there as φ and u here respectively. By doing so, we may conclude via the implication (2.11) that

$$\|\varphi_{[q]} - u_{[q]}\|_{\text{Lip}(\eta, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})} \leq \xi \quad (10.64)$$

where we use the notation that if $\phi = (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ then $\phi_{[q]} := (\phi^{(0)}, \dots, \phi^{(q)})$.

Moreover, we have that $Q_m \leq 1 + MD \leq n_0$ so that u is guaranteed to be a linear combination of no greater than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} . Thus given an integer $n_0 \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ for which $n_0 \geq 1 + 2^d D / \omega_d$, we are guaranteed that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can find an approximation $u \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ of φ that is a linear combination of no more than n_0 of the functions in \mathcal{F} , and is within ξ , for ξ defined in (10.59), of φ throughout $[0, 1]^d$ in the $\text{Lip}(\eta, [0, 1]^d, \mathbb{R})$ norm sense detailed in (10.64).

We end this section by providing a proof of the *HOLGRIM Convergence Theorem* 10.1. Our strategy is to use the separation of the points selected during the **HOLGRIM** algorithm, established in the *Point Separation Lemma* 9.1, to obtain the desired upper bound on the number of steps which the algorithm can completed before terminating.

Proof of Theorem 10.1. Let $\mathcal{N}, \Lambda, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \gamma > 0$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\gamma \in (k, k + 1]$, and fix a choice of $q \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$ be real numbers such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}$. Let V and W be finite dimensional real Banach spaces, of dimensions d and c respectively, with $\Sigma \subset V$ finite. Assume that the tensor products of V are all equipped with admissible norms (cf. Definition 2.1). Assume, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $f_i = (f_i^{(0)}, \dots, f_i^{(k)}) \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ is non-zero and define $\mathcal{F} := \{f_i : i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}\} \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$. Choose scalars $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq A_i$. Given $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, define $\varphi = (\varphi^{(0)}, \dots, \varphi^{(k)}) \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ and constants $C, D > 0$ by (cf. (10.1))

$$\text{(I)} \quad \varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i, \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \varphi^{(l)} := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} a_i f_i^{(l)} \\ \text{for every } l \in \{0, \dots, k\} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{(II)} \quad C := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i > 0. \quad (10.65)$$

and (cf. (10.2))

$$D = D(d, k) := \sum_{s=0}^k \beta(d, s) = \sum_{s=0}^k \binom{d+s-1}{s}. \quad (10.66)$$

With a view to later applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ let $\tilde{a}_i := |a_i|$ and \tilde{f}_i be given by f_i if $a_i > 0$ and $-f_i$ if $a_i < 0$. Observe that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we have that $\|\tilde{f}_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} = \|f_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)}$. Moreover, we also have that $\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ and that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{f}_i$. Further, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we set $h_i := \tilde{f}_i / A_i$ and $\alpha_i := \tilde{a}_i A_i$ (cf. **HOLGRIM** (B)). A first consequence is that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ we have that $\|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq 1$. Further consequences are that C satisfies

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |a_i| A_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{a}_i A_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i, \quad (10.67)$$

and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $\alpha_i h_i = \tilde{a}_i \tilde{f}_i = a_i f_i$. Thus the expansion for φ in (I) of (10.65) is equivalent to

$$\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i h_i, \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \|h_i\|_{\text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \stackrel{(10.67)}{=} C. \quad (10.68)$$

Define a positive constant $r = r(C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) > 0$ as in (10.3). That is,

$$r := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0 : 2C\lambda^{\gamma-q} + \varepsilon_0 e^\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \right\}. \quad (10.69)$$

Define $N = N(\Sigma, C, \gamma, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ to be the r -packing number of Σ as in (10.4). That is,

$$N := \max \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists z_1, \dots, z_s \in \Sigma \text{ for which } \|z_a - z_b\|_V > r \text{ if } a \neq b\}, \quad (10.70)$$

Consider applying the **HOLGRIM** algorithm to approximate φ on Σ , with $M := \min \left\{ \frac{N-1}{cd}, \Lambda \right\}$, the target accuracy in **HOLGRIM** (A) is ε , the acceptable recombination error in **HOLGRIM** (A) is ε_0 , the order level in **HOLGRIM** (A) is q , the shuffle numbers in **HOLGRIM** (A) are $s_1 = \dots = s_M = 1$, the integers $k_1, \dots, k_M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ in **HOLGRIM** (A) are $k_1 = \dots = k_M = 1$, and the scaling factors in **HOLGRIM** (A) as $A_1, \dots, A_N > 0$. Suppose that the integer N in (10.4) satisfies $N \leq M$.

We first prove that the algorithm terminates after completing, at most, N steps. If $N = M$ then this is immediate since the **HOLGRIM** algorithm is guaranteed to terminate after step M . Hence we only verify the claim in the non-trivial setting that $N < M$, in which case terminating after (at most) N steps requires the termination criterion in **HOLGRIM** (D) to be triggered.

Let $z_1 \in \Sigma$ be the point chosen in the first step (cf. **HOLGRIM** (C)). Let $u_1 \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ be the approximation found via the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** satisfying, in particular, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_1}^k(z_1) \leq \varepsilon_0$. Define $\Sigma_1 := \{z_1\} \subset \Sigma$. We conclude via (9.3) in Lemma 9.1 that, for every $z \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_1, r) \cap \Sigma$, we have $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_1}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$.

If $N = 1$ then (10.70) means that $\overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_1, r) \cap \Sigma = \Sigma$. Thus we have established, for every $z \in \Sigma$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_1}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$. For each $z \in \Sigma$ it follows from (5.62) in Lemma 5.5 that, for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$, we have $|\sigma(\varphi-u_1)| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$. Recalling **HOLGRIM** (D), this means that the algorithm terminates before step 2 is completed. Hence the algorithm terminates after completing $N = 1$ steps.

If $N \geq 2$ then we note that if the stopping criterion in **HOLGRIM** (D) is triggered at the start of step $l \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ then we evidently have that the algorithm has terminated after carrying out no more than N steps. Consequently, we need only deal with the case in which the algorithm reaches and carries out step N without terminating. In this case, we claim that the algorithm terminates after completing step N , i.e. that the termination criterion at the start of step $N+1$ is triggered.

Before proving this we fix some notation. Recalling **HOLGRIM** (D), for $l \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ let $z_l \in \Sigma$ denote the point selected at step l , and let $u_l \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the approximation found via the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** satisfying, for every $s \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_l}^k(z_s) \leq \varepsilon_0$.

By appealing to Lemma 9.1 we deduce both that, whenever $s, t \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ with $s \neq t$, we have (cf. (9.4))

$$\|z_t - z_s\|_V > r, \quad (10.71)$$

and that whenever $t \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $z \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_t, r) \cap \Sigma$ we have (cf. (9.3))

$$\Lambda_{\varphi-u_l}^b(z) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}. \quad (10.72)$$

Consider step $N+1$ of the algorithm at which we examine the quantity $K := \max \{|\sigma(\varphi - u_N)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$. If $K \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$ then the algorithm terminates without carrying out step $N+1$, and thus has terminated after carrying out N steps.

Assume that $K > \varepsilon/cd^q$ so that $\sigma_{N+1} := \operatorname{argmax} \{|\sigma(\varphi - u_N)| : \sigma \in \Sigma_q^*\}$ satisfies

$$|\sigma_{N+1}(\varphi - u_N)| > \frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q}. \quad (10.73)$$

Recall from the **HOLGRIM Extension Step** that $z_{N+1} \in \Sigma$ is taken to be the point for which $\sigma_{N+1} \in \mathcal{T}_{z_{N+1}, q}$. It is then a consequence of Lemma 5.3 that (cf. (5.33))

$$|\sigma_{N+1}(\varphi - u_N)| \leq \Lambda_{\varphi-u_N}^q(z_{N+1}). \quad (10.74)$$

Thus we have that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{cd^q} \stackrel{(10.73)}{<} |\sigma_{N+1}(\varphi - u_N)| \stackrel{(10.74)}{\leq} \Lambda_{\varphi-u_N}^q(z_{N+1}). \quad (10.75)$$

Together, (10.72) for $l := N$ and (10.75) yield that, for every $t \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have $z_{N+1} \notin \overline{\mathbb{B}}_V(z_t, r)$; that is, $\|z_{N+1} - z_t\|_V > r$.

Therefore the points $z_1, \dots, z_{N+1} \in \Sigma$ satisfy that, whenever $s, t \in \{1, \dots, N+1\}$ with $s \neq t$, we have

$\|z_s - z_t\|_V > r$. Hence

$$N \stackrel{(10.70)}{=} \max \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists x_1, \dots, x_t \in \Sigma \text{ such that } \|x_s - x_t\|_V > r \text{ whenever } s \neq t\} \geq N + 1 \quad (10.76)$$

which is evidently a contradiction. Thus we must in fact have that $K \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$, and hence the algorithm must terminate before carrying out step $N + 1$.

Having established the claimed upper bound for the maximum number of steps that the **HOLGRIM** algorithm can complete without terminating, we turn our attention to establishing the properties claimed for the approximation returned after the algorithm terminates. Let $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the integer for which the **HOLGRIM** algorithm terminates after step m . Let $u := u_m \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$. Then u is the final approximation returned by the **HOLGRIM** algorithm.

If $m < \{1, \dots, M - 1\}$ then the termination criterion of **HOLGRIM** (D) is triggered at the start of step $m + 1$. Consequently, we have that for every linear functional $\sigma \in \Sigma_q^*$ that $|\sigma(\varphi - u)| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$. Recall that $\Sigma_q^* := \cup_{z \in \Sigma} \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Thus, for any $z \in \Sigma$, we must have that $|\sigma(\varphi - u)| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$ for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{z,q}$. Consequently, by appealing to Lemma 5.5 (specifically to the implication (5.63)), we conclude that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z) \leq \varepsilon$. Since $z \in \Sigma$ was arbitrary we have established that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$.

If $m = M$ then, since $N \leq M$ and we have already established that the **HOLGRIM** terminates before completing step k for any $k > N$, we must have that $N = M$. Consequently, in this case we have that $u = u_N$, and thus have previously established that for every linear functional $\sigma \in \Sigma_q^*$ we have $|\sigma(\varphi - u)| \leq \varepsilon/cd^q$. And so, by repeating the argument of the paragraph above, we may once again conclude that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$.

The combination of the previous two paragraphs enables us to conclude that $\max_{z \in \Sigma} \{\Lambda_{\varphi-u}^q(z)\} \leq \varepsilon$ as claimed in the second part of (10.6).

Recalling **HOLGRIM** (C) and (D), the **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** has found $u_m \in \text{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfying, for every $s \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, that $\Lambda_{\varphi-u_m}^k(z_s) \leq \varepsilon_0$. In particular, this is achieved via an application of Lemma 3.1 in [LM22-I] to a system of $Q_m := 1 + mcD(d, k)$ real-valued equations (cf. (6.5) and **HOLGRIM Recombination Step** (C)). Therefore recombination returns non-negative coefficients $b_1, \dots, b_{Q_m} \geq 0$ with

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} b_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \alpha_i \stackrel{(10.67)}{=} C, \quad (10.77)$$

and indices $e(1), \dots, e(Q_m) \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ for which

$$u = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} b_s h_{e(s)} \quad \text{so that for every } j \in \{0, \dots, n\} \quad u^{(j)} = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} b_s h_{e(s)}^{(j)}. \quad (10.78)$$

A consequence of (10.78) is that

$$u = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} b_s h_{e(s)} = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} \frac{b_s}{A_{e(s)}} \tilde{f}_{e(s)}. \quad (10.79)$$

For each $s \in \{1, \dots, Q_m\}$, define $c_s := \frac{b_s}{A_{e(s)}}$ if $\tilde{f}_{e(s)} = f_{e(s)}$ (which, we recall, is the case if $a_{e(s)} > 0$) and $c_s := -\frac{b_s}{A_{e(s)}}$ if $\tilde{f}_{e(s)} = -f_{e(s)}$ (which, we recall, is the case if $a_{e(s)} < 0$). Then (10.79) gives the expansion for $u \in \text{Lip}(\gamma, \Sigma, W)$ in terms of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\mathcal{N}}$ claimed in the first part of (10.6). Moreover, from (10.77) we have that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} |c_s| A_{e(s)} = \sum_{s=1}^{Q_m} b_s \stackrel{(10.77)}{=} C \quad (10.80)$$

as claimed in (10.5).

It remains only to prove that if the coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ corresponding to φ (cf. (I) of (10.65)) are all positive (i.e. $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$) then the coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to u (cf. (10.79)) are all non-negative (i.e. $c_1, \dots, c_{Q_m} \geq 0$). First note that $a_1, \dots, a_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ means, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$, that $\tilde{f}_i = f_i$. Consequently, for every $s \in \{1, \dots, Q_m\}$, we have that $\tilde{f}_{e(s)} = f_{e(s)}$, and so by definition $c_s = b_s/A_{e(s)}$. Since $A_{e(s)} > 0$ and $b_s \geq 0$, it follows that $c_s \geq 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 10.1. \blacksquare

References

- [ABDHP21] D. Alistarh, T. Ben-Nun, N. Dryden, T. Hoefler and A. Peste, *Sparsity in Deep Learning: Pruning and growth for efficient inference and training in neural networks*, J. Mach. Learn. Res., **22**(241), 1-124, 2021.
- [ABCGMM18] J.-P. Argaud, B. Bouriquet, F. de Caso, H. Gong, Y. Maday and O. Mula, *Sensor Placement in Nuclear Reactors Based on the Generalized Empirical Interpolation Method*, J. Comput. Phys., vol. **363**, pp. 354-370, 2018.
- [ABGMM16] J.-P. Argaud, B. Bouriquet, H. Gong, Y. Maday and O. Mula, *Stabilization of (G)EIM in Presence of Measurement Noise: Application to Nuclear Reactor Physics*, In Spectral and High Order Methods for Partial Differential Equations-ICOSAHOM 2016, vol. **119** of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., pp.133-145, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [AGGLS18] Imanol P. Arribas, Guy M. Goodwin, John R. Geddes, Terry Lyons and Kate E. Saunders, *A signature-based machine learning model for distinguishing bipolar disorder and borderline personality disorder*, Translational psychiatry, vol. **8**, no. 1, pp. 1-7, 2018.
- [ACLLN24] Paola Arrubbarrena, Tom Cass, Maud Lemercier, Terry Lyons and Bojan Nikolic, *Novelty Detection on Radion Astronomy Data using Signatures*, arXiv preprint, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14892>
- [AK13] M. G. Augasts and T. Kathirvalavakumar, *Pruning algorithms of neural networks - A comparative study*, Open Computer Science **3**, p.105-115, 2013.
- [BLL15] Francis Bach, Simon Lacoste-Julien and Fredrik Lindsten, *Sequential Kernel Herding: Frank-Wolfe Optimization for Particle Filtering*, In Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pages 544-552, PMLR, 2015.
- [BMPSZ08] F. R. Bach, J. Mairal, J. Ponce, G. Sapiro and A. Zisserman, *Discriminative learned dictionaries for local image analysis*, Compute Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp.1-8, IEEE 2008.
- [BMPSZ09] F. R. Bach, J. Mairal, J. Ponce, G. Sapiro and A. Zisserman, *Supervised dictionary learning*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp.1033-1040, 2009.
- [BGLT97] A. D. Back, C. L. Giles, S. Lawrence and Ah Chung Tsoi, *Face recognition: a convolutional neural-network approach*, in IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, vol. **8**, no. 1, pp. 98-113, January 1997.
- [BMNP04] M. Barrault, Y. Maday, N. C. Nguyen and A. T. Patera, *An Empirical Interpolation Method: Application to Efficient Reduced-Basis Discretization of Partial Differential Equations*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I., **339**, pp.667-672, 2004.
- [BS22] S. Bawa and H. Singh, *Predicting COVID-19 statistics using machine learning regression model: Li-MuLi-Poly*, Multimedia Systems **28**, 113-120, 2022.
- [BCKLLT24] Iman Munire Bilal, Ryan Sze-Yin Chan, Elena Kochkina, Maria Liakata, Terry Lyons and Talia Tseriotou, *Sig-Networks Toolking: Signature Networks for Longitudinal Language Modelling*, Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics System Demonstrations, Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 223-237, March 2024.
- [Bou15] Youness Boutaib, *On Lipschitz maps and the Hölder regularity of flows*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appli. **65**, no. 2, 129-175, 2020.
- [Bou22] Youness Boutaib, *The Accessibility Problem for Geometric Rough Differential Equations*, J. Dyn. Control Syst. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10883-023-09648-y>
- [BL22] Youness Boutaib and Terry Lyons, *A new definition of rough paths on manifolds*, Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques, Serie 6, Volume **31**, no. 4, pp. 1223-1258, 2022.
- [BCGMO18] F. -X. Briol, W. Y. Chen, J. Gorham, L. Mackey and C. J. Oates, *Stein Points*, In Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, Volume **80**, pp. 843-852, PMLR, 2018.

- [Car81] B. Carl, *Entropy numbers of diagonal operators with an application to eigenvalue problems*, J. Approx. Theory, **32**, pp.135-150, 1981.
- [CS90] B. Carl and I. Stephani, *Entropy, Compactness, and the Approximation of Operators*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1990.
- [CLL04] M. Caruana, T. Lévy and T. Lyons, *Differential equations driven by rough paths*, Lecture Notes in mathematics, vol. **1908**, Springer, 2007, Lectures from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6-24 2004, with an introduction concerning the Summer School by Jean Picard.
- [CLL12] T. Cass, C. Litterer and T. Lyons, *Rough paths on manifolds*, in New trends in stochastic analysis and related topics, Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences, vol. **12**, World Scientific, pp. 33-88, 2012.
- [CCFLS20] Ryan Sze-Yin Chan, Thomas Cochrane, Peter Foster, Terry Lyons and Zhen Shao, *Dimensionless Anomaly Detection on Multivariate Streams with Variance Norm and Path Signature*, Preprint 2020. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03487>
- [CDLT18] Ming-Wei Chang, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee and Kristina Toutanova, *BERT: Pre-Training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding*, Proceedings of NAACL-HLT, Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 4171-4186, 2019.
- [CHXZ20] L. Chen, A. Huang, S. Xu and B. Zhang, *Convolutional Neural Network Pruning: A Survey*, 39th Chinese Control Conference (CCC), IEEE, p.7458-7463, 2020.
- [CSW10] Y. Chen, A. Smola and M. Welling, *Super-Samples from Kernel Herding*, In Proceedings of the Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, 2010.
- [CLLMQW24] Yichuan Cheng, Haoliang Li, Terry Lyons, Andrew D. McLeod, Tiexin Qin and Benjamin Walker, *Log Neural Controlled Differential Equations: The Lie Brackets Make a Difference*, Accepted at ICML 2024.
- [CK16] Ilya Chevyrev and Andrey Kormilitzin, *A Primer on the Signature Method in Machine Learning*, arXiv preprint, 2016. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03788>
- [CM73] Jon F. Claerbout and Francis Muir, *Robust Modeling with Erratic Data*, Geophysics, Vol. **38**, So. 5, pp. 826-844, (1973)
- [DGOY08] J. Darbon, D. Goldfarb, S. Osher and W. Yin, *Bregman Iterative Algorithms for L1 Minimization with Applications to Compressed Sensing*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci. **1**, pp.143-168, 2008.
- [DM21-I] Raaz Dwivedi and Lester Mackey, *Kernel Thinning*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05842> [stat.ML], 13 November 2021.
- [DM21-II] Raaz Dwivedi and Lester Mackey, *Generalized Kernel Thinning*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.01593> [stat.ML], 16 November 2021.
- [DMS21] Raaz Dwivedi, Lester Mackey and Abhishek Shetty, *Distribution Compression in Near-Linear Time*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.07941>. [stat.ML], 17 November 2021.
- [ET96] D. E. Edmunds and H. Triebel, *Function Spaces, Entropy Numbers, and Differential Operators*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1996.
- [EMS08] M. Elad, J. Mairal and G. Sapiro, *Sparse representation for color image restoration*, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, **17**(1), 53-69, 2008.
- [EPP00] T. Evgeniou, M. Pontil and T. Poggio, *Regularization networks and support vector machines*, Adv. Comput. Math., **13**, pp.1-50, 2000.
- [FS21] S. Fischer and I. Steinwart, *A closer look at covering number bounds for Gaussian kernels*, Journal of Complexity, Volume **62**, 2021.

- [FKLLO21] J. Foster, P. Kidger, X. Li, T. Lyons and H. Oberhauser, *Neural SDEs as Infinite-Dimensional GANs*, International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) 2021.
- [FKLM20] J. Foster, P. Kidger, T. Lyons and J. Morrill, *Neural Controlled Differential Equations for Irregular Time Series*, Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2020.
- [FKLMS21] J. Foster, P. Kidger, T. Lyons, J. Morrill and C. Salvi, *Neural Rough Differential Equations for Long Time Series*, In International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), pp. 7829-7838, 2021.
- [FKLL21] James Foster, Patrick Kidger, Xuechen Li and Terry Lyons, *Efficient and Accurate Gradients for Neural SDE*, NeurIPS 2021.
- [GLSWZ21] John Glossner, Tailin Liang, Shaobo Shi, Lei Wang and Xiaotong Zhang, *Pruning and quantization for deep neural network acceleration: A survey*, Neurocomputing, Volume 461, pages 370-403, 2021.
- [GO09] T. Goldstein and S. Osher, *The Split Bregman Method for L1-Regularized Problems*, SIAM J. Imaging Sci. 2, pp.323-343, 2009.
- [GMNP07] M. A. Grepl, Y. Maday, N. C. Nguyen and A. T. Patera, *Efficient Reduced-Basis Treatment of Nonaffine and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, M2AN (Math. Model. Numer. Anal.), 2007.
- [HLO21] Satoshi Hayakawa, Terry Lyons and Harald Oberhauser, *Positively weighted kernel Quadrature via Sub-sampling*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35, NeurIPS, 2022.
- [HRSZ15] Kaiming He, Shaoqing Ren, Jian Sun and Xiangyu Zhang, *Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition*, arXiv preprint, 2015. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385>
- [HKR15] Samer Hijazi, Rishi Kumar, and Chris Rowen, *Using convolutional neural networks for image recognition*, Cadence Design Systems Inc.: San Jose, CA, USA 9.1 (2015).
- [HKLMNS19] S. Howison, A. Kormilitzin, T. Lyons, J. Morrill, A. Nevado-Holgado and S. Swaminathan, *The signature-based model for early detection of sepsis from electronic health records in the intensive care unit*, In: 2019 Computing in Cardiology (CinC) (2019).
- [HKLMNS20] S. Howison, A. Kormilitzin, T. Lyons, J. Morrill, A. Nevado-Holgado and S. Swaminathan, *Utilization of the signature method to identify the early onset of sepsis from multivariate physiological time series in critical care monitoring*, Critical Care Medicine 48(10), 976–981, 2020.
- [JNYZ24] Lei Jiang, Hao Ni, Weixin Yang and Xin Zhang, *GCN-DevLSTM: Path Development for Skeleton-Based Action Recognition*, arXiv Preprint, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.15212>
- [JLSNY17] Lianwen Jin, Terry Lyons, Hao Ni, Cordelia Schmid and Weixin Yang, *Developing the Path Signature Methodology and its Application to Landmark-based Human Action Recognition*, In: Yin, G., Zariphopoulou, T. (eds) Stochastic Analysis, Filtering and Stochastic Optimization, Springer, Cham. 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98519-6_18
- [KK20] M. Kalinić and P. Kómár, *Denoising DNA encoded library screens with sparse learning*, ACS Combinatorial Science, Vol. 22, no. 8, pp.410-421, 2020.
- [KTT18] Bernard Kamsu-Foguem, Fana Tangara and Boukaye Boubacar Traore, *Deep Convolution Neural Network for Image Recognition*, Ecological Informatics, Volume 48, pages 257-268, 2018.
- [Kol56] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Asymptotic characteristics of some completely bounded metric spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 108, pp.585-589, 1956.
- [Kuh11] T. Kühn, *Covering numbers of Gaussian reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, J. Complexity, 27, pp.489-499, 2011.
- [LLNSW19] Maria Liakata, Terry Lyons, Alejo J. Nevado-Holgado, Hao Ni, Kate Saunders and Bo Wang, *A Path Signature Approach for Speech Emotion Recognition*, Interspeech 2019.

- [LLNSTWW20] Maria Liakata, Terry Lyons, Alejo J. Nevado-Holgardo, Kate Saunders, Niall Taylor, Bo Wang and Yue Wu, *Learning to Detect Bipolar Disorder and Borderline Personality Disorder with Language and Speech in Non-Clinical Interviews*, Interspeech 2020.
- [LLSVWW21] Maria Liakata, Terry Lyons, Kate E. Saunders, Nemanja Vaci, Bo Wang and Yue Wu, *Modelling Paralinguistic Properties in Conversational Speech to Detect Bipolar Disorder and Borderline Personality Disorder*, ICASSP 2021.
- [LY07] Y. Lin and M. Yuan, *On the Non-Negative Garrote Estimator*, J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B **69**, pp. 143-161, 2007
- [LL99] W. V. Li and W. Linde, *Approximation, metric entropy and small ball estimates for Gaussian measures*, Ann. Probab., **27**, pp.1556-1578, 1999.
- [Lyo98] Terry Lyons, *Differential equations driven by rough signals*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana, **14**(2): 215-310, 1998.
- [LM22-I] Terry Lyons and Andrew D. McLeod, *Greedy Recombination Interpolation Method (GRIM)*, arXiv preprint, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.07495>
- [LM22-II] Terry Lyons and Andrew D. McLeod, *Signature Methods in Machine Learning*, arXiv preprint, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.14674>
- [LM24] Terry Lyons and Andrew D. McLeod, *Higher Order Lipschitz Sandwich Theorems*, arXiv preprint, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06849>
- [LP04] H. Luschgy and G. Pagés, *Sharp asymptotics of the Kolmogorov entropy for Gaussian measures*, J. Funct. Anal., **212**, pp.89-120, 2004.
- [MM13] Y. Maday, O. Mula, *A generalized empirical interpolation method: Application of reduced basis techniques to data assimilation*, F. Brezzi, P. Colli Franzone, U. Gianazza, G. Gilardi (Eds.), Analysis and Numerics of Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 4 of Springer INdAM Series, Springer Milan, 2013, pp. 221–235.
- [MMPY15] Y. Maday, O. Mula, A. T. Patera and M. Yano, *The Generalized Empirical Interpolation Method: Stability Theory On Hilbert Spaces With An Application To Stokes Equation*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **287**, 310-334, 2015.
- [MMT14] Y. Maday, O. Mula and G. Turinici, *Convergence analysis of the Generalized Empirical Interpolation Method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **54**(3) 1713-1731, 2014.
- [MNPP09] Y. Maday, N. C. Nguyen, A. T. Patera and G. S. H. Pau, *A General Multipurpose Interpolation Procedure: The Magic Points*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal., **81**, pp. 383-404, 2009.
- [McS34] Edward James McShane, *Extension of range of functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **40**, p.837-842, 1934.
- [MRT12] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh and Ameet Talwalkar, *Foundations of Machine Learning*, Massachusetts: MIT Press, USA, 2012.
- [NPS22] M. Nikdast, S. Pasricha and F. Sunny, *SONIC: A Sparse Neural Network Inference Accelerator with Silicon Photonics for Energy-Efficient Deep Learning*, 27th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC), pp. 214-219, 2022.
- [PTT22] Sebastian Pokutta, Ken'ichiro Tanaka and Kazuma Tsuji, *Sparser Kernel Herding with Pairwise Conditional Gradients without Swap Steps*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.12650>, [math.OC], 8 February 2022.
- [Ree93] R. Reed, *Pruning Algorithms - A Survey*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks **4**, p.74-747, 1993.
- [Rya02] Raymond A Ryan, *Introduction to tensor products of Banach spaces*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.

- [SS86] Fadil Santosa and William W. Symes, *Linear Inversion of Band-Limited Reflection Seismograms*, SIAM J. Sci. STAT. COMPUT. Vol. 7, No. 4, 1986.
- [SSW01] B. Schölkopf, A. J. Smola and R. C. Williamson, *Generalization performance of regularization networks and support vector machines via entropy numbers of compact operators*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **47**, pp.2516-2532, 2001.
- [Ste70] E. M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970.
- [Ste03] I. Steinwart, *Entropy numbers of convex hulls and an application to learning algorithms*, Arch. Math., **80**, pp.310-318, 2003.
- [SS07] I. Steinwart and C. Scovel, *Fast rates for support vector machines using Gaussian kernels*, Ann. Statist. **35** (2), 2007.
- [TT21] Ken'ichiro Tanaka and Kazuma Tsuji, *Acceleration of the Kernel Herding Algorithm by Improved Gradient Approximation*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.07900>, [math.NA], 17 May 2021.
- [TW19] GL. Tian and M. Wang, *Adaptive Group LASSO for High-Dimensional Generalized Linear Models*, Stat Papers **60**, pp. 1469-1486, 2019.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani, *Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 267-288, 1996.
- [Wel09a] M. Welling, *Herding Dynamical Weights to Learn*, In Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Machine Learning, Montreal, Quebec, CAN, 2009.
- [Wel09b] M. Welling, *Herding Dynamic Weights for Partially Observed Random Field Models*, In Proc. of the Conf. on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Montreal, Quebec, CAN, 2009.
- [Whi34] H. Whitney, *Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 36 (1934) pp. 63-89, 1934.
- [Whi44] H. Whitney, *On the extension of differentiable functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **50**(2): 76-81, 1944.
- [XZ16] Y. Xiang and C. Zhang, *On the Oracle Property of Adaptive Group LASSO in High-Dimensional Linear Models*, Stat. Pap. **57**, pp. 249-265, 2016.
- [Zho02] D. -X. Zhou, *The covering number in learning theory*, J. Complexity, **18**, pp.739-767, 2002.

University of Oxford, Radcliffe Observatory, Andrew Wiles Building, Woodstock Rd, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK.

TL: tlyons@maths.ox.ac.uk

<https://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/people/terry.lyons>

AM: andrew.mcleod@maths.ox.ac.uk

<https://www.maths.ox.ac.uk/people/andrew.mcleod>