

# Nearly Linear Sparsification of $\ell_p$ Subspace Approximation

David P. Woodruff  
Carnegie Mellon University  
dwoodruf@cs.cmu.edu

Taisuke Yasuda  
Carnegie Mellon University  
taisukekey@cs.cmu.edu

July 4, 2024

## Abstract

The  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation problem is an NP-hard low rank approximation problem that generalizes the median hyperplane problem ( $p = 1$ ), principal component analysis ( $p = 2$ ), and the center hyperplane problem ( $p = \infty$ ). A popular approach to cope with the NP-hardness of this problem is to compute a *strong cores*et, which is a small weighted subset of the input points which simultaneously approximates the cost of every  $k$ -dimensional subspace, typically to  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  relative error for a small constant  $\varepsilon$ .

We obtain the first algorithm for constructing a strong coreset for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation with a nearly optimal dependence on the rank parameter  $k$ , obtaining a nearly linear bound of  $\tilde{O}(k) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2}) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p > 2$ . Prior constructions either achieved a similar size bound but produced a coreset with a modification of the original points [SW18, FKW21], or produced a coreset of the original points but lost  $\text{poly}(k)$  factors in the coreset size [HV20, WY23a].

Our techniques also lead to the first nearly optimal *online* strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation with similar bounds as the offline setting, resolving a problem of [WY23a]. All prior approaches lose  $\text{poly}(k)$  factors in this setting, even when allowed to modify the original points.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The $\ell_p$ subspace approximation problem

Consider a set of  $n$  points  $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$  in  $d$ -dimensional space. A natural problem is to determine the “cost” of moving these  $n$  points to lie on a  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . This is an old and important question that has been studied independently in varied fields such as operations research, statistics, and computational geometry. For concreteness, we may consider the *linear location allocation problem* in transportation theory, where we have  $n$  cities to be served by a railroad represented by a line (i.e. a subspace of dimension  $k = 1$ ), and we wish to determine the cost of “serving” these cities by a given line [MB72, MN80].

It is common to measure the cost of moving a point to a subspace by the Euclidean distance, given by

$$\text{cost}(\mathbf{a}_i, F) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in F} \|\mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{x}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the  $d \times d$  identity and  $\mathbf{P}_F$  denotes the orthogonal projection matrix onto  $F$ . This cost is rotationally invariant, which is important for accurately modeling real world data in many cases [DZHZ06]. To measure the cost of the entire set of points, we aggregate the cost of the individual points via the  $\ell_p$  loss, which is parameterized by some exponent  $p \geq 1$  and is given by

$$\text{cost}^p(\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=1}^n, F) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^p \right]^{1/p}.$$

For smaller values of  $p$ , this cost tends to capture the average cost of a point  $\mathbf{a}_i$ , while for larger values of  $p$ , this cost tends to capture the maximum cost of a point  $\mathbf{a}_i$ . The problem of minimizing this objective over rank  $k$  subspaces  $F$  is known as the  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation problem. To simplify the notation, we will often write the objective as simply  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the  $n \times d$  matrix containing  $\mathbf{a}_i$  in the  $i$ -th row and  $\|\cdot\|_{p,2}$  is the  $(p, 2)$ -norm, which is defined for a  $n \times d$  matrix  $\mathbf{Y}$  as  $\|\mathbf{Y}\|_{p,2} := [\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{Y}\|_2^p]^{1/p}$ . We will denote the optimal value of this problem as

$$\text{OPT} := \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_k$  denotes the set of all rank  $k$  subspaces  $F$ . We will let  $\mathbf{P}^*$  denote the projection matrix for a rank  $k$  subspace achieving this optimum.

Several special cases of this problem are particularly well-studied. Perhaps the most natural cost from the point of view of the railroad example in transportation theory is simply the sum of the costs, or the  $\ell_1$  loss [MB72, MN80]. The problem of minimizing this objective function over rank  $k$  subspaces  $F$  is known as the *median hyperplane problem* [MS01], and also has a rich history in computational geometry [KM12, Sch99] and robust statistics [SW87, DZHZ06, GZAL14, YHY17]. In particular, this problem can be thought of as an alternative to robust linear regression methods when the covariates can be noisy, in contrast to the usual least absolute deviations regression which assumes that only the predicted variable is noisy. In computational geometry, another popular cost is to measure the cost by the maximum cost, or the  $\ell_\infty$  loss. The problem of minimizing this objective over rank  $k$  subspaces  $F$  is known as the *center hyperplane problem* [MS01], and generalizes a variety of *containment* or *extent* problems in computational geometry such as minimum enclosing balls and minimum enclosing cylinders [GK94, HV04, AHV04]. Yet another popular special case is the sum of squared costs, or the  $\ell_2$  loss, which is the usual *principal component analysis problem* and is one of the most popular dimension reduction techniques in statistics and data analysis. The general case of  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation gives a smooth interpolation between these well-known problems [SV12].

## 1.2 Sparsification and coresets

It is common to encounter settings where the number of points  $n$  is extremely large, especially in big data settings. *Sparsification* and *coresets* belong to a class of techniques which has been extremely successful in handling such parameter regimes. Sparsification generally refers to the approximation of a large object by a sparse object, and has been studied extensively in settings such as graphs [BK96, ST04, BSS12] and hypergraphs [BST19, KKTY21, JLS23, Lee23] as well as a large variety of decomposable loss functions such

as clustering [Che09, FL11, BFL16, FSS20, HV20, BJKW21, CSS21, CLSS22, CLS<sup>+</sup>22, HLW22], submodular functions [RY22, JLLS23b],  $\ell_p$  regression [DMM06a, Cla05, DDH<sup>+</sup>09, CP15, WY23b], and generalized linear models [MMR21, MOP22, MMWY22, JLLS23a]. When the object being sparsified is a dataset, then its sparse approximation is often called a coreset. Coresets can often be used as a substantially smaller drop-in replacement of the original dataset, and leads to both time- and space-efficient algorithms.

Coresets have been a particularly important tool in the study of algorithms for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation, due to the fact that the problem is known to be NP-hard for any  $p \neq 2$  [DTV11, GRSW12, CW15]. In fact, the best known  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  approximation algorithms for this problem proceed exactly by reducing the input size via coreset techniques, and then applying an exponential time algorithm on the reduced instance [FMSW10, CW15]. Thus, the best known running time of  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation is almost completely determined by how small the coreset can be made to be. Various coreset algorithms for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation have been developed for both  $p = 2$  [DMM06b, DMM08, CEM<sup>+</sup>15, CMM17] and  $p \neq 2$  with increasingly improved sizes, running times, and guarantees [DV07, FL11, SV12, VX12, SW18, FSS20, HV20, FKW21], generalized loss functions [CW15, MMWY22], and in information-limited settings such as streaming [FMSW10, LSW18, MRWZ20, DP22] and online [BLVZ19, BDM<sup>+</sup>20, WY23a] models.

### 1.2.1 Strong coresets for $\ell_p$ subspace approximation

While several different coreset guarantees have been studied, we focus on the strongest possible guarantee known as a *strong coreset*, which is a weighted subset of points  $\mathbf{a}_i$  such that the cost of any rank  $k$  subspace  $F$  for the coreset approximates the cost on the original dataset, up to a factor of  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  for some small  $\varepsilon$ .

**Definition 1.1** (Strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Then, a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$  strong coreset for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation if*

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$$

for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . We refer to the number of nonzero entries  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S})$  of  $\mathbf{S}$  as the size of the coreset.

**Remark 1.2.** *In this work, we treat  $\varepsilon$  as a small constant. For concreteness, experiments in [GZAL14] on real world data demonstrate that the loss performance of different algorithms may differ by anywhere from 10% to 100% (i.e.  $\varepsilon = 0.1$  to  $\varepsilon = 1$ ). Furthermore, for  $p > 2$ , it is NP-hard to approximate the objective to any constant factor smaller than  $\gamma_p$  where  $\gamma_p = \Theta(\sqrt{p})$  is the  $\ell_p$  norm of a standard Gaussian [DTV11, GRSW12]. Thus, it is appropriate to think of  $\varepsilon$  as a constant (say 5%), while we think of  $k$  as growing.*

The guarantee of Definition 1.1 can also be viewed as the natural generalization of *projection cost-preserving sketches* [CEM<sup>+</sup>15, CMM17, MM20] to the  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation setting. Strong coresets can be used to reduce the size of the input instance to at most  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S})$  points in  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S})$  dimensions by rotation invariance. In particular, strong coresets of size  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$  immediately remove the dependence of this problem on  $n$  and  $d$ , making this a powerful tool in the design of fast algorithms.

It is useful to compare the guarantee of Definition 1.1 with other popular coreset guarantees. One weaker guarantee is a *weak coreset*, which requires that if  $\tilde{F}$  is the optimal solution to the subspace approximation problem for  $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}$ , then it is also a  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -optimal solution for  $\mathbf{A}$  [FL11, HV20]. Another further weaker guarantee is a *spanning coreset*, which requires that there is a rank  $k$  subspace  $\tilde{F}$  in the row span of  $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}$  that is a  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -optimal solution [DV07, SV12, CW15]. The guarantee of Definition 1.1 immediately achieves both of these guarantees, and offers further benefits that cannot be realized by these other guarantees, such as applications to *constrained* versions of  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation, or solving  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation in distributed and streaming models via the merge-and-reduce technique [BDM<sup>+</sup>20, CWZ23].

While it has long been known that strong coresets of size  $\text{poly}(k, d, \varepsilon^{-1})$  independent of  $n$  exist [FL11], the first dimension-independent result, i.e. a strong coreset of size only  $\text{poly}(k, \varepsilon^{-1})$  independent of  $d$ , was achieved by the work of [SW18]. In fact, the result of [SW18] achieves a coreset with a nearly optimal size of  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \tilde{O}(k)\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \tilde{O}(k^{p/2})\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p > 2$ . Furthermore, as we show in Appendix C, this result can be made to run in input sparsity time, by combining techniques from several follow-up works [CW15, HV20, FKW21]. However, this result has the drawback that it does not quite satisfy Definition 1.1, due to the fact that the coreset is a weighted subset of points *with an appended coordinate*

which must be treated separately from the original coordinates, rather than a weighted subset of the original data points themselves. This is unfavorable for a number of reasons:

- The use of an appended coordinate deviates from the traditional definition of coresets, which is the standard for a vast majority of the coreset literature.
- Coreset size lower bounds against row subsets no longer apply to these constructions, which are often substantially easier to establish than general data structure lower bounds. For instance, there are several coreset lower bounds which are specific to row subsets such as [HV20, CLSS22, HLW22] for clustering. Another example is [LWW21], which obtains nearly optimal (row subset) coreset lower bounds for  $\ell_p$  subspace embeddings, and looser lower bounds for general data structures.
- Downstream algorithms for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation must be modified to handle the additional coordinate, which may not always be simple. Algorithms for subspace approximation are highly varied, ranging from convex relaxation and rounding [DTV11] to power iterations [DZHZ06, NNSS20] to polynomial solvers [CW15], and it is undesirable to adapt all of these analyses and implementations.
- In the online coreset model, in which the coreset must be constructed “on the fly” as the input points  $\mathbf{a}_i$  arrive, this approach leads to suboptimal bounds [WY23a] (see Section 1.3.1).

Among purely row subset coresets following Definition 1.1, the work of [HV20] gives the first dimension-independent strong coresets, using a technique known as sensitivity sampling. However, the coreset size in this work, while dimension-independent, is not optimal, and loses  $\text{poly}(k)$  factors in the coreset size  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S})$ . Indeed, the best known lower bounds for  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S})$  are  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \tilde{\Omega}(k\varepsilon^{-2})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \tilde{\Omega}(k^{p/2}\varepsilon^{-1} + k\varepsilon^{-2})$  for  $p > 2$  by a reduction from coreset lower bounds for  $\ell_p$  subspace embeddings [LWW21, WY23a]. On the other hand, the result of [HV20] establishes upper bounds of roughly  $\tilde{O}(k^3\varepsilon^{-4})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2+3}\varepsilon^{-(p+2)})$  for  $p > 2$ . Thus, there is a  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$  factor gap in our understanding of the complexity of strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation, and it is a central question in this literature to pin down the dependence of  $k$ , which is the main parameter in this problem since  $\varepsilon$  is often treated as a constant. In particular, it is natural to conjecture that the [SW18] result can be matched with a purely row subset coreset.

**Question 1.3.** *Do strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation of size  $\tilde{O}(k)\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p > 2$  exist? Can such coresets be constructed efficiently?*

### 1.3 Our contributions

The main result of this work is a positive resolution to Question 1.3 for all  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . For  $1 \leq p < 2$ , we obtain the first row subset strong coreset with a nearly linear dependence on  $k$ . In particular, for  $p = 1$ , we obtain strong coresets of size  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon^6)$  for the median hyperplane problem, which is off by only a  $1/\varepsilon^4$  factor off from the lower bound of  $\tilde{\Omega}(k/\varepsilon^2)$  [LWW21, WY23a], and improves the previous upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(\min\{k^3/\varepsilon^6, k^4/\varepsilon^5\})$  due to [HV20].

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $1 \leq p < 2$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Then, there is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega)$  time which, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , constructs a strong coreset  $\mathbf{S}$  of size*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{k}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} (\log(k/\varepsilon\delta))^{O(1)}$$

satisfying Definition 1.1, that is,

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p \quad \text{for every subspace } F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \text{ of rank at most } k.$$

For  $2 < p < \infty$ , we obtain a bound that scales as  $k^{p/2}$ . While this is not nearly linear, this dependence on  $k$  necessary for this range of  $p$ , and matches a lower bound of  $\tilde{\Omega}(k^{p/2}\varepsilon^{-1} + k\varepsilon^{-2})$  [LWW21, WY23a].

**Theorem 1.5.** Let  $2 < p < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Then, there is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega)$  time which, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , constructs a strong coreset  $\mathbf{S}$  of size

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{k^{p/2}}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} (\log(k/\varepsilon\delta))^{O(p)}$$

satisfying Definition 1.1, that is,

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p \quad \text{for every subspace } F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \text{ of rank at most } k.$$

We give several remarks concerning our results. First, we are the first to establish even the *existence* of a weighted subset of points with the property of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5, and we are able to construct such a subset in nearly input sparsity time. We also note that for  $p < 2$ , the fact that we achieve nearly linear size for the strong coreset guarantee implies that we simultaneously achieve the first nearly optimal size guarantees for other weaker yet popular coreset guarantees, including weak coresets [FL11, HV20] and spanning coresets [DV07, SV12]. That is, for  $p < 2$ , we are in fact the first to resolve Question 1.3 even for weaker notions of coresets, both for existence and efficient constructions. For  $p > 2$ , we obtain the best known construction for weak coresets and the best known efficient construction for spanning coresets.

Table 1: Coreset size upper bounds for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation.

	Coreset size	Coreset guarantee	Extra coordinate	Running time
[DV07]	$k^2(k\varepsilon^{-1})^{p+1}$	spanning	–	polynomial
[SV12]	$k^2\varepsilon^{-1}$	spanning	–	existence only
[FL11]	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}}\varepsilon^{-2} \cdot k^3\varepsilon^{-1}$	weak	–	input sparsity
[FL11]	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}}\varepsilon^{-2} \cdot dk$	strong	–	input sparsity
[SW18]	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}}\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p^2)}$	strong	yes	exponential
[FKW21] <sup>1</sup>	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}}\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p^2)}$	strong	yes	input sparsity
[HV20]	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}+3}\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p)}$	strong	–	input sparsity
This work	$k^{\max\{1,p/2\}}\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p^2)}$	strong	–	input sparsity

### 1.3.1 Nearly optimal online coresets for $\ell_p$ subspace approximation

Despite the several drawbacks discussed in Section 1.2.1, strong coresets that use an additional coordinate as in [SW18, FKW21] may still be acceptable for applications to time- and space-efficient algorithms. This is especially true since we have shown that these approaches can be implemented in input sparsity time with nearly optimal dependence on  $k$  on the coreset size in Appendix C. However, we discuss one application of our results which requires our new approach to this problem, which is an application to sampling strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation in the *online coreset model*.

The literature of online algorithms studies algorithms which must make irrevocable decisions as its input arrives incrementally. In online machine learning and data analysis, a typical setting is for new data points to arrive one by one. The algorithm must then immediately make a decision about this data point, such as assigning them to clusters [Mey01] or outputting a prediction [Haz16]. The online coreset model, introduced by work of [CMP16], studies the question of implementing coreset algorithms in such online settings. More specifically, the rows of our design matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  arrive one by one in a stream, and we must sample the rows of the coreset in an online fashion, that is, we must decide whether or not to keep a row  $i \in [n]$  when it arrives, and we cannot discard rows that we keep, or retrieve rows that we discard. This model was originally studied in the context of coresets for  $\ell_2$  linear regression [CMP16], and has subsequently been analyzed for a variety of problems in data analysis, computational geometry, and numerical linear algebra [BLVZ19, BDM<sup>+</sup>20, WY22, WY23b, WY23a, MMO23].

<sup>1</sup> The guarantee as stated in [FKW21] loses  $\text{poly}(k)$  factors in the coreset size and does not run in input sparsity time. We show that both of these shortcomings can be rectified relatively simply in Appendix C.

For  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation in particular, the works of [BLVZ19, BDM<sup>+</sup>20] studied the case of  $p = 2$  and achieved a nearly optimal coresets size of  $\tilde{O}(k\varepsilon^{-2})$ , while [WY23a] studied the case of  $p \neq 2$ , achieving a coresets size of roughly  $\tilde{O}(k^{p+O(1)})\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p)}$  by analyzing an algorithm based on sensitivity sampling [HV20].<sup>2</sup> One of the main open questions left in [WY23a] is to obtain a nearly optimal dependence on  $k$  for online strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation.

**Question 1.6.** *Are there online coresets algorithms for constructing strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation of size  $\tilde{O}(k)\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  for  $p > 2$ ?*

In the online coresets setting, all prior techniques for dimension-free coresets [SW18, HV20, FKW21] face a key challenge. The problem is that all of these techniques are based on computing a fixed low-dimensional subspace  $S$  which is used to construct the coresets. In the online coresets setting, this is a major obstruction, due to the fact that this low-dimensional subspace  $S$  can evolve as more inputs arrive. In the recent work of [WY23a], it was shown that this problem can be circumvented by bounding the number of times that a subspace can undergo a significant change, using the so-called *online Lewis weights* [WY23b]. However, this technique increases the coresets size by the number of times this subspace changes, which is a factor of  $\tilde{O}(k^{\max\{1, p/2\}})$ , leading to a suboptimal overall bound of  $\tilde{O}(k^{p+O(1)})\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ . In particular, the extra factor of  $k^{p/2}$  is a glaring gap in our understanding of this problem, as pointed out by [WY23a].

Despite these challenges, our work gives a positive resolution of Question 1.6 by introducing a completely new approach towards coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation. One of the key aspects of our techniques will be to avoid a “commitment” to a specific low dimensional subspace via the use of regularization, and will allow us to seamlessly handle the online coresets setting. The technical details are given in Section 4.1.

## 1.4 Technical overview

We will now give a technical overview of our results. In the following discussion,  $\mathbf{S}$  will always be constructed as a  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix, with varying choices of sampling probabilities  $q_i$ .

**Definition 1.7** ( $\ell_p$  sampling matrix). *Let  $p \geq 1$ . A random diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is an  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with sampling probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  if for each  $i \in [n]$ , the  $i$ th diagonal entry is independently set to be*

$$\mathbf{S}_{i,i} = \begin{cases} 1/q_i^{1/p} & \text{with probability } q_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

### 1.4.1 Pitfalls in prior work

The central technique of [SW18] is a structural result which shows the existence of a *representative subspace*  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $s = O(k)\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  dimensions such that for any  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_S \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the vector with  $i$ -th entry given by  $\mathbf{b}_S(i) = \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2$ , and  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]$  is the  $n \times (d+1)$  matrix formed by the concatenation of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)$  and  $\mathbf{b}_S$ .<sup>3</sup> That is, the  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation cost of  $F$  can be approximated by the projection cost onto the subspace  $S$ , plus the additional projection cost of the lower dimensional points  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S$  to the query subspace  $F$ . This reduces the subspace approximation problem in  $d$  dimensions to a similar problem in  $s+1$  dimensions. In turn, this lower dimensional problem can be solved using dimension-dependent techniques, since the dimension is now only  $s+1 = O(k)\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ . Then to analyze sampling algorithms, [SW18] show that Dvoretzky’s theorem [Dvo61, FLM77, PVZ17] can be applied to convert the problem of approximating the  $(p, 2)$ -norm to a problem of approximating the  $(p, p)$ -norm, i.e. the entrywise  $\ell_p$  norm, which can then be handled by sampling techniques for approximating  $\ell_p$  norms of vectors in a subspace [CP15, WY23b]. This shows that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

<sup>2</sup> In our discussion of online coresets, we allow for the  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  notation to suppress polylogarithmic factors in  $n$  and an “online condition number” quantity  $\kappa^{\text{OL}}$  which appears in all prior works on online coresets and is known to be necessary.

<sup>3</sup> We improve the analysis of this result by removing a  $1/\varepsilon^3$  factor from  $s$  in Appendix B.

when  $\mathbf{S}$  is constructed as a subspace embedding for the column space of  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S, \mathbf{b}_S]$ . Ideally, we would like to apply the same reasoning as before to argue that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

to complete the chain of approximations. Unfortunately, it is unclear whether this step goes through when  $\mathbf{S}$  is constructed as a subspace embedding of  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S, \mathbf{b}_S]$ . The intuition for this is that  $S$  is constructed to be a representative subspace for  $\mathbf{A}$  using information about  $\mathbf{A}$  *outside* of the column space of  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S, \mathbf{b}_S]$ , and there is no guarantee that a sampling matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  that preserves  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S, \mathbf{b}_S]$  also preserves this information.

On the other hand, the result of [HV20] takes a different approach based on the classic *sensitivity sampling* technique [LS10, FL11, VX12], and uses the representative subspace constructed [SW18] in an *existential* manner rather than algorithmic. In the sensitivity sampling approach, one first defines *sensitivity scores*

$$\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}) := \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^p}{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p} \quad (1)$$

for each row  $i \in [n]$  which represent the largest fraction of the cost occupied by the  $i$ -th coordinate, ranging over all queries  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . Then, by Bernstein bounds, it follows that for any fixed  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ , sampling the rows  $i \in [n]$  proportionally to the sensitivity scores preserves  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$  up to  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$  factors. We can then apply this result to every  $F$  in a net over the space of rank  $k$  subspaces  $F$ , which has size roughly  $\exp(dk)$ , to construct coresets of size  $\text{poly}(d, k, \varepsilon^{-1})$ . The work of [HV20] improves this argument by showing that the representative subspace  $S$  constructed by [SW18] allows one to derive a strong coreset guarantee from a weak coreset guarantee, which in turn admit dimension-independent bounds [FL11]. However, the weak coreset argument of [FL11] requires VC-dimension arguments, and loses  $\text{poly}(k)$  factors.

### 1.4.2 Ridge leverage scores

Our algorithmic technique takes a drastically different approach compared to the prior works of [SW18, HV20, FKW21]. Our starting point is a result of [CMM17], which resolves Question 1.3 for the much simpler case of  $p = 2$ . For  $p = 2$ , finding an explicit rank  $O(k)$   $\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  with properties similar to the representative subspace  $S$  is not difficult due to the singular value decomposition (SVD) [DMM06b, DMM08, CEM<sup>+</sup>15, CMM17]. However, as noted by [CMM17], while this gives a polynomial time algorithm for low rank approximation for  $p = 2$ , finding these scores is already as hard as low rank approximation itself. Thus, this defeats the purpose of finding the coreset if the goal is to design faster algorithms. To address this problem, [CMM17] make use of the following alternative scores for a sampling-based algorithm, known as the *ridge leverage scores*.

**Definition 1.8** (Ridge leverage scores [AM15, CMM17]). *Let  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Then, for each  $i \in [n]$ , the  $i$ th ridge leverage score is defined as*

$$\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) := \mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{a}_i = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}.$$

Note that ridge leverage scores can be approximated up to  $O(1)$  factors in just  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega)$  time, where  $\omega$  is the exponent of matrix multiplication [SS11, DMMW12, CW13, CLM<sup>+</sup>15].

The main result of [CMM17] establishes that if we set  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$  where  $\mathbf{A}_k$  is the best rank  $k$  approximation in the Frobenius norm, then sampling  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon^2)$  rows  $\mathbf{a}_i$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  proportionally to their ridge leverage scores yields a strong coreset  $\mathbf{S}$  of nearly optimal size satisfying Definition 1.1 for  $p = 2$ . Furthermore, the scores  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})$  only depend on a constant factor approximation to the *value* of the optimal low rank approximation, which can be obtained more readily than a subspace which (approximately) witnesses this value. Unfortunately, the analysis of [CMM17] is highly specific to the  $\ell_2$  norm, and makes heavy use of the structural properties of the SVD and the fact that the  $(p, 2)$ -norm is an entrywise norm for  $p = 2$ , and thus does not apply to  $p \neq 2$ . Nonetheless, several key ideas still do carry over to the setting of  $p \neq 2$ , which will be crucial to our analysis.

### 1.4.3 Reduction to embedding low rank matrices

Our starting point is still based on the structural result of [SW18]: there exists an  $s$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  for  $s = \dim(S) = O(k) \text{ poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  and a vector  $\mathbf{b}_S \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that for any  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p.$$

Our analysis will roughly take two steps. First, we will show that  $\mathbf{S}$  preserves the right hand side, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

and then in the second step, we will show that for the same subspace  $S$ , we have

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p. \quad (2)$$

Chaining together these bounds will give the desired result.

In fact, the sampling algorithm analysis for both of these steps will be quite similar. Ignoring the offset vector  $\mathbf{b}_S$  for now for simplicity, the first step essentially asks for the guarantee that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \quad (3)$$

for every  $\mathbf{X}$  with columns that lie in the subspace  $S$ . The second step will in fact follow from a generalization of this guarantee. The representative subspace theorem of [SW18] shows that (2) follows if

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^p \text{OPT} \quad \text{for every } F \in \mathcal{F}_k, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F}$  denotes the projection matrix onto  $\text{span}(S \cup F)$ . Here,  $S$  already satisfies  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^p \text{OPT}$  by the construction of  $S$ . Furthermore,  $(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_S)$  is a rank  $k$  matrix with operator norm at most 1. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = O(1) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ with } \text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq k \text{ and } \|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \leq 1.$$

Note that this differs from (3) since it asks for  $\mathbf{S}$  to preserve *all* low rank matrices, rather than  $\mathbf{X}$  with columns restricted in a *fixed* low dimensional subspace, which can be handled by existing techniques such as  $\ell_p$  Lewis weight sampling [CP15, WY23b]. Thus, this guarantee is substantially more interesting than the first guarantee, and complicates our analysis. A crucial relaxation is that it in fact suffices to show that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \pm \varepsilon \text{OPT} \quad (5)$$

in our setting. Thus for the rest of this technical overview, we will focus on showing (5).

### 1.4.4 Idea 1: additive-multiplicative $\ell_p$ subspace embeddings via root ridge leverage scores

We begin by applying Dvoretzky's theorem, which gives a linear map  $\mathbf{H}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , so that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{H}\|_{p,p}^p$ . This decouples the norm of the columns, reducing our problem to preserving the  $\ell_p$  norm of vectors of the form  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ , i.e., we wish to show  $\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \approx \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p$ .

The first new ingredient in our analysis is to adapt the *additive-multiplicative  $\ell_2$  subspace embedding* idea of [CMM17]. In this result, [CMM17] show that a sampling matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  with probabilities proportional to the ridge leverage scores  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})$  with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$  satisfies the additive-multiplicative guarantee

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \pm \varepsilon \lambda \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad \text{for every } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

with only  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon^2)$  samples. This fact immediately follows from applying the more standard guarantee for *leverage score sampling* on a concatenated matrix  $[\mathbf{A}; \sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+d) \times d}$ , where  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $d \times d$  identity.

For an  $\ell_p$  version of this result, a recent result of [WY23c] shows an analysis of *root leverage score sampling* for nearly optimal  $\ell_p$  subspace embeddings for  $p < 2$ , where the sampling probabilities are taken to be proportional to  $\tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}$ , i.e., the  $(p/2)$ -th roots of the leverage score  $\tau_i(\mathbf{A})$ . Although the row sample size is roughly  $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2} n^{1-p/2} d^{p/2})$ , which depends on  $n$ , this result can be applied recursively for  $O(\log \log n)$

applications to reduce the sample complexity down to  $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-4/p}d)$ , which is nearly linear in  $d$  and thus nearly optimal. We show that a similar analysis in fact also works for  $p > 2$  with a sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-p}d^{p/2})$ .

With the  $\ell_p$  subspace embedding theorem in hand, we can now apply a similar trick as [CMM17]: we set  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$  so that we only sample  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2}) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  rows for  $p > 2$  and  $\tilde{O}(k) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  rows for  $p < 2$ , and then obtain an additive-multiplicative subspace embedding guarantee by viewing it as a subspace embedding for the matrix formed by concatenating  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{I}$ , so that the leverage scores of the concatenated matrix correspond to the ridge leverage scores of  $\mathbf{A}$ . The resulting guarantee is that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p.$$

Now, we can apply the above  $\ell_p$  affine embedding guarantees for the sampling matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  on each column of  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{H}\|_{p,p}^p$  to obtain the approximation guarantee

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{H}\|_{p,p}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{H}\|_{p,p}^p \pm \varepsilon\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{H}\|_{p,p}^p.$$

Now by applying Dvoretzky's theorem again to map the  $(p, p)$ -norm back to the  $(p, 2)$ -norm, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \pm \varepsilon\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p.$$

Finally, it remains to bound  $\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$ , but here we will encounter some problems.

#### 1.4.5 Problems when bounding the additive error

To bound the additive error  $\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$ , we will case on  $p < 2$  and  $p > 2$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathbf{X}$  has at most  $n$  rows, by restricting to the row span of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then for  $p < 2$ ,  $\lambda^{p/2}$  is at most

$$\lambda^{p/2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p}{k^{p/2}} = \frac{\text{OPT}}{k^{p/2}} \quad (6)$$

by the monotonicity of  $\ell_p$  norms, while for  $p > 2$ ,  $\lambda^{p/2}$  is at most

$$\lambda^{p/2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{n^{p/2-1}\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p}{k^{p/2}} = \frac{n^{p/2-1}\text{OPT}}{k^{p/2}}. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \leq \begin{cases} n^{1-p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p & \text{if } p < 2 \\ \|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p & \text{if } p > 2 \end{cases} \leq \begin{cases} n^{1-p/2}s^{p/2} & \text{if } p < 2 \\ s^{p/2} & \text{if } p > 2 \end{cases}$$

by using that  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq s$  and  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \leq 1$ . Then overall, we obtain a bound of

$$\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \leq \begin{cases} n^{1-p/2}s^{p/2}\frac{\text{OPT}}{k^{p/2}} & \text{if } p < 2 \\ n^{p/2-1}s^{p/2}\frac{\text{OPT}}{k^{p/2}} & \text{if } p > 2 \end{cases}$$

If we use rank  $s$  root ridge leverage scores instead of rank  $k$  root ridge leverage scores, we would be able to replace the  $k^{p/2}$  on the denominator by  $s^{p/2}$  to cancel out the  $s^{p/2}$  in the numerator, with only a  $\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  cost to the sample complexity. Even still, our bound is  $n^{1-p/2}\text{OPT}$  for  $p < 2$  and  $n^{p/2-1}\text{OPT}$  for  $p > 2$ , which is off by  $\text{poly}(n)$  factors from  $\text{OPT}$ . While there is recent work on sampling with a mixture of different norms that could potentially help handle the regularization term [JLLS23b], these do not seem to help either.

In order to fix this problem and improve our analysis by  $\text{poly}(n)$  factors, we will use two different types of ‘‘flattening’’ tricks, one for  $p < 2$  and one for  $p > 2$ , which we discuss in the next two sections.

### 1.4.6 Idea 2: splitting rows for sharper additive error bounds for $p < 2$

To overcome the previous issue for  $p < 2$ , we will sharpen the bound of (6). The loose bound that we will tighten is bounding the Frobenius norm loss  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^p$  by the  $(p, 2)$ -norm loss  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p$ . For general matrices, this bound is indeed tight since the rows of  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)$  could be imbalanced so that most of the mass is concentrated on a few rows. However, this bound is loose when the rows are flat, in which case there can be a  $\text{poly}(n)$  factor separation in the two quantities. We will show how to recover this separation.

A classic result of [VX12] shows that the sensitivity scores (1) for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation sum to at most  $O(k)$  for  $p < 2$ . Then, a standard flattening argument shows that by replacing rows  $\mathbf{a}_i$  with large sensitivity with  $l$  copies of the scaled row  $\mathbf{a}_i/l^{1/p}$ , we obtain a new matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  with  $n' \leq 2n$  rows that are each just scaled copies of rows of  $\mathbf{A}$ , such that  $\sigma_{i'}(\mathbf{A}') = O(k/n)$  for every row  $i' \in [n']$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$  for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . Because this matrix is now flat, it can be shown that

$$\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^2 \lesssim (k/n)^{2/p-1} \text{OPT}^{2/p}.$$

Thus by replacing  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $\mathbf{A}'$ , we obtain a matrix formed by the rows of  $\mathbf{A}$  that gives the same objective function, yet has a much smaller additive error when bounding  $\lambda$ , giving

$$\lambda^{p/2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{A}'_k\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq (k/n)^{1-p/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p}{k^{p/2}} = (k/n)^{1-p/2} \frac{\text{OPT}}{k^{p/2}}.$$

rather than the original bound in (6). We note, however, that this argument is still lossy, since the standard sensitivity-based flattening argument would flatten *any* matrix, whereas we only need this result for a single constant factor approximate subspace  $\tilde{F}$ . Thus, we instead explicitly compute a constant factor bicriteria solution, which can be done very quickly [DTV11, FKW21, WY23a] (see Lemma 2.3), and flatten this particular solution nearly optimally, so that we instead get the bound

$$\lambda^{p/2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{A}'_k\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_F^p}{k^{p/2}} \leq (1/n)^{1-p/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p}{k^{p/2}} = n^{p/2-1} \frac{O(\text{OPT})}{k^{p/2}}.$$

Thus, we recover the extra factor of  $n^{1-p/2}$  lost when converting from the  $\ell_p$  norm to the  $\ell_2$  norm. This completes our proof sketch for  $p < 2$ .

### 1.4.7 Idea 3: Dvoretzky's theorem for sharper additive error bounds for $p > 2$

To improve our argument for  $p > 2$ , we note that we have an additional degree of freedom when choosing to concatenate  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{I}$  when analyzing the ridge leverage score sampling algorithm. Indeed, as long as we concatenate  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{U}$  for any orthonormal matrix  $\mathbf{U}$ , then the leverage scores of  $\mathbf{A}$  concatenated with  $\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbf{U}$  will have leverage scores which coincide with the ridge leverage scores of  $\mathbf{A}$ , since

$$\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + \lambda \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{a}_i.$$

The resulting guarantee is that

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p, \quad (8)$$

so we may select  $\mathbf{U}$  to be an orthonormal matrix which makes this additive error as small as possible. We will choose  $\mathbf{U}$  to be a random  $n \times d$  orthonormal matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  scaled by  $n^{-1/2}$ , which has the advantage of flattening the mass of  $\mathbf{x}$  and thus minimizing the  $\ell_p$  norm.

By Dvoretzky's theorem [Dvo61, FLM77, PVZ17], it follows that as long as  $n$  is at least  $\tilde{O}(s^{p/2}) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1}) = \tilde{O}(k^{p/2}) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ , then for any  $\mathbf{x}$  in a fixed  $s$ -dimensional subspace, we will have that

$$\frac{1}{n^{p/2}} \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) n^{1-p/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p. \quad (9)$$

This cancels out with the factor of  $n^{p/2-1}$  that we lost in (7), giving us a sharp enough additive error. It may be tempting to reduce the additive error even further by choosing  $\mathbf{G}$  to have  $m \gg n$  rows rather than just  $n$ . However, this would affect the total number of rows sampled, since we would then need to

oversample the root ridge leverage scores by a factor of  $m^{p/2-1}$ , which would increase the sample complexity. Note also that once the additive error is sufficiently small, (8) would give the purely multiplicative subspace embedding guarantee  $\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p$ , for which there is a sample complexity lower bound of  $\Omega(d^{p/2}/\varepsilon)$  [LWW21].

Although we have fixed the  $n^{p/2-1}$  factor, we must now address a subtle issue. The above analysis works for a fixed rank  $s$  subspace specified by the low rank matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ . However, if we want this guarantee for every rank  $s$  matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  with operator norm 1 as we need, then we run into problems, since for any fixed embedding  $\mathbf{G}$  of dimension only  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2}) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ , there exists a choice of  $\mathbf{X}$  which causes (9) to fail. To fix our final problem, we crucially exploit independence in our analysis. We first fix the sampling matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  and let  $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be the rank  $s$  matrix with  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \text{OPT}\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \leq 1$  that maximizes the sampling error  $|\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p - \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p|$ . Note then that  $\mathbf{X}$  depends only on  $\mathbf{S}$  but not on  $\mathbf{G}$ , so we may bound  $\|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$  as we did before. This completes our proof sketch for  $p > 2$ .

## 1.5 Corollaries

### 1.5.1 Streaming algorithms

A simple corollary of our nearly optimal constructions for strong coresets is that we immediately obtain similar results in *streaming* model of computation. In the streaming model, the rows  $\mathbf{a}_i$  of the input matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  arrive one at a time, and we wish to maintain a strong coreset for  $\mathbf{A}$ . In this setting, the classic *merge-and-reduce* technique (see, e.g., [BDM<sup>+</sup>20] for a discussion) shows that a construction for a coreset of size  $\tilde{O}(k^c) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  can be converted into a streaming implementation of size  $\tilde{O}(k^c) \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1} \log n)$  by setting the accuracy parameter to  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon / \log n$  and composing the coreset construction in a binary tree fashion. Recent work of [CWZ23] shows that this argument can in fact be sharpened to a  $\text{poly}(\log \log n)$  factor overhead rather than  $\text{poly}(\log n)$ , by first computing an online coreset (see Section 1.3.1), as we show in Section 4.2.

### 1.5.2 Entrywise $\ell_p$ low rank approximation

For  $p < 2$ , our nearly optimal coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation imply new algorithms for the related problem of *entrywise  $\ell_p$  low rank approximation*.

**Definition 1.9.** Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and let  $k$  be a rank parameter. Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then, the entrywise  $\ell_p$  low rank approximation problem is the problem of minimizing the objective function

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{X}\|_{p,p}^p = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^d |(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{X})_{i,j}|^p$$

among all rank  $k$  matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ .

This problem is another computationally difficult variant of the low rank approximation problem, and approximation algorithms and hardness have been studied in a long line of work [SWZ17, CGK<sup>+</sup>17, DWZ<sup>+</sup>19, MW21, JLL<sup>+</sup>21, WY23a]. The works of [JLL<sup>+</sup>21, WY23a] show that for  $p < 2$ , if we multiply  $\mathbf{A}$  on the right by a dense matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  of  $p$ -stable random variables [Nol20] and then compute an  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation coreset  $\mathbf{S}$  of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}$  of size  $\tilde{O}(k)$ , then there exists a rank  $k$  matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\|_{p,p}^p \leq \tilde{O}(k^{1/p-1/2}) \min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{X}\|_{p,p}^p.$$

Among subset selection algorithms, this approximation guarantee is nearly optimal [MW21]. Furthermore, because  $\mathbf{S}$  is constructed based on sketching and coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation, this algorithm can be implemented in streaming and distributed settings, and previously discussed. However, these prior results had drawbacks. The result of [JLL<sup>+</sup>21] relied on the coreset construction of [SW18], and thus does not give a true row subset, meaning that the subset selection lower bounds of [MW21] do not apply. In the work of [WY23a], this idea was applied in the setting of online coresets, but their online coreset required a size of at least  $k^4$ , which resulted in a suboptimal approximation factor of at least  $k^{4(1/p-1/2)}$ . Our result fixes both of these problems, by giving a true row subset implementation of this result, as well as the first online coreset algorithm which selects  $\tilde{O}(k)$  rows with a  $\tilde{O}(k^{1/p-1/2})$  distortion.

## 1.6 Open directions

The main natural direction left open by our work is to tighten the dependence on  $\varepsilon$  in the coreset size both in the upper bounds and lower bounds. Currently, the best known lower bound on the number of rows required is  $\tilde{\Omega}(k/\varepsilon^2)$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(k/\varepsilon^2 + k^{p/2}/\varepsilon)$  for  $p > 2$  via a reduction to lower bounds for  $\ell_p$  subspace embeddings [LWW21, WY23a], while we have a dependence of  $\varepsilon^{-O(p^2)}$  in our upper bounds.

**Question 1.10.** *How many rows are necessary and sufficient for strong coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation as a function of both  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ ?*

In particular, we believe that the following special case is already an interesting question:

**Question 1.11.** *Is there a  $\varepsilon^{-\Omega(p)}$  lower bound on the size of a strong coreset for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation for large  $p$ ? Is there a  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})\varepsilon^{-O(p)}$  upper bound?*

We note that sensitivity sampling achieves a  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2+O(1)})\varepsilon^{-O(p)}$  upper bound [HV20, WY23a], while our upper bound is  $\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})\varepsilon^{-O(p^2)}$ .

Similar questions can also be asked for other guarantees for row subset selection for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation, all of which are well-understood for  $p = 2$  but remain to be settled for  $p \neq 2$ .

**Question 1.12.** *How many rows are necessary and sufficient for a weak coreset  $\mathbf{S}$  such that  $\tilde{F} := \arg \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_p^p$  satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_p^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_p^p,$$

*as a function of both  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ ?*

**Question 1.13.** *How many rows are necessary and sufficient for a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that the span of the rows in  $S$  contains a  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F$  such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_p^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_p^p,$$

*as a function of both  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ ?*

**Question 1.14.** *How many rows are necessary and sufficient for a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that the span  $\tilde{F}$  of the rows in  $S$  of dimension  $\dim(S)$  satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_p^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_p^p,$$

*as a function of both  $k$  and  $\varepsilon$ ?*

Our strong coreset immediately implies upper bounds to all three questions above, but it is possible to improve further in some of these cases. The guarantee in Question 1.13 was studied by [DV07, SV12] for  $p \neq 2$  with an efficient construction achieving an upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(k^2 \cdot (k/\varepsilon)^{p+1})$  due to [DV07] and an inefficient construction achieving an upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(k^2/\varepsilon)$  due to [SV12, Theorem 3.1] as well as  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon^2)$  for  $p = 1$   $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  for  $p \in (1, 2)$  due to [WY24, Theorem 1.9]. The result [DV07] has a better dependence on  $\varepsilon$  than our strong coresets as well as those of [HV20, WY23a], and [SV12] has a better dependence on  $\varepsilon$  for all  $p$  and a better dependence on  $k$  for  $p > 4$ . In particular, it is an interesting question to achieve a nearly linear dependence in  $k$  for all  $p$ , and to construct such a subset of rows in polynomial time.

## 2 Preliminaries

For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , we write  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$  for the singular value decomposition (SVD) of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For a rank parameter  $k$ , we let  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$  denote the matrix  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  with all but the top  $k$  singular values zeroed out,  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\setminus k}$  for the matrix  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  with all but the bottom  $d - k$  singular values zeroed out, and  $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}_k\mathbf{V}^\top$  for the optimal rank  $k$  approximation of  $\mathbf{A}$  under the Frobenius norm.

For a subspace  $F$ , we let  $\mathbf{V}_F$  denote some orthonormal basis for the subspace.

## 2.1 Facts about Gaussians

### 2.1.1 Dvoretzky's theorem

A classic result of Dvoretzky and Milman [Dvo61, Mil71] shows that a random subspace of a normed space is approximately Euclidean. We will need the following version of this result for  $\ell_p$  norms:

**Theorem 2.1** (Dvoretzky's theorem for  $\ell_p$  norms [FLM77, PVZ17]). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/p$ . Let  $n \geq O(\max\{\varepsilon^{-2}k, \varepsilon^{-1}k^{p/2}\})$ , and let  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  be an i.i.d. random Gaussian matrix. Then,*

$$\Pr\left\{\text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)n\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p\right\} \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

### 2.1.2 Random linear combinations

The next lemma shows that the  $(p, 2)$ -norm of a matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  can be estimated by the  $\ell_p$  norm of  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}$  for a Gaussian vector  $\mathbf{g}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Fix a constant  $p > 0$ . Then, for each  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)}\left\{\delta\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p \lesssim \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta^p}\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p\right\} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}$  is distributed as a standard Gaussian with variance  $\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^2$ .

For the first bound, we have  $\mathbf{E}|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}|^p \lesssim \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^p$ , so by Markov's inequality,  $\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p \lesssim (1/\delta)\|\mathbf{X}\|_p^p$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ .

For the second bound, note that  $|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \gtrsim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/4$ . Then,

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^p \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \lesssim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2\}\right] \leq \frac{\delta}{4}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$$

so by Markov's inequality, this is at most  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p/2$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}|^p \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \gtrsim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2\} \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^n \delta^p \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^p \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \gtrsim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \delta^p \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^p \cdot (1 - \mathbb{1}\{|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \lesssim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2\}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , we have that

$$\frac{1}{\delta^p}\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p \geq \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p - \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2^p \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}| \lesssim \delta\|\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{X}\|_2\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p. \quad \square$$

## 2.2 Flattening

It is known that constant factor bicriteria solutions for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation can be computed quickly via convex relaxations [DTV11] or by combining sketching techniques with  $\ell_p$  Lewis weight sampling [FKW21, WY23a]. The following lemma gives a version of [WY23a, Algorithm 3] that is optimized for running time.

**Lemma 2.3** (Fast constant factor approximation). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$  be a sparse embedding matrix [NN13, Coh16] with  $t = O(k \log(n/\delta))$  and sparsity  $s = O(\log(n/\delta))$ . Let  $\tilde{F}$  denote the span of  $O(t \log(t/\delta))$  rows sampled according to the  $\ell_p$  Lewis weights of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}^\top$  [CP15]. Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the following hold:*

- $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p \leq O(\text{OPT})$ .
- The subspace  $\tilde{F}$  can be computed in  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + t^\omega)$  time

*Proof.* The correctness is shown in [WY23a], so it remains to argue the running time. The sparse embedding matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  only requires time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) \log(1/\delta))$  to apply due to its sparsity. The  $\ell_p$  Lewis weights of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}^\top$  can then be computed in time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}^\top) + t^\omega) = \tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + t^\omega)$  [CP15].  $\square$

By using Lemma 2.3, we will obtain a fast algorithm for quickly *flattening* a matrix by splitting rows, which will be a crucial component of our sampling algorithm for  $p < 2$ . Similar techniques have long been used in the literature of  $\ell_p$  subspace embeddings [BLM89, CP15, MMWY22, WY23b].

**Lemma 2.4** (Flattening). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a subspace. Then, there is an  $n' \times d$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  with  $n \leq n' \leq (3/2)n$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = \|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$  for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$  and*

$$\|\mathbf{a}'_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p \leq \frac{2}{n} \|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p$$

for every  $i \in [n']$ . Furthermore, the rows of  $\mathbf{A}'$  are reweighted rows of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows, e.g., [MMWY22, Lemma 2.10]. Note that if we replace a row  $\mathbf{a}_i$  by  $l$  copies of the scaled row  $\mathbf{a}_i/l^{1/p}$ , then  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = \|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$  and for every row  $i'$  in  $\mathbf{A}'$  that is a copy of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{a}'_{i'}{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p = \|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p/l$ . Now for every row  $i$  in  $\mathbf{A}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p \geq 2\|\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p/n$ , replace the row  $\mathbf{a}_i$  with

$$l_i := \left\lceil \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p / \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p}{2/n} \right\rceil$$

copies of  $\mathbf{a}_i/l_i^{1/p}$ . Note then that the number of rows we add is at most

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (l_i - 1) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p / \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p}{2/n} \leq \frac{n}{2}.$$

Furthermore, by construction, every row in the new matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  has sensitivity at most  $C_2 k/n$ .  $\square$

The advantage of flattening is that for  $p < 2$ , it makes the  $\ell_2$  subspace approximation cost much smaller than the  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation cost. We will exploit the following result later in our results for  $p < 2$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}) \leq C\|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p \|\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p/n$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . Then, we have*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_F \leq (C/n)^{1/p-1/2} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p (\|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2)^{2/p-1} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i{}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p \left( \frac{C}{n} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p \right)^{2/p-1} \\ &= (C/n)^{2/p-1} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^{2/p}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

### 2.3 Properties of ridge leverage scores

It is known that for  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ , the ridge leverage scores have a small sum.

**Lemma 2.6** (Sum of ridge leverage scores [CMM17]). *Let  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ . Then,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \leq 2k$$

Next, we show that ridge leverage scores upper bound the  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation  $\ell_2$  sensitivities (1).

**Lemma 2.7** (Ridge leverage scores bound sensitivities). *Let  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ . Then,*

$$\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \geq \frac{1}{48} \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_F^2}$$

for every  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* Note that

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{2k}\|_2^2 = \sigma_{k+1}^2(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k) \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j^2(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2}{k} = \lambda$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{2k})\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + 2\lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$  be any rank  $k$  subspace. Let  $G$  denote the span of the rows of  $\mathbf{A}_{2k}$ ,  $F$ , and  $\mathbf{a}_i$ , which is a subspace of dimension at most  $3k + 1$ . We then set  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}_G(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g}$  for a standard normal Gaussian vector  $\mathbf{g}$ . Note then that

$$[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i) = \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{P}_G(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g}$$

is distributed as a Gaussian with variance  $\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2$ , so

$$\Pr\{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2/3\} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Note also that

$$\mathbf{E}[\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2] = \mathbf{E}[\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{P}_G(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g}\|_2^2] = \mathbf{E}[\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g}\|_2^2] \leq \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_F^2$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}[\lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2] = \mathbf{E}[\lambda\|\mathbf{P}_G(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\mathbf{g}\|_2^2] \leq \lambda(3k + 1) \leq 4\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2.$$

Then by Markov's inequality, we have

$$\Pr\{\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + 2\lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq 16\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_F^2\} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus with positive probability, there exists a vector  $\mathbf{x}$  such that

$$\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \geq \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + 2\lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \geq \frac{1}{48} \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_F^2}.$$

Since  $F$  was arbitrary, we conclude as desired.  $\square$

### 3 Main sampling theorems

We will crucially use the following structural result, which is due to [SW18, Theorem 10] with some improvements that we show in Appendix B:

**Theorem 3.1** (Representative subspace theorem). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Suppose that an  $s$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT}$$

for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . Then if  $\mathbf{P}_S$  is the projection matrix onto  $S$  and  $\mathbf{b}_S \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the vector defined by

$$\mathbf{b}_S(i) := \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2,$$

then

$$\text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}_k, \quad \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p, \quad (10)$$

where  $[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]$  denotes the  $n \times (d+1)$  concatenation of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_S \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, such a subspace  $S$  exists for

$$s = \frac{O(k)}{\varepsilon^{\max\{2,p\}}}$$

such that  $\|\mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \leq \text{OPT}$ .

We note that any subspace  $S'$  that contains a subspace  $S$  satisfying the properties of Theorem 3.1 will continue to have the same properties.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $S' \supseteq S$  be two subspaces such that  $S$  satisfies the guarantees of Theorem 3.1. Then,  $S'$  does as well.*

*Proof.* Note that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^\top (\mathbf{P}_{S'} - \mathbf{P}_{S' \cup F})\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top (\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^2$$

since  $(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_S)$  maps its input to the component of  $F$  orthogonal to  $S$  and similarly for  $(\mathbf{P}_{S' \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_{S'})$ . Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_{S'} - \mathbf{P}_{S' \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT}$$

It follows that (10) holds from arguments in [SW18, Theorem 10]. We also have that

$$\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S'})\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2$$

so  $\|\mathbf{b}_{S'}\|_p^p \leq \|\mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \leq \text{OPT}$  holds as well.  $\square$

### 3.1 Additive-multiplicative $\ell_p$ affine embeddings

We first show an affine embedding guarantee for root ridge leverage score sampling, which will be used to apply Lemma 3.6. The main workhorse behind this lemma is Theorem A.1, which establishes a relative error  $\ell_p$  affine embedding theorem for root ridge leverage score sampling, and generalizes recent work of [WY23c] by handling the case of  $p > 2$  as well as allowing for an affine translation rather than just subspaces. The following lemma translates the relative error guarantee into an additive-multiplicative guarantee in the presence of a ridge regularization.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for*

$$q_i \geq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & \text{if } p > 2 \\ \min\{1, \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & \text{if } p < 2 \end{cases}$$

with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ . Let  $S$  be an  $s$ -dimensional subspace for some  $s \leq n$  such that  $\|\mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \leq B$  where  $\mathbf{b}_S(i) = \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2$ , and let  $\mathbf{P}_S = \mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{V}_S^\top$  be the orthogonal projection matrix onto  $S$ . Let  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times s}$  satisfy  $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \succeq \frac{1}{C} \mathbf{I}$  for some constant  $C = O(1)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have simultaneously for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$  that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S]\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + B + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \right).$$

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \\
&\geq \sup_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^s} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^s} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}\|_2^2} = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^s} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2} \\
&\geq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^s} \frac{[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}](i)^2}{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 + C\lambda\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{z}\|_2^2}
\end{aligned}$$

so  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})$  upper bounds the  $i$ -th *leverage score* of the  $3n \times s$  matrix given by

$$\mathbf{A}' := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \\ \sqrt{C\lambda}\mathbf{U} \end{pmatrix}$$

Now note that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{y}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_p^p} \leq n^{p/2-1} \frac{|\mathbf{y}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^p} = n^{p/2-1} \left( \frac{|\mathbf{y}(i)|^2}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2} \right)^{p/2}. \quad (11)$$

Then by Lemma 2.7 and (11), we have that  $\min\{1, n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}\}$  upper bounds the rank  $k$   $\ell_p$  subspace approximation sensitivities for  $p > 2$ . Similarly,  $\min\{1, \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}\}$  upper bounds the rank  $k$   $\ell_p$  subspace approximation sensitivities for  $p < 2$ . Thus,

$$\frac{|\mathbf{b}_S(i)|^p}{B} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_2^p}{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p} \leq \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}).$$

We then define  $\mathbf{b}' = [\mathbf{b}_S; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}$  to be the vector  $\mathbf{b}_S$  with  $2n$  zeros appended to it. Finally, let  $\mathbf{S}' \in \mathbb{R}^{3n \times 3n}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix which samples the first  $n$  rows according to  $\mathbf{S}$  and the last  $n$  rows with probability 1. Then by Theorem A.1, we have the  $\ell_p$  affine embedding guarantee for  $\mathbf{A}'$  and thus with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , simultaneously for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{S}'[\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}']\|_p^p &= \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S]\|_p^p + (C\lambda)^{p/2}\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \\
&= (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}'\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon B = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\left[\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p + (C\lambda)^{p/2}\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p\right] \pm \varepsilon B.
\end{aligned}$$

Now by subtracting  $(C\lambda)^{p/2}\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p$  from both sides of the inequality, we conclude that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S]\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon(C\lambda)^{p/2}\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon B.$$

Scaling  $\varepsilon$  by constant factors yields the claimed result.  $\square$

### 3.2 Outside the representative subspace: preserving $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{SUF})\|_{p,2}^p$

Next, we convert the affine embedding guarantee in Lemma 3.3 into a guarantee about preserving the norms of matrices under  $\mathbf{S}$ . For the  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{SUF})\|_{p,2}^p$  terms, we only need to preserve this quantity up to a constant factor, plus an additive  $\varepsilon^p \text{OPT}$ . For this, it in fact suffices to preserve the  $\ell_p$  norm of a carefully chosen vector.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for*

$$q_i \geq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & \text{if } p > 2 \\ \min\{1, \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & \text{if } p < 2 \end{cases}$$

with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ . Let  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times d}$  satisfy  $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \succeq \mathbf{I}/C$  for some  $C = O(1)$ . Then for all matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \lesssim \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \varepsilon\lambda^{p/2}\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$$

where  $R = \text{rowspan}(\mathbf{A})$ .

*Proof.* We apply Lemma 3.3 with the subspace  $S$  set to be the row span  $R$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  which has dimension at most  $n$ , so that we have the following additive-multiplicative subspace embedding guarantee for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{R\mathbf{x}}\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{R\mathbf{x}}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{R\mathbf{x}}\|_p^p + (C\lambda)^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{x}\|_p^p \right) \quad (12)$$

Now fix a matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  and let  $\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$  be a standard Gaussian vector. Then by Lemma 2.2, we have that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_{p,2}^p = \Theta(1)\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$ ,  $\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p = \Theta(1)\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$ , and  $\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p = \Theta(1)\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p$  all simultaneously with positive probability. Then, (12) with the vector  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p &\lesssim \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p + \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_R \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p + (C\lambda)^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{g}\|_p^p \right) \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

For  $p > 2$ , we need the following refinement of Lemma 3.4, which uses Dvoretzky's theorem to flatten the ridge additive error term.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $2 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for*

$$q_i \geq \min \left\{ 1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} / \alpha \right\}$$

with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ . Then for all rank  $s$  matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \lesssim \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a fixed rank  $s$  matrix (depending on  $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$ ) that maximizes

$$\left| \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p - \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \right|$$

over all rank  $s$  matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \leq 1$ . Note that we may WLOG assume that  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{P}_R \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}_R \mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}$  where  $R$  is the row span of  $\mathbf{A}$ , since any component outside of the row span of  $\mathbf{X}$  will vanish after multiplying by  $\mathbf{A}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times \dim(R)}$  be a random standard Gaussian matrix. It is well-known that  $\mathbf{I}/C \preceq \frac{1}{2n} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G}$  with probability at least  $2/3$  [RV09]. Furthermore,  $\|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = \Theta(n) \|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p$  with probability at least  $9/10$  by Dvoretzky's theorem. Finally, we have  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p \leq s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p$  since  $\mathbf{X}$  has rank  $s$ . We thus have

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{G}} \left\{ \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = O(ns^{p/2}) \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{10} = \frac{4}{5}. \quad (13)$$

Thus by a union bound,  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfies both of these events with probability at least  $1/3$ .

Now consider  $t = O(\log(1/\delta))$  independent drawings of  $\mathbf{G}$ , say  $\mathbf{G}^{(i)}$  for  $i \in [t]$ . For each  $\mathbf{G}^{(i)}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}$  has a  $1 - \delta/2t$  probability of succeeding in the guarantee of Lemma 3.4, if  $\mathbf{G}^{(i)}$  satisfies the condition that  $\frac{1}{2n} (\mathbf{G}^{(i)})^\top \mathbf{G}^{(i)} \succeq \mathbf{I}/C$ . By a union bound, this holds for all  $i \in [t]$  simultaneously with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Furthermore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , there is at least one  $i \in [t]$  such that (13) and  $\frac{1}{2n} (\mathbf{G}^{(i)})^\top \mathbf{G}^{(i)} \succeq \mathbf{I}/C$  holds. Thus over all, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , there is a matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  such that for  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{G}/\sqrt{2n}$ , we have

$$\varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p = \varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} n^{-p/2} \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}_R^\top \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p \lesssim \varepsilon \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p. \quad \square$$

### 3.3 Inside the representative subspace: preserving $\|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$

In Section 3.2, we showed how to preserve  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p$  by showing that it suffices to preserve a single carefully chosen vector. This is fine when we can afford a  $O(1)$  error on  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p$ , but not when we require  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$  approximations, which is what we need to preserve the  $\|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$  term. For this, we will replace the use of Lemma 2.2 with Dvoretzky's theorem (Theorem A.8), which essentially averages the same argument over multiple draws of the Gaussian to obtain a high-accuracy version of the statement.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$  satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + K\mathbf{b})\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon(\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p + K^p R^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p) \quad (14)$$

for every constant  $K \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times d}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{AX}, \mathbf{b}]\|_{p,2}^p = \|[\mathbf{AX}, \mathbf{b}]\|_{p,2}^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{AX}\|_{p,2}^p + R^p + \lambda^{p/2} s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \right]$$

*Proof.* Let  $m$  be a large enough number to be chosen, and let  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be drawn with standard Gaussian entries. If  $m \geq O(\max\{\varepsilon^{-2}s, \varepsilon^{-1}s^{p/2}\})$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\mathbf{AX}, \mathbf{b}]\|_{p,2}^p &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \frac{1}{m} \left\| [\mathbf{AX}, \mathbf{b}] \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}^\top \\ \mathbf{g}^\top \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{p,p}^p && \text{Theorem 2.1} \\ &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \frac{1}{m} \|\mathbf{AXG}^\top + \mathbf{bg}^\top\|_{p,p}^p \\ &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \|\mathbf{AXG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{bg}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_p^p \end{aligned}$$

Now using the additive-multiplicative  $\ell_p$  affine embedding property (14), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{AXG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{bg}^\top \mathbf{e}_j)\|_p^p &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{AXG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{bg}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_p^p \pm \\ &\quad \varepsilon(\|\mathbf{AXG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_p^p + |\mathbf{g}_i|^p R^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{XG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_2^p) \end{aligned}$$

Note then that the total error is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \|\mathbf{AXG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_p^p + |\mathbf{g}_i|^p R^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{XG}^\top \mathbf{e}_j\|_2^p &= \frac{\varepsilon}{m} \left[ \|\mathbf{AXG}^\top\|_{p,p}^p + mR^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{GX}^\top\|_{p,2}^p \right] \\ &= O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{AX}\|_{p,2}^p + R^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we have again used Dvoretzky's theorem (Theorem 2.1). Finally, since  $\mathbf{X}$  is rank  $s$ , we have that  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{2,2}^p \leq s^{p/2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.4 Results for $p > 2$

We first give an error bound after one round of root ridge leverage score sampling.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let  $p > 2$  and let  $s = O(k/\varepsilon^p)$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  with  $n \geq n'$  for some  $n' = O(s^{p/2}/\varepsilon)$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for

$$q_i \geq \min\left\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} / \alpha\right\}$$

with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^2/s$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{SA}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p.$$

*Proof.* First note that

$$\lambda^{p/2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^p}{s^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_F^p}{s^{p/2}} \leq n^{p/2-1} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^*)\|_{p,2}^p}{s^{p/2}} = \frac{n^{p/2-1}}{s^{p/2}} \text{OPT} \quad (15)$$

By Theorem 3.1 and Dvoretzky's theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{AP}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p \\ &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{AV}_S \mathbf{V}_S^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Let  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times s}$  be a random Gaussian matrix. It is well-known that  $\mathbf{I}/C \preceq \frac{1}{2n} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G}$  with probability at least  $2/3$  [RV09]. Furthermore, we have required  $n$  to be large enough such that  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfies Dvoretzky's theorem. By a union bound, there exists a  $\mathbf{G}$  which satisfies both properties simultaneously. Fix such a matrix  $\mathbf{G}$ . By Lemma 3.3 with  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{G}/\sqrt{2n}$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S]\|_p^p &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \right) \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + (2n)^{1-p/2} \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p \right) \quad \text{Dvoretzky's theorem} \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + s^{-p/2} \text{OPT} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p \right) \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 3.6, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \text{OPT} + \text{OPT} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \right]$$

for any  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times d}$ . Then, applying this result with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}_S^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)$ , which has operator norm 1, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p + \text{OPT} \right] \\ &= (1 \pm O(\varepsilon)) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (15) and the fact that  $\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F}$  is a matrix with rank at most  $k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p &\lesssim \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p + \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} k^{p/2} && \text{Lemma 3.5} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT} + \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} k^{p/2} && \text{Theorem 3.1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT} + \varepsilon^{p^2/2} \cdot \text{OPT} \leq 2\varepsilon^p \text{OPT} && (15) \end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 3.1, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm O(\varepsilon)) \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$$

as claimed. Chaining together the previous bounds and rescaling  $\varepsilon$  by constant factors shows the claimed result.  $\square$

Finally, we show that by applying Theorem 3.7 recursively for  $O(\log \log n)$  rounds, we obtain our desired sampling theorem. We will use the following recurrence:

**Lemma 3.8** (Lemma 6.12, [MMWY22]). *Suppose  $(a_i)_{i=0}^\infty$  satisfies the recurrence  $a_{i+1} = \lambda a_i + b$  for some  $b > 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Then,*

$$a_i = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} (b - \lambda^i (b - (1-\lambda)a_0)).$$

We then arrive at our main theorem for  $p > 2$ . Note that Theorem 1.5 follows by first applying sensitivity sampling [HV20, WY23a], which reduces  $n$  to  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$ .

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $p > 2$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . There is an algorithm that runs in time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\omega)$  time to construct a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  with*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{O(k^{p/2})}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} \left[ (\log n)^{3p/2} + (\log(1/\delta))^{p/2} \right] (\log \log n)^{p^2/2+p} = \frac{k^{p/2}}{\varepsilon^{O(p^2)}} (\log(n/\delta))^{O(p)}$$

that satisfies Definition 1.1 with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

*Proof.* We will apply Theorem 3.7 for  $r = O(\log \log n)$  rounds, with  $\varepsilon$  set to  $\varepsilon/r$  and  $\delta$  set to  $\delta/r$ . Let  $\alpha$  and  $s$  be the values given by Theorem 3.7 with this setting of parameters. We first analyze the number of rows sampled at each round in expectation. Note first that if  $n^{p/2-1} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$ , then  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \geq n^{2/p-1}$  so there

are at most  $O(s)n^{1-2/p}$  such rows  $i \in [n]$ , since  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})$  sum to at most  $2s$  by Lemma 2.6. On the other hand, if  $n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}$ , then  $\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \leq n^{2/p-1}$  so we have that

$$\sum_{i:n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} \leq 1} n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} \leq n^{p/2-1}(n^{2/p-1})^{p/2-1} \sum_{i:n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} \leq 1} \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \leq n^{1-2/p} \cdot 2s.$$

Thus, in either case, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \min\{1, n^{p/2-1}\tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}\} \leq O(s)n^{1-2/p}.$$

Thus, the expected number of sampled rows is at most  $O(s)n^{1-2/p}/\alpha$ . By Chernoff bounds, if the expected number of sampled rows is at least  $O(\log(r/\delta))$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta/r$ , the number of sampled rows is within a constant factor of the expectation. Then by a union bound, for the first  $r$  rounds of the recursive calls, we succeed in obtaining a  $(1 \pm \varepsilon/r)$  approximation and reduce the number of rows from  $m$  to  $O(s)m^{1-2/p}/\alpha$ . We now define  $a_i$  to be the logarithm of the number of rows after the  $i$ th recursive call. Then,

$$a_{i+1} = (1 - 2/p)a_i + \log(O(s)/\alpha)$$

so by Lemma 3.8, we have that

$$a_r = \frac{p}{2}(\log(O(s)/\alpha) - (1 - 2/p)^i(\log(O(s)/\alpha) - (2/p))(\log n))$$

so the number of rows is at most

$$\exp(a_r) = \left(\frac{O(s)}{\alpha}\right)^{p/2} = \frac{O(s^{p/2})}{\alpha^{p/2}} = \frac{O(k^{p/2})}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} \left[ (\log n)^{3p/2} + (\log(1/\delta))^{p/2} \right] (\log \log n)^{p^2/2+p}. \quad \square$$

### 3.5 Results for $p < 2$

The next theorem gives an error bound after one round of root ridge leverage score sampling.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $p < 2$  and let  $s = O(k/\varepsilon^2)$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix with probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for*

$$q_i \geq \min\left\{1, \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\right\}$$

with  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^2/s$  for  $s$  at least  $O(k/\varepsilon^2)$  as required by Theorem 3.1. Furthermore, suppose that there is a rank  $s$  subspace  $\tilde{F}$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{a}_i^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_2^p \leq O(1/n)\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p \leq O(1) \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = O(\text{OPT}).$$

Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p.$$

*Proof.* First note that

$$\lambda^{p/2} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^p}{s^{p/2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_F^p}{s^{p/2}} \leq O(1/n)^{1-p/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{F}})\|_{p,2}^p}{s^{p/2}} = \frac{O(\text{OPT})}{s^{p/2}n^{1-p/2}} \quad (17)$$

By Theorem 3.1, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

$$= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \left\| [\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{V}_S^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S] \right\|_{p,2}^p$$

By Lemma 3.3 with  $\mathbf{U}$  set to the identity padded with zeros,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S]\|_p^p &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \right) \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + n^{1-p/2} \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p \right) \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_S\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \left( \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{x}\|_p^p + \text{OPT} + O(s^{-p/2}) \text{OPT} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^p \right) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Then by Lemma 3.6, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}_S \mathbf{X}\|_{p,2}^p + \text{OPT} + \text{OPT} \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^p \right]$$

for any  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times d}$ . Then, applying this result with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}_S^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)$ , which has operator norm 1, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \pm O(\varepsilon) \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p + \text{OPT} \right] \\ &= (1 \pm O(\varepsilon)) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S\|_{p,2}^p \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by using Lemma 3.4 with  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$ , (17), and the fact that  $\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F}$  is a matrix with rank at most  $k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})]\|_{p,2}^p &\lesssim \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p + \lambda^{p/2} \|\mathbf{V}_R^\top (\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p && \text{Lemma 3.4} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p + \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} \|\mathbf{V}_R^\top (\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{2,2}^p \\ &\leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT} + \lambda^{p/2} n^{1-p/2} k^{p/2} && \text{Theorem 3.1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \text{OPT} + O(\varepsilon^p) \cdot \text{OPT} = O(\varepsilon^p) \text{OPT} && (17) \end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 3.1, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm O(\varepsilon)) \|\mathbf{S}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)]\|_{p,2}^p$$

as claimed. Chaining together the previous bounds and rescaling  $\varepsilon$  by constant factors shows the claimed result.  $\square$

Finally, we show that by applying Theorem 3.10 recursively for  $O(\log \log n)$  rounds, we arrive at our main theorem for  $p < 2$ . Note that Theorem 1.4 follows by first applying sensitivity sampling [HV20, WY23a], which reduces  $n$  to  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$ .

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $p < 2$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . There is an algorithm that runs in time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + d^\nu)$  time to construct a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  with*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{O(k)}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} \left[ (\log n)^{6/p+1} + (\log(1/\delta))^{2/p+1} \right] (\log \log n)^{4/p+2} = \frac{k}{\varepsilon^{O(1)}} (\log(n/\delta))^{O(1)}$$

that satisfies Definition 1.1 with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

*Proof.* We will apply Theorem 3.10 for  $r = O(\log \log n)$  rounds, with  $\varepsilon$  set to  $\varepsilon/r$  and  $\delta$  set to  $\delta/r$ . In order to satisfy the precondition of the existence of a ‘‘flat’’ solution, we quickly compute a constant factor solution via Lemma 2.3 and flatten via Lemma 2.4, so that our condition is satisfied as long as we take  $s$  to be at least some  $O(k \log(n/\delta))$ .

Let  $\alpha$  and  $s = O(k/\varepsilon^2 + k \log(n/\delta))$  be the values given by Theorem 3.10 with this setting of parameters. We first analyze the number of rows sampled at each round in expectation. Since the ridge leverage scores sum to at most  $2s'$  by Lemma 2.6, we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} \leq n^{1-p/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \right)^{p/2} = O(s^{p/2} n^{1-p/2})$$

by Hölder's inequality. Thus, the expected number of sampled rows is at most  $O(s^{p/2}n^{1-p/2})/\alpha$ . By Chernoff bounds, if the expected number of sampled rows is at least  $O(\log(r/\delta))$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta/r$ , the number of sampled rows is within a constant factor of the expectation. Then by a union bound, for the first  $r$  rounds of the recursive calls, we succeed in obtaining a  $(1 \pm \varepsilon/r)$  approximation and reduce the number of rows from  $m$  to  $O(s^{p/2}m^{1-p/2})/\alpha$ . We now define  $a_i$  to be the logarithm of the number of rows after the  $i$ th recursive call. Then,

$$a_{i+1} = (1 - p/2)a_i + \log(O(s^{p/2})/\alpha)$$

so by Lemma 3.8, we have that

$$a_r = \frac{2}{p} \left( \log(O(s^{p/2})/\alpha) - (1 - p/2)^i (\log(O(s^{p/2})/\alpha) - (p/2)) (\log n) \right)$$

so the number of rows is at most

$$\exp(a_r) = \left( \frac{O(s^{p/2})}{\alpha} \right)^{2/p} = \frac{O(s)}{\alpha^{2/p}} = \frac{O(k)}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} \left[ (\log n)^{6/p+1} + (\log(1/\delta))^{2/p+1} \right] (\log \log n)^{4/p+2}. \quad \square$$

## 4 Streaming and online coresets

We present our results on streaming and online coresets for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation.

### 4.1 Online coresets

In this section, we note that our Theorems 3.9 and 3.11 give the first nearly optimal online coreset construction for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation. In the online coreset model, the rows of the input matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  arrive one by one. At each row arrival, we must decide whether to include the row in the coreset or not in an *online fashion*, meaning we must irrevocably commit to keeping the row in the coreset or discard it permanently.

Online coresets typically depend on a quantity known as the *online condition number*, which is known to be necessary in many cases [CMP16]:

**Definition 4.1** (Online condition number [CMP16]). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Then, the online condition number of  $\mathbf{A}$  is defined as*

$$\kappa^{\text{OL}} := \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A}_{(i)}^-\|_2,$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}^-$  denotes the pseudoinverse of the  $i \times d$  matrix formed by the first  $i$  rows of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

Then, the following is an immediate corollary of Theorems 3.9 and 3.11.

**Corollary 4.2** (Online coresets). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  have online condition number  $\kappa^{\text{OL}}$ . Then, there is an online coreset algorithm which constructs a diagonal map  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfying Definition 1.1 with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , such that*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} (\log(n\kappa^{\text{OL}}/\delta))^{O(p)} \\ \frac{\tilde{O}(k)}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} (\log(n\kappa^{\text{OL}}/\delta))^{O(1)} \end{cases}$$

while storing at most  $O(k(\log k)(\log \kappa^{\text{OL}})^2)$  additional rows in an online fashion.

*Proof.* The result of [BDM<sup>+</sup>20, Theorem 3.1] gives an online coreset algorithm for maintaining a  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$  strong coreset for  $\ell_2$  subspace approximation which stores  $O(\varepsilon^{-2}k(\log k)(\log \kappa^{\text{OL}})^2)$  rows. Furthermore, given such a strong coreset with  $\varepsilon = O(1)$ , it is shown in [BDM<sup>+</sup>20, Lemma 2.11] that one can obtain scores  $\tilde{\tau}_i$  such that

$$\tilde{\tau}_i \geq \tau_i^\lambda(\mathbf{A})$$

for  $\lambda = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2/k$ , and also satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\tau}_i \leq O(k \log \kappa^{\text{OL}}).$$

The result for  $p > 2$  then follows as an immediate corollary of Theorem 3.9. For  $p < 2$ , we additionally need an online constant factor approximation to flatten the matrix, which is constructed in [WY23a] by obtaining online Lewis sample due to [WY23b]. The result for  $p < 2$  then follows as an immediate corollary of Theorem 3.11.  $\square$

For integer matrices with entries bounded by  $\Delta$ , we may replace the dependence on the online condition number with  $\Delta$ , by using an analogous result of [BDM<sup>+</sup>20] for integer matrices.

**Corollary 4.3** (Online coresets – integer matrices). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times d}$  have entries bounded by  $|\mathbf{A}_{i,j}| \leq \Delta$ . Then, there is an online coreset algorithm which constructs a diagonal map  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfying Definition 1.1 with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , such that*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} (\log(n\Delta/\delta))^{O(p)} \\ \frac{\tilde{O}(k)}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} (\log(n\Delta/\delta))^{O(1)} \end{cases}$$

while storing at most  $O(k(\log \Delta)^2)$  additional rows in an online fashion.

## 4.2 Streaming coresets

Next, we state our corollaries for constructing streaming coresets in the row arrival model of streaming, which is slightly different from the online coreset model since we are allowed to remove rows from our coreset. In the streaming model, the resource measure is typically the space complexity, and thus the input is usually assumed to be an integer matrix as a bit complexity assumption. In this setting, we combine the classic merge-and-reduce technique [BDM<sup>+</sup>20] with the technique of [CWZ23] of first applying an online coreset to obtain a result with only  $\text{poly}(\log \log(n\Delta))$  factor overhead in the coreset size.

**Corollary 4.4** (Streaming coresets – integer matrices). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times d}$  have entries bounded by  $|\mathbf{A}_{i,j}| \leq \Delta$ . Then, there is a row arrival streaming algorithm which constructs a diagonal map  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfying Definition 1.1 with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , such that*

$$\text{nnz}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{O}(k^{p/2})}{\varepsilon^{p^2/2+p}} (\log(k/\varepsilon\delta) + \log \log(n\Delta/\delta))^{O(p^2)} \\ \frac{\tilde{O}(k)}{\varepsilon^{4/p+2}} (\log(k/\varepsilon\delta) + \log(n\Delta/\delta))^{O(1)} \end{cases}$$

while storing at most  $O(k(\log \Delta)^2)$  additional rows in an online fashion.

*Proof.* We may assume without loss of generality that the stream length is at most  $m = \text{poly}(k, \varepsilon^{-1}, \log(n\Delta/\delta))$  by first applying Corollary 4.3. We then apply the merge-and-reduce technique, which results in a coreset with size where the  $\varepsilon$  dependence is replaced by  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/\log m$ . This results in the claimed bounds.  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda were supported in part by NSF CCF-2335411 and a Simons Investigator Award.

## References

- [AHV04] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sariel Har-Peled, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Approximating extent measures of points. *J. ACM*, 51(4):606–635, 2004. [1.1](#)
- [AM15] Ahmed El Alaoui and Michael W. Mahoney. Fast randomized kernel ridge regression with statistical guarantees. In Corinna Cortes, Neil D. Lawrence, Daniel D. Lee, Masashi Sugiyama, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2015, December 7-12, 2015, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 775–783, 2015. [1.8](#)
- [BDM<sup>+</sup>20] Vladimir Braverman, Petros Drineas, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Jalaj Upadhyay, David P. Woodruff, and Samson Zhou. Near optimal linear algebra in the online and sliding window models. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020, Durham, NC, USA, November 16-19, 2020*, pages 517–528. IEEE, 2020. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3.1](#), [1.5.1](#), [4.1](#), [4.2](#)
- [BFL16] Vladimir Braverman, Dan Feldman, and Harry Lang. New frameworks for offline and streaming coresets constructions. *CoRR*, abs/1612.00889, 2016. [1.2](#)
- [BJKW21] Vladimir Braverman, Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang, Robert Krauthgamer, and Xuan Wu. Coresets for clustering in excluded-minor graphs and beyond. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 2679–2696. SIAM, 2021. [1.2](#)
- [BK96] András A. Benczúr and David R. Karger. Approximating  $s$ - $t$  minimum cuts in  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  time. In Gary L. Miller, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, May 22-24, 1996*, pages 47–55. ACM, 1996. [1.2](#)
- [BLM89] J. Bourgain, J. Lindenstrauss, and V. Milman. Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes. *Acta Math.*, 162(1-2):73–141, 1989. [2.2](#), [A.3](#)
- [BLVZ19] Aditya Bhaskara, Silvio Lattanzi, Sergei Vassilvitskii, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Residual based sampling for online low rank approximation. In David Zuckerman, editor, *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 1596–1614. IEEE Computer Society, 2019. [1.2](#), [1.3.1](#)
- [BSS12] Joshua D. Batson, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Twice-ramanujan sparsifiers. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(6):1704–1721, 2012. [1.2](#)
- [BST19] Nikhil Bansal, Ola Svensson, and Luca Trevisan. New notions and constructions of sparsification for graphs and hypergraphs. In David Zuckerman, editor, *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 910–928. IEEE Computer Society, 2019. [1.2](#)
- [CD21] Xue Chen and Michal Dereziński. Query complexity of least absolute deviation regression via robust uniform convergence. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2021, 15-19 August 2021, Boulder, Colorado, USA*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1144–1179. PMLR, 2021. [A.2](#)
- [CEM<sup>+</sup>15] Michael B. Cohen, Sam Elder, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, and Madalina Persu. Dimensionality reduction for k-means clustering and low rank approximation. In Rocco A. Servedio and Ronitt Rubinfeld, editors, *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 163–172. ACM, 2015. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.4.2](#)

- [CGK<sup>+</sup>17] Flavio Chierichetti, Sreenivas Gollapudi, Ravi Kumar, Silvio Lattanzi, Rina Panigrahy, and David P. Woodruff. Algorithms for  $\ell_p$  low-rank approximation. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 806–814, Australia, 2017. PMLR. [1.5.2](#)
- [Che09] Ke Chen. On coresets for k-median and k-means clustering in metric and euclidean spaces and their applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(3):923–947, 2009. [1.2](#)
- [Cla05] Kenneth L. Clarkson. Subgradient and sampling algorithms for  $\ell_1$  regression. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA ’05, pages 257–266, USA, 2005. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. [1.2](#)
- [CLM<sup>+</sup>15] Michael B. Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. Uniform sampling for matrix approximation. In Tim Roughgarden, editor, *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS 2015, Rehovot, Israel, January 11-13, 2015*, pages 181–190. ACM, 2015. [1.4.2](#)
- [CLS<sup>+</sup>22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Kasper Green Larsen, David Saulpic, Chris Schwiegelshohn, and Omar Ali Sheikh-Omar. Improved coresets for euclidean k-means. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. [1.2](#)
- [CLSS22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Kasper Green Larsen, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Towards optimal lower bounds for k-median and k-means coresets. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC ’22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1038–1051. ACM, 2022. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#)
- [CMM17] Michael B. Cohen, Cameron Musco, and Christopher Musco. Input sparsity time low-rank approximation via ridge leverage score sampling. In Philip N. Klein, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 1758–1777. SIAM, 2017. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.4.2](#), [1.8](#), [1.4.2](#), [1.4.4](#), [2.6](#)
- [CMP16] Michael B. Cohen, Cameron Musco, and Jakub Pachocki. Online row sampling. In Klaus Jansen, Claire Mathieu, José D. P. Rolim, and Chris Umans, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2016, September 7-9, 2016, Paris, France*, volume 60 of *LIPICs*, pages 7:1–7:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. [1.3.1](#), [4.1](#), [4.1](#)
- [Coh16] Michael B. Cohen. Nearly tight oblivious subspace embeddings by trace inequalities. In Robert Krauthgamer, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 278–287. SIAM, 2016. [2.3](#)
- [CP15] Michael B. Cohen and Richard Peng.  $L_p$  row sampling by lewis weights. In Rocco A. Servedio and Ronitt Rubinfeld, editors, *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 183–192. ACM, 2015. [1.2](#), [2](#), [1.4.3](#), [2.3](#), [2.2](#), [A.2](#), [A.2](#)
- [CSS21] Vincent Cohen-Addad, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. A new coreset framework for clustering. In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC ’21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 169–182. ACM, 2021. [1.2](#)
- [CW13] Kenneth L. Clarkson and David P. Woodruff. Low rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. In Dan Boneh, Tim Roughgarden, and Joan Feigenbaum, editors, *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 81–90. ACM, 2013. [1.4.2](#)

- [CW15] Kenneth L. Clarkson and David P. Woodruff. Input sparsity and hardness for robust subspace approximation. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015*, pages 310–329. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [C](#)
- [CWZ23] Vincent Cohen-Addad, David P. Woodruff, and Samson Zhou. Streaming Euclidean  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means with  $o(\log n)$  space. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023*. IEEE Computer Society, 2023. [1.2.1](#), [1.5.1](#), [4.2](#)
- [DDH<sup>+</sup>09] Anirban Dasgupta, Petros Drineas, Boulos Harb, Ravi Kumar, and Michael W. Mahoney. Sampling algorithms and coresets for  $\ell_p$  regression. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(5):2060–2078, 2009. [1.2](#)
- [DMM06a] Petros Drineas, Michael W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Sampling algorithms for  $\ell_2$  regression and applications. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2006, Miami, Florida, USA, January 22-26, 2006*, pages 1127–1136. ACM Press, 2006. [1.2](#)
- [DMM06b] Petros Drineas, Michael W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Subspace sampling and relative-error matrix approximation: Column-row-based methods. In Yossi Azar and Thomas Erlebach, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2006, 14th Annual European Symposium, Zurich, Switzerland, September 11-13, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4168 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 304–314. Springer, 2006. [1.2](#), [1.4.2](#)
- [DMM08] Petros Drineas, Michael W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Relative-error CUR matrix decompositions. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 30(2):844–881, 2008. [1.2](#), [1.4.2](#)
- [DMMW12] Petros Drineas, Malik Magdon-Ismael, Michael W. Mahoney, and David P. Woodruff. Fast approximation of matrix coherence and statistical leverage. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13:3475–3506, 2012. [1.4.2](#)
- [DP22] Amit Deshpande and Rameshwar Pratap. One-pass additive-error subset selection for  $\ell_p$  subspace approximation. In Mikolaj Bojanczyk, Emanuela Merelli, and David P. Woodruff, editors, *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022, July 4-8, 2022, Paris, France*, volume 229 of *LIPICs*, pages 51:1–51:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. [1.2](#)
- [DTV11] Amit Deshpande, Madhur Tulsiani, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Algorithms and hardness for subspace approximation. In Dana Randall, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2011, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 2011*, pages 482–496. SIAM, 2011. [1.2](#), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.4.6](#), [2.2](#)
- [DV07] Amit Deshpande and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Sampling-based dimension reduction for subspace approximation. In David S. Johnson and Uriel Feige, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, San Diego, California, USA, June 11-13, 2007*, pages 641–650. ACM, 2007. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1](#), [1.6](#)
- [Dvo61] Aryeh Dvoretzky. Some results on convex bodies and Banach spaces. In *Proc. Internat. Sympos. Linear Spaces (Jerusalem, 1960)*, pages 123–160. Jerusalem Academic Press, Jerusalem; Pergamon, Oxford, 1961. [2](#), [1.4.7](#), [2.1.1](#)
- [DWZ<sup>+</sup>19] Chen Dan, Hong Wang, Hongyang Zhang, Yuchen Zhou, and Pradeep Ravikumar. Optimal analysis of subset-selection based  $L_p$  low-rank approximation. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 2537–2548, Canada, 2019. Neural Information Processing Systems Foundation, Inc. (NeurIPS). [1.5.2](#)

- [DZHZ06] Chris H. Q. Ding, Ding Zhou, Xiaofeng He, and Hongyuan Zha.  $r_1$ -pca: rotational invariant  $l_1$ -norm principal component analysis for robust subspace factorization. In William W. Cohen and Andrew W. Moore, editors, *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Conference (ICML 2006), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, June 25-29, 2006*, volume 148 of *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, pages 281–288. ACM, 2006. [1.1](#), [1.2.1](#)
- [FKW21] Zhili Feng, Praneeth Kacham, and David P. Woodruff. Dimensionality reduction for the sum-of-distances metric. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3220–3229. PMLR, 2021. ([document](#)), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1](#), [1.3.1](#), [1](#), [1](#), [1.4.2](#), [1.4.6](#), [2.2](#), [C](#), [C](#), [C](#)
- [FL11] Dan Feldman and Michael Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In Lance Fortnow and Salil P. Vadhan, editors, *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, 6-8 June 2011*, pages 569–578. ACM, 2011. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1](#), [2](#), [2](#)
- [FLM77] T. Figiel, J. Lindenstrauss, and V. D. Milman. The dimension of almost spherical sections of convex bodies. *Acta Math.*, 139(1-2):53–94, 1977. [2](#), [1.4.7](#), [2.1](#)
- [FMSW10] Dan Feldman, Morteza Monemizadeh, Christian Sohler, and David P. Woodruff. Coresets and sketches for high dimensional subspace approximation problems. In Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, pages 630–649. SIAM, 2010. [1.2](#)
- [FSS20] Dan Feldman, Melanie Schmidt, and Christian Sohler. Turning big data into tiny data: Constant-size coresets for k-means, pca, and projective clustering. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(3):601–657, 2020. [1.2](#)
- [GK94] Peter Gritzmann and Victor Klee. On the complexity of some basic problems in computational convexity: I. containment problems. *Discret. Math.*, 136(1-3):129–174, 1994. [1.1](#)
- [GRSW12] Venkatesan Guruswami, Prasad Raghavendra, Rishi Saket, and Yi Wu. Bypassing UGC from some optimal geometric inapproximability results. In Yuval Rabani, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*, pages 699–717. SIAM, 2012. [1.2](#), [1.2](#)
- [GZAL14] John Goes, Teng Zhang, Raman Arora, and Gilad Lerman. Robust stochastic principal component analysis. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2014, Reykjavik, Iceland, April 22-25, 2014*, volume 33 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 266–274. JMLR.org, 2014. [1.1](#), [1.2](#)
- [Haz16] Elad Hazan. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Found. Trends Optim.*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016. [1.3.1](#)
- [HLW22] Lingxiao Huang, Jian Li, and Xuan Wu. On optimal coreset construction for Euclidean  $(k, z)$ -clustering. *ArXiv, abs/2211.11923*, 2022. [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#)
- [HV04] Sariel Har-Peled and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. High-dimensional shape fitting in linear time. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 32(2):269–288, 2004. [1.1](#)
- [HV20] Lingxiao Huang and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Coresets for clustering in euclidean spaces: importance sampling is nearly optimal. In Konstantin Makarychev, Yury Makarychev, Madhur Tulsiani, Gautam Kamath, and Julia Chuzhoy, editors, *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, pages 1416–1429. ACM, 2020. ([document](#)), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1.3](#), [1](#), [1.3.1](#), [1](#), [2](#), [2](#), [1.4.2](#), [1.6](#), [1.6](#), [3.4](#), [3.5](#), [C](#)

- [JLL<sup>+</sup>21] Shuli Jiang, Dennis Li, Irene Mengze Li, Arvind V. Mahankali, and David P. Woodruff. Streaming and distributed algorithms for robust column subset selection. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4971–4981, Virtual, 2021. PMLR. [1.5.2](#)
- [JLLS23a] Arun Jambulapati, James R. Lee, Yang P. Liu, and Aaron Sidford. Sparsifying generalized linear models. *CoRR*, abs/2311.18145, 2023. [1.2](#)
- [JLLS23b] Arun Jambulapati, James R. Lee, Yang P. Liu, and Aaron Sidford. Sparsifying sums of norms. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023, Santa Cruz, CA, USA, November 6-9, 2023*, pages 1953–1962. IEEE, 2023. [1.2](#), [1.4.5](#)
- [JLS23] Arun Jambulapati, Yang P. Liu, and Aaron Sidford. Chaining, group leverage score overestimates, and fast spectral hypergraph sparsification. In Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 196–206. ACM, 2023. [1.2](#)
- [KKTY21] Michael Kapralov, Robert Krauthgamer, Jakab Tardos, and Yuichi Yoshida. Spectral hypergraph sparsifiers of nearly linear size. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 1159–1170. IEEE, 2021. [1.2](#)
- [KM12] Nikolai M Korneenko and Horst Martini. Chapter vi. hyperplane approximation and related topics. *New Trends in Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 10:135, 2012. [1.1](#)
- [Lee23] James R. Lee. Spectral hypergraph sparsification via chaining. In Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 207–218. ACM, 2023. [1.2](#)
- [LS10] Michael Langberg and Leonard J. Schulman. Universal epsilon-approximators for integrals. In Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, pages 598–607. SIAM, 2010. [2](#)
- [LSW18] Roie Levin, Anish Prasad Sevekari, and David P. Woodruff. Robust subspace approximation in a stream. In Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 10706–10716, 2018. [1.2](#)
- [LT91] Michel Ledoux and Michel Talagrand. *Probability in Banach spaces*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. Isoperimetry and processes, Reprint of the 1991 edition. [A.3](#)
- [LWW21] Yi Li, Ruosong Wang, and David P. Woodruff. Tight bounds for the subspace sketch problem with applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(4):1287–1335, 2021. [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1.3](#), [1.4.7](#), [1.6](#)
- [MB72] Ross D MacKinnon and Gerald M Barber. New approach to network generation and map representation: the linear case of the location-allocation problem. *Geographical Analysis*, 4:156–168, 1972. [1.1](#)
- [Mey01] Adam Meyerson. Online facility location. In *42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2001, 14-17 October 2001, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 426–431. IEEE Computer Society, 2001. [1.3.1](#)
- [Mil71] V. D. Milman. A new proof of A. Dvoretzky’s theorem on cross-sections of convex bodies. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, 5(4):28–37, 1971. [2.1.1](#)

- [MM20] Cameron Musco and Christopher Musco. Projection-cost-preserving sketches: Proof strategies and constructions. *CoRR*, abs/2004.08434, 2020. [1.2.1](#)
- [MMO23] Yury Makarychev, Naren Sarayu Manoj, and Max Ovsiankin. Near-optimal streaming ellipsoidal rounding for general convex polytopes. *CoRR*, abs/2311.09460, 2023. [1.3.1](#)
- [MMR21] Tung Mai, Cameron Musco, and Anup Rao. Coresets for classification - simplified and strengthened. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 11643–11654, 2021. [1.2](#)
- [MMWY22] Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, David P. Woodruff, and Taisuke Yasuda. Active linear regression for  $\ell_p$  norms and beyond. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Denver, CO, USA, October 31 - November 3, 2022*, pages 744–753. IEEE, 2022. [1.2](#), [2.2](#), [2.2](#), [3.8](#)
- [MN80] James G Morris and John P Norback. A simple approach to linear facility location. *Transportation Science*, 14(1):1–8, 1980. [1.1](#)
- [MOP22] Alexander Munteanu, Simon Omlor, and Christian Peters. p-generalized probit regression and scalable maximum likelihood estimation via sketching and coresets. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2022, 28-30 March 2022, Virtual Event*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2073–2100. PMLR, 2022. [1.2](#)
- [MRWZ20] Sepideh Mahabadi, Ilya P. Razenshteyn, David P. Woodruff, and Samson Zhou. Non-adaptive adaptive sampling on turnstile streams. In Konstantin Makarychev, Yury Makarychev, Madhur Tulsiani, Gautam Kamath, and Julia Chuzhoy, editors, *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, pages 1251–1264. ACM, 2020. [1.2](#)
- [MS01] Horst Martini and Anita Schöbel. Median and center hyperplanes in minkowski spaces—a unified approach. *Discret. Math.*, 241(1-3):407–426, 2001. [1.1](#)
- [MW21] Arvind V. Mahankali and David P. Woodruff. Optimal  $\ell_1$  column subset selection and a fast PTAS for low rank approximation. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 560–578, Virtual, 2021. SIAM. [1.5.2](#)
- [NN13] Jelani Nelson and Huy L. Nguyen. OSNAP: faster numerical linear algebra algorithms via sparser subspace embeddings. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013, 26-29 October, 2013, Berkeley, CA, USA*, pages 117–126. IEEE Computer Society, 2013. [2.3](#)
- [NNS20] Sebastian Neumayer, Max Nimmer, Simon Setzer, and Gabriele Steidl. On the rotational invariant  $\ell_1$ -norm pca. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 587:243–270, 2020. [1.2.1](#)
- [Nol20] John P. Nolan. *Univariate stable distributions: models for heavy tailed data*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020. [1.5.2](#)
- [PVZ17] Grigoris Paouris, Petros Valettas, and Joel Zinn. Random version of Dvoretzky’s theorem in  $\ell_p^n$ . *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 127(10):3187–3227, 2017. [2](#), [1.4.7](#), [2.1](#)
- [RV09] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Smallest singular value of a random rectangular matrix. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 62(12):1707–1739, 2009. [3.2](#), [3.4](#)

- [RY22] Akbar Rafiey and Yuichi Yoshida. Sparsification of decomposable submodular functions. In *Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022*, pages 10336–10344. AAAI Press, 2022. [1.2](#)
- [Sch99] Anita Schöbel. *Locating lines and hyperplanes: theory and algorithms*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999. [1.1](#)
- [SS11] Daniel A. Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(6):1913–1926, 2011. [1.4.2](#)
- [ST04] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. In László Babai, editor, *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Chicago, IL, USA, June 13-16, 2004*, pages 81–90. ACM, 2004. [1.2](#)
- [SV12] Nariankadu D. Shyamalkumar and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Efficient subspace approximation algorithms. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 47(1):44–63, 2012. [1.1](#), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1](#), [1.6](#)
- [SW87] H. Späth and G. A. Watson. On orthogonal linear  $\ell_1$  approximation. *Numer. Math.*, 51(5):531–543, 1987. [1.1](#)
- [SW18] Christian Sohler and David P. Woodruff. Strong coresets for k-median and subspace approximation: Goodbye dimension. In Mikkel Thorup, editor, *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pages 802–813. IEEE Computer Society, 2018. ([document](#)), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1](#), [1.3.1](#), [1](#), [1.4.1](#), [2](#), [2](#), [1.4.2](#), [1.4.3](#), [1.4.3](#), [1.5.2](#), [3](#), [3](#), [B](#), [B.1](#), [B.1](#), [B.1](#), [B.2](#), [B.2](#), [C](#), [C](#)
- [SWZ17] Zhao Song, David P. Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Low rank approximation with entrywise  $\ell_1$ -norm error. In Hamed Hatami, Pierre McKenzie, and Valerie King, editors, *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 688–701, Canada, 2017. ACM. [1.5.2](#)
- [VX12] Kasturi R. Varadarajan and Xin Xiao. On the sensitivity of shape fitting problems. In Deepak D’Souza, Telikepalli Kavitha, and Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, editors, *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2012, December 15-17, 2012, Hyderabad, India*, volume 18 of *LIPICs*, pages 486–497. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2012. [1.2](#), [2](#), [1.4.6](#)
- [Woo14] David P. Woodruff. Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 10(1-2):1–157, 2014. [C](#)
- [WY22] David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda. High-dimensional geometric streaming in polynomial space. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Denver, CO, USA, October 31 - November 3, 2022*, pages 732–743. IEEE, 2022. [1.3.1](#)
- [WY23a] David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda. New subset selection algorithms for low rank approximation: Offline and online. In Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 1802–1813. ACM, 2023. ([document](#)), [1.2](#), [1.2.1](#), [1.3](#), [1.3](#), [1.3.1](#), [1](#), [1](#), [1.4.6](#), [1.5.2](#), [1.6](#), [1.6](#), [1.6](#), [2.2](#), [2.2](#), [3.4](#), [3.5](#), [4.1](#), [C](#)
- [WY23b] David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda. Online Lewis weight sampling. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 4622–4666. SIAM, 2023. [1.2](#), [1.3.1](#), [1](#), [2](#), [1.4.3](#), [2.2](#), [4.1](#)

- [WY23c] David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda. Sharper bounds for  $\ell_p$  sensitivity sampling. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 37238–37272. PMLR, 2023. [1.4.4](#), [3.1](#), [A](#), [A.2](#), [A.2](#), [A.3](#), [A.3](#)
- [WY24] David P. Woodruff and Taisuke Yasuda. Coresets for multiple  $\ell_p$  regression. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2024. [1.6](#)
- [YHY17] Shuangyan Yi, Zhenyu He, and Wei-Guo Yang. Robust principal component analysis via joint  $\ell_{2,1}$ -norms minimization. In *International Conference on Security, Pattern Analysis, and Cybernetics, SPAC 2017, Shenzhen, China, December 15-17, 2017*, pages 13–18. IEEE, 2017. [1.1](#)

## A $\ell_p$ affine embeddings via root leverage score sampling

Following the techniques of [WY23c], we obtain a root leverage score sample guarantee for  $\ell_p$  affine embeddings, for both  $p < 2$  and  $p > 2$ .

Our main result of this section is the following theorem, which shows that root leverage score sampling yields  $\ell_p$  affine embeddings.

**Theorem A.1** (Root leverage score sampling). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Suppose that*

$$\frac{|\mathbf{b}(i)|^p}{R^p} \leq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}\} & p > 2 \\ \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} & p < 2 \end{cases}$$

for every  $i \in [n]$ . Let  $\alpha = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)/((\log n)^3 + \log(1/\delta))$  and let

$$q_i \geq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & p > 2 \\ \min\{1, \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}/\alpha\} & p < 2 \end{cases}$$

Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be the  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix (Definition 1.7) with sampling probabilities  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon R^p$$

### A.1 Reduction to a small number of scales

Our first task is to reduce the proof of Theorem A.1 to showing a similar theorem when  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  is restricted to a certain scale, for a small number of scales. This is shown in the following lemma:

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $R_0 \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ . Suppose that*

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p=1} \left| \|\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p^p \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

and that

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq R_i} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right| \leq \varepsilon R_i^p$$

holds for each  $R_i = 2^i \cdot R_0$ ,  $i \in [I]$ , where  $I = O(\log \varepsilon^{-1})$ . Then,

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p = (1 \pm 2 \cdot 4^p \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm 2^p \varepsilon R_0^p$$

for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Proof.* First note that if  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R_1$ , then we immediately have

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon R_1^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm 2^p \varepsilon R_0^p.$$

Next, suppose that  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \geq R_0/\varepsilon$ . Note that

$$\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p = \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \pm \|\mathbf{b}\|_p = (1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p$$

and similarly,

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p = \|\mathbf{SAx}\|_p \pm \|\mathbf{Sb}\|_p = (1 \pm 4\varepsilon)\|\mathbf{SAx}\|_p$$

Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p = (1 \pm 4\varepsilon)(1 \pm \varepsilon)\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p = (1 \pm 7\varepsilon)\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p.$$

Finally, we handle the intermediate scales between  $R_0$  and  $R_0/\varepsilon$ . Consider  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $R_i \leq \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p < 2 \cdot R_i$ . Note then that

$$\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p \geq \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p - \|\mathbf{b}\|_p \geq \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p/2 \geq R_i/2$$

so

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \cdot (2R_i)^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm \varepsilon \cdot (4\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p)^p.$$

This covers all cases.  $\square$

## A.2 Reduction to a Gaussian process with flat sensitivities

We now work towards bounding a quantity as the one used in Lemma A.2. The following lemma is a standard reduction in chaining arguments (see, e.g., Lemma D.1 of [WY23c], also [CP15, CD21]):

**Lemma A.3** (Reduction to Gaussian processes). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be a random  $\ell_p$  sampling matrix (Definition 1.7). Then,*

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right|^l \leq (2\pi)^{l/2} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \sum_{i \in T} \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})(i)|^p \right|^l,$$

where  $T \subseteq [n]$  is the set of rows with sampling probability  $q_i < 1$ .

We will further reduce the problem to a similar problem for an instance with “flat sensitivities”, following [CP15, WY23c]. We will use the following trivial generalization of the result of [WY23c, Lemma D.5].

**Lemma A.4** (Flattening all sensitivities). *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Then, there exists  $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for  $m = O(n\alpha^{-1})$  such that*

$$\sigma_i^q(\mathbf{A}') \leq \alpha, \quad \sigma_i^q(\mathbf{b}') = \frac{|\mathbf{b}(i)|^q}{\|\mathbf{b}\|_q^q} \leq \alpha$$

for every  $i \in [m]$  and  $1 \leq q < \infty$ . Furthermore, for any  $1 \leq q < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have that  $\|\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}'\|_q = \Theta(\alpha^{1/p-1/q})\|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_q$ .

Using Lemma A.4, we construct the following new instance with bounded  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_p$  sensitivities:

**Lemma A.5** (Flattened instance). *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Suppose that*

$$\frac{|\mathbf{b}(i)|^p}{R^p} \leq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2}\} & p > 2 \\ \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} & p < 2 \end{cases}$$

for every  $i \in [n]$ . Let  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and let

$$q_i \geq \begin{cases} \min\{1, n^{p/2-1} \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} / \alpha\} & p > 2 \\ \min\{1, \tau_i(\mathbf{A})^{p/2} / \alpha\} & p < 2 \end{cases}$$

Let  $T \subseteq [n]$  be the set of rows  $i \in [n]$  with  $q_i < 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be a diagonal matrix with  $\mathbf{S}_{i,i} \leq 1/q_i^{1/p}$ . Then, there is  $\mathbf{A}'' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b}'' \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for  $m = O(n/\alpha)$  such that

- $\tau_i(\mathbf{A}'') \leq O(\alpha)$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tau_i(\mathbf{A}'') \leq O(\alpha)/n^{1-2/p}$  for  $p > 2$ , for every  $i \in [m]$
- $\sigma_i^p(\mathbf{A}'') \leq O(\alpha)$  and  $|\mathbf{b}''(i)|^p/R^p \leq O(\alpha)$  for every  $i \in [m]$
- $\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}''\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p + \|\mathbf{S}|_T(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- $\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_p^p = \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p + \|\mathbf{S}|_T\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be the flattened instances given by Lemma A.4, where  $m = O(n/\alpha)$ . Now let

$$\mathbf{A}'' := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}' \\ \mathbf{S}|_T\mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b}'' := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}' \\ \mathbf{S}|_T\mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}$$

be the  $(m + n_S) \times d$  matrix and  $(m + n_S)$ -dimensional vector formed by the vertical concatenation of  $\mathbf{A}'$  and  $\mathbf{b}'$  with  $\mathbf{SA}$  and  $\mathbf{Sb}$ , where  $n_S$  is the number of rows sampled by  $\mathbf{S}$ .

We now show how to bound the sensitivities of  $\mathbf{A}''$  and  $\mathbf{b}''$ .

For any row  $i$  corresponding to a row of  $\mathbf{A}'$ , the  $\ell_2$  sensitivities are already bounded by  $\alpha$ , and furthermore,  $\ell_2$  sensitivities can clearly only decrease with row additions. For any row  $i$  corresponding to a row of  $\mathbf{SA}$  that is sampled with probability  $q_i < 1$ , we have that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^2}{\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^2}{\|\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} = \frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^2}{\Theta(\alpha^{2/p-1})\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{q_i^{2/p}} \frac{|\mathbf{Ax}(i)|^2}{\Theta(\alpha^{2/p-1})\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{\tau_i(\mathbf{A})}{\Theta(\alpha^{2/p-1})q_i^{2/p}} = O(\alpha).$$

In fact, for  $p > 2$ , we have the stronger bound of

$$\frac{\tau_i(\mathbf{A})}{\Theta(\alpha^{2/p-1})q_i^{2/p}} \leq \frac{O(\alpha)}{n^{1-2/p}}.$$

Thus, we have that  $\tau_i(\mathbf{A}'') = \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{A}'') \leq O(\alpha)$  for every row  $i$  of  $\mathbf{A}''$ .

For  $p < 2$ , the max sensitivity is bounded by  $O(\alpha)$  by the monotonicity of max sensitivities. For  $p > 2$ , we have by reverse monotonicity of max sensitivities that

$$\sigma_i^p(\mathbf{A}) \leq n^{p/2-1}\tau_i(\mathbf{A})$$

so for any row  $i$  corresponding to a row of  $\mathbf{SA}$  sampled with probability  $q_i < 1$ , we have that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_p^p} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x}\|_p^p} = \frac{|\mathbf{SAx}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p} \leq \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{|\mathbf{Ax}(i)|^p}{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p} \leq \frac{\sigma_i^p(\mathbf{A})}{q_i} \leq O(\alpha).$$

By similar reasoning, we have that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{Sb}(i)|^p}{R^p} \leq \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{|\mathbf{b}(i)|^p}{R^p} \leq O(\alpha). \quad \square$$

The next lemma shows that in order to bound the Gaussian process in Lemma A.3, it suffices to bound a similar Gaussian process for  $\mathbf{A}''$  and  $\mathbf{b}''$ .

**Lemma A.6** (Reduction to flattened instance). *Let  $\mathbf{S}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{A}''$ ,  $\mathbf{b}''$  be as given in Lemma A.5. Let  $\delta, \varepsilon, l$  be such that  $\delta\varepsilon^l \leq 1/2$ . Furthermore, suppose that*

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq R} \left| \sum_{i \in T} \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}(i)|^p \right|^l \leq \delta\varepsilon^l (R^p)^l$$

for every  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Then,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right|^l \leq 2\delta(2^{3p}\varepsilon R^p)^l$$

for every  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ .

*Proof.* Fix an outcome of  $\mathbf{S}$  and let

$$F_{\mathbf{S},R} = \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right|.$$

Note then that for any  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_p &\leq \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p + \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p + \|\mathbf{Sb}\|_p \\ &\leq R + \left( \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p + \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right| \right)^{1/p} + \left( \|\mathbf{b}\|_p^p + \left| \|\mathbf{Sb}\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right| \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq R + \left( \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p + F_{\mathbf{S},R} \right)^{1/p} + \left( \|\mathbf{b}\|_p^p + F_{\mathbf{S},R} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq R + \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p + F_{\mathbf{S},R}^{1/p} + \|\mathbf{b}\|_p + F_{\mathbf{S},R}^{1/p} \\ &\leq 4R + 2F_{\mathbf{S},R}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \sum_{i \in T} \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})(i)|^p \right|^l && \text{Lemma A.3} \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \sum_i \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}''(i)|^p \right|^l \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq 4R + 2F_{\mathbf{S},R}^{1/p}} \left| \sum_i \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{A}''\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}''(i)|^p \right|^l \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \delta \varepsilon^l ((4R + 2F_{\mathbf{S},R}^{1/p})^p)^l && \text{by hypothesis} \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \delta (2^{2p} \varepsilon)^l ((2R)^p)^l + F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l \\ &= \delta (2^{2p} \varepsilon)^l \left[ ((2R)^p)^l + \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l \right] \end{aligned}$$

so rearranging gives

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l}{(2^p R^p)^l + \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l} \leq \delta (2^{2p} \varepsilon)^l.$$

In turn, this implies that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} F_{\mathbf{S},R}^l \leq \frac{\delta (2^{2p} \varepsilon)^l (2^p R^p)^l}{1 - \delta (2^{2p} \varepsilon)^l} \leq 2\delta (2^{3p} \varepsilon R^p)^l. \quad \square$$

### A.3 Bounds on the Gaussian process

In this section, we present results from [WY23c] (which in turn are based on [BLM89, LT91]) which will allow us to bound a Gaussian process of the form of Lemma A.6.

The following is a straightforward generalization of Lemma C.3 of [WY23c].

**Lemma A.7.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Define the pseudo-metric*

$$d_X(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') := \left( \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{y}(i)|^p - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i |\mathbf{y}'(i)|^p \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

Let  $\sigma \geq \max_{i \in S} \sigma_i^p(\mathbf{A}) + |\mathbf{b}(i)|^p / R^p$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{Ax}' + \mathbf{b}$  with  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p, \|\mathbf{Ax}'\|_p \leq R$ ,

$$d_X(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') \leq \begin{cases} O(1) \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\|_{\infty}^{p/2} R^{p/2} & p < 2 \\ O(1) \sigma^{1/2-1/p} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\|_{\infty} R^{p-1} & p > 2 \end{cases}$$

With Lemma A.7 in hand, the following result follows immediately from the proofs in [WY23c]:

**Theorem A.8.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  with  $p \neq 2$  be fixed and let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $R \geq \|\mathbf{b}\|_p$ . Let  $\tau \geq \max_{i=1}^n \tau_i(\mathbf{A})$  and let  $\sigma \geq \max_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^p(\mathbf{A})$ . Define*

$$\mathcal{E} := \begin{cases} \tau^{1/2}(\sigma n)^{1/2-1/p} \cdot (\log n)^{3/2} & p > 2 \\ \tau^{1/2} \cdot (\log n)^{3/2} & p < 2 \end{cases}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{g} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n)} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i |[\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}](i)|^p \right|^l \leq \left[ (2\mathcal{E})^l (\mathcal{E}/\sigma^{1/2}) + O(\sqrt{l}\sigma^{1/2})^l \right] (R^p)^l$$

## A.4 Proof of main sampling theorems

We now prove Theorem A.1 by combining the previous results of this section.

*Proof of Theorem A.1.* By Lemma A.2, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R_i} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right| \leq \varepsilon R_i^p \quad (18)$$

for  $R_i = 2^i R$  for  $i \in [I]$ ,  $I = O(\log \varepsilon^{-1})$ . The corresponding statement for bounding

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p = 1} \left| \|\mathbf{SAx}\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p^p \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

will follow from the exact same analysis by setting  $\mathbf{b} = 0$  and  $R = 0$ .

In order to obtain (18) for a single scale with high probability, we will bound the  $l$ th moment for a large even power  $l$ . We will bound this quantity by passing to a Gaussian process bound in Lemma A.6, which we can in turn bound using Theorem A.8. Note that by our construction of the flattened instance  $\mathbf{A}''$  and  $\mathbf{b}''$  in Lemmas A.5 and A.6, we have  $\tau = O(\alpha)$  and  $\sigma = O(\alpha)$  for  $p < 2$  and  $\tau = O(\alpha)/n^{1-2/p}$  and  $\sigma = O(\alpha)$  for  $p > 2$ , so we can bound the  $\mathcal{E}$  parameter in Theorem A.8 by

$$\mathcal{E} \leq \begin{cases} O(\alpha^{1-1/p})(\log n)^{3/2} & p > 2 \\ O(\alpha^{1/2})(\log n)^{3/2} & p < 2 \end{cases}$$

In turn, the bound on the Gaussian process in Theorem A.8 is  $\delta \varepsilon^l (R_i^p)^l / (I+1)$  by our choice of  $\alpha$ , for

$$l = O\left(\log \log n + \log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right).$$

That is, we have shown that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{S}} \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R_i} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right|^l \leq \frac{\delta}{I+1} \varepsilon^l (R_i^p)^l.$$

Then by Markov's inequality, we have that

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \sup_{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_p \leq R_i} \left| \|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p - \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \right| \leq \varepsilon R_i^p \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{I+1}.$$

Now by a union bound, this is simultaneously true for all  $i \in [I]$  as well as for  $\mathbf{b} = 0$  and  $R = 0$  by a union bound, all with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . In turn, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b})\|_p^p = (1 \pm 2 \cdot 4^p \varepsilon) \|\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{b}\|_p^p \pm 2^p \varepsilon R_0^p$$

by Lemma A.2. We conclude with the desired conclusion by rescaling  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  up to constant factors.  $\square$

## B Sharper bounds for representative subspaces

We provide sharper bounds for the result of [SW18, Theorem 10].

### B.1 Sharper scalar inequalities

The following result simplifies and sharpens [SW18, Claim 2].

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $u, v, w \geq 0$  satisfy  $u^2 = v^2 - w^2$ . Then,*

$$u^p \leq \begin{cases} \min\{\varepsilon v^p, 2^{p-1}\varepsilon^{1-2/p}(v^p - w^p)\} & 1 \leq p \leq 2 \\ v^p - w^p & 2 \leq p < \infty \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The second inequality follows from the subadditivity of  $(\cdot)^{p/2}$  [SW18] so it remains to show the first. We may assume that  $v = 1$  by scaling. We also reparameterize  $w = 1 - x$  for some  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ . Then,

$$u^p = (1 - (1 - x)^2)^{p/2} \leq (2x)^{p/2}$$

and

$$\frac{u^p}{v^p - w^p} = \frac{u^p}{1 - (1 - x)^p} \leq \frac{(2x)^{p/2}}{x} = 2^{p/2} x^{p/2-1}$$

Thus, if  $x \leq \varepsilon^{2/p}/2$ , then  $u^p \leq \varepsilon$ , and if  $x \geq \varepsilon^{2/p}/2$ , then  $u^p \leq 2^{p-1}\varepsilon^{1-2/p}(v^p - w^p)$ .  $\square$

The following result sharpens [SW18, Claim 5].

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $u, v \geq 0$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then,*

$$(u + v)^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)u^p + \frac{(2p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}}v^p$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $u = 1$  by scaling. If  $v \geq 1$ , then  $(1 + v)^p \leq 2^p v^p$  so assume that  $v \leq 1$ . Then,  $(1 + v)^p \leq 1 + 2pv$  so if  $2pv \leq \varepsilon$ , then  $(1 + v)^p \leq \varepsilon$ , while if  $2pv \geq \varepsilon$ , then

$$(1 + v)^p \leq 1 + 2pv = 1 + \frac{2p}{v^{p-1}}v^p \leq 1 + \frac{(2p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}}v^p.$$

$\square$

The following result generalizes [SW18, Lemma 4] to  $p > 1$ .

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $a, b, f, g \geq 0$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then,*

$$|(a^2 + b^2)^{p/2} - (f^2 + g^2)^{p/2}| \leq \frac{(4p)^p}{2\varepsilon^{p-1}}(|a - f|^p + |b - g|^p) + \varepsilon((a^2 + b^2)^{p/2} + (f^2 + g^2)^{p/2}).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma B.2, we have that

$$\|(a, b)\|_2^p \leq (\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2 + \|(f, g)\|_2)^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|(f, g)\|_2^p + \frac{(2p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}}\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2^p$$

and similarly

$$\|(f, g)\|_2^p \leq (\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2 + \|(a, b)\|_2)^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|(a, b)\|_2^p + \frac{(2p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}}\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2^p.$$

Thus,

$$\| \|(a, b)\|_2^p - \|(f, g)\|_2^p \| \leq \frac{(2p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}}\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2^p + \varepsilon(\|(a, b)\|_2^p + \|(f, g)\|_2^p).$$

Finally, we bound

$$\|(a - f, b - g)\|_2^p \leq \|(a - f, b - g)\|_1^p \leq 2^{p-1}(|a - f|^p + |b - g|^p).$$

$\square$

## B.2 Representative subspace theorem

The first lemma shows that if  $\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2$  is small, then the projection of a vector  $\mathbf{a}$  onto  $S \cup F$  is close to its projection onto  $S$ , and the projection of  $\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F}$  onto  $F$  is close to the projection of  $\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S$  onto  $F$ .

**Lemma B.4.** *Let  $S, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be subspaces and let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be a vector. Then,*

- $\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2 = \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2 \pm \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2$
- $\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 = \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 \pm \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2$

*Proof.* These are proven in [SW18]. We reproduce a proof for the reader's convenience. The first inequality is just the triangle inequality, so it remains to show the latter. One direction of the inequality follows by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 &= \min_{\mathbf{x} \in F} \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S \mathbf{P}_F\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

and the other by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 &= \min_{\mathbf{x} \in F} \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_F\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

□

We may combine Lemma B.4 with Lemma B.3 to show the following, which states that the projection cost of  $\mathbf{a}$  onto  $F$  is approximately the sum of the cost of projecting onto  $S$ , and then projecting onto  $F$ .

**Lemma B.5.** *Let  $S, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be subspaces and let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be a vector. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^p - (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2)^{p/2} \right| &\leq \left( \frac{(4p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}} + 2^{p-1}\varepsilon \right) \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^p \\ &\quad + (2^{p-1} + 1)\varepsilon \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^p \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Note that by orthogonality,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2.$$

Then, we apply Lemma B.3 with  $a = \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2$ ,  $b = \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2$ ,  $f = \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2$ , and  $g = \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2$  as well as the bound

$$|a - b|, |f - g| \leq \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2$$

from Lemma B.4 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|(a, b)\|_2^2 - \|(f, g)\|_2^2 \right|^{p/2} &= \left| \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2 - (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2)^{p/2} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{(4p)^p}{2\varepsilon^{p-1}} (|a - f|^p + |b - g|^p) + \varepsilon (\|(a, b)\|_2^2 + \|(f, g)\|_2^2) \\ &\leq \frac{(4p)^p}{\varepsilon^{p-1}} \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^p \\ &\quad + \varepsilon (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2 + (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2)^{p/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2)^{p/2} &\leq 2^{p-1} (\|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_{S \cup F} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2)^{p/2} \\ &\quad + 2^{p-1} \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^p \\ &= 2^{p-1} \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_2^2 + 2^{p-1} \|\mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^p \end{aligned}$$

so combining the bounds gives the claimed result. □

It remains to construct a subspace  $S$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p$  is small for every  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F$ .

**Lemma B.6.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . There is an  $s$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  where  $s = O(k/\varepsilon^{\max\{2,p\}})$  such that for every  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F$ ,*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^p \text{OPT}$$

where  $\text{OPT} = \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p$ .

*Proof.* The proof largely follows [SW18] combined with our improved inequalities proved earlier. We reproduce a proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 6 in [SW18] shows that there is an  $s$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p - \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon^{\max\{2,p\}} \text{OPT} \quad (19)$$

for every  $k$ -dimensional subspace  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . We now use the fact that for any vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^\top (\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{a}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{a}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_2^2$$

by orthogonality and Lemma B.1 (with  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon^p$ ) to show that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \begin{cases} \varepsilon^p \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p + 2\varepsilon^{p-2} (\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p - \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p) & 1 \leq p < 2 \\ \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_{p,2}^p - \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p & 2 \leq p < \infty \end{cases}$$

by summing up the inequalities over vectors  $\mathbf{a}_i$  for  $i \in [n]$ . By (19), we have that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq 3\varepsilon^p \text{OPT}$$

in any case. Rescaling  $\varepsilon$  by constant factors yields the statement of the theorem.  $\square$

Finally, we combine this bound with Lemma B.5 to conclude Theorem 3.1.

## C Efficient constructions of nearly linear representative subspaces

In this section, we sharpen a result of [FKW21] and show that representative subspaces of dimension  $\tilde{O}(k)\varepsilon^{-\Theta(p)}$  can be constructed in polynomial time. This implies that strong coresets of size  $\tilde{O}(k^{\max\{1,p/2\}})\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1})$  with an added dimension can be constructed in time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})) + d\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$ . Indeed, note that the work of [HV20, WY23a] shows that strong coresets of size  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$  can be constructed in input sparsity time via sensitivity sampling, so we may assume that  $n$  and  $d$  are at most  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$ . Thus, it suffices to design a polynomial time algorithm for constructing representative subspaces. For this, we use the observation of [FKW21] that we only need an efficient bicriteria algorithm that outputs a subspace which has objective value at most  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  times the rank  $k$  optimum. The work of [FKW21] uses an algorithm with bicriteria rank  $\text{poly}(k/\varepsilon)$ . We will show instead how to improve this to an algorithm with bicriteria rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$ .

We first start with a sketching result which sharpens [CW15, Theorem 32].

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be an  $d \times r$  random Gaussian matrix for  $r = \tilde{O}((k + \log(n/\delta))/\varepsilon)$ . Then,*

$$\min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{\text{rank}(F) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{V}^*$  be an orthonormal basis for the optimal rank  $k$  projection  $\mathbf{P}^*$ , so that

$$\text{OPT} = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}^*(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p = \min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p.$$

Note that the latter problem can be viewed as  $n$  different  $\ell_2$  linear regression problems. Then by sketching with  $\mathbf{G}$  [Woo14], for each  $i \in [n]$ , we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta/n$  that  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}((\mathbf{V}^*)^\top \mathbf{G})^{-1}$  satisfies

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{A}\|_2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k} \|\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{A}\|_2.$$

By a union bound over the  $n$  rows, this is simultaneously true for all  $i \in [n]$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . Then by taking  $p$ -th powers and summing, we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}((\mathbf{V}^*)^\top \mathbf{G})^{-1}(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon)) \min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}} \|\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{V}^*)^\top - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p = (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}. \quad \square$$

The next lemma shows how Lemma C.1 implies an efficient bicriteria algorithm of rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$ .

**Lemma C.2.** *There is a poly( $nd$ ) time algorithm which, given an input matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , outputs a rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  subspace  $\hat{F}$  such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\hat{F}})\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{\text{rank}(F) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma C.1, we have that

$$\min_{\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \min_{\text{rank}(F) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p.$$

Then, we can simply drop the rank  $k$  constraint on  $\mathbf{X}$  to solve for a matrix  $\mathbf{Y}$  of rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{A}\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{Y}$  can be computed efficiently by, e.g., applying Dvoretzky's theorem to approximate the  $(p, 2)$ -norm by a  $(p, p)$ -norm and then solving an instance of  $\ell_p$  regression  $d$  times. Finally, we can take  $\hat{F} = \text{rowspan}(\mathbf{Y})$  to produce a rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  subspace such that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\hat{F}})\|_{p,2}^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}. \quad \square$$

Finally the above bicriteria algorithm can be combined with the iteration algorithm idea of [SW18], as done in [FKW21], to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem C.3.** *There is an algorithm which, given an input matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , runs in time poly( $nd$ ) and outputs a rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  subspace  $S$  such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F)\|_{p,2}^p = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \|[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_F), \mathbf{b}_S]\|_{p,2}^p$$

for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_k$ , where  $\mathbf{b}_S(i) = \|\mathbf{a}_i^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S)\|_2$ .

*Proof.* To construct a linear size representative subspace in polynomial time, we will use the work of [FKW21], which observes that  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  approximation algorithms in the algorithm of [SW18] can be replaced by  $(1 + \varepsilon)$  bicriteria approximation algorithms, which can in turn be implemented efficiently. The proof of this theorem now simply replaces the bicriteria algorithm of [FKW21] with our bicriteria algorithm of Lemma C.2 and our sharpened analysis of [SW18] in Appendix B. Note that to find a space  $S$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}_S - \mathbf{P}_{S \cup F})\|_{p,2}^p \leq \varepsilon \text{OPT}$$

the algorithm will add a rank  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  bicriteria space for  $\varepsilon^{-\max\{2/p, 1\}}$  iterations, so the resulting subspace has rank at most  $\tilde{O}(k)\varepsilon^{-\max\{2/p+1, 2\}}$ . We need to apply this with  $\varepsilon$  replaced by  $\varepsilon^p$ , so the result bound on the rank of the representative subspace is  $\tilde{O}(k)\varepsilon^{-\max\{2+p, 2p\}}$ .  $\square$