

---

# ALMOST-SURE QUASI-OPTIMAL APPROXIMATION IN REPRODUCING KERNEL HILBERT SPACES

---

✉ **Philipp Trunschke\***

Centrale Nantes  
Nantes Université  
Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray  
CNRS UMR 6629  
France  
[philipp.trunschke@univ-nantes.fr](mailto:philipp.trunschke@univ-nantes.fr)

✉ **Anthony Nouy**

Centrale Nantes  
Nantes Université  
Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray  
CNRS UMR 6629  
France  
[anthony.nouy@ec-nantes.fr](mailto:anthony.nouy@ec-nantes.fr)

## ABSTRACT

This manuscript addresses the problem of approximating an unknown function from point evaluations. When obtaining these point evaluations is costly, minimising the required sample size becomes crucial, and it is unreasonable to reserve a sufficiently large test sample for estimating the approximation accuracy. Therefore, an approximation with a certified quasi-optimality factor is required. This article shows that such an approximation can be obtained when the sought function lies in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) and is to be approximated in a finite-dimensional linear subspace. However, selecting the sample points to minimise the quasi-optimality factor requires optimising over an infinite set of points and computing exact inner products in RKHS, which is often infeasible in practice. Extending results from optimal sampling for  $L^2$  approximation, the present manuscript proves that random points, drawn independently from the Christoffel sampling distribution associated with  $\mathcal{V}_d$ , can yield a controllable quasi-optimality factor with high probability. Inspired by this result, a novel sampling scheme, coined subspace-informed volume sampling, is introduced and evaluated in numerical experiments, where it outperforms classical i.i.d. Christoffel sampling and continuous volume sampling. To reduce the size of such a random sample, an additional greedy subsampling scheme with provable suboptimality bounds is introduced. Our presentation is of independent interest to the community researching the parametrised background data weak (PBDW) method, as it offers a simpler interpretation of the method.

**Key words.** approximation · reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces · optimal sampling · volume sampling · greedy algorithm · submodular set functions

**AMS subject classifications.** 41A25 · 41A65 · 68W25 · 90C59

**Code.** [https://github.com/ptrunschke/almost\\_sure\\_least\\_squares](https://github.com/ptrunschke/almost_sure_least_squares)

## 1 Introduction

This manuscript considers the problem of approximating a function in a finite-dimensional subspace of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). It presents a method for obtaining a set of points and computing a quasi-optimal approximation using the function's values at these points.

To make this concrete, we consider the problem of approximating a function  $u : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in a  $d$ -dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d$  of a RKHS  $\mathcal{V}$  with norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  and reproducing kernel  $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The best possible approximation is given by the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}},$$

---

\*Corresponding Author.

which is, in general, impossible to compute. This paper introduces the computable, kernel-based approximation

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(u - v)\|_{\mathcal{V}},$$

where  $P_{\mathcal{V}_x}$  denotes the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection onto the space  $\mathcal{V}_x := \text{span}\{k(x_i, \bullet) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ , and corresponds to the kernel interpolation operator at points  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . This approximation is proven to satisfy the subsequent error bound.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . There exist (computable) constants  $1 \leq \mu(\mathbf{x})$  and  $0 \leq \tau(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  such that*

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq (1 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \tau(\mathbf{x})^2) \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2.$$

*Moreover, it holds that  $\tau(\mathbf{x}) \leq (1 + \sqrt{d})(1 - \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2})$ .*

Theorem 3 guarantees that the error of  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$  is proportional to the best approximation error in the  $\mathcal{V}$ -norm. In this sense, the approximation  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$  is quasi-optimal in the  $\mathcal{V}$ -norm. Moreover, since the quasi-optimality factor depends mainly on the (computable) constant  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ , it is natural to minimise this constant.

## 1.1 Structure

After section 2 concisely introduces some required notations, section 3 defines the projection operator  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}$  and proves the main Theorem 3. Section 4 starts by deriving basic properties of the quasi-optimality constants  $\mu$  and  $\tau$ . Subsequently, it discusses that optimising  $\mu$  is NP-hard and proposes to use a probabilistic approach to generate the point sets  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . This idea is justified by demonstrating that drawing  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  by continuous volume sampling [BBC20] already yields a small value of  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  with non-zero probability. Section 5 introduces a novel sampling method that is better adapted to the problem of minimising  $\mu$ , and section 6 discusses a greedy sample selection strategy that can be used to reduce the sample size. Finally, section 7 extends the error bounds from Theorem 3 to perturbed observations and section 8 provides experimental evidence for the proposed methods. Section 9 concludes the paper by discussing some limitations of the presented method.

## 1.2 Related work

**Least squares approximation.** Controlling the quasi-optimality constant through  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  is not a new idea and has already been considered in the context of least squares approximation. In this context, we require a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and suppose that  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq L^2(\nu)$  (Note that the existence of a measure  $\nu$  is not required for the kernel-based regression!). Then the  $L^2(\nu)$ -orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is well-defined and we can denote it by  $Q_{\mathcal{V}_d}$ . Moreover, for a fixed weight function  $w : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  satisfying  $\int w^{-1} d\nu = 1$  and point set  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , we can define the empirical projection

$$Q_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} |u - v|_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \quad \text{with} \quad |u - v|_{\mathbf{x}}^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(x_i) |u(x_i) - v(x_i)|^2. \quad (1)$$

Drawing  $\mathbf{x} \sim (w^{-1}\nu)^{\otimes n}$ , one can prove [CM17] that

$$\|u - Q_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \leq \|u - Q_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 + \mu_{L^2}(\mathbf{x}) \|u - Q_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_{L^2}(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2}{|v|_{\mathbf{x}}^2}.$$

The aim of many sampling methods (cf. [CM17; DWH22; HNP22; NM24]) is to bound the quasi-optimality factor  $\mu_{L^2}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{\star}$  with high probability  $p_{\star}$ . Conditioned on this event, it then holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|u - Q_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \right] \leq (1 + \frac{\mu_{\star}}{p_{\star}}) \|u - Q_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2.$$

Even though both approximations solve different problems, this error bound is similar to the bound of Theorem 3. However, compared to the least squares approximation  $Q_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$ , our kernel-based approximation  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$  has several theoretical advantages.

- Quasi-best approximation guarantees of Theorem 3 hold almost surely and not just in expectation. This gives confidence to practitioners who want their approximation to be correct in all cases and not just in expectation.
- Almost sure error bounds make it easy to reuse previously used sample points while error bounds that hold in expectation must navigate the difficulties of statistical dependence.
- A critical difference is that the constant  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  decreases when adding additional data points, while this is not guaranteed for the constant  $\mu_{L^2}(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Kernel interpolation.** When approximating the function  $u$  living in a RKHS  $\mathcal{V}$  using point evaluations at  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , it is natural to consider the kernel interpolation  $P_{\mathcal{V}_x} u$ . The advantage of the proposed method over kernel interpolation lies in the fact that we can introduce further knowledge about the function  $u$  to reduce the error. Suppose that  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$  is a bounded Lipschitz domain and that  $\mathcal{V} = H^s(\mathcal{X})$  for some  $s > \frac{D}{2}$ . Then classical convergence rates for kernel interpolation (cf. [Kem23, Corollary 2.3.11]) are given by

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} u\|_{H^t(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim n^{-(t-s)/D}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq s,$$

for all  $u \in H^s(\mathcal{X})$ . This rate is always algebraic and suffers the curse of dimensionality. Moreover, we only obtain meaningful rates when the error is measured in the weaker  $H^t(\mathcal{X})$ -norm for  $t < s$ . In contrast, the proposed kernel-based least squares approximation provides quasi-optimal approximation errors in the  $H^s(\mathcal{X})$ -norm.

To illustrate this point, suppose that  $u$  admits the convergence rate

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \lesssim d^{-r}$$

for some  $r > 0$  and some sequence of linear spaces  $\{\mathcal{V}_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Theorem 3 ensures that every linear space  $\mathcal{V}_d$  admits a suboptimality constant  $\mu_d(\mathbf{x})$  such that

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq (1 + \mu_d(\mathbf{x})^2) \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2.$$

If we can find for every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  a point set  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  satisfying  $\mu_d(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu^*$  with  $n \leq Cd$  (for some fixed  $\mu^*$  and  $C$ ), we obtain the convergence rate

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_{n/C}}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \lesssim n^{-r}.$$

Although it is not clear if such point sets always exist, Corollary 9 provides several examples. Moreover, when the original approximation rate is exponential, we still obtain an exponential rate of convergence even if the number of points grows algebraically.

**PBDW method.** Combining the approximation  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$  with a kernel interpolation of the residual  $P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u$  gives rise to the parameterised background data weak (PBDW) method [CDMS22; MPPY15], which defines the interpolant

$$u^{d,\mathbf{x}} := P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u + P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u.$$

Theorem 3 and the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonality of the kernel interpolation operator  $P_{\mathcal{V}_x}$  trivially yield the PBDW error bound

$$\|u - u^{d,\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq 2\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq 2\sqrt{1 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \tau(\mathbf{x})^2} \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

Note that this error bound is not optimal, since  $u^{d,\mathbf{x}} \in (\mathcal{V}_d + \mathcal{V}_x)$  is compared to  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d} u \in \mathcal{V}_d$ . However, using intricate properties of the projectors, we can obtain the tighter bound

$$\|u - u^{d,\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \mu(\mathbf{x}) \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d \oplus (\mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{V}_d^\perp)} u\|_{\mathcal{V}}. \quad (2)$$

First presented in a more general setting in [Bin+15], we provide a simplified proof of this bound in Appendix A.

**Optimal measurements selection.** In the more general context of approximating a function from bounded linear measurements, [BCM18] introduced a greedy optimisation strategy for selecting optimal measurements. This strategy, however, requires optimising over an infinite set of measurements and computing exact dual pairings, which is often infeasible in practice.

## 2 Notations

- $\mathcal{V}$  is a RKHS of functions on the set  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- The inner product of  $\mathcal{V}$  is denoted by  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{V}}$  and the norm of  $\mathcal{V}$  is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$ .
- The reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{V}$  is denoted by  $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .
- $\mathcal{V}_d$  is a fixed,  $d$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathcal{V}$ .
- For any  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  we let  $P_{\mathcal{W}}$  denote the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{W}$ .
- We identify a finite sequence of functions  $b_1, \dots, b_m : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  with the vector-valued function  $b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^m$ .
- It will be convenient to assign an arbitrary ordering to the point sets and view them as elements of  $\mathcal{X}^n$ . The ordering has no influence on the theoretical arguments and is only used to simplify the notation.

- Given two point sets  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^m$ , we write  $\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^{n+m}$  as the concatenation of both vectors.
- We define for any function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  the vector of evaluations  $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{Y}^n$  by  $f(\mathbf{x})_k := f(x_k)$ .
- One important instance of this notation is the partial evaluation of the kernel  $k$ . Interpreting the kernel as a function  $k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ , we can write  $k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ .
- Another important instance is the matrix of evaluations of a vector-valued function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  on points  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . Using the introduced notation we can interpret  $f(\mathbf{x}) \in (\mathbb{R}^m)^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  as  $f(\mathbf{x})_{jk} := f(x_k)_j$ . The indices are ordered mnemonically. “ $f$ ” comes before “ $\mathbf{x}$ ” in “ $f(\mathbf{x})$ ” and the index  $j$  comes before  $k$ .
- $\text{span}(b) = \text{span}\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$  denotes the linear space generated by  $b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ .
- $k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)$  forms a generating system of the linear space

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}} := \text{span}(k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)) = \text{span}\{k(x_1, \bullet), \dots, k(x_n, \bullet)\}.$$

- Due to its significance, we define the special notation

$$K(\mathbf{x}) := k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n},$$

which is not only the evaluation of  $k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)$  at the point set  $\mathbf{x}$  but also the Gramian matrix (or kernel matrix)

$$K(\mathbf{x})_{jk} = (k(x_j, \bullet), k(x_k, \bullet))_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

- Let  $b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . Then the reproducing kernel for  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is given by

$$k_d(x, y) := (P_{\mathcal{V}_d} \otimes P_{\mathcal{V}_d})k = b(x)^\top b(y).$$

We denote the corresponding kernel matrix by  $K_d(\mathbf{x})$ .

### 3 Noiseless observations

Given a point set  $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , we let  $P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}}$  denote the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}} = \text{span}(k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet))$ , and we define the (semi-)inner product and its induced (semi-)norm by

$$(\bullet, \bullet)_{\mathbf{x}} := (P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \bullet, \bullet)_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bullet\|_{\mathbf{x}} := \|P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \bullet\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

We let  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}$  denote the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  with respect to the (semi-)inner-product  $(\bullet, \bullet)_{\mathbf{x}}$ , defined for  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  by

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|u - v\|_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

The minimiser is uniquely defined when the constant

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) := \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}}}$$

is finite.

**Remark 1.** Note that  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$  ensures that the mapping  $P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} : \mathcal{V}_d \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{V}_d$  is invertible, and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u &:= \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}}(u - v)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}}^{-1} \arg \min_{v \in P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{V}_d} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}}^{-1} P_{P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{V}_d} P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} u \\ &= P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}}^{-1} P_{P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{V}_d} u, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from  $P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{V}_d \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}$ .

The subsequent lemma tightens the error bound for this type of approximation that was first presented in Theorem 2.3 of [CDMS22]. The magic of this almost sure error bound comes from the definition of the discrete norm  $\|\bullet\|_{\mathbf{x}}$ , which is always dominated by the  $\mathcal{V}$ -norm. This stands in contrast to standard least-squares projections, which do not exploit any information about the sought function. The norm can also be seen as an instance of the measurement by random projectors, which is studied in [ACD23; EST22; GNT24].

**Lemma 2.** Let  $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . Then  $(v, w)_{\mathbf{x}} = v(\mathbf{x})^\top K(\mathbf{x})^+ w(\mathbf{x})$ .

*Proof.* Since  $P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} v = v(\mathbf{x})^\top K(\mathbf{x})^+ k(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^n (K(\mathbf{x})^+ v(\mathbf{x}))_j k(x_j, \cdot)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (v, w)_{\mathbf{x}} &= (P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} v, P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} w)_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^n (K(\mathbf{x})^+ v(\mathbf{x}))_j (k(x_j, \cdot), k(x_k, \cdot))_{\mathcal{V}} (K(\mathbf{x})^+ w(\mathbf{x}))_k \\ &= v(\mathbf{x})^\top K(\mathbf{x})^+ K(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ w(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= v(\mathbf{x})^\top K(\mathbf{x})^+ w(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Theorem 3.** Let  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and define the Gramian matrix  $G_{jk}^{\mathbf{x}} := (b_j, b_k)_{\mathbf{x}} = (b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top)_{jk}$ . Then  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2}$  and

$$\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq (1 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \tau(\mathbf{x})^2) \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2,$$

with the constant  $\tau(\mathbf{x}) := \min\{\|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{Fro}} + \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2, 1\}$ .

*Proof.* Since every  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$  can be written as  $v(x) = c^\top b(x)$ , Lemma 2 implies

$$\mu(\mathbf{x})^2 = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}}^2} = \left( \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\|c^\top b\|_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{\|c\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \right)^{-1} = \left( \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{c^\top b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top c}{\|c\|_2^2} \right)^{-1} = \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1}.$$

Moreover, since  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}$  is a projection, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 &= \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \|(P_{\mathcal{V}_d} - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \\ &\leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \|(P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \\ &= \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \\ &\leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \mu(\mathbf{x})^2 \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}^2 \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Defining the operator  $A = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})$ , it remains to bound  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \tau(\mathbf{x})$ . Since  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}$  is an  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathbf{x}}$ -orthogonal projection and  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection, it holds for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  that

$$\|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})v\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})v\|_{\mathbf{x}} \leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})v\|_{\mathbf{x}} \leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

This implies  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq 1$ . Deriving the bound  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{Fro}} + \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$  is more involved and therefore deferred to the Lemma 34 in Appendix B.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** It was already noted in [Bin+15, Remark 2.13] that  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  can be computed as the smallest singular value of the cross-Gramian matrix  $H_{jk}^{\mathbf{x}} := (b_j, \omega_k)_{\mathcal{V}}$ , where  $b_1, \dots, b_d$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_d$  and  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_x$ . When  $K(\mathbf{x}) = \Lambda U U^\top$  is the rank-revealing spectral decomposition, such a basis can be defined by  $\omega = \Lambda^{-1/2} U^\top k(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ . The smallest singular value of  $H^{\mathbf{x}}$  is given by the smallest eigenvalue of  $H^{\mathbf{x}}(H^{\mathbf{x}})^\top = G^{\mathbf{x}}$ , and the assertion follows from Theorem 3.

## 4 Controlling the error

Theorem 3 implies that to control the error of the projection  $P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u$ , it is sufficient to control the constant  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ . It is, therefore, natural to ask whether we can minimise this constant. Qualitative approximation guarantees can be derived with the help of the subsequent lemma.

**Lemma 5.** It holds that  $\lambda_{\max}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 2 implies that

$$\lambda_{\max}(b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top) = \max_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{c^\top b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top c}{\|c\|_2^2} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \leq 1. \quad \square$$

The above lemma will be useful in multiple places and can be used directly to derive the subsequent bounds on  $\tau(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Remark 6.** Minimising the factor  $\tau(\mathbf{x})$  is equivalent to minimising  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  in the sense that

$$\min\{2(1 - \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2}), 1\} \leq \tau(\mathbf{x}) \leq \min\{(1 + \sqrt{d})(1 - \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2}), 1\}.$$

To see this, we use that Lemma 5 implies  $0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 1$  and, consequently,

$$\|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 = \lambda_{\max}(I - G^{\mathbf{x}}) = 1 - \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = 1 - \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2}.$$

The claim follows due to the norm equivalence  $\|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 \leq \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{Fro}} \leq \sqrt{d}\|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$ .

Another consequence of Lemma 5 is the subsequent qualitative approximation guarantees.

**Proposition 7.** For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , the following properties are satisfied.

(i)  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1$ .

(ii)  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$  when  $n < d$ .

(iii) For every  $\mu_{\star} > 1$  there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a sample  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  such that  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{\star}$ .

*Proof.* Property (i) follows from Theorem 3 and Lemma 5, since  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2} \geq \lambda_{\max}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2} \geq 1$ . The claim (ii) follows from Theorem 3, since  $b(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  and therefore  $G^{\mathbf{x}}$  is at most of rank  $n < d$ . To show (iii), let  $S(\mathcal{V}_d) := \{v \in \mathcal{V}_d : \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}} = 1\}$  and recall that

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\sqrt{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - \|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}} = \max_{v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}}.$$

It hence suffices to show that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a sample  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \varepsilon$  for every  $v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)$ . Once this is proven, the claim follows by choosing  $\varepsilon = (1 - \mu_{\star}^{-2})^{1/2}$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is finite-dimensional, the unit sphere  $S(\mathcal{V}_d)$  is compact, and there exists an  $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -covering with centres  $\{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ . This means that for every  $v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)$  there exists a centre  $c_{i(v)}$  such that

$$\|v - c_{i(v)}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By the Moore–Aronszajn theorem we know that  $\mathcal{V} = \overline{\text{span}\{k(x, \cdot) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}}$ . This implies that every  $c_i$  can be approximated by

$$\tilde{c}_i := \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{i,j} k(x_{i,j}, \cdot)$$

for some choice of  $x_{i,j} \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $m_i$ , with an error of  $\|c_i - \tilde{c}_i\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . We now define the sample  $\mathbf{x} := (x_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m_i}$  and observe that  $\tilde{c}_i \in \mathcal{V}_x$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Therefore

$$\|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\| \leq \|v - \tilde{c}_{i(v)}\| \leq \|v - c_{i(v)}\| + \|c_{i(v)} - \tilde{c}_{i(v)}\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

The preceding theorem guarantees that we can always find a sample such that the suboptimality factor  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  deceeds a prespecified threshold  $\mu_{\star}$ . However, it does not tell us how large this sample needs to be, nor does it provide a strategy to generate it. This question is addressed by the subsequent theorem.

To prove this result, we assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(\nu)$  for some probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, the integral operator

$$\Sigma : v \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\cdot, y) v(y) d\nu(y),$$

is compact from  $L^2(\nu)$  to  $L^2(\nu)$  and admits a spectral decomposition

$$\Sigma = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_m \phi_m(\phi_m, \cdot)_{L^2},$$

where  $\{\phi_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an  $L^2(\nu)$ -orthonormal and  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal system. This corresponds to a decomposition of the kernel  $k(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_m \phi_m(x) \phi_m(y)$ , which converges pointwise. Moreover, we assume that  $\Sigma$  is a trace-class (or nuclear) operator, i.e. that  $\int K(x) d\nu(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_m < \infty$ . Then it can be shown [BBC20] that

$$\det(K(\mathbf{x})) d\nu^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$$

is a finite measure.

**Theorem 8** (Proposition 5 and Theorem 6 in [BBC20]). Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(\nu)$  for some probability measure  $\nu$  on  $X$  and that  $\int K(x) d\nu(x) < \infty$ . Moreover, suppose that  $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies either

- $\lambda_m = \lambda_m^{\text{alg}} = m^{-2s}$  for some  $s > 1/2$  (e.g. Sobolev spaces of finite smoothness) or
- $\lambda_m = \lambda_m^{\text{exp}} = \alpha^m$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  (e.g. the Gaussian kernel),

and define  $B := B^{\text{alg}}(s) := (1 + \frac{1}{2s-1})^{2s}$  if  $\lambda = \lambda^{\text{alg}}$  or  $B := B^{\text{exp}}(\alpha) := \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$  if  $\lambda = \lambda^{\text{exp}}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{x} \in X^n$  be drawn from the (unnormalised) continuous volume sampling distribution

$$\det(K(\mathbf{x})) d\nu^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3)$$

Then for any  $v \in \Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{V}$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2] \leq (2 + B)\lambda_n \|\Sigma^{-1/2} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2.$$

**Corollary 9.** Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(\nu)$  for some probability measure  $\nu$  on  $X$  and that  $\int K(x) d\nu(x) < \infty$ . Moreover, suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  satisfies the regularity conditions from Theorem 8 and that  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq \Sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x} \in X^n$  be drawn from the continuous volume sampling distribution (3). Then, using the same notations as in Theorem 8, for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , it holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}}\right] \leq \frac{(2 + B)C_d^2 \lambda_n}{\varepsilon^2},$$

where  $C_d := \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|\Sigma^{-1/2} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{V}_d = \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d\}$ , then  $C_d^2 = \lambda_d^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\sqrt{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - \|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}}.$$

Theorem 8 guarantees that for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2] \leq (2 + B)C_d^2 \lambda_n \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2.$$

Markov's inequality thus implies

$$\mathbb{P}[\|v - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \geq \varepsilon \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}] \leq \frac{(2 + B)C_d^2 \lambda_n}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

To prove the final claim, recall that  $\Sigma^{-1/2} v = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_l^{-1/2} (v, \phi_l)_{L^2} \phi_l$  and therefore,

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(v, \phi_l)_{L^2}^2}{\lambda_l} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Sigma^{-1/2} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(v, \phi_l)_{L^2}^2}{\lambda_l^2}.$$

Defining the matrix  $A_d := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$  and expanding  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$  in terms of  $\phi_l$ , it thus holds that

$$C_d^2 = \max_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{c^\top A_d^{-2} c}{c^\top A_d^{-1} c} = \lambda_{\max}(A_d^{-1}) = \lambda_{\min}(A_d)^{-1} = \lambda_d^{-1}. \quad \square$$

Theorem 8 guarantees that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_\star] \geq 1 - (2 + B)C_d^2 \lambda_n \frac{\mu_\star^2}{\mu_\star^2 - 1}.$$

For any  $n$  for which this lower bound is positive, there exists a sample set  $\mathbf{x}$  that satisfies  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_\star$ . In particular, when  $\mathcal{V}_d = \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d\}$  is spanned by the first  $d$  spectral basis functions of the RKHS  $\mathcal{V}$ , we know that  $C_d^2 = \lambda_d^{-1}$ , and therefore

$$(2 + B)C_d^2 \lambda_n \frac{\mu_\star^2}{\mu_\star^2 - 1} \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} n \geq d \left( (2 + B^{\text{alg}}(s)) \frac{\mu_\star^2}{\mu_\star^2 - 1} \right)^{1/2s} & \lambda_n = n^{-2s} \\ n \geq d + \log_\alpha \left( (2 + B^{\text{exp}}(\alpha)) \frac{\mu_\star^2}{\mu_\star^2 - 1} \right) & \lambda_n = \alpha^n. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This not only guarantees the existence of a sample  $\mathbf{x}$  of size  $n \propto d$  satisfying  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_\star$  but also provides a strategy for generating such a sample. However, this bound only holds under strong assumptions on  $\mathcal{V}_d$  and counter-examples are provided in sections 8.1 and 8.2.

**Remark 10.** *The problem of minimising  $\mu$  has also been considered in the context of optimal sensor placement [BCMN18]. We can compare the sample size bound from equation (4) to the one provided in [BCMN18]. In the setting when  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1(0, 1)$  and when  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is the span of the first  $d$  Fourier basis elements, [BCMN18, Theorem 2.3] guarantees the existence of a sample  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  with  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_\star$  and  $n \propto d$ . Theorem 8 extends this bound to more general RKHS (such as  $H^s(\mathcal{X})$  for  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $s > \frac{d}{2}$ ) under suitable regularity assumptions and for any choice of subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d$  satisfying assumptions of Corollary 9.*

## 5 Sampling the points

Minimising  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2}$  over  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  for a fixed sample size  $n$  is a non-trivial, non-convex problem and potentially NP-hard.<sup>2</sup> However, the Theorem 8 from the preceding section shows that exact optimisation is not necessary and that good point sets  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  can already be obtained by sampling.

Building on this insight, we propose to replace the minimisation of  $\mu$  with a related sampling problem. We suppose that there exists some measure  $\rho$  for which the integral  $Z := \int \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite. Then

$$Z^{-1} \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$$

constitutes a probability measure and we can draw  $\mathbf{x}$  according to this measure.

Compared to classical continuous volume sampling from  $\det(K(\mathbf{x})) d\nu^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$ , sampling from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  has two major advantages. Firstly, the theory of continuous volume sampling (see Corollary 9) requires a strong integrability condition  $\int K(x) d\nu(x) < \infty$ . Secondly, the theory of continuous volume sampling depends on the embedding constant  $C_d$ , which is hard to compute and potentially very large.

To see why sampling from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  is a sensible idea, we first argue that  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  is a good surrogate for minimising  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2}$ . Recall that Lemma 5 ensures that  $0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 1$  and therefore

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})^{1/d}.$$

Hence, the value of the determinant provides a bound on the smallest eigenvalue, which in turn bounds  $\mu$ . Replacing the maximisation of the surrogate  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  with a sample from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  is a classical idea in global optimisation and, in principle, justified by the Paley–Zygmund inequality, which provides lower bounds for the probability that a sample lies in a certain superlevel set of the objective function. The reason for using the surrogate in the first place, even though it does not reduce the complexity of the optimisation problem,<sup>3</sup> is that it simplifies the sampling.

It remains to find a measure  $\rho$  for which the normalisation constant  $Z = \int \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite. This question is addressed in the subsequent lemma.

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $\rho$  be a finite measure on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The function  $\mathcal{X}^n \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  with  $G^{\mathbf{x}} = \det(b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^\top)$ , is non-negative and  $\rho^{\otimes n}$ -integrable.*

*Proof.* To show non-negativity, recall that  $K(\mathbf{x})$  is a kernel matrix, and thus positive semidefinite by definition. This implies that  $K(\mathbf{x})^+$  and therefore  $G^{\mathbf{x}} = b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^\top$  are positive semidefinite matrices. This proves that  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  is non-negative. To show integrability, recall that Lemma 5 ensures  $0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 1$  and therefore

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 1.$$

This implies

$$\int \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}) < \infty. \quad \square$$

**Remark 12.** *Note that the definition of the sampling density  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  depends on the arbitrary measure  $\rho$ , which does not appear in the definition of  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ . This introduces an artificial preference of some  $\mathbf{x}$  over others, which does not result from maximising  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ . There are indeed uncountably many choices for  $\rho$ , and the optimal choice would be as close as possible to a mixture of discrete measures  $\delta_{x_1^\star}, \dots, \delta_{x_n^\star}$  where  $\mathbf{x}^\star = \{x_1^\star, \dots, x_n^\star\}$  is a maximiser of  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  or even a minimiser of  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ .*

<sup>2</sup>In case  $\mathcal{X}$  has finite cardinality and  $K(\mathbf{x}) = I$ , minimising  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ , i.e. maximising  $\lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ , is equivalent to an E-optimal design problem, which is known to be NP-hard [CM09].

<sup>3</sup>In case  $\mathcal{X}$  has finite cardinality and  $K(\mathbf{x}) = I$ , maximising  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  is equivalent to a D-optimal design problem, which is known to be NP-hard [Wel82].



In the following, we consider a generalisation of the above sampling distribution of the form

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n)(\mathbf{x}) \quad (5)$$

where  $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of possibly distinct measures.

### 5.1 Drawing a sample of size $d$

Assuming  $\det(K(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$ , we can factorise the determinant as

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = \det(b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^\top) = \frac{\det(b(\mathbf{x})^\top b(\mathbf{x}))}{\det(K(\mathbf{x}))} = \frac{\det(K_d(\mathbf{x}))}{\det(K(\mathbf{x}))}.$$

The density is a ratio of densities of determinantal point processes, and the resulting distribution appears as a competition between a repulsive point process associated with the kernel  $k_d$  and an attractive point process associated with the kernel  $k$ . We now decompose  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^d$  as  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{<d} \oplus x_d = \mathbf{x}_{<d-1} \oplus x_{d-1} \oplus x_d = \dots$  and write

$$K(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} K(\mathbf{x}_{<d}) & k(\mathbf{x}_{<d}, x_d) \\ k(x_d, \mathbf{x}_{<d}) & K(x_d) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $K(x_d) > 0$ , it follows that  $\ker(K(\mathbf{x}_{<d})) = 0$ , and we can use Schur's formula to compute

$$\det(K(\mathbf{x})) = \det(K(\mathbf{x}_{<d}))(K(x_d) - k(x_d, \mathbf{x}_{<d})K(\mathbf{x}_{<d})^{-1}k(\mathbf{x}_{<d}, x_d)).$$

Recursive application of this relation to both kernels yields the factorisation

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{\det(K_d(\mathbf{x}))}{\det(K(\mathbf{x}))} = \prod_{i=1}^d q(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}) \quad \text{with} \quad q(x | \mathbf{x}) := \frac{K_d(x) - k_d(x, \mathbf{x})K_d(\mathbf{x})^{-1}k_d(\mathbf{x}, x)}{K(x) - k(x, \mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^{-1}k(\mathbf{x}, x)}. \quad (6)$$

**Proposition 13.** Suppose that  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  are such that the functions

$$Z_i : \mathcal{X}^{i-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad Z_i : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \int q(x | \mathbf{x}) d\rho_i(x)$$

are constant for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then, the probability density

$$p(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z} \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \quad \text{with} \quad Z := \int \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x})$$

can be written in terms of the conditional probabilities  $p(\mathbf{x}) = p(x_1)p(x_2 | \mathbf{x}_{<2}) \cdots p(x_d | \mathbf{x}_{<d})$  and

$$p(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}) = \frac{1}{Z_i} q(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}).$$

Moreover, if  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \cdots = \rho_d = \rho$ , the marginal density of any component  $x_i$  of  $\mathbf{x} \sim \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n)(\mathbf{x})$  is proportional to  $\frac{K_d(x_i)}{K(x_i)}$ .

*Proof.* To compute the conditional probabilities, recall that

$$p(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i})}{\int p(\mathbf{x}_{\leq i}) d\rho_i(x_i)} = \frac{\int p(\mathbf{x}) d(\rho_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x}_{>i})}{\int p(\mathbf{x}) d(\rho_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x}_{\geq i})}.$$

Now recall that  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = \det(b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^\top)$ . Since  $\det(K(\mathbf{x})) = 0$  implies  $\det(K(\mathbf{x})^+) = 0$  and thus  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ , sampling from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$  guarantees that  $\det(K(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$  almost surely. We can thus use the factorisation of the determinantal density from equation (6) and write

$$\int p(\mathbf{x}) d(\rho_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x}_{\geq i}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{<j}) \int \prod_{j=i}^d q(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{<j}) d(\rho_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x}_{\geq i}).$$

Using the assumption that the  $Z_i$ -functions are constant, we can compute the integral on the right-hand side as

$$\int \prod_{j=i}^d q(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{<j}) d(\rho_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x}_{\geq i}) = \prod_{j=i}^d Z_j.$$




Figure 1: Distribution of  $Z_i(\mathbf{x}_{<i>})$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^d$  drawn according to  $x_i \sim q(\bullet \mid \mathbf{x}_{<i>}) \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K \nu$ , with  $\mathfrak{R}$  and  $\nu$  as in Theorem 16. The experiment was performed with  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$ , and with  $\mathcal{V}_d$  being the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to 9 satisfying the boundary conditions  $v(-1) = v(1) = 0$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$ . See Section 8 for further information.

Inserting these expressions into the definition of the conditional probability yields

$$p(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{<i>}) = \frac{\frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j=1}^i q(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{<j>}) \prod_{j=i+1}^d Z_j}{\frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{<j>}) \prod_{j=i}^d Z_j} = \frac{q(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{<i>})}{Z_i}.$$

Now suppose that  $\rho := \rho_1 = \dots = \rho_d$  and observe that the factorisation of  $p$  into conditional probabilities yields  $x_1 \sim \frac{K_d(x_1)}{K(x_1)} d\rho(x_1)$ . This proves that the marginal density of  $x_1$  is  $\frac{K_d}{K}$ . Since the probability  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes d}(\mathbf{x})$  is invariant under permutation of the points, the marginal probability density functions must be the same for all  $x_i$ .  $\square$

Proposition 13 provides a way to draw  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^d$  from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_d)(\mathbf{x})$  by sequential conditional sampling, first drawing  $x_1$ , then  $x_2$  given  $x_1$ , then  $x_3$  given  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , and so on. In order to apply this result, it is necessary to find  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  such that the parametric integrals  $Z_i$  remain constant. However, strict adherence to this condition is not necessary because it is possible to choose  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  such that the  $Z_i$  functions remain in a bounded interval and use the resulting sample as a proposal for rejection sampling. Figure 1 shows that this is the case for the choice  $\rho_1 = \dots = \rho_d \propto \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K \nu$ , where  $\mathfrak{R}$  and  $\nu$  are defined as in Theorem 16.

## 5.2 Drawing a sample of size $n > d$

For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n-1}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{X}$ , we can decompose

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}} v = P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}} v + (v, \omega_y) \mathcal{V} \omega_y, \quad v \in \mathcal{V},$$

with  $\omega_y := \frac{\tilde{\omega}_y}{\|\tilde{\omega}_y\|_{\mathcal{V}}}$  and  $\tilde{\omega}_y := (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}}})k(y, \bullet)$ . The Gramian matrix can thus be written in terms of the rank-1 update

$$G_{jk}^{\mathbf{x} \oplus y} = (P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}} b_j, P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}} b_k)_{\mathcal{V}} = G_{jk}^{\mathbf{x}} + (g_y)_j (g_y)_k, \quad (7)$$

with  $(g_y)_j := (\omega_y, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}}$ . Assuming  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \neq 0$ , we can factorise the determinant as

$$\det(G^{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}) = \det(G^{\mathbf{x}} + g_y g_y^{\top}) = (1 + r(y | \mathbf{x})) \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \quad \text{with} \quad r(y | \mathbf{x}) := g_y^{\top} (G^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1} g_y \quad (8)$$

via the matrix determinant lemma. To compute this explicitly, note that  $\tilde{\omega}_y = k(y, \cdot) - k(y, \mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^{-1}k(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ , and therefore  $(\tilde{\omega}_y, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}} = b_j(y) - b_j(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^{-1}k(\mathbf{x}, y)$  and  $\|\tilde{\omega}_y\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = K(y) - k(y, \mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^{-1}k(\mathbf{x}, y)$ .

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $n > d$  and  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n$  be a sequence of probability measures. Suppose that  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n-1}$  is distributed according to  $\mathbf{x} \sim \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{n-1})(\mathbf{x})$  and  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  is distributed according to  $y \sim (1 + r(y | \mathbf{x})) d\rho_n(y)$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{x} \oplus y \sim \det(G^{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_n)(\mathbf{x} \oplus y).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{x} \sim \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ , it holds that  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) \neq 0$  almost surely. We can, therefore, factorise the determinant as described in equation (8) and compute

$$\int \det(G^{\mathbf{x} \oplus y}) d\rho_n(y) = \int \underbrace{(1 + r(y | \mathbf{x}))}_{=Z(\mathbf{x})} d\rho_n(y) \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Consequently, the conditional probability density of  $p(\mathbf{x} \oplus y) \propto \det(G^{\mathbf{x} \oplus y})$  given  $\mathbf{x}$  is given by

$$p(y | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x} \oplus y)}{\int p(\mathbf{x} \oplus y) d\rho_n(y)} = \frac{1 + r(y | \mathbf{x})}{Z(\mathbf{x})}. \quad \square$$

**Remark 15.** *Proposition 14 proves that the conditional density of  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ , given  $\mathbf{x}_{<n}$ , is a mixture of the uniform density and  $r(x_n | \mathbf{x}_{<n})$ . To examine the implications of this result on the sample  $\mathbf{x} \sim \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$ , recall that  $r(x_n | \mathbf{x}_{<n}) = g_{x_n}^{\top} (G^{\mathbf{x}_{<n}})^{-1} g_{x_n} \leq \lambda_{\min}(G^{\mathbf{x}_{<n}})^{-1} \|g_{x_n}\|_2^2$  and*

$$\|g_{x_n}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{\|\tilde{\omega}_{x_n}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \sum_{j=1}^d (\tilde{\omega}_{x_n}, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \frac{1}{\|\tilde{\omega}_{x_n}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d (\tilde{\omega}_{x_n}, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}} b_j \right\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_d} \tilde{\omega}_{x_n}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|\tilde{\omega}_{x_n}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \leq 1.$$

*We can thus conclude from Theorem 3 that  $0 \leq r(x_n | \mathbf{x}_{<n}) \leq \mu(\mathbf{x}_{<n})^2$ . This indicates that when  $\mu(\mathbf{x}_{<n})$  is small, the conditional density of  $x_n$  contains a non-negligible uniform part. I.e., for large sample sizes  $n$ , many of the points  $x_i$  will be i.i.d. with respect to  $\rho$ . This once again underscores the importance of the choice of  $\rho$  discussed in Remark 12.*

Algorithm 1 presents a heuristic sampling algorithm returning a sample  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  which is approximately distributed according to  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d(\rho_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_n)(\mathbf{x})$  and with  $n$  such that  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{\star}$ .

---

#### Algorithm 1: Heuristic determinantal sampling algorithm

---

**Data:**  $\mu_{\star} > 1$  and sequence of probability measures  $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$

**Result:**  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  satisfying  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{\star}$

- 1 Set  $\mathbf{x} := \emptyset$
  - 2 **for**  $i := 1$  **to**  $d$  **do**
  - 3     Draw  $x_i \sim q(\cdot | \mathbf{x}) \rho_i$  with  $q$  as in equation (6)
  - 4     Update  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} \oplus \{x_i\}$
  - 5 **end**
  - 6 Set  $i := d + 1$
  - 7 **while**  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) > \mu_{\star}$  **do**
  - 8     Draw  $x_i \sim (1 + r(\cdot | \mathbf{x})) \rho_i$  with  $r$  as in equation (8)
  - 9     Update  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} \oplus \{x_i\}$
  - 10    Set  $i := i + 1$
  - 11 **end**
  - 12 Set  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{y}$
-

### 5.3 Theoretical guarantees

The preceding sections establish that sampling from the (unnormalised) probability measure  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  is well-defined and provide a concrete strategy for sampling from this distribution. However, as discussed in Remark 12, the introduction of  $\rho$  is artificial, and a proper choice of this measure is important to ensure  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu^*$  with high probability. The subsequent theorem provides probability bounds for a specific choice of  $\rho$ , and the subsequent corollaries investigate its implication to the proposed sampling scheme.

**Theorem 16.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}_d$  can be embedded into  $L^2(\nu)$  for some probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and let*

$$\mathfrak{K}(x) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{|v(x)|^2}{\|v\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2} \quad (9)$$

*be the classical inverse Christoffel function (or variation function) for the space  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . Then, if  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  are i.i.d. with  $\tilde{x}_i \sim \frac{1}{d}\mathfrak{K}\nu$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \mu_\star] \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{2n\delta_\star^2}{d}\right), \quad \text{with} \quad \delta_\star := \frac{\mu_\star^2 - 1}{\mu_\star^2 + 1}.$$

*For the particular choice  $\mu_\star = 2$  this yields  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 2] \leq 2d \exp(-\frac{n}{2d})$ .*

*Proof.* The idea of this proof is to find a norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  satisfying  $\|v\|_n = \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}v\|_n$  and the restricted isometry property (RIP)

$$|\|v\|_n^2 - \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2| \leq \delta \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}_d.$$

Under these conditions, we can bound

$$\alpha_n^2 := \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\|v\|_n^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_n^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \leq 1 + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n^2 := \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_n^2} = \left( \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|v\|_n^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \right)^{-1} \leq (1 - \delta)^{-1},$$

and Theorem 3.2 from [CDMS22] implies

$$\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \mu_n \alpha_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}}.$$

It now remains to find a norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  satisfying the required conditions. To do this, we let  $b$  be the simultaneously  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal and  $L^2(\nu)$ -orthogonal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_d$  and define the  $\mathcal{X}$ -indexed family of linear operators

$$L_x v := \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{(v, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}} b_j(x) e_j.$$

Using these operators, we define the unbiased, sample-based estimate of the  $\mathcal{V}$ -norm

$$\|v\|_n^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(\tilde{x}_i) \|L_{\tilde{x}_i} v\|_2^2,$$

with weight function  $w = \mathfrak{K}^{-1}d$  and i.i.d. sample points  $\tilde{x}_i \sim w^{-1}\nu$ . It is known [EST22; GNT24] that this choice of weight function ensures that  $\|\cdot\|_n^2$  concentrates quickly around its expectation  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2$  and the RIP is satisfied with a high probability. Indeed, the probability of the complementary event is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}[\forall v \in \mathcal{V}_d : |\|v\|_n^2 - \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2| > \delta \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2] \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{2n\delta^2}{\|w\mathfrak{K}_L\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}}\right) \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathfrak{K}_L$  is the generalised inverse Christoffel function (or variation function)

$$\mathfrak{K}_L(x) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|L_x v\|_2^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \lambda_{\max} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (L_x b_j)(L_x b_j)^\top \right) = \lambda_{\max} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{b_j(x)^2}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2} e_j e_j^\top \right) = \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \frac{b_j(x)^2}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2}.$$

Note that, since  $\frac{b_j}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}}$  form an  $L^2(\nu)$ -orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{V}_d$ , the uniform upper bound

$$\mathfrak{K}_L(x) = \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \frac{b_j(x)^2}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{b_j(x)^2}{\|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2} = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{|v(x)|^2}{\|v\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2} = \mathfrak{K}(x)$$

is indeed the classical inverse Christoffel function for the space  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . This bound is tight and is attained for piecewise constant basis functions. Using the uniform bound  $\mathfrak{R}_L \leq \mathfrak{R}$ , we can bound the  $L^\infty(\nu)$ -norm in (10) by

$$\|w\mathfrak{R}_L\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} \leq \|w\mathfrak{R}\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} = \|d\mathfrak{R}^{-1}\mathfrak{R}\|_{L^\infty(\nu)} = d.$$

This yields the bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) > \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}}\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\forall v \in \mathcal{V}_d : \left|\|v\|_n^2 - \|v\|_\nu^2\right| > \delta\|v\|_\nu^2\right] \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{2n\delta^2}{d}\right)$$

and concludes the proof, since  $\delta_\star$  is defined such that  $\sqrt{\frac{1+\delta_\star}{1-\delta_\star}} = \mu_\star$ .  $\square$

**Remark 17.** *The i.i.d. sampling strategy from Theorem 16 yields the well-known [CM17; HNP22] but slightly suboptimal sample complexity of  $n \gtrsim d \log(d)$ , requiring no assumptions on  $\mathcal{V}$  and only the weak regularity assumption  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq L^2(\nu)$ . This stands in sharp contrast to the bound in Theorem 8, which uses a dependent sample to guarantee the optimal linear complexity  $n \gtrsim d$  but requires strong assumptions on both  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . Since the probability bound in Theorem 16 holds for any  $\nu$  satisfying  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq L^2(\nu)$ , we obtain an additional degree of freedom, which may be helpful in removing the log factor.*

Resuming the discussion of Remark 12, and building on the result of Theorem 16, there exist two natural choices for the density  $\rho$ .

- For a small sample size of  $n = d$ , the choice  $\rho \propto \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K\nu$  is motivated by Proposition 13 and the discussion thereafter. Since  $\rho$  almost satisfies the conditions of Proposition 13 (see Figure 1), we reason that the marginal probability distributions of the individual sample points  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  are close to  $\frac{K_d}{K}\rho = \mathfrak{R}\nu$ . This is the optimal i.i.d. sampling distribution  $\frac{1}{d}\mathfrak{R}\nu$  from Theorem 16.
- For a larger sample, with  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  close to one, the choice  $\rho \propto \mathfrak{R}\nu$  is motivated by Remark 15. This choice ensures that a significant portion of the samples is distributed according to the optimal i.i.d. sampling distribution  $\frac{1}{d}\mathfrak{R}\nu$  from Theorem 16.

Both measures are indeed finite if  $\mathcal{V}$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(\nu)$  and  $\int K(x) d\nu(x) < \infty$ .<sup>4</sup> However, since our goal is to obtain a sample of minimal size  $n \approx d$ , it makes sense to use the choice  $\rho = \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K\nu$ .

Under the assumptions of Proposition 13, the subsequent theorem implies that sampling from  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\rho = \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K\nu$  improves over the i.i.d. sampling with respect to  $\frac{1}{d}\mathfrak{R}\nu$  (in the sense that  $\log \det G^{\mathbf{x}}$  is larger in expectation).

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $\nu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\rho = \frac{1}{Z} \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\nu^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$  with  $Z = \int \det(G^{\mathbf{x}}) d\nu^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$ . Moreover, let  $\tilde{\rho}$  denote the marginal distribution of  $\rho$  with respect to any one variable  $x$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is distributed according to  $\rho$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is distributed according to the product measure  $\tilde{\rho}^{\otimes n}$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \det G^{\mathbf{x}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\log \det G^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}]$$

*Proof.* Recall that the probability density of  $\rho$  with respect to  $\nu^{\otimes n}$  is given by  $P(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z} \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ , let  $p$  denote the density of  $\tilde{\rho}$  with respect to  $\nu$  and define  $Q = p^{\otimes n}$ . The claim is then equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\log \det G^{\mathbf{x}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\log \det G^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}] \\ \Leftrightarrow & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim P} [\log(ZP(\mathbf{x}))] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q} [\log(ZP(\mathbf{x}))] \\ \Leftrightarrow & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim P} [\log(P(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q} [\log(P(\mathbf{x}))] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Recall the definitions of the (cross-)entropy and Kullback–Leibler divergence

$$H(Q, P) := -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q} [\log(P(\mathbf{x}))], \quad H(P) := H(P, P) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{KL}(Q \| P) := H(Q, P) - H(Q)$$

<sup>4</sup>To see this, let  $b_1, \dots, b_d$  be an  $L^2(\nu)$ -orthogonal and  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . Then

$$\mathfrak{R} \leq (\max_j \|b_j\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-2}) K_d \quad \text{and} \quad K_d \leq K,$$

which implies  $\mathfrak{R}\nu \lesssim K_d\nu \leq K\nu$  and  $\frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d} K\nu \lesssim K\nu$ .

for two densities  $P$  and  $Q$ . Using these definitions, we can reformulate equation (11) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim P} [\log(P(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q} [\log(P(\mathbf{x}))] \geq 0 &\Leftrightarrow -H(P) + H(Q, P) \geq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow H(Q, P) - H(Q) + H(Q) - H(P) \geq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{KL}(Q \parallel P) + H(Q) - H(P) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, recall that the entropy is subadditive in general and additive for product measures, i.e. that

$$H(P) \leq nH(p) = H(p^{\otimes n}) = H(Q).$$

This implies  $H(Q) - H(P) \geq 0$ , and since also  $\text{KL}(Q \parallel P) \geq 0$ , equation (12) holds true.  $\square$

## 6 Subsampling

The preceding section proposes drawing samples according to the (unnormalised) distribution  $\det(G^{\mathbf{x}})d\rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x})$ , with the intuition that the samples will concentrate where the determinant is large. This section explores the option to reduce the size of an already given sample. For this purpose, we suppose that a finite sample  $\mathcal{D} := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  is given, satisfying  $\mu(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mu_{\star}$ , and we seek a subset  $S^{\star} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  of minimal size satisfying the condition  $\mu(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mu(S^{\star}) \leq \mu_{\star}$ .

**Remark 19.** *Subsampling algorithms for the weighted least squares projection (1) have already been proposed in [BSU23; HNP22]. These algorithms exploit the fact that the Gram matrix for weighted least squares is a sum of  $n$  rank-one matrices  $\sum_{i=1}^n a(x_i)a(x_i)^{\top}$ , each matrix depending on a single sample point  $x_i$ . These algorithms can not be applied to the Gram matrix  $G^{\mathbf{x}} = b(\mathbf{x})K(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^{\top}$  associated with our kernel-based projection.*

As a direct consequence of the definition, the quasi-optimality factor  $\mu(S)$  decreases monotonically with increasing sample size  $|S|$ . This means that in contrast to classical least squares approximation, adding new sample points is guaranteed to improve the quasi-optimality constant. This suggests using an incremental, greedy algorithm for sample selection. Such greedy algorithms enjoy strong convergence guarantees, provided that the objective function is non-negative, monotone and submodular. Since a lot of the theory on greedy optimisation is formulated in the setting of maximisation, we will adopt this convention and replace the minimisation of  $\mu$  with the equivalent maximisation of  $\lambda(S) := \mu(S)^{-2}$ . Monotonicity and submodularity of this function can then be defined as follows.

**Definition 20** (Monotonicity). Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a set, and let  $f : 2^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a non-negative set function.  $f$  is called monotone if  $f(S) \leq f(T)$  whenever  $S \subseteq T$ .

**Definition 21** (Submodularity). Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a set, and let  $f : 2^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a non-negative, monotone set function.  $f$  is called submodular if  $f(S \cup \{v\}) - f(S) \geq f(T \cup \{v\}) - f(T)$  for all  $S \subseteq T$  and for all  $v \in \mathcal{D}$ .

Now suppose that  $\lambda$  were non-negative, monotone, and submodular, and consider the algorithm defining the set sequence

$$S_0 := \emptyset, \quad S_{k+1} = S_k \cup \{v_{k+1}\}, \quad v_{k+1} \in \arg \max_{v \in \mathcal{D}} \lambda(S_k \cup \{v\}).$$

By a classical result of [NWF78], this algorithm achieves a quasi-optimal function value

$$\lambda(S_k) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \lambda(S_k^{\star}),$$

when  $S_k^{\star}$  is an optimal set of cardinality  $k$ . A related theorem of [Wol82] ensures a similar bound for the ‘‘complementary’’ problem of finding the smallest set  $S$  with  $\lambda(S) \geq C$ . Defining  $k(C) := \min\{k : \lambda(S_k) \geq C\}$  and  $k^{\star}(C) := \min\{|S| : \lambda(S) \geq C\}$  for  $C \leq \lambda(\mathcal{D})$ , it holds that

$$k(C) \leq \left(1 + \log\left(\frac{C}{C - \lambda(S_{k(C)-1})}\right)\right) k^{\star}(C).$$

These bounds would justify approximating the sought set  $S^{\star}$  through efficient, greedy algorithms. Unfortunately, however, the subsequent proposition shows that  $\lambda$  is not submodular. The proof of this fact can be found in Appendix C.

**Proposition 22.**  $\lambda$  is monotone but not submodular.

This result might seem quite surprising initially because one might intuitively assume that the marginal gains of orthogonal projections become smaller with increasing sample size. One would intuitively assume that  $\lambda$  is submodular, and the construction in Appendix C indeed suggests that  $\lambda$  is not ‘‘too far’’ from being submodular. Moreover, it seems natural that the optimality guarantees of submodular functions extend to functions that are ‘‘close’’ to being submodular. This intuition can be formalised by defining the submodularity ratio  $\gamma$  as a measure of ‘‘approximate submodularity’’ [DK18].

**Definition 23** (Submodularity Ratio). Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a set, and let  $f : 2^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a non-negative, monotone set function. The submodularity ratio of  $f$  with respect to a set  $U \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  and a parameter  $k \geq 1$  is

$$\gamma_{U,k}(f) := \min_{L \subseteq U, S: |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} [f(L \cup \{s\}) - f(L)]}{f(L \cup S) - f(L)},$$

with the convention that  $0/0 = 1$ .

The submodularity ratio captures how much more  $f$  can increase by adding any subset  $S$  of size  $k$  to  $L$ , compared to the combined benefits of adding its individual elements to  $L$ . In particular, a function  $f$  is submodular precisely when  $\gamma_{U,k} \geq 1$  for all  $U$  and  $k$  [DK18, Proposition 3]. In this way, the submodularity ratio quantifies the submodularity of  $f$ . Moreover, the classical results of [Wol82] on submodular functions extend to approximately submodular functions by means of the subsequent result of [DK18].

**Theorem 24** (Theorem 11 in [DK18]). For any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $C > 0$ , let  $k := k((1 - \varepsilon)C)$  and  $k^* := k^*(C)$ . Then

$$k \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{S_k, k^*}(\lambda)} \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) k^*.$$

We want to use this result to obtain an algorithm with certified approximation guarantees. For this, first, observe that

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) := \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2} = \min_{v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = 1 - \max_{v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)} \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = 1 - \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})P_{\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2,$$

where  $S(\mathcal{V}_d)$  denotes the unit sphere in  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . Bounding the operator norm with the Hilbert–Schmidt norm yields

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1 - \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})P_{\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^d \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - d + 1.$$

We hence propose to maximise the surrogate

$$\eta(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \text{tr}(G^{\mathbf{x}}).$$

The subsequent proposition 25 proves that this function is approximately submodular. Replacing the spectral norm with the Hilbert–Schmidt norm, however, comes at the cost of a slightly suboptimal bound since the Hilbert–Schmidt norm can exceed the spectral norm by a factor of  $d^{1/2}$  (cf. [BCMN18, Remark 3.1]).

Since our sampling strategy in section 5 is motivated as a surrogate for maximising the function  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \log \det(G^{\mathbf{x}})$ , it may seem more natural to use the function  $S \mapsto \log \det(G^{\mathbf{x}^S})$  for subsampling. Indeed, when  $H^{\mathbf{x}^{\oplus y}}$  can be written as a rank-one update  $H^{\mathbf{x}^{\oplus y}} = H^{\mathbf{x}} + h_y h_y^{\top}$ , it can be shown [CSL14] that the functions

$$S \mapsto -\text{tr}((H^{\mathbf{x}^S})^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad S \mapsto \log \det(H^{\mathbf{x}^S})$$

are submodular. However, since the  $g_y$ -terms in the rank-one update (7) of  $G^{\mathbf{x}^{\oplus y}}$  depend on  $\mathbf{x}$ , the arguments from [CSL14] do not transfer directly. Although it may be possible to show (approximate) submodularity for these functions, we focus on the more straightforward case of  $\eta$ . Moreover, for the purpose of finding a subsample  $\mathbf{x}_S$  of close-to-optimal size  $|S| \approx d$ , it is better to optimise the function  $\eta$  (at least for the first  $d$  iterations). The functions  $S \mapsto -\text{tr}((H^{\mathbf{x}^S})^{-1})$  and  $S \mapsto \log \det(H^{\mathbf{x}^S})$  are both constant for  $|S| < d$ .

The greedy maximisation of  $\eta$  is a specialised version of the SDS<sub>OMP</sub> algorithm for dictionary selection presented in [DK18, Section 4.2] and comes with the same guarantees on monotonicity and approximate submodularity, as is shown in the subsequent proposition.

**Proposition 25.** Define  $C_{i,j} := \frac{k(x_i, x_j)}{\sqrt{K(x_i)K(x_j)}}$  and denote by  $C_{S,S}$  the restriction of  $C$  onto the indices contained in  $S$ . Moreover, let  $\lambda_{\min}(C, k) := \min_{|S| \leq k} \lambda_{\min}(C_{S,S})$  denote the minimal  $k$ -sparse eigenvalue of  $C$ . Then,  $\eta$  is monotone and approximately submodular with

$$\gamma_{U,k}(\eta) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C, |U| + k) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  be given. To facilitate this proof, we introduce the notation  $\mathbf{x}_L$  for the sub-vector of  $\mathbf{x}$  with indices in  $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  and extend this notion to matrices as well. Since  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}_L} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}_S}$  for all  $L \subseteq S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , it follows that  $\|P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}_L}} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|P_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x}_S}} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . This proves  $\eta(\mathbf{x}_L) \leq \eta(\mathbf{x}_S)$  and thereby monotonicity.

To compute the submodularity ratio, we define the dictionary of normalised functions  $\omega : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\omega_i := K(x_i)^{-1/2}k(x_i, \cdot)$  and introduce for any  $L, S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  the notation  $P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}$  for the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal projection onto  $\langle \omega_L \rangle := \text{span}\{\omega_l : l \in L\}$  and write  $P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle} \omega_S$  for the component-wise application of the projection operator to  $\omega_S$ . With this, we can succinctly write

$$P_{\langle \omega_{L \cup S} \rangle} = P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle} + P_{\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_S \rangle}.$$

It thus holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{U,k}(\eta) &:= \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} (\eta(\mathbf{x}_{L \cup \{s\}}) - \eta(\mathbf{x}_L))}{\eta(\mathbf{x}_{L \cup S}) - \eta(\mathbf{x}_L)} \\ &= \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} (\sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\langle \omega_{L \cup \{s\} \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - \|P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2)}{\sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\langle \omega_{L \cup S} \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - \|P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\ &= \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_{\{s\} \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_S \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now define a basis  $\omega_S^L$  for the spaces  $\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_{\{s\} \rangle}$  occurring in the numerator of the preceding expression. Using the Gramian matrix  $C_{i,j} := (\omega_i, \omega_j)_{\mathcal{V}}$ , these basis elements and their corresponding Gramian can be expressed as

$$\omega_i^L := (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_i = \omega_i - C_{i,L} C_{L,L}^{-1} \omega_L \quad \text{and} \quad C_{i,j}^L := (\omega_i^L, \omega_j^L)_{\mathcal{V}} = C_{i,j} - C_{i,L} C_{L,L}^{-1} C_{L,j}.$$

Similarly, we can express the inner products between  $\omega^L$  and  $b$  through the cross-Gramian matrix  $B_{i,j}^L := (\omega_i^L, b_j)_{\mathcal{V}}$  and define the diagonal scaling matrix  $D := \text{diag}(\|\omega_1^L\|_{\mathcal{V}}, \dots, \|\omega_n^L\|_{\mathcal{V}})$ . This allows us to write the submodularity ratio as

$$\gamma_{U,k}(\eta) = \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{s \in S} \|P_{\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_{\{s\} \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{\langle (I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_S \rangle} b_j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d (B_{S,j}^L)^\top D^{-2} (B_{S,j}^L)}{\sum_{j=1}^d (B_{S,j}^L)^\top (C_{S,S}^L)^{-1} (B_{S,j}^L)}.$$

Stacking  $d$  copies of  $C_{S,S}^L$  and  $D$  in the block-diagonal matrices  $\bar{C} := \text{diag}(C_{S,S}^L, \dots, C_{S,S}^L)$  and  $\bar{D} := \text{diag}(D, \dots, D)$  and concatenating all  $B_{S,j}^L$  into the vector  $b_{i+|S|(j-1)} := (B_{S,j}^L)_i$  the fraction can be estimated as

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^d (B_{S,j}^L)^\top D^{-2} (B_{S,j}^L)}{\sum_{j=1}^d (B_{S,j}^L)^\top (C_{S,S}^L)^{-1} (B_{S,j}^L)} = \frac{b^\top \bar{D}^{-2} b}{b^\top \bar{C}^{-1} b} \geq \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^{d|S|}} \frac{b^\top b}{b^\top \bar{D} \bar{C}^{-1} \bar{D} b} = \lambda_{\min}(\bar{D}^{-1} \bar{C} \bar{D}^{-1}) = \lambda_{\min}(D^{-1} C_{S,S}^L D^{-1}).$$

To estimate this eigenvalue, we proceed in two steps. First, we note that

$$D_{i,i} = \|\omega_i^L\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \|(I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_i\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|\omega_i\|_{\mathcal{V}} = 1,$$

which implies

$$\lambda_{\min}(D^{-1} C_{S,S}^L D^{-1}) \geq \lambda_{\max}(D)^{-2} \lambda_{\min}(C_{S,S}^L) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C_{S,S}^L).$$

Next, we note that  $C_{S,S}^L$  is precisely the Schur complement  $C_{S \cup L, S \cup L} / C_{L,L}$ , which implies

$$\lambda_{\min}(C_{S,S}^L) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C_{S \cup L, S \cup L}).$$

A proof of this fact can be found in Appendix D. The submodularity ratio is, therefore, bounded by

$$\gamma_{U,k}(\eta) \geq \min_{L \subseteq U, |S| \leq k, L \cap S = \emptyset} \lambda_{\min}(C_{S \cup L, S \cup L}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C, |U| + k) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C). \quad \square$$

**Remark 26.** The idea of using submodular optimisation to select subsamples is not new and was studied for the maximisation of the determinant of a kernel matrix in [CZZ18].

**Remark 27.** For the set  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X}$ , this algorithm was already proposed in [BCMNI18] under the name collective OMP. A problem with the approach in [BCMNI18] is that the proofs require dense dictionaries  $\mathcal{D}$  for which  $\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . Hence, we cannot use their algorithms in the setting of section 6. Their algorithm was originally designed to tackle the original sampling problem in section 5. However, its complexity is unknown, and it could very well be NP-complete to find the exact minimum.



**Remark 28.** It is illustrated in [BCMN18] that the incremental selection of sample points (when the dimension  $d$  of  $\mathcal{V}_d$  increases) is of roughly the same quality as when the sample points are drawn anew for each  $d$ . This observation is not surprising since, for a given set of basis functions  $\mathcal{B} := \{b_1, \dots, b_d\}$ , the corresponding function

$$\eta_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2$$

is modular in  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e.  $\eta_{\mathcal{B} \cup \{v\}} = \eta_{\mathcal{B}} + \eta_{\{v\}}$  for all  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $v \notin \mathcal{B}$ . When the function  $\eta_{\{v\}}$  is not significantly larger than  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$  (which seems reasonable), then a subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  that is selected to maximise  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$  will also produce a large value for the function  $\eta_{\mathcal{B} \cup \{v\}} = \eta_{\mathcal{B}} + \eta_{\{v\}}$ . This encourages the idea that old sample points that have already been used for the approximation in  $\mathcal{V}_d$  can be recycled for the approximation in  $\mathcal{V}_{d+1}$  without drawbacks.

We conclude this section by listing the proposed sampling strategy with greedy subsampling in pseudo-code.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Sampling algorithm with greedy subsampling

---

**Data:**  $\mu_{\star} > 1, \beta \in [1, \infty)$  and sequence of probability measures  $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$

**Result:**  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  satisfying  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_{\star}$

- 1 Use Algorithm 1 to draw a sample set  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  satisfying  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1 + \frac{\mu_{\star} - 1}{\beta}$
  - 2 Set  $\mathbf{y} := \emptyset$
  - 3 **while**  $\mu(\mathbf{y}) > \mu_{\star}$  **do**
  - 4     Set  $\mathbf{y} := \arg \max\{\eta(\mathbf{y} \oplus \{y\}) : y \in \mathbf{x}\}$
  - 5     Update  $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{y} \oplus \{y\}$
  - 6 **end**
  - 7 Set  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{y}$
- 

## 7 Perturbed observations

Now assume that the observations are perturbed by deterministic noise, i.e. we only have access to  $y_i := u(x_i) + \eta(x_i)$  where  $\eta$  is a function in some normed vector space  $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{V}$ . We let  $k_{\mathcal{R}}$  be a positive semi-definite kernel, which defines for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  a semi-norm

$$\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{R}}^2 := \|v(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x})}^2 := v(\mathbf{x})^{\top} K_{\mathcal{R}}^+(\mathbf{x}) v(\mathbf{x}),$$

with  $K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x})$  being the positive semi-definite kernel matrix associated with  $k_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Furthermore, we assume that

$$\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{R}} \leq c_n \|v\|_{\mathcal{R}}, \quad (13)$$

with a constant  $c_n$  that may depend on  $n$ .

**Example 29.** Consider the case where  $\mathcal{R}$  is a RKHS with kernel  $k_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Then the semi-norm  $\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{R}} = \|P_{\mathcal{R}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{R}}$ , where  $P_{\mathcal{R}_x}$  is the  $\mathcal{R}$ -orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{R}_x = \text{span}(k_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot))$ . This yields property (13) with constant  $c_n = 1$ .

**Example 30.** Consider the case where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the weighted Lebesgue space  $L_{\gamma}^{\infty}$  for some weight function  $\gamma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , equipped with the norm  $\|v\|_{L_{\gamma}^{\infty}} := \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \gamma(x)^{-1/2} |v(x)|$ , and where  $k_{\mathcal{R}}(x, y) = \gamma(x) \mathbf{1}_{x=y}$  is the weighted white noise kernel. Then  $K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{diag}(\gamma(\mathbf{x}))$  and  $\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{R}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n v(x_i)^2 \gamma(x_i)^{-1} \leq n \|v\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2$ . Thus (13) holds with constant  $c_n = \sqrt{n}$ .

For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , we define the regularised matrix

$$K_S(\mathbf{x}) := K(\mathbf{x}) + c_n K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x})$$

and define the corresponding norm  $\|v\|_{\mathbf{x}, S} := \|v(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_S(\mathbf{x})}$ .

The regularised projection  $u^{\mathbf{x}, S} \in \mathcal{V}_d$  is defined by

$$u^{\mathbf{x}, S} := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|v - v(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_S(\mathbf{x})} = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|(u + \eta) - v\|_{\mathbf{x}, S} =: P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}, S}(u + \eta).$$

**Proposition 31.** *Let  $b$  be a  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{V}_d$  and define  $\mu_S(\mathbf{x}) := \lambda_{\min}(b(\mathbf{x})K_S(\mathbf{x})^+b(\mathbf{x})^\top)^{-1/2}$ . Then*

$$\|u - u^{x,S}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq (1 + \mu_S(\mathbf{x}))\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \mu_S(\mathbf{x})\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{R}}.$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Theorem 3, we can estimate

$$\|u - u^{x,S}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u - u^{x,S}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \mu_S(\mathbf{x})\|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u - u^{x,S}\|_{x,S}.$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u - u^{x,S}\|_{x,S} &= \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{x,S}(u + \eta)\|_{x,S} \\ &\leq \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{x,S}(u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u)\|_{x,S} + \|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{x,S}\eta\|_{x,S} \\ &\leq \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{x,S} + \|\eta\|_{x,S}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $K_S(\mathbf{x}) \geq K(\mathbf{x})$  and  $K_S(\mathbf{x}) \geq c_n K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x})$ , we can estimate

$$\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{x,S} = \|(u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u)(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_S(\mathbf{x})^+} \leq \|(u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u)(\mathbf{x})\|_{K(\mathbf{x})^+} = \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_x$$

and

$$\|\eta\|_{x,S} = \|\eta(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_S(\mathbf{x})^+} \leq c_n^{-1}\|\eta(\mathbf{x})\|_{K_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x})^+} = c_n^{-1}\|\eta\|_{x,\mathcal{R}}.$$

Using the bounds  $\|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_x \leq \|u - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}u\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\|\eta\|_{x,\mathcal{R}} \leq c_n\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{R}}$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 8 Experiments

We propose to generate  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  from the distribution (5) using Algorithm 1 with  $\rho_1 = \dots = \rho_d = \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d}K\nu$  and  $\rho_n = \mathfrak{R}\nu$  for all  $n > d$ , where the measure  $\nu$  depends on the test case. The choice of the reference measures  $\rho_i$  is motivated by the discussion in Section 5.3, where we argue that  $\rho_i \propto \frac{\mathfrak{R}}{K_d}K\nu$  is preferable for small sample sizes, while  $\rho_i \propto \mathfrak{R}\nu$  is preferable for large sample sizes. We compare this method against the well-established

- continuous volume sampling [BBC20], where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is drawn from (3) (sample size bounds are provided in Corollary 9) and
- Christoffel sampling [CM17], where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  are  $n$  i.i.d. samples from  $\mathfrak{R}\nu$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$  is defined as in (9) (sample size bounds are provided in Theorem 16).

For the purpose of this discussion, we denote the proposed method as subspace-informed volume sampling (SIVS), since the density is proportional to the volume of the Gramian matrix  $G^x$ , which depends on the subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d$  as well as the ambient RKHS  $\mathcal{V}$ . This sets it apart from continuous volume sampling, which only takes into account the ambient space  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Remark 32.** *An alternative volume-rescaled sampling distribution has been proposed in [DWH22] for least squares approximation in a subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d$  of  $L^2(\nu)$ . It is equivalent to sampling  $d$  points from a projection determinantal point process associated with  $\mathcal{V}_d$  and the reference measure  $\nu$ , and  $n - d$  additional i.i.d. points from the Christoffel sampling distribution  $\mathfrak{R}\nu$ . We do not consider this method in our experiments since it has similar properties as i.i.d. Christoffel sampling.*

We compare these methods for three prototypical cases.

- **Section 8.1:** For  $\mathcal{V} = H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  the kernel  $1 \lesssim K(x) \lesssim 1$  is uniformly bounded from above and below.
- **Section 8.2:** For  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  the kernel  $K(x) \lesssim 1$  is uniformly bounded only from above.
- **Section 8.3:** For  $\mathcal{V} = H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  the kernel  $1 \lesssim K(x)$  is uniformly bounded only from below.<sup>5</sup>

The kernels for  $H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and  $H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  are standard and can be found for example in [BCM18; PR16; Tut19]. The kernel for  $H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  can be found in the same manner as those of  $H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and  $H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$ , and a derivation is provided, for the sake of completeness, in Appendix E. For the convenience of the reader, we restate the reproducing kernels for the corresponding spaces in the beginning of each section.

<sup>5</sup>Note that an unbounded domain is necessary in this case since  $K(x)$  has to be finite for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by the definition of an RKHS. This implies that  $k(x, x)$  must be bounded from above as soon as it is continuous and  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact.

### 8.1 A polynomial subspace of $H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$

Consider the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{V} = H^1([-1, 1], \nu)$  with  $\nu := \frac{1}{2} dx$  and the  $(d = 10)$ -dimensional polynomial subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d = \text{span}\{1, x, \dots, x^{d-1}\}$ . The reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{V}$  is given by

$$k(x, y) := \frac{2 \cosh(1 - \max\{x, y\}) \cosh(1 + \min\{x, y\})}{\sinh(2)}.$$

Phase diagrams for the probability of  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2$  are presented in Figure 2. Several interesting conclusions can be drawn from these observations, which are in line with the theoretical guarantees presented in Theorem 16 and Corollary 9.

- Christoffel sampling follows the  $n \gtrsim d \log(d)$  sample size bound from Theorem 16. Notably, however, the factor for the rate in this plot is smaller than 1, which is significantly smaller than the factor predicted by Theorem 16.
- Continuous volume sampling performs worse than Christoffel sampling, following a sample size bound of  $n \gtrsim d^2$ . This can probably be attributed to the fact that  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is not spanned by the spectral basis of  $\mathcal{V}$ .
- Subspace-informed volume sampling follows the optimal sample size bound  $n \gtrsim d$ . The factor for the rate in the plot is 1.5, which is close to the optimal factor 1.

Finally, we illustrate the convergence of the proposed greedy subsampling method (Algorithm 2) in Figure 3. It can be seen that the proposed algorithm produces an acceptable quasi-optimality constant  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 3$  already for the minimal possible sample size of  $n = d$  in all 100 repetitions of the experiment.




Figure 2: Phase diagrams for the probability  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2]$  with  $\mathcal{V} = H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and where  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is spanned by polynomials. The probability is estimated using 200 independent samples  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  for different dimensions  $d$  and sample sizes  $n$ . Green marks a probability of 1, violet a probability of 0. Points having  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2] \geq \frac{1}{2}$  are marked with bold, green borders. The factor for the linear rate in the phase diagram for subspace-informed volume sampling is 1.5.

### 8.2 A polynomial subspace of $H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$

Consider the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1([-1, 1], \nu)$  with  $\nu = \frac{1}{2} dx$  and the  $d$ -dimensional polynomial subspace  $\mathcal{V}_d$  that is spanned by the monomials  $\text{span}\{1, x, \dots, x^{d+1}\}$  subject to the boundary conditions  $v(-1) = v(1) = 0$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$ .




Figure 3: Violin plot of the submodular surrogate  $\eta$  and the suboptimality constant  $\mu$  for the first 20 steps of the greedy optimisation procedure. The initial sample  $\mathcal{D}$  is of size 100 and drawn using the Christoffel sampling method. The experiment was repeated 100 times to compute the violins.  $\mathcal{V} = H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and  $d = 10$  with  $\mathcal{V}_d$  being spanned by polynomials.

The reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{V}$  is given by

$$k(x, y) := \frac{(\min\{x, y\} + 1)(1 - \max\{x, y\})}{4}.$$

Phase diagrams for the probability of  $\mu(x) \leq 2$  are presented in Figure 4, and the convergence of the proposed greedy subsampling method is illustrated in Figure 5. The qualitative observations remain similar to the  $H^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$ -case, and even the factor for linear rate in the subspace-informed volume sampling plot remains the same (1.5). The greedy subsampling algorithm produces an acceptable quasi-optimality constant  $\mu(x) \leq 3$  for the almost optimal sample size  $n = d + 2$  in all 100 repetitions of the experiment.

### 8.3 A polynomial subspace of $H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$

Consider the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{V} = H^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\nu})$  with  $\tilde{\nu} := \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and choose  $\nu = \tilde{\nu}$ . Moreover, consider the  $d$ -dimensional polynomial subspaces  $\mathcal{V}_d = \text{span}\{1, x, \dots, x^{d-1}\}$ . The reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{V}$  is given by

$$k(x, y) := \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{x^2 + y^2}{2}\right) \left(\text{erf}\left(\frac{\min\{x, y\}}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right) \left(1 - \text{erf}\left(\frac{\max\{x, y\}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).$$

**Remark 33.** As discussed after Remark 17, a sufficient condition for the finiteness of the measures  $\frac{\delta}{K_d} K \nu$  is  $\int K(x) d\nu < \infty$ . This **sufficient** condition is satisfied for the choice  $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, 1 + \varepsilon)$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , but it is not satisfied for the choice  $\varepsilon = 0$ . However, since this condition may not be **necessary**, we perform the experiments for this test case with the choice  $\nu = \tilde{\nu} = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . We observe that the resulting method indeed produces adequate results.

Phase diagrams for the probability of  $\mu(x) \leq 2$  are presented in Figure 6, and the convergence of the proposed greedy subsampling method is illustrated in Figure 7. As in both preceding cases, the greedy subsampling algorithm performs




Figure 4: Phase diagrams for the probability  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2]$  with  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and where  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is spanned by polynomials. The probability is estimated using 200 independent samples  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  for different dimensions  $d$  and sample sizes  $n$ . Green marks a probability of 1, violet a probability of 0. Points having  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2] \geq \frac{1}{2}$  are marked with bold, green borders. The factor for the linear rate in the phase diagram for subspace-informed volume sampling is 1.5.

quite well, producing an acceptable quasi-optimality constant  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 3$  for the almost optimal sample size  $n = d + 1$  in all 100 repetitions of the experiment. However, in contrast to the preceding test cases, the phase transition boundary for continuous volume sampling is linear in this case. This is explained theoretically by the fact that the Hermite polynomials form the spectral basis for  $\mathcal{V}$ . (See the discussion following Corollary 9.)

## 9 Discussion

This manuscript focuses on finding sample points adapted to the approximation problem at hand. However, this presupposes the ability to generate new data, which is not the case in many classical approximation tasks, where we have to make the best of the data that is already given. An interesting direction of research would, therefore, be to restrict the space  $\mathcal{V}_d$  to be adapted to the given data. Since  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  depends on the smallest eigenvalue of  $G^{\mathbf{x}}$ , it seems natural to use a span of the eigenspaces of  $G^{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  as a suitable subspace of  $\mathcal{V}_d$ . This projection introduces an additional approximation error, but it is conceivable that the eigenvectors corresponding to the smallest eigenvalues have a high  $\mathcal{V}$ -norm. Projecting onto the complement of these vectors would, therefore, only result in a minor additive approximation error if the sought function is sufficiently regular, and the overall error may indeed decrease.

Proposition 31 can be extended to general random noise (in contrast to the deterministic perturbations considered in Section 7). A proof for this claim is given, in a general setting, in Theorem 2.3 in [CDMS22]. Note, however, that the approximation from Section 7 depends on an appropriate choice of norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}}$  for measuring the noise. Since this norm also influences the approximation  $u^{\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{S}}$ , acting as a regulariser, the optimal choice of this norm would be an interesting research topic.

All results in this paper depend on the choice of an appropriate RKHS and require explicit knowledge of the corresponding reproducing kernel. Finding such an explicit expression may be difficult when the domain  $\mathcal{X}$  is nontrivial. For certain RKHS of band-limited functions, however, arguments relating to “escaping the native space” (cf. section 2.3.3 in [Kem23]) may yield error bounds even if the regularity of the sought function  $u$  is overestimated.




Figure 5: Violin plot of the submodular surrogate  $\eta$  and the suboptimality constant  $\mu$  for the first 20 steps of the greedy optimisation procedure. The initial sample  $\mathcal{D}$  is of size 100 and drawn using the Christoffel sampling method. The experiment was repeated 100 times to compute the violins.  $\mathcal{V} = H_0^1([-1, 1], \frac{1}{2} dx)$  and  $d = 10$  with  $\mathcal{V}_d$  being spanned by polynomials.

## Acknowledgements

This project is funded by the ANR-DFG project COFNET (ANR-21-CE46-0015). This work was partially conducted within the France 2030 framework programme, Centre Henri Lebesgue ANR-11-LABX-0020-01.

Our code makes extensive use of the Python packages: `numpy` [Har+20], `scipy` [Vir+20], and `matplotlib` [Hun07].

## References

- [ACD23] B. Adcock, J. M. Cardenas, and N. Dexter. A unified framework for learning with nonlinear model classes from arbitrary line. 2023. arXiv: 2311.14886 [cs.LG] (cited on page 4).
- [BSU23] F. Bartel, M. Schäfer, and T. Ullrich. “Constructive subsampling of finite frames with applications in optimal function recovery”. Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis 65 (2023), pages 209–248. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2023.02.004> (cited on page 14).
- [BBC20] A. Belhadji, R. Bardenet, and P. Chainais. Kernel interpolation with continuous volume sampling. 2020. arXiv: 2002.09677 [stat.ML] (cited on pages 2, 6, 7, 18).
- [Bin+15] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Data Assimilation in Reduced Modeling. 2015. arXiv: 1506.04770 [math.NA] (cited on pages 3, 5).
- [BCMN18] P. Binev, A. Cohen, O. Mula, and J. Nichols. “Greedy Algorithms for Optimal Measurements Selection in State Estimation Using Reduced Models”. SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification 6.3 (2018), pages 1101–1126. doi: [10.1137/17m1157635](https://doi.org/10.1137/17m1157635) (cited on pages 3, 8, 15–18).
- [CZZ18] L. Chen, G. Zhang, and E. Zhou. “Fast Greedy MAP Inference for Determinantal Point Process to Improve Recommendation Diversity”. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. Edited by S. Bengio,




Figure 6: Phase diagrams for the probability  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2]$  with  $\mathcal{V} = H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  and where  $\mathcal{V}_d$  is spanned by polynomials. The probability is estimated using 200 independent samples  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  for different dimensions  $d$  and sample sizes  $n$ . Green marks a probability of 1, violet a probability of 0. Points having  $\mathbb{P}[\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2] \geq \frac{1}{2}$  are marked with bold, green borders. The factor for the linear rate in the phase diagram for volume sampling is 2.1. The factor for the linear rate in the phase diagram for subspace-informed volume sampling is 1.2.

H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett. Volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018 (cited on page 16).

- [ÇM09] A. Çivril and M. Magdon-Ismail. “On selecting a maximum volume sub-matrix of a matrix and related problems”. *Theoretical Computer Science* 410.47–49 (2009), pages 4801–4811. doi: 10.1016/j.tcs.2009.06.018 (cited on page 8).
- [CDMS22] A. Cohen, M. Dolbeault, O. Mula, and A. Somacal. *Nonlinear approximation spaces for inverse problems*. 2022. arXiv: 2209.09314 [math.NA] (cited on pages 3, 4, 12, 21).
- [CM17] A. Cohen and G. Migliorati. “Optimal weighted least-squares methods”. en. *The SMAI Journal of computational mathematics* 3 (2017), pages 181–203. doi: 10.5802/smai-jcm.24 (cited on pages 2, 13, 18).
- [CSL14] F. L. Cortesi, T. H. Summers, and J. Lygeros. “Submodularity of energy related controllability metrics”. *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2014. doi: 10.1109/cdc.2014.7039832 (cited on page 15).
- [DK18] A. Das and D. Kempe. “Approximate Submodularity and Its Applications: Subset Selection, Sparse Approximation and Dictionary Selection”. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 19.1 (2018), pages 74–107 (cited on pages 14, 15).
- [DWH22] M. Dereziński, M. K. Warmuth, and D. Hsu. “Unbiased estimators for random design regression”. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 23.1 (2022), pages 7539–7584. doi: 10.5555/3586589.3586756 (cited on pages 2, 18).
- [EST22] M. Eigel, R. Schneider, and P. Trunschke. “Convergence bounds for empirical nonlinear least-squares”. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 56.1 (2022), pages 79–104. doi: 10.1051/m2an/2021070 (cited on pages 4, 12).
- [GNT24] R. Gruhlke, A. Nouy, and P. Trunschke. *Optimal sampling for stochastic and natural gradient descent*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.03113 [math.OC] (cited on pages 4, 12).
- [HNP22] C. Haberstich, A. Nouy, and G. Perrin. “Boosted optimal weighted least-squares”. *Mathematics of Computation* 91.335 (2022), pages 1281–1315 (cited on pages 2, 13, 14).




Figure 7: Violin plot of the submodular surrogate  $\eta$  and the suboptimality constant  $\mu$  for the first 20 steps of the greedy optimisation procedure. The initial sample  $\mathcal{D}$  is of size 100 and drawn using the Christoffel sampling method. The experiment was repeated 100 times to compute the violins.  $\mathcal{V} = H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  and  $d = 10$  with  $\mathcal{V}_d$  being spanned by polynomials.

- [Har+20] C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant. “Array programming with NumPy”. *Nature* 585.7825 (2020), pages 357–362. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2 (cited on page 22).
- [Hun07] J. D. Hunter. “Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment”. *Computing in Science & Engineering* 9.3 (2007), pages 90–95. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55 (cited on page 22).
- [Kem23] R. Kempf. “The Tensor Product Multilevel Method for High-dimensional Meshfree Approximation”. en. PhD thesis. 2023. doi: 10.15495/EPUB\_UBT\_00007006 (cited on pages 3, 21).
- [MPPY15] Y. Maday, A. T. Patera, J. D. Penn, and M. Yano. “A parameterized-background data-weak approach to variational data assimilation: formulation, analysis, and application to acoustics”. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.* 102.5 (2015), pages 933–965. doi: 10.1002/nme.4747 (cited on page 3).
- [NWF78] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey, and M. L. Fisher. “An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I”. *Mathematical Programming* 14.1 (1978), pages 265–294. doi: 10.1007/bf01588971 (cited on page 14).
- [NM24] A. Nouy and B. Michel. *Weighted least-squares approximation with determinantal point processes and generalized volume* 2024. arXiv: 2312.14057 [math.NA] (cited on page 2).
- [PR16] V. I. Paulsen and M. Raghupathi. *An Introduction to the Theory of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge University Press, 2016. ISBN: 9781316219232. doi: 10.1017/cbo9781316219232 (cited on page 18).
- [Tut19] E. Tutaj. “Some Particular Norm in the Sobolev Space  $H^1[a, b]$ ”. *Complex Analysis and Operator Theory* 13.4 (2019), pages 1931–1947. doi: 10.1007/s11785-019-00893-3 (cited on page 18).
- [Vir+20] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, Í. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde,



- J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. “SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python”. Nature Methods 17 (2020), pages 261–272. doi: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2 (cited on page 22).
- [Wel82] W. J. Welch. “Algorithmic complexity: threeNP- hard problems in computational statistics”. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation 15.1 (1982), pages 17–25. doi: 10.1080/00949658208810560 (cited on page 8).
- [Wol82] L. A. Wolsey. “An analysis of the greedy algorithm for the submodular set covering problem”. Combinatorica 2.4 (1982), pages 385–393. doi: 10.1007/bf02579435 (cited on pages 14, 15).

## A Proof of the error bound (2)

To prove this error bound, we start by noting that  $\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 - \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x}v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2} &= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_x}v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\
&= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} 1 - \frac{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\
&= 1 - \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\
&= 1 - \left( \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{V}_x^\perp} \frac{(v, w)_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}} \right)^2 \\
&= 1 - \sup_{w \in \mathcal{V}_x^\perp} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\
&= \inf_{w \in \mathcal{V}_x^\perp} 1 - \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{V}_d}w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\
&= \inf_{w \in \mathcal{V}_x^\perp} \frac{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{w \in \mathcal{V}_x^\perp} \frac{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})w\|_{\mathcal{V}}}.$$

We can, therefore, conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u - u^{d, \mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{V}} &= \|u - (P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} + P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}))u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= \|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&\leq \mu(\mathbf{x})\|(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}})u\|_{\mathcal{V}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, let  $\mathcal{W} := P_{\mathcal{V}_x}\mathcal{V}_d$  and recall from Remark 1 that  $P_{\mathcal{V}_x}P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} = P_{\mathcal{W}}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}) &= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}) - (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}) \\
&= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) - (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - P_{\mathcal{V}_x}P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}) \\
&= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) - (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - P_{\mathcal{W}}) \\
&= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x} + P_{\mathcal{W}}) \\
&= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(P_{\mathcal{V}_x^\perp} + P_{\mathcal{W}}) \\
&= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})P_{\mathcal{V}_x^\perp \oplus \mathcal{W}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows because  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_x$  implies  $\mathcal{W} \perp \mathcal{V}_x^\perp$ . Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{V}_x^\perp \oplus \mathcal{W})^\perp &= \mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{W}^\perp \\
&= \{v \in \mathcal{V}_x : (v, w)_{\mathcal{V}} = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \mathcal{W}\} \\
&= \{v \in \mathcal{V}_x : (v, P_{\mathcal{V}_x}w)_{\mathcal{V}} = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \mathcal{V}_d\} \\
&= \{v \in \mathcal{V}_x : (v, w)_{\mathcal{V}} = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \mathcal{V}_d\} \\
&= \mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{V}_d^\perp.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}}) &= (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d})(I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{V}_d^\perp}) \\
&= I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d} - P_{\mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{V}_d^\perp} \\
&= I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d \oplus (\mathcal{V}_x \cap \mathcal{V}_d^\perp)},
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

## B Lemma 34

**Lemma 34.** Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and define the operator

$$A = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}).$$

Then  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{Fro}} + \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_2$ .

*Proof.* Observe that for every  $u \in \mathcal{V}$

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} u := \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|u - v\|_{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x}(P_{\mathcal{V}_x} u - v)\|_{\mathcal{V}} = P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} P_{\mathcal{V}_x} u,$$

which allows us to write

$$A = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} (P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) = \underbrace{P_{\mathcal{V}_x} (P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) P_{\mathcal{V}_x}}_{=: A_1} + \underbrace{P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} (P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - I)}_{=: A_2}.$$

We can therefore use the triangle inequality  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|A_1\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} + \|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$  to split the computation into two steps. Both steps will rely heavily on the identities

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{V}_x} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) &= k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet), & P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} b &= b, & P_{\mathcal{V}_d} b &= b, \\ P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b &= b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet), & P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) &= b(\mathbf{x})^\top (G^{\mathbf{x}})^+ b, & P_{\mathcal{V}_d} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) &= b(\mathbf{x})^\top b, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the projectors are applied component-wise to the vectors of functions. The first line of the preceding identities follows by the projection properties and the second by simple computation.

In the first step, we bound  $\|A_1\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$ . Using the identities (14) and the linearity of the projection operator, we compute

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} P_{\mathcal{V}_x} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d}^{\mathbf{x}} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b(\mathbf{x})^\top (G^{\mathbf{x}})^+ b = \underbrace{b(\mathbf{x})^\top (G^{\mathbf{x}})^+ b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)}_{=: D_1}$$

and

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} P_{\mathcal{V}_x} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b(\mathbf{x})^\top b = \underbrace{b(\mathbf{x})^\top b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)}_{=: D_2}.$$

Combining both equations yields  $A_1 k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = (D_1 - D_2) k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)$ , which allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_1\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}^2 &= \|A_1 P_{\mathcal{V}_x}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}^2 = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_x} \frac{\|A_1 v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{c^\top (D_1 - D_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (D_1 - D_2)^\top c}{c^\top K(\mathbf{x}) c} \\ &= \lambda_{\max}(K(\mathbf{x})^{+1/2} (D_1 - D_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (D_1 - D_2)^\top K(\mathbf{x})^{+1/2}) \\ &\leq \text{tr}(K(\mathbf{x})^{+1/2} (D_1 - D_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (D_1 - D_2)^\top K(\mathbf{x})^{+1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the notation  $K(\mathbf{x})^{+1/2} := (K(\mathbf{x})^+)^{1/2}$ . The final matrix-algebraic expression can be computed explicitly. To do this, we will simplify the notation and write  $B := b(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $K := K(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G := G^{\mathbf{x}}$ . We will also make extensive use of the symmetry of  $K$  and  $G$  and the identity  $G = BK^+ B^\top$ . Noting that  $D_1 - D_2 = B^\top (G^+ - I) BK^+$ , we can now use the invariance of the trace under cyclic permutations to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(K^{+1/2} (D_1 - D_2) K (D_1 - D_2)^\top K^{+1/2}) &= \text{tr}(K^{+1/2} B^\top (G^+ - I) BK^+ K K^+ B^\top (G^+ - I) BK^{+1/2}) \\ &= \text{tr}((G^+ - I) BK^+ B^\top (G^+ - I) BK^+ B^\top) \\ &= \text{tr}((G^+ - I) G (G^+ - I) G) \\ &= \text{tr}((I - G)^2) \\ &= \|I - G\|_{\text{Fro}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This bounds  $\|A_1\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|I - G^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{Fro}}$ .

In the second step, we bound  $\|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$ . For this, we define the space  $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{V}_x + \mathcal{V}_d$  and note that  $\ker(A_2) \supseteq \ker(P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - P_{\mathcal{V}_d}) \supseteq \mathcal{W}^\perp$ . Denoting the  $\mathcal{V}$ -orthogonal complement of  $\mathcal{V}_d$  in  $\mathcal{W}$  by  $\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{V}_d \subseteq \mathcal{V}_x$ , we can thus write

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} &= \|A_2 P_{\mathcal{W}}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \\ &= \|A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_d} + A_2 P_{\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \\ &= \|A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_d} + A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \\ &= \|A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_x} = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} (P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - I) P_{\mathcal{V}_x} = 0$ . To compute the norm  $\|A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$ , we utilise again the identities (14) to write

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet) = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top b = \underbrace{b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+ b(\mathbf{x})^\top b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+}_{=: E_1} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)$$

and

$$P_{\mathcal{V}_x} P_{\mathcal{V}_d} b = P_{\mathcal{V}_x} b = \underbrace{b(\mathbf{x}) K(\mathbf{x})^+}_{=: E_2} k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet).$$

Combining both equations yields  $A_2 b = (E_1 - E_2) k(\mathbf{x}, \bullet)$ , which allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}^2 &= \|A_2 P_{\mathcal{V}_d}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}^2 = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_d} \frac{\|A_2 v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{c^\top (E_1 - E_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (E_1 - E_2)^\top c}{c^\top c} \\ &= \lambda_{\max}((E_1 - E_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (E_1 - E_2)^\top). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $E_1 - E_2 = BK^+(B^\top BK^+ - I)$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}((E_1 - E_2) K(\mathbf{x}) (E_1 - E_2)^\top) &= \lambda_{\max}(BK^+(B^\top BK^+ - I)K(K^+ B^\top B - I)K^+ B^\top) \\ &= \lambda_{\max}((GBK^+ - BK^+)K(K^+ B^\top G - K^+ B^\top)) \\ &= \lambda_{\max}((G - I)BK^+ K K^+ B^\top (G - I)) \\ &= \lambda_{\max}((G - I)G(G - I)) \\ &= \|(G - I)G(G - I)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|G\|_2 \|G - I\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|G - I\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 5. This bounds  $\|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|I - G^x\|_2$ .

Combining both estimates yields the claimed bound  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|A_1\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} + \|A_2\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}} \leq \|I - G^x\|_{\text{Fro}} + \|I - G^x\|_2$ .  $\square$

## C Proof of Proposition 22

Let  $\mathbf{x}' \subseteq \mathbf{x}$  and  $y$  be fixed and observe that  $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(\mathbf{x})^{-2} = \min_{v \in S(\mathcal{V}_d)} \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ . This ensures that  $\lambda$  is monotone because  $\mathbf{x}' \subseteq \mathbf{x}$  implies  $\|P_{\mathcal{V}_{x'}} v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}_d$ . To show that it is not submodular, we have to construct a counter-example to the inequality

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x} \oplus y) - \lambda(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda(\mathbf{x}' \oplus y) - \lambda(\mathbf{x}'). \quad (15)$$

We do this by defining  $\mathcal{V}_d := \mathcal{V}_{x'} + \langle v \rangle$  for some  $v \in S(\mathcal{V})$ , which is chosen later. This simplifies

$$\lambda(\mathbf{z}) = \min_{w \in \mathcal{V}_{x'}, w \perp v} \frac{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \|P_{\mathcal{V}_z} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|w\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} = \|P_{\mathcal{V}_z} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2$$

for any  $\mathbf{z}$  with  $\mathbf{x}' \subseteq \mathbf{z}$ . Now, we decompose  $k(y, \bullet) = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3$  with

$$\omega_1 := P_{\mathcal{V}_{x'}} k(y, \bullet), \quad \omega_2 := (P_{\mathcal{V}_x} - P_{\mathcal{V}_{x'}}) k(y, \bullet) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_3 := (I - P_{\mathcal{V}_x}) k(y, \bullet).$$

This allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mathbf{x} \oplus y) &= \|P_{\mathcal{V}_x} v + P_{\langle \omega_3 \rangle} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{(\omega_3, v)_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|\omega_3\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \\ \lambda(\mathbf{x}' \oplus y) &= \|P_{\mathcal{V}_{x'}} v + P_{\langle \omega_2 + \omega_3 \rangle} v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \lambda(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{(\omega_2 + \omega_3, v)_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|\omega_2 + \omega_3\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and implies that equation (15) becomes

$$\frac{(\omega_3, v)_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|\omega_3\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2} \leq \frac{(\omega_2 + \omega_3, v)_{\mathcal{V}}^2}{\|\omega_2 + \omega_3\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2}.$$

A counter-example is given by the choice  $v = \omega_3$ .

## D The Schur complement

Consider a linearly independent set of vectors  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$  with Gramian matrix  $C$ . Moreover, define for  $L \cup S = \{1, \dots, n\}$  the notations  $\omega_S$  and  $P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle} \omega_S$  just as in Proposition 25. We can then ask ourselves what the Gramian of  $(I - P_{\langle \omega_L \rangle}) \omega_S$  looks like. Some algebra reveals that this Gramian is given by the Schur complement  $C/C_{L,L} := C_{S,S} - C_{S,L} C_{L,L}^{-1} C_{L,S}$ . To prove  $\lambda_{\min}(C/C_{L,L}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(C)$ , consider the quadratic function

$$v \mapsto v^\top C v = \begin{bmatrix} v_S & v_L \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} C_{S,S} & C_{S,L} \\ C_{L,S} & C_{L,L} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_S \\ v_L \end{bmatrix}$$

for fixed  $v_S$  and optimise it over  $v_L$ . The minimiser of this problem is given by  $v_L = -C_{L,L}^{-1} C_{L,S} v_S$  and the minimum is

$$v_S^\top (C_{S,S} - C_{S,L} C_{L,L}^{-1} C_{L,S}) v_S = v_S^\top (C/C_{L,L}) v_S.$$

This implies

$$\lambda_{\min}(C/C_{L,L}) = \min_{v_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}} \frac{v_S^\top (C/C_{L,L}) v_S}{v_S^\top v_S} = \min_{v_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}} \frac{\min_{v_L} v^\top C v}{v_S^\top v_S} = \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^\top C v}{v_S^\top v_S} \geq \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^\top C v}{v^\top v} = \lambda_{\min}(C).$$

## E The kernel of $H^1(\rho)$

In this section, we derive an explicit expression for the kernel  $k_x := k(x, \bullet)$  of the RKHS  $H^1(\rho)$  with the Gaussian measure  $\rho$ . By an abuse of notation, we also denote by  $\rho$  the density of the Gaussian measure with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Performing integration by parts on the intervals  $(-\infty, x]$  and  $[x, \infty)$  for the Riesz representation equation  $(\phi, k_x)_{H^1(\rho)} = \phi(x)$  with smooth test functions  $\phi$  yields the condition

$$-(\phi, k_x'')_{L^2(\rho)} + (\phi, p k_x')_{L^2(\rho)} + (\phi, k_x)_{L^2(\rho)} + [\phi k_x' \rho]_{-\infty}^x + [\phi k_x' \rho]_x^\infty = \phi(x), \quad (16)$$

with the function  $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $p(y) := y$ . Now define  $k_{L,x} := k_x|_{(-\infty, x]}$  and  $k_{R,x} := k_x|_{[x, \infty)}$  and observe that equation (16) provides the following six conditions on  $k_x$ .

1. By considering the  $L^2$ -term in the variational equation for test functions  $\phi$  that are compactly supported in  $(-\infty, x)$ , we see that

$$-k_{L,x}''(y) + y k_{L,x}'(y) + k_{L,x}(y) = 0 \quad \text{on } (-\infty, x). \quad (17)$$

2. By considering the  $L^2$ -term in the variational equation for test functions  $\phi$  that are compactly supported in  $(x, \infty)$ , we see that

$$-k_{R,x}''(y) + y k_{R,x}'(y) + k_{R,x}(y) = 0 \quad \text{on } (x, \infty). \quad (18)$$

3. By considering the boundary terms that contain  $x$ , we obtain  $(k_{L,x}'(x) - k_{R,x}'(x))\rho(x) = 1$ .

4. By considering the boundary term containing the limit  $y \rightarrow -\infty$ , we conclude that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} k_{L,x}'(y)\rho(y) = 0, \quad (19)$$

because  $\phi$  can approach arbitrary values.

5. For the same reason, we obtain the condition

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} k_{R,x}'(y)\rho(y) = 0.$$

6. Since  $k_x \in H^1(\rho)$  must be continuous, it must hold that  $k_{L,x}(x) = k_{R,x}(x)$ .

The differential equations (17) and (18) are Sturm–Liouville equations and are solved by the functions

$$k_{L/R,x}(y) = c_{L/R,1} \exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2}\right) \left( \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + c_{L/R,2} \right).$$

This means that  $k_{L/R,x}'(y) = y k_{L/R,x}(y) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} c_{L/R,1}$  and the limit condition (19) is thus equivalent to

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} y \left( \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + c_{L,2} \right) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + c_{L,2} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad c_{L,2} = 1.$$

Analogously, we obtain

$$c_{R,2} = -1$$

and, since the continuity condition  $k_{L,x}(x) = k_{R,x}(x)$  has to be satisfied for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{L,1} \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right) &= c_{R,1} \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right) \\ \Leftrightarrow c_{L,1} \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right) &= c_{R,1} \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

We can thus write  $c_{L,1} := c \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right)$  and  $c_{R,1} := c \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right)$  for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . This yields the equations

$$\begin{aligned} k_{L,x}(y) &= c \exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2}\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right) \\ k_{R,x}(y) &= c \exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2}\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + 1\right) \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

The constant  $c$  is determined by the boundary condition  $(k'_{L,x}(x) - k'_{R,x}(x))\rho(x) = 1$  and evaluates to  $c = -\frac{1}{2\rho(x)}$ . This yields the final formula

$$k_x(y) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{x^2+y^2}{2}\right) \left(1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\min\{x,y\}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right) \left(1 - \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\max\{x,y\}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).$$