

# Efficient and provably convergent randomized greedy algorithms for neural network optimization

Jinchao Xu<sup>a</sup>, Xiaofeng Xu<sup>1a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Applied Mathematics and Computational Sciences Program, Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, 23955, Saudi Arabia*

---

## Abstract

Greedy algorithms have been successfully analyzed and applied in training neural networks for solving variational problems, ensuring guaranteed convergence orders. However, their practical applicability is limited due to the sub-problems, which often require an exhaustive search over a discrete dictionary and incur significant computational costs. This limitation becomes critical, especially in high-dimensional problems. In this paper, we propose a more practical approach of randomly discretizing the dictionary at each iteration of the greedy algorithm. We quantify the required size of the randomized discrete dictionary and prove that, with high probability, the proposed algorithm realizes a weak greedy algorithm, achieving optimal convergence orders. Through numerous numerical experiments, we demonstrate the advantage of using randomized discrete dictionaries over a deterministic one by showing orders of magnitude reductions in the size of the discrete dictionary, particularly in higher dimensions.

*Keywords:* Greedy algorithms, Randomized dictionaries, Neural network optimization, Partial differential equations

---

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, neural networks have been widely used in scientific computing, particularly for solving partial differential equations (PDEs) numerically. Notable approaches include, e.g., physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) [1, 2], the deep Ritz method [3], and the finite neuron method [4]. Each of these methods aims to find optimal parameters for a given neural network by minimizing a given loss function, essentially solving an optimization problem of the form

$$\min_{v \in \mathcal{F}} E(v), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes a class of functions that can be represented by a neural network, and  $E: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a suitable loss function.

Despite the superior expressivity of neural networks compared to conventional approaches for numerical PDEs [5, 6], the optimization problem (1) is highly non-convex and ill-conditioned. In [7], it is proven that even training the linear layers in shallow neural networks is ill-conditioned. This makes it extremely difficult to find a global optimum, even for shallow neural networks, which significantly undermines the application of neural networks in solving PDEs.

Due to the difficulty of training neural networks for solving PDEs mentioned above, various training algorithms tailored for solving PDEs, besides conventional gradient descent-based algorithms (see, e.g., [8]), have been designed to tackle optimization problems of the form (1). The hybrid least squares gradient descent method in [9] was motivated by the adaptive basis viewpoint. The active neuron least squares method [10, 11], which manually adjusts position of the neurons according to the training data, was designed to escape from plateaus during training. The neuron-wise parallel subspace correction method was proposed in [12], providing a way to precondition the linear layers in shallow neural networks and adjust neurons in a parallel manner. Random feature methods [13, 14, 15, 16] and extreme learning machines [17, 18, 19] have also gained attention as powerful methods for solving PDEs using

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: xiaofeng.xu@kaust.edu.sa

neural networks. Recently, greedy algorithms [20, 21, 22, 23] have been successfully applied in neural network optimization; see [24, 25, 26]. Most notably, the orthogonal greedy algorithm (OGA) [25, 26] for solving the optimization problem (1) has been shown to achieve the optimal approximation rates of shallow neural networks [27].

Despite the guaranteed approximation properties of greedy algorithms, they have a significant drawback; each iteration requires solving a non-convex optimization subproblem [25, Section 6]. Obtaining an exact optimum for this subproblem is very challenging in general; see [28] for some special cases. Consequently, an approximate solution is typically obtained by searching over a sufficiently fine discretized dictionary of finite size [25]. However, this approach becomes extremely challenging and nearly infeasible in higher dimensions, where the required size of the discretized dictionary becomes exceptionally large. Therefore, the application of greedy algorithms to higher-dimensional problems is mostly limited due to computational constraints, except for problems where the target functions have very special structures, such as being additively separable [25].

Given these significant challenges, in this paper, we propose a randomized approach for discretizing dictionaries in greedy algorithms for the optimization of shallow neural networks, with a focus on OGA. Deterministic approaches are commonly used to discretize dictionaries in greedy algorithms. In contrast, we propose using a randomized discrete dictionary at each iteration. First, we extend the convergence results of some greedy algorithms to their weak counterparts [29], which allow for inexact solutions of the non-convex subproblems. We then use these results to analyze our proposed randomized discretization approach. More precisely, we prove that, with high probability, the proposed approach applied to OGA realizes a weak orthogonal greedy algorithm (WOGA), achieving the optimal approximation rate same as the standard OGA. In addition, we quantify the size of the randomized discrete dictionary that is sufficient to realize WOGA. The practical performance of the proposed approach is verified by various numerical experiments involving function approximation problems and PDEs, demonstrating orders of magnitude reductions in the size of the discrete dictionary when compared with using a deterministic one.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce our model problems, and discuss relevant approximation results. In section 3, we introduce the weak greedy algorithms, and present their convergence results. In section 4, we discuss schemes for dictionary discretization and propose a randomized version. In section 5, we present OGA that uses discrete dictionaries of finite size. We quantify the required size of a discrete dictionary to guarantee realizations of WOGA, and show that with high probability, our proposed randomized algorithm achieves the same convergence rate of WOGA. In section 6, we verify the validity and demonstrate the computational advantage of our proposed method through numerous numerical experiments on function approximation problems and elliptic PDEs. Finally, we give concluding remarks in section 7.

## 2. Neural network optimization

In this section, we review neural network optimization problems appearing in the finite neuron method [4] and PINNs [1, 2].

### 2.1. Finite neuron method

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded domain and  $V \subset L^2(\Omega)$  be a Hilbert space consisting of functions on  $\Omega$ . We consider the following minimization problem:

$$\min_{v \in V} \left\{ E(v) := \frac{1}{2} a(v, v) - \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  and  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a continuous, coercive, and symmetric bilinear form defined on  $V$ . Various elliptic boundary value problems can be formulated as optimization problems of the form (2). For example, for the following elliptic PDE:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + u &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

the corresponding weak formulation of the form (2) has the bilinear form

$$a(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} (\nabla u \cdot \nabla v + uv) dx, \quad u, v \in H^1(\Omega).$$

For more general settings on differential operators and boundary conditions, see [4, 25].

In the finite neuron method, we minimize the loss function  $E$  given in (2) within a class  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions that can be represented by a given neural network. Namely, we solve the minimization problem

$$\min_{v \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ E(v) = \frac{1}{2} a(v, v) - \int_{\Omega} f v dx \right\}. \quad (3)$$

The convergence analysis of the finite neuron method in terms of the approximation properties of the class  $\mathcal{F}$  was provided in [4]. Additionally, various numerical algorithms for the finite neuron method have been studied in [30, 12, 25, 26].

**Remark 1.** *The finite neuron method (3) can be interpreted as a function approximation problem with respect to the energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_a$  induced by the bilinear form  $a$ . Let  $u \in V$  denote the solution of the variational problem (2). Then it is straightforward to verify that (3) is equivalent to the following:*

$$\min_{v \in \mathcal{F}} \|v - u\|_a.$$

That is, (3) is equivalent to finding the best approximation of  $u$  from the class  $\mathcal{F}$  in the sense of the energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_a$ .

## 2.2. Physics-informed neural networks

In PINNs [1, 2], a minimization problem different from (2) is used. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded domain. We define the following general boundary value problem on  $\Omega$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Lu &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Bu &= g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $f$  is a continuous function over  $\Omega$ ,  $L$  is a linear differential operator of order  $m$ , and  $B$  is a boundary operator linear in  $u$ . It is clear that the solution of the above boundary value problem solves the following residual minimization problem:

$$\min_{v \in V} \left\{ E(v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (Lv - f)^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega} (Bv - g)^2 ds \right\} \quad (4)$$

where  $V = C^m(\Omega)$ , and  $\beta$  is a positive penalty hyperparameter. In PINNs, we find a minimizer of  $E$  as defined in (4) within a class of functions  $\mathcal{F}$  represented by a specific neural network.

The advantages of PINNs lie in their flexibility with respect to equations and boundary conditions, as well as their ease of implementation. Owing to these benefits, PINNs have been applied to solve various important problems in scientific computing [31, 32, 33]. Additionally, convergence analyses of PINNs can be found in [34, 35].

**Remark 2.** *We can verify that (4) is equivalent to the minimization problem*

$$\min_{v \in V} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \tilde{a}(v, v) - \tilde{L}(v) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where we define the terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}(u, v) &= \int_{\Omega} (Lu)(Lv) dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} (Bu)(Bv) ds, \\ \tilde{L}(v) &= \int_{\Omega} (Lv)f dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} (Bv)g ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, similar to Remark 1, the problem (5) can be viewed as a function approximation problem in the energy norm induced by the bilinear form  $\tilde{a}$ .

### 2.3. Shallow neural networks

Here, we discuss the function classes represented by shallow neural networks and their approximation properties. Recall that a shallow neural network with  $n$  neurons,  $d$ -dimensional input, and  $\text{ReLU}^k$  activation ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) is written as

$$u_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sigma_k(\omega_i \cdot x + b_i), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for parameters  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset S^{d-1}$ , and  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\sigma_k$ , defined as  $\text{ReLU}^k: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is the activation function

$$\sigma_k(t) = \text{ReLU}(t)^k, \quad \text{ReLU}(t) = \max(0, t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and  $S^{d-1}$  represents the unit  $d$ -sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  centered at the origin. Following [25, 27], we examine the function class  $\Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})$ , defined for some  $M > 0$ , as

$$\Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D}) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i d_i : a_i \in \mathbb{R}, d_i \in \mathbb{D}, \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| \leq M \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where the dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  is symmetric and given by

$$\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{P}_k^d := \left\{ \pm \sigma_k(\omega \cdot x + b) : \omega \in S^{d-1}, b \in [c_1, c_2] \right\}, \quad (7)$$

with two constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  chosen to satisfy

$$c_1 \leq \inf \left\{ \omega \cdot x : x \in \Omega, \omega \in S^{d-1} \right\} \leq \sup \left\{ \omega \cdot x : x \in \Omega, \omega \in S^{d-1} \right\} \leq c_2. \quad (8)$$

Throughout this paper, we denote the function class  $\mathcal{F}$  in (1) by  $\Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})$ .

Recently, a sharp bound on the approximation rate of  $\Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})$  was established in [27]. We present the approximation results of  $\Sigma_{n,M}$  in the space  $V = H^m(\Omega)$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded domain and  $H^m(\Omega)$  is the Hilbert space of functions with square-integrable  $m$ th-order partial derivatives.

To describe the result from [27], we introduce several mathematical notions. We first consider the set

$$\mathcal{B}_1(\mathbb{D}) = \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i d_i : n \in \mathbb{N}, d_i \in \mathbb{D}, \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| \leq 1 \right\}}, \quad (9)$$

which is the  $H^m(\Omega)$ -closure of the convex, symmetric hull of  $\mathbb{D}$ . The variation norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}$  with respect to the dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  is defined as

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} = \inf \{c > 0 : v \in c\mathcal{B}_1(\mathbb{D})\}, \quad v \in H^m(\Omega), \quad (10a)$$

and the corresponding variation space  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  is given by

$$\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D}) = \{v \in H^m(\Omega) : \|v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} < \infty\}. \quad (10b)$$

For a detailed characterization of this variation space  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ , see [36]. If the target function  $u$  belongs to  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ , the best approximation  $u_n \in \Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})$  enjoys the following approximation rate.

**Proposition 1.** [27, Theorems 2 and 3] *Given  $u \in \mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ , there exists a positive constant  $M$  depending on  $k$  and  $d$  such that*

$$\inf_{u_n \in \Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})} \|u - u_n\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2(k-m)+1}{2d}},$$

where  $\Sigma_{n,M}(\mathbb{D})$  and  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  were given in (6) and (10), respectively, and  $C$  is a constant independent of  $u$  and  $n$ .

### 3. Weak greedy algorithms

Greedy algorithms are well-established methods that have been extensively studied over the past decades for various applications [20, 21, 22, 23]. Recently, the application of greedy algorithms to neural network optimization has been explored in [24, 25, 26]. In this section, we introduce the pure greedy algorithms, the weak relaxed greedy algorithm (WRGA) and WOGA. We discuss their convergence results which will be an important tool in the convergence analysis for greedy algorithms with discrete dictionaries as introduced in section 4. Notably, these weak greedy algorithms preserve the same convergence order as the original greedy algorithm.

Let  $V$  be a Hilbert space equipped with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and its induced norm  $\| \cdot \|$ . We first introduce the pure greedy algorithms in a setting of minimizing a convex,  $K$ -smooth loss function  $E: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and then discuss the weak greedy algorithms that are better suited for practical implementation.

Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be a symmetric dictionary, that is, if  $g \in \mathbb{D}$ , then  $-g \in \mathbb{D}$ . Assume that  $\max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \|g\| = C < \infty$ . Given a current iterate  $u_{n-1}$ , greedy algorithms pick  $g_n$  that maximizes  $\langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), g_n \rangle$ . The  $n$ th step of the pure greedy algorithm with shrinkage  $s > 0$  [23, 37] reads as

$$g_n = \arg \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle, \quad (11a)$$

$$u_n = u_{n-1} - s \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), g_n \rangle g_n. \quad (11b)$$

Here,  $\nabla E(u_{n-1})$  is the variational derivative of the loss function  $E$  at  $u_{n-1}$ .

We note that at each iteration of greedy algorithms, we must solve the optimization problem (11a), which is challenging and computationally intractable for practical implementation. To make it more ready for practical implementation, one possible strategy is to replace the problem (11a) with a weaker version: we find  $g_n \in \mathbb{D}$  such that

$$\langle g_n, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle \geq \gamma \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle \quad (12)$$

for a given parameter  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ . That is, we solve (11a) only approximately so that the value of  $\langle g_n, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle$  closely approximates the maximum of  $\langle g, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle$  over  $g \in \mathbb{D}$ . Greedy algorithms that adopt (12) are called *weak greedy algorithms*.

#### 3.1. Weak relaxed greedy algorithm

Here, we consider relaxed greedy algorithms (RGAs) [38, 20, 21, 25], which adopt certain relaxation approaches to obtain guaranteed convergence [39]. Following [20, 40, 25], we present a version of WRGA that minimizes a convex loss function  $E$  in Algorithm 1. Other versions of WRGA and their the convergence analysis can be found in [29].

---

#### Algorithm 1 Weak relaxed greedy algorithm (WRGA)

---

Given a dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  defined in (7),  $M > 0$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , and  $u_0 = 0$ ,

**for**  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**

Find  $g_n \in \mathbb{D}$  such that  $\langle g_n, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle \geq \gamma \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, \nabla E(u_{n-1}) \rangle$ .

$u_n = (1 - \alpha_n) u_{n-1} - \alpha_n M g_n$ , where  $\alpha_n = \min(1, \frac{2}{n})$

**end for**

---

Before proceeding, we present a lemma used in analysis of greedy algorithms.

**Lemma 1.** *Given  $f \in \mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  and  $h \in V$ , we have*

$$\langle f, h \rangle \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, h \rangle,$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  was given in (10).

*Proof.* We may assume that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} = 1$ . Take any  $\epsilon > 0$ . By the definition (10) of  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ , we can find  $c \in [1, 1 + \epsilon)$  such that  $f \in cB_1(\mathbb{D})$ , where  $B_1(\mathbb{D})$  was defined in (9). Hence, there exists a sequence  $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset cB_1(\mathbb{D})$  such that  $f_j \rightarrow f$  in  $cB_1(\mathbb{D})$  and for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$f_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m_j} a_{ij} d_{ij}$$

for some  $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{d_{ij}\}_{i=1}^{m_j} \subset \mathbb{D}$ , and  $\{a_{ij}\}_{i=1}^{m_j} \subset \mathbb{R}$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^{m_j} |a_{ij}| \leq c$ . It follows that

$$\langle f, h \rangle = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m_j} a_{ij} \langle d_{ij}, h \rangle \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m_j} |a_{ij}| \cdot \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, h \rangle \right) \leq c \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, h \rangle.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we obtain the desired result by taking  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

We now present the convergence theorem for WRGA in Theorem 3.1. Some early results on the convergence analysis of RGAs can be found in [20, 21, 29, 25].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that  $\max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \|g\| \leq C$ , and that the loss function  $E$  is convex and  $K$ -smooth. Then, in WRGA (Algorithm 1) we have*

$$E(u_n) - \inf_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \leq M\gamma} E(v) \leq \frac{8(CM)^2 K}{n}.$$

*Proof.* We first note it is easy to verify that

$$\|u_n\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \leq CM, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (13)$$

By  $K$ -smoothness, we have

$$E(u_n) \leq E(u_{n-1}) + \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), u_n - u_{n-1} \rangle + \frac{K}{2} \|u_n - u_{n-1}\|^2.$$

Since  $u_n - u_{n-1} = -\alpha_n u_{n-1} - \alpha M g_n$ , we obtain

$$E(u_n) \leq E(u_{n-1}) - \alpha_n \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), u_{n-1} + M g_n \rangle + \frac{K \alpha_n^2}{2} \|u_{n-1} + M g_n\|^2. \quad (14)$$

Now for  $\|v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \leq M\gamma$ , we have

$$\langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), M g_n \rangle \geq M\gamma \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), g \rangle \geq \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), -v \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 1. On the other hand, by invoking (13), we get

$$\|u_{n-1} + M g_n\|^2 \leq (\|u_{n-1}\| + M \|g_n\|)^2 \leq 4C^2 M^2. \quad (16)$$

Combining (14) with (15), (16) and subtracting  $E(v)$  from (14) gives

$$E(u_n) - E(v) \leq E(u_{n-1}) - E(v) - \alpha_n \langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), u_{n-1} - v \rangle + 2\alpha_n (CM)^2 K$$

The convexity of  $E$  means  $\langle \nabla E(u_{n-1}), u_{n-1} - v \rangle \geq E(u_{n-1}) - E(v)$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$E(u_n) - E(v) \leq (1 - \alpha_n)(E(u_{n-1}) - E(v)) + 2\alpha_n (CM)^2 K.$$

An application of an inductive argument gives that

$$E(u_n) - E(v) \leq \frac{8(CM)^2 K}{n}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Taking the infimum over  $v$  with  $\|v\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \leq M\gamma$  gives the result.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** *WRGA can be applied to solving linear or nonlinear PDEs as long as the PDE admits a variational formulation that corresponds to a convex and  $K$ -smooth loss function.*

---

**Algorithm 2** WOGA for function approximation

---

Given a dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  defined in (7),  $u_0 = 0$ , and a parameter  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ ,

**for**  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**

Find  $g_n \in \mathbb{D}$  such that  $\langle g_n, u - u_{n-1} \rangle \geq \gamma \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, u - u_{n-1} \rangle$ .

$u_n = P_n u$ , where  $P_n$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $H_n := \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ .

**end for**

---

### 3.2. Weak orthogonal greedy algorithm

We consider in Algorithm 2 the WOGA for function approximation that minimizes the energy functional  $E(v) = \frac{1}{2}\|u - v\|^2$ . This is a special instance of the more general weak chebyshev algorithm for convex optimization [41, 42].

If  $\gamma = 1$ , WOGA reduces to the original OGA [43, 44, 20, 45, 26] that combines the greedy algorithm with orthogonal projections, achieves improved convergence behavior. The convergence analysis of OGA for function approximation was first carried out in [20]; see also [38]. For WOGA, the convergence analysis is done in [29]. Both analyses lead to an  $O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$  convergence rate. Recently, in [26, 45], a significantly improved convergence rate was obtained for OGA when  $B_1(\mathbb{D})$  has small entropy. We follow the proof in [45] and generalize the improved convergence results to WOGA in Theorem 3.2.

**Theorem 3.2.** *In WOGA (Algorithm 2), we have*

$$\|u - u_n\| \leq \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \epsilon_n(B_1(\mathbb{D}))_V$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  was given in (10), and  $C$  is a constant independent of  $u$ ,  $n$ , and  $\gamma$ .

*Proof.* Let  $r_n = u - u_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $r_n \perp H_n$  and  $g_n - P_{n-1}g_n \in H_n$ , we have

$$\|r_n\|^2 \leq \|r_{n-1} - \alpha(g_n - P_{n-1}g_n)\|^2 \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Minimizing over  $\alpha$ , we obtain

$$\|r_n\|^2 \leq \|r_{n-1}\|^2 - \frac{|\langle r_{n-1}, g_n - P_{n-1}g_n \rangle|^2}{\|g_n - P_{n-1}g_n\|^2}. \quad (17)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_{n-1}\|^2 &= \langle r_{n-1}, u \rangle \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} |\langle r_{n-1}, g \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}}{\gamma} |\langle r_{n-1}, g_n \rangle| \\ &= \frac{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}}{\gamma} |\langle r_{n-1}, g_n - P_{n-1}g_n \rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the last equality is due to that  $r_{n-1} \perp H_{n-1}$ . Combining (17) and (18), we obtain

$$\|r_n\|^2 \leq \|r_{n-1}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma^2 \|r_{n-1}\|^4}{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}^2 \|g_n - P_{n-1}g_n\|^2},$$

from which we should set the notation slightly different from [45]

$$a_n = \frac{\gamma^2}{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}^2} \|u - u_n\|, \quad b_n = \|g_n - P_{n-1}g_n\|^{-2},$$

to obtain a recurrence relation  $a_n \leq a_{n-1}(1 - b_n a_{n-1})$ .

We then apply the same argument as in [45], and obtain  $a_n \leq C(\epsilon_n(B_1(\mathbb{D})))^2$ , where  $\epsilon_n(B_1(\mathbb{D}))$  is the metric entropy of  $B_1(\mathbb{D})$  defined in (9),  $C$  is a constant. Finally, we obtain the desired estimate

$$\|u - u_n\| \leq \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \epsilon_n(B_1(\mathbb{D}))_V$$

This completes the proof. □

Knowing that for  $V = H^m(\Omega)$ ,  $\varepsilon_n(B_1(\mathbb{D}))_V \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2(k-m)+1}{2d}}$  from [27], we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.3.** *In WOGA (Algorithm 2), we have*

$$\|u - u_n\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2(k-m)+1}{2d}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$  was given in (10), and  $C$  is a constant independent of  $u$ ,  $n$ , and  $\gamma$ .

**Remark 4.** *Note that WOGA (Algorithm 2) is for function approximation in a general Hilbert space  $V$ . As shown in Remarks 1 and 2, both the finite neuron method and the PINN method can be recast as best approximation problems under some energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_a$ . This allows us to solve some linear PDEs using WOGA.*

#### 4. Discretized dictionaries

In this section, we introduce the scheme of a deterministic discrete dictionary to approximately solve the arg max subproblem (11a) in the greedy algorithms, and then propose its randomized variant.

##### 4.1. Deterministic discretization

In [25, Section 6.2], discretizing the dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  using a regular grid on polar and spherical coordinates for parametrization of the dictionary in two- and three-dimensions, respectively, was proposed. Here, we present a generalization of the scheme for arbitrary dimensions.

From the definition (7) of  $\mathbb{D}$ , we parametrize the unit  $d$ -sphere  $S^{d-1}$  in order to obtain a parametrization of  $\mathbb{D}$ . In the cases  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ , we may use the polar and spherical coordinates to parametrize  $S^{d-1}$ , respectively, as discussed in [25]. Accordingly, for higher dimensions, it is natural to make use of the hyperspherical coordinates [46] to parametrize  $S^{d-1}$ . Namely, for  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d) \in S^{d-1}$ , we have  $\omega = \mathcal{S}(\phi)$  for some  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{d-1}) \in [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi) \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ , where the hyperspherical coordinate map  $\mathcal{S}: [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi) \rightarrow S^{d-1}$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{S}(\phi))_i &= \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \sin \phi_j \right) \cos \phi_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d-1, \\ (\mathcal{S}(\phi))_d &= \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} \sin \phi_j, \end{aligned} \quad \phi \in [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi). \quad (19)$$

A useful property of the hyperspherical coordinate map  $\mathcal{S}$  is that it is nonexpansive, as stated in Lemma 2.

**Lemma 2.** *The hyperspherical coordinate map  $\mathcal{S}: [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi) \rightarrow S^{d-1}$  defined in (19) is nonexpansive. That is, we have*

$$|\mathcal{S}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\hat{\phi})| \leq |\phi - \hat{\phi}|, \quad \phi, \hat{\phi} \in [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi).$$

*Proof.* We readily obtain the desired result by invoking the following identity:

$$|\mathcal{S}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\hat{\phi})|^2 = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \sin \phi_j \sin \hat{\phi}_j \right) \sin^2 \frac{\phi_i - \hat{\phi}_i}{2}, \quad \phi, \hat{\phi} \in [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi),$$

which can be proven without major difficulty. □

With the help of the hyperspherical coordinate map  $\mathcal{S}$ , the dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$  can be parametrized as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}: R \rightarrow \mathbb{D}, \quad (\phi, b) \mapsto \sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\phi) \cdot x + b). \quad (20)$$

The parameter space  $R$  is defined as

$$R = \left( [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi) \right) \times [c_1, c_2]. \quad (21)$$



We denote  $|R|$  as the volume of the parameter space  $R$ , given by

$$|R| = 2\pi^{d-1}(c_2 - c_1).$$

Since the domain  $\Omega$  is bounded, we deduce the map  $\mathcal{P}$  is Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

$$\|\mathcal{P}(\phi, b) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{b})\| \leq \text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})\|(\phi, b) - (\hat{\phi}, \hat{b})\|, \quad (\phi, b), (\hat{\phi}, \hat{b}) \in R, \quad (22)$$

where the Lipschitz modulus  $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})$  depends on  $d, k, \Omega, c_1$ , and  $c_2$ .

**Remark 5.** To examine the dependence of the Lipschitz modulus  $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})$  on the problem setting, we conduct an analysis of  $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})$ , assuming  $\Omega = (0, 1)^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . We observe that setting  $c_1 = -\sqrt{d}$  and  $c_2 = \sqrt{d}$  in the definition (7) of  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies the condition (8). Namely, we have

$$|\omega \cdot x| \leq |\omega| |x| \leq \sqrt{1^2 + \dots + 1^2} = \sqrt{d}.$$

In this setting, we see that  $\omega \cdot x + b \in [-2\sqrt{d}, 2\sqrt{d}]$  for any  $(\omega, b) \in S^{d-1} \times [c_1, c_2]$  and  $x \in \Omega$ . On the interval  $[-2\sqrt{d}, 2\sqrt{d}]$ , the activation function  $\sigma_k$  is Lipschitz continuous with modulus

$$\max_{t \in [-2\sqrt{d}, 2\sqrt{d}]} |\sigma_k'(t)| = k(2\sqrt{d})^{k-1}. \quad (23)$$

Hence, for any  $(\phi, b), (\hat{\phi}, \hat{b}) \in R$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}(\phi, b) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{b})\|^2 &\stackrel{(20)}{=} \int_{\Omega} |\sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\phi \cdot x + b)) - \sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\hat{\phi} \cdot x + \hat{b}))|^2 dx \\ &\stackrel{(23)}{\leq} k^2 (4d)^{k-1} \int_{\Omega} |(\mathcal{S}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\hat{\phi})) \cdot x + (b - \hat{b})|^2 dx \\ &\leq k^2 (4d)^{k-1} \left( (\mathcal{S}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\hat{\phi}))^2 + (b - \hat{b})^2 \right) \int_{\Omega} (|x|^2 + 1) dx \\ &\leq k^2 (4d)^{k-1} \left( \frac{d}{3} + 1 \right) \|(\phi, b) - (\hat{\phi}, \hat{b})\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 2. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P}) \leq k(2\sqrt{d})^{k-1} \sqrt{\frac{d}{3} + 1}.$$

To construct a deterministic discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  of size  $N$ , we use a regular hyperrectangular grid on  $R$ , and then apply the map  $\mathcal{P}$  given in (20). We have

$$\mathbb{D}_N = \{\pm \sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\phi) \cdot x + b) : (\phi, b) \in G_N\}, \quad (24)$$

where  $G_N$  is defined as the set of centers of the cells in a regular hyperrectangular grid that divides  $R$  into  $N$  cells. Using elementary inequalities, it is straightforward to verify that the length  $\ell$  of the main diagonal of each cell in the grid  $G_N$  satisfies

$$\ell \geq \sqrt{d} \left( \frac{|R|}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}}.$$

We define the constant  $\delta \geq 1$  as

$$\delta = \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{d}} \left( \frac{N}{|R|} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}}. \quad (25)$$

#### 4.2. Random discretization

Now, we consider a random discretization of the dictionary  $\mathbb{D}$ . One straightforward way of randomly discretizing the dictionary is to utilize the hyperspherical coordinate map (19). We draw  $N$  samples from the uniform distribution on the parameter space  $R$ , and then apply the parametrization map  $\mathcal{P}$  given in (20). Therefore, a randomized discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  is defined as

$$\mathbb{D}_N = \{\pm\sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\phi_i) \cdot x + b_i) : (\phi_i, b_i) \sim \text{Uniform}(R), 1 \leq i \leq N\}. \quad (26)$$

**Remark 6.** An alternative approach to defining a randomized discrete dictionary is to directly sample points from the uniform distribution on  $S^{d-1} \times [c_1, c_2]$  directly, without relying on its parametrization. Generating uniform random variables defined on a hypersphere can be achieved by appropriately manipulating normal random variables, see [47, 48]. However, generating deterministic points that are evenly spaced on  $S^{d-1}$  is less obvious in higher dimensions. For the sake of simplicity and consistency in our analysis, we adhere to the method that utilizes the parametrization  $\mathcal{P}$  for both deterministic and randomized discretizations in this paper.

**Remark 7.** We note that the discretization must be fine enough to ensure a realization of the weak greedy algorithm as the residual norm  $\|u - u_{n-1}\|$  gets smaller. So it is natural to seek for a discrete dictionary of minimal size for a desired accuracy. In our case, this is equivalent to finding an arrangement of points that forms a covering of the parameter space  $R$  with congruent balls. See [49] for relevant investigation. However, constructing an ideal arrangement of points is a highly nontrivial task in different dimensions, especially in higher ones [50, 51]. Covering density, roughly defined as the ratio of sum of the Lebesgue measures of the bodies and that of the domain being covered, measures the efficiency of a covering. On one hand, although the upper bound ([52, 53]) and the lower bound ([54]) for the covering density with congruent balls are available, the proofs are non-constructive, meaning that we do not know how to construct an arrangement of points that can achieve the lower bound in high dimensions. On the other hand, the optimal covering of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with balls is only known for  $d \leq 5$  [55, 56, 57, 58, 59]. Among the lattice arrangement covering, for which our deterministic discretization belongs to, the optimal covering is only known in 2D and is related to the regular hexagonal pattern [55]. Our usage of the regular hyperrectangular grid introduced in (24) is due to highly non-trivial explicit construction of efficient coverings in different dimensions. Nevertheless, we will see later in the analysis, the required size of the randomized discrete dictionary when using a uniform distribution is actually optimal up to a logarithmic term independent of the dimension. See our discussion at the end of section 5.

### 5. Analysis of dictionary sizes

In this section, we present a rigorous analysis demonstrating that utilizing discretized dictionaries for OGA, as introduced in the previous section, can yield convergence rates same as the original OGA, provided that the size of the discrete dictionary is sufficiently large. Furthermore, we establish that the lower bound for the size of randomized discrete dictionaries is significantly smaller than that of deterministic discrete dictionaries in high dimensions. Consequently, leveraging randomized dictionaries holds promise for reducing computational costs while maintaining a good accuracy, thereby making greedy algorithms more applicable to relatively higher-dimensional problems. Throughout this section, we will focus on OGA, and we will use the  $L^2$ -minimization as an example. The analysis for some elliptic PDE examples will be similar because they are essentially best approximation problems in an appropriate Hilbert space, see Remark 1. Additionally, the analysis for RGA with discrete dictionaries will be similar but is not discussed in this paper.

First, in Algorithm 3, we present OGA that uses a deterministic discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  defined in (24).

---

#### Algorithm 3 OGA with a deterministic discrete dictionary

---

Given a deterministic discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  of size  $N$ , which was defined in (24), and  $u_0 = 0$ ,

**for**  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**

$$g_n = \arg \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}_N} \langle g, u - u_{n-1} \rangle$$

$$u_n = P_n u, \text{ where } P_n \text{ is the orthogonal projection onto } H_n := \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}.$$

**end for**

---

In Theorem 5.1, we state a lower bound for the size  $N$  of the deterministic discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  that ensures the optimal convergence rate of the error  $\|u - u_n\|$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . In OGA with the deterministic discrete dictionary  $\mathbb{D}_N$  (see Algorithm 3), for any  $n \geq 1$ , if*

$$N \geq |R| \left( \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \frac{\delta \sqrt{d} \text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})}{2C} \right)^d n^{(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2k+1}{2d})d}, \quad (27)$$

then we have

$$\|u - u_n\| \leq \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}},$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ ,  $C$ ,  $R$ ,  $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})$ , and  $\delta$  were given in (10), (3.3), (21), (22), and (25), respectively.

*Proof.* As the sequence  $\{\|u - u_m\|\}$  is decreasing in Algorithm 3, we may assume the following:

$$\|u - u_m\| > \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq n-1. \quad (28)$$

Now, we suppose that (27) holds and take any  $m$ . Let  $(\phi_m^*, b_m^*)$  be an element of  $R$  such that  $g = \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*)$  maximizes  $|\langle g, u - u_{m-1} \rangle|$  in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Recall that the length of the main diagonal of each cell in the grid  $G_N$  is denoted by  $\ell$ . Then we can find a grid point  $(\phi_m, b_m) \in G_N$  such that

$$|(\phi_m, b_m) - (\phi_m^*, b_m^*)| \leq \frac{\ell}{2}. \quad (29)$$

By combining (25), (27), and (29), we have

$$|(\phi_m, b_m) - (\phi_m^*, b_m^*)| \leq \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} \frac{C}{\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}}. \quad (30)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*), u - u_{m-1} \rangle| - |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m, b_m), u - u_{m-1} \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m, b_m) - \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*), u - u_{m-1} \rangle| \\ & \stackrel{(22)}{\leq} \text{Lip}(\mathcal{P}) |(\phi_m, b_m) - (\phi_m^*, b_m^*)| \|u - u_{m-1}\| \\ & \stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} C n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}} \|u - u_{m-1}\| \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} C n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}} \frac{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*), u - u_{m-1} \rangle|}{\|u - u_{m-1}\|} \\ & \stackrel{(28)}{\leq} (1-\gamma) |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*), u - u_{m-1} \rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where (\*) is due to the following:

$$\|u - u_{m-1}\|^2 = \langle u, u - u_{m-1} \rangle = \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \left\langle \frac{f}{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})}}, u - u_{m-1} \right\rangle \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}} \langle g, u - u_{m-1} \rangle.$$

Rearranging (31), we obtain

$$|\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m, b_m), u - u_{m-1} \rangle| \geq \gamma |\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*), u - u_{m-1} \rangle|, \quad (32)$$

which implies that the initial  $n$  iterations of Algorithm 3 realize WOGA (see Algorithm 2). Therefore, invoking Theorem 3.3 yields the desired result.  $\square$

---

**Algorithm 4** OGA with randomized discrete dictionaries
 

---

Given  $u_0 = 0$ ,

**for**  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**

    Sample  $(\phi_{i,n}, b_{i,n}) \sim \text{Uniform}(R)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , to generate a randomized discrete dictionary

$$\mathbb{D}_{N,n} = \{\sigma_k(\mathcal{S}(\phi_{i,n}) \cdot x + b_{i,n}) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}.$$

$$g_n = \arg \max_{g \in \mathbb{D}_{N,n}} |\langle g, u - u_{n-1} \rangle|$$

$$u_n = P_n u, \text{ where } P_n \text{ is the orthogonal projection onto } H_n := \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}.$$

**end for**

---

Next, the approach that uses a randomized discrete dictionary (26) at each iteration of OGA is given in Algorithm 4. This approach is also explored in [60] for greedy algorithms in reduced basis methods. In practice, one can always further optimize the arg max subproblem using a few steps of Newton's iteration after selecting from the randomized dictionary. This might further improve the accuracy but is not considered or verified in the paper as we will see from experiments in section 6 that using randomized dictionaries is already very effective.

**Remark 8.** Algorithm 4 is also suitable for solving some linear PDEs. We may refer to Remark 1, Remark 2, and [25] for details.

Theorem 5.2 provides a lower bound for the size of the randomized discrete dictionaries  $\{\mathbb{D}_{N,n}\}$  that ensures the optimal convergence rate of the residual error  $\|u - u_n\|$  presented in Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let  $\gamma, \eta \in (0, 1)$ . In OGA with the randomized discrete dictionaries  $\{\mathbb{D}_{N,n}\}_n$  (see Algorithm 4), for any  $n \geq 1$ , if

$$N \geq |R| \cdot \frac{1}{V_d} \left( \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \frac{\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})}{C} \right)^d n^{(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2k+1}{2d})d} \log \frac{n}{\eta}, \quad (33)$$

then, with probability  $1 - \eta$ , we have

$$\|u - u_n\| \leq \frac{C}{\gamma} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}},$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_1(\mathbb{D})$ ,  $C$ ,  $R$ , and  $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})$  were given in (10), (3.3), (21), and (22), respectively, and  $V_d = \frac{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}$  is the volume of an  $\ell^2$ -unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Proof.* Similar as in Theorem 5.1, we may assume that (28) holds. For each  $m$  with  $0 \leq m \leq n-1$ , let  $(\phi_m^*, b_m^*)$  be an element of  $R$  such that  $g = \mathcal{P}(\phi_m^*, b_m^*)$  maximizes  $|\langle g, u - u_{m-1} \rangle|$  in  $\mathbb{D}$ . By the same argument as in (31), we can prove that for each  $(\phi_m, b_m) \in R$ , (30) implies (32). Accordingly, we conclude the following:

(\*) If there exists an element  $(\phi_m, b_m) \in \mathbb{D}_{N,m}$  such that

$$|(\phi_m, b_m) - (\phi_m^*, b_m^*)| \leq \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} \frac{C}{\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P})} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2k+1}{2d}} =: \epsilon$$

for each  $0 \leq m \leq n-1$ , then the initial  $n$  iterations of Algorithm 4 realize WOGA (see Algorithm 2).

Therefore, if the condition (\*) holds, invoking Theorem 3.3 yields the desired result.

Next, we show that (33) implies that (\*) holds with probability  $1 - \eta$ . It is straightforward to verify that the probability that the premise of (\*) holds is given by

$$\left(1 - (1-p)^N\right)^m,$$

where  $p$  is the ratio between the volume of a  $d$ -dimensional ball with radius  $\epsilon$  and that of the entire parameter space  $R$ , i.e.,

$$p = \frac{V_d \epsilon^d}{|R|}.$$

Now, we suppose that  $N$  satisfies (33). Then we have

$$N \geq \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log \frac{n}{\eta} \geq \frac{\log \frac{n}{\eta}}{\log \frac{1}{1-p}}, \quad (34)$$

where the third inequality is due to an elementary inequality (see, e.g., [61, equation (3.5)])

$$\log \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) \geq \frac{2}{2t+1}, \quad t > 0.$$

By direct calculation, we verify that (34) implies

$$\left(1 - (1-p)^N\right)^m \geq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 - \eta,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 9.** *Although Algorithm 4 is tailored for training ReLU<sup>k</sup> shallow neural networks, the strategy of employing randomized dictionaries works for other activation functions with non-compact parameter spaces, e.g., tanh, sigmoid, etc. In these situations, we can still randomly sample the parameters to form a randomized discrete dictionary, e.g., using a Gaussian distribution or a uniform distribution on a truncated parameter space, see [25, Example 6].*

## 6. Numerical results

In this section, we present numerical results for  $L^2$ -minimization problems and elliptic PDEs in various dimensions to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method of using randomized dictionaries. We verify our theoretical finding that one may use much fewer dictionary elements while retaining the same or higher level of accuracy than an OGA with a deterministic discrete dictionary.

Numerical integration is needed for evaluating inner product in the arg max subproblem and for assembling linear systems in the orthogonal projection subproblem. In 1D, 2D and 3D, we use the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule. We first divide the computational domain into smaller regular subdomains and then use  $p$  quadrature points on each subdomain. For higher dimensions, we use quasi-Monte Carlo integration [62, 63]. We do not investigate the effect of the number of sampling points on the stability of the orthogonal projection. See [64, 65, 66] for relevant studies on least squares approximations using polynomials. The number of samples points, chosen to ensure sufficient accuracy, is stated in each experiment.

All experiments are implemented using Python and PyTorch, and run on a NVIDIA A100 GPU.

We first carry out numerical experiments on solving  $L^2$ -minimization problems in low dimensions, followed by 4D and 10D examples. We then demonstrate the method's efficacy for solving elliptic PDEs using the Neumann problem as an example. The computational domain  $\Omega$  is  $[0, 1]^d$  in all examples.

### 6.1. Low-dimensional examples

For the 1D case, we fit the sine function

$$f(x) = \sin(2\pi x), \quad (35)$$

and the Gabor function

$$f(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x-0.5)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cos(2\pi m x), \quad \sigma = 0.15, m = 8. \quad (36)$$

For numerical integration, we divide the interval  $[0, 1]$  into 1024 subintervals and use a Gaussian quadrature of order 5 on each subinterval.

In 2D, we fit

$$f(x) = \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2), \quad (37)$$




Figure 1: 2D Gabor function (38)

and a Gabor function (see Figure 1) given by

$$f(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x_1 - 0.5)^2 + (x_2 - 0.5)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cos(2\pi mx), \quad \sigma = 0.15, m = 8. \quad (38)$$

For numerical integration, we divide the square domain  $[0, 1]^2$  into  $50^2$  uniform square subdomains and use a Gaussian quadrature of order 3 on each subdomain.

In 3D, we fit the following function

$$f(x) = \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2) \sin(\pi x_3). \quad (39)$$

For numerical integration, we divide the cubic domain  $[0, 1]^3$  into  $25^3$  uniform cubic subdomains and use a Gaussian quadrature of order 3 on each subdomain.

Results for all dimensions are all shown in fig. 2. The  $L^2$  errors are plotted against the number of iterations, with the optimal convergence rate in Theorem 3.1 plotted as a dotted reference line. For 1D results in fig. 2 (a) & (b), both methods achieve an optimal convergence rate. Although in 1D, randomized dictionaries do not significantly improve accuracy, they achieve comparable results with fewer elements. For the 2D example, from Figure 2 (c) & (d), we now see that using randomized dictionaries give more accurate numerical results that achieves the optimal convergence order with a smaller discrete dictionary. On the other hand, when using a deterministic discrete dictionary, the accuracy deteriorates significantly as the number of iterations increases, failing to achieve an optimal convergence, if the size of the deterministic dictionary is not larger than that of a randomized one. For the 3D example, from Figure 2 (e), we observe a much more significant improvement after using randomized dictionaries. We see that using randomized dictionaries of size only  $2^6$  outperform using a deterministic dictionary of size  $2^{14}$  which is more than 200 times larger.

Now we present numerical examples in higher dimensions to verify the effectiveness of our proposed method.

## 6.2. Four-dimensional examples

In this subsection, we demonstrate two 4-dimensional examples of the  $L^2$ -minimization problem.

We first fit the function

$$f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^4 \sin(\pi x_i), \quad (40)$$

and then we fit the Gaussian function

$$f(x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d c(x_i - \omega)^2\right), \quad c = \frac{7.03}{d}, \quad d = 4, \quad \omega = 0.5. \quad (41)$$




Figure 2: Comparison between using  $\text{ReLU}^1$  randomized dictionaries and  $\text{ReLU}^1$  deterministic dictionaries of various sizes. (a): 1D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (35). (b): 1D  $L^2$ -minimization problem 36. (c): 2D  $L^2$ -minimization problem 37. (d): 2D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (38). (e): 3D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (39).

In each problem, we use shallow neural networks with  $\text{ReLU}^1$  and  $\text{ReLU}^4$  activation, respectively. For the numerical integration, we use Quasi-Monte Carlo method [62, 63] with  $5 \times 10^5$  integration points generated by the Sobol sequence.




Figure 3: Comparison between using randomized dictionaries and deterministic dictionaries of various sizes. 4D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (40). (a):  $\text{ReLU}^1$  activation. (b):  $\text{ReLU}^4$  activation.

The results for the first and second examples are plotted in Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively. In both cases, we can see that using a randomized dictionary of much smaller size lead to better accuracy than using deterministic dictionary of a large size. The reduction in the number of dictionary elements spans several orders of magnitude. Furthermore, the optimal convergence order is observed for using randomized dictionaries, which agrees with our analysis result in section 5.

### 6.3. Ten-dimensional examples

Now, we present numerical results for a 10 dimensional problem. We fit the Gaussian function

$$f(x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d c(x_i - \omega)^2\right), \quad c = \frac{7.03}{d}, \quad d = 10, \quad \omega = 0.5. \quad (42)$$

For the numerical integration, we use Quasi Monte-Carlo method with  $10^6$  integration points generated by the Sobol sequence.

The numerical results for the 10D example are plotted in Figure 5. We observe that using randomized dictionaries, we can still obtain very accurate numerical approximations that achieve an optimal convergence order in such a high dimensional problem with a moderate dictionary size of around  $2^9$ . However, on the other hand, in 10D, using a deterministic dictionary of a similar size would lead to a very coarse discretization of the dictionary, which cannot guarantee any accuracy.

### 6.4. Elliptic PDEs

As mentioned in Remark 8, the proposed algorithm also works for solving PDEs. To demonstrate, we solve the following problem

$$-\nabla \cdot (\alpha \nabla u) + u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = g \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (43)$$

We note that examples of solving PDEs in 1D and 2D with exact solutions  $u(x_1) = \cos(\pi x_1)$  and  $u(x_1, x_2) = \cos(\pi x_1) \cos(\pi x_2)$ , respectively, are already demonstrated in [25] using OGA with a deterministic dictionary, while higher dimensional examples are not possible due to huge computational costs. Therefore, to showcase the effectiveness of OGA with randomized dictionaries, we carry out experiments in 3D and higher dimensions. We only carry out experiments with randomized dictionaries since comparisons with using deterministic dictionaries are already demonstrated in numerous  $L^2$ -minimization problems.






Figure 4: Comparison between using randomized dictionaries and deterministic dictionaries of various sizes. 4D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (41). **a:** ReLU<sup>1</sup> activation. **b:** ReLU<sup>4</sup> activation.




Figure 5: 10D  $L^2$ -minimization problem (42) with randomized dictionaries. **(a):** ReLU<sup>1</sup> activation. **(b):** ReLU<sup>4</sup> activation.

We consider the following three-dimensional example on  $\Omega = (0, 1)^3$  for (43):

$$\Omega = (0, 1)^3, \quad \alpha = 1, \quad f(x) = (1 + 3\pi^2) \prod_{i=1}^3 \cos \pi x_i, \quad g(x) = 0, \quad (44)$$

whose exact solution is  $u(x) = \prod_{i=1}^3 \cos \pi x_i$ .

We also consider the following three-dimensional example on  $\Omega = (0, 1)^3$  for (43) with an oscillatory coefficient function  $\alpha$ :

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sin(6\pi x_1) + 1, \quad u(x) = \prod_{i=1}^3 \cos \pi x_i, \quad g(x) = 0. \quad (45)$$

The corresponding right hand side  $f(x)$  is computed.

We then consider the following four-dimensional and ten-dimensional examples on  $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$  for (43) with a constant  $\alpha$ :

$$\alpha = 1, \quad u(x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^d c(x_i - \omega)^2\right), \quad c = \frac{7.03}{d}, \quad d = 4 \text{ or } 10, \quad \omega = 0.5. \quad (46)$$

The right hand side  $f(x)$  and the boundary condition function  $g(x)$  are computed accordingly.

Regarding the numerical integration, for examples (44) and (45), we divide the cubic domain into  $50^3$  subdomains and use a Gaussian quadrature of order 3 on each subdomain. For the example (46), within the domain  $\Omega$ , we use Quasi Monte-Carlo methods with  $5 \times 10^5$  integration points generated by the Sobol sequence. On the boundary, we divide it into  $50^3$  subdomains and use a Gaussian quadrature of order 3 on each subdomain. For the example (42), we use  $2 \times 10^6$  integration points and  $2 \times 10^5$  integration points generated by the Sobol sequence, within the domain and on each side of the boundary, respectively. The size of a randomized dictionary used in the 3D and 4D examples is only  $2^8$  and that used in the 10D example is  $2^{11}$ .

We report the errors under the  $L^2$  norm and the  $H^1$  seminorm for each experiment in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. We observe that, in the 3D and 4D cases, the optimal convergence orders are achieved for both  $L^2$  and  $H^1$  errors. We also note that the actual convergence order is consistently slightly better than the optimal convergence order. For the 10D example, the overall convergence order is also better the optimal one, achieving good accuracy despite a drop in the order at the neuron number 256.

Given the very small dictionary size of  $2^8$  and  $2^{11}$ , we confirm that using randomized dictionaries in OGA is indeed as effective for solving PDEs as for  $L^2$ -minimization problems.

$n$	$\ u - u_n\ _{L^2}$	order ( $n^{-5/3}$ )	$ u - u_n _{H^1}$	order ( $n^{-4/3}$ )
8	3.50e-1	*	3.11e0	*
16	9.56e-2	1.87	1.54e0	1.01
32	2.34e-2	2.03	4.93e-1	1.65
64	5.07e-3	2.21	1.41e-1	1.81
128	9.75e-4	2.38	3.75e-2	1.91
256	2.43e-4	2.01	1.26e-2	1.58
512	6.75e-5	1.84	4.55e-3	1.47

Table 1:  $L^2$  and  $H^1$  errors using ReLU<sup>3</sup> activation for 3D Neumann problem with (44).

## 7. Conclusion

OGA is proven to achieve optimal convergence rate for approximation problems using shallow neural networks. However, its practical application is limited even in three or slightly higher dimensions due to the arg max subproblems that require an exhaustive search over the entire dictionary. In this paper, we discuss two approaches to discretize the dictionary: one using a deterministic hyperrectangular grid-based discretization and the other using a random discretization. As our major tool for analyzing these approaches, we first extend the convergence results of some

$n$	$\ u - u_n\ _{L^2}$	order ( $n^{-5/3}$ )	$ u - u_n _{H^1}$	order ( $n^{-4/3}$ )
8	3.33e-1	*	3.18e0	*
16	9.56e-2	1.80	1.54e0	1.04
32	3.31e-2	1.53	6.70e-1	1.20
64	4.86e-3	2.77	1.32e-1	2.35
128	1.11e-3	2.13	4.2e-2	1.65
256	2.65e-4	2.07	1.34e-2	1.65
512	6.49e-5	2.03	4.32e-3	1.64

Table 2:  $L^2$  and  $H^1$  errors using ReLU<sup>3</sup> activation for 3D Neumann problem with (45).

$n$	$\ u - u_n\ _{L^2}$	order $O(n^{-1.625})$	$ u - u_n _{H^1}$	order $O(n^{-1.375})$
8	1.86e-1	*	1.66e0	*
16	7.49e-2	1.31	1.16e0	0.523
32	5.31e-2	0.50	1.03e0	0.173
64	1.08e-2	2.30	2.64e-1	1.96
128	3.81e-3	1.50	1.02e-1	1.36
256	4.91e-4	2.95	1.69e-2	2.60
512	1.32e-4	1.90	5.60e-3	1.59

Table 3:  $L^2$  and  $H^1$  errors using ReLU<sup>4</sup> activation for 4D Neumann problem with (46).

greedy algorithms to weak greedy algorithms. We then rely on the convergence of weak greedy algorithms to obtain convergence results for greedy algorithms that use a discrete dictionary in practice. More specifically, we rigorously show that both the deterministic discretization approach and the randomized one amount to a realization of a weak greedy algorithm, and we further quantify the required size of the discrete dictionary to achieve a convergence order. Remarkably, our theoretical analysis reveals that in high dimensions, using randomized discrete dictionaries may lead to significantly fewer dictionary elements than using a deterministic discrete dictionary. Finally, we corroborate the theoretical findings with extensive numerical experiments on solving  $L^2$  function approximation problems and PDEs, demonstrating the effectiveness of a more practical approach of using randomized dictionaries for greedy algorithms in application to neural network optimization problems.

## Acknowledgement

This work is supported by KAUST Baseline Research Fund. The second author would like to thank Dr. Jongho Park for the helpful discussions and the careful reading and review of the paper.

## Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the revising process the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve the readability and language of the manuscript. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

## References

- [1] S. Cuomo, V. S. Di Cola, F. Giampaolo, G. Rozza, M. Raissi, F. Piccialli, Scientific machine learning through physics-informed neural networks: Where we are and what's next, *J. Sci. Comput.* 92 (3) (2022) Paper No. 88.
- [2] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, G. E. Karniadakis, Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations, *J. Comput. Phys.* 378 (2019) 686–707.
- [3] W. E, B. Yu, The deep Ritz method: a deep learning-based numerical algorithm for solving variational problems, *Commun. Math. Stat.* 6 (1) (2018) 1–12.
- [4] J. Xu, Finite neuron method and convergence analysis, *Commun. Comput. Phys.* 28 (5) (2020) 1707–1745.

$n$	$\ u - u_n\ _{L^2}$	order $O(n^{-0.95})$	$ u - u_n _{H^1}$	order $O(n^{-0.85})$
8	1.11e-1	*	2.00e0	*
16	1.01e-1	0.14	1.72e0	0.21
32	6.69e-2	0.59	1.19e0	0.53
64	2.16e-2	1.63	4.73e-1	1.33
128	8.79e-3	1.29	2.53e-1	0.90
256	6.58e-3	0.42	2.16e-1	0.23
512	3.28e-3	1.00	9.08e-2	1.25

Table 4:  $L^2$  and  $H^1$  errors using ReLU<sup>4</sup> activation for 10D Neumann problem with (46).

- [5] J. He, T. Mao, J. Xu, Expressivity and approximation properties of deep neural networks with  $ReLU^k$  activation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16483 (2023).
- [6] J. He, J. Xu, Deep neural networks and finite elements of any order on arbitrary dimensions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14276 (2023).
- [7] Q. Hong, J. W. Siegel, Q. Tan, J. Xu, On the activation function dependence of the spectral bias of neural networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04924 (2022).
- [8] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, A. Courville, Deep Learning, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016, <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- [9] E. C. Cyr, M. A. Gulian, R. G. Patel, M. Perego, N. A. Trask, Robust training and initialization of deep neural networks: An adaptive basis viewpoint, in: Proceedings of The First Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning Conference, Vol. 107 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 2020, pp. 512–536.
- [10] M. Ainsworth, Y. Shin, Plateau phenomenon in gradient descent training of ReLU networks: Explanation, quantification, and avoidance, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 43 (5) (2021) A3438–A3468.
- [11] M. Ainsworth, Y. Shin, Active Neuron Least Squares: A training method for multivariate rectified neural networks, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 44 (4) (2022) A2253–A2275.
- [12] J. Park, J. Xu, X. Xu, A neuron-wise subspace correction method for the finite neuron method, To appear in J. Comput. Math., arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12031 (2022).
- [13] J. Chen, X. Chi, W. E, Z. Yang, Bridging traditional and machine learning-based algorithms for solving PDEs: The random feature method, J. Mach. Learn. 1 (2022) 268–298.
- [14] W. E, C. Ma, L. Wu, A comparative analysis of optimization and generalization properties of two-layer neural network and random feature models under gradient descent dynamics, Sci. China Math. 63 (7) (2020) 1235–1258.
- [15] A. Lamperski, T. Lekang, Approximation with random shallow ReLU networks with applications to model reference adaptive control, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17142 (2024).
- [16] A. Rahimi, B. Recht, Random features for large-scale kernel machines, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Vol. 20, Curran Associates, Inc., 2007.
- [17] S. Dong, Z. Li, Local extreme learning machines and domain decomposition for solving linear and nonlinear partial differential equations, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 387 (2021) Paper No. 114129.
- [18] G.-B. Huang, Q.-Y. Zhu, C.-K. Siew, Extreme learning machine: Theory and applications, Neurocomputing 70 (1-3) (2006) 489–501.
- [19] C.-O. Lee, Y. Lee, B. Ryoo, A nonoverlapping domain decomposition method for extreme learning machines: Elliptic problems, arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15959 (2024).
- [20] R. A. DeVore, V. N. Temlyakov, Some remarks on greedy algorithms, Adv. Comput. Math. 5 (1) (1996) 173–187.
- [21] L. K. Jones, A simple lemma on greedy approximation in Hilbert space and convergence rates for projection pursuit regression and neural network training, Ann. Statist. 20 (1) (1992) 608–613.
- [22] S. G. Mallat, Z. Zhang, Matching pursuits with time-frequency dictionaries, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. 41 (12) (1993) 3397–3415.
- [23] V. Temlyakov, Greedy Approximation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [24] A. Dereventsov, A. Petrosyan, C. Webster, Greedy shallow networks: An approach for constructing and training neural networks, Int. J. Artif. Intell. Res. 19 (2) (2021).
- [25] J. W. Siegel, Q. Hong, X. Jin, W. Hao, J. Xu, Greedy training algorithms for neural networks and applications to PDEs, J. Comput. Phys. 484 (2023) Paper No. 112084.
- [26] J. W. Siegel, J. Xu, Optimal convergence rates for the orthogonal greedy algorithm, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 68 (5) (2022) 3354–3361.
- [27] J. W. Siegel, J. Xu, Sharp bounds on the approximation rates, metric entropy, and  $n$ -widths of shallow neural networks, Found. Comput. Math. 24 (2024) 481–537.
- [28] P. L. Bartlett, S. Mendelson, Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results, J. Mach. Learn. Res. 3 (Nov) (2002) 463–482.
- [29] V. N. Temlyakov, Weak greedy algorithms, Adv. Comput. Math. 12 (2) (2000) 213–227.
- [30] J. Jia, Y. J. Lee, R. Shan, An unconstrained formulation of some constrained partial differential equations and its application to finite neuron methods, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16894 (2024).
- [31] S. Cai, Z. Mao, Z. Wang, M. Yin, G. E. Karniadakis, Physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) for fluid mechanics: A review, Acta Mech. Sin. 37 (12) (2021) 1727–1738.
- [32] Z. Mao, A. D. Jagtap, G. E. Karniadakis, Physics-informed neural networks for high-speed flows, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 360 (2020) Paper No. 112789.
- [33] G. Pang, L. Lu, G. E. Karniadakis, fPINNs: Fractional physics-informed neural networks, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 41 (4) (2019) A2603–A2626.
- [34] S. Mishra, R. Molinaro, Estimates on the generalization error of physics-informed neural networks for approximating a class of inverse

- problems for PDEs, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 42 (2) (2022) 981–1022.
- [35] Y. Shin, J. Darbon, G. E. Karniadakis, On the convergence of physics informed neural networks for linear second-order elliptic and parabolic type PDEs, *Commun. Comput. Phys.* 28 (5) (2020) 2042–2074.
- [36] J. W. Siegel, J. Xu, Characterization of the variation spaces corresponding to shallow neural networks, *Constr. Approx.* 57 (3) (2023) 1109–1132.
- [37] J. M. Klusowski, J. W. Siegel, Sharp convergence rates for matching pursuit, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07679 (2023).
- [38] A. R. Barron, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. A. DeVore, Approximation and learning by greedy algorithms, *Ann. Statist.* 36 (1) (2008) 64–94.
- [39] E. D. Livshits, Lower bounds for the rate of convergence of greedy algorithms, *Izv. Math.* 73 (6) (2009) 1197.
- [40] T. Zhang, Sequential greedy approximation for certain convex optimization problems, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 49 (3) (2003) 682–691.
- [41] A. Dereventsov, V. N. Temlyakov, Biorthogonal greedy algorithms in convex optimization, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 60 (2022) 489–511.
- [42] V. Temlyakov, Greedy approximation in convex optimization, *Constr. Approx.* 41 (2) (2015) 269–296.
- [43] Y. C. Pati, R. Rezaifar, P. S. Krishnaprasad, Orthogonal matching pursuit: Recursive function approximation with applications to wavelet decomposition, in: *Proceedings of 27th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, IEEE, 1993, pp. 40–44.
- [44] A. Dereventsov, V. Temlyakov, A unified way of analyzing some greedy algorithms, *J. Funct. Anal.* 277 (12) (2019) 108286.
- [45] Y. Li, J. W. Siegel, Entropy-based convergence rates of greedy algorithms, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 34 (5) (2024) 779–802.
- [46] L. E. Blumenson, A derivation of  $n$ -dimensional spherical coordinates, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 67 (1) (1960) 63–66.
- [47] G. Marsaglia, Choosing a point from the surface of a sphere, *Ann. Math. Statist.* 43 (2) (1972) 645–646.
- [48] M. E. Muller, A note on a method for generating points uniformly on  $n$ -dimensional spheres, *Commun. ACM* 2 (4) (1959) 19–20.
- [49] A. G. Sukharev, Optimal strategies of the search for an extremum, *USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys.* 11 (4) (1971) 119–137.
- [50] G. Fejes Tóth, Packing and covering in higher dimensions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11358 (2022).
- [51] G. Fejes Tóth, W. o. Kuperberg, Packing and covering with convex sets, in: *Handbook of Convex Geometry*, Vol. A, B, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993, pp. 799–860.
- [52] C. A. Rogers, A note on coverings, *Mathematika* 4 (1) (1957) 1–6.
- [53] C. A. Rogers, Lattice coverings of space, *Mathematika* 6 (1) (1959) 33–39.
- [54] H. Coxeter, L. Few, C. Rogers, Covering space with equal spheres, *Mathematika* 6 (2) (1959) 147–157.
- [55] R. Kershner, The number of circles covering a set, *Amer. J. Math.* 61 (3) (1939) 665–671.
- [56] R. P. Bambah, Lattice coverings with four-dimensional spheres, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 50 (2) (1954) 203–208.
- [57] B. N. Delone, S. S. Ryškov, Solution of the problem on the least dense lattice covering of a 4-dimensional space by equal spheres, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 152 (1963) 523–524.
- [58] S. S. Ryškov, E. P. Baranovskii, Solution of the problem of the least dense lattice covering of five-dimensional space by equal spheres, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 222 (1) (1975) 39–42.
- [59] S. S. Ryškov, E. P. Baranovskii,  $C$ -types of  $n$ -dimensional lattices and 5-dimensional primitive parallelehedra (with application to the theory of coverings), *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* (4) (1978) 140.
- [60] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, J. Nichols, Reduced basis greedy selection using random training sets, *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 54 (5) (2020) 1509–1524.
- [61] J. Park, Fast gradient methods for uniformly convex and weakly smooth problems, *Adv. Comput. Math.* 48 (3) (2022) Paper No. 34.
- [62] R. E. Caflisch, Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods, *Acta Numer.* 7 (1998) 1–49.
- [63] W. J. Morokoff, R. E. Caflisch, Quasi-Monte Carlo integration, *J. Comput. Phys.* 122 (2) (1995) 218–230.
- [64] A. Cohen, M. A. Davenport, D. Leviatan, On the stability and accuracy of least squares approximations, *Found. Comput. Math.* 13 (2013) 819–834.
- [65] G. Migliorati, F. Nobile, E. Von Schwerin, R. Tempone, Analysis of discrete  $L^2$  projection on polynomial spaces with random evaluations, *Found. Comput. Math.* 14 (3) (2014) 419–456.
- [66] A. Chkifa, A. Cohen, G. Migliorati, F. Nobile, R. Tempone, Discrete least squares polynomial approximation with random evaluations - application to parametric and stochastic elliptic PDEs, *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 49 (3) (2015) 815–837.