KERNEL SUM OF SQUARES FOR DATA ADAPTED KERNEL LEARNING OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS FROM DATA: A GLOBAL OPTIMIZATION APPROACH

DANIEL LENGYEL*, BOUMEDIENE HAMZI**_{*}***, HOUMAN OWHADI**, PANOS PARPAS*

Abstract. This paper examines the application of the Kernel Sum of Squares (KSOS) method for enhancing kernel learning from data, particularly in the context of dynamical systems. Traditional kernel-based methods, despite their theoretical soundness and numerical efficiency, frequently struggle with selecting optimal base kernels and parameter tuning, especially with gradient-based methods prone to local optima. KSOS mitigates these issues by leveraging a global optimization framework with kernelbased surrogate functions, thereby achieving more reliable and precise learning of dynamical systems. Through comprehensive numerical experiments on the Logistic Map, Henon Map, and Lorentz System, KSOS is shown to consistently outperform gradient descent in minimizing the relative- ρ metric and improving kernel accuracy. These results highlight KSOS's effectiveness in predicting the behavior of chaotic dynamical systems, demonstrating its capability to adapt kernels to underlying dynamics and enhance the robustness and predictive power of kernel-based approaches, making it a valuable asset for time series analysis in various scientific fields.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

The widespread presence of time series data across numerous scientific fields has spurred the development of a wide range of statistical and machine learning methods for forecasting [\[34,](#page-18-0) [12,](#page-16-1) [33,](#page-18-1) [53,](#page-19-0) [25,](#page-17-0) [24,](#page-17-1) [14,](#page-16-2) [11,](#page-16-3) [52,](#page-19-1) [46,](#page-18-2) [1\]](#page-16-4).

Among the various learning approaches, kernel-based methods offer substantial advantages in terms of theoretical analysis, numerical implementation, regularization, guaranteed convergence, automation, and interpretability [\[15,](#page-17-2) [51\]](#page-18-3). Notably, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS) [\[17\]](#page-17-3) have established solid mathematical foundations for the analysis of dynamical systems [\[7,](#page-16-5) [33,](#page-18-1) [26,](#page-17-4) [21,](#page-17-5) [23,](#page-17-6) [61,](#page-19-2) [31,](#page-17-7) [28,](#page-17-8) [36,](#page-18-4) [37,](#page-18-5) [4,](#page-16-6) [38,](#page-18-6) [8,](#page-16-7) [9,](#page-16-8) [10,](#page-16-9) [30,](#page-17-9) [29\]](#page-17-10) and surrogate modeling (cf. [\[55\]](#page-19-3) for a survey) as well as analyzing neural networks [\[56\]](#page-19-4). However, the accuracy of these emulators relies on the choice of base kernel, and insufficient attention has been given to the challenge of selecting an appropriate kernel.

In recent studies conducted by Hamzi and Owhadi and their collaborators, it has been demonstrated that kernel flows (KFs) [\[49\]](#page-18-7), a cross-validation technique that can also be viewed as a compression method, can effectively reconstruct the dynamics of chaotic dynamical systems in both regular [\[31\]](#page-17-7) and irregular [\[40\]](#page-18-8) time sampling scenarios. The parametric variant of KFs involves utilizing a parameterized kernel function and minimizing the regression relative error between two interpolants represented by the kernel. One interpolant is obtained using all data points, while the other is derived using half of the data points. This approach can be considered as a variation of the cross-validation method. It can also be viewed as a method of data compression using Kolmogorov complexity in the context of Algorithmic Information Theory (AIT) [\[27\]](#page-17-11). Subsequently, several research works have extended the concept of KFs. For instance, a non-parametric version of kernel flows [\[49\]](#page-18-7), employing kernel warping, has been employed to approximate chaotic dynamical systems in [\[18\]](#page-17-12). Another version of KFs has been developed for stochastic differential equations (SDEs) [\[19\]](#page-17-13), as well as for systems with missing dynamics [\[32\]](#page-17-14) and Hamiltonian dynamics [\[62\]](#page-19-5). From an application perspective, KFs have been employed in the context of machine learning for classification tasks $[63]$, and in geophysical forecasting [\[47\]](#page-18-9). A recent version of kernel flows named Sparse Kernel Flows [\[61\]](#page-19-2) has been applied to 133 chaotic dynamical systems from various fields such as biochemistry, fluid mechanics, and astrophysics.

It is important to note that while the kernel learning algorithms mentioned earlier can derive optimal parameters from data, they still require a base kernel. This limitation makes it challenging for practitioners to select an appropriate kernel function for their specific practical problem. Furthermore, machine learning methods have been successfully applied to various long and short-term prediction tasks, and the choice of the machine learning algorithm should depend on the objective at hand. In previous work, Hamzi and Owhadi and their collaborators introduced different variants of Kernel Flows (KFs) that cater to specific dynamic objectives. One variant, based on Lyapunov exponents, aims to capture the long-term behavior of the system [\[31\]](#page-17-7). Another variant, based on the Maximum Mean Discrepancy, focuses on capturing the statistical properties of the system and its potential connection to the Frobenius-Perron operator [\[31\]](#page-17-7). Another variant is based on choosing a kernel that allows to reconstruct attractors and that was named Hausdorff Metric Kernel Flows (HMKFs) [\[60\]](#page-19-7).

These versions can be viewed as different approaches to learning dynamical systems from data, each with its own specific "dynamic objective" in mind. In these different versions of KFs, the kernel was learned through local optimization of the corresponding objective functions. In this paper, we consider the problem of global optimization of some of these objective functions using kernel sum of squares (kernel SOS) where the objective function is represented as a sum of kernels that could be then represented as a sum of squares in some suitable RKHS.

2. Statement of the Problem

Given a time series x_1, \dots, x_n from a deterministic dynamical system in \mathbb{R}^d , our goal is to forecast the evolution of the dynamics from historical observations.

A natural solution to forecasting the time series is to assume that the data are sampled from a discrete dynamical system

$$
x_{k+1} = f^{\dagger}(x_k, \cdots, x_{k-\tau^{\dagger}+1})
$$
\n(2.1)

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the state of the system at time t_k , f^{\dagger} represents the unknown vector field and $\tau^{\dagger} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ represents the delay embedding or delay^{[1](#page-2-1)}.

In order to approximate f^{\dagger} , given $\tau \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the problem of the dynamical system approximation can be recast as a kernel interpolation problem

$$
Y_k = f^{\dagger}(X_k), \ k = 1, \cdots, N \tag{2.2}
$$

with $X_k := (x_{k+\tau-1}, \dots, x_k), Y_k := x_{k+1}$ and $N = n - \tau$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Given a reproducing kernel Hilbert space^{[2](#page-2-2)} of candidates $\mathcal H$ for f^{\dagger} , and using the relative error in the RKHS norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ as a loss, the regression of the data (X_k, Y_k) with the kernel $K : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ associated with H provides a minimax optimal approximation [\[48\]](#page-18-10) of f^{\dagger} in H. This regressor (in the presence of measurement noise of variance $\lambda > 0$) is

$$
f(x) = K(x, X) (K(X, X) + \lambda I)^{-1} Y
$$
\n(2.3)

where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$, $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)$, $K(x, X)$ is the $N \times N$ matrix with entries $K(x, X_i)$, $K(X, X)$ is the $N \times N$ matrix with entries $K(X_i, X_j)$, I is the identity matrix and $\lambda \geq 0$ is a hyper-parameter that ensures the matrix $K(X, X) + \lambda I$ invertible. This regressor has also a natural interpretation in the setting of Gaussian process (GP) regression: (2.3) is the conditional mean of the centered GP $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, K)$ with covariance function K conditioned on $\xi(X_k) = Y_k + \sqrt{\lambda Z_k}$ where the Z_k are centered i.i.d. normal random variables.

2.1. On Kernel Learning. The accuracy of any kernel-based method depends on the kernel K . Here, we follow the parametrized KFs algorithm to learn a "good" kernel in the sense that there will be no significant loss in accuracy if the number of regression points can be halved. The intuition is that if the induced function does not change much when the data is halved, then the kernel induces the appropriate bias for the given function class. Consequently, the induced function should generalize well and be preferred. Notably, this is reminiscent of a cross-validation approach to obtain optimal hyperparameters.

To make this more precise, let $K_{\theta}(x, x')$ be a family of kernels parameterized by θ , and let $K_{\theta}(X, X)$ be the corresponding gram matrix associated with a vector of points X. We also denote by Θ the space of valid parameters for K. Finally, let $f_{\theta}^{(X,Y)}$ $\theta_{\theta}^{(X,Y)}$ be the functions induced by the kernel K_{θ} on data (X,Y) . While there has been a range of metrics introduced that follow the above cross-entropy approach, in this paper, we consider the *relative-* ρ metric^{[3](#page-2-4)}. This is because it closely follows the idea of measuring the distance between the induced function on the complete and on the reduced data set. To define ρ we prepare a data vector $X^b = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ and $Y^b = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)$. We then sub-sample half of the data at random and define this data as X^c and Y^c . Then ρ is given as

$$
\rho(\theta) = \frac{\|f_{\theta}^{b} - f_{\theta}^{c}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{2}}{\|f_{\theta}^{b}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{2}} = 1 - \frac{Y^{c\top} \left(K_{\theta}(X^{c}, X^{c}) + \lambda I\right)^{-1} Y^{c}}{Y^{b\top} \left(K_{\theta}(X^{b}, X^{b}) + \lambda I\right)^{-1} Y^{b}}
$$
\n(2.4)

which is the squared relative error (in the RKHS norm $\|\cdot\|_{K_{\theta}}$ defined by K_{θ}) between the interpolants f_{θ}^{b} and f_{θ}^{c} obtained from the two nested subsets of the time series. Since we work with no noise in the paper, we assume that $\lambda = 0$.

Finding the minimizer θ^* of ρ is however not straightforward. For one, ρ is generically not a convex function and can hence have a range of minima which can be difficult to find. Furthermore, evaluating ρ may be expensive when there is a large amount of data to fit. Every evaluation of ρ corresponds to having to produce a new best fit based on κ_{θ} and the dataset (X, Y) . Therefore, we want to find an algorithm that is able to efficiently find good candidate solutions for θ^* . Such an algorithm will have to explore the space to avoid getting stuck at sub-optimal minima and saddle-points.

¹In this paper, we fix τ^{\dagger} a priori. Selection strategies of τ^{\dagger} are detailed in [\[31\]](#page-17-7)),

²A brief overview of RKHSs is given in the Appendix.

³Check Appendix B for other variants of KFs and corresponding ρ functions.

2.2. Gradient-based methods. The most commonly used method to find θ^* candidates is via gradient-descent based algorithms. The advantage of such methods is the simplicity and the guarantee of converging to some local minimum. However, if the function has a range of sub-optimal minima or saddle-points, it may get quickly stuck at such points. Furthermore, every update step requires an evaluation of ρ , potentially making this method prohibitively expensive.

2.3. Kernel Sum of Squares as a Global Method. We contrast the gradient-based method with a global optimization method, which promises avoidance of local minima and allows for tighter control of the number of function evaluations. The kernel sum of squares $(KSOS)$ is an extension of the classic sum of squares [\[39\]](#page-18-11) and solves for a global minimum via the use of kernel-based surrogate functions.

To make this idea more precise, consider the following optimization problem

$$
\max_{c \in \mathbb{R}} c \quad \text{such that} \quad \rho(\theta) - c \geq 0 \text{ for } \theta \in \Theta.
$$

While this problem is convex, there are uncountably many constraints that need to be satisfied, making it generally intractable. However, under some circumstances, this verification can be feasible.

Assume that for a given ρ and c there exists a non-negative h_c such that $\rho(\theta) - c = h_c(\theta)$. Then trivially, the constraint $\rho(\theta) - c \geq 0$ for $\theta \in \Theta$ is satisfied. An instance where this is feasible is when ρ is given by a polynomial. Then one can use semi-definite programming and the Positivstellensatz to verify the constraint efficiently [\[57,](#page-19-8) [3\]](#page-16-10). When ρ is not a polynomial, this may be difficult when ρ is not well approximated by polynomials as it can lead to instability [\[16\]](#page-17-15). Instead, one may introduce a similar approximation by using functions where an appropriate kernel provides a more flexible approach adapting to the structure of ρ .

Let $\phi(\theta)$ be a feature representation and introduce the function $\langle \phi(\theta), A\phi(\theta) \rangle$ for some positive-semi definite operator A. This represents a rich function class and a low-complexity universal function approximator on all non-negative functions. Hence, if there exists A such that $\rho(\theta) - c = \langle \phi(\theta), A\phi(\theta) \rangle$ for $\theta \in \Theta$ then the constraint is satisfied [\[43\]](#page-18-12). While this function form is flexible, it remains infeasible to ensure that it is exact for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Hence, the constraint is sub-sampled and enforced on a finite subset of parameters $\mathcal{T} \subset \Theta$ with $\mathcal{T} = {\theta_i}_{1 \leq i \leq N(SOS)}$. This is valid as the introduced function is a universal function approximator, that is the accuracy can be improved arbitrarily with more samples [\[54,](#page-19-9) [43\]](#page-18-12). It then only remains to find A such that $\rho(\theta_i) - c = \langle \phi(\theta_i), A\phi(\theta_i) \rangle$ for $1 \leq i \leq N^{(SOS)}$. However, when an A exists to satisfy the sub-sampled constraints, it is often not unique. To ensure that $\langle \phi(\theta), A\phi(\theta) \rangle$ is sufficiently regular to be a good approximation of $\rho(\theta) - c$, a regularizer on the trace of A is added to the objective function.

To introduce the optimization problem in KSOS, we note that it has been shown that instead of working in the infinite-dimensional space of $\phi(\theta)$, we may work in a finite-dimensional space [\[54,](#page-19-9) [43\]](#page-18-12). Then, instead of defining an infinite dimensional feature map, it suffices to work with a kernel function. Let $K^{(SOS)}$ be a kernel and the gram matrix over $\mathcal T$ be given by $K^{(SOS)}(\mathcal T, \mathcal T) = RR^T$ with R being upper-triangular. Furthermore, let Φ_j be the j-th column of R and represent the j-th feature vector. We then write the KSOS optimization problem as

$$
\max_{c \in \mathbb{R}, B \ge 0} c - \lambda Tr(B) \quad \text{such that} \quad \rho(\theta_i) - c = \Phi_i^T B \Phi_i \text{ for } 1 \le i \le N^{(SOS)}, \tag{2.5}
$$

for some $\lambda > 0$. An increased λ will then lead to more weight on the regularity of the approximation of $\rho(\theta) - c$. Conversely, if λ is zero, we have $c = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \rho(\theta_i)$ and hence the lowest function value over T is proposed as optimal. This is because $c \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \rho(\theta_i)$ and since there is no penalty for B being irregular, it suffices to choose the matrix which achieves this [\[54\]](#page-19-9).

We note that the number of function evaluations on ρ is given directly by $N^{(SOS)}$. This can be controlled a-priori and specifies the accuracy of the approximation of $\rho - c$ via $\Phi_i^T B \Phi$. This may be beneficial when ρ is expensive to evaluate due a large data-set, specifically compared to gradient descent where the number of function evaluations until convergence is more difficult to deduce. This does not come without some added complexity, as KSOS incurs the cost of solving the optimization problem in Equation [2.5.](#page-3-2) However, efficient algorithms exist, and once ρ has been evaluated over \mathcal{T} , this complexity is independent of the complexity of evaluating ρ itself [\[54\]](#page-19-9).

3. Numerical Experiments

We now consider applications in three dynamical systems, specifically the Logistic and Hénon Map and the Lorentz System. The kernel function we use is given by

$$
K(x,y) = \gamma_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \max(0, 1 - \frac{|x_i - y_i|}{\sigma_1^2}) + \gamma_2^2 e^{-\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{\sigma_2^2}} + \gamma_3^2 e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i|}{\sigma_3^2}} + \gamma_4^2 e^{-\sigma_4^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi \sigma_5^2 |x_i - y_i|)} e^{-\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{\sigma_6^2}}.
$$

This kernel is made up of the triangular, Gaussian, Laplace, and locally periodic kernels. These kernels have been found to capture many physical properties. The goal is then to find parameters that appropriately adapt the kernel to the dynamical system being considered. The γ parameters weigh each kernel appropriately in the linear combination, and the σ parameters capture the appropriate length scale. The domain for the parameters is given by $\Theta = [0.001, 10]^{\otimes 10}$.

3.1. Algorithmic Setup. To find a good candidate parameter θ , the function ρ needs to be initialized first. For this, we fix a starting position $x_0^{(train)}$ $\binom{train}{0}$ and specify the number of steps $N^{(train)}$ for the training trajectory $x^{(train)} = \{x_t^{(train)}\}$ $\{u^{(train)}\}_{0 \leq i \leq N^{(train)}}$. This will make up the full data set (X^b, Y^b) , where $X_t^b = x_{t-1}^{(train)}$ $\binom{(train)}{t-1}$ and $Y_t^b = x_t^{(train)}$ $t_t^{(train)}$ since each dynamical system only requires the current state to compute the next.

We evaluate each optimization method using ten random seeds. For each random seed, we randomly subset half of the data (X^b, Y^b) to obtain (X^f, Y^f) and hence ρ . For the given random seed, the same ρ is used for the gradient descent and KSOS to keep comparisons fair. Lastly, we allocate a budget of 200 function evaluations of ρ to each method to better reason about the method complexity.

3.1.1. Gradient Descent. We then run gradient descent for 200 steps with a step-size η starting each parameter at one. This is the baseline parameter value for the kernel and keeps the method consistent. As we have found the performance very sensitive to the learning rate, we present the best learning rate for the problem over a hyperparameter search in $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 0.5, 1\}$. Note that for some problems, it appears that the method is making little progress, mostly due to scale imbalance. Specifically, the KSOS algorithm begins with a significantly worse starting point and then quickly improves. A larger learning rate would often lead to erratic results, hence settling for the one presented. The source of randomness then comes from ρ , as we randomly subset the full data.

3.1.2. Kernel Sum of Squares. We now characterize the optimization problem in Equation [2.5](#page-3-2) and discuss how to solve it. To obtain the subset \mathcal{T} , we use the budget of 200 function evaluations to sample uniformly at random from Θ. This is also the sole source of randomness of this method. Then, we set the regularizer to $\lambda = 10^{-5}$. Lastly, the feature map is given by a Gaussian kernel with $\sigma = 0.1$. These values were chosen as they performed well across our experiments.

While the optimization problem in Equation [2.5](#page-3-2) can be solved efficiently by standard solvers, we choose to use the interior point algorithm presented by Rudi et al. as it allows for parallelization and provides a clearer understanding of how the optimization is achieved [\[54\]](#page-19-9). For the treatment, we let $n = N^{(SOS)}$. To enforce that B is positive semi-definite, a log barrier 4 4 is added to the objective and weighted by a precision term ϵ

$$
\max_{B \ge 0, c \in \mathbb{R}} c - \lambda \text{Tr}(B) + \frac{\epsilon}{n} \log \det(B) \quad \text{such that} \quad f(x_i) - c - \Phi_i^T B \Phi_i = 0, \text{ for } 1 \le i \le n.
$$

⁴The log-barrier log det(B) enforces that if an optimization algorithm starts with $B \geq 0$ then B will remain positive definite. Recall, for a symmetric matrix the determinant is the product of its eigenvalues and hence $\det(B) > 0$. To obtain a negative eigenvalue, an optimization algorithm has to cross a point where an eigenvalue is zero and hence $\det(B)$ is zero. This leads $log \det(B)$ to approach negative infinity and causes a maximization algorithm to avoid such regions [\[58,](#page-19-10) [45\]](#page-18-13).

Under this formulation, we know that the optimal solution is at most ϵ away from the optimal value given in Equation [2.5](#page-3-2) [\[45\]](#page-18-13). Recalling that $\hat{K}^{(SOS)} = \Phi \Phi^{T}$ we have by standard Lagrange duality that

$$
\sup_{B \ge 0, c} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n} c + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (f(x_i) - c - \Phi_i^T B \Phi_i) - \lambda \text{Tr}(B) + \frac{\epsilon}{n} \log \det(B)
$$

=
$$
\inf_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f(x_i) - \frac{\epsilon}{n} \log \det(\Phi^T \text{Diag}(\alpha) \Phi + \lambda I) + \frac{\epsilon}{n} \log(\frac{\epsilon}{n}) - \epsilon \text{ s.t } \alpha^T \mathbf{1} = 1,
$$

where the last step follows from differentiating the first equation and setting to zero to remove the dependence on B and c. To solve this minimization over the dual-variables α the following Newton Algorithm is deployed. Let $H(\alpha)$ be the objective function given in the above minimization problem. The Damped Newton algorithm is then given by the update step $\alpha_{t+1} = \alpha_t - \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{t}}$ $\frac{1}{1+\sqrt{\frac{n}{\epsilon}}\lambda(\alpha)}\Delta$ where

$$
\Delta = H''(\alpha)^{-1}H'(\alpha) - \frac{\mathbf{1}^T H''(\alpha)^{-1} H'(\alpha)}{\mathbf{1}^T H''(\alpha)^{-1} \mathbf{1}} H''(\alpha)^{-1} \mathbf{1}
$$
 and $\lambda(\alpha)^2 = \Delta^T H''(\alpha)\Delta$ is the Newton decrement.
Note, the update direction Δ is both the Newton update step $H''(\alpha)^{-1}H'(\alpha)$ and the correction term to ensure that the constraint $\alpha^T \mathbf{1} = 1$ is satisfied at each step.

For this algorithm, we have found that a precision of $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ and 100 iterations of the algorithm are For this algorithm, we have found that a precision of $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ and 100 iterations of the algorithm are sufficient to provide a strong convergent solution. To obtain a candidate for θ^* we use $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \theta_i$. We note that even with increased precision ϵ , this only provides a candidate for Equation [2.5.](#page-3-2) A more principled way is provided in Section 7 of Rudi et al. and relies on replacing c in Equation [2.5](#page-3-2) by a quadratic function [\[54\]](#page-19-9). Nevertheless, we have found it to work well numerically and retain it as it keeps the method more simple.

3.2. Evaluation. Even when a good candidate solution for θ^* is found, it remains to confirm that this truly leads to an improved kernel for the estimation of the dynamical system. Hence, we compare the optimization methods in both how well they minimize ρ and how well kernels induced by the candidate solutions perform as estimators for the forward map in the dynamical system.

Assessing the performance in minimizing ρ is simple, as we simply consider the value achieved by the candidate solution given by the optimization algorithm. Notice here that the loss of KSOS may at times increase as it optimizes over surrogates of ρ rather than directly on the function itself and hence does not directly translate.

To assess the induced kernel performance, we compare predicted trajectories to true trajectories using three measures. The true trajectories are based on both the training trajectory $x^{(train)}$ and a test trajectory $x^{(test)}$, which has a different starting point to $x^{(train)}$.

To introduce the measures, let $x^{(pred)}$ be the predicted trajectory and $x^{(true)}$ the true trajectory. The first is the **Mean Error** (ME), specifically we write $\frac{1}{N}$ $\bar{\nabla}^{N(true)}$ $\int_{i=1}^{N(t^{\text{true}})} \|f_{\theta}(x_{t-1}^{(true)})\|$ $\binom{(true)}{t-1}$ - $x_t^{(true)}$ $\|t^{(true)}\|$. This measures the one-step error and is reminiscent of the error assessment of supervised learning algorithms. Note, if $x^{(true)}$ is given by the training trajectory, the error should be zero as the function f_{θ} interpolates all the training points. Then we introduce the Hausdorff Distance (HD), which measures the largest distance from one trajectory to another. To ensure that this is a symmetric function, first introduce the one-sided metric given by $HD_1(X, X') = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \min_{1 \leq j \leq N} ||X'_i - X_j||$. We then introduce the one-sided metric given by $HD_1(X, X') = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \min_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|X'_i - X_j\|$. We then
let $HD = \max (HD_1(x^{(pred)}, x^{(true)}), HD_1(x^{(true)}, x^{(pred)}))$. Notice that in the continuous case, the definition of HD_1 would have sufficed, but due to the trajectories being discrete, symmetry needs to be enforced. The final metric assesses the number of iterations until the trajectories diverge more than some predefined amount. Specifically, we let $\textbf{Deviation}(\gamma) = \min \{ t : \frac{\|x_t^{(pred)} - x_t^{(true)}\|}{\| \dots (true) \|}$ $\frac{-x_i}{\|x_i^{(true)}\|} \ge \gamma$. We chose to normalize by the size of the current point on the trajectory as it provided the most consistent results for the specific dynamical systems considered here.

The results are presented as summary statistics over the range of random runs. Specifically, in the summary statistic tables, we provide the median value and the 25th and 75th percentile values in brackets. For intuition, we also visualize the results across three figures by considering the first random run of each optimization method. The first figure presents loss values over the optimization period. Note that gradient descent and KSOS have different lengths. This is because gradient descent executes 200 iterations on ρ directly, while the sum of squares method obtains 200 samples and then performs

100 IPM steps. As noted earlier, the seeming lack of progress in gradient descent is largely due to the different scales on which both methods operate. The second figure focuses on the distance to the true trajectory. The last figure visualizes the predicted trajectories and provides the true trajectory as a reference.

3.3. Logistic Map. For the first dynamical system, we consider the logistic map given by the following form exhibiting chaotic behavior

$$
x_{t+1} = 4x_t(1 - x_t).
$$

For both the training and test trajectories, we let the number of steps be 200. To construct the training set, we let $x_0^{(train)} = 0.1$, and for the test set, we let $x_0^{(test)} = 0.3$. We set the learning rate of gradient descent to $\eta = 10^{-3}$.

We make the following observations. As seen in Table [1,](#page-6-2) the median performance is nearly a magnitude better for KSOS. Given the percentile values, the KSOS is then mostly biased to lower values, even though, on some occasions, it can perform as poorly as the gradient descent. As seen in Table [2,](#page-6-3) the mean error for KSOS is also a magnitude better on the test trajectory. The KSOS also stays accurate for more steps compared to gradient descent. Notably, the Hausdorff distance is both small and comparable for both methods. While the trajectories quickly diverge, this happens as all trajectories, due to their chaotic behavior, cover the interval $[0, 1]$. Hence, for every point on a trajectory, there exists a point on another trajectory that, while not temporally, is spatially close. In Table [3,](#page-6-4) we see that the methods perform mostly similarly on the training trajectory. They have close to zero loss on the mean error, which is expected as they interpolate the points.

Measure	KSOS.	Gradient Descent
Mean Error	2.08 $[1.73, 2.46] \times 10^{-5}$ 3.88 $[1.78, 4.41] \times 10^{-4}$	
HD.	2.03 [1.73, 2.54] \times 10 ⁻² 1.92 [1.88, 2.29] \times 10 ⁻²	
Deviation(0.1)	10.00	4.00
Deviation (0.25)	10.00	8.00 [4.00, 8.00]

TABLE 1. Relative ρ Statistics for the Logistic Map.

Table 2. Test Set Statistics for the Logistic Map.

Measure	KSOS	Gradient Descent
Mean Error	5.29 [2.63, 14.96] $\times 10^{-14}$	1.99 $[0.60, 4.26] \times 10^{-14}$
HD.	1.60 [1.45, 1.64] $\times 10^{-2}$	1.73 $[1.56, 2.48] \times 10^{-2}$
Deviation(0.1)	3.80 [3.80, 4.30] $\times 10^{1}$	3.80 [3.80, 4.33] $\times 10^1$
Deviation (0.25)	4.05 [3.80, 4.45] $\times 10^{1}$	4.05 [3.80, 4.45] $\times 10^{1}$

Table 3. Training Set Statistics for the Logistic Map.

3.4. The Hénon Map. The Henon map is given by

$$
x_{t+1} = 1 - 1.4x_t^2 + y_t
$$

$$
y_{t+1} = 0.3x_t
$$

For both the training and test trajectories, we let the number of steps be 1000. To construct the training set we let $X_0^{(train)} = (-0.75, -0.3)$ and for the test set we let $X_0^{(test)} = (0.5, 0)$. We set the learning rate of gradient descent to $\eta = 10^{-1}$.

Figure 1. Rho Relative on Logistic Map Training Set.

Figure 2. Distances of Predicted Trajectory to True Trajectory for Logistic Map.

We see in Table [4](#page-8-1) that while KSOS improves on gradient descent in both the median and 25th percentile values, it is more prone to outliers. However, this small improvement does lead to more pronounced improvements in the behavior of the learned kernel. We see in Table [5](#page-8-2) that the median mean error is significantly improved for KSOS, and the 25th percentile of the flow is larger than the 75th percentile of KSOS. Also, the predicted trajectory using KSOS results remains close to the true trajectory for longer than the trajectory obtained via the gradient descent parameters. While the Hausdorff distance is also slightly improved, the difference is not large, which we suspect to be due to the predicted trajectories remaining in a similar region as seen in Figure [6.](#page-10-0) This is then similar to the Logistic dynamics, where the deviation from the true trajectory can not become too large. For the results on the training trajectory given in Table 6 , the statistics are very similar. The most significant difference is that the trajectory predicted by gradient descent remains closer to the true trajectory for slightly longer.

Figure 3. Predicted Trajectories for Logistic Dynamics.

Measure	KSOS	Gradient Descent
	Relative ρ 6.08 [2.35, 21.53] \times 10 ⁻³ 7.94 [6.70, 10.96] \times 10 ⁻³	

TABLE 4. Relative ρ Statistics for the Henon Map.

Measure	KSOS	Gradient Descent
Mean Error	8.68 $[6.40, 11.98] \times 10^{-5}$ 3.01 $[2.90, 3.21] \times 10^{-4}$	
HD.	9.64 [9.21, 9.70] $\times 10^{-2}$	9.69 [9.63, 9.70] $\times 10^{-2}$
Deviation(0.1)	9.00 [8.25, 9.00]	4.00
Deviation (0.25)	1.00 $[0.93, 1.00] \times 10^{1}$	4.00 [$4.00, 6.00$]

Table 5. Test Set Statistics for the Henon Map.

Measure	KSOS	Gradient Descent
Mean Error	2.43 [1.55, 4.14] $\times 10^{-13}$	3.04 [2.73, 3.25] $\times 10^{-15}$
HD.	8.51 [8.36, 8.75] \times 10 ⁻²	8.48 [8.40, 8.52] \times 10 ⁻²
Deviation(0.1)	7.20 [6.50, 7.20] $\times 10^{1}$	8.00 [7.60, 8.40] $\times 10^{1}$
Deviation (0.25)	7.20 [6.60, 7.40] $\times 10^{1}$	8.00 [7.60, 8.40] $\times 10^1$

Table 6. Training Set Statistics for the Henon Map.

3.5. Lorentz System. The continuous version of the Lorentz map is given by

$$
\dot{x} = 10(y - x)
$$

\n
$$
\dot{y} = 28x - y - xz
$$

\n
$$
\dot{z} = xy - \frac{10}{3}z.
$$

Figure 5. Distances of Predicted Trajectory to True Trajectory for Henon Map.

To obtain the discrete system, we use the standard forward Euler method with a step size of 10^{-2} . For both the training and test trajectories, we let the number of steps be 1000. To construct the training set we let $X_0^{(train)} = (0.5, 1.5, 2.5)$ and for the test set we let $X_0^{(test)} = (0.7, 1.1, 2)$. We set the learning rate of gradient descent to $\eta = 0.5$.

In Table [7,](#page-10-1) we see that the performance of KSOS as a minimizer of ρ is almost three times better than of gradient descent and that the 75th percentile of KSOS is lower than the 25th percentile of the gradient descent. To reason whether this translates to a better kernel, we consider Table [8](#page-10-2) on the test trajectory. While the Mean Error's 25th percentile of gradient descent is larger than the 75th percentile of KSOS, the difference in the median value is not as pronounced. However, observing the number of iterations, the predicted trajectory stays true is much larger for KSOS, specifically when $\gamma = 0.25$. To better understand this consider Figure [8,](#page-11-0) where for KSOS only minor fluctuations in the

error occur for the first few hundred iterations. We also observe more pronounced improvements for

KSOS in the Hausdorff Distance, which is explained by the behavior of the trajectories in Figure [9.](#page-12-1) Similar results hold on the Training Trajectory, with the exception of the Mean Error being close to zero, as expected.

Measure	KSOS	Gradient Descent
Mean Error	1.10 $[0.93, 1.32] \times 10^{-1}$ 2.30 $[2.14, 3.00] \times 10^{-1}$	
HD.	6.32 [5.52, 6.44]	8.57 [6.72, 12.75]
Deviation (0.1)	1.00	1.00
Deviation (0.25)		3.32 [3.14, 3.46] \times 10 ² 6.15 [4.42, 16.57] \times 10 ¹

Table 8. Test Set Statistics for the Lorentz Map.

Table 9. Training Set Statistics for the Lorentz Map.

Figure 8. Distances of Predicted Trajectory to True Trajectory for Lorentz Map.

Discussion. While many of the results for KSOS are promising, we mean this paper to be an invitation to further explore global optimization methods in the context of kernel learning. We found that a lot of the benefit of KSOS appears already in sampling the domain. That is, the sample points in $\mathcal T$ often perform comparable to gradient descent. KSOS helps then extract additional performance of this random sampling by building a surrogate. However, even then, many solutions remain relatively close to the sample points, as the accuracy of such surrogate functions is strongest locally.

We believe that further work aiming to combine local and global methods will yield the strongest results. An avenue of exploration may be a principled multi-start methodology, that is finding an appropriate distribution for parameter initialization, then using the KSOS framework to find an appropriate starting point for gradient descent [\[44\]](#page-18-14). When it is difficult to formulate a distribution for the parameters, one may also focus on a Bayesian Optimization framework to better explore the parameter space $[22]$. This is specifically useful when evaluating ρ is prohibitive and hence exploring the parameter space is expensive.

Figure 9. Predicted Trajectories for Lorentz Dynamics.

Lastly, we see value in appropriate metaheuristic algorithms, such as genetic algorithms and ant colony optimization [\[35,](#page-18-15) [2,](#page-16-11) [20\]](#page-17-17). These methods have been shown to numerically perform well on global optimization tasks and combinatorial problems, which is crucial when limiting the number of kernels in the base kernel to reduce model complexity $[61]$. While some links to more principled optimization methods, such as stochastic gradient descent, exist, we note that it remains difficult to theoretically prove the observed performance of metaheuristic algorithms making numerical experiments the most accurate performance test [\[6,](#page-16-12) [13,](#page-16-13) [42,](#page-18-16) [41\]](#page-18-17).

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we used the method of the Kernel Sum of Squares (KSOS) method as a novel global optimization approach for data-adapted kernel learning in dynamical systems. Traditional kernelbased methods, while theoretically robust and numerically efficient, often face challenges in selecting appropriate base kernels and optimizing their parameters, especially when relying on gradient-based methods prone to local minima.

KSOS addresses these limitations by providing a global optimization framework that leverages kernelbased surrogate functions, ensuring more reliable and accurate learning of dynamical systems from data. Through extensive numerical experiments on the Logistic Map, Henon Map, and Lorentz System, we demonstrated that $KSOS$ consistently outperforms gradient descent in minimizing the relative- ρ metric and improving the accuracy of the induced kernel.

Our results highlight the significant potential of KSOS in forecasting the evolution of chaotic dynamical systems. By effectively adapting kernels to the underlying dynamics, KSOS enhances the predictive capabilities and robustness of kernel-based methods. The approach also allows for tighter control over function evaluations, making it computationally efficient for large datasets.

The theoretical foundations laid out in this paper, combined with the promising empirical results, suggest that KSOS can be a powerful tool for researchers and practitioners working with time series data across various scientific fields. Future work will focus on further refining the KSOS algorithm, exploring its applications in other complex systems and particularly the database of 135 chaotic systems that were explored in other papers by Hamzi and Owhadi and their collaborators, and integrating it with other machine learning techniques to broaden its applicability and effectiveness.

In summary, the Kernel Sum of Squares method represents a significant step forward in the quest for more accurate and reliable kernel learning for dynamical systems, offering a robust alternative to traditional gradient-based optimization methods.

5. Acknowledgment

HO acknowledges support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under MURI award number FA9550-20-1-0358 (Machine Learning and Physics-Based Modeling and Simulation) and the Department of Energy under the MMICCs SEA-CROGS award. BH acknowledges support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (award number FA9550-21-1-0317) and the Department of Energy (award number SA22-0052-S001). HO is grateful for support from a Department of Defense Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship.

Appendix A. Appendix

A.1. Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces (RKHS). We give a brief overview of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces as used in statistical learning theory [\[17\]](#page-17-3). Early work developing the theory of RKHS was undertaken by N. Aronszajn [\[5\]](#page-16-14).

Definition A.1. Let H be a Hilbert space of functions on a set X. Denote by $\langle f, g \rangle$ the inner product on H and let $||f|| = \langle f, f \rangle^{1/2}$ be the norm in H, for f and $g \in \mathcal{H}$. We say that H is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) if there exists a function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that

- i. $k_x := k(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.
- ii. k spans H: $\mathcal{H} = \overline{span\{k_x \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}}$.
- iii. k has the reproducing property: $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}$, $f(x) = \langle f, k_x \rangle$.

k will be called a reproducing kernel of H . H_k will denote the RKHS H with reproducing kernel k where it is convenient to explicitly note this dependence.

The important properties of reproducing kernels are summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition A.1. If k is a reproducing kernel of a Hilbert space H , then

- i. $k(x, y)$ is unique.
- ii. $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}, k(x, y) = k(y, x)$ (symmetry).
- iii. $\sum_{i,j=1}^q \alpha_i \alpha_j k(x_i, x_j) \geq 0$ for $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $q \in \mathcal{N}_+$ (positive definiteness).
- iv. $\langle k(x, \cdot), k(y, \cdot) \rangle = K(x, y)$.

Common examples of reproducing kernels defined on a compact domain $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are the (1) constant kernel: $K(x, y) = m > 0$ (2) linear kernel: $k(x, y) = x \cdot y$ (3) polynomial kernel: $k(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d$ for $d \in \mathbf{N}_{+}$ (4) Laplace kernel: $k(x, y) = e^{-||x-y||_2/\sigma^2}$, with $\sigma > 0$ (5) Gaussian kernel: $k(x, y) =$ $e^{-||x-y||_2^2/\sigma^2}$, with $\sigma > 0$ (6) triangular kernel: $k(x, y) = \max\{0, 1 - \frac{||x-y||_2^2}{\sigma}\}$, with $\sigma > 0$. (7) locally periodic kernel: $k(x, y) = \sigma^2 e^{-2 \frac{\sin^2(\pi ||x-y||_2/p)}{\ell^2}}$ $\frac{x-y||_2/p)}{l^2}e^{-\frac{||x-y||_2^2}{2l^2}}, \text{ with } \sigma, \ell, p > 0.$

Theorem A.1. Let $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbf{R}$ be a symmetric and positive definite function. Then there exists a Hilbert space of functions $\mathcal H$ defined on $\mathcal X$ admitting k as a reproducing Kernel. Conversely, let $\mathcal X$ be a Hilbert space of functions $f: \mathcal{X} \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \exists \kappa_x > 0$, such that $|f(x)| \leq \kappa_x \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$ Then H has a reproducing kernel k.

Theorem A.2. Let $k(x, y)$ be a positive definite kernel on a compact domain or a manifold X. Then, there exists a Hilbert space F and a function $\Phi: X \to F$ such that

$$
k(x,y) = \langle \Phi(x), \Phi(y) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \quad \textit{for} \quad x, y \in X.
$$

 Φ is called a feature map, and F a feature space^{[5](#page-14-1)}.

A.2. Function Approximation in RKHSs: An Optimal Recovery Viewpoint. In this section, we review function approximation in RKHSs from the point of view of optimal recovery as discussed in [\[48\]](#page-18-10).

Problem P:. Given input/output data $(x_1, y_1), \cdots, (x_N, y_N) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$, recover an unknown function u^* mapping X to R such that $u^*(x_i) = y_i$ for $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$.

In the setting of optimal recovery, [\[48\]](#page-18-10) Problem P can be turned into a well-posed problem by restricting candidates for u to belong to a Banach space of functions $\mathcal B$ endowed with a norm $|| \cdot ||$ and identifying the optimal recovery as the minimizer of the relative error

$$
\min_{v} \max_{u} \frac{||u - v||^2}{||u||^2},
$$
\n(A.1)

where the max is taken over $u \in \mathcal{B}$ and the min is taken over candidates in $v \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $v(x_i)$ $u(x_i) = y_i$. For the validity of the constraints $u(x_i) = y_i$, \mathcal{B}^* , the dual space of \mathcal{B} , must contain delta Dirac functions $\phi_i(\cdot) = \delta(\cdot - x_i)$. This problem can be stated as a game between Players I and II and can then be represented as

If $|| \cdot ||$ is quadratic, i.e. $||u||^2 = [Q^{-1}u, u]$ where $[\phi, u]$ stands for the duality product between $\phi \in \mathcal{B}^*$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}$ and $Q : \mathcal{B}^* \to \mathcal{B}$ is a positive symmetric linear bijection (i.e. such that $[\phi, Q\phi] \geq 0$ and $[\psi, Q\phi] = [\phi, Q\psi]$ for $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{B}^*$. In that case, the optimal solution of $(A.1)$ has the explicit form

$$
v^* = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} u(x_i) A_{i,j} Q \phi_j,
$$
 (A.3)

where $A = \Theta^{-1}$ and $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is a Gram matrix with entries $\Theta_{i,j} = [\phi_i, Q\phi_j].$

To recover the classical representer theorem, one defines the reproducing kernel K as

$$
K(X, y) = [\delta(\cdot - x), Q\delta(\cdot - y)]
$$

In this case, $(\mathcal{B}, || \cdot ||)$ can be seen as an RKHS endowed with the norm

$$
||u||^{2} = \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{B}^{*}} \frac{(\int \phi(x)u(x)dx)^{2}}{(\int \phi(x)K(X,y)\phi(y)dxdy)}
$$

and [\(A.3\)](#page-14-3) corresponds to the classical representer theorem

$$
v^*(\cdot) = y^T A K(X, \cdot), \tag{A.4}
$$

using the vectorial notation $y^T AK(X, \cdot) = \sum_{i,j=1}^N y_iA_{i,j}K(X_j, \cdot)$ with $y_i = u(x_i)$, $A = \Theta^{-1}$ and $\Theta_{i,j} = K(X_i, x_j).$

Now, let us consider the problem of learning the kernel from data. As introduced in [\[49\]](#page-18-7), the method of KFs is based on the premise that a kernel is good if there is no significant loss in accuracy in the prediction error if the number of data points is halved. This led to the introduction of

$$
\rho = \frac{||v^* - v^s||^2}{||v^*||^2}
$$

⁵The dimension of the feature space can be infinite, for example, in the case of the Gaussian kernel.

which is the relative error between v^* , the optimal recovery $(A.4)$ of u^* based on the full dataset $X = \{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_N, y_N)\}\$, and v^s the optimal recovery of both u^* and v^{*} based on half of the dataset $X^s = \{(x_i, y_i) | i \in S\}$ (Card $(S) = N/2$) which admits the representation

$$
v^s = (y^s)^T A^s K(X^s, \cdot) \tag{A.5}
$$

with $y^s = \{y_i \mid i \in S\}$, $x^s = \{x_i \mid i \in S\}$, $A^s = (\Theta^s)^{-1}$, $\Theta^s_{i,j} = K(X^s_i, x^s_j)$. This quantity ρ is directly related to the game in $(A.2)$ where one is minimizing the relative error of v^* versus v^s . Instead of using the entire the dataset X one may use random subsets X^{s_1} (of X) for v^* and random subsets X^{s_2} (of (X^{s_1}) for v^s . In practice, it is computed as [\[49\]](#page-18-7)

$$
\rho = 1 - \frac{Y_{s_2}^T K(X^{s_2}, X^{s_2})^{-1} Y_{s_2}}{Y_{s_1}^T K(X^{s_1}, X^{s_1})^{-1} Y_{s_1}}
$$
\n(A.6)

Writing $\sigma^2(x) = K(X, x) - K(X, X^f)K(X^f, X^f)^{-1}K(X^f, x)$ we have the pointwise error bound

$$
|u(x) - v^*(x)| \leq \sigma(x) \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}},\tag{A.7}
$$

Local error estimates such as $(A.7)$ are classical in Kriging [\[59\]](#page-19-11) (see also [\[50\]](#page-18-18)[Thm. 5.1] for applications to PDEs). $||u||_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded from below (and, in with sufficient data, can be approximated by) by $Y^{f,T}K(X^f, X^f)^{-1}Y^f$, i.e., the RKHS norm of the interpolant of v^* .

Appendix B. Different ρ functions corresponding to different versions of KFs

In previous work, we introduced different variants of kernel flows

• Lyapunov Exponents based Kernel Flows and the premise that a kernel is good if there is no significant loss in accuracy if half of the data is used to estimate the maximal Lyapunov exponent from data^{[6](#page-15-2)}. The following metric is minimized

$$
\rho_L = |\lambda_{\text{max},N} - \lambda_{\text{max},N/2}|
$$

The goal here is to learn a dynamical system that has similar long term behavior as the underlying system from which the data is coming.

' Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD-) based Kernel Flows and the premise that a kernel is good if there is no significant loss in accuracy when estimating the MMD when two different samples, S_1 and S_2 , of the time series are used and minimize

$$
\rho_{\text{MMD}} = \text{MMD}(S_1, S_2)
$$

The goal here is to capture the statistical properties of the underlying dynamical system in the spirit of what is done through the Frobenius-Perron operator.

' Sparse Kernel Flows: For an additive base kernel of the form

$$
K_{\beta,\theta}(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i^2 k_i(x,y;\beta),
$$

(where the $k_i(x, y; \beta)$ are kernels) we consider the L_1 regularization

$$
\mathcal{L}(\beta, \theta) = \arg \min_{\beta, \theta} \left(1 - \frac{y_c^{\top} K_{\beta, \theta}^{-1} y_c}{y_b^{\top} K_{\beta, \theta}^{-1} y_b} + \lambda \|\theta\|_1 \right)
$$

in order to sparsify the base kernel and set as many θ_i to zero.

' Hausdorff-Metric Kernel Flows (HMKFs)

When the system has an attractor, we will consider a kernel of the form^{[7](#page-15-3)}

$$
K_{\beta,\theta}(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \theta_i^2 k_i(x,y;\beta)
$$

 ${}^{6}A$ similar principle can be used with other Lyapunov exponents.

⁷For kernels of this form with $m > 2$, the method of Kernel Flows can be viewed as a problem of data compression in the context of Algorithmic Information Theory (AIT) [\[27\]](#page-17-11).

and find the parameters θ and β using the following metric

$$
\rho_{\text{HD}} = \text{HD}(\mathcal{A}_N, \mathcal{A}_{N/2})
$$

instead of (2.4) . This metric is the Hausdorff distance between the attractor reconstruction with N points and its reconstruction with $N/2$ points. We will call this method Regular Hausdorff metric-based Kernel Flows. To improve the performance of this method, we will combine it with the method of Sparse Kernel Flows that we introduced in [\[61\]](#page-19-2), and we will also consider training the kernel by minimizing the following metric

$$
\rho_{\rm HD} = {\rm HD}(\mathcal{A}_N,\mathcal{A}_{N/2}) + \lambda \|\theta\|_1
$$

with respect to β , θ . We will call this approach *Sparse Hausdorff metric-based Kernel Flows*.

References

- [1] H. Abarbanel. Analysis of Observed Chaotic Data. Institute for Nonlinear Science. Springer New York, 2012.
- [2] Mohamed Abdel-Basset, Laila Abdel-Fatah, and Arun Kumar Sangaiah. Metaheuristic algorithms: A comprehensive review. Computational intelligence for multimedia big data on the cloud with engineering applications, pages 185–231, 2018.
- [3] Amir Ali Ahmadi. Sum of squares (sos) techniques: an introduction. Princeton, Princeton, NJ, USA, Tech. Rep, pages 1–9, 2018.
- [4] Romeo Alexander and Dimitrios Giannakis. Operator-theoretic framework for forecasting nonlinear time series with kernel analog techniques. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 409:132520, 2020.
- [5] N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 68(3):337–404, 1950.
- [6] David Matthew Bortz and Carl Tim Kelley. The simplex gradient and noisy optimization problems. In Computational Methods for Optimal Design and Control: Proceedings of the AFOSR Workshop on Optimal Design and Control Arlington, Virginia 30 September–3 October, 1997, pages 77–90. Springer, 1998.
- [7] Jake Bouvrie and Boumediene Hamzi. Balanced reduction of nonlinear control systems in reproducing kernel hilbert space. In 2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), pages 294–301, 2010.
- [8] Jake Bouvrie and Boumediene Hamzi. Empirical estimators for stochastically forced nonlinear systems: Observability, controllability and the invariant measure. *Proc. of the 2012 American* Control Conference, pages 294–301, 2012. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.0563v1>.
- [9] Jake Bouvrie and Boumediene Hamzi. Kernel methods for the approximation of nonlinear systems. SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1108.2903>.
- [10] Jake Bouvrie and Boumediene Hamzi. Kernel methods for the approximation of some key quantities of nonlinear systems. Journal of Computational Dynamics, 1, 2017. [http://arxiv.org/abs/](http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.0563) [1204.0563](http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.0563).
- [11] Steven L. Brunton, Joshua L. Proctor, and J. Nathan Kutz. Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(15):3932–3937, 2016.
- [12] Martin Casdagli. Nonlinear prediction of chaotic time series. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, $35(3):335 - 356$, 1989.
- [13] Neil K Chada, Yuming Chen, and Daniel Sanz-Alonso. Iterative ensemble kalman methods: A unified perspective with some new variants. $arXiv$ preprint $arXiv:2010.13299$, 2020.
- [14] Ashesh Chattopadhyay, Pedram Hassanzadeh, Krishna V. Palem, and Devika Subramanian. Datadriven prediction of a multi-scale lorenz 96 chaotic system using a hierarchy of deep learning methods: Reservoir computing, ann, and RNN-LSTM. CoRR, abs/1906.08829, 2019.
- [15] Yifan Chen, Bamdad Hosseini, Houman Owhadi, and Andrew M. Stuart. Solving and learning nonlinear PDEs with Gaussian processes. Journal of Computational Physics, 447:110668, December 2021.
- [16] Elliott Ward Cheney and William Allan Light. A course in approximation theory, volume 101. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.
- [17] Felipe Cucker and Steve Smale. On the mathematical foundations of learning. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 39:1–49, 2002.
- [18] M. Darcy, B. Hamzi, J. Susiluoto, A. Braverman, and H. Owhadi. Learning dynamical systems from data: a simple cross-validation perspective, part II: nonparametric kernel flows. Physica D, 444:133583, 2023.
- [19] Matthieu Darcy, Boumediene Hamzi, Giulia Livieri, Houman Owhadi, and Peyman Tavallali. Oneshot learning of stochastic differential equations with data adapted kernels. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 444:133583, 2023.
- [20] Marco Dorigo and Thomas Stützle. The ant colony optimization metaheuristic: Algorithms, applications, and advances. Handbook of metaheuristics, pages 250–285, 2003.
- [21] B.Haasdonk ,B.Hamzi , G.Santin , D.Wittwar. Kernel methods for center manifold approximation and a weak data-based version of the center manifold theorems. Physica D, 2021.
- [22] Peter I Frazier. A tutorial on bayesian optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02811, 2018.
- [23] P. Giesl, B. Hamzi, M. Rasmussen, and K. Webster. Approximation of Lyapunov functions from noisy data. Journal of Computational Dynamics, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.01568>.
- [24] R. González-García, R. Rico-Martínez, and I.G. Kevrekidis. Identification of distributed parameter systems: A neural net based approach. Computers $\mathcal C$ Chemical Engineering, 22:S965–S968, 1998. European Symposium on Computer Aided Process Engineering-8.
- [25] Ove Grandstrand. Nonlinear system identification using neural networks: dynamics and instanbilities. In A. B. Bulsari, editor, Neural Networks for Chemical Engineers, chapter 16, pages 409–442. Elsevier, Elsevier, 1995.
- [26] B. Haasdonk, B. Hamzi, G. Santin, and D. Wittwar. Greedy kernel methods for center manifold approximation. Proc. of ICOSAHOM 2018, International Conference on Spectral and High Order Methods, (1), 2018. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11329>.
- [27] B Hamzi, M Hutter, and O Owhadi. A note on learning kernels from data from an algorithmic information theoretic point of view, 2023.
- [28] Boumediene Hamzi and Fritz Colonius. Kernel methods for the approximation of discrete-time linear autonomous and control systems. SN Applied Sciences, 1(7):674, July 2019.
- [29] Boumediene Hamzi, Amirhossein Jafarian, Houman Owhadi, and Léo Paillet. A Note on Microlocal Kernel Design for Some Slow-Fast Stochastic Differential Equations with Critical Transitions and Application to EEG Signals. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 2022.
- [30] Boumediene Hamzi, Christian Kuehn, and Sameh Mohamed. A note on kernel methods for multiscale systems with critical transitions. Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, 42(3):907– 917, 2019.
- [31] Boumediene Hamzi and Houman Owhadi. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part i: Parametric kernel flows. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 421:132817, 2021.
- [32] Boumediene Hamzi, Houman Owhadi, and Yannis Kevrekidis. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part iv: Case with partial observations. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 454:133853, 2023.
- [33] J.L. Hudson, M. Kube, R.A. Adomaitis, I.G. Kevrekidis, A.S. Lapedes, and R.M. Farber. Nonlinear signal processing and system identification: applications to time series from electrochemical reactions. Chemical Engineering Science, 45(8):2075–2081, 1990.
- [34] Holger Kantz and Thomas Schreiber. Nonlinear Time Series Analysis. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1997.
- [35] Sourabh Katoch, Sumit Singh Chauhan, and Vijay Kumar. A review on genetic algorithm: past, present, and future. Multimedia tools and applications, 80:8091–8126, 2021.
- [36] Stefan Klus, Feliks Nuske, and Boumediene Hamzi. Kernel-based approximation of the koopman generator and schrödinger operator. Entropy, 22, 2020. [https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/22/](https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/22/7/722) [7/722](https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/22/7/722).
- [37] Stefan Klus, Feliks Nüske, Sebastian Peitz, Jan-Hendrik Niemann, Cecilia Clementi, and Christof Schütte. Data-driven approximation of the koopman generator: Model reduction, system identification, and control. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 406:132416, 2020.
- [38] Andreas Bittracher, Stefan Klus, Boumediene Hamzi, Peter Koltai, and Christof Schutte. Dimensionality reduction of complex metastable systems via kernel embeddings of transition manifold, 2019. https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08622.
- [39] J. B. Lasserre. A theorem of the alternative in Banach lattices. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, pages 189–194, 1998.
- [40] Jonghyeon Lee, Edward De Brouwer, Boumediene Hamzi, and Houman Owhadi. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part iii: Irregularly-sampled time series, 2021.
- [41] Daniel Lengyel. Optimal Sample Set Selection for the Simplex Gradient. PhD thesis, Imperial College London, 2024. PhD thesis, not yet uploaded to arXiv.
- [42] Daniel Lengyel, Panos Parpas, Nikolas Kantas, and Nicholas R Jennings. Curvature aligned simplex gradient: Principled sample set construction for numerical differentiation. $arXiv$ preprint arXiv:2310.12712, 2023.
- [43] Ulysse Marteau-Ferey, Francis Bach, and Alessandro Rudi. Non-parametric models for nonnegative functions. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:12816–12826, 2020.
- [44] Rafael Martí. Multi-start methods. Handbook of metaheuristics, pages 355–368, 2003.
- [45] Arkadi Nemirovski. Interior point polynomial time methods in convex programming. Lecture notes, 42(16):3215–3224, 2004.
- [46] A. Nielsen. Practical Time Series Analysis: Prediction with Statistics and Machine Learning. O'Reilly Media, 2019.
- [47] Boumediene Hamzi , Romit Maulik, Houman Owhadi. Simple, low-cost and accurate data-driven geophysical forecasting with learned kernels. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 477(2252), 2021.
- [48] H. Owhadi and C. Scovel. Operator-Adapted Wavelets, Fast Solvers, and Numerical Homogenization: from a game theoretic approach to numerical approximation and algorithm design. Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [49] H. Owhadi and G. R. Yoo. Kernel flows: From learning kernels from data into the abyss. Journal of Computational Physics, 389:22–47, 2019.
- [50] Houman Owhadi. Bayesian numerical homogenization. Multiscale Modeling & Simulation, 13(3):812–828, 2015.
- [51] Houman Owhadi. Computational graph completion. Research in the Mathematical Sciences, 9(2):27, 2022.

20 DANIEL LENGYEL^{*}, BOUMEDIENE HAMZI^{**,***}, HOUMAN OWHADI^{**}, PANOS PARPAS^{*}

- [52] Jaideep Pathak, Zhixin Lu, Brian R. Hunt, Michelle Girvan, and Edward Ott. Using machine learning to replicate chaotic attractors and calculate lyapunov exponents from data. Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science, 27(12):121102, 2017.
- [53] Ramiro Rico-Martinez, K Krischer, IG Kevrekidis, MC Kube, and JL Hudson. Discrete-vs. continuous-time nonlinear signal processing of cu electrodissolution data. Chemical Engineering Communications, 118(1):25–48, 1992.
- [54] Alessandro Rudi, Ulysse Marteau-Ferey, and Francis Bach. Finding global minima via kernel approximations. Mathematical Programming, pages 1–82, 2024.
- [55] Gabriele Santin and Bernard Haasdonk. Kernel methods for surrogate modeling. 2019. [https:](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.105566) [//arxiv.org/abs/1907.105566](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.105566).
- [56] Alexandre Smirnov, Boumediene Hamzi, and Houman Owhadi. Mean-field limits of trained weights in deep learning: A dynamical systems perspective. Dolomites Research Notes on Approximation, 15(3), 2022.
- [57] Gilbert Stengle. A nullstellensatz and a positivstellensatz in semialgebraic geometry. Mathematische Annalen, 207:87–97, 1974.
- [58] Stephen J Wright. On the convergence of the newton/log-barrier method. Mathematical programming, 90:71–100, 2001.
- [59] Zongmin Wu and Robert Schaback. Local error estimates for radial basis function interpolation of scattered data. IMA J. Numer. Anal, 13:13–27, 1992.
- [60] Lu Yang, Boumediene Hamzi, Yannis Kevrekidis, Houman Owhadi, Xiuwen Sun, and Naiming Xie. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part vi: Hausdorff metric based training of kernels to learn attractors with application to 133 chaotic dynamical systems. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 2024.
- [61] Lu Yang, Xiuwen Sun, Boumediene Hamzi, Houman Owhadi, and Naiming Xie. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part v: Sparse kernel flows for 132 chaotic dynamical systems. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 460:134070, 2024.
- [62] Jalalian Yasamin, Bounediene Hamzi, Houman Owhadi, Tavallali Peyman, and Samir Moustafa. Learning dynamical systems from data: A simple cross-validation perspective, part vii: Hamiltonian systems. 2023.
- [63] Gene Ryan Yoo and Houman Owhadi. Deep regularization and direct training of the inner layers of Neural Networks with Kernel Flows. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 426:132952, November 2021.

Email address, Daniel Lengyel: d.lengyel19@imperial.ac.uk

Email address, Boumediene Hamzi: boumediene.hamzi@gmail.com

˚Department of Computing, Imperial College London

˚˚Department of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Caltech, Pasadena/CA, USA

***THE ALAN TURING INSTITUTE, LONDON, UK