

Optimal Convergence Rates for Neural Operators

Mike Nguyen*

Technical University of Braunschweig
mike.nguyen@tu-braunschweig.de

Nicole Mücke

Technical University of Braunschweig
nicole.muecke@tu-braunschweig.de

December 24, 2024

Abstract

We introduce the neural tangent kernel (NTK) regime for two-layer neural operators and analyze their generalization properties. For early-stopped gradient descent (GD), we derive fast convergence rates that are known to be minimax optimal within the framework of non-parametric regression in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS). We provide bounds on the number of hidden neurons and the number of second-stage samples necessary for generalization. To justify our NTK regime, we additionally show that any operator approximable by a neural operator can also be approximated by an operator from the RKHS. A key application of neural operators is learning surrogate maps for the solution operators of partial differential equations (PDEs). We consider the standard Poisson equation to illustrate our theoretical findings with simulations.

1 Introduction

Operator learning has emerged as a transformative methodology in machine learning, focusing on learning mappings between spaces of functions. This approach is particularly powerful for surrogate modeling tasks in fields like uncertainty quantification, inverse problems, and design optimization, where the goal often involves approximating complex operators, such as the solution operator of partial differential equations (PDEs).

Learning linear operators. A classical field where learning linear operators arises is functional data analysis (FDA), particularly in functional linear regression with functional responses, also known as function-to-function regression. FDA focuses on understanding and modeling data best described as functions rather than discrete points. Unlike traditional data, where observations might be scalar or vector-valued, functional data are represented by smooth curves, surfaces, or other continuous objects. These functions are typically observed over a continuum, such as time, space, or wavelength, and are inherently infinite-dimensional (Febrero-Bande et al., 2024; Morris, 2015). The model can be seen as a generalization of multivariate regression, where the regression coefficient is now an unknown operator. A standard approach to this problem involves applying Tikhonov regularization (see Benatia et al. (2017)), with classical rates of convergence resembling a typical bias-variance trade-off.

The framework of learning operators extends naturally to nonparametric approaches, such as conditional mean embeddings (CMEs) in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS). In these settings, the goal is to represent conditional distributions as operators acting on functions, enabling the integration of

*Corresponding Author

probabilistic modeling with functional data analysis (Klebanov et al., 2020; Park and Muandet, 2020; Grünewälder et al., 2012). Conditional mean embeddings generalize the idea of representing conditional expectations as operators in RKHS, bridging the gap between statistical learning of distributions and operator learning. In Li et al. (2022) classical Tikhonov regularization has also been analyzed in this setting, and optimal convergence rates have been established.

These approaches have inspired further research, as highlighted in Mollenhauer et al. (2022), where the problem of learning linear operators is placed into the broader framework of supervised learning in random design and analyzed through the family of spectral regularization methods, encompassing the earlier examples as special cases. This line of work is advanced in Meunier et al. (2024) and Li et al. (2024), which establish upper bounds for the finite-sample risk of general vector-valued spectral algorithms. These results are applicable to both well-specified and misspecified scenarios, where the true regression function may lie outside the hypothesis space, and achieve minimax optimality across various regimes.

Learning non-linear operators. The extension of linear techniques for operator learning into non-linear contexts has been realized through innovative approaches incorporating neural networks, enabling greater flexibility and efficiency in handling complex functional relationships. In Shimizu et al. (2024), the authors introduce a method that integrates deep learning into CME by leveraging an end-to-end neural network (NN) optimization framework. The approach replaces the computationally expensive Gram matrix inversion required in traditional CME methods with a kernel-based objective, significantly improving scalability and computational efficiency. For non-linear function-on-function regression, Rao and Reimherr (2023) proposes a novel framework featuring a continuous hidden layer with continuous neurons to model functional responses. Two strategies, function-on-function direct neural networks and function-on-function basis neural networks, are developed to enhance flexibility in modeling complex functional relationships. While demonstrating strong empirical performance through simulations and real data applications, this method lacks theoretical learning guarantees. Shi et al. (2024) presents a functional deep neural network architecture with a fully data-dependent dimension reduction strategy. The architecture comprises three steps: a kernel embedding for integral transformation using a smooth, data-driven kernel; a projection step using eigenfunction bases for dimension reduction; and a deep ReLU network for prediction. This approach is accompanied by theoretical analyses, including approximation and generalization error bounds, providing robust theoretical support for the method. These developments highlight the significant advancements in non-linear operator learning, driven by neural network-based frameworks that blend theoretical rigor with practical flexibility and scalability.

Another key application area for learning non-linear operators mapping between function spaces is solving partial differential equations (PDEs), where the solution operators that connect initial or boundary conditions to the PDE’s solution are of particular interest (Boullé and Townsend, 2023). Understanding and approximating these operators is essential, as they encapsulate the underlying dynamics of the system being studied (Gonon et al., 2024; Tarantola, 2005).

Traditional approaches for approximating operators, especially for solving PDEs, have been well-established for decades. Techniques such as the Finite Element Method (FEM), Finite Difference Method (FDM), and Finite Volume Method (FVM) are classical methods employed to estimate these operators (Hughes, 2003). These methods discretize the problem space into manageable subdomains, enabling numerical approximations of the solution. While highly effective, they have notable limitations. A primary drawback is their computational cost, which increases exponentially with the problem’s dimensionality, a phenomenon known as the curse of dimensionality. Additionally, these methods require detailed dis-

cretization of the underlying function space, which can be challenging to achieve for high-dimensional or complex geometries. Another significant challenge arises when dealing with inverse problems or noisy data, where classical methods often struggle with stability and robustness (Strang and Fix, 1973).

As a result, there has been a growing interest in novel operator estimation techniques that incorporate machine learning, and more specifically, neural networks. Neural networks offer the capability to learn complex patterns and relationships from data, making them well-suited for operator learning tasks that might be intractable via traditional methods Goodfellow et al. (2016). A particularly intriguing development is the emergence of neural network-based operator learning techniques, which can be broadly categorized into "encoder/decoder" architectures and neural operators. Both categories of methods have demonstrated remarkable success in operator learning, showcasing their ability to handle high-dimensional inputs, complex geometries, and noisy data.

Encoder/Decoder Operators. This framework typically involves three key stages: encoding the input function into a finite-dimensional parameter space, mapping these parameters using neural network architectures, and subsequently decoding the parameters back into a functional representation. The encoding phase often employs parameterization techniques where the function is projected onto a lower-dimensional basis, allowing for computationally feasible manipulation. Spectral Neural Operators represent a prominent example utilize transformations such as Fourier or wavelet transforms to convert input functions into spectral coefficients, delivering notable robustness and efficiency, particularly in scenarios featuring periodic behaviors Fanaskov and Oseledets (2024). In parallel, PCA Operators utilize Principal Component Analysis to transform input functions into scores corresponding to principal components. This transformation highlights significant variance patterns within the data, thereby facilitating effective learning and retention of crucial functional characteristics Lanthaler (2023); Kovachki et al. (2024c). Further notable examples include the DeepONet architecture, which comprises a branch network that encodes the discrete input function space and a trunk network that encodes the domain of the output functions Lu et al. (2021). Additionally, the application of Variational Autoencoders Kingma and Welling (2022) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) is prominent; the latter utilizes encoder-decoder architectures for addressing image-to-image translation problems, where the translation can be interpreted as an operator task Badrinarayanan et al. (2017).

Neural Operators. On the other hand, neural operators constitute an innovative extension of classical neural networks designed to directly learn mappings between function spaces. The architecture of neural operators resembles that of traditional neural networks but with a crucial distinction: each layer incorporates a kernel integral operator to leverage the entire functional information. This design enables them to effectively process and map the complex relationships inherent in function spaces. One prominent example is the Fourier Neural Operator (FNO), which employs fast Fourier transforms to model the kernel integral transformations central to many operators related to partial differential equations (PDEs). This approach offers a robust framework capable of efficiently managing high-dimensional input spaces with reduced computational complexity Li et al. (2021); Qin et al. (2024); Kovachki et al. (2023). Another example are Low Rank Neural Operators simplify computations by approximating the kernel integral operators with low-rank representations, thus reducing the computational complexity while retaining essential information Kovachki et al. (2023). Physics-Informed Neural Operators (PINOs) integrate physical laws and constraints directly into the learning process via modified loss functions, which helps in ensuring that the learned mappings adhere to known physical principles. This hybrid approach combines data-driven methodologies with theoretical insights, enhancing the model's generalization capabilities across diverse scenarios from fluid dynamics to material sciences and many others Wang et al. (2021);

Raissi et al. (2019). Graph Neural Operators extend the neural operator framework to graph-structured data, efficiently capturing spatial and topological information intrinsic to many real-world problems. By adapting neural operators to graph settings, these models skillfully navigate complex data relationships, making them suitable for applications in network analysis and beyond Li et al. (2020); Kovachki et al. (2023); Sharma et al. (2024).

Contribution. We aim to learn potential non-linear operators, mapping between normed function spaces. We cast this problem into the framework of supervised learning and focus on neural operators that encompasses all the aforementioned examples. We assume our first-stage data are functions from some possibly infinite dimensional normed space, drawn independently and identically from some unknown probability distribution. Since we deal with infinite dimensional objects, further discretization is necessary for any practical implementation. We suppose that some evaluations of the data functions are available, which we call the second-stage samples, see Section 2. Our primary objective is to establish fast convergence rates for the mean squared error. Following the paradigm in Kovachki et al. (2024b), we investigate the data complexity of learning non-linear operators within the framework of the vector-valued neural tangent kernel (vvNTK). In doing so, we meticulously account for the precise number of neurons and the second-stage samples required to achieve these rates.

To attain fast convergence rates, however, it is necessary to restrict the class of operators to be estimated. More precisely, we impose an a priori smoothness assumption defined in terms of powers of the integral operator associated with the vvNTK, commonly referred to as a Hölder source condition in classical RKHS methods. Specifically, we limit our scope to learning operators that reside in the range of powers of the integral operator, with the well-specified case included. To justify this assumption, we demonstrate that any operator approximable by a neural operator can also be approximated by an operator from the vvRKHS.

Additionally, we derive convergence rates that account for the assumed eigenvalue decay of the associated vvNTK integral operator. Our bounds match those from traditional nonparametric methods in RKHS, which are known to be minimax optimal; see also Nguyen and Mücke (2023).

Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our setting and review relevant results on learning with kernels, and learning with random features. In Section 3, we present and discuss our main results. Finally, numerical experiments are presented in Section 4. All proofs are deferred to the Appendix.

2 Setup

In this section we provide the mathematical framework for our analysis.

We let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ be the input space of our function spaces. The unknown data probability measure on the input data space \mathcal{X} is denoted by ρ . Further we let \mathcal{U} be a normed function input space, mapping from $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ and \mathcal{V} be a normed function target space, mapping from $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \subset \mathbb{R}$, to be specified in Assumption 3.1. The unknown data distribution on the data space $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ is denoted by μ , while the marginal distribution on \mathcal{U} is denoted as μ_u and the regular conditional distribution on \mathcal{V} given $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is denoted by $\mu(\cdot|u)$, see e.g. Shao (2003).

Given an operator $G : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ we further define the expected risk as

$$\mathcal{E}(G) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\|G(u) - v\|_{L^2(\rho_x)}^2]. \quad (2.1)$$

It is known that the global minimizer of \mathcal{E} over the set of all measurable operators is given by the regression operator G^* , defined as

$$G^*(u) := \int_{\mathcal{V}} v(\cdot) \rho(dv|u). \quad (2.2)$$

2.1 Two-Layer Neural Operator

The hypothesis class considered in this paper is given by the following set of two-layer neural operators: Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be the network width. Given an activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ acting point wise and some continuous operator $A : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^{d_k})$ we consider the class

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_M := & \left\{ G_\theta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \mid G_\theta(u)(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \langle a, \sigma(B_1 A(u)(x) + B_2 u(x) + B_3 c(x)) \rangle, \right. \\ & \left. \theta = (a, B_1, B_2, B_3) \in \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_k} \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_y} \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_b} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where we denote with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the euclidean vector inner product. We condense all parameters in $\theta = (a, B_1, B_2, B_3) = (a, B) \in \Theta$, with $B = (B_1, B_2, B_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times \tilde{d}}$, $\tilde{d} := d_k + d_y + d_b$ and equip the parameter space Θ with the euclidean vector norm $\|\cdot\|_\Theta$

$$\|\theta\|_\Theta^2 = \|a\|_2^2 + \|B\|_F^2 = \|a\|_2^2 + \sum_{m=1}^M \|b_m\|_2^2, \quad (2.4)$$

for any $\theta \in \Theta$, where we used the notation $B = (b_1, \dots, b_M)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times \tilde{d}}$.

For the activation function σ , we impose the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1 (Activation Function). *There exists $C_\sigma > 0$ such that $\|\sigma''\|_\infty \leq C_\sigma$, $\|\sigma'\|_\infty \leq C_\sigma$, $|\sigma(u)| \leq 1 + |u|$ for $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition we assume that the second derivative σ'' is Lipschitz continuous.*

In our operator class 2.3, we first apply an operator transformation $B_1 A(u)$, where B_1 defines a matrix and typically, A defines a kernel integral operator. Depending on the choice of A , our operator class covers a wide range of practically well-studied neural operators, such as Fourier Neural Operators, Graph Neural Operators, and Low-rank Neural Operators [Kovachki et al. \(2023\)](#); [Huang et al. \(2024\)](#); [Kovachki et al. \(2024c\)](#). The kernel integral operation $A(u)$, can be seen as an intuitive extension of matrix multiplication in traditional neural networks to an infinite-dimensional setting. Inspired by Residual Neural Networks, the second transformation, $B_2 u(\cdot)$ with $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_y}$ is just a matrix multiplication and keeps information of the original input $u(\cdot)$. The final component, $B_3 c(\cdot)$ with $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_b}$ defines the bias. Unlike standard neural networks, the bias here is typically not a constant but a function. This function can be a linear transformation or a shallow neural network with trainable parameters. However, to keep our proofs succinct, we assume that c is given and instead multiply the bias with a trainable matrix $B_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_b}$, see Figure 1.

In practice, one typically wraps the neural operator between a lifting operator L and a projection operator P , forming $P \circ G_\theta \circ L$. Here L and P act pointwise, meaning $L(u)(x) = L(u(x))$, and they are typically defined via linear transformations or shallow neural networks [Kovachki et al. \(2023\)](#). However, to keep the proofs concise, we assume in our work that L and P are the identity operators.




Figure 1: Depiction of the architecture of our operator class.

Note that our operator class requires the function spaces \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} to have the same input space $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$. However, if their input spaces differ, they are typically uplifted to a common higher-dimensional space [Kovachki et al. \(2023\)](#). For example, let \mathcal{U} contain functions mapping from $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and \mathcal{V} contain functions mapping from \mathcal{X} , for $\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}) \neq \dim(\mathcal{X})$. In this case, one could consider the operator class

$$\mathcal{F}_M := \left\{ G_\theta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \mid G_\theta(u)(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \langle a, \sigma(B_1 A(u)(x) + B_2 u(\xi(x)) + B_3 c(x)) \rangle \right\},$$

for a lifting or projection map $\xi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. This generalization can be easily adapted to our analytical results.

Our goal is to minimize the expected risk (2.1) over the set \mathcal{F}_M , i.e.

$$\min_{G_\theta \in \mathcal{F}_M} \mathcal{E}(G_\theta).$$

Here, the distributions μ , μ_x and ρ_X are known only through ν i.i.d. samples $((u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_{n_u}, v_{n_u})) \in (\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V})^n$, evaluated at n_x points $(x_1, \dots, x_{n_x}) \in \mathcal{X}^{n_x}$. Hence, we seek for a solution for the empirical risk minimization problem

$$\min_{G_\theta \in \mathcal{F}_M} \hat{\mathcal{E}}(G_\theta), \quad \hat{\mathcal{E}}(G_\theta) = \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_u} \|G_\theta(u_j) - v_j\|_{n_x}^2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{n_x}$ denotes the empirical norm, defined as $\|f\|_{n_x}^2 := \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |f(x_j)|^2$.

Gradient Descent. We aim at analyzing the generalization properties of gradient descent, whose basic iterations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{t+1}^j &= \theta_t^j - \alpha \partial_{\theta^j} \hat{\mathcal{E}}(G_{\theta_t}) \\ &= \theta_t^j - \frac{\alpha}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \langle (G_{\theta_t}(u_i) - v_i), \partial_{\theta^j} G_{\theta_t}(u_i) \rangle_{n_x}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

with $\alpha > 0$ being the stepsize, for some initialization $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ and $\langle u, u' \rangle_{n_x} := \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} u(x_i) u'(x_i)$ denotes the empirical inner product.

Initialization. Similar as in [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#); [Nitanda and Suzuki \(2020\)](#), we assume a symmetric initialization. The parameters for the output layer are initialized as $a_m^{(0)} = \tau$ for $m \in \{1, \dots, M/2\}$ and $a_m^{(0)} = -\tau$ for $m \in \{M/2+1, \dots, M\}$, for some $\tau > 0$. Let π_0 be a uniform distribution on the sphere $\mathbb{S}_1^{\tilde{d}-1} = \{b \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}} \mid \|b\|_2 = 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$. The parameters for the input layer are initialized as $b_m^{(0)} = b_{m+M/2}^{(0)}$ for

$m \in \{1, \dots, M/2\}$, where $(b_m^{(0)})_{m=1}^{M/2}$ are independently drawn from the distribution π_0 . The aim of the symmetric initialization is to make an initial operator $G_{\theta_0} \equiv 0$, where $\theta_0 = (a^{(0)}, B^{(0)})$. Note that this symmetric trick does not have an impact on the limiting NTK, see [Zhang et al. \(2020\)](#), and is just for theoretical simplicity. Indeed, we can relax the symmetric initialization by slightly changing our source condition in Assumption 3.3 to

$$G^* - G_{\theta_0} = \mathcal{L}_\infty^r H^* , \quad (2.6)$$

for some $H^* \in L_\mu^2$, satisfying $\|H^*\|_{L_\mu^2} \leq R$. The proofs can then be easily adapted.

2.2 Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK)

In the more classical setting of nonparametric regression with neural networks, employing techniques involving the NTK has been well analyzed ([Nguyen and Mücke, 2023](#); [Bietti and Mairal, 2019](#); [Chen et al., 2020](#); [Golikov et al., 2022](#); [Xu et al., 2024](#)). We extend this approach to the setting of operator learning, which involves a vector-valued kernel. We therefore recall the definitions and properties of vector-valued kernels. For more insights into vector-valued kernels and their RKHSs, we refer to [Carmeli et al. \(2005, 2008\)](#).

Definition 2.2. 1. For two function spaces \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} we denote by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ the space of operators $F : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ and by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ the subspace of continuous operators. $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ denotes the space of linear operators from $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V})$ denotes the space of linear operators from $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$. For $F : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, we write $F^* : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ to denote the adjoint operator.

2. Given a topological space \mathcal{U} and a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{V} , a map $K : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V})$ is called a \mathcal{V} -reproducing kernel on \mathcal{U} if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle K(u_i, u_j) v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \geq 0$$

for any u_1, \dots, u_N in \mathcal{U} , v_1, \dots, v_N in \mathcal{V} and $N \geq 1$.

3. Given $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $K_u : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{V})$ denotes the linear operator whose action on a vector $y \in \mathcal{V}$ is the function $K_u y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ defined by

$$(K_u y)(t) = K(t, u) y \quad t \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Given a \mathcal{V} -reproducing kernel K , there is a unique Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_K \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{V})$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} K_u &\in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}_K) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U} \\ F(u) &= K_u^* F \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}, F \in \mathcal{H}_K, \end{aligned}$$

where $K_u^* : \mathcal{H}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is the adjoint of K_u . Note that from the second property we have that $K(u, t) = K_u^* K_t$. The space \mathcal{H}_K is called the reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with K , given by

$$\mathcal{H}_K = \overline{\text{span}}\{K_u v \mid u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}\}.$$

4. A reproducing kernel $K : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V})$ is called Mercer provided that \mathcal{H}_K is a subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{V})$.

The connection between kernel methods and standard neural networks is established via the NTK, see [Jacot et al. \(2018\)](#); [Lee et al. \(2019\)](#). For standard fully connected neural networks, the feature map of the NTK is defined via the gradient of the neural network at initialization. Similar we can define a feature map for neural operators by $\Phi^M : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x), \Theta)$; $\Phi^M(u) := \Phi_u^M$,

$$\Phi_u^M(v) := \nabla_{\theta} \langle G_{\theta_0}(u), v \rangle_{L^2(\rho_x)}.$$

This map defines a $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x)$ -reproducing kernel in the sense of [Definition 2.2](#), for any $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} K_M(u, u') &= (\Phi_u^M)^* \Phi_{u'}^M = \sum_{p=1}^P \partial_p G_{\theta_0}(u) \otimes \partial_p G_{\theta_0}(u') \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) \otimes \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\tau^2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{d}} \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) J(u)^{(j)} \otimes \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) J(u')^{(j)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used for the parameter matrix at initialization the notation $B^{(0)} = (b_1^{(0)}, \dots, b_M^{(0)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times \tilde{d}}$, $P = M \cdot (\tilde{d} + 1)$ denotes the amount of parameters and for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ we set $J(u) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^{d_k + d_y + d_b})$ with $J(u)(x) := (A(u)(x), u(x), c(x))^\top$. Further we define the tensor product \otimes with respect to the $L^2(\rho_x)$ inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2_{\rho_x}}$, i.e. $(u \otimes v)(f) := u \cdot \langle v, f \rangle_{L^2_{\rho_x}}$. The corresponding RKHS is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_M = \left\{ H \in \mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x); L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x)) \mid H(u) = \langle \tilde{\theta}, \nabla_{\theta} G_{\theta_0}(u) \tilde{\theta} \rangle, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta \right\},$$

([Carmeli et al. \(2008\)](#) Example 4).

Given the [Assumptions 2.1](#) and [3.1](#) we have for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\|J(u)(x)\|_1 := \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{d}} |(J(u)(x))^{(j)}| \leq 1$ and for all M ,

$$\sup_{u, u' \in \mathcal{U}} \|K_M(u, u')\| \leq 4 + \tau^2 C_{\sigma}^2 := \kappa^2.$$

Further we have that $\nabla_{\theta} G_{\theta_0}(\cdot)$ is continuous, therefore K_M is mercer. In the following result we show that for all $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$, $K_M(u, u')$ converges for $M \rightarrow \infty$ to $K_{\infty}(u, u') \in \mathcal{C}(L^2(\rho_x), L^2(\rho_x))$ in Hilbert-Schmidt norm, with

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\infty}(u, u') &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0} \sigma \left(\langle b^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) \otimes \sigma \left(\langle b^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) + \\ &\quad \tau^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{d}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0} \sigma' \left(\langle b^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) J(u)^{(j)} \otimes \sigma' \left(\langle b^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) J(u')^{(j)}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is provided in [Appendix E.2](#).

Proposition 2.3. *Given the [Assumptions 2.1](#), [3.1](#) we have for any $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\|K_M(u, u') - K_{\infty}(u, u')\|_{HS} \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{M}} \log \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

3 Main Results

In this section we state all of our results and give an outline of the proof.

3.1 Assumptions and Main Results

In this section we formulate our assumptions and state our main results.

Assumption 3.1 (Data Distribution and Operatorclass). *We assume that the input space \mathcal{U} denotes a Banach space, consisting of functions that map from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} . For example we could choose $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$. Similar we assume for our output space \mathcal{V} to be a separable function Hilbert space, that is naturally embedded in $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}, \rho_x)$. Further we assume that \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} , the operator $A : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^{d_k})$ and the bias function $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_b}$ is bounded, i.e. for any $(u, v) \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and $x \in \text{supp}(\rho_x)$ we have $|v(x)| \leq 1$ and $\|J(u)(x)\|_1 \leq 1$, where $J(u)(x) := (A(u)(x), u(x), c(x))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

We impose these assumptions on the input and output spaces to facilitate the application of the theory of random feature approximation for vector valued kernels as developed in [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#) and to justify the point evaluations in our gradient descent algorithm (2.5).

We bound $\|J(u)(x)\|_1$ in order to keep the NTK finite and limit the bound of $\|J(u)(x)\|_1$ and $|v(x)|$ to 1, to keep this paper more concise, but the expressions could also be bounded by any arbitrary constants $C_v, C_J > 0$.

Approximation property. Inspired by the approximation properties of neural operators, our first theorem demonstrates that the vvRKHS associated with the vvNTK can approximate all operators that can also be approximated by neural operators, whose parameters do not deviate significantly from their initialization. The proof can be found in [Appendix B](#).

Theorem 3.2 (Approximation Property). *Let $\theta_0 = (a^{(0)}, B^{(0)}) \in \Theta$ be a random initialization, such that $\{(a_m^{(0)}, B_m^{(0)})\}_{m=1}^M$ is iid with respect to some measure π_0 . Let K_∞ and \mathcal{H}_∞ denote as before the NTK and the RKHS with respect to π_0 . Suppose Assumptions 3.1 and 2.1 are satisfied. Further, let $\varepsilon > 0$ such that there exists some $G_{\theta^*} \in \mathcal{F}_M$ for some $M > 0$, with*

$$\|G_{\theta^*} - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then there exists some $H_\infty \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (over the initialization),

$$\|H_\infty - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \varepsilon + \frac{2\kappa\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{M^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\|a^{(0)}\| + R \right) + \frac{CR^3}{\sqrt{M}},$$

with $C > 0, R := \|\theta^ - \theta_0\|$.*

Rates of convergence. In the following, we establish fast convergence rates for the excess risk and thus need to impose refined a priori assumptions in terms of a source condition and eigenvalue decay.

We let $\mathcal{L}_\infty : L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mu_u) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mu_u)$, $\mathcal{L}_\infty G := \int_{\mathcal{U}} K_\infty(u, \cdot) G(u) \mu_u(du)$ denote the kernel integral operator associated to the NTK K_∞ . Here the integral is defined in the sense of Bochner integration (see, e.g., [Dashti \(2017\)](#), Sec. A.2). Note that \mathcal{L}_∞ is bounded and self-adjoint. Moreover, it is compact and thus has discrete spectrum $\{\mu_j\}_j$, with $\mu_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By our assumptions, \mathcal{L}_∞ is of trace-class, i.e., has summable eigenvalues (see e.g. [Steinwart and Christmann \(2008\)](#)).

Assumption 3.3 (Source Condition). *We assume*¹

$$G^* = \mathcal{L}_\infty^r H^* , \quad (3.1)$$

for some $H^* \in L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$, satisfying $\|H^*\|_{L^2} \leq R$ with $R > 0$, $r \geq 0$.

This assumption characterizes the hypothesis space and relates to the regularity of the regression operator G^* . The bigger r is, the smaller the hypothesis space is, the stronger the assumption is, and the easier the learning problem is, as $\mathcal{L}_\infty^{r_1}(L_{\mu_u}^2) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\infty^{r_2}(L_{\mu_u}^2)$ if $r_1 \geq r_2$. Note that $G^* \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ holds for all $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$, in fact we have $\text{ran}(\mathcal{L}_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{H}_\infty$ (see e.g. [Steinwart and Christmann \(2008\)](#)).

The next assumption relates to the capacity of the hypothesis space.

Assumption 3.4 (Effective Dimension). *For any $\lambda > 0$ we assume*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda) := \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{L}_\infty + \lambda I)^{-1}) \leq c_b \lambda^{-b}, \quad (3.2)$$

for some $b \in [0, 1]$ and $c_b > 0$.

The number $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)$ is called *effective dimension* or *degrees of freedom* [Caponnetto and De Vito \(2007\)](#). It is related to covering/entropy number conditions, see [Steinwart and Christmann \(2008\)](#). The condition (3.2) is naturally satisfied with $b = 1$, since \mathcal{L}_∞ is a trace class operator which implies that its eigenvalues $\{\mu_i\}_i$ satisfy $\mu_i \lesssim i^{-1}$. Moreover, if the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_∞ satisfy a polynomial decaying condition $\mu_i \sim i^{-c}$ for some $c > 1$, or if \mathcal{L}_∞ is of finite rank, then the condition (3.2) holds with $b = 1/c$, or with $b = 0$. The case $b = 1$ is referred to as the capacity independent case. A smaller b allows deriving faster convergence rates for the studied algorithms.

Our next general result establishes an upper bound for the excess risk in terms of the stopping time T and the number of neurons M of our gradient descent algorithm (2.5), under the assumption that the weights remain in a vicinity of the initialization. The proof is outlined in Section 3.2 and further detailed in Appendix B.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 are satisfied. Assume further that $\alpha \in (0, \kappa^{-2})$, $T \leq C n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $2r + b > 1$, $n_u \geq n_0 := e^{\frac{2r+b}{2r+b-1}}$, $n_x \geq \tilde{C} B_\tau^2 T^{2r} \log^2(T)$,*

$$M \geq \tilde{C} B_\tau^6 \log^2(n_u) \cdot \begin{cases} T & : r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ T^{1+b(2r-1)} & : r \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \\ T^{2r} & : r \in (1, \infty) \end{cases} , \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\forall t \in [T] : \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_\Theta \leq B_\tau , \quad (3.4)$$

for some $B_\tau \geq 1 + \tau$. Then we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - G^*\|_{L_2(\mu_u)} \leq \bar{C} T^{-r} \log^3(2/\delta) , \quad (3.5)$$

with $C, \tilde{C}, \bar{C} > 0$ independent of n_u, n_x, M, T, B_τ .

¹Note that the power of \mathcal{L}_∞ is defined via its SVD: $\mathcal{L}_\infty^r := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu_j^r \langle \phi_j, \cdot \rangle \phi_j$.

Finally, the above result directly leads to rates of convergence for operator learning in the vvNTK regime.

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose all assumptions of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied. Choosing $T_{n_u} = n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$ gives with probability at least $1 - \delta$*

$$\|G_{\theta_{T_{n_u}}} - G^*\|_{L_2(\mu_u)} \leq \bar{C} \log^3(2/\delta) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n_u}\right)^{\frac{r}{2r+b}},$$

for some $\bar{C} > 0$.

We comment on the above result. Theorem 3.5 provides an upper bound for the excess risk in estimating nonlinear operators using a shallow neural operator network trained with gradient descent. The risk bound is expressed in terms of the stopping time and demonstrates that gradient descent is, in fact, a descent algorithm, decreasing the risk at each step with high probability, provided the algorithm is stopped early. We also specify the minimum number of neurons required to achieve this bound, which depends on our a priori assumptions about the model (source condition and eigenvalue decay). Notably, in the misspecified case $r \in (0, 1/2)$, this minimum number increases and matches the results found in Nguyen and Mücke (2023) for nonparametric regression in the NTK regime. In addition, our result provides a minimum number of second stage samples from the discretization to achieve this bound.

We can reformulate Theorem 3.5 to obtain the sample complexity required to achieve a certain ε -accuracy. On order for the excess risk to have accuracy of $\varepsilon > 0$, the algorithm requires $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2r+b}{r}})$ first stage samples and $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2} \log^2(\varepsilon^{-1/r}))$ second stage samples.

Choosing $T = \mathcal{O}(n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}})$ in Theorem 3.5 leads to the convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(n_u^{-\frac{r}{2r+b}})$, which is known to be minimax optimal in the RKHS framework Caponnetto and De Vito (2007); Blanchard and Mücke (2017).

For the well-specified case $b = 1$, $r = \frac{1}{2}$, where we can only assume that $G^* \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$, we obtain from Theorem 3.5:

$$\|G_{\theta_{T_n}} - G^*\|_{L_2(\mu_u)} = \mathcal{O}\left(n^{\frac{1}{4}}\right).$$

Note that in this case we only need $M \geq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n_u} \log^2 n_u)$ many neurons and $n_x \geq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n_u} \log^2 n_u)$ many second stage samples.

In the kernel learning framework, the assumption $2r + b > 1$ refers to easy learning problems and if $2r + b \leq 1$ one speaks of hard learning problems Pillaud-Vivien et al. (2018). In this paper we only investigate easy learning problems and leave the question, how many neurons M and second stage samples are needed to obtain optimal rates in hard learning problems Lin et al. (2020), open for future work.

We finally want to point out that all bounds given in Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 require the iterates θ_t to stay close to the initialization. We show below in Theorem 3.7 that this assumption is indeed satisfied.

The weights barely move. Our next result shows that the Assumption (3.4) is indeed satisfied and the weights remain in a vicinity of the initialization θ_0 . The proof is provided in Appendix C.

Theorem 3.7 (Bound for the Weights). *Suppose the Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 are satisfied. Let $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $T \geq 3$ and $M \geq M_0$, $n_u, n_x \geq n_0$, where M_0, n_0 are defined in (C.22). With probability at least $1 - 10\delta$ it holds*

$$\forall t \in [T] : \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_\Theta \leq B_\tau,$$

where

$$B_\tau := C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} \log(T) T^{(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+} \cdot \mathcal{B}_\delta\left(\frac{1}{\alpha T}\right),$$

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta\left(\frac{1}{\alpha T}\right) := 1 + 10\kappa \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right),$$

and $C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} > 0$ defined in (C.20).

Corollary 3.8 (Refined Bounds). *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 are satisfied. Let $T = cn_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $2r + b > 1$.*

1. Let $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $n_u \geq n_0$, for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on δ, r, b . With probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$B_\tau(\delta, T) \leq C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} \log(T), \quad (3.6)$$

if

$$\begin{aligned} M &\geq C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}^2 \log^4(T) T^{2r} \log^2(\tilde{d}/\delta), \\ n_x &\geq C_{\alpha,b,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} T^{1+b} \log^3(1/\delta) \end{aligned}$$

2. Let $r < \frac{1}{2}$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$B_\tau(\delta, T) \leq C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha,b} \log(T) T^{1-2r}.$$

This holds if we choose

$$\begin{aligned} M &\geq C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}^2 \log^4(T) T^{5-8r} \log^2(\tilde{d}/\delta), \\ n_x &\geq C_{\alpha,b,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} T^{2r+b} \log^3(1/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

For some constants $c, C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha,b}, C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}, C_{\alpha,b,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} > 0$.

Remark 1 (Analysis of NTK Spectrum). *It is known that a certain eigenvalue decay of the kernel integral operator \mathcal{L}_∞ implies a bound on the effective dimension. Thus, assumptions on the decay of the effective dimension directly relate to the approximation ability of the underlying RKHS, induced by the NTK.*

Meanwhile, there are some results known that shed light on the RKHS of standard neural networks, that are induced by specific NTKs and activation functions [Bietti and Mairal \(2019\)](#), [Geifman et al. \(2020\)](#), [Chen and Xu \(2020\)](#), [Bietti and Bach \(2020\)](#), [Fan and Wang \(2020\)](#). For neural operators, however, the RKHS has not yet been explored, at least to the best of our knowledge. We hope to build on the existing results for neural networks in future research to gain a deeper understanding of the RKHS in the context of neural operators.

However, the approximation properties of neural operators are well-studied [Huang et al. \(2024\)](#); [Schwab and Zech \(2021\)](#); [Marcati and Schwab \(2023\)](#); [Kovachki et al. \(2021, 2024c\)](#). For example, [Kovachki et al. \(2024c\)](#) show that all continuous operators can be arbitrarily well approximated by neural operators with a non-polynomial and continuous activation function.

3.2 Outline of Proof

Our proof is based on a suitable error decomposition. To this end, we further introduce additional linearized iterates in \mathcal{H}_M :

$$F_{t+1}^M(u) = F_t^M(u) - \frac{\alpha}{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_u} \ell'(F_t^M(u_j), v_j) K_M(u_j, u), \quad (3.7)$$

$$H_t(u)(x) = \langle \nabla(G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)), \theta_t - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta}, \quad (3.8)$$

with initialization $F_0^M = H_0 = 0$. The iterative algorithm of F_t^M is known as kernel gradient descent (KGD) with respect to the kernel K_M and H_t describes a linear Taylor approximation of the neural Operator around θ_0 . We may split

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \|G_{\theta_T} - \mathcal{S}_M H_T\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} + \|\mathcal{S}_M(H_T - F_T^M)\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} + \|\mathcal{S}_M F_T^M - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_M : \mathcal{H}_M \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$ is the inclusion of \mathcal{H}_M into $L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$.

The first error in (3.9) describes an Taylor approximation error. More precisely we use a Taylor expansion in θ_t around the initialization θ_0 . For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in [T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\theta_t}(u)(x) &= G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) + \mathcal{S}_M \langle \nabla(G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)), \theta_t - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta} + r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u)(x) \\ &= \mathcal{S}_M H_t(u)(x) + r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u)(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Here, $r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(x)$ denotes the Taylor remainder and can be uniformly bounded by

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - \mathcal{S}_M H_T\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \|r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}\|_{\infty} \lesssim B_{\tau} \frac{\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2}{\sqrt{M}},$$

as Proposition D.2 shows. This requires the iterates $\{\theta_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ to stay close to the initialization θ_0 , i.e.

$$\sup_{t \in [T]} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} \leq B_{\tau},$$

with high probability, for some $B_{\tau} < \infty$. We show in Theorem 3.7 that this is satisfied for sufficiently many neurons.

The second error term in (3.9) depends on the number of neurons M and on the number of second stage samples n_x , see Theorem B.4. More precisely, we obtained

$$\|\mathcal{S}_M(H_T - F_T^M)\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \lesssim \log(T) B_{\tau}^3 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right),$$

Nguyen and Mücke (2023) considered a similar error term, but for neural networks instead of operators. We used improved spectral regularisation inequalities to obtain rates for second stage samples and a shorter, more concise proof than in Nguyen and Mücke (2023).

The last error term in (3.9) describes the generalisation error of KGD. We apply the results in Nguyen

and Mücke (2023) and find that with high probability,

$$\|\mathcal{S}_M F_T^M - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \lesssim T^{-r},$$

for sufficiently many neurons, see Proposition B.5.

As a result, we arrive at an overall bound of Theorem 3.5

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \lesssim \log(T) B_\tau^3 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) + T^{-r}.$$

4 Numerical Illustration

In this section we support our theoretical investigation that in the well-specified case, the optimal generalization properties can be achieved with a neural operator comprising only $M = O(\sqrt{n_u})$ neurons and $n_x = O(\sqrt{n_u})$ second stage samples (see Theorem 3.5). Remarkably, the empirical evidence presented in Figure 3 and 4 aligns with this theoretical prediction. More precisely we considered the one dimensional Poisson problem,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta v &= u && \text{in } (0, 1) \\ v &= 0 && \text{on } \{0, 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

We aim to estimate the solution operator that maps the input function u to the solution v . In the one-dimensional case with zero boundary conditions, the analytical form of the solution operator is straightforward to obtain. Specifically, we have:

$$v(x) = \int_0^1 G(x, y) u(y) dy$$

with $G(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(x + y - |x - y|) - xy$.

Therefore, we randomly sampled 800 polynomials u_i and computed their analytical solutions v_i . These functions $\{u_i, v_i\}_{i=1}^{400}$ were then used as training data to train our neural operator using GD, and a symmetric initialization (2.1). The test set $\{u_i, v_i\}_{i=400}^{800}$ was used for evaluation.




Figure 2: A random realization of a polynomial u , its solution v and the estimator $NO(u)$.

As shown in Figures 5 and 6, after reaching $n_x = M = T = \sqrt{n_u} = 20$, there is no further significant improvement in the neural operator's performance. For additional numerical simulations that underscore




Figure 3: The logarithmic test-error for different choices of neurons M and iterations T and fixed $n_x = 50$.




Figure 4: The logarithmic test-error for different choices of n_x and iterations T and fixed $M = 50$.




Figure 5: The test-error for different choices of M and fixed $T = 50$ and $n_x = 50$.




Figure 6: The test-error for different choices of n_x and fixed $T = 50$ and $M = 50$.

the utility and significance of neural operators, see for example Lowery et al. (2024); Kovachki et al. (2023); Li et al. (2021); Gin et al. (2020); Kovachki et al. (2024a); Kaijun et al. (2024); Bhattacharya et al. (2021).

References

- A. B. Aleksandrov and V. V. Peller. Operator hölder–zygmund functions, 2009. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.3049>. E.4
- Vijay Badrinarayanan, Alex Kendall, and Roberto Cipolla. Segnet: A deep convolutional encoder-decoder architecture for image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 39(12):2481–2495, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2016.2644615. 1
- David Benatia, Marine Carrasco, and Jean-Pierre Florens. Functional linear regression with functional response. *Journal of econometrics*, 201(2):269–291, 2017. 1
- Kaushik Bhattacharya, Bamdad Hosseini, Nikola B. Kovachki, and Andrew M. Stuart. Model Reduction And Neural Networks For Parametric PDEs. *The SMAI Journal of computational mathematics*, 7:121–

- 157, 2021. doi: 10.5802/smai-jcm.74. URL <https://smai-jcm.centre-merseenne.org/articles/10.5802/smai-jcm.74/>. 4
- Alberto Bietti and Francis Bach. Deep equals shallow for relu networks in kernel regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14397*, 2020. 1
- Alberto Bietti and Julien Mairal. On the inductive bias of neural tangent kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. 2.2, 1
- Gilles Blanchard and Nicole Mücke. Optimal rates for regularization of statistical inverse learning problems. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 18:971–1013, 2017. 3.1, C.1, E.4
- Nicolas Boullé and Alex Townsend. A mathematical guide to operator learning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.14688>. 1
- A. Caponnetto and Ernesto De Vito. Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7:331–368, 2007. 3.1, 3.1, E.2
- C. Carmeli, E. De Vito, and V. Umanità A. Toigo. Vector valued reproducing kernel hilbert spaces and universality, 2008. 2.2, 2.2
- Claudio Carmeli, Ernesto De Vito, and Alessandro Toigo. Reproducing kernel hilbert spaces and mercer theorem, 2005. 2.2
- Lin Chen and Sheng Xu. Deep neural tangent kernel and laplace kernel have the same rkhs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10683*, 2020. 1
- Zixiang Chen, Yuan Cao, Quanquan Gu, and Tong Zhang. A generalized neural tangent kernel analysis for two-layer neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13363–13373, 2020. 2.2
- Andrew M. Dashti, Masoumehand Stuart. *The Bayesian Approach to Inverse Problems*, pages 311–428. Springer International Publishing, 2017. 3.1
- Zhou Fan and Zhichao Wang. Spectra of the conjugate kernel and neural tangent kernel for linear-width neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7710–7721, 2020. 1
- V. Fanaskov and I. Oseledets. Spectral neural operators, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10573>. 1
- Manuel Febrero-Bande, Manuel Oviedo-de la Fuente, Mohammad Darbalaei, and Morteza Amini. Functional regression models with functional response: a new approach and a comparative study. *Computational Statistics*, pages 1–27, 2024. 1
- Amnon Geifman, Abhay Yadav, Yoni Kasten, Meirav Galun, David Jacobs, and Basri Ronen. On the similarity between the laplace and neural tangent kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1451–1461, 2020. 1
- Craig R. Gin, Daniel E. Shea, Steven L. Brunton, and J. Nathan Kutz. Deepgreen: Deep learning of green’s functions for nonlinear boundary value problems, 2020. 4

- Eugene Golikov, Eduard Pokonechnyy, and Vladimir Korviakov. Neural tangent kernel: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13614*, 2022. 2.2
- Lukas Gonon, Arnulf Jentzen, Benno Kuckuck, Siyu Liang, Adrian Riekert, and Philippe von Wurstemberger. An overview on machine learning methods for partial differential equations: from physics informed neural networks to deep operator learning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.13222>. 1
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016. 1
- Steffen Grünwälder, Guy Lever, Luca Baldassarre, Sam Patterson, Arthur Gretton, and Massimiliano Pontil. Conditional mean embeddings as regressors. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1803–1810, 2012. 1
- Daniel Zhengyu Huang, Nicholas H. Nelsen, and Margaret Trautner. An operator learning perspective on parameter-to-observable maps, 2024. 2.1, 1
- Thomas JR Hughes. *The finite element method: linear static and dynamic finite element analysis*. Courier Corporation, 2003. 1
- Arthur Jacot, Clément Hongler, and Franck Gabriel. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2018. 2.2
- Bao Kaijun, Qian Xu, Liu Ziyuan, Wang Haifeng, and Song Songhe. Kernel neural operator for efficient solving PDEs. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 3094(1):500042, 06 2024. ISSN 0094-243X. doi: 10.1063/5.0210744. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0210744>. 4
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6114>. 1
- Ilja Klebanov, Ingmar Schuster, and Timothy John Sullivan. A rigorous theory of conditional mean embeddings. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 2(3):583–606, 2020. 1
- Nikola Kovachki, Samuel Lanthaler, and Siddhartha Mishra. On universal approximation and error bounds for fourier neural operators. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(290):1–76, 2021. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/21-0806.html>. 1
- Nikola Kovachki, Zongyi Li, Burigede Liu, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operator: learning maps between function spaces with applications to pdes. 24(1), 2024a. ISSN 1532-4435. 4
- Nikola B. Kovachki, Zong-Yi Li, Burigede Liu, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew M. Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operator: Learning maps between function spaces with applications to pdes. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:89:1–89:97, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259149906>. 1, 2.1, 2.1, 4
- Nikola B Kovachki, Samuel Lanthaler, and Hrushikesh Mhaskar. Data complexity estimates for operator learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15992*, 2024b. 1
- Nikola B. Kovachki, Samuel Lanthaler, and Andrew M. Stuart. Operator learning: Algorithms and analysis, 2024c. 1, 2.1, 1

- Samuel Lanthaler. Operator learning with pca-net: upper and lower complexity bounds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(318):1–67, 2023. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/23-0478.html>. 1
- Jaehoon Lee, Lechao Xiao, Samuel Schoenholz, Yasaman Bahri, Roman Novak, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Jeffrey Pennington. Wide neural networks of any depth evolve as linear models under gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. 2.2
- Zhu Li, Dimitri Meunier, Mattes Mollenhauer, and Arthur Gretton. Optimal rates for regularized conditional mean embedding learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:4433–4445, 2022. 1
- Zhu Li, Dimitri Meunier, Mattes Mollenhauer, and Arthur Gretton. Towards optimal sobolev norm rates for the vector-valued regularized least-squares algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(181):1–51, 2024. 1
- Zongyi Li, Nikola Kovachki, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Burigede Liu, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Neural operator: Graph kernel network for partial differential equations, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.03485>. 1
- Zongyi Li, Nikola Borislavov Kovachki, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Burigede liu, Kaushik Bhattacharya, Andrew Stuart, and Anima Anandkumar. Fourier neural operator for parametric partial differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=c8P9NQVtmn0>. 1, 4
- Junhong Lin and Volkan Cevher. Optimal convergence for distributed learning with stochastic gradient methods and spectral algorithms, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.07226>. E.2
- Junhong Lin, Alessandro Rudi, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Volkan Cevher. Optimal rates for spectral algorithms with least-squares regression over hilbert spaces. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 48(3):868–890, 2020. 3.1
- Matthew Lowery, John Turnage, Zachary Morrow, John D. Jakeman, Akil Narayan, Shandian Zhe, and Varun Shankar. Kernel neural operators (knos) for scalable, memory-efficient, geometrically-flexible operator learning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00809>. 4
- Lu Lu, Pengzhan Jin, Guofei Pang, Zhongqiang Zhang, and George Karniadakis. Learning nonlinear operators via deeponet based on the universal approximation theorem of operators. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3:218–229, 03 2021. doi: 10.1038/s42256-021-00302-5. 1
- Carlo Marcati and Christoph Schwab. Exponential convergence of deep operator networks for elliptic partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 61(3):1513–1545, jun 2023. ISSN 1095-7170. doi: 10.1137/21m1465718. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/21M1465718>. 1
- Dimitri Meunier, Zikai Shen, Mattes Mollenhauer, Arthur Gretton, and Zhu Li. Optimal rates for vector-valued spectral regularization learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14778*, 2024. 1
- Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2 edition, 2018. D.2

- Mattes Mollenhauer, Nicole Mücke, and TJ Sullivan. Learning linear operators: Infinite-dimensional regression as a well-behaved non-compact inverse problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08875*, 2022. 1
- Jeffrey S Morris. Functional regression. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 2(1):321–359, 2015. 1
- Mike Nguyen and Nicole Mücke. How many neurons do we need? a refined analysis for shallow networks trained with gradient descent, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08044>. 2.1, 2.2, 3.2
- Mike Nguyen and Nicole Mücke. Random feature approximation for general spectral methods, 2023. 1, 3.1, 3.1, 3.2, B.2, B.3, B.5, 3, B.3, C, C.1, C.1, D.3, E.10, E.2
- Atsushi Nitanda and Taiji Suzuki. Optimal rates for averaged stochastic gradient descent under neural tangent kernel regime. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. arXiv, 2020. 2.1
- Junhyung Park and Krikamol Muandet. A measure-theoretic approach to kernel conditional mean embeddings. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21247–21259, 2020. 1
- Loucas Pillaud-Vivien, Alessandro Rudi, and Francis Bach. Statistical optimality of stochastic gradient descent on hard learning problems through multiple passes, 2018. 3.1
- Shaoxiang Qin, Fuyuan Lyu, Wenhui Peng, Dingyang Geng, Ju Wang, Xing Tang, Sylvie Leroyer, Naiping Gao, Xue Liu, and Liangzhu Leon Wang. Toward a better understanding of fourier neural operators from a spectral perspective, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07200>. 1
- M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G.E. Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019. ISSN 0021-9991. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999118307125>. 1
- Aniruddha Rajendra Rao and Matthew Reimherr. Modern non-linear function-on-function regression. *Statistics and Computing*, 33(6):130, 2023. 1
- Alessandro Rudi and Lorenzo Rosasco. Generalization properties of learning with random features. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. A, E.1, E.9
- Christoph Schwab and Jakob Zech. Deep learning in high dimension: Neural network approximation of analytic functions in $l^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \gamma_d)$, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.07080>. 1
- Jun Shao. *Mathematical Statistics*. Springer-Verlag New York Inc, 2nd edition, 2003. 2
- Anil Sharma, Suresh Singh, and Sameer Ratna. Graph neural network operators: A review. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83:23413–23436, 2024. doi: 10.1007/s11042-023-16440-4. 1
- Zhongjie Shi, Jun Fan, Linhao Song, Ding-Xuan Zhou, and Johan AK Suykens. Nonlinear functional regression by functional deep neural network with kernel embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02890*, 2024. 1
- Eiki Shimizu, Kenji Fukumizu, and Dino Sejdinovic. Neural-kernel conditional mean embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10859*, 2024. 1

- Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christmann. *Support vector machines*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008. [3.1](#), [3.1](#), [3.1](#), [A](#), [C.1](#), [E.2](#)
- Gilbert Strang and George J. Fix. *An Analysis of the Finite Element Method*. Prentice Hall, 1973. [1](#)
- Albert Tarantola. *Inverse Problem Theory and Methods for Model Parameter Estimation*, volume xii. 01 2005. ISBN 978-0-89871-572-9. doi: 10.1137/1.9780898717921. [1](#)
- Joel A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, 2011. [E.2](#)
- Sifan Wang, Hanwen Wang, and Paris Perdikaris. Learning the solution operator of parametric partial differential equations with physics-informed deepnets. *Science Advances*, 7(40):eabi8605, 2021. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abi8605. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/sciadv.abi8605>. [1](#)
- Xianliang Xu, Ye Li, and Zhongyi Huang. Convergence analysis of wide shallow neural operators within the framework of neural tangent kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05545*, 2024. [2.2](#)
- Yaoyu Zhang, Zhi-Qin John Xu, Tao Luo, and Zheng Ma. A type of generalization error induced by initialization in deep neural networks. In *Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning*, pages 144–164. PMLR, 2020. [2.1](#)

A Preliminaries

For our analysis we need some further notation.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}_M : \mathcal{H}_M \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$ the inclusion of \mathcal{H}_M into $L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$ for $M \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

The adjoint operator $\mathcal{S}_M^* : L^2(\mathcal{U}, \rho_u) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_M$ is identified as

$$\mathcal{S}_M^* G = \int_{\mathcal{U}} K_{M,u} G(u) \mu_u(du),$$

where $K_{M,u}$ denotes the element of \mathcal{H}_M equal to the function $t \mapsto K_M(u, t)$. The covariance operator $\Sigma_M : \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_M$ and the kernel integral operator $\mathcal{L}_M : L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{U}, \mu_u)$ are given by

$$\Sigma_M G := \mathcal{S}_M^* \mathcal{S}_M G = \int_{\mathcal{U}} K_{M,u} G(u) \mu_u(du), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_M G := \mathcal{S}_M \mathcal{S}_M^* f = \int_{\mathcal{U}} K_{M,u} G(u) \mu_u(du), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which can be shown to be positive, self-adjoint, trace class (and hence is compact) (see e.g. [Steinwart and Christmann \(2008\)](#)). The empirical versions of these operators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M : \mathcal{H}_M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{V}^{n_u}, & \left(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M G \right)_j &= K_{M,u_j}^* G, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* : \mathcal{V}^{n_u} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_M, & \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \mathbf{v} &= \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_u} K_{M,u_j} v_j, \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_M := \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M : \mathcal{H}_M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_M, & \widehat{\Sigma}_M &= \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_u} K_{M,u_j} K_{M,u_j}^*, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{V}^{n_u} is equipped with the norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{n_u}}^2 := \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \|v_i\|_{L^2(\rho_x)}^2$. We introduce the following definitions similar to definition 2 of [Rudi and Rosasco \(2017\)](#). This framework was originally established to bound the generalization error $\|f_t^M - g_\rho\|$ where the function f_t^M follows the tikhonov algorithm with respect to an real valued kernel. Fortunately these definitions will also be useful to bound the weights of the neural operator.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_M : \Theta &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_M, & (\mathcal{Z}_M \theta)(\cdot) &= \nabla G_{\theta_0}(\cdot)^\top \theta, \\ \mathcal{Z}_M^* : \mathcal{H}_M &\rightarrow \Theta, & \mathcal{Z}_M^* G &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) G(u)(x) d\rho_x(x) d\mu_u(u), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M : \Theta &\rightarrow \left(\mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u n_x}} \|\cdot\|_F \right), & \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M \theta \right)_{i,j} &= \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)^\top \theta, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* : \left(\mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u n_x}} \|\cdot\|_F \right) &\rightarrow \Theta, & \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* a &= \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) a_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_M : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta, \quad \mathcal{C}_M = \int_{\mathcal{U}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)^\top d\rho_x(x) d\mu_u(u), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M = \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)^\top. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Remark 2. Note that \mathcal{C}_M and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M$ are self-adjoint and positive operators, with spectrum in $[0, \kappa^2]$ and we further have $\mathcal{C}_M = \mathcal{Z}_M^* \mathcal{Z}_M$, $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M$, $\Sigma_M = \mathcal{Z}_M \mathcal{Z}_M^*$.

B Error Bounds

Recall the error decomposition from Section 3.2:

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \underbrace{\|G_{\theta_T} - \mathcal{S}_M H_T\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}}_{\mathcal{I}} + \underbrace{\|\mathcal{S}_M (H_T - F_T^M)\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}}_{\mathcal{II}} + \underbrace{\|\mathcal{S}_M F_T^M - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}}_{\mathcal{III}}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

This section is devoted to bounding each term on the right hand side of (B.1). To this end, we need the following assumptions:

Assumption B.1. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume we have

$$\forall t \in [T] : \quad \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} \leq B_\tau, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for some constant $B_\tau \geq 1 + \tau$.

We will show in Section C that this assumption is satisfied with high probability, as long as M is large enough.

B.1 Bounding \mathcal{I}

In this section we provide an estimate of the first error term $\|G_{\theta_T} - \mathcal{S}_M H_T\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}$ in (B.1).

Proposition B.2. *Suppose the Assumptions B.1 is satisfied.*

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - \mathcal{S}_M H_T\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}},$$

with $C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) := 162 \max\{C_\sigma^2, C_\sigma^2(B_\tau^2 + \tau^2)\}$. Recall that the norm is defined as $\|G\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}^2 := \int_{\mathcal{U}} \|G(u)\|_{L^2_{\rho_x}}^2 d\mu_x$.

Proof of Proposition B.2. From the Assumption B.1 and Proposition D.2, a) we immediately obtain for all $x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\begin{aligned} |G_{\theta_T}(u)(x) - \mathcal{S}_M H_T(u)(x)| &= |r_{(\theta_0, \theta_T)}(u)(x)| \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_T - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

□

B.2 Bounding \mathcal{II}

In this section we estimate the second term $\|\mathcal{S}_M(H_T - F_T^M)\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}}$ in (B.1). A short calculation proves the following recursion:

Lemma B.3. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}, M \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $\hat{u}_t := H_t - F_t^M \in \mathcal{H}_M$. Then $(\hat{u}_t)_t$ follows the recursion $\hat{u}_0 = 0$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_{t+1} &= (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M) \hat{u}_t - \alpha \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_t^{(1)} - \alpha \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_t^{(2)} - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \hat{\xi}_t^{(3)} \\ &= \alpha \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \left(\mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(1)} + \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(2)} + \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(3)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\xi}_t^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \in \Theta, \\ \hat{\xi}_t^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} (\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i - \mathbf{s}_i) \in \Theta, \\ \hat{\xi}_t^{(3)} &= \bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_t)} \in \mathcal{V}^{n_u}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_t)} = (r_{(\theta_0, \theta_t)}(u_1), \dots, r_{(\theta_0, \theta_t)}(u_{n_u}))$ and $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i, \mathbf{s}_i \in \Theta$, $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i^{(m)} := \langle (G_{\theta_t}(u_i) - v_i), \partial_m G_{\theta_0}(u_i) \rangle_{n_x}$, $\mathbf{s}_i^{(m)} := \langle (G_{\theta_t}(u_i) - v_i), \partial_m G_{\theta_0}(u_i) \rangle_{L^2_{\rho_x}}$.

Proof of Lemma B.3. Plugging in H_t the recursive definition of θ_t leads to

$$\begin{aligned} H_{t+1} &= \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u), \theta_{t+1} - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta} \\ &= H_t - \alpha \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_t^{(1)} - \alpha \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_t^{(2)} - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \hat{\xi}_t^{(3)} - \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_M(u_i, \cdot) (H_t(u_i) - v_i). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Here we used the fact that $G_{\theta_0} \equiv 0$. Therefore, applying a Taylor expansion again yields $G_{\theta_t} = H_t + r_{(\theta_0, \theta_t)}$. Combining the above recursive formula of H_t with the recursive definition of F_t^M results in the first equation of the statement. The second equation can be derived by iterating the first equation t times. \square

Theorem B.4. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha < 1/\kappa^2$. Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.3, B.1, are satisfied. Let $M \geq M_0 := (8\tilde{d}\kappa^2\beta_\infty\alpha T) \vee 8\kappa^4\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1}\log^2\frac{2}{\delta}$ with $\beta_\infty = \log\frac{4\kappa^2(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\alpha T)+1)}{\delta\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}$. Then we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\forall t \in [T]: \quad \|\mathcal{S}_M \hat{u}_t\|_{L^2(\mu_u)} \leq 4\xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa)(\log(T) + 6),$$

where $u_t := H_t - F_t^M$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa, \delta) \\ &:= \left(\frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\kappa B_\tau + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} B_\tau^2 + 1 \right) + \frac{4\kappa^2(B_\tau + 1)}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{16}{\delta}\right) + \frac{(2\kappa + 1)C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If we further assume $M \geq M_{II} := \max\{M_0, M_1\}$ with $M_1 := 48C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)^2 B_\tau^4 \kappa T^{2r} (\log(T) + 6)^2$ and $n_x \geq 32\kappa^4 (B_\tau + 1)^2 T^{2r} (\log(T) + 6)^2 \log(\frac{16}{\delta})$, we have

$$\forall t \in [T]: \quad \|\mathcal{S}_M \hat{u}_t\|_{L^2(\mu_u)} \leq \frac{1}{T^r}.$$

Proof of Theorem B.4. Applying (Nguyen and Mücke, 2023, Proposition A.15) gives (for $\lambda := (\alpha T)^{-1}$ and $M \geq (8\tilde{d}\kappa^2\beta_\infty\alpha T) \vee 8\kappa^4\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1}\log^2\frac{2}{\delta}$) with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\|\mathcal{S}_M \hat{u}_t\|_{L^2} = \|\Sigma_M^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{u}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq 2 \|\widehat{\Sigma}_M^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{u}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} + 2 \frac{\|\hat{u}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_M}}{\sqrt{\alpha T}}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Let $a \in \{0, 1/2\}$. Using Lemma B.3, we find for any $t \in [T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Sigma}_M^a \hat{u}_{t+1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} &= \alpha \left\| \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_M^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \left(\mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(1)} + \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(2)} + \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{(3)} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \\ &\leq \alpha^{1-a} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{T-s}^{(1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} + \\ &\quad \alpha^{1-a} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \mathcal{Z}_M \hat{\xi}_{T-s}^{(2)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} + \\ &\quad \alpha^{1-a} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^* \hat{\xi}_{T-s}^{(3)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

From Proposition D.10 we further obtain with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_M^a \hat{u}_{t+1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq \alpha^{1-a} \left(\frac{2\eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{2\eta_a(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha T}} \right) \max_{s \leq T} \left(\|\hat{\xi}_s^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} + \|\hat{\xi}_s^{(2)}\|_{\Theta} + \|\xi_s^{(3)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{n_u}} \right), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where η_a was defined in Lemma D.8.

Bounding $\|\hat{\xi}_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta}$: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\xi}_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)| \|\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)\|_{\Theta}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Assumption 3.1 we have $|v_i(x_j)| \leq 1$ and from Proposition D.3 we have

$$|G_{\theta_t}(u)(x)| \leq \kappa \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau})}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2,$$

with $C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau}) := 162 \max\{C_{\sigma}^2, C_{\sigma}^2(B_{\tau}^2 + \tau^2)\}$. Using these bounds we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\xi}_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} &\leq \left(\kappa \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau})}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2 + 1 \right) \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}} \|\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)\|_{\Theta} \\ &\leq \left(\kappa \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau})}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2 + 1 \right) \left(\frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau})}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau}) B_{\tau}}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\kappa B_{\tau} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_{\tau})}{\sqrt{M}} B_{\tau}^2 + 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition D.1 for the second inequality.

Bounding $\|\hat{\xi}_t^{(2)}\|_{\Theta}$: By definition of $\hat{\xi}_t^{(2)}$ we have

$$\left\| \hat{\xi}_t^{(2)} \right\|_{\Theta} = \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) (G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) (G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x) - v_i(x)) \right\|_{\Theta}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) v_i(x_j) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) v_i(x) \right\|_{\Theta} +, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$:= I + II. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

For I we set $W_j := \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) v_i(x_j)$. Note that $\|W_j\|_2 \leq \kappa^2 := B$, $\mathbb{E}\|W_j\|_2^2 \leq \kappa^4 := V^2$.

Therefore we have from Proposition E.7 with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$I \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right).$$

For II , we cannot directly apply Proposition E.7, since the summands involve θ_t , which means they are no longer independent. However from Proposition E.15 we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$II \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \frac{2\kappa C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2.$$

Therefore we have,

$$\|\hat{\xi}_t^{(2)}\|_{\Theta} \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) (\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + 1) + \frac{2\kappa C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2 \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\leq \frac{4\kappa^2(B_\tau + 1)}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + \frac{2\kappa C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Bounding $\|\xi_t^{(3)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{n_u}}$:

Using Proposition D.2 we have

$$\|\xi_t^{(3)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{n_u}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \|r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u)\|_{L^2(\rho_x)}^2} \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}}.$$

To sum up:

Plugging the bounds of the errors $\xi_t^{(i)}$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ into B.7 leads to

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_M^a \hat{u}_{T+1}\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq \alpha^{1-a} \left(\frac{2\eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{2\eta_a(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha T}} \right) \max_{s \leq T} \left(\|\hat{\xi}_s^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} + \|\hat{\xi}_s^{(2)}\|_{\Theta} + \|\xi_s^{(3)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{n_u}} \right) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$\leq \alpha^{1-a} \left(\frac{2\eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{2\eta_a(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha T}} \right) \cdot \xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa, \delta), \quad (\text{B.15})$$

with

$$\xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa, \delta) := \left(\frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\kappa B_\tau + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} B_\tau^2 + 1 \right) + \frac{4\kappa^2(B_\tau + 1)}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + \frac{(2\kappa + 1)C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right).$$

Plugging (B.14) into (B.5) gives,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{S}_M \hat{u}_T\|_{L^2} &\leq 2 \|\widehat{\Sigma}_M^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{u}_T\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} + 2 \frac{\|\hat{u}_T\|_{\mathcal{H}_M}}{\sqrt{\alpha T}} \\ &\leq 4\xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa, \delta) \left(\eta_1(T) + \frac{\eta_{1/2}(T)}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\eta_{1/2}(T)}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\eta_0(T)}{T} \right) \\ &= 4\xi(M, n_x, B_\tau, \kappa, \delta) (\log(T) + 6). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, to derive this final bound we conditioned on four events, where each of the events holds true with probability at least $1 - \delta$. By Proposition D.11, we therefore obtain the last inequality holds with

probability at least $1 - 4\delta$. Redefining $\delta = 4\delta$ proves the claim. \square

B.3 Bounding \mathcal{III}

For bounding the last term in our error decomposition we use the results obtained in [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#).

Proposition B.5 (Theorem A.4. in [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#)). *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 3.3, 3.1 and 3.4 are satisfied. Let $\delta \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha < 1/\kappa^2$, $T \leq C_1 n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $2r + b > 1$ and $n_u \geq n_0 := e^{\frac{2r+b}{2r+b-1}}$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\|\mathcal{S}_M f_T^M - G^*\|_{L^2(\mu_u)} \leq C_2 \log^3(2/\delta) T^{-r},$$

provided that

$$M \geq M_{III}(T, r) := C_3 \log(n_u) \cdot \begin{cases} T & : r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ T^{1+b(2r-1)} & : r \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \\ T^{2r} & : r \in (1, \infty) \end{cases}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where the constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ do not depend on n_u, n_x, δ, M, T .

Remark 3. In Theorem A.4. of [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#), different assumptions on n_u were proposed, however in the proof of Theorem 3.5 from [Nguyen and Mücke \(2023\)](#), it was shown that $T \leq C_1 n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$ is enough to guarantee the bound of B.5.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Following the error decomposition of (B.1) and using the bounds of Proposition B.2, B.4, B.5 we obtain with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|G_{\theta_T} - G^*\|_{L^2(\mu_x)} \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}} + T^{-r} + C_2 \log^3(2/\delta) T^{-r} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

$$\leq C \log^3(2/\delta) T^{-r}. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Collecting the restrictions on the number of neurons and samples from the above Propositions, we obtain the final lower bounds $T \leq C_1 n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $2r+b > 1$ and $n_u \geq n_0 := e^{\frac{2r+b}{2r+b-1}}$, $n_x \geq 32\kappa^2(B_\tau + 1)T^{2r}(\log(T) + 6)\log(\frac{16}{\delta})$.

$$M \geq M_0(T, \delta, \tilde{d}, r, b, \alpha, B_\tau) := \max\{M_{II}, M_{III}\}, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

with M_{II}, M_{III} defined in B.4 and B.16. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We prove the existence of some $H_\infty \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (over the initialisation),

$$\|H_\infty - G_{\theta^*}\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \frac{2\kappa\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{M^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\|a^{(0)}\| + R \right) + \frac{C_\sigma R^3}{\sqrt{M}}. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

The rest of the statement then directly follows from

$$\|H_\infty - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \|H_\infty - G_{\theta^*}\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} + \|G_{\theta^*} - G^*\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

$$\leq \varepsilon + \frac{2\kappa\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{M^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\|a^{(0)}\| + R \right) + \frac{C_\sigma R^3}{\sqrt{M}}. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

To prove (B.20), we once again use a Taylor approximation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\theta^*}(u)(x) &= G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) + \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta^* - \theta_0 \rangle_\Theta + r_{(\theta^*, \theta_0)}(u)(x) \\ &= H_M + r_{(\theta^*, \theta_0)}(u)(x), \end{aligned}$$

with $H_M := G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) + \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta^* - \theta_0 \rangle_\Theta$. Note that $G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) = \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), (a^{(0)}, 0) \rangle_\Theta$, where $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times \tilde{d}}$ denotes the zero matrix and $(a^{(0)}, 0) \in \Theta$. Therefore we have that

$$H_M \in \mathcal{H}_M = \left\{ H \in \mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x); L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x)) \mid H(u)(x) = \left\langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \tilde{\theta} \right\rangle_\Theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta \right\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_M = \text{ran}\left(\mathcal{L}_M^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$ we have some operator $F \in \mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x); L^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho_x))$ with $H_M = \mathcal{L}_M^{\frac{1}{2}}F$. Further Note that

$$\|F\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} = \|\mathcal{L}_M^{\frac{1}{2}}F\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} = \|H_M\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq \|a^{(0)}\| + R. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Now we set $H_\infty := \mathcal{L}_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}}F$ and obtain from Proposition D.2 and (B.23)

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_\infty - G_{\theta^*}\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} &\leq \|H_\infty - H_M\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} + \|r_{(\theta^*, \theta_0)}\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \\ &\leq \|H_\infty - H_M\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} + \frac{C_\sigma R^3}{\sqrt{M}} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}} - \mathcal{L}_M^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \left(\|a^{(0)}\| + R \right) + \frac{C_\sigma R^3}{\sqrt{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition E.4 we have $\|\mathcal{L}_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}} - \mathcal{L}_M^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq \|\mathcal{L}_\infty - \mathcal{L}_M\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and from Nguyen and Mücke (2023) (Proposition A.21.) we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\infty - \mathcal{L}_M\|_{HS} \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{M}} \log \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

Therefore we have

$$\|H_\infty - G_{\theta^*}\|_{L^2_{\mu_u}} \leq \frac{2\kappa\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{M^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\|a^{(0)}\| + R \right) + \frac{C_\sigma R^3}{\sqrt{M}},$$

what proves the claim. □

C Bounds on the Weights

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We prove this by induction over $T \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assume that the claim holds for $T \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that this implies the claim for $T + 1$, for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$. A short calculation, similar to B.4 shows that the weights $(\theta_t)_t$ follow the recursion

$$\theta_{T+1} - \theta_0 = \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t (\zeta_{T-t}^{(1)} + \zeta_{T-t}^{(2)} + \zeta_{T-t}^{(3)} + \zeta_{T-t}^{(4)} + \zeta_{T-t}^{(5)}),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_s^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G_{\theta_s}(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_s}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)), \\ \zeta_s^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_s}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)), \\ \zeta_s^{(3)} &= \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_s)}, & (\bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_s)})_{i,j} &:= r_{(\theta_0, \theta_s)}(u_i)(x_j) \\ \zeta_s^{(4)} &= \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^*, & \mathbf{v}_{i,j} &:= v_i(x_j) \\ \zeta_s^{(5)} &= \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{T+1} - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} &\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{T-t}^{(1)} \right\|_{\Theta} + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{T-t}^{(2)} \right\|_{\Theta} \\ &\quad + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{T-t}^{(3)} \right\|_{\Theta} + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{T-t}^{(4)} \right\|_{\Theta} \\ &\quad + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{T-t}^{(5)} \right\|_{\Theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding $\alpha \sum_{s=0}^t \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{t-s}^{(1)} \right\|_{\Theta}$.

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(1)} \right\|_{\Theta} &\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{T-t} \right\| \cdot \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} \\ &\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we already bounded $\zeta_t^{(1)}$ in the proof of Theorem B.4. However, to bound the weights, we need a more refined bound. From Proposition C.2 we obtain for $T \leq C_{\alpha, r, \kappa} n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $n_x \geq t^{2 \max\{0, \frac{1}{2} - r\}}$ and $M \geq M_{III}$ with M_{III} from Theorem B.5, that there exists some $\tilde{C}_{\alpha, \tau, \sigma, r, \kappa} > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{\alpha, \sigma, r, \kappa} \left(\frac{TB_{\tau}^5 + TB_{\tau}^3 T^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2} - r\}}}{M} + \left(\frac{T \log(T) B_{\tau}^2}{\sqrt{n_u M}} + \frac{T \log(T) B_{\tau}^2}{\sqrt{n_x M}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\eta_r(T) B_{\tau}^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If further

$$M \geq M(\zeta^{(1)}) := \max\{M_{III}, M_{\alpha, \tau, \sigma, r, \kappa}\}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$n_u \geq n_u(\zeta^{(1)}) := \max\{C_{\alpha, r, \kappa}^{-1} T^{2r+b}, T \log^2(T) \log(12/\delta)\}, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$n_x \geq n_x(\zeta^{(1)}) := \max\{T^{\max\{0, 1-2r\}}, T \log^2(T) \log(12/\delta)\} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$(\text{C.4})$$

where $M_{\alpha, \tau, \sigma, r, \kappa} := C_{\alpha, \sigma, r, \kappa} B_\tau^4 T$ for some $C_{\alpha, \sigma, r, \kappa} > 0$, we have

$$\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_\Theta \leq B_\tau/5.$$

Bounding $\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(2)}\|_\Theta$.

From Lemma C.3, we obtain with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\max_{t \in [T]} \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_\Theta \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_\sigma \tilde{d} B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_u \cdot M}} \sqrt{\log(\tilde{d}/\delta)},$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(2)}\|_\Theta &\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{T-t}\| \cdot \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_\Theta \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \tilde{C}_\sigma \tilde{d} B_\tau^2 T}{\sqrt{n_u \cdot M}} \sqrt{\log(\tilde{d}/\delta)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{5} B_\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

provided that $n_u \geq n_u(\zeta^{(1)})$, $M \geq M(\zeta^{(2)})$, with

$$M(\zeta^{(2)}) = C_{\alpha, \sigma} B_\tau^2 T \tilde{d}^2 \log(\tilde{d}/\delta), \quad (\text{C.6})$$

for some $C_{\alpha, \sigma} > 0$.

Bounding $\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(3)}\|_\Theta$.

Since with probability at least $1 - \delta/5$, for all $t \in [T]$,

$$\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_\Theta \leq B_\tau,$$

we obtain from Proposition D.10 and D.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(3)} \right\|_{\Theta} &= \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{T-t} \zeta_t^{(3)} \right\|_{\Theta} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n_u n_x}} \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{T-t} (\sqrt{\alpha} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^*) \right\| \cdot \|\bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_s)}\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha T}}{\sqrt{n_u n_x}} \cdot \max_{s \in [T]} \|\bar{r}_{(\theta_0, \theta_s)}\|_F \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\alpha T} \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)}{\sqrt{M}} \max_{s \in [T]} \|\theta_s - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{5} B_\tau, \tag{C.7}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $M \geq M(\zeta^{(3)})$, with

$$M(\zeta^{(3)}) = C_{\alpha, \sigma} B_\tau^4 T, \tag{C.8}$$

for some $C_{\alpha, \sigma} > 0$.

Bounding $\alpha \sum_{s=0}^t \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{t-s}^{(4)} \right\|_{\Theta}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(4)} \right\|_{\Theta} &= \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{y} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^*) \right\|_{\Theta} \\
&\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{1/2} \right\| \cdot \|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1/2} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{1/2}\| \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{-1/2} (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{y} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^*) \right\|_{\Theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term we obtain from (D.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{1/2} \right\| &\leq \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t (\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{1/2} \right\| + \alpha \sqrt{\lambda} \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \right\| \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\alpha T} + \sqrt{\lambda} \cdot (\alpha T) \\
&= 4\sqrt{\alpha T},
\end{aligned}$$

if we assume that $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$.

From Proposition E.11, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have for $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$,

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1/2} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{1/2}\| \leq 2,$$

if $M \geq C_{\kappa, \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \log^2 \frac{1}{\delta}$ and $n_u, n_x \geq C_{\kappa, \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta)$ for some $C_{\kappa, \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} > 0$.

Applying Proposition E.14 for $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$ gives with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right) \right\| \\
& \leq 2 \left(\kappa \sqrt{\alpha T} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 5 \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{\alpha T}} + 10 \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

if $M \geq C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}T \log(T) \log(1/\delta)$, $n_u, n_x \geq C_{\alpha,\kappa} T \log^2(1/\delta)$ for some $C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}, C_{\alpha,\kappa} > 0$. Collecting all pieces gives with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$

$$\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(4)} \right\|_{\Theta} \tag{C.9}$$

$$\leq 8\sqrt{\alpha T} \left(\frac{1}{8\sqrt{\alpha T}} + 10 \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \right) \tag{C.10}$$

$$\leq B_\tau/5, \tag{C.11}$$

under the assumptions,

$$M \geq M(\zeta^{(4)}) := C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta), \tag{C.12}$$

$$n_u \geq n_u(\zeta^{(4)}) := C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta), \tag{C.13}$$

$$n_x \geq n_x(\zeta^{(4)}) := C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta) \tag{C.14}$$

for some for some $C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} > 0$.

Bounding $\alpha \sum_{s=0}^t \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s \zeta_{t-s}^{(5)} \right\|_{\Theta}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(5)} \right\|_{\Theta} &= \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right\|_{\Theta} \\
&\leq \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda} \right\| \cdot \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda} \right\| \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_M^* \mathcal{L}_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \cdot \left\| \mathcal{L}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \cdot \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} G^* \right\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda} \right\|_{\Theta} &\leq \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t (\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M) \right\|_{\Theta} + \alpha \lambda \cdot \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \right\|_{\Theta} \\
&\leq 2 \log(T) + \lambda(\alpha T) \\
&\leq 3 \log(T),
\end{aligned}$$

if we again let $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$.

From Proposition E.13 we find with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^1 \right\| \leq 2 \left(\kappa^2 \left(\frac{\alpha T}{n_u} + \frac{\alpha T}{n_x} \right) + 5\kappa \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \quad (\text{C.15})$$

$$\leq 1 + 10\kappa \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \quad (\text{C.16})$$

if $M \geq M(\zeta^{(4)})$, $n_u \geq n_u(\zeta^{(4)})$, $n_x \geq n_x(\zeta^{(4)})$.

From Proposition E.1 we obtain almost surely

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_M^* \mathcal{L}_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2.$$

Furthermore, (Nguyen and Mücke, 2023, Proposition A.14) gives with $1 - \delta$

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2.$$

By Assumption 3.3 and Proposition E.3,

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} G^* \right\|_{L_2} \leq R\kappa^r (\alpha T)^{(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+}.$$

Combining the previous bounds gives for $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$ with probability at least $1 - 5\delta$

$$\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^t \zeta_{T-t}^{(5)} \right\|_{\Theta} \leq 12 \log(T) R\kappa^r (\alpha T)^{(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+} \cdot \mathcal{B}_\delta \left(\frac{1}{\alpha T} \right), \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$= \frac{1}{5} C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} \log(T) T^{(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+} \cdot \mathcal{B}_\delta \left(\frac{1}{\alpha T} \right) \quad (\text{C.18})$$

$$= \frac{B_\tau}{5} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where we set

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta \left(\frac{1}{\alpha T} \right) := 1 + 10\kappa \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right), \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} := 60R\kappa^r \alpha^{(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

Collecting everything. Finally, combining the bounds of all error terms and plugging in $\lambda = 1/(\alpha T)$ gives with probability at least $1 - 10\delta$, for all $t \in [T + 1]$

$$\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} \leq B_\tau$$

provided that

$$M \geq \max\left\{M(\zeta^{(j)}) : j = 1, 2, 3, 4\right\}, \quad (\text{C.22})$$

$$n_u \geq \max\left\{n_u(\zeta^{(j)}) : j = 1, 4\right\}, \quad (\text{C.23})$$

$$n_x \geq \max\left\{n_x(\zeta^{(j)}) : j = 1, 4\right\}. \quad (\text{C.24})$$

□

Proof of Corollary 3.8. Recall that we assume $T = cn_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$. First we have to check if in this case the assumption of Theorem 3.7: $n_u \geq \max\{n_u(\zeta^{(j)}) : j = 1, 4\}$ is fulfilled for our choice of T . Plugging in the definitions of $n_u(\zeta^{(j)})$ shows that n_u must be larger than

$$n_u \geq \max\{C_{\alpha,r,\kappa}^{-1}T^{2r+b}, T \log(T) \log(12/\delta), C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta)\}$$

Therefore it is enough if

$$n_u \geq C_{\alpha,r,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}T^{2r+b} = C_{\alpha,r,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}n_u.$$

for some constant $C_{\kappa,r,b,\alpha,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} > 0$ as long as $n_u \geq n_1(\delta)$ is large enough so that

$$\left(\log(T_{n_1})^2 T_{n_1} \log^2\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right) \leq T_{n_1}^{2r+b}$$

holds true. Therefore if $c \leq C_{\kappa,r,b,\alpha,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}^{-1}$ our choice of T fulfills the assumption of n_u . Now we can prove the statement.

1. Let $r > \frac{1}{2}$. A short calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\delta\left(\frac{1}{\alpha T}\right) &= 1 + 10\kappa\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}((\alpha T)^{-1})}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha T}{n_x}}\right)\log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \\ &\leq 1 + C_{\alpha,b,\kappa}\left(\sqrt{\frac{T^{1+b}}{n_u}} + \sqrt{\frac{T^{1+b}}{n_x}}\right)\log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \\ &\leq 1 + C_{\alpha,b,\kappa}\left(n_u^{\frac{1-2r}{4r+2b}} + \sqrt{\frac{T^{1+b}}{n_x}}\right)\log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \leq 2 \end{aligned}$$

if we let $c \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} n_u &\geq n_2 := \left(2C_{\alpha,b,\kappa}\log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)\right)^{\frac{4r+2b}{2r-1}}, \\ n_x &\geq \left(2C_{\alpha,b,\kappa}\log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)\right)^2 T^{1+b}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $B_\tau(\delta, T) \leq C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha} \log(T)$.

For $r = \frac{1}{2}$ we similar obtain $\mathcal{B}_\delta(T) \leq 2$ if we let $c \leq C_{\alpha,\kappa,b,\delta}$ be small enough.

We finally bound the number of neurons that are required for achieving this rate from Theorem

3.7. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\left\{M(\zeta^{(j)}) : j = 1, 2, 3, 4\right\} \\ & \leq \max\left\{C_3 \log(T)T^{2r}, C_{\alpha,\sigma,r,\kappa}B_\tau^4T, C_{\alpha,\sigma}B_\tau^2T\tilde{d}^2 \log(\tilde{d}/\delta), C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}\tilde{d}T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the maximum gives that it is enough if

$$M \geq C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}^2 \log^4(T)T^{2r} \log^2(\tilde{d}/\delta),$$

for some $C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} > 0$. Similar we obtain for number of second stage samples that are required,

$$n_x \geq \max\left\{T \log(T)^2 \log(12/\delta), C_{\alpha,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}T \log(T) \log^2(1/\delta), \left(2C_{\alpha,b,\kappa} \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)\right)^2 T^{1+b}\right\}$$

Bounding the maximum gives that it is enough if

$$n_x \geq C_{\alpha,b,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}T^{1+b} \log^3(1/\delta),$$

if $n_u \geq n_3(\delta)$ is large enough so that

$$\log^2(T_{n_3})T_{n_3} \leq T_{n_3}^{1+b}$$

holds true.

2. If $r < \frac{1}{2}$, then similar as before we have

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta(\alpha T) \leq C_{\alpha,b,\kappa}T^{\frac{1}{2}-r}$$

for some $C_{\alpha,b,\kappa} > 0$, if $c \leq \log^{-3}(1/\delta)$ and $c^{-1}T^{2r+b} \leq n_x$. Hence, $B_\tau(T) \leq C_{R,r,\kappa,\alpha,b} \log(T)T^{1-2r}$. A lower bound for the number of neurons follows the same way as in the other case:

$$\begin{aligned} M & \geq C_{\kappa,\alpha,r,\sigma,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|} \tilde{d}^2 \log^4(T)T^{5-8r} \log^2(\tilde{d}/\delta), \\ n_x & \geq C_{\alpha,b,\kappa,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}T^{2r+b} \log^3(1/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

To sum up the statement holds true if we set

$$\begin{aligned} c & := \min\left\{1, C_{\kappa,r,b,\alpha,\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}^{-1}, C_{\alpha,\kappa,b,\delta}\right\}, \\ n & \geq n_0 := \max\{n_1, n_2, n_3\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.1 Error bounds of the weights

Lemma C.1 (Nguyen and Mücke (2023)). *Let*

$$F_t^* := \mathcal{S}_M^* \phi_t(\mathcal{L}_M) G^* \in \mathcal{H}_M, \quad (\text{C.25})$$

where ϕ_t denotes the spectral regularization function associated to gradient descent, see e.g. Blanchard and Mücke (2017). Then

$$\|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq C'_{\kappa, \alpha} t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}},$$

for some $C'_{\kappa, R, \alpha} < \infty$.

Proposition C.2. *For all $t \in [T]$, let $\|\theta_t - \theta_0\| \leq B_\tau$, and $T \leq C_{\alpha, r, \kappa} n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+5}}$, $n_x \geq t^{2 \max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}$ and $M \geq M_{III}$ with M_{III} from Theorem B.5. Then there exists some $C_{\alpha, \tau, \sigma, r, \kappa} > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} \\ & \leq C_{\alpha, \tau, \sigma, r, \kappa} \left(\frac{TB_\tau^5 + TB_\tau^3 T^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}}{M} + \left(\frac{T \log(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_u M}} + \frac{T \log(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_x M}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\eta_r(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By using once again a Taylor expansion we obtain for $t \in [T]$,

$$\|\zeta_t^{(1)}\| = \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{C.26})$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u_i)(x_j) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} + \quad (\text{C.27})$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (H_t(u_i)(x_j) - F_t^*(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} + \quad (\text{C.28})$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{C.29})$$

$$:= I_t + II_t + III_t, \quad (\text{C.30})$$

where F_t^* was defined in (C.25).

Bound I : By using Proposition D.1 and D.2, we obtain for $t \in [T]$

$$I_t \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)^2}{M} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^3 \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)^2 B_\tau^3}{M}$$

Bound II : Note that $F_t^* \in \mathcal{H}_M$, therefore there exist some θ_t^* such that $F_t^*(u)(x) = \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta_t^* \rangle$ and $\|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} = \|\theta_t^*\|_{\Theta}$ (see for example Steinwart and Christmann (2008) Theorem 4.21). Using these equations we obtain

$$II_t \leq \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \left\| (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j))^T \right\| (\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M}). \quad (\text{C.31})$$

By definition of the operator norm and Proposition D.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j))^T \right\| \\ &= \max_k \left\| (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j))^T e_k \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)\|_2 \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{M}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)\kappa}{M} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.32})$$

where e_k denotes the k . unit vector in \mathbb{R}^P . Plugging (C.32) into (C.31) and applying Lemma C.1 leads to

$$II_t \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)\kappa}{M} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} (\|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M}) \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)B_\tau\kappa}{M} \left(B_\tau + C'_{\kappa,\alpha} t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}} \right). \quad (\text{C.33})$$

Bound III :

By Proposition D.1 we have

$$III_t = \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{C.34})$$

$$\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} \cdot \left(III_t^{(i)} + III_t^{(ii)} \right), \quad (\text{C.35})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} III_t^{(i)} &= \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)| - \mathbb{E} |F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \right|, \\ III_t^{(ii)} &= \mathbb{E} |F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

To sum up: If we plug the bounds of I, II, III into (C.26) we get for some $C_{\alpha,\sigma,r,\kappa} > 0$,

$$\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} \leq C_{\alpha,\sigma,r,\kappa} \left(\frac{TB_\tau^5 + TB_\tau^3 T^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}}{M} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(B_\tau)B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=0}^T III_t^{(i)} + III_t^{(ii)} \right) \right). \quad (\text{C.36})$$

From Proposition E.16 we have for all $t \in [T]$ with $T \leq C_{\alpha,r,\kappa} n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $n_x \geq t^{2\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}$ and $M \geq M_{III}$ with M_{III} from Theorem B.5, that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$III_t^{(i)} = \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)| - \mathbb{E} |F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \right| \quad (\text{C.37})$$

$$\leq \tilde{C}_{\alpha,\kappa} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right). \quad (\text{C.38})$$

Combining this bound with Proposition D.11, we obtain,

$$\sum_{t=0}^T III_t^{(i)} \leq \tilde{C}_{\alpha,\kappa} \left(\frac{T \log(T)}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{T \log(T)}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right). \quad (\text{C.39})$$

With the same assumptions as for $III_t^{(i)}$ we have from (Nguyen and Mücke, 2023, Proposition A.1) (with $\lambda = (\alpha t)^{-1}$)

$$III_t^{(ii)} = \mathbb{E}|F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \leq \|\mathcal{S}_M F_t^* - G^*\|_{L^2(\mu_u)} \leq C_{\alpha,r} t^{-r}, \quad (\text{C.40})$$

$$\sum_{t=0}^T III_t^{(ii)} \leq C_{\alpha,r} \eta_r(T), \quad (\text{C.41})$$

for some $C_{r,\alpha} < \infty$ and where we used Jensen inequality in the first equation.

Plugging (C.40) and (C.39) into (C.36), implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \|\zeta_t^{(1)}\|_{\Theta} \\ & \leq C_{\alpha,\sigma,r,\kappa} \left(\frac{TB_\tau^5 + TB_\tau^3 T^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}}{M} + \left(\frac{T \log(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_u M}} + \frac{T \log^{3/2}(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_x M}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\eta_r(T) B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition C.3. For all $t \in [T]$ and some $T \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\|\theta_t - \theta_0\| \leq B_\tau$. Then there exists some $\tilde{C}_\sigma > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\max_{t \in [T]} \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_{\Theta} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_\sigma \tilde{d} B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_u \cdot M}} \sqrt{\log(\tilde{d}/\delta)}.$$

Proof of Lemma C.3. We start with the following decomposition for any $t \in [T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_{\Theta} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) (\nabla G_{\theta_s}(u_i)(x_j) - \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)) \right\|_{\Theta} \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \left(\sigma((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) - \sigma((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right) \right)^2 + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \cdot \left(a_m^{(t)} \sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} - a_m^{(0)} \sigma'((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &=: \sqrt{I + II} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.42})$$

We will now bound I and II separately.

I) Using the mean-value theorem for $b_m^{(t)}$ we obtain for some \tilde{b}_m on the line between $b_m^{(t)}$ and $b_m^{(0)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \left(\sigma((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) - \sigma((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(\tilde{b}_m^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \langle b_m^{(t)} - b_m^{(0)}, J(u_i)(x_j) \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|b_m^{(t)} - b_m^{(0)}\|_2^2 \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(\tilde{b}_m^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j) \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_\Theta^2 \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j) \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{B_\tau^2}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(j)} \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_{B_\tau} := B_\tau + 1$. For the penultimate inequality we used that $\max_{i \in [M], t \in [T]} \{|a_t^{(i)} - a_0^{(i)}|, \|b_t^{(i)} - b_0^{(i)}\|_2\} \leq B_\tau$ and therefore

$$\max_{i \in [M]} \{|\tilde{a}^{(i)}|, \|\tilde{b}^{(i)}\|_2\} \leq \max_{i \in [M]} \{|a_t^{(i)} - a_0^{(i)}| + |a_0^{(i)}|, \|b_t^{(i)} - b_0^{(i)}\|_2 + \|b_0^{(i)}\|_2\} \leq B_\tau + 1. \quad (\text{C.43})$$

II) Similar we obtain with (C.43) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \left. \left(a_m^{(t)} \sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} - a_m^{(0)} \sigma'((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) (a_m^{(t)} - a_m^{(0)}) \sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2 + \\
&\quad \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) a_m^{(0)} \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \left. \left(\sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} - \sigma'((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2B_\tau^2}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2 + \\
&\quad \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \left. \left(\sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} - \sigma'((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right) \right)^2. \quad (\text{C.44})
\end{aligned}$$

For the second sum (C.44) we use again the mean-value theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \cdot \left(\sigma'((b_m^{(t)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} - \sigma'((b_m^{(0)})^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right) \right)^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{d}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma''(\tilde{b}_m^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \langle b_m^{(t)} - b_m^{(0)}, J(u_i)(x_j) \rangle J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| b_m^{(t)} - b_m^{(0)} \right\|_2 \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{d}} \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma''(\tilde{b}_m^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2B_\tau^2}{M} \sum_{k,l=1}^{\tilde{d}} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma''(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} J(u_i)(x_j)^{(l)} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To sum up, we obtain by plugging the bounds of I and II into (C.42),

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{t \in [T]} \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_\Theta & \leq \frac{B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} \left[3 \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{d}} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma'(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2 + \right. \\
& \quad \left. 2 \sum_{k,l=1}^{\tilde{d}} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} (G^*(u_i)(x_j) - v_i(x_j)) \sigma''(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) J(u_i)(x_j)^{(k)} J(u_i)(x_j)^{(l)} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{C.45}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $z = (u, v) \in \mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ we define for all $k, l \in [\tilde{d}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{k,j}(z) & = (G^*(u)(x_j) - v(x_j)) J(u)(x_j)^{(k)}, \\
h_{k,l,j}(z) & = (G^*(u)(x_j) - v(x_j)) J(u)(x_j)^{(k)} J(u)(x_j)^{(l)},
\end{aligned}$$

and the following events,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_j & := \left\{ \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_{k,j}(z_i) \sigma'(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right| \leq \frac{24C_\sigma}{\sqrt{n_u}} \left(2C_{B_\tau} C_\sigma + \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right) \right\}, \\
E_{j,k} & := \left\{ \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_{B_\tau}} \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_{k,l,j}(z_i) \sigma''(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right| \leq \frac{24C_\sigma}{\sqrt{n_u}} \left(2C_{B_\tau} C_\sigma + \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we can prove that each of the above events holds true with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we obtain from Proposition D.11 together with C.45 that with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{t \in [T]} \|\zeta_t^{(2)}\|_\Theta & \leq \frac{B_\tau}{\sqrt{M}} (\sqrt{3\tilde{d}} + \sqrt{2\tilde{d}^2}) \frac{24C_\sigma}{\sqrt{n_u}} \left(2C_{B_\tau} C_\sigma + \sqrt{\log \frac{2(\tilde{d}^2 + \tilde{d})}{\delta}} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_\sigma \tilde{d} B_\tau^2}{\sqrt{n_u \cdot M}} \sqrt{\log(\tilde{d}/\delta)},
\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{C}_\sigma > 0$, depending only on C_σ . This proves the claim.

To see that the events $E_j, E_{j,k}$ occur with probability at least $1 - \delta$, note that $\|h_{k,j}\|_\infty, \|h_{k,l,j}\|_\infty \leq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[h_{k,j}(z)\sigma'(b^\top x)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[h_{k,l,j}(z)\sigma''(b^\top x)] = 0$$

and that σ', σ'' are C_σ -Lipschitz. The claim now follows from Proposition D.6. □

D Technical Inequalities

D.1 Lipschitz Bounds

In this section we provide some technical inequalities. We start proving that the gradient of our neural operator is pointwisely Lipschitz-continuous on a ball around θ_0 which we define as

$$Q_{\theta_0}(R) := \{\theta = (a, B) \in \Theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\|_\Theta \leq R\}.$$

Proposition D.1. *Suppose the Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and is satisfied. We have for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\|u\|_\infty \leq 1$, where $\|u\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in \text{supp}(\rho_X)} \|u(x)\|_2$ and for any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in Q_{\theta_0}(R)$,*

$$\|\nabla G_\theta(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_\Theta \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\|_\Theta,$$

where

$$C_{\nabla G}(R) := 2 \max\{C_\sigma, C_\sigma(R + \tau)\},$$

for some $C_\sigma < \infty$.

Proof of Proposition D.1. Recall the definition of our operator class

$$\mathcal{F}_M := \left\{ G_\theta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \mid G_\theta(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{m=1}^M a_m \sigma(\langle b_m, J(u) \rangle), \right. \\ \left. \theta = (a, B) \in \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times (d_k + d_y + d_b)} \right\}.$$

The partial derivatives are given by

$$\partial_{a_m} G_\theta(u)(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sigma(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle), \quad \partial_{b_m^j} G_\theta(u)(x) = \frac{a_m}{\sqrt{M}} \sigma'(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) (J(u)(x))^{(j)}.$$

Denoting further $\nabla G_\theta(u) = (\partial_a G_\theta(u), \partial_B G_\theta(u))$

$$\partial_a G_\theta(u) = (\partial_{a_1} G_\theta(u), \dots, \partial_{a_M} G_\theta(u)) \in \mathbb{R}^M, \quad \partial_B G_\theta(u) = \left(\partial_{b_m^j} G_\theta(u)(x) \right)_{m,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times (d_k + d_y + d_b)}$$

we then have for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $x \in \text{supp}(\rho_X)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_a G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{a}} G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_2^2 &= \sum_{m=1}^M (\partial_{a_m} G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{a}_m} G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x))^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\sigma(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) - \sigma(\langle \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\|\sigma'\|_\infty^2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|b_m - \tilde{b}_m\|_2^2 \|J(u)(x)\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{C_\sigma^2}{M} \|B - \tilde{B}\|_F^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption $\|J(u)(x)\|_2 \leq \|J(u)(x)\|_1 \leq 1$.

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_B G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{B}} G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_2^2 &= \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} (\partial_{b_m} G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{b}_m} G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x))^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} \left(a_m \sigma'(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) (J(u)(x))^{(j)} - \tilde{a}_m \sigma'(\langle \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) (J(u)(x))^{(j)} \right)^2 \\
&\leq (I) + (II)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(I) = \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} (a_m - \tilde{a}_m)^2 (\sigma'(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle))^2 ((J(u)(x))^{(j)})^2 \leq \frac{2C_\sigma^2}{M} \|a - \tilde{a}\|_2^2$$

and where

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) &= \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} (\tilde{a}_m - a_{0,m})^2 \left(\sigma'(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) - \sigma'(\langle \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) \right)^2 ((J(u)(x))^{(j)})^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} a_{0,m}^2 \left(\sigma'(\langle b_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) - \sigma'(\langle \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle) \right)^2 ((J(u)(x))^{(j)})^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2R^2 C_\sigma^2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} \left(\langle b_m - \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle \right)^2 ((J(u)(x))^{(j)})^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2\tau^2 C_\sigma^2}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{d_k+d_y+d_b} \left(\langle b_m - \tilde{b}_m, J(u)(x) \rangle \right)^2 ((J(u)(x))^{(j)})^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2C_\sigma^2(R^2 + \tau^2)}{M} \|B - \tilde{B}\|_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla G_\theta(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_\Theta^2 &= \|\partial_a G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{a}} G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_2^2 + \|\partial_B G_\theta(u)(x) - \partial_{\tilde{B}} G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{C_\sigma^2}{M} \|B - \tilde{B}\|_F^2 + \frac{2C_\sigma^2}{M} \|a - \tilde{a}\|_2^2 + \frac{162C_\sigma^2(R^2 + \tau^2)}{M} \|B - \tilde{B}\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{M} \max\{C_\sigma^2, C_\sigma^2(R^2 + \tau^2)\} (\|a - \tilde{a}\|_2^2 + \|B - \tilde{B}\|_F^2) \\
&\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}^2}{M} \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition D.2. Denote by $r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}$ the remainder term of the Taylor expansion from

$$G_\theta(u)(x) - G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x) = \langle \nabla G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x), \theta - \bar{\theta} \rangle_\Theta + r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}(u)(x).$$

Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in Q_{\theta_0}(R)$. Then, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a) \quad |r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}(u)(x)| &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_\Theta^2, \\
b) \quad \langle \nabla G_\theta(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x), \theta - \bar{\theta} \rangle_\Theta &\leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_\Theta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\nabla G}(R)$ is defined in Proposition D.1.

Proof of Proposition D.2. a) Recall that the remainder term $r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}$ of the Taylor expansion is given by

$$r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}(u)(x) = (\theta - \bar{\theta})^T \nabla^2 G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x) (\theta - \bar{\theta}).$$

where $\nabla^2 G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)$ denotes the Hessian matrix evaluated at some $\tilde{\theta}$ on the line between θ and $\bar{\theta}$. Note that the remainder term can be bounded by the Lipschitz constant L of the gradients i.e. for any $\mathbf{v} \in \Theta$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x) \mathbf{v} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla G_{\tilde{\theta} + h\mathbf{v}}(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)}{h} \\
&\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\nabla G_{\tilde{\theta} + h\mathbf{v}}(x) - \nabla G_{\tilde{\theta}}(u)(x)\|_2}{|h|} \\
&\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} L \frac{|h| \|\mathbf{v}\|_2}{|h|} \\
&\leq L \|\mathbf{v}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition D.1 shows that for the set $Q_{\theta_0}(R)$ this Lipschitz constant is given by $L = C_{\nabla G}/\sqrt{M}$. Therefore by setting $\mathbf{v} = \theta - \bar{\theta}$ we obtain for the remainder term,

$$|r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}(u)(x)| \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_\Theta^2.$$

b) Using again Proposition D.1 together with Cauchy - Schwarz inequality, we obtain for the second inequality,

$$\langle \nabla G_\theta(u)(x) - \nabla G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x), \theta - \bar{\theta} \rangle_\Theta \leq \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_\Theta^2.$$

□

Proposition D.3. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in Q_{\theta_0}(R)$. Then for any $u \in \mathcal{U}, x \in \mathcal{X}, t \geq 0$ we have*

$$|G_{\theta}(u)(x) - G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x)| \leq \kappa \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_{\Theta} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_{\Theta}^2.$$

Proof. From D.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\theta}(u)(x) - G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x) &= \langle \nabla G_{\bar{\theta}}(u)(x), \theta - \bar{\theta} \rangle_{\Theta} + r_{(\theta, \bar{\theta})}(u)(x) \\ &\leq \kappa \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_{\Theta} + \frac{C_{\nabla G}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\|_{\Theta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

D.2 Uniform Bounds in Hilbert Spaces

In this section we recall uniform convergence bounds for functions with values in a real separable Hilbert space.

Proposition D.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be a family of functions mapping from $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ to $[-C, C]$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of an i.i.d. sample S of size n_u , the following holds*

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(z_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(z)] \right| \leq 8C \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}) + 12C \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2n_u}},$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}) := \mathbb{E}_r \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(x_i) r_i.$$

denotes the empirical Rademacher complexity with r_i being iid rademacher variables.

Proof. The proof can be found in Mohri et al. (2018). □

Proposition D.5. *Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant c_{σ} , $h_j : \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and define*

$$\mathcal{G}_C = \left\{ g : B_{\bar{d}}(C) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : g(b, z) = \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) \tilde{\sigma}(\langle b, J(u)(x_j) \rangle) \right\}.$$

where $B_{\bar{d}}(C)$ denotes the closed ball of radius C in $\mathbb{R}^{\bar{d}}$. Provided the Assumptions 3.1 and 2.1 we have

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}_C) \leq \frac{CC_h c_{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n_u}},$$

with $C_h := \max_{j \in [n_x]} \|h_j\|_{\infty}$.

Proof of Proposition D.5. By definition of $\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}_C)$ we have,

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}_C) = \frac{1}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(b, z_i) r_i \right] = \frac{1}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_{r_1, \dots, r_{n_u-1}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{r_{n_u}} \left[\sup_{\|a\|_2 \leq C} g_{n_u-1}(b) + g(b, z_{n_u}) r_{n_u} \right] \right],$$

where $q_{n_u-1}(b) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_u-1} g(b, z_i) r_i$. By definition of the supremum, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $\|b_1\|_2, \|b_2\|_2 \leq C$ such that

$$q_{n_u-1}(b_1) + g(b_1, z_{n_u}) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) + g(b, z_{n_u}) \right]$$

and $q_{n_u-1}(b_2) - g(b_2, z_{n_u}) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) - g(b, z_{n_u}) \right]$.

Thus by definition of $\mathbb{E}_{r_{n_u}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \epsilon) \mathbb{E}_{r_{n_u}} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) + r_{n_u} g(b, z_{n_u}) \right] \\ &= (1 - \epsilon) \left[\frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) + g(b, z_{n_u})] + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) - g(b, z_{n_u})] \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} [q_{n_u-1}(b_1) + g(b_1, z_{n_u})] + \frac{1}{2} [q_{n_u-1}(b_2) - g(b_2, z_{n_u})]. \end{aligned}$$

Now set $s^{n_u} = \text{sgn} \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b_1 - b_2)$ with $\tilde{g}(z, b) := \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) \langle b, J(u)(x_j) \rangle$ (note that s^{n_u} is independent of r_{n_u}). Then, the previous inequality implies together with the Lipschitz property:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \epsilon) \mathbb{E}_{r_{n_u}} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) + r_{n_u} g(b, z_{n_u}) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} [q_{n_u-1}(b_1) + q_{n_u-1}(b_2) + c_\sigma s^{n_u} \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b_1 - b_2)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) + c_\sigma s^{n_u} \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b)] + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) - c_\sigma s^{n_u} \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) + c_\sigma \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b)] + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} [q_{n_u-1}(b) - c_\sigma \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{r_n} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) + r_{n_u} c_\sigma \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we proved

$$(1 - \epsilon) \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u}(b) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{r_{n_u}} \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} q_{n_u-1}(b) + r_{n_u} c_\sigma \tilde{g}(z_{n_u}, b) \right]. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Proceeding in the same way for all other q_i with $i \leq n_u - 1$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - \epsilon)^{n_u} \frac{1}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(b, z_i) r_i \right] &\leq \frac{1}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} r_i c_\sigma \tilde{g}(z_i, b) \right] \\
&= \frac{c_\sigma}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} \left\langle b, \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} r_i \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) J(u)(x_j) \right\rangle \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C c_\sigma}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} r_i \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) J(u)(x_j) \right\|_2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C c_\sigma}{n_u} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \mathbb{E}_r \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_u} r_i \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) J(u)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2} \\
&= \frac{C c_\sigma}{n_u} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \left(\frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z) J(u)(x_j)^{(k)} \right)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C C_h c_\sigma}{n_u} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{d}} (J(u)(x_j)^{(k)})^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C C_h c_\sigma}{\sqrt{n_u}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\frac{1}{n_u} \mathbb{E}_r \left[\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(b, z_i) r_i \right] \leq \frac{C C_h c_\sigma}{\sqrt{n_u}}.$$

□

Proposition D.6. Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant c_σ and $h_j : \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[h_j(z) \tilde{\sigma}(b^\top J(u)(x))] = 0$ for any $\|b\|_2 \leq C_B$ and $\max_{j \in [n_x]} \|h_j\|_\infty \leq c_h$. Then we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_B} \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z_i) \tilde{\sigma}(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right| \leq \frac{12 C_h \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_\infty}{\sqrt{n_u}} \left(C_B c_\sigma C_h + \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right).$$

Proof. From Proposition D.4 we have with probability $1 - \delta$

$$\sup_{\|b\|_2 \leq C_B} \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z_i) \tilde{\sigma}(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right| \leq 8 C_h \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_\infty \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}_{C_B}) + 12 C_h \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_\infty \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{2 n_u}}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}) := \mathbb{E}_r \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} g(x_i) r_i.$$

denotes the empirical Rademacher complexity with r_i being iid rademacher variables and the function

class \mathcal{G}_{C_B} is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_{C_B} = \left\{ g : B_{\bar{d}}(C_B) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : g(b, z) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} h_j(z_j) \bar{\sigma}(b^\top J(u_i)(x_j)) \right\}.$$

From Proposition D.5 we have

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}_{C_B}) \leq \frac{C_B c_\sigma C_h}{\sqrt{n_u}}.$$

Plugging this inequality into (D.2) proves the claim. □

D.3 Elementary Inequalities

Lemma D.7. *The function $f(x) = (1-x)^j x^r$ for $j, r > 0$ has a global maximum on $[0, 1]$ at $\frac{r}{r+j}$. Therefore we have $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} f(x) \leq \left(\frac{r}{r+j}\right)^r$.*

Proof of Lemma D.7. If $f(x)$ is continuous and has an maximum, then $\log f(x)$ will at the same point because $\log x$ is a monotonically increasing function.

$$\begin{aligned} \ln f(x) &= r \log x + j \log(1-x) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{d \ln f(x)}{d x} &= \frac{r}{x} - \frac{j}{1-x} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{d^2 \ln f(x)}{d x^2} &= -\frac{r}{x^2} - \frac{j}{(1-x)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second derivative is obviously less than zero everywhere, and the first derivative is equal zero at $\frac{r}{r+j}$. Therefore it is a global maximum. □

Lemma D.8. *Let $v \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^t i^{-v} \leq \eta_v(t) \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_v(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{v}{v-1} & v > 1 \\ 1 + \log(t) & v = 1 \\ \frac{t^{1-v}}{1-v} & v \in [0, 1[\end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma D.8. We will only prove the first case $v > 1$. The other cases can be bounded with the same arguments. Since

$$i^{-v} \leq \int_{i-1}^i x^{-v} dx$$

we have for $v > 1$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^t i^{-v} \leq 1 + \int_1^t x^{-v} dx \leq \frac{v}{v-1}.$$

□

Lemma D.9. *Let $a \geq b \geq 0$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{s^a} \frac{1}{(T-s)^b} \leq \frac{2^a}{T^a} \eta_b(T-1) + \frac{2^b}{T^b} \eta_a(T-1).$$

Proof of Lemme D.9. For any $t \in [T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{s^a} \frac{1}{(T-s)^b} &= \sum_{s=t+1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{s^a} \frac{1}{(T-s)^b} + \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{1}{s^a} \frac{1}{(T-s)^b} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^a} \sum_{s=t+1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{(T-s)^b} + \frac{1}{(T-t)^b} \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{1}{s^a} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^a} \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{s^b} + \frac{1}{(T-t)^b} \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{s^a} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^a} \eta_b(T-1) + \frac{1}{(T-t)^b} \eta_a(T-1). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $t = T/2$ the result follows. □

Proposition D.10. *For $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{\kappa^2}]$ we have,*

$$\begin{aligned} i) \quad &\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s\| \leq \eta_a(T), \\ ii) \quad &\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^*\| \leq \eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T) / \sqrt{\alpha}, \\ iii) \quad &\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \left\| (Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s (\sqrt{\alpha} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^*) \right\| \leq \eta_{\frac{1}{2}}(T) = 2\sqrt{T}. \end{aligned}$$

Further we have for any $M \geq 8\tilde{d}\kappa^2\beta_\infty T \vee 8\kappa^4\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1} \log^2 \frac{2}{\delta}$ with $\beta_\infty = \log \frac{4\kappa^2(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(T)+1)}{\delta\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}$, $\tilde{d} := d_k + d_y + d_b$ that with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$,

$$iv) \quad \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \mathcal{Z}_M\| \leq \frac{2\eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{2\eta_a(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha T}},$$

Proof. Note that the spectrum of $\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M$ is contained in $[0, 1]$, therefore by Lemma D.7 we have for any $r \geq 0$,

$$\|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^r (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s\| = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} (1-x)^s x^r \leq \left(\frac{r}{r+s} \right)^r, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where we use the convention $(0/0)^0 := 1$.

From (D.3) and Lemma D.8 we further obtain for any $r \in [0, 1]$

$$\sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^r (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s\| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \left(\frac{r}{r+s}\right)^r \quad (\text{D.4})$$

$$\leq \sum_{s=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^r \leq \eta_r(T). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

This already proves part *i*). For part *ii*) we have from (D.3) Lemma D.8

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_M^*\| \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^{2a+1} (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^{2s}\|/\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{2a+1}{2a+1+2s}\right)^{2a+1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sum_{s=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{a+\frac{1}{2}} \leq \eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)/\sqrt{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar as in part *ii*) we have for *iii*) we have from (D.3) Lemma D.8

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^s (\sqrt{\alpha} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^*)\| \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|(Id - \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)^{2s} (\sqrt{\alpha} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M)\|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{1+2s}\right)} \leq \sum_{s=0}^T \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \eta_{\frac{1}{2}}(T). \end{aligned}$$

For part *iv*) we have with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s \mathcal{Z}_M\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sum_{s=0}^{T-1} \|(\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^a (Id - \alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_M)^s (\alpha \widehat{\Sigma}_{M,\lambda})^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{Z}_M\| \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_{a+\frac{1}{2}}(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{2\eta_a(T)}{\sqrt{\alpha T}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the second inequality (D.4), (Nguyen and Mücke, 2023, Proposition A.15) (for $\lambda := (\alpha T)^{-1}$) and E.1. \square

Proposition D.11. *Let E_i be events with probability at least $1 - \delta_i$ and set*

$$E := \bigcap_{i=1}^k E_i$$

If we can show for some event A that $\mathbb{P}(A|E) \geq 1 - \delta$ then we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A) &\geq \int_E \mathbb{P}(A|\omega) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \geq (1 - \delta)\mathbb{P}(E) \\ &= (1 - \delta) \left(1 - \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k (\Omega/E_i) \right) \right) \geq (1 - \delta) \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^k \delta_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

E Operator Bounds and Concentration Inequalities

E.1 Operator Bounds

Proposition E.1.

a) For any $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \right\| \leq 1, \quad \left\| \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{Z}_M \right\| \leq 1,$$

b) For any $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_M^* \mathcal{L}_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2.$$

Proof. The bound of b) can be found in [Rudi and Rosasco \(2017\)](#) (see proof of lemma 3). For a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \right\|^2 &= \left\| (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M + \lambda)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\| (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M + \lambda)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M + \lambda)^{-1/2} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M (\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M + \lambda)^{-1} \right\| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows the same way where we used that $\Sigma_M = \mathcal{Z}_M \mathcal{Z}_M^*$. \square

Proposition E.2. Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space and let A and B be two bounded self-adjoint positive linear operators on \mathcal{H} and $\lambda > 0$. Then

$$\left\| A_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq (1 - c)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \left\| A_\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq (1 + c)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with

$$c = \left\| B_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (A - B) B_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|.$$

Proposition E.3. For $r \geq 0$ we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^r \right\| \leq \kappa^r \lambda^{-(\frac{1}{2}-r)^+}.$$

Proof. For $r \geq 1/2$ we have $\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^r \right\| \leq \kappa^{r-1/2}$. For $r < 1/2$ we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\infty^r \right\| = \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{\mu_i^r}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^{1/2}} \right| \leq \lambda^{r-1/2}$$

$$\text{since } \left| \frac{\mu_i^r}{(\mu_i + \lambda)^{1/2}} \right| \leq \begin{cases} \lambda^{r-1/2} & \lambda \geq \mu_i \\ \mu_i^{r-1/2} & \mu_i \geq \lambda \end{cases} \leq \lambda^{r-1/2}. \quad \square$$

Proposition E.4 (Aleksandrov and Peller (2009), Blanchard and Mücke (2017) (Proposition B.1.)).
Let B_1, B_2 be two non-negative self-adjoint operators on some Hilbert space with $\|B_j\| \leq a, j = 1, 2$, for some non-negative a .

(i) If $0 \leq r \leq 1$, then

$$\|B_1^r - B_2^r\| \leq \|B_1 - B_2\|^r,$$

for some $C_r < \infty$.

(ii) If $r > 1$, then

$$\|B_1^r - B_2^r\| \leq C_{a,r} \|B_1 - B_2\|,$$

for some $C_{a,r} < \infty$.

E.2 Concentration Inequalities

In this subsection we generalize Bernstein type inequalities for double sums and apply them to our operators from section A. The first inequality was first established for matrices by Tropp (2011). For the general case including operators the proof can for example be found in Lin and Cevher (2018) (see Lemma 26):

Proposition E.5. Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m be a sequence of independently and identically distributed selfadjoint Hilbert-Schmidt operators on a separable Hilbert space. Assume that $\|\xi_1\| \leq B/2$ almost surely for some $B > 0$. Let \mathcal{V} be a positive trace-class operator such that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_1^2] \preceq \mathcal{V}$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta, (\delta \in]0, 1[)$, there holds

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i - \mathbb{E}[\xi] \right\| \leq \frac{2B\beta}{3m} + \sqrt{\frac{2\|\mathcal{V}\|\beta}{m}}, \quad \beta = \log \frac{4 \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{V}}{\|\mathcal{V}\|\delta}.$$

Corollary E.6. Let X_1, \dots, X_m and Y_1, \dots, Y_n be independent sequences of independently and identically distributed random variables such that $f(X_i, Y_j)$ defines a selfadjoint Hilbert-Schmidt operator on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , for some function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$. Assume that $\|f(X_1, Y_1)\| \leq B/2$ almost surely for some $B > 0$. Let for any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $f(x, y)^2$ and \mathcal{V} be positive trace-class operators such that $\mathbb{E}[f(X, Y)^2] \preceq \mathcal{V}$. Then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, there holds

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\| \leq \frac{2B\tilde{\beta}}{3n} + \frac{2B\beta}{3m} + \sqrt{\frac{2B\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\tilde{\beta}}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\|\mathcal{V}\|\beta}{m}},$$

with $\beta := \log \frac{4 \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{V}}{\|\mathcal{V}\|\delta}$, $\tilde{\beta} := \log \frac{4 \operatorname{tr} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\delta}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y)$.

Proof. We start by proving that the following events hold true with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$A := \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) \right\| \leq \frac{2B\tilde{\beta}}{3n} + \sqrt{\frac{2B\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\tilde{\beta}}{n}} \right\}, \quad (\text{E.1})$$

$$B := \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\| \leq \frac{2B\beta}{3m} + \sqrt{\frac{2\|\mathcal{V}\|\beta}{m}} \right\}. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Bounding A: Using that X_i, Y_j are independent, we can condition on $\{X_i = x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ as follow,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_X^{\otimes m}}[\mathbb{P}(A|x_1, \dots, x_m)]. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

We set $\xi_j := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f(x_i, Y_j)$. Note that conditioned on $\{X_i = x_i\}_{i=1}^m$, where x_i is contained in the support of μ_X , we have that ξ_j are iid w.r.t. μ_Y . By assumption we have $\|\xi_j\| \leq B/2$ and for the second moment we have by Jensen inequality and by assumption, $\mathbb{E}_Y[\xi^2] \preceq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(x_i, Y)^2 \preceq B \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(x_i, Y) := B\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$.

From Proposition E.5 we therefore have, that with probability (over $\mu_Y^{\otimes n}$) at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(x_i, Y) \right\| \leq \frac{2B\tilde{\beta}}{3n} + \sqrt{\frac{2B\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\tilde{\beta}}{n}}.$$

From (E.3) we therefore have that $P(A) \geq 1 - \delta$.

Bounding B: Again we set $\xi_i = \mathbb{E}_Y[f(X_i, Y)]$. By assumption we have $\|\xi\| \leq B/2$ and $\mathbb{E}_X \xi^2 \preceq \mathcal{V}$. From Proposition E.5 we therefore have, that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the event B holds true.

To sum up: Using the bounds of event A and B , we therefore have with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) \right\| \quad (\text{E.4})$$

$$+ \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\| \quad (\text{E.5})$$

$$\leq \frac{2B\tilde{\beta}}{3n} + \frac{2B\beta}{3m} + \sqrt{\frac{2B\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\tilde{\beta}}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\|\mathcal{V}\|\beta}{m}}. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

This proves the claim. \square

The following concentration result for Hilbert space valued random variables can be found in [Caponnetto and De Vito \(2007\)](#).

Proposition E.7 (Bernstein Inequality). *Let W_1, \dots, W_n be i.i.d random variables in a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Suppose that there are two positive constants B and V such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|W_1 - \mathbb{E}[W_1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^l \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} l! B^{l-2} V^2, \quad \forall l \geq 2. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n W_k - \mathbb{E}[W_1] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right).$$

In particular, (E.7) holds if

$$\|W_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq B/2 \quad a.s., \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|W_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \leq V^2.$$

Corollary E.8. Let X_1, \dots, X_m and Y_1, \dots, Y_n be independent sequences of independently and identically distributed random variables such that $f(X_i, Y_j)$ is contained in a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$, for some function $f: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that there are two positive constants B and V such that

$$\|f(X_1, Y_1)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq B/2 \quad a.s., \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\|f(X_1, Y_1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \leq V^2.$$

Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{m} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{B}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right),$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) + V^2$.

Proof. We start by proving that the following events hold true with high probability,

$$A := \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|f(X, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right| \leq \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{E.8})$$

$$B := \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2]}{n}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{E.9})$$

$$C := \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{E.10})$$

$$D := \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{m} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{E.11})$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) + V^2$.

Bounding A: Set $W_i = \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2]$. Then by assumption $|W_i| \leq B^2/4$ and $\mathbb{E}[|W_i|^2] \leq \frac{B^2 V^2}{4}$. From Proposition E.7 we therefore have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|f(X, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right| \leq \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right).$$

Bounding B: Using that X_i, Y_j are independent, we can condition on $\{X_i = x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ as follow,

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_x^{\otimes m}}[\mathbb{P}(B|x_1, \dots, x_m)]. \quad (\text{E.12})$$

We set $W_j := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f(x_i, Y_j)$. Note that conditioned on $\{X_i = x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ we have that W_j are iid w.r.t. μ_Y . By assumption we have $\|W_j\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq B/2$ and for the second moment we have

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[\|W\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(x_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2].$$

From Proposition E.7 we therefore have, that with probability (over $\mu_y^{\otimes n}$) at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(x_i, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(x_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2]}{n}} \right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right).$$

From (E.12) we therefore have that $P(B) \geq 1 - \delta$.

Bounding C: Note that $P(C|A, B) = 1$, since conditioned on A we have by assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &\leq \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + \mathbb{E}[\|f(X, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{B^2}{m} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + V^2, \end{aligned}$$

and plugging this inequality into the bound of B , leads to the bound of C . By Proposition D.11 we therefore have, $P(C) \geq 1 - 2\delta$.

Bounding D: Again we set $W_i = \mathbb{E}_Y[\|f(X_i, Y)\|_{\mathcal{H}}]$ and obtain by Proposition E.7 with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{m} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{m}} \right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right).$$

To sum up: Using the bounds of event C and D , we therefore have with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n f(X_i, Y_j) - \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (\text{E.13})$$

$$+ \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_Y f(X_i, Y) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

$$\leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{m} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{B}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n}} \right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right). \quad (\text{E.15})$$

This proves the claim. \square

Proposition E.9 (Rudi and Rosasco (2017) (Lemma 9)). For any $M \geq 8\kappa^4 \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1} \log^2 \frac{2}{\delta}$ we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\|\mathcal{L}_M\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|.$$

Proposition E.10 (Nguyen and Mücke (2023) Proposition A.18.). For any $\lambda > 0$ with $M \geq \frac{8\tilde{d}\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{\lambda}$ with $C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa} := \log \frac{80\kappa^4}{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|\lambda\delta}$ we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_M}(\lambda) \leq 4 \left(1 + 2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}\right) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda).$$

Proposition E.11. For any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, any $M \geq 8\kappa^4 \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1} \log^2 \frac{2}{\delta}$ and $n_u, n_x \geq \frac{72\kappa^4 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}(1+\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|)}{\lambda}$ with $C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa} := \log \frac{80\kappa^4}{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|\lambda\delta}$, define the following events,

$$E_1 = \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M \right) \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 3/4 \right\}, \quad (\text{E.16})$$

$$E_2 = \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2, \quad \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2 \right\}. \quad (\text{E.17})$$

Providing Assumption 3.1 we have that both events holds true with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$.

Proof. E_1) Set $f(u, x) := \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)^\top \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We have $\|f(u, x)\| \leq \kappa^2/\lambda := B$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_x}[f(u, x)^2] \preceq \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} := \mathcal{V}.$$

From Proposition E.6 we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M \right) \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 \tilde{\beta}}{3\lambda n_x} + \frac{2\kappa^2 \beta}{3\lambda n_u} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 \|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\| \tilde{\beta}}{\lambda n_x}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 \beta}{\lambda n_u}}, \quad (\text{E.18})$$

with $\beta := \log \frac{4 \text{tr } \mathcal{V}}{\|\mathcal{V}\|\delta}$, $\tilde{\beta} := \log \frac{4 \text{tr } \tilde{\mathcal{V}}}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\|\delta}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} := \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} f(u_i, x)$ and where we used $\|\mathcal{V}\| \leq \kappa^2/\lambda$.

For β we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \log \frac{4 \text{tr } \mathcal{V}}{\|\mathcal{V}\|\delta} = \log \frac{4 \text{Tr } \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}}{\|\mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}\|\delta} \\ &= \log \frac{4 \text{Tr } \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} (\|\mathcal{C}_M\| + \lambda)}{\|\mathcal{C}_M\|\delta} \\ &\leq \log \frac{4 \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \|\mathcal{C}_M\| + 4 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{C}_M)}{\|\mathcal{C}_M\|\delta} \\ &\leq \log \frac{8\kappa^2}{\lambda \|\mathcal{C}_M\|\delta} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.19})$$

$$\leq \log \frac{16\kappa^4}{\lambda \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|\delta} := C_{\lambda,\delta}, \quad (\text{E.20})$$

where we used for the last equation, that we have from Proposition E.9,

$$\|\mathcal{C}_M\| = \|\mathcal{L}_M\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|. \quad (\text{E.21})$$

Now we want to further bound $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$.

First we set $\xi_i = \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} f(u_i, x)$. Note that $\|\xi\| \leq \kappa^2/\lambda$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\xi^2 \preceq \mathbb{E}f(u, x)^2 \preceq \mathcal{V}.$$

From Proposition E.5 and (E.19) we therefore have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta}}{3\lambda n_u} + \kappa \sqrt{\frac{2C_{\lambda,\delta}}{\lambda n_u}}.$$

Now let $n_u \geq \frac{8C_{\lambda,\delta}\kappa^2}{\lambda}$, then we have $\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| \leq 1$ and therefore

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} \right\| \leq \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| + \left\| \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| \leq 2. \quad (\text{E.22})$$

If we assume $n_u \geq \frac{72\kappa^4 C_{\lambda,\delta} \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{\lambda}$, we instead have

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{5\kappa^2}.$$

This implies together with the reversed triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\| &\geq \|\mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}\| - \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right\| \\ &\geq \|\mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}\| - \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{5\kappa^2} = \frac{\|\mathcal{C}_M\|}{\|\mathcal{C}_M\| + \lambda} - \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{5\kappa^2} \\ &\geq \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{4\kappa^2} - \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{5\kappa^2} \geq \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|}{20\kappa^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.23})$$

where we used (E.21) and $\lambda \leq 1 \leq \kappa^2$ in the last step.

Plugging (E.23) into $\tilde{\beta}$ gives,

$$\tilde{\beta} = \log \frac{4 \operatorname{tr} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{V}}\| \delta} \leq \log \frac{80\kappa^4}{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\| \lambda \delta} := C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}. \quad (\text{E.24})$$

To sum up we have $\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{V}} \right\| \leq 2$ and $\tilde{\beta}, \beta \leq C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}$. Plugging these bounds into (E.18) leads to

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M \right) \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{3\lambda n_x} + \frac{2\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{3\lambda n_u} + \sqrt{\frac{4\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{\lambda n_x}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{\lambda n_u}}. \quad (\text{E.25})$$

using the assumption $n_u, n_x \geq \frac{72\kappa^4 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa} (1 + \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|)}{\lambda}$, proves the result.

E_2) The result now follows from Proposition E.2 and the event E_1 . □

Proposition E.12. *For any $\lambda > 0$ define the following events,*

$$E_1 = \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M) \right\|_{HS} \leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + \sqrt{25\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{E.26})$$

$$E_2 = \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M \right\|_{HS} \leq \left(2\kappa^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 4\kappa^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \right\}. \quad (\text{E.27})$$

Providing Assumption 3.1 we have for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ that each of the above events holds true with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. E_1) Set $f(u_i, x_j) := \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)^\top$. Note that

$$\|f(u_i, x_j)\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2 / \sqrt{\lambda} := B$$

For the second moment we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|f(u, x)\|_{HS}^2 &\leq \kappa^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)^\top]) \\ &= \kappa^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}) = \kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_M(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where we used for the last equation, that $\Sigma_M = Z_M Z_M^*$ and $\mathcal{C}_M = \mathcal{Z}_M^* \mathcal{Z}_M$, so therefore

$$\mathcal{N}_M(\lambda) = \text{Tr} \Sigma_M \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-1} = \text{Tr} \mathcal{Z}_M^* \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_M = \text{Tr} \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}. \quad (\text{E.28})$$

Further we have by Proposition E.10:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_M}(\lambda) \leq \left(1 + 2 \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right) 4 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda) \leq 12 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda). \quad (\text{E.29})$$

From Proposition E.8 we therefore have for $V^2 := 12\kappa^2 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)$

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M) \right\|_{HS} \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n_u} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{B}{n_x} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n_x}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right),$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{B^2}{n_u} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{n_u}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) + V^2$.

Note that if we let $n_u \geq \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \log^2(12/\delta)$ we further obtain $Z \leq 25\kappa^2 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)$, where we used that $\log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda) \geq 1$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M) \right\|_{HS} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + \sqrt{25\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

E_2) Set $f(u_i, x_j) := \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)^\top$. Note that

$$\|f(u_i, x_j)\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2 =: B$$

For the second moment we have,

$$\mathbb{E}\|f(u, x)\|_{HS}^2 \leq \kappa^4 =: V^2$$

From Proposition E.8 we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M \right\|_{HS} &\leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{n_u} + \frac{\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{\kappa^2}{n_x} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n_x}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \\ &\leq \left(2\kappa^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 4\kappa^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{\kappa^4}{n_u} + \frac{\kappa^4}{\sqrt{n_u}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + \kappa^4$.

□

Proposition E.13. For any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, any $M \geq 8\kappa^4 \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|^{-1} \log^2 \frac{2}{\delta}$ and $n_u, n_x \geq \frac{72\kappa^4 C_{\lambda, \delta, \kappa} (1 + \|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|)}{\lambda}$ with $C_{\lambda, \delta, \kappa} := \log \frac{80\kappa^4}{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\| \lambda \delta}$, we have that with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$,

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^1 \right\| \leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 5\kappa \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right). \quad (\text{E.30})$$

If in addition $n_u, n_x \geq \frac{400\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)}{\lambda} \log^3\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)$

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda} \right\| \leq 2.$$

Proof. Using Proposition E.12 we obtain with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M) \right\|_{HS} + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_M - \mathcal{C}_M) \right\|_{HS} + 1 \\ &\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 5\sqrt{\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.31})$$

From Proposition E.11 we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2 \quad (\text{E.32})$$

and therefore

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M, \lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M, \lambda}^1 \right\| \leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 5\sqrt{\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right). \quad (\text{E.33})$$

The above inequality therefore holds if we condition on the events ((E.31), (E.32)). Using Proposition D.11 now shows that the above inequality holds with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$.

If in addition $n_u, n_x \geq \frac{400\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)}{\lambda} \log^3\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)$ we further obtain

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda} \right\| \leq 2.$$

□

Proposition E.14. *Let $M \geq \frac{8d\bar{\kappa}^2 C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa}}{\lambda}$, $n_u \geq \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \log^2(12/\delta)$ with $C_{\lambda,\delta,\kappa} := \log \frac{80\kappa^4}{\|\mathcal{L}_\infty\|\lambda\delta}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that the following event holds true:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right) \right\| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + 5 \sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition E.14. By Definition A.3 we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right) \right\|_2 = \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} f(z_i, x_j) - \mathbb{E} f(z, x) \right\|_2$$

where $f(z_i, x_j) := \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) v_i(x_j)$ and $z_i = (u_i, v_i)$.

Note that by Assumption 3.1 we have

$$\|f(z, x)\|_2 \leq \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}} \|\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \|f(z, x)\|_2^2 \leq \int_{\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{X}} \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \right\|_2^2 := \nu.$$

Now we need to prove that $\nu = \mathcal{N}_M(\lambda)$. Note that we have $\Sigma_M = Z_M Z_M^*$ and $\mathcal{C}_M = Z_M^* Z_M$, so

$$\mathcal{N}_M(\lambda) = \text{Tr} \Sigma_M \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-1} = \text{Tr} Z_M^* \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-1} Z_M = \text{Tr} \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1},$$

since $Z_M^* \Sigma_{M,\lambda}^{-1} Z_M = \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1}$. By the the ciclicity of the trace and the definition of \mathcal{C}_M , we have

$$\text{Tr} \mathcal{C}_M \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}} \text{Tr} \left(\nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x)^\top \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1} \right) = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}} \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x) \right\|_2^2 = \nu.$$

Further we have by Proposition E.10:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_M}(\lambda) \leq \left(1 + 2 \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right) 4 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda) \leq 12 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda). \quad (\text{E.34})$$

So by setting $B = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$ and $V^2 = 12 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)$, it follows from Proposition E.8, that with probability

at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right) \right\| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n_u} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{B}{n_x} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n_x}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{B^2}{n_u} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{n_u}} \right) \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) + V^2$. Note that if we let $n_u \geq \frac{\kappa^2}{\lambda} \log^2(12/\delta)$ we further obtain $Z \leq 25 \log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)$, where we used that $\log(4/\delta) \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda) \geq 1$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{C}_{M,\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_M^* \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{Z}_M^* G^* \right) \right\| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\frac{1}{n_u} + \frac{1}{n_x} \right) + \sqrt{25 \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty}(\lambda)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition E.15. *Given that $\theta_t \in Q_{\theta_0}(R)$ and Assumption 2.1, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x) \right\|_{\Theta} \\ & \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log \left(\frac{4}{\delta} \right) \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta} + \frac{2\kappa C_{\nabla g}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using a Taylor expansion in θ_0 we have

$$G_{\theta_t}(u)(x) = \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta_t - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta} + r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u)(x).$$

Therefore

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x_j) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) G_{\theta_t}(u_i)(x) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{E.35})$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j), \theta_t - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta} - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x), \theta_t - \theta_0 \rangle_{\Theta} \right\|_{\Theta} + \quad (\text{E.36})$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u_i)(x_j) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x) r_{(\theta_t, \theta_0)}(u_i)(x) \right\|_{\Theta} \quad (\text{E.37})$$

$$:= I + II. \quad (\text{E.38})$$

For I we have

$$I \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_x} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} W_j - \mathbb{E}_{\rho_x} W_j \right\|_{HS} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}$$

with $W_j := \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j) \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u_i)(x_j)^T$. Note that $\|W\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2$, $\|W\|_{HS}^2 \leq \kappa^4$. Therefore we

have from Proposition E.7 with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$I \leq \frac{4\kappa^2}{\sqrt{n_x}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}.$$

For II we have from Proposition D.2,

$$II \leq 2\kappa \frac{C_{\nabla g}(R)}{\sqrt{M}} \|\theta_t - \theta_0\|_{\Theta}^2.$$

□

Proposition E.16. *Let $T \leq Cn_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, $2r + b > 1$, $n_x \geq t^{2\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}$ and $M \geq M_{III}$ with M_{III} from Theorem B.5 and some $C > 0$, defined in the proof. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for $t \in [T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)| - \mathbb{E}|F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \right| \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_{\alpha, \kappa} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2}\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we start with bounding F_t^* and G^* . Note that $F_t^* \in \mathcal{H}_M$, therefore there exist some θ_t^* such that $F_t(u)(x) = \langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta_t^* \rangle$ and $\|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} = \|\theta_t^*\|_{\Theta}$ (see for example Steinwart and Christmann (2008) Theorem 4.21). Therefore we have from Lemma C.1

$$|F_t(u)(x)| = |\langle \nabla G_{\theta_0}(u)(x), \theta_t^* \rangle| \leq \kappa \|F_t^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_M} \leq C'_{\kappa, \alpha} t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}.$$

For G^* we have from Assumption 3.1

$$|G^*(u)(x)| \leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} |v(x)| \rho(dv|u) \leq 1.$$

Now set $f(u_i, x_j) := |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)|$.

Then we have $|f(u_i, x_j)| \leq C'_{\kappa, \alpha} t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}} + 1 := C_{\kappa, \alpha} t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}} := B$ and from (Nguyen and Mücke, 2023, Proposition A.1) we have (with $\lambda = (\alpha t)^{-1}$)

$$\mathbb{E}f(u, x)^2 = \|\mathcal{S}_M F_t^* - G^*\|_{L^2(\mu_u)}^2 \leq C_{\alpha, r} t^{-2r} := V^2, \quad (\text{E.39})$$

for some $C_{r, \alpha} < \infty$ as long as $M \geq M_{III}$, $T \leq Cn_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$, with C from Theorem B.5.

From Proposition E.8 we therefore have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)| - \mathbb{E}|F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{B}{n_u} + \frac{V}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{B}{n_x} + \sqrt{\frac{Z}{n_x}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \end{aligned}$$

with $Z := \left(\frac{B^2}{n_u} + \frac{BV}{\sqrt{n_u}} \right) \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) + V^2$. From $T \leq C_{\alpha, r} n_u^{\frac{1}{2r+b}}$ for some $C_{\alpha, r} > 0$ we further have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{n_u n_x} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} |F_t^*(u_i)(x_j) - G^*(u_i)(x_j)| - \mathbb{E} |F_t^*(u)(x) - G^*(u)(x)| \right| \\
& \leq \hat{C}_{\alpha, \kappa} \left(\frac{t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}}{n_u} + \frac{1}{t^r \sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{t^{\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}-r\}}}{n_x} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \\
& \leq \tilde{C}_{\alpha, \kappa} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_u}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x}} \right) \log^{3/2} \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_M(u, u') &= (\Phi_u^M)^* \Phi_{u'}^M = \sum_{m=1}^{3M} \partial_m G_{\theta_0}(u) \otimes \partial_m G_{\theta_0}(u') \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) \otimes \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \tau^2 \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) J(u) \otimes \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) J(u'),
\end{aligned}$$

We now set

$$\begin{aligned}
w_m &= \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) \otimes \sigma \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) + \\
&\quad \tau^2 \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u) \rangle \right) J(u) \otimes \sigma' \left(\langle b_m^{(0)}, J(u') \rangle \right) J(u').
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|w_1\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2$ and $\mathbb{E} [\|w_1\|_{HS}^2] \leq \kappa^4$. The result now follows from E.7.

□