

Fast Approximate Solution of Stein Equations for Post-Processing of MCMC

Qingyang Liu¹, Heishiro Kanagawa¹, Matthew A. Fisher¹,
François-Xavier Briol², Chris. J. Oates^{1,3}

¹Newcastle University, UK

²University College London, UK

³The Alan Turing Institute, UK

January 14, 2025

Abstract

Bayesian inference is conceptually elegant, but calculating posterior expectations can entail a heavy computational cost. Monte Carlo methods are reliable and supported by strong asymptotic guarantees, but do not leverage smoothness of the integrand. Solving Stein equations has emerged as a possible alternative, providing a framework for numerical approximation of posterior expectations in which smoothness can be exploited. However, existing numerical methods for Stein equations are associated with high computational cost due to the need to solve large linear systems. This paper considers the combination of iterative linear solvers and preconditioning strategies to obtain fast approximate solutions of Stein equations. Our main finding is that these methods can be effective, but that the performance of different preconditioning strategies is context-dependent, so that no single strategy can be universally preferred.

1 Introduction

Conditional probability underpins statistical inference, yet the actual calculation of conditional probabilities remains a challenging computational task. Our focus is on probability distributions arising in Bayesian statistics, where one starts with the joint distribution of parameters \mathbf{X} and data \mathbf{Y} , and seeks to compute the distribution of parameters \mathbf{X} conditional upon the realised dataset $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}$. Eschewing measurability considerations, we assume that this conditional distribution admits a Lebesgue density $p(\cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^d . From Bayes' theorem, this conditional density is given by

$$p(\mathbf{x}) := p_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p_{\mathbf{X}}(x)p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y})} \quad (1)$$

where $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot)$ denotes a marginal density of \mathbf{X} ('the prior'), $p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$ denotes a probability mass function or density for \mathbf{Y} conditional on $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ ('the likelihood'), and $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot)$ denotes a

marginal mass function or density for \mathbf{Y} (‘the marginal likelihood’). Practical applications of Bayesian statistics are characterised by explicit access to $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot)$ and $p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$, but not $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot)$ or $p_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot|\mathbf{y})$. The conditional distribution $p_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot|\mathbf{y})$ is termed the *posterior* and is the object of scientific interest, from which conclusions are deduced. Armed with the prior and the likelihood, in simple situations one can directly calculate the marginal likelihood $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ and thus obtain the posterior density $p_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot|\mathbf{y})$ via (1). However, in all but the simplest situations $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y})$ represents an analytically intractable integral which is often also numerically intractable, due to the highly localised nature of the integrand in the context of an informative likelihood.

Numerical approximation of posterior distributions has been a central research topic in statistics since the advent of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC). There are now myriad ingenious ways to obtain asymptotically exact approximations to the posterior (1). For example, MCMC methods [21], sequential Monte Carlo methods [14], variational methods [8], and gradient flow methods [12]. Among these, sampling-based methods are widely considered state-of-the-art [7]. This is due in perhaps equal part to their widely understood (asymptotic) theoretical guarantees [36] and the availability of production-level software [10]. At a high-level, sampling-based methods output a sequence $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the distribution of \mathbf{x}_n converges in an appropriate sense to the posterior (1), and such that \mathbf{x}_m is approximately independent from \mathbf{x}_n whenever the indices m and n are sufficiently far apart. Omitting technical details, one can make rigorous sense of these properties to guarantee the almost sure convergence of averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}_i) \rightarrow \int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} \quad (2)$$

for all f such that $\int f^2(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} < \infty$; see e.g. Chapter 17 of [36]. Further, the approximation error is typically $O_P(N^{-1/2})$, whose exponent is dimension-independent. Considering that parameters of statistical models are often high-dimensional (i.e. $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \gg 1$), the dimension-independent convergence rate is usually regarded as a positive attribute of sampling methods. However, there are two scenarios where sampling methods are sub-optimal:

1. the integrand f is in some sense ‘smooth relative to the dimension d ’
2. evaluation of f incurs a non-negligible cost.

In the first case, by analogy with established cubature methods, one might expect to obtain a faster convergence rate by leveraging the smoothness of the integrand [38]. The challenge here is that cubature methods are not directly applicable in the Bayesian context, due to the implicit characterisation of the posterior distribution via (1). In the second case, the relatively slow error decay of sampling-based methods means that a potentially high cost is paid to obtain an accurate numerical approximation to the integral. Yet this rate of convergence is characteristic to all Monte Carlo methods, and it is difficult to see how any meaningful acceleration can be achieved within the class of sampling methods, except for perhaps improving the rate constant.

Solving Stein equations has emerged as a promising solution to both of the problems just discussed. In brief, Stein equations cast the task of calculating a posterior expectation

as the task of solving a partial differential equation (PDE). Though solving a PDE appears to be a more challenging computational task, a key observation is that PDE solvers can directly exploit smoothness. This enables improved convergence rates for numerical approximations, which can in turn reduce the cost required to achieve a certain level of numerical precision in approximating posterior expected quantities of interest.

To date, several research groups have explored collocation and closely related numerical methods for solving Stein equations, where the sequence of collocation nodes are chosen to be the output $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ from a sampling method, usually MCMC [42, 41, 3, 46, 6, 47, 49, 48, 51, 30, 5]. Despite theoretical support and encouraging empirical demonstrations, the computational complexity of these methods can often preclude their application to typically-sized MCMC output. For example, the computational complexity of kernel-based collocation methods is typically $O(N^3)$, while $N = 10^4$ or $N = 10^5$ samples are routinely produced using MCMC. There exist numerical approximation techniques for scaling collocation methods to large N , both in the PDE literature and in the kernel methods literature, but a detailed and objective assessment of their suitability for solving Stein equations has yet to be performed.

The aims of this article are threefold. First, we aim for a self-contained exposition of collocation methods for solving Stein equations and their application to computing posterior expectations. Second, we aim to review existing preconditioning techniques for scaling collocation-type methods to large datasets, with a critical discussion of their suitability for solving Stein equations in our motivating context. Third, we aim to present an objective empirical assessment of the performance gains than can be achieved using the strategies which will be discussed.

2 Background

We now recall how Stein equations can be used to post-process MCMC output. Section 2.1 introduces Stein equations, and Section 2.2 discusses how approximate solutions of Stein equations enable approximate computation of posterior expectations. Numerical methods, including collocation methods, are discussed in Section 2.3. The main numerical techniques that we consider are iterative linear solvers and preconditioning, and we briefly recall how these can be applied for collocation in Section 2.4.

2.1 Stein Equations

Stein equations provide a mathematical link between a posterior expected quantity of interest and the solution of a PDE. They were introduced in a special case by Charles Stein in [50], where they were initially just a theoretical tool. There are now a plethora of different approaches to construct Stein equations with both theoretical and computational purposes in mind [2], but we focus only on the *canonical* Stein equation in this work. Let ∇ denote the gradient and $\nabla \cdot$ denote the divergence operators in \mathbb{R}^d . Given a probability density function p on \mathbb{R}^d , an integrand $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of interest, and assuming that the gradient $\nabla \log p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is well-defined, the canonical *Stein equation* (also known as

the *Langevin Stein equation*) is the first-order PDE

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = c + \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{x})}(\nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}))(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3)$$

whose solutions are defined as pairs (c, \mathbf{u}) where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant and $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a differentiable vector field. The existence of solutions to the Stein equation is a deep and technical subject beyond this paper, but we note that if \mathbf{u} is a gradient field $\mathbf{u} = \nabla v$ then existence of a solution to the Stein equation can be deduced from existence of a solution to the (weighted) Poisson equation on \mathbb{R}^d . See e.g. Proposition 2 of [46] for further detail, or see Theorem 1 of [3] for the simpler case where the domain is a closed compact Riemannian manifold.

There are two key observations explaining the relevance of the Stein equation:

1. *Computability:* From the product rule for differentiation, we can re-express the Stein equation as $f(\mathbf{x}) = c + (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x})$. The term $\nabla \log p$ completely characterises the density p , and can be computed for posterior distributions directly from (1) without evaluation of intractable integrals, since

$$(\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}) = (\nabla \log p_{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{x}) + (\nabla \log L)(\mathbf{x}) \quad (4)$$

where $L(\cdot) = p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\cdot)$ is the likelihood. Indeed, most modern MCMC algorithms exploit (4) as part of their Markov transition kernel (for example, in Metropolis–Hastings one can propose a candidate state for the Markov chain by moving in a direction of increasing log-probability gradient), and as such the gradients $(\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}_n)$ can be cached along the sample path, so that they are available for use in post-processing at no additional computational cost.

2. *Integral Approximation:* If (c, \mathbf{u}) is a solution to the Stein equation, then from an appropriately general formulation of the divergence theorem

$$\int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = c + \int (\nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}))(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = c + 0 = c \quad (5)$$

provided $p\mathbf{u}$ and $\nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u})$ are both integrable on \mathbb{R}^d ; see [4] or Proposition 3 of [40]. This indicates that c is precisely the value of the posterior expectation of interest, suggesting that if we can numerically approximate a solution (c, \mathbf{u}) of the Stein equation then we can read off an approximation to the corresponding posterior expectation as well. Further details are provided next.

2.2 Using Approximate Solutions of Stein Equations

Armed with an approximate solution $(\tilde{c}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}})$ to the canonical Stein equation (3), there are two main ways in which the approximation can be leveraged to approximate the posterior integral $\int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}$ of interest.

1. *Point Estimator:* First, one may directly take \tilde{c} as an approximation to the integral of interest, motivated by (5). This approach was considered in works such as [3, 47, 9, 13], where it was shown to be effective providing the approximating class is rich enough that the ground truth (c, \mathbf{u}) can be (in an appropriate sense) consistently approximated.

2. *Control Variate*: One can use the corresponding approximation to f as a control variate to construct a reduced-variance alternative to the estimator in (2):

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}_n) - \underbrace{\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_n)}_{=\tilde{c}} + \int \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \tilde{f} = \tilde{c} + \frac{1}{p} \nabla \cdot (p \tilde{\mathbf{u}}).$$

This was the approach considered by authors such as [6, 5]. The variance of this estimator with respect to the randomness of sampling $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ may be smaller than that of the usual MCMC estimator. However, the analysis of this strategy is complicated by the reality that \tilde{f} would typically be constructed using the same samples $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$, and these samples are typically correlated samples since they arise from MCMC.

For concreteness, the point estimator approach is the approach that will be considered in the present manuscript.

2.3 Solving the Canonical Stein Equation

Several strategies for numerical solution of the Stein equation can be conceived. A reflexive strategy is to assume a gradient field $\mathbf{u} = \nabla v$ and then use existing numerical methods designed for second-order elliptic PDEs. Among such methods, Galerkin methods are popular and well-understood, with finite element bases often a practical gold-standard. However, there are features of the Stein equation for which Galerkin methods are not well-suited. First, the equation is often defined on an unbounded domain, which is somewhat non-standard. Although it may be practically sufficient to solve the Stein equation in regions where most of the probability mass of p is contained, this region is typically unknown at the outset. Second, the dimension of the domain can often be large (i.e. $d \gg 1$) so that the number of basis elements needed to appropriately resolve the solution can be prohibitively large in general. Third, the integration over basis elements that is required to obtain a stiffness matrix involves a weighted integral with respect to the density p , up to a normalisation constant, introducing a circularity since integration with respect to p is the motivating task.

As a result, several research groups have instead explored collocation (or *meshless*) methods for numerical solution of the Stein equation. Collocation methods are characterised as seeking a strong solution to the PDE, requiring only that the quantities appearing in the PDE can be pointwise evaluated, and scaling favourably with dimension by circumventing the explicit construction of a mesh [18, 11]. Among collocation methods for PDEs, our focus is on the popular *symmetric collocation* method [19], since this has elegant connections with minimum norm interpolation and kernel methods that we wish to exploit. To introduce these, we first consider the simplified setting of a linear PDE of the form $f = \mathcal{L}v$, where the strong solution $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to uniquely exist as an element of $\mathcal{H}(k)$, the Hilbert space reproduced by a symmetric and positive definite kernel $k : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assuming the linear functionals $v \mapsto (\mathcal{L}v)(\mathbf{x}_n)$ are continuous, the symmetric collocation method approximates v as

$$v_N(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^N w_n \mathcal{L}_2 k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_n) \tag{6}$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ are the *collocation nodes*, and \mathcal{L}_i denotes the action of the operator on the i th argument of a bivariate functional; see Chapter 16 in [54]. The weights \mathbf{w} are obtained from solving the linear system of equations $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{b}$ where

$$\mathbf{A} = [A_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}, \quad A_{i,j} = (\mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{L}_2 k)(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j),$$

is called the *collocation matrix* and

$$\mathbf{b} = [b_i]_{1 \leq i \leq N}, \quad b_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The symmetric collocation method is rather natural and arises from several different perspectives. One perspective is minimal norm interpolation, where (6) is the solution to the variational problem

$$\arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{H}(k)} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k)} \text{ such that } f(\mathbf{x}_n) = (\mathcal{L}v)(\mathbf{x}_n), \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (7)$$

see Theorem 16.1 of [54]. Though the Stein equation (3) does not exactly fit into this set-up, due to the presence of the unknown constant c and the fact that the function \mathbf{u} appearing in the Stein equation is a vector field, we explain in Section 3 how the numerical solution of the Stein equation (3) can also be couched as a variational problem in a similar spirit to (7) with the *Langevin Stein operator* $\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{p} \nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u})$, and thus approximately solved using a collocation-type method.

2.4 Conjugate Gradients and Preconditioning of Collocation Methods

Under appropriate regularity conditions, the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ appearing in collocation methods has a well-defined inverse \mathbf{A}^{-1} ; see Chapter 16 in [54]. However, the matrix \mathbf{A} can become severely ill-conditioned for moderate-to-large values of N , meaning that \mathbf{A}^{-1} cannot be accurately computed using a direct method. Further, the memory requirement of simply storing \mathbf{A} in typically-sized RAM on a personal computer can be prohibitive when N is larger than a few thousand. As such, iterative linear solvers that require only the *action* of \mathbf{A} in the form of a matrix-vector product, together with preconditioning strategies, are routinely employed in combination with the symmetric collocation method. Let $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and $\text{cond}(\mathbf{A}) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^{-1}$ denote the condition number of \mathbf{A} , with large values representing poor conditioning. Practically, one first seeks a symmetric and cheaply invertible *preconditioner* matrix of the form $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^\top$ for some $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ such that $\text{cond}(\mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{E}^{-\top}) \ll \text{cond}(\mathbf{A})$, and then one approximately solves

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{E}^{-\top}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{b} \quad (8)$$

using m iterations of an iterative linear solver, such as the conjugate gradient (CG) method [27], returning an approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$. The preconditioned linear system $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ is equivalent to the original linear system $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{b}$, since one can extract $\mathbf{w}_m = \mathbf{E}^{-\top}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m$ as a numerical approximation to the solution vector \mathbf{w} of interest. Further, since the preconditioned matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ has a smaller condition number compared to the

original matrix \mathbf{A} , fewer iterations of an iterative method will typically be required [37]. In particular, Theorem 11.3.3 of [24] shows that for a sequence of approximations $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2, \dots$ produced using the CG method applied to (8),

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\text{cond}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{m-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}, \quad \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}} = (\mathbf{z}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{z})^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

suggesting that a smaller condition number for $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ entails faster convergence of the CG method. The ideal preconditioner is one for which $\text{cond}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = 1$. This can in theory be achieved by taking $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A}^{1/2}$, but this is as hard as solving the numerical system itself. Instead, it is common to use approximations of this quantity which are easier to invert. For example, Sec. 3.1.2 of [20] advocated a Jacobi preconditioner, meaning $\mathbf{E} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{A})^{1/2}$, presenting empirical evidence that even this simple preconditioning strategy can markedly improve the overall condition of the system of linear equations that must be solved. Likewise, the importance of preconditioning for large-scale kernel methods is well-understood [15], with Nyström-based preconditioning [45, 1] being popular in the field. Yet, a comparison of the suitability and effectiveness of different preconditioning techniques for numerical solution of the Stein equation has yet to be performed. This is our focus next.

3 Fast Approximate Solutions of Stein Equations

The numerical solution of the Stein equation (3) is described in a variational form in Section 3.1. Subject to practical considerations discussed in Section 3.2, this leads to a linear system of equations which can then be further preconditioned. A range of different preconditioning techniques are described in Section 3.3.

3.1 A Variational Formulation

This section explains how the basic form of the symmetric collocation method from Section 2.3 can be extended to the case of the Stein equation (3), following the approach of [42, 41, 3]. Again we let $k : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a symmetric and positive definite kernel, which we will call the *base kernel*, and now we let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{H}(k) \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}(k)$ denote the Cartesian product of d copies of $\mathcal{H}(k)$, with norm satisfying $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \|u_i\|_{\mathcal{H}(k)}^2$. Taking inspiration from collocation methods for PDEs, we cast approximate numerical solution of the Stein equation (3) as the variational problem

$$\arg \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{U}} \text{ such that } f(\mathbf{x}_n) = c + \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{x}_n)} (\nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}))(\mathbf{x}_n), \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (10)$$

whose solution takes the form of a collocation-type method. Indeed, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ implies that $\frac{1}{p} \nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{H}(k_p)$ where $k_p : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the *Stein reproducing kernel*

$$k_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla_2 k)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') + (\nabla_1 k)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \cdot (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}') + (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\nabla_2 k)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') + k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}') \quad (11)$$

and $\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)} = \inf\{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{U}} : v = \frac{1}{p}\nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}\}$; see Theorem 1 of [42]. Here we have used ∇_i to denote gradient and $\nabla_i \cdot$ to denote the divergence with respect to the i th argument. Thus (10) can be expressed as

$$\arg \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}, v \in \mathcal{H}(k_p)} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)} \text{ such that } f(\mathbf{x}_n) = c + v(\mathbf{x}_n), \quad n = 1, \dots, N. \quad (12)$$

The solution (c_N, v_N) to the variational problem (12) has an explicit closed form, which is summarised in the following result:

Proposition 1. *Assume that the Stein kernel k_p in (11) is well-defined, and let the collocation nodes $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ be distinct. Then (12) has a unique solution (c_N, v_N) with the constant c_N admitting the explicit closed form*

$$c_N = \frac{\mathbf{f}^\top \mathbf{K}_p^{-1} \mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{K}_p^{-1} \mathbf{1}}, \quad \mathbf{f} = [f(\mathbf{x}_i)]_{1 \leq i \leq N}, \quad \mathbf{K}_p = [k_p(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{1} = [1, \dots, 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

As this result is central to the paper, we provide a self-contained proof in the Online Appendix. Several comments are immediately in order:

1. Proposition 1 assumes the collocation nodes are distinct, so that \mathbf{K}_p can be inverted. If the collocation nodes arise as output from Metropolis–Hastings MCMC, then we will need to manually discard duplicate samples to proceed. One might worry that the thinned samples are no longer p -invariant. However, p -invariance of the MCMC output is not a necessary condition for consistency of the estimator c_N ; essentially, all information about p is contained in the Stein reproducing kernel; see e.g. Appendix L of [47]. Alternative sampling methods, which may generate collocation nodes better-suited to numerical solution of the Stein equation, are discussed in [53], but to limit scope here we consider only collocation nodes that are generated using p -invariant MCMC.
2. The resulting linear system that we need to solve is

$$\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{1}. \quad (14)$$

Due to the number N of samples that define this linear system, instantiating the matrix \mathbf{K}_p in RAM can incur a prohibitive $O(N^2)$ computational cost. As such, iterative methods that use only the action of \mathbf{K}_p on vectors are strongly preferred. To emphasise this requirement, we let $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the map $\mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{v}$. The computational complexity of evaluating $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}$ is $O(N^2)$, but the storage complexity is now $O(N)$. Pseudocode for memory-efficient computation of $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}$ is presented in the Online Appendix.

3. The performance of iterative linear solvers such as the CG method depends strongly on the condition number of the matrix \mathbf{K}_p . Depending on the base kernel k appearing in (11), the eigenvalue decay of \mathbf{K}_p can be rapid, leading to \mathbf{K}_p being severely ill-conditioned.

Together these considerations motivate the use of preconditioned iterative methods for (14) in which only the action of \mathbf{K}_p is required. For the experiments that we report in Section 4 we use CG as the iterative linear solver, as this is most widely-used. Different preconditioning strategies for (14) are discussed in Section 3.3.

3.2 Practical Considerations

This section summarises the main practical considerations associated with numerical solution of the Stein equation; the choice of kernel, monitoring performance, and memory-efficient numerical preconditioning.

3.2.1 Choice of Kernel

As with all kernel methods, it is important to select a kernel that is appropriate for the task at hand. In our case, this amounts to selecting an appropriate base kernel k in (11). For example, we might consider a base kernel of the form

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \phi\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{\ell}\right) \quad (15)$$

where $\ell > 0$ is a length scale to be specified. Standard techniques, such as cross-validation, provide a useful rationale for how ℓ can be selected. However, these techniques require solving the Stein equation on subsets of the collocation nodes, which gives rise again to the motivating computational task. In particular, larger length scales ℓ tend to result in matrices \mathbf{K}_p that are more ill-conditioned. Thus any computational advantage of the preconditioning techniques that we will consider in Section 3.3 can also be brought to bear on the kernel choice task.

3.2.2 Monitoring Performance

Suppose that \mathbf{w}_m is an approximate solution of (14), for example as obtained using m iterations of the CG method. Then we may consider the corresponding approximation $c_{N,m} = (\mathbf{f}^\top \mathbf{w}_m) / (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w}_m)$ to c_N in (13). Let $f = c + v$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathcal{H}(k_p)$. Noting that $c_{N,m}$ is a normalised cubature rule, an application of the reproducing property and Cauchy–Schwarz shows that the error of the estimator $c_{N,m} \equiv c_{N,m}(f)$ can be explicitly bounded:

$$\left| c_{N,m}(f) - \int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right| = \left| c_{N,m}(v) - \int v(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right| \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)} \sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)$$

where

$$\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m) = \sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)} \leq 1} \left| c_{N,m}(v) - \int v(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \right| = \frac{(\mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w}_m)^{1/2}}{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w}_m}. \quad (16)$$

Although the term $\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)}$ will be unknown in general, one can monitor the worst-case error $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)$, providing a proxy for estimator performance that can be explicitly computed in $O(N^2)$ time and $O(N)$ storage cost.

3.2.3 Memory-Efficient Preconditioning the Canonical Stein Equation

Motivated by the discussion of preconditioning collocation methods in Section 2.4, here we consider analogous preconditioning for the Stein equation. That is, we first solve

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_p \tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{1}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_p = \mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{E}^{-\top}$$

for $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ using an iterative method, and then solve $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{E}^{-\top} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$. The preconditioner is $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^\top$, and the hope is that $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_p$ is better conditioned than \mathbf{K}_p . Pseudocode for preconditioned CG applied to the Stein equation is presented in the Online Appendix. A notable feature of preconditioned CG is that it requires only the action of \mathbf{M}^{-1} , denoted $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, rather than the matrix \mathbf{M} itself, which permits memory efficient computation in a similar manner to that previously discussed. In the next section we explore various different choices for the preconditioner matrix \mathbf{M} .

3.3 Preconditioners

The literature on collocation and kernel methods contains different approaches to preconditioning, and a non-exhaustive selection of representative examples will be discussed.

3.3.1 Jacobi Preconditioning

Following the suggestion of [20], we could consider Jacobi preconditioning with $\mathbf{E} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{K}_p)^{1/2}$. Let $\Delta = \nabla \cdot \nabla$ denote the Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^d . For base kernels of the form (15), from (11) we have

$$[\mathbf{K}_p]_{i,i} = k_p(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = -\frac{(\Delta\phi)(\mathbf{0})}{\ell^2} + \phi(\mathbf{0})\|(\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}_i)\|^2 \quad (17)$$

so that $[\mathbf{E}]_{i,i} \asymp \|(\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}_i)\|$ in the tail. For example, for a Gaussian posterior with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, we would have $[\mathbf{E}]_{i,i} \asymp \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu})\|$, meaning that Jacobi preconditioning is mitigating the negative effect of states \mathbf{x}_i with low posterior probability on the conditioning of the matrix \mathbf{K}_p . On the other hand, for $\ell \rightarrow 0$ the first term in (17) dominates and \mathbf{E} converges to a multiple of the identity matrix, meaning that no meaningful preconditioning is achieved. An extension of Jacobi preconditioning is so-called *block* Jacobi, where \mathbf{E} is taken to be a block diagonal matrix whose blocks are of size $b \times b$, for some b to be specified, and coincide with the corresponding elements of \mathbf{K}_p .

3.3.2 Nyström Preconditioning

The Nyström method [39] samples a subset of $n \leq N$ collocation nodes (specified by indices $1 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_n \leq N$, called the *inducing points*) and uses these to approximate the full matrix \mathbf{K}_p . To avoid cumbersome notation, we will also use the shorthand \mathbf{K} for \mathbf{K}_p , where the p subscript is omitted. Specifically, the Nyström method approximates \mathbf{K} by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{K}_{n,n} = [k_p(\mathbf{x}_{s_i}, \mathbf{x}_{s_j})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}, \\ \mathbf{K}_{N,n} = \mathbf{K}_{n,N}^\top = [k_p(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{s_j})]_{1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq n} \end{array}, \quad (18)$$

which can be interpreted as computing the similarity between inputs \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j only through the projection of their feature vectors onto the span of the feature vectors corresponding to inducing points. To convert this approximation into a preconditioner, the Woodbury method is commonly used:

$$\mathbf{M}^{-1} = (\mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N} + \eta \mathbf{I})^{-1} = \eta^{-1} [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_{N,n} (\eta \mathbf{K}_{n,n} + \mathbf{K}_{n,N} \mathbf{K}_{N,n})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N}] \quad (19)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is a parameter of the preconditioner (sometimes called a *nugget*) to be specified. The time complexity of calculating \mathbf{M}^{-1} is $O(n^3 + n^2N)$, significantly smaller than $O(N^3)$ for taking the inverse of \mathbf{K} when $n \ll N$. Nyström approximations have recently been considered in combination with Stein reproducing kernels in [29], though there the task of numerically solving the Stein equation was not considered.

3.3.3 Nyström Preconditioning and Diagonal Sampling

The performance of Nyström-based methods can be sensitive to which n inducing points are selected, and several methods for node selection have been developed. These methods can be classified into *fixed sampling* and *adaptive sampling*. Fixed sampling methods sample without replacement from a fixed probability distribution to select n nodes, with the uniform distribution giving rise to the classic Nyström method. Adaptive sampling methods instead update the sampling scheme to ensure good coverage of the domain, typically by down-weighting nodes that are close to nodes which have already been selected. A trade-off between efficiency and accuracy exists for these sampling methods, as complex sampling methods spend more time selecting higher quality nodes for Nyström method.

For this manuscript, we focus on a fixed sampling method called *diagonal sampling*. Diagonal sampling [17] samples collocation nodes with probabilities proportional to $[\mathbf{K}_p]_{i,i}$ (note that the referenced work contains an erroneous square on the sampling probability, which was rectified in later work). From (17), we see that diagonal sampling preferentially samples nodes from the tail of p ; i.e. samples are over-dispersed. This idea is similar to that of [53], who suggested obtaining the original node set $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ by sampling from $q(\mathbf{x}) \propto \sqrt{k_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}p(\mathbf{x})$ using MCMC, which also leads to samples that are typically over-dispersed.

3.3.4 Fully Independent Training Conditional

The fully independent training conditional (FITC) approach was introduced in [44] as an approximation technique for computing with Gaussian processes, where \mathbf{K}_p is interpreted as a covariance matrix. To avoid cumbersome notation, we again use the shorthand \mathbf{K} for \mathbf{K}_p , where the p subscript is omitted. The FITC approach can be viewed as the Nyström approximation (18) together with an additional correction term:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N} + \text{diag}(\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N})$$

Here the second term is a diagonal matrix which serves as a correction term for the marginal variance that is not fully captured by the inducing points (i.e. the diagonal of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ now coincides with the diagonal of \mathbf{K}). Denote $\mathbf{D} := \text{diag}(\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N}) + \eta \mathbf{I}$. Since \mathbf{D} is diagonal, we use Woodbury matrix inversion formula and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}^{-1} &= [\mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N} + \underbrace{\text{diag}(\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}_{N,n} \mathbf{K}_{n,n}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N})}_{=: \mathbf{D}} + \eta \mathbf{I}]^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{N,n} (\mathbf{K}_{n,n} + \mathbf{K}_{n,N} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{N,n})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{n,N} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

at $O(n^3 + n^2N)$ computational cost.

3.3.5 Randomised Nyström Preconditioning

The randomised Nyström preconditioner [23] leverages the same idea of Nyström method, but instead of sampling a small subset of rows and columns of the kernel matrix, it uses random projections to achieve a low-rank approximation. Let $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ have entries drawn independently from the standard Gaussian distribution. The kernel matrix is then approximated by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_p \approx \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega} (\mathbf{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega} + \eta \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega})^\top.$$

An application of the Woodbury identity leads to the preconditioner

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}^{-1} &= (\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega} (\mathbf{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega} + \eta \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega})^\top)^{-1} \\ &= \eta^{-1} [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega} (\eta (\mathbf{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega}) + (\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega})^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega})^{-1} (\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega})^\top]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The randomised Nyström preconditioner has time complexity $O(n^3 + n^2 N)$, identical to the classic Nyström preconditioner, but this perspective naturally accommodates several generalisations beyond the Gaussian matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ that we have presented. For example, the use of sparse Johnson-Lindenstrauss transforms has been considered [16]. For the present purposes only the Gaussian case is considered.

3.3.6 Randomised Truncated SVD

The randomised singular value decomposition (SVD) preconditioner proposed by [26] consists of two stages: First, the original kernel matrix is projected onto a lower-dimensional subspace. Then a standard SVD is applied to the projected matrix, the result of which can be mapped back to the original dimension in the second stage. Specifically, we first generate a matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ whose entries are independently sampled from the standard Gaussian distribution, where n is the target rank. We compute $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{K}_p^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{\Omega}$ and perform a QR decomposition on \mathbf{Y} as $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$ to obtain \mathbf{Q} . We project \mathbf{K}_p onto \mathbf{Q} as $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{K}_p$. A SVD decomposition is performed on \mathbf{B} , yielding $\mathbf{B} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$. Finally the dimension is recovered by $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$. Hence, \mathbf{K}_p can be approximated by $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, and to obtain a preconditioner we use the Woodbury method

$$\mathbf{M}^{-1} = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top + \eta \mathbf{I})^{-1} = \eta^{-1} [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{U}(\eta \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{V}]$$

at $O(n^3 + n^2 N)$ computational cost. This method, together with randomised Nyström preconditioning, are general-purpose strategies that do not leverage the origins of \mathbf{K}_p as a kernel matrix.

3.3.7 Spectral Preconditioning

Our final candidate is the spectral preconditioner proposed by [34]. To motivate this preconditioner, note that our linear system (14) is a discrete version of the least-squares task

$$\min_{h \in \mathcal{H}(k_p)} \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - h(\mathbf{x}_n))^2, \quad (21)$$

which can be equivalently stated as the minimisation of a quadratic function on $\mathcal{H}(k_p)$ defined by a positive (empirical covariance) operator. The convergence speed of iterative

methods such as CG depends on the condition number of this operator. To accelerate the convergence of gradient descent, [33] proposed a preconditioning operator that replaces the leading $r - 1$ eigenvalues of the operator with the r th largest. The actual preconditioner we implement is an approximation to this preconditioning operator computed with subsampling [34, 1], and is used to directly perform CG in the RKHS. Using the same notation as in (18), let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r$ be the leading eigenvalues of $\mathbf{K}_{n,n}$ with $r \leq n$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_r = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{r-1})$. Similarly define $\mathbf{V}_r = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{r-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r-1}$ to be the matrix composed of the corresponding eigenvectors, each satisfying $\|\mathbf{v}_i\| = 1$. Then, the preconditioner corresponds to setting

$$\mathbf{M}^{-1} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{E}_n \mathbf{V}_r (\mathbf{I} - \lambda_r \mathbf{\Lambda}_r^{-1}) \mathbf{\Lambda}_r^{-1} \mathbf{V}_r^\top \mathbf{K}_{n,N},$$

where $\mathbf{E}_n = [\mathbf{e}_{s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{s_n}]$ and s_1, \dots, s_n again denote the indices of the collocation nodes that were sampled. Note that \mathbf{M} is not symmetric as it is derived from the CG algorithm in the RKHS, while the underlying preconditioning operator is symmetric with respect to the RKHS inner product.

4 Empirical Assessment

This section presents an empirical comparison of the preconditioners from Section 3.3. Our test bed is a logistic regression problem described in Section 4.1. The results are presented in Section 4.2 and the scalability of these methods is discussed in Section 4.3. Python code to reproduce these results can be downloaded from <https://github.com/MatthewAlexanderFisher/FastStein>.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Logistic Regression Test Bed: Logistic regression is a simple example of an analytically intractable posterior distribution for which numerical methods are required. Full details are reserved for the Online Appendix, but we note that the dimension of the posterior was initially fixed to $d = 4$. Approximate samples were generated from the posterior distribution obtained using random walk Metropolis–Hastings MCMC, and we took the first N *distinct* samples as our collocation nodes $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$. Initially $N = 10^3$ samples were generated, so that the linear system (14) could be exactly solved to provide a ground truth against which performance can be measured; performance on tasks with larger N will be discussed in Section 4.3. For the base kernel k in (15) we used the inverse multi-quadric function $\phi(\cdot) = (1 + \|\cdot\|^2)^{-1/2}$, which is a common choice for construction of Stein kernels [25], and a length scale $\ell > 0$ to be specified. Through varying the length scale the condition of the matrix \mathbf{K}_p was worsened or improved, so that a range of task difficulties were considered.

Performance Metric: For this empirical assessment we focused on a performance metric that is directly related to the motivating numerical task. Namely, we considered the minimum number of iterations m_{PCG} of preconditioned CG required until the iterate $\mathbf{w}_{m_{\text{PCG}}}$ has worst-case error $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_{m_{\text{PCG}}})$ falling within 1% of the worst-case error $\sigma(\mathbf{w})$ that would be achieved by the exact solution \mathbf{w} of (14); i.e. $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_{m_{\text{PCG}}}) < 1.01\sigma(\mathbf{w})$. This

number m_{PCG} can be compared to the corresponding number of iterations m_{CG} required by standard CG, and we define the *gain* as

$$\text{gain} = \log \left(\frac{1 + m_{\text{CG}}}{1 + m_{\text{PCG}}} \right).$$

A positive gain indicates an improvement compared to standard CG, while a negative gain indicates inferior performance compared to standard CG. This performance measure amounts to focusing on the worst-case performance of the estimator for $f = c + v$ with v constrained to the unit ball of $\mathcal{H}(k_p)$, and avoids the need to focus on a specific test function f in our assessment. A total of 50 replicate logistic regression datasets were constructed and the average gain across these different experiments was reported.

Although we do not report timings in these experiments (since these depend heavily on the implementation used), we enforced approximate comparability among the preconditioning methods by insisting that the computational complexity associated with $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}-1}$ is $O(N^2)$, so that the overall complexity of preconditioned CG is unchanged relative to the standard CG method. For example, in the case of Nyström preconditioning, we take the number n of inducing points to be $n = O(N^{1/2})$, since the computational complexity of $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}-1}$ is $O(n^3 + n^2N)$.

4.2 Comparison of Preconditioners

The results of our investigation are summarised in Figure 1, where the gain of different preconditioning strategies is displayed as a function of the length scale ℓ , and as a function of the parameters pertinent to each preconditioning method. (Large values of ℓ correspond to matrices that are more ill-conditioned.)

First we note that not all preconditioners are equal, and there is no single strategy that dominates the others over all problem settings considered. Second, we observe that all preconditioners *worsened* performance at small values of ℓ . On the other hand, all preconditioners except Jacobi yielded improvements for certain regimes of ℓ and η , though these regimes were not intuitive (to us) to predict at the outset. In favourable settings, gains of 3-4 were observed, corresponding a 20-50 times reduction in the number of iterations required, which is substantial. The randomised SVD preconditioner demonstrated some of the best and worst performance, depending on the ℓ and η regime, while Nyström and spectral preconditioners offered reliable modest gains of 0-2, corresponding to a 1-7 times reduction in the number of iterations required, provided that ℓ was not too small.

In the Online Appendix we show that the results we present are not strongly affected by the dimension d of the posterior distribution that defines the numerical task.

4.3 Scaling to Large N

Though we lose access to a ground truth when N is large, we were curious whether the Jacobi preconditioner might demonstrate gains in this setting, given that it had previously been advocated in the PDE context [20]. To investigate, we fixed a logistic regression task and ran 5×10^4 iterations of MCMC, which is a realistic sample size for MCMC output, obtaining $N = 23,282$ distinct collocation nodes in total. The worst-case error $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)$ was computed as a function of the number m of iterations for both Jacobi preconditioned




Figure 1: Empirical comparison of preconditioning strategies for fast approximate solution of the canonical Stein equation. (The dimension was $d = 4$.) The colours on the heat map show a Monte Carlo estimate of the average gain, calculated over 50 replicate datasets, while the numbers on the heat map show the standard error associated to each Monte Carlo estimate. Blue represents positive gain (improved performance) and red represents negative gain (reduced performance) relative to the standard conjugate gradient method. Log base 10 of the length scale ℓ of the kernel and log base 10 of the nugget η used in Woodbury formula are shown on the horizontal and vertical axes respectively for the second to the sixth preconditioning strategies. For block Jacobi preconditioning, the block size b is shown on the vertical axis. For spectral preconditioning, the number of the replaced top eigenvalues r is presented on the vertical axis.




Figure 2: Performance of Jacobi preconditioning for large MCMC output. Here the worst-case error $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)$ in (16) was computed as a function of the number m of iterations of both standard and preconditioned CG, where the number of MCMC iterations was 5×10^4 (corresponding to $N = 23,282$ distinct collocation nodes). Here, we set $\ell = 1$ and used the Jacobi preconditioner with $b = 1$, so that the preconditioner was diagonal.

(block size $b = 1$) and standard CG. The results are displayed in Figure 2 and show that a non-trivial reduction in approximation error is achieved during the initial iterations, but the number of iterations required to achieve convergence was essentially unchanged.

5 Discussion

Despite considerable recent interest and encouraging proofs-of-concept, the numerical solution of Stein equations remains a challenging task. This article shed light on the challenge, and explored the potential of numerical preconditioning techniques to improve the cost-accuracy trade-off. Our main finding was that preconditioning can be an effective strategy, but that the performance of different preconditioners was highly context-dependent. At the same time, we acknowledge the limitations of our empirical investigation, which focused on a particular logistic regression example, a particular kernel, and samples provided by a particular MCMC method. The cumulative weight of subsequent empirical evidence will be required to determine the generality with which our findings hold.

As a possible avenue for future work, we note that restricting the function space can provide an orthogonal route to reduction in computational cost that can also exploit preconditioning, as exemplified in [45, 35]. As another avenue, our results suggest the potential of combining different preconditioners together, to benefit from their complementary performance in different regimes.

More speculatively, we note that the same linear system (14) appears in the *Stein importance sampling* method [32, 28, 22, 53], albeit in a constrained optimisation context where one wishes to minimise $\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w}$ subject to $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1$ and $\mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0}$; we speculate on a useful role for the preconditioning techniques that we have discussed. Further, in

practice one is usually faced with solving a collection of related linear systems (e.g. in exploring the effect of the length scale ℓ , as we noted in Section 3.2.1). Techniques such as warm-starting, subspace recycling, and meta-learning may offer a useful additional speed-up in that broader context [43, 52, 31].

Acknowledgments QL was supported by the China Scholarship Council 202408060123. HK and CJO were supported by EPSRC EP/W019590/1. CJO was supported by The Alan Turing Institute and a Philip Leverhulme Prize PLP-2023-004. FXB was supported by EPSRC EP/Y022300/1.

Online Appendices

These appendices are online-only supplement to the manuscript *Fast Approximate Solutions of Stein Equations for Post-Processing of MCMC* by Liu *et al.*, 2025.

A Proof of Proposition

First consider $c \in \mathbb{R}$ to be fixed. Following identical reasoning to that used in the discussion of collocation methods in the main text, a solution $v_N(\cdot; c)$ to

$$\arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{H}(k_p)} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)} \text{ such that } f(\mathbf{x}_n) = c + v(\mathbf{x}_n), \quad n = 1, \dots, N$$

will have the form

$$v_N(\mathbf{x}; c) = \sum_{n=1}^N w_n(c) k_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_n),$$

for some weights $\mathbf{w}(c) = [w_1(c), \dots, w_N(c)]^\top$. Since

$$\|v_n(\cdot; c)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_p)}^2 = \mathbf{w}(c)^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w}(c),$$

the original optimisation problem is equivalent to

$$\arg \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} \text{ such that } \mathbf{f} = c\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w}.$$

This is a linearly constrained quadratic programme which can be solved in closed-form using Lagrange multipliers $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N]^\top$. That is, we consider the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(c, \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top (c\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{f})$$

and solve for the values c , \mathbf{w} and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ for which $\partial_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{0}$, $\partial_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{L} = \mathbf{0}$, and $\partial_c \mathcal{L} = 0$. That is to solve

$$\begin{aligned} c\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{f} &= \mathbf{0} \\ 2\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{K}_p \boldsymbol{\lambda} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{1} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since k_p is a symmetric and positive definite kernel, and since the collocation nodes $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ are assumed to be distinct, the matrix \mathbf{K}_p is invertible, and we have that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{K}_p^{-1}(\mathbf{f} - c\mathbf{1})$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = 2\mathbf{w}$. Eliminating \mathbf{w} and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ from the simultaneous equations and solving for c , we obtain the stated result.

B Pseudocode

Pseudocode for memory-efficient computation of $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}$ is presented in Algorithm 1. This pseudocode assumes that the gradients $\mathbf{g}_n := (\nabla \log p)(\mathbf{x}_n)$ have been pre-computed and cached. The memory bandwidth B should be selected so that a $B \times N$ sub-matrix of \mathbf{K}_p can be comfortably stored in RAM.

Algorithm 1 Memory-Efficient Multiplication with \mathbf{K}_p

Require: $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ (states), $(\mathbf{g}_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ (gradients), B (memory bandwidth)

- 1: **procedure** $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}(\mathbf{v})$
- 2: $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ ▷ initialise $N \times 1$ vector
- 3: **for** $b = 1, \dots, \lceil N/B \rceil$ **do** ▷ for each batch
- 4: $(n_{\min}, n_{\max}) \leftarrow ((b-1)B + 1, \min(N, bB))$ ▷ range of data to load
- 5: $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ ▷ initialise $(n_{\max} - n_{\min} + 1) \times N$ matrix
- 6: **parfor** $n_{\min} \leq i \leq n_{\max}$ and $1 \leq j \leq N$ **do** ▷ parallel for loop
- 7: $\kappa_{i-n_{\min}+1, j} \leftarrow (\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla_2 k)(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) + (\nabla_1 k)(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \cdot \mathbf{g}_j$
+ $\mathbf{g}_i \cdot (\nabla_2 k)(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) + k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \mathbf{g}_i \cdot \mathbf{g}_j$ ▷ Stein kernel
- 8: **end parfor**
- 9: $[a_n]_{n_{\min} \leq n \leq n_{\max}} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\kappa}[v_n]_{n_{\min} \leq n \leq n_{\max}}$ ▷ compute b th block
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **end procedure** ▷ return \mathbf{a}

Pseudocode for the preconditioned conjugate gradient method that we implemented is contained in Algorithm 2. The pseudocode does not specify a termination criterion. For the experiments that we conducted, the termination criterion was $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)/\sigma(\mathbf{w})$ and the tolerance was $\tau = 1.01$, meaning that the algorithm terminated when the worst case integration error $\sigma(\mathbf{w}_m)$, defined in (16), was within 1% of the worst case integration error obtained by exactly solving the linear system (14). In practice $\sigma(\mathbf{w})$ will not be exactly known, as this depends on the solution of the linear system (14) itself, and an alternative termination criterion will be required; this could be residual-based (e.g. $\|\mathbf{r}_m\|/\|\mathbf{r}_0\| > \tau$) or simply terminating after a prescribed number of iterations have been performed.

C Logistic Regression Test Bed

Logistic regression is perhaps the most commonly encountered example of a Bayesian analysis where the posterior distribution does not admit a closed form, and is therefore a suitable test bed for this work.

C.1 The Logistic Regression Model

Suppose we have data $\{(\mathbf{z}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{data}}}$ consisting of *covariates* $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and *responses* $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, and the aim is to learn a statistical model capable of predicting responses when covariates are provided. The *logistic regression* model interprets the responses y_i as realisations of random variables Y_i , which are conditionally independent given *parameters*

Algorithm 2 Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient for the Stein Equation

Require: $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}(\cdot)$, $\text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}(\cdot)$, $\text{criterion}(\cdot)$

```

1: procedure PCG-STEIN( $\mathbf{w}_0$ ,  $\tau$ )                                ▷ initial guess  $\mathbf{w}_0$  and tolerance  $\tau$ 
2:    $\mathbf{r}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{1} - \text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}(\mathbf{w}_0)$                                 ▷ initial residual
3:    $\mathbf{z}_0 \leftarrow \text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}(\mathbf{r}_0)$                                 ▷ apply inverse preconditioner
4:    $\mathbf{s}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{z}_0$                                 ▷ initial search direction
5:    $m \leftarrow 0$                                 ▷ initialise iteration counter
6:   while  $\text{criterion}(\mathbf{w}_m) > \tau$  do                                ▷ termination criterion
7:      $\alpha_m \leftarrow \langle \mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{z}_m \rangle / \langle \mathbf{s}_m, \text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}(\mathbf{s}_m) \rangle$ 
8:      $\mathbf{w}_{m+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_m + \alpha_m \mathbf{s}_m$                                 ▷ update approximate solution
9:      $\mathbf{r}_{m+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_m - \alpha_m \text{Act}_{\mathbf{K}_p}(\mathbf{s}_m)$                                 ▷ updated residual
10:     $\mathbf{z}_{m+1} \leftarrow \text{Act}_{\mathbf{M}^{-1}}(\mathbf{r}_{m+1})$                                 ▷ apply inverse preconditioner
11:     $\beta_{m+1} \leftarrow \langle \mathbf{r}_{m+1}, \mathbf{z}_{m+1} \rangle / \langle \mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{z}_m \rangle$ 
12:     $\mathbf{s}_{m+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{z}_{m+1} + \beta_{m+1} \mathbf{s}_m$                                 ▷ next search direction
13:     $m \leftarrow m + 1$                                 ▷ update iteration counter
14:  end while
15: end procedure                                ▷ return  $\mathbf{w}_m$ 

```

$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$\text{Prob}(Y_i = 1 | \mathbf{X}) = \rho_i(\mathbf{X}), \quad \rho_i(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{z}_i \rangle)}. \quad (22)$$

It is common to assume that the first element of each vector \mathbf{z}_i is the constant 1, so that X_1 can be viewed as a baseline rate or intercept. Conditional on $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, the response data admit the probability mass function

$$p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{data}}} \rho_i(\mathbf{x})^{y_i} [1 - \rho_i(\mathbf{x})]^{1-y_i}.$$

The Bayesian framework requires also a prior density function for \mathbf{X} , and for this work we took $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/2)$. In this case the posterior distribution admits a density function

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv p_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) \propto p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2}{2}\right) \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{data}}} \rho_i(\mathbf{x})^{y_i} [1 - \rho_i(\mathbf{x})]^{1-y_i} \end{aligned}$$

for which the normalisation constant $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y})$ cannot be analytically computed. As a result, numerical approximation is required to perform Bayesian inference using a logistic regression model, and numerical methods such as MCMC are routinely employed. The logistic regression model is a simple instance of a *generalised linear model*, or more generally of a *statistical model*, and increasing model complexity is usually associated with a more complex posterior distribution, increasing the difficulty of the numerical task.

C.2 Data Generation

For the assessment reported in the main text, we fixed the data-generating parameters to $\mathbf{x} = [1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4]$, reflecting the typical situation where some covariates are more influential than others in the model. Then we sampled the covariates $\mathbf{z}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ independently for $i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{data}}$ with the number of data $n_{\text{data}} = 10^3$ fixed. Conditional on the covariates, responses y_i were sampled from the logistic regression model (22). A single realisation of the dataset was stored before comparing the performance of different preconditioners, so that randomness in the data generation does not act as a confounding factor in the empirical assessment.

The Metropolis–Hastings algorithm that we used was based on a Gaussian symmetric random walk proposal with covariance $\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I}$, where the variance parameter ϵ was manually tuned through visual inspection of the trace plot. The acceptance rate was approximately 0.251 when $d = 4$, while for $d = 10$ the acceptance rate was approximately 0.059. For the experiments reported in the main text, we ran MCMC until 1,000 *distinct* samples were obtained.

The full workflow was replicated a total of 50 times, and average gains (and associated standard errors) were reported.

D Experimental Details

This appendix contains full details required to reproduce the experiments that were reported in the main text.

D.1 Specific Details for Preconditioners

D.1.1 Jacobi Preconditioning

In our experiment, the sizes of the blocks of preconditioners are $b = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. When the size is 1, the block Jacobi preconditioner is reduced to be the classic Jacobi preconditioner. If the data size is not divisible by the block size b , the size of the last block is the remainder.

D.1.2 Nyström Preconditioning

We used $n = 50$ as the number of selected collocation nodes. We used the `jax.numpy.linalg.pinv` function to calculate the inverse part in the Nyström preconditioner. We use $\eta = 10^{-4}, 10^{-2}, 1, 10^2, 10^4$ as the constant required in the Woodbury inverse formula. The same set of η values are used for all the rest preconditioners.

D.1.3 Nyström Preconditioning and Diagonal Sampling

We used $n = 50$ as the number of selected collocation nodes.

D.1.4 Randomised Truncated SVD

We used $n = 50$ as the rank of the approximation. We used `jax.numpy.linalg.qr` and `jax.numpy.linalg.svd` function to do the QR decomposition and SVD decomposition.

D.1.5 Fully Independent Training Conditional

We selected $n = 50$ inducing points uniformly at random from the 1,000 data points.

D.1.6 Spectral Preconditioning

We used the top $r = 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$ eigenvalues and $n = 50$ inducing points.

E Additional Experimental Results

Here we varied the dimension d of the logistic regression task from $d = 4$ in the main text to $d = 10$, to understand how the performance of different preconditioners depends on the dimension of the posterior distribution defining the numerical task. The regression coefficients were now taken to be $\mathbf{x} = [1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots, 1/10]$. Results are reported in Figure 3. It can be seen that the performance of preconditioners was broadly similar to the case $d = 4$ presented in the main text.

References

- [1] Abedsoltan, A., Pandit, P., Rademacher, L., Belkin, M.: On the Nyström approximation for preconditioning in kernel machines. In: International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pp. 3718–3726. PMLR (2024)
- [2] Anastasiou, A., Barp, A., Briol, F.X., Ebner, B., Gaunt, R.E., Ghaderinezhad, F., Gorham, J., Gretton, A., Ley, C., Liu, Q., Mackey, L., Oates, C.J., Reinert, G., Swan, Y.: Stein’s method meets computational statistics: A review of some recent developments. *Statistical Science* **38**(1), 120–139 (2023)
- [3] Barp, A., Oates, C.J., Porcu, E., Girolami, M.: A Riemann–Stein kernel method. *Bernoulli* **28**(4), 2181–2208 (2022)
- [4] Barp, A., Simon-Gabriel, C.J., Girolami, M., Mackey, L.: Targeted separation and convergence with kernel discrepancies. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12835 (2022)
- [5] Belomestny, D., Goldman, A., Naumov, A., Samsonov, S.: Theoretical guarantees for neural control variates in MCMC. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* **220**, 382–405 (2024)
- [6] Belomestny, D., Iosipoi, L., Moulines, E., Naumov, A., Samsonov, S.: Variance reduction for Markov chains with application to MCMC. *Statistics and Computing* **30**, 973–997 (2020)
- [7] Bhattacharya, A., Linero, A., Oates, C.J.: Grand challenges in Bayesian computation. *Bulletin of the International Society for Bayesian Analysis* **31**(3) (2024)
- [8] Blei, D.M., Kucukelbir, A., McAuliffe, J.D.: Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American statistical Association* **112**(518), 859–877 (2017)




Figure 3: Empirical comparison of preconditioning strategies for fast approximate solution of the canonical Stein equation. (The dimension was $d = 10$.) The colours on the heat map show a Monte Carlo estimate of the average gain, calculated over 50 replicate datasets, while the numbers on the heat map show the standard error associated to each Monte Carlo estimate. Blue represents positive gain (improved performance) and red represents negative gain (reduced performance) relative to the standard conjugate gradient method. Log base 10 of the length scale ℓ of the kernel and log base 10 of the nugget η used in Woodbury formula are shown on the horizontal and vertical axes respectively for the second to the sixth preconditioning strategies. For block Jacobi preconditioning, the block size b is shown on the vertical axis. For spectral preconditioning, the number of the replaced top eigenvalues r is presented on the vertical axis.

- [9] Briol, F.X., Oates, C.J., Cockayne, J., Chen, W.Y., Girolami, M.: On the sampling problem for kernel quadrature. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 586–595 (2017)
- [10] Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M.D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M.A., Guo, J., Li, P., Riddell, A.: Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical Software* **76**(1), 1–32 (2017)

- [11] Chen, J.S., Hillman, M., Chi, S.W.: Meshfree methods: Progress made after 20 years. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* **143**(4), 04017,001 (2017)
- [12] Chen, Y., Huang, D.Z., Huang, J., Reich, S., Stuart, A.M.: Gradient flows for sampling: Mean-field models, Gaussian approximations and affine invariance. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11024 (2023)
- [13] Chen, Z., Naslidnyk, M., Gretton, A., Briol, F.X.: Conditional Bayesian quadrature. In: *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence* (2024)
- [14] Chopin, N., Papaspiliopoulos, O.: *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer (2020)
- [15] Cutajar, K., Osborne, M., Cunningham, J., Filippone, M.: Preconditioning kernel matrices. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2529–2538. PMLR (2016)
- [16] Demmel, J., Grigori, L., Rusciano, A.: An improved analysis and unified perspective on deterministic and randomized low-rank matrix approximation. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **44**(2), 559–591 (2023)
- [17] Drineas, P., Mahoney, M.W.: On the Nyström method for approximating a Gram matrix for improved kernel-based learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **6**, 2153–2175 (2005)
- [18] Fasshauer, G.: *Meshfree Approximation with MATLAB*. World Scientific (2008)
- [19] Fasshauer, G.E.: Solving partial differential equations by collocation with radial basis functions. In: *Proceedings of Chamonix*, pp. 1–8 (1996)
- [20] Fasshauer, G.E.: Solving differential equations with radial basis functions: Multilevel methods and smoothing. *Advances in Computational Mathematics* **11**(2), 139–159 (1999)
- [21] Fearnhead, P., Nemeth, C., Oates, C.J., Sherlock, C.: *Scalable Monte Carlo for Bayesian Learning*. Cambridge University Press (2025). In press.
- [22] Fisher, M., Oates, C.J.: Gradient-free kernel Stein discrepancy. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36 (2023)
- [23] Frangella, Zachary and Tropp, Joel A. and Udell, Madeleine: Randomized Nyström Preconditioning. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **44**(2), 718–752 (2023)
- [24] Golub, G.H., Van Loan, C.F.: *Matrix Computations*, 4th edn. The Johns Hopkins University Press (2013)
- [25] Gorham, J., Mackey, L.: Measuring sample quality with kernels. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1292–1301. PMLR (2017)

- [26] Halko, N., Martinsson, P.G., Tropp, J.A.: Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions. *SIAM Review* **53**(2), 217–288 (2011)
- [27] Hestenes, M.R., Stiefel, E.: Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards* **49**(6) (1952)
- [28] Hodgkinson, L., Salomone, R., Roosta, F.: The reproducing Stein kernel approach for post-hoc corrected sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09266* (2020)
- [29] Kalinke, F., Szabo, Z., Sriperumbudur, B.K.: Nyström kernel Stein discrepancy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08401* (2024)
- [30] Leluc, R., Portier, F., Segers, J., Zhuman, A.: Speeding up Monte Carlo integration: Control neighbors for optimal convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06151* (2023)
- [31] Lin, J.A., Padhy, S., Mlodozieniec, B., Antorán, J., Hernández-Lobato, J.M.: Improving linear system solvers for hyperparameter optimisation in iterative Gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18457* (2024)
- [32] Liu, Q., Lee, J.: Black-box importance sampling. In: *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 952–961. PMLR (2017)
- [33] Ma, S., Belkin, M.: Diving into the shallows: A computational perspective on large-scale shallow learning. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017)
- [34] Ma, S., Belkin, M.: Kernel machines that adapt to GPUs for effective large batch training. In: *Annual Conference on Machine Learning and Systems*, pp. 360–373 (2019)
- [35] Meanti, G., Carratino, L., Rosasco, L., Rudi, A.: Kernel methods through the roof: Handling billions of points efficiently. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 14,410–14,422 (2020)
- [36] Meyn, S.P., Tweedie, R.L.: *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
- [37] Nocedal, J., Wright, S.J.: *Numerical Optimization*. Springer (1999)
- [38] Novak, E.: Optimal algorithms for numerical integration: Recent results and open problems. In: *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods*, pp. 105–131 (2024)
- [39] Nyström, E.J.: Über die praktische auflösung von integralgleichungen mit anwendungen auf randwertaufgaben. *Acta Mathematica* **54**(1), 185–204 (1930)
- [40] Oates, C.J.: Minimum kernel discrepancy estimators. In: *International Conference on Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing*, pp. 133–161. Springer (2022)

- [41] Oates, C.J., Cockayne, J., Briol, F.X., Girolami, M.: Convergence rates for a class of estimators based on Stein’s method. *Bernoulli* **25**(2), 1141–1159 (2019)
- [42] Oates, C.J., Girolami, M., Chopin, N.: Control functionals for Monte Carlo integration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **79**(3), 695–718 (2017)
- [43] Parks, M.L., De Sturler, E., Mackey, G., Johnson, D.D., Maiti, S.: Recycling Krylov subspaces for sequences of linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **28**(5), 1651–1674 (2006)
- [44] Quinonero-Candela, J., Rasmussen, C.E.: A unifying view of sparse approximate Gaussian process regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **6**, 1939–1959 (2005)
- [45] Rudi, A., Carratino, L., Rosasco, L.: FALKON: An optimal large scale kernel method. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017)
- [46] Si, S., Oates, C.J., Duncan, A.B., Carin, L., Briol, F.X.: Scalable control variates for Monte Carlo methods via stochastic optimization. In: *International Conference on Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing*, pp. 205–221. Springer (2020)
- [47] South, L.F., Karvonen, T., Nemeth, C., Girolami, M., Oates, C.J.: Semi-exact control functionals from Sard’s method. *Biometrika* **109**(2), 351–367 (2022)
- [48] South, L.F., Oates, C.J., Mira, A., Drovandi, C.: Regularized zero-variance control variates. *Bayesian Analysis* **18**(3), 865–888 (2023)
- [49] South, L.F., Riabiz, M., Teymur, O., Oates, C.J.: Postprocessing of MCMC. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **9**(1), 529–555 (2022)
- [50] Stein, C.: A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 2: Probability Theory*, pp. 583–603. University of California Press (1972)
- [51] Sun, Z., Barp, A., Briol, F.X.: Vector-valued control variates. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 32,819–32,846. PMLR (2023)
- [52] Sun, Z., Oates, C.J., Briol, F.X.: Meta-learning control variates: Variance reduction with limited data. In: *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 2047–2057. PMLR (2023)
- [53] Wang, C., Chen, Y., Kanagawa, H., Oates, C.J.: Stein Π -importance sampling. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2023)
- [54] Wendland, H.: *Scattered Data Approximation*. Cambridge University Press (2004)